



"I indeed Baptize with Water"

A BOOK FOR THE TIMES:

OR THE PHILOSOPHY OF

79374

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM;

SCRIPTURALLY, HISTORICALLY, AND RATIONALLY ESTABLISHED, BY THE TESTIMONY OF NUMEROUS AND CREDIBLE WITNESSES, BOTH ANCIENT AND MODERN.

EXHIBITING THE TRUE

NATURE AND DESIGN, ELIGIBLE SUBJECTS, SCRIPTURAL MODE, AND BINDING OBLIGATIONS, OF THIS

DIVINE ORDINANCE.

BY
in
REV. H. GILLMORE,

OF THE M. E. CHURCH,

AUTHOR OF "LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY."

PUBLISHED BY A COMMITTEE.

PRINTED BY W. R. ALLISON,

STEUBENVILLE, OHIO.

1846.

EV
211
G-2

CORRESPONDENCE.

REV. H. GILLMORE,

DEAR BROTHER:—

In this age of Book-making we are impressed with the belief, that another might be added to the list, which would greatly subserve the interests of Christianity. A Book embracing, in a condensed form, the substance of the arguments in favor of Scripture Baptism, we think would help greatly to silence the captious, and establish the weak and wavering.

If your duties will permit, we respectfully request you to prepare such a work for publication.

Yours, respectfully,

THE COMMITTEE.

Steubenville, Ohio, Jan. 1st, 1846.

TO THE COMMITTEE,

DEAR BRETHREN:—

I have long been of the opinion that a small work on the subject of Christian Baptism, of the character of which you speak, is highly necessary, and might aid much in presenting truth in a clearer light, and settle the minds of the wavering. It is surprising that such a work has not long since been furnished to the public. But as no one has yet undertaken the task, and as you have done me the honor of requesting it from my pen, I shall cheerfully endeavor to comply with your request, though it may be in the midst of pressing cares and responsibilities.

Yours, with respect,

H. GILLMORE.

Steubenville, Ohio, Jan. 10, 1846.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

FROM REV. C. D. BATTELLE OF THE METHODIST E.
CHURCH, AND REV. E. S. HOAGLAND OF THE METH-
ODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH, STEUBENVILLE, OHIO.

Having examined the manuscript of this work, especially the first and second parts, we are prepared most cheerfully to recommend it to the public.

The *plan* differs from most works on baptism, and will be found both instructive and interesting. The arguments are clear and conclusive, and we think well calculated to convince the candid that *Submersion* is not the only mode of baptism. In short, we hail it as a Book adapted to the present times, embracing, as it does, the *strength* of what has been written on this subject, in a cheap form. We do not suppose, that it will fully settle the long controversy on this subject, but believe that it will be of essential service to the sincere enquirer after truth. We say to all, carefully read, and inwardly digest it, and your labor will not be in vain.

C. D. BATTELLE,

Pastor of the M. E. Church.

E. S. HOAGLAND,

Pastor of the M. P. Church.

Steubenville, Ohio, August, 1846.

TO THE REV. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D. D.

EDITOR OF THE WESTERN CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE, CIN.

DEAR SIR,—I trust that I shall not be accused of either ostentation or flattery, while I take the liberty of dedicating these few unpretending pages to one, who has taken such deep interest in the subject therein discussed. The masterly and unflinching manner, in which you have, for many years, promoted and guarded the interests of the Church, has gained for you her unshaken confidence, and it is just that she acknowledge to you her great obligations.

Your published views on the subject of *Christian Baptism*, have disturbed the quiet of our opponents; but many minds, anxiously inquiring after truth, have been satisfied by the power of your arguments.

Your timely and valuable Treatise on *Roman Catholicism*, has called down upon your head the blessings of a Christian Protestant Community, as well as the fulminations of the Vatican.

The labours of your present office have been arduous; and unremitting, in guiding, amid whirlwind and storm, the helm of one of our most useful and popular *Periodicals* of the day.

May peace and tranquillity attend you, through the remaining cares, and toils of life, and a blissful immortality, finally, be your reward in Heaven.

I am, Dear Sir, your obliged friend, and
Servant, in the bonds of a Peaceful Gospel,
HIRAM GILLMORE.

PREFACE.

IN appearing before the public as an author, on the subject of Christian Baptism, it is deemed proper, (as all authors think, of course,) to make a few prefatory remarks explanatory of our plan; and the motives by which we have been prompted.

It has long been our opinion, that a small work on this subject, entirely different, in many respects, from any yet published, is much needed for general circulation. Many others have expressed the same opinion.—We do not suppose that too little has been written upon this prolific subject: but, for the benefit of all classes, a *synopsis* of the most forcible and convincing arguments, sustaining orthodox views of this Christian ordinance, has not yet been furnished. This seems to be what we need, and this is what has been attempted in the following pages.

Whether this desideratum has been fully and satisfactorily supplied, the public must, of course, be left to judge. In this attempt we think, at least, that the views and practice of pedo-baptists have been scripturally and logically sustained.

It is not necessary, at this stage of the controversy, to adduce many new arguments; but so to simplify and condense the arguments already furnished, as to adapt them to the understanding of all.

Simplification and *retrenchment* have been, therefore, kept constantly in view, in the preparation of this work; so as to disincumber the whole, as far as possible, of all that would be likely to embarrass those of limited means or information.

The plan adopted is, under each appropriate head, to state the proposition designed to be proved or illustrated, adduce the evidence, and draw conclusions from the whole. This plan, we think, will give both *distinctness* and *force* to the subject. It is due to say, that numerous authors, both ancient and modern, have contributed greatly in this humble effort, to furnish the reader with a kind of *Text-book*, on a subject, which, for centuries, has agitated the religious world. This general acknowledgment of indebtedness, we trust, will be satisfactory; as we do not wish to encumber the work with numerous names and titles.

If the same purity of motive shall actuate the reader of these pages, which has governed the writer, it is to be hoped, at least, that some little good may be accomplished thereby.

H. GILLMORE.

INTRODUCTION.

It is a source of great mortification to us, that our Baptist friends are constantly representing us as an *unbaptized* people; and that we do not belong to the visible church of Christ, because we do not think proper to make use of the same amount of *water* in the administration of Christian Baptism, which *they* are accustomed to use. They call our baptism invalid—they ridicule our claims to orthodoxy—yea, some of them hand us over to the devil, or the uncovenanted mercies of God. “We would, therefore, repudiate these ungenerous reflections, cast upon the fair reputation of the great body of the church;” and show, that our belief and practice, on this subject, are not based upon false premises, but are sustained by indubitable testimony drawn from numerous sources. And we hope, by the divine blessing, to relieve the minds of some who may have been influenced by the vain speculations and false philosophy of immersionists. We shall endeavor to present truth in its proper light. And though we feel disposed to treat all Christians with due respect, we can neither give up the truth, or refuse to stand in its defence. Truth never lost any thing from investigation; and when properly understood it will commend itself to every man’s judgment. Those things which involve the soul’s eternal interest, are paramount to all others, and must be studied, and carefully digested. Thousands have been led astray on

the subject of Christian baptism; and it is obvious, that the well known imposture palmed upon the world as the "ancient gospel," and other speculative systems professedly introduced for the *reformation* of mankind, have made use of *exclusive immersion*, as a proselyting engine. This is the *sumum bonum*—the supreme good, of modern times. The ignorant are entangled, and proselytes are increased by its influence. As to the propagators of this false notion of God's truth, we are led to suspect either their *honesty* or their *information*. How *bigoted*, *self-conceited*, and *restless*, are many of those, especially, who adopt Mr. Campbell's views of baptism—*immersion* for the remission of sins; and no salvation *without immersion*! This is an unjustifiable exclusiveness, which none but *bigots*, and the *ignorant*, will contend for. The ignorant are to be pitied, and instructed; but bigots, and impostors, must be left to their own folly. The exclusiveness of baptists in regard to the *subjects* of baptism, is equally reprehensible. In order, therefore, to present this subject in its proper light, it is thought advisable to inquire into the true *nature and design*, the *eligible subjects*, the *scriptural mode of application*, and the *grounds of obligation*, of this holy ordinance. This arrangement, we trust, will meet the objections of those, who place undue stress upon the ordinance, and also those who may be inclined to reject it altogether.

PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

PART FIRST.

THE TRUE NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM,

CHAPTER I.

Opinions of Different Denominations Stated.

It is of vital importance that we understand the true *nature* and *design* of Christian Baptism. If we err on these points, orthodoxy on every other, connected with the main question, will avail nothing. And there never was a period in the world's history, when men were more liable to be led astray on the subject of Baptism, than the present. Speculation is abundant—old theories, long since exploded, are reviving; or new theories, which have no authority from Scripture or reason, are rising up. And while error is gaining adherents, either for *gain*, or on the ground of *ignorance*, the lovers of Christ should speak out; the evangelical churches should be ready to promulgate and defend the truth. In regard to the subject of Baptism, it will be proper to let all denominations, as far as practicable, give their own views upon its nature and design; and then show, in what particulars evangelical churches agree. This enables the reader to compare, and choose for himself.

1. PROPOSITION.—The great body of Methodists both in Europe and America, hold that Baptism is a sacramental sign of our Christian profession, and of the new birth.

TESTIMONY. “Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth.” *Methodist Discipline*, Art. 17. “Question. What is Baptism? Ans. Baptism is a sacrament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water, to be a sign and seal of regeneration by his spirit.”—*Wesley's Sermon on the “New Birth.”*

2. PROPOSITION.—The Presbyterians hold that Baptism is a sacrament, and a sign and seal of the covenant of grace.

TESTIMONY. “Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life.”—*Confession of Faith*, page 146.

3. PROPOSITION.—The Protestant Episcopal Church considers Baptism a sign of our profession and regene-

ration, and the instrument whereby the promises of God are signed and sealed.

TESTIMONY. "Baptism is not only a sign of our profession, and mark of difference whereby Christian men are distinguished from others that are not christened; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightfully are grafted into the church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed." *Art. of Religion.*

Some of the members of the church of England incline to Baptismal regeneration in their belief; but the great majority of them hold the same views with the Prot. Epis. Church.

4. PROPOSITION.—The Lutheran Church teaches that Baptism is a sacrament, the sign and seal of God's covenant, and a recognition of our right to membership in his church; and that its efficiency is in regeneration, and by it faith is conveyed to the soul of the infant.

TESTIMONY. "Christian Baptism is a sacrament ordained by Christ, as the sign and seal of God's Covenant with his people, and a formal recognition of their right of membership in his church." *Kurtz on Infant Baptism*, page 5.

"We conclude that children believe at baptism, and have faith of their own."—*Luther*. And Luther, in writing to a friend, requesting her to become sponsor for his child

says:—"I invite you to aid in introducing her to Christianity, and become her spiritual mother, in order that through your instrumentality and assistance, she may pass from the old faith of Adam to the new birth of Christ by holy baptism."—*Table Talk*.

5. PROPOSITION.—The Catholics hold, that Baptism is a sacrament, in which a person is spiritually regenerated, and is necessary to salvation.

TESTIMONY. "As infants are not capable of helping themselves by faith and repentance, were they not capable of being helped by the sacrament of Baptism, they can have no share in Christ, and no means to be delivered from original sin, and consequently almost one half of mankind, dying before the use of reason, must inevitably *perish* if infants were not to be Baptized".—*Catholic Christian Instructed*—page 30. "Whosoever shall say that baptism is optional, that is, not necessary to salvation, let him be accursed."—*Canons of the Council of Trent*. Baptism is "a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord, in which through the external ablution of the body, with the invocation of the most Holy Trinity, a person is spiritually regenerated."—*Peter Dens' Moral Theology*.

6. PROPOSITION.—The Quakers reject the ordinance of water Baptism altogether, and as adverse to the spirituality of the Christian Religion.

TESTIMONY. On the occasion of the baptism

of the Rev. Elisha Bates, formerly an accredited minister of the society, belonging to the Ohio yearly meeting, the society of Friends, at their morning meeting, held in London, in 1836, record the following language:—"This meeting thinks it right, in much Christian love for Elisha Bates, to record its deep concern, and its continued sense, that the practice thus adverted to (against which our society has uniformly believed itself called upon to bear a public testimony, as no part of the Christian dispensation) was not instituted by our Lord and Saviour."—See *Hibbard on Ch. Baptism*, page 158.

7. PROPOSITION.—The Disciples, or more appropriately speaking, the Campbellites, hold, that Baptism by immersion, is the act of turning to God; and that without immersion there is no remission of sins. Also, that immersion produces moral purity equal to that of angels, and we must be lost without it.

TESTIMONY. As Mr. Campbell is the great *oracle of his own Church*, he must, of course, speak for them. In his "Debate with M^r. Calla," as published by himself, he tells us, that God "appointed Baptism to be to every one that believed the record he has given of his Son, a *formal pledge on his part* of that believer's personal acquittal or pardon; so significant and so expressive, that when the baptized believer rises out of the water, *is born of water*, enters the world the second time, he enters it

B

as *innocent, as clean, as unspotted, as an angel*. His conscience is purged from *guilt*, his body is washed with pure water, even the washing of *regeneration*." Again, "as soon as he," (that is, ~~the~~ sinner) "is immersed, he has evidence of forgiveness; and until then, whatever may be his feelings, or his hopes, they are delusive, and he is under condemnation." In his *Christianity Restored*, page 215, he adds, "All is mental and invisible before coming out of the water: and as immersion is the first act commanded, and the first constitutional act; so it was in the commission, *the act* by which the Apostles were commanded to turn or convert those to God, who believed their testimony. In this sense, then, it is the converting act. No man can, scripturally, be said to be converted until he is immersed."—Again, page 280, he says, "When we speak in the style of the living oracles on this subject, we must represent being born again (John iii. 5,) and regeneration (Titus iii. 5,) as relating to the act of immersion alone."

Other Baptist Churches, that do not embrace Mr. C's peculiar views relative to water regeneration, believe, with him, that baptism is designed expressly to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Making it the same in design, as the Lord's Supper.

8. PROPOSITION—Socinians hold, that Baptism is a

mere mode of professing the Religion of Christ ; while Universalists, and other heretical churches, not named, do not practice it at all.

TESTIMONY. See *Watson on Baptism* and the writings and practice of these sects. Other minor sects need not be mentioned here.

CHAPTER II.

THE OPINIONS, AND AGREEMENT OF METHODISTS, PRESBYTERIANS, PROT. EPISCOPALIANS, AND LUTHERANS, CONCERNING PROMINENT, AND IMPORTANT POINTS, AUTHORIZED AND SUSTAINED, BY SCRIPTURE AND REASON.

1. PROPOSITION.—Baptism is a *sealing* ordinance under the Christian economy, as circumcision was under the old.

TESTIMONY. It has been denied that the points of difference between circumcision and baptism, show that the latter has not been *substituted* for the former. And Mr. Campbell has laboured hard to show, that there are, at least, *fifteen* points of difference between them. But it does not follow, that when one thing is put for another, there must be, in every respect, a perfect resemblance between them. All that is necessary to constitute a substitute, is that there should be a general agreement as

to the *main object* in view, or the *great end* to be accomplished. This being the case, there may be a variety of discrepancies without, in the least, affecting the principle of substitution. Now, circumcision was a *sign* and *seal* of God's covenant with his people, solemnly entered into with Abraham nearly two thousand years anterior to the Christian era, and is thus expressed:—"*And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.*"* Of this covenant, *circumcision* was the original *sign* and *seal*, or token. But circumcision, one of the burdensome rites of the old economy, was annulled to make room for Christian Baptism, an institution better adapted to the simplicity, increased light, and more "easy yoke" of the New Testament economy. The Abrahamic covenant however, usually denominated "the covenant of grace," was not and could not be abrogated, for that was designed to be an "*everlasting covenant.*" The points of resemblance between circumcision and baptism are the following—circumcision has a spiritual meaning, so has baptism:—circumcision was a seal of a covenant guaranteeing not only temporal but also and chiefly spiritual blessings, so baptism is the pledge of

*Gen. vii. chapter.

an external relation, and outward advantages, but is mainly the seal of spiritual blessings.—Circumcision was an emblem of moral cleansing and purity. So is baptism. But baptism is actually called the *Christian circumcision*. In Col. ii. 12—we read, “ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in *baptism*. What can the apostle intend by the “*circumcision of Christ*?” Doubtless not the literal rite; but that righteousness of faith, that mortifying of sin, that quickening influence, which flow from Christ, and were signified by circumcision. But that same righteousness of faith, yea, all of these, are also signified by *baptism*. The primitive fathers also viewed baptism as a substitute for circumcision.

CHRYSOSTOM says “our circumcision, I mean the grace of *Baptism*, gives cure without pain, and procures to us a thousand benefits. And it has no determinate time, as the ancient circumcision had; but one that is in the *beginning* of his age, or one that is in the middle of it, or one that is in his old age, may receive this circumcision made without hands.” Chrysostom thus spoke within 270 years of the Apostolic age.

BASIL, his cotemporary, speaks of “the *circumcision made without hands*, which is performed in *baptism*.”

AUSTIN, another cotemporary, says—"we may make an estimate how much baptism avails *infants*, by the *circumcision* which God's people formerly received."

CYPRIAN, who lived 120 years nearer the apostolic age, says, "we have not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision, and we have received it by *baptism*."

We remark, that in consequence of these fathers understanding that Baptism was a *means* of grace, and a *sign* of inward grace, they, therefore, speak of the *grace* of *baptism*; and sometimes, by a figure of speech, put the *sign* for the thing represented.—*See writings of the Fathers.*

2. PROPOSITION.—Baptism is a pledge of our Christian discipleship.

TESTIMONY. This ordinance is a recognition and avowal of an obligation, to be like Christ. In Romans vi. 3, 4, it imports our obligation of death unto sin, and life with respect unto holiness. Paul says to the Galatians (ch. iii. 27) "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." That is, "have *clothed* yourselves with Christ." An expression among the Greeks, signifying most exact *imitation* of a person. By baptism, then, we publicly invest ourselves with Christianity. We assume the *name* and *habits*, and *profession* of Christ. We publicly engage to

act as he acted,—to imitate his example,—in a word, to be *Christians*.

3. PROPOSITION.—Christian Baptism is a sacrament.

TESTIMONY. 'The word sacrament comes from the Latin *sacramentum*, and has been borrowed from the writers of the Latin Church, and applied to baptism and the Lord's Supper. But we do not contend for the word. It is the *sense*, the *meaning*, the *idea*. *Sacramentum*, among the ancient Romans, signified a gage, or pledge in money, deposited in court by the adverse parties that went to Law, which, being forfeited by the party that was cast, was devoted to *sacred* purposes, and hence was called *sacramentum*. The word also signified an *oath* because of its sacredness. Hence, the word was used by the Latin fathers to denote those ordinances of religion, by which men came under an obligation of fidelity to the gospel.—These, on account of their sacredness, and of their being a token of voluntary submission, were deemed binding as an oath. Baptism, then, as a sacrament, confers upon its subjects the obligation of fidelity to God, arising in the scale of religious sanctity, to the awful considerations of a formal oath.—*Kurtz and Hibbard on Baptism*.

4. PROPOSITION.—Baptism is a standing proof of the divine authenticity of the Christian religion.

TESTIMONY. If this ordinance did not commence with the disciples of Christ, by his direction, *when* did it commence, and by *whom* was it first introduced? It is said to be a *Christian* ordinance, confirming God's covenant of grace with his people; prefiguring the influence of the Holy Spirit, and binding as by an oath, all that are baptized, to renounce the devil, and all his works; the vain pomp and vanities of the world. And if infidels contradict the scriptural account of its origin, and design; let them show by indubitable evidence *how*, and *when* and *where*, this ordinance originated.—The Christian can, in all confidence, view it as a stream that extends *back* to the days of Christ, when he commanded his disciples to “go, and teach all nations, baptizing them,”—as a visible, tangible, evidence of the truth of scripture. The ordinance may have passed through *unholy hands*; but its nature, and design, are still known, and it proves a blessing to all who attend to it in a proper manner.—And the *abuse* of this ordinance should not prevent true believers from appreciating it, or embolden the sceptic to assert, that it is not of God. Other coincidences are found in the opinions of evangelical denominations, but our limits will not admit of an enumeration of them.

CHAPTER III.

CONTRADICTIONS, AND ABSURDITIES, ARISING
FROM FALSE NOTIONS, RELATIVE TO THE NA-
TURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

False premises, lead to false conclusions.— And this truth is obvious in nothing more, than the subject of baptism ; while whole systems, or schemes of religion (or speculation rather,) have been based upon false notions, relative to its nature and design. Witness the endless *speculations, absurdities, and contradictions* of Mr. Campbell, on this subject. We shall notice a few of them, for the benefit of our readers.

1. PROPOSITION.—Mr. C. makes the *act*, which is immersion, and the *effect* of that act, precisely the same thing.

TESTIMONY.—“No man can scripturally, be said to be converted to God until he is *immersed*. Immersion alone is that act of turning to God.”—*Chr. Restored*, 214-15. “When we speak in the style of the living oracles on this subject, we must represent being *born again* and *regeneration*, as relating to the act of *immersion alone*.”—*Chr. Restored*, page 280.

2. PROPOSITION.—Mr. C. makes *immersion* the climax of moral purity.

TESTIMONY. He paraphrases Heb. x. 14. thus: "By one offering up of himself, he (Christ) has perfected forever the *immersed* or *sanctified*."—*Chr. Restored*, page 247. "When the baptized believer, is *born of water*, enters the world the second time, he enters it as *innocent*, as *clean*, as *unspotted*, as an *angel*."—*Debate with McCalla*.

3. PROPOSITION.—Campbellism bids us receive Christ, or turn to God, in a way that there can be no perseverance.

TESTIMONY. He tells us, that we are turned to God by *immersion*, and the apostle says: "as ye have *received* the Lord Jesus, so walk ye in him." Now if we receive Christ, by immersion alone, then must we *continue* to be immersed, so long as we walk with him! Just look at it!

4. PROPOSITION.—The Baptists make Baptism to represent a thing, to which it will not apply, even were immersion alone baptism.

TESTIMONY. Baptism, according to the opinion of all immersionists, can have no definite meaning, or application, unless it represents the *burial of Christ*. But what resemblance is there between a dip, or a plunge in the water, and the burial of Christ in the Sepulchre? There is none. None can be shown. The text generally taken to support this view is,

Rom. III. 3-6, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death. But the *burial* cannot refer to the *baptism* of Christ, as his baptism cannot be shown to have been by *immersion*. Neither can it apply to his burial in the Sepulchre, for he was placed in a rock, hewn out, for a place of deposit, and a great stone rolled against the door. The perfect dissimilarity can be seen by all. Therefore, it is absurd to make one the representative of the other. But the apostle excludes water entirely from the subject. "Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death." Not into *water*; therefore, Baptists are *wrong* in their representations, and baptism according to them, remains an *unmeaning rite*.

5. PROPOSITION.—Mr. Campbell contradicts Scripture, in asserting many things according to his theory.

TESTIMONY. "They," the apostles, "taught all the disciples to consider not only themselves as *saved* persons, but all whom they *saw* or knew to be immersed into the Lord Jesus."—*Christian System*. page 218. Now if *Simon Magus* was immersed, (and certainly he was if immersion alone is baptism) then, according to Mr. C. he was *saved*. But Peter declared that he was still, after his baptism, "in the gall of bitterness, and the bonds of iniquity." Cer-

tainly, Peter must have been *mistaken* if Mr. C. is right !

6. PROPOSITION.—Mr. C. differs from the apostle, in requiring TWELVE propositions, discussed at length, in order to show by what means a person may enjoy a knowledge of a personal and plenary pardon of all his sins.—See his *Christian System*.

TESTIMONY. Had he turned his attention to Paul's Epistle to the Romans, he could have been furnished with a single passage, that would afford more satisfaction on this point, than all he has written. "Therefore being *justified by faith* we have *peace* with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ."—See C's *Debate with McCalla*.

7. PROPOSITION.—Mr. C. gives to water a saving efficacy.

TESTIMONY. "No one acquainted with Peter's style, will think it strange, that Paul represents persons as *saved, cleansed, or sanctified by water*."—*Chr. Restored*, page 272.—Surely Mr. C. in this matter contradicts Paul in another place, and grossly misrepresents him in this, Paul's doctrine is, "By *grace* are ye *saved*, through *faith*, and that *not of yourselves*, it is the gift of God. Not of *works*, lest any man should boast." The passage alluded to by Mr. C. will be noticed in another place, in order to show, that Paul did not preach

Campbellism. How the foregoing notions, and absurdities, can find a lodging place in the minds of men acquainted with scriptural representations of God's plan of saving sinners, is one of the mysteries of these latter days, and additional evidence of human depravity.

We have no unkind feelings towards those who are *necessarily ignorant*, and embrace these views of Christian Baptism, and give evidence of hearts and lives devoted to God.— But to these notions themselves we do most sincerely and fervently object. And we are fully of the opinion that the views of Pede-Baptists on this subject, are neither subject to such difficulties, or to be overthrown by any scriptural, logical, or even *sophistical* argumentation.— Our views, when rightly understood, will bear the test of the closest scrutiny, and the most critical and rigid investigation. This has been felt by our opponents; and this endears truth to the hearts of its friends.

We must now give place to reflections upon another main branch of the question under consideration. And we trust, that the mind of the reader will yield (if it has not,) to the authority, and inflexibility of divine truth.

PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

PART SECOND.

THE ELIGIBLE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM,

CHAPTER I.

The Eligibility of Penitent Adults.

Mankind are constantly running into *extremes*. Hence we need not wonder, that this should be the case, relative to the proper *subjects* of Baptism. Some tell us that *none* are to be baptized; others hold that all who *profess Christianity*, with *all infants and little children*, are eligible subjects of this ordinance. And then, there is a difference of opinion concerning that which *constitutes* a true *believer*. But, amid the multitudinous notions embraced, and inculcated, we think that we may, by careful investigation, arrive at the *truth* on this subject. And though it may appear like a novel doctrine, and like passing out of the beaten track, we shall endeavor to make it appear, first, that *true penitents*, though unconverted, are proper subjects of Baptism. Then will follow evidence in favor of *believers and children*.

1. PROPOSITION.—True penitents are made such, by the Holy Spirit, and therefore, are entitled to receive Christian Baptism.

TESTIMONY. A man cannot make himself a penitent; neither can any, or all, the means of grace, make him such, without the influence of God's Spirit upon his heart. Christ says, "No man can come unto me except the Father which sent me, *draw* him." And this drawing is by the "*Spirit*" which saith *come*, to all sinners. Now we do not suppose, that God will thus convict a man for sin, and then prohibit his consecrating himself to Him, in the ordinance of Baptism. This would look like requiring him to become a Christian, and then withholding from him an important *ordinance* of Christianity. Who can believe it possible!

2. PROPOSITION.—Baptism is a means of grace, and therefore should not be withheld from true penitents.

TESTIMONY. Do those already converted *need* this ordinance to *confirm* and *establish* them in grace? Surely, the truly penitents are in need of it, as a means to *secure* that grace, by which the soul is saved from guilt, and impurity. If it is lawful for one, it must be for the other; for both are *sincere*, both moved by God's *grace*.

3. PROPOSITION.—True penitents were understood

by Peter, to be eligible to the ordinance of Baptism, and gave advice accordingly.

TESTIMONY. "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, repent and be *baptized* every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts ii, 37, 38. This is direct testimony.

4. PROPOSITION.—True penitents were baptized by Philip, and therefore should be Baptized now.

TESTIMONY. "After Philip had preached at Samaria, and baptized many, both men and women, Peter and John went down and "prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for as yet he was not fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts, ch. 8th. Observe, they were baptized, but they had not received the *Spirit*, and of course, they were not converted. That is, they were not changed in heart, yet they were not denied the ordinance of baptism. And how can we withhold it from true penitents now, who may be seeking sincerely, and diligently, for all that may be represented by baptism, and that too under the influence of the Spirit, which shall finally witness

C

34 SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.—TRUE BELIEVERS.

with their spirits that they are children of God; when in the appropriate means, faith is brought into full exercise. It is true, that the administrator may be *deceived* in regard to those who profess to be true penitents, and administer the ordinance to them. And so he may in regard to the professed *believer*; and inappropriately administer the ordinance. But in both instances, the responsibility must rest with the candidate, and not the administrator. After we have judged, as well as we can, by their *actions*, God must be the judge of the *heart*.—We certainly assume too much responsibility, when we refuse to baptize any who profess to be seeking the kingdom of God, and give corresponding evidence in their external conduct. And though pardon may be obtained in the use of other means of grace, yet penitents *may* obtain God's pardoning grace in the very act of attending to *Christian Baptism*. It has been the case; it may be again. Why then say, they shall not be baptized? Why refuse them the seal of the covenant—this figure and means of grace? Baptists may, but *we* cannot!

CHAPTER II.

THE ELIGIBILITY OF BELIEVING ADULTS.

It may appear like a superfluous work, to devote a chapter to the consideration of a right

to Christian Baptism, on the part of *adult believers*; as this is not questioned by any who regard the ordinance at all. But it must be kept in mind, that there is a great disagreement among men, relative to *faith*, or that which constitutes a true believer. This being the case, it is important that we define our position, and, as far as possible, understand this matter. All men have not faith; therefore all are not true believers; and impenitent unbelievers cannot be eligible to baptism.

What, then, is that faith, which distinguishes us from *un-believers*, and gives us a claim to this ordinance? How are we to understand when we *are* true believers? These are questions of the first importance; and questions that should have a scriptural, satisfactory answer.

1. PROPOSITION.—The theory of Mr. Campbell, on the subject of justifying faith, is unsatisfactory and absurd.

TESTIMONY. Mr. C. teaches, that men believe the gospel “by their *own efforts*,” “after the same manner that they believe Rome to be situated on the Tiber,” and that “*that* is saving faith which purifies the heart.” And in his “Christian System,” page 238, he says, that “it is not our faith in God’s promise of remission, but our going down *into the water*, that obtains the remission of sins.” Surely, *such* faith would leave *such* believers in “the gall of

36 SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.—TRUE BELIEVERS.

bitterness and bonds of iniquity." This would be justification by *works*, to all intents and purposes. And we conclude, that faith, which is the result of our own efforts, would not make us eligible subjects of baptism. To believe the scriptures, and that Christ is the Son of God, is all the faith that Mr. C. requires of his candidates for baptism. And, verily, all sinners, (except infidels,) thus believe, and therefore all sinners have justifying faith, or are the proper subjects of baptism. On this ground, he certainly may make Christians more rapidly than the Gospel has ever done it! But they would need to be made over again.

2. PROPOSITION.—The Scriptures teach, that we need divine aid in order to believe, to the saving of the soul.

TESTIMONY. In Col. ii. 12, the sinner is represented as being brought from the condemnation of sin, "through the faith of the *operation of God*." In 1st Cor. 3d ch. St. Paul says, "Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man." And Christ says, "without me, ye can do nothing." Of course, *faith* could not be exercised without him.—Hence, one said, "Lord, *help* my unbelief."

3. PROPOSITION.—The true Believer, is not justified by baptism, but by faith alone.

TESTIMONY. Baptism comes under the gen-

eral term, *works*; and may show our faith in Christ; but it evidently is not the grounds on which we are justified. It cannot take the place of faith, which makes us *eligible* to Baptism. The apostle says, "It is God that justifies." But *how* does he justify? Ans. "It is one God who shall justify the circumcision *by faith*, and the uncircumcision *through faith*." While it is declared, that "by the deeds of the (Son) shall *no flesh* be justified." But to him that worketh not, but *believeth on him* that justified the ungodly, his *faith* is counted for *righteousness*." Rom. iv. The scriptures also declare, that we are "justified by faith," that we "receive the promise of the spirit through faith." Gal. iii. And St. Paul tells the Corinthians that they "are all the children of God by faith." Gal. iii. 26. And his Roman brethren are informed, that "Being justified by faith we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. v. ch. and so on. Scripture testimony, on this point, is abundant and explicit. Who, then, dares to set himself in array against such a cloud of witnesses, and hold up water Baptism as the justifying condition, and make faith a mere assent of the understanding, to the truth of Scripture and Messiahship of Christ? Campbell and Paul are evidently at variance. The latter says, that we are "justified *by faith*;" and the former "that it is *not* faith, but an *act*

38 SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.—TRUE BELIEVERS.

resulting from faith, which changes our state." One declares that it is faith, the other that it is not.—Which shall we believe? Surely not *both!*

4. PROPOSITION.—That faith which justifies, and makes us eligible to the ordinance of Baptism, implies reliance upon God's promises, and trust in the merits of Christ.

TESTIMONY. A man may believe the word of God, as mere *history*; and as containing a code of moral precepts, divinely inspired; also doctrines to be embraced; and yet remain destitute of saving faith,—and consequently remain a sinner. There must be something more than a mere assent of the mind. The *affections* must be *stirred*. The *heart* must *feel*. God's promises must be implicitly *relied upon*, and the merits of Christ *trusted in fully*, and *applied* to our individual cases. Having such faith, we shall be recognized as true believers; and may, upon the grounds of *mercy*, claim a right to Christian Baptism, as an evidence of our connexion with the visible church of God, and our avowed attachment to the covenant of grace. Having this faith, we shall understand, more fully, the *nature* and *design* of Baptism, and be inclined to "show our *faith by our works*" of *devotion* and *benevolence*.

CHAPTER III.

THE ELIGIBILITY OF INFANT CHILDREN.

No branch of the main question, has been more strongly contested, than that of *Infant Baptism*. And yet, the evidence in favor of the same, is so abundant, that it seems strange, that the practice should have been contested *at all*. Pede-baptists have been ridiculed and abused, for their belief and practice on this subject; as much so, as if they had not the first witness to speak in its favor. But they *have* witnesses—true witnesses, that have spoken, and shall speak again. We do not intend to be driven from the strong foundations of truth, by either abuse or ridicule, while we have scripture and sound argument on our side. It is a painful consideration, that baptists are in the habit of using similar weapons against infant baptism, that infidels use against the system of Revealed Religion. And among the ignorant, these weapons may appear mighty and not to be broken, or wrested, from the hands of our opponents, by any efforts that may be put forth. To the law, and to the testimony, then. We shall call upon, not one witness alone, but a *cloud* of witnesses, to testify in this important case. And if they do not convince, or confound, those who think differently, we trust

that they will prevent others from following in their footsteps.

1. PROPOSITION.—The baptism of infant children is not forbidden in the Word of God, and therefore they may be baptized.

TESTIMONY. Suppose the baptism of infant children is not directly *commanded* in scripture, yet that would not prove that it is not lawful; since it is not *forbidden*. This, doubtless, would have been the case, had it been wrong. For pedo-baptism had been known and practiced in the Jewish Church, long before the Saviour took baptism into his hands, and directed it to a larger use and worthier end. * There was no need of a *precept* for that, which had ever, by common use, prevailed. And as it was known by the whole Jewish nation, that *little children* were baptized among *them*, if Christ did not intend that infant baptism should be *continued* in his church, when advanced to a higher state of perfection, he certainly would have laid a prohibition upon it. This he did *not* do: therefore, infant children *may still be baptized*.

2. PROPOSITION.—Infant Children have always been recognized as members of the Church of God, and are, therefore, eligible to the ordinance of Baptism.

TESTIMONY. 1. It appears that the covenant made with Abraham, had not its spirituality

changed by the giving the Law at Mount Sinai. For Paul says, Gal. iii. 16, "That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." 2. This covenant was to *continue forever*. "Be ye mindful always of his covenant, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; even of the covenant which I made with Abraham; and of his oath unto Isaac, and hath continued the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant." 3. This covenant was confirmed of God in *Christ*. "Now to Abraham and his seed was the promise made; he saith not, and to seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is *Christ*; and this I say, that the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law was 430 years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." Gal. iii. 16, 17. 4. This covenant is the *covenant of grace*. "Therefore it is of *faith*, that it might be of *grace*; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the *law*, but to that also which is of the *faith* of Abraham, who is the father of *us all*." Rom. iv. 16. "Know ye, therefore, that they which are of *faith*, the same are the *children of Abraham*; and the scriptures, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through *faith*, preached before the

gospel unto Abraham, saying, "*In thee shall all nations* be blessed." Gal. iii. 7, 8. "Now I say that Jesus Christ was the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promise made unto the fathers." Rom. xv. 8. 5. *Infant children were included* in this covenant. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee." Gen. xvii. 7. 6. God had a *church* among the Hebrews in the wilderness; this was a *Gospel church*, and *Christ* was the foundation of it. "This is he that was in the *church* in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him on Mount Sinai, and with our fathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us."—Acts, vii. 37, 38. "Know ye, therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached the *gospel* unto Abraham."—Gal. iii. 78. Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints (or pious Hebrews) and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, *Jesus Christ himself* being the *chief corner stone*." Eph. ii. 19, 20. 7. Circumcision was the *seal* of the covenant in God's ancient church. "Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and

it shall be a *token* of the covenant between me and thee." 8. This seal was to be set upon *infants*. "And he that is *eight days old* shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations." Gen. xvii. 12. 9. Though the *church* still remains, this seal of the covenant is not continued. This will not be doubted by Christians. Consequently, proof is unnecessary.—We are now prepared for the legitimate conclusion, and that is: as Baptism is *now* the seal of the covenant of grace, it is not to be withheld from any of the members of the church of God. Infants and little children are members of God's universal church, therefore *they are to be baptized*.

3. PROPOSITION.—The seal of divine truth has been set upon inanimate nature, and may, with equal propriety, be set upon infants and little children, by baptism.

TESTIMONY. The *bow* in the *cloud*, is a *seal* of the *covenant*. The *law* engraven on the *altar*, Josh. viii. was a *seal* of the *covenant*. The *blood* sprinkled on the *twelve pillars*, which were set up to represent the twelve tribes, was a *seal* and *bond* of the covenant, Exod. xxiv. And now tell us, are not *infants* capable, in like manner, of such a sealing?—They were capable, heretofore, of *circumcision*, and *our* infants have an equal capacity. The sacrament of baptism does not lose this its end, through the indisposition of the receiver. Its sealing virtue still remains.



"I in

INCLUDED IN THE PROMISE TO

5: "Except ye be converted and the children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of Heaven. Whosoever, humble himself as this little child, the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven, whoso shall receive one such little name, receiveth me." And in the 14th verse, we read: But Jesus called little children, and forbid them to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of Heaven." While Paul, when speaking of the atonement, says: "The sentence of one, judgment came upon condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men for the justification of life." All fitness for church membership must be primarily predicated of the moral state that constitutes the basis for future happiness. The church, in its moral features, is designed to be a transcript of the church triumphant. In this respect, the two "kingdoms" are one. Of course, therefore, all who are partakers of that grace which is promised in the covenant to Abraham, and signified by baptism, belong to the spiritual family of God, and are entitled to baptism. If they have the grace signified by baptism, they may and ought to receive baptism itself also. Now it is shown in the above passages, that infants and little children are justified; that we must be like

44 SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.—INFANTS BE SEALED.

4. PROPOSITION.—Infants and little children were included in the promise made to Abraham, and should, therefore, be baptized.

TESTIMONY. “For the promise is unto you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.” Acts, ii. 39. Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham: “And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.” Acts, iii. 25. “Know ye, therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.” “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Gal. iii. 7, 29. From these promises, the result is plainly this: that infants, in the *New Testament*, stand in the same relation to *baptism*, that they did in the *Old*, to *circumcision*; consequently their right to the one, must be the same as it was to the other.—Is not this direct proof in favor of infant baptism? “You and your *children*,” evidently mean, adults and *infants*. The word translated children, was understood by the Jews to include *infants*.

5. PROPOSITION.—Infants are under the provisions of the gospel, and receive a title to eternal life, through the atonement; and, therefore, should be baptized.

TESTIMONY. Christ says, in Math. xviii. 2,

5: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of Heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me." And in the xix. ch. and 14th verse, we read: But Jesus said, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of Heaven." While Paul, when speaking of the extent of the atonement, says: "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." All fitness for church relations must be primarily predicated of, and based upon, that moral state that constitutes a fitness for future happiness. The church militant, in its moral features, is designed to be an image and transcript of the church triumphant. In this respect, the two "kingdoms are but one." Of course, therefore, all who are the subjects of that grace which is promised in the covenant to Abraham, and signified by baptism—all who belong to the spiritual family of God—are entitled to baptism. If they have the thing signified by baptism, they may and ought to receive baptism itself also. Now it is shown, in the above passages, that infants and little children are *justified*; that we must be *like* them; that

if we receive *them* we receive *Christ*; and of *such* is the *kingdom of Heaven*. Surely, then; this Christian ordinance should not be denied them.

6. PROPOSITION.—Baptism is a seal to be given to all nations indiscriminately; therefore, infants are entitled to it.

TESTIMONY. "For as many of you as have been Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither *Jew* nor *Greek*; there is neither *bond* nor *free*; there is neither *male* nor *female*; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus: and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise." Gallatians, iii. 27, 29. If Paul does not reject infants, why should we?

7. PROPOSITION.—It was the universal practice of the church, in early times, to baptize infant children, and was handed down to us from the times of the Apostles.

TESTIMONY. Before the testimony of church history is produced on this point, we wish the reader to keep constantly in mind the fact, that the early Christian fathers, whose language we quote, used the terms *regeneration* and *baptize* synonymously, or generally as meaning the same thing. This, doubtless, arose from the circumstance of its being understood, that the subject always possessed that *change of*

heart which was represented by the application of water.

JUSTIN MARTYR, a learned Samaritan, who was converted to Christianity about A. D. 133, and wrote 40 years after the death of St. John, says: "Many persons among us, of sixty and seventy years old, of both sexes, who were *discipled* to Christ in their *childhood*, do continue uncorrupted." The word rendered "*made disciples*," is the same as in Math. xxviii. 19, where Christ commands the apostles to go "*make disciples* of all nations, baptizing them." This shows that *children* were *discipled* as well as adults, and consequently, *baptized*.—*Apologia Prima*.

IRENIUS, bishop of Lyons, in France, and disciple of *Polycarp*, who was conversant with *St. John*, about A. D. 178, says: that Christ "came to save all persons by himself: all I say, who by him are regenerated [that is *baptized*] to God; *infants*, and *little ones*, and *children*, and *youth*, and elder persons." *Second Book against Heresies*.

TERTULLIAN, presbyter of the church at Carthage, about A. D. 192, declares that "according to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the *delaying* of baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of little children." *Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap.* page 26. This testimony of Tertullian, proves that infant baptism existed within one hundred years after

the death of the Apostle John ; and he does not oppose it only under certain circumstances.—In less than a single century, after the apostles, this practice had become general over Europe, Western Asia, and Northern and Eastern Africa, and yet its *novelty* was not objected to by one who opposed its practice. And if the testimony of this witness proves, that infant baptism was much older than his day ; it is impossible, then, to date it later than the *Apostles* and *Christ*. Had it been an innovation, some attempt would have been made to point out its *origin*. This was not done by Tertullian ; therefore, it must have had a common origin with *adult* baptism.

ORIGEN, who was born A. D. 185, and educated at Alexandria, and spent the main part of his life in Syria and Palestine, concerning whom Eusebius says : “ the Christian doctrine was conveyed to him from his forefathers,” or “ from his grand-fathers, and his great-grand-fathers,” speaks thus, of infant baptism : “ For this cause [that is, original sin] the church received from the apostles a tradition [that is, an order] even to *give baptism to infants* :” *Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap.* Origen had access to *all the writings of his age*.

CYPRIAN, who was cotemporary with Origen, and converted from heathenism to Christianity in early life, in connection with sixty-five other bishops, who had been inquired of

whether, in case of necessity, an infant might be baptized before it was eight days old! answers thus: "We were all, in our assembly, of a *contrary opinion*, [that is, that they must *not* be baptized, within two or three days after they are born.] Our opinion in the assembly is, not for us to hinder *any* person from baptism and the grace of God." *Cyprian's Epistle to Fidus*. These bishops were approved and devoted men; and this is their uniform testimony in the year 253. And it appears impossible to account for this concurrent testimony, relative to infant baptism, only upon the ground that it had *ever been allowed*, and was the custom of the first churches.

OPTATUS, bishop of Meleui, in Numidia, about A. D. 370, says, "As many of you as have been baptized in the name of Christ, have put on Christ. O what a garment is this, that is always one and never renewed; that decently fits *all ages*, and all forms: it is neither plaited for *infants*, nor stretched for men, and without alteration is suitable to women." *Fifth Book concerning the schism of the Donatists*. How *familiarly* he alludes to the subject of infant baptism! Is this no proof?

GREGORY NAZIANZEN, born about A. D. 320, gives clear and abundant testimony in favor of infant baptism. In his day, the practice of deferring baptism had become alarmingly prevalent; which had received the example of the

D

emperor Constantine, and grew out of a superstitious notion of the saving efficacy of baptism. They wished to defer it, therefore, until just before death. But Gregory says, "Hast thou an *infant child*? Let not wickedness have the advantage of time. Let him be sanctified from his infancy. Let him be dedicated from his cradle in the Spirit." And again "What say you of those that are as yet *infants*, and are not in capacity to be sensible, either of the grace or the want of it? Shall we *baptize them too*? Yes, *by all means*." *Discourse on Baptism.*

AMBROSE, born in Gaul about A. D. 338, when speaking of the miracle of Elijah in dividing the waters of Jordan, says, "But perhaps this may seem to be fulfilled in our time. For that turning of the river waters backward toward the spring head, which was caused by Elijah when the river was divided, signified the sacrament of the laver of salvation, which was afterward to be instituted, by which those *infants who have been baptized* are reformed from perverseness, to their primitive nature."—*Ambrose concerning the Patriarch Abraham.*

CHRYSOSTOM, bishop of Constantinople, was born at Antioch about A. D. 354, when speaking of circumcision, says, "But our circumcision—I mean the grace of baptism—gives cure without pain, and procures to us a thousand benefits, and fills us with the grace of the Spirit; and it has no *determinate time* as that had;

but one in *immature age*, or in middle life, or, that is, in old age, may receive circumcision made without hands.—*Homily XI on Genesis.*

ST. HIEROME, in a letter to a lady, about A. D. 380, says, "He that is a *child*, and thinks as a *child*, his good deeds, as well as his evil deeds, are imputed to his parents. Unless you suppose that the children of Christians are themselves only under the guilt of the sin, except they receive baptism; and that the wickedness is not imputed to those also who would not give it them, especially at that time when they that were to receive it could make no opposition to the reception of it."—*Letter to Leta.*

The doctrine of this passage is simply this; Infants are not chargeable with any sin in the omission of their baptism. Such delinquency could be imputed only to those who *withheld* baptism from them.

AUSTIN, or AUGUSTINE, 300 years after the apostles, opposes the *repetition* of baptism under certain circumstances, and says: "So that many persons increasing in knowledge after their baptism, and especially those who have been baptized either *when they were infants*, or when they were youths; as their understanding is cleared and enlightened, and their 'inward man renewed day by day,' do themselves decide, and with abhorrence and confession abjure the former opinions which they had of God, when they were imposed upon by their

own imaginations. And yet they are not therefore accounted either *not* to have received baptism, or to have a baptism of the same nature of their error. But in their case, both the *validity* of the *sacrament is acknowledged*, and the vanity of their own understanding rectified.”—Again, “If any one do ask for divine authority in this matter, though that which the *universal church practises*, which has not been instituted by councils, but *has always been observed*, is most justly believed to be nothing else than a thing delivered [or handed down] *by the authority of the apostles*: yet we may besides take a true estimate, how much the sacrament of *baptism* does *avail infants*, by the circumcision which God’s former people received.” *Fourth Book against the Donatists, concerning Baptism.*

In his tenth book on Genesis, St. Austin says: “The custom of our mother, the church, *in baptizing infants*, is by no means to be disregarded, nor be accounted needless, nor believed to be other than a *tradition of the apostles*.” And in the 48th canon of the third council of Carthage, held about A. D. 397, it was asked, whether those baptized in infancy, among the Donatists, could be promoted to be ministers.—And AURELIUS, bishop of Carthage, answers thus: “They will consent to our determination, that such as were baptized by them *in infancy*, may be admitted to orders.”

The testimony on this proposition might be increased, but enough has been furnished to demonstrate its truth, and convince any unprejudiced mind, that infant baptism is not a *recent innovation*, as Mr. Campbell and others contend. We need not spend time to show, that this ordinance has been practised in the church since the testimony of the last witness was penned. None will dare dispute this. Should they do so, they would at once bind themselves to point out its recent origin. And certainly they would undertake that with reluctance.

8. PROPOSITION.—For eleven hundred years after the birth of Christ, there was not one person found to oppose the baptism of infants.

TESTIMONY. The reader will recollect, that we have shown in the foregoing proposition, that it was the uniform practice of the general church, for several hundred years after the days of the apostles, to baptize infants. But from the body of the church there separated disaffected, or *heretical* parties. Yet these, though distinguished from the church by some peculiar doctrine, or principle, were not known to deny infant baptism.

IRENIUS, who wrote a history of all the sects and parties, that had arisen up in the church before his time, from the history of Simon Magus, mentions none that denied infant baptism. He wrote his treatise about 77 years after the

death of the apostle John, and had there been any variety of practice on the subject of baptism, he must have known it. And had he known it, he certainly would have mentioned it. Inasmuch, therefore, as he says nothing about baptizing infants among heretics, it may be concluded that they practiced as the general church did on this subject.†

EPIPHANIUS, about A. D. 374, wrote an account of all the sects that had appeared until his time. He enumerates, in all, 80 heresies, which, he says, "were all that he had heard of in the world." He says nothing of their baptizing or not baptizing infants; but, after he has spoken of all the heretical sects, he speaks of the doctrines of the general church, and states that baptism is to us "instead of the old circumcision." Had there been any denial of infant baptism, he would, certainly, have known and recorded it.

PHILASTRIUS wrote an account of all the heresies, up to about A. D. 380. And though he makes a difference of opinion about any trifling matter a heresy, of which he numbers above one hundred, yet he mentions no dispute about infant baptism.

ST. AUSTIN wrote his history of all the sects, about A. D. 420. He records 88 heresies in all, of which that of PELAGIUS was the last. And he expressly declares that he never knew of any sect, or heresy, that denied infant baptism.

THEODORE, bishop of Cyrius, in Syria, wrote about the same time. He classifies all the heretics under four divisions. He mentions some, who were of the most impious character, who denied all baptism; but of those who admitted any baptism, he mentions none who denied it to *infants*. A plain proof that they held nothing on that point, different from the ordinary practice of the church.

PELAGIUS, though heretical in many points, complains in a letter to Innocent, bishop of Rome, of his opponents, and says: "Many do slander me, as if I *denied* the sacrament of *baptism to infants*." He further declares, "that he never heard of even an *impious heretic* who would *affirm this concerning infants*." And adds: "Who is so ignorant of the reading of the *Evangelists*, as to attempt (not to say establish this, [doctrine] but) to speak of it *heedlessly*, or even have such a thought? In fine, who can be so impious as to *hinder infants from being baptized?*" As this letter to Pope Innocent was written in A. D. 417; and as Pelagius would have found it greatly to his interest, to have been able to cast discredit upon the practice of infant baptism, by showing that it was a human invention, he certainly would have done so, had it been in his power. For this would have been more favorable to his notion of the *innate purity of infants*. Yet such was the evidence and practice, upon this subject, in his day, that

he was obliged to be *orthodox* concerning it.—See *Hibbard on Infant Baptism*.

Finally, “For the first 400 *years* after *Christ*, there appears only one man, TERTULIAN, who advises the *delay* of infant baptism in some cases, and one GREGORY, who did, perhaps, practise such delay, in the case of his own children; but no *society* of men so thinking, or so practising, or any one saying it was unlawful to baptize infants. So in the *next* 700 *years*, there is not so much as *one man* to be found, who either spoke for, or practised such delay; *but all to the contrary*. And when about the year 1130, one sect, among the WALDENSES or ALBIGENSES, declared against the baptizing of infants, as *incapable of salvation*, the *main body* of the people *rejected* their opinion; and they who held that opinion, quickly *dwindled away* and *disappeared*, there being no more heard of, holding that tenet, until the rising of the German *Anti-pedobaptists*, or baptists in the year 1522.”—See *Wall's History of Infant Baptism*, written in 1705, which called forth the thanks of the clergy of England, in general convention, on account of its accuracy and research.

9. PROPOSITION.—The Address of St. Paul to the Ephesian children, shows, that adults are not the only subjects of baptism recognized in the Scriptures.

TESTIMONY. In it Paul says to the Ephe-

sian children: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord." Now, how could they obey *in the Lord*, if they, themselves, were not in the Lord? In every instance, this expression marks incorporation into the Christian body.

And as it respects the *age* of the persons designated, there can be no question; as a subsequent verse distinctly states them to be such children as were *subjects of discipline* and mental institution. And how exactly the sequel of the apostles's address accords with the commencement; the injunction being given as to those in express covenant. "Honor thy father and thy mother—for this is the first commandment with promise." Had those addressed been *out of the church* of God, this language would not have been employed; it being inapplicable. But they were acknowledged to be "*fellow citizens with the saints; and of the household of God.*" They were, therefore, included and interested in the promise; and consequently entitled to the ordinance of baptism, which distinguished them from others.

10. PROPOSITION.—The right of infants to baptism, is recognized in the words of St. Peter, recorded in Acts ii: 38, 39.

TESTIMONY. "Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy

Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." The promise referred to here, is found in Gen. xvii, 7. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."—Now, if the awakened Jews had apprehended the apostle to mean only *adults*, when he said "to you and your children," they must have had an understanding of such a peculiar construction, as to make that sense of a word, which to them was totally unnatural and forced, and altogether *unheard of* in such a peculiar connection, to become all at once familiarly easy. From all the circumstances of the case, it appears, not that all addressed should *repent*, (for *infants* cannot repent,) but that all are to be baptized, to whom the *promise* will apply: unless they have forfeited the right by an infraction of the covenant. The promise applies to infants, (for, certainly they have never forfeited the right) therefore, they are to be baptized.

.11 PROPOSITION.—Whole families were baptized by the apostles, and doubtless infants were included in them.

TESTIMONY. In four different places household baptisms are recorded, namely, Acts x, 1, 4, 8, Cornelius and all his house, Acts xvi, Ly-

dia and her household, verse 33; the jailor "and all his;" 1 Cor. i, 16; "the household of Stephanus." We conclude that both the *language* employed, and the *circumstances* concur, to favor our proposition. The opponents of infant baptism take the ground, that infants were not included in the households which the apostles baptized, because they are not *specified*, and that there are households, or families, without infant children. But may not children be included in the term, as well as parents and servants? And is it not probable that they are always included, unless there is a specification to the contrary? If the term will not apply to infants, neither will it apply to *parents*, or domestics of any kind. But it is not necessary to specify parents, servants, or children, in order to show, that they may help to compose a family, when the term house or household may include any or all of them. Indeed, if we restrict the term in the case of Lydia's baptism, we must confine it to her alone; for it is said, the Lord opened *her* heart, "that *she* attended unto the things that were spoken by Paul." Nothing is said of the faith, or conversion, of her *household*, the apostle baptized. Therefore, infants, or little children, must have been included, or else she was the only person baptized!—To baptize the whole house, means to administer the ordinance to *all who dwell in the edifice*, whether young or old. And the Editor of Cal-

met's Dictionary, has given *fifty* examples in proof of the fact, and assures us as many as *three hundred* instances have been examined, and proved perfectly satisfactory.—See *Ed. of Cal.* p. 155.

It is worthy of remark that the Greek word *oikos*, rendered household, should have been rendered *house* or *family*. And it is a remarkable fact, that the Syriac, the best of all versions, and of the first century, and the Coptic, read, "and when she (Lydia) was baptized *with her children*." But, after all, should the baptists be able to disprove the existence of little children in the families referred to, (which they have never been able to do,) yet the great practice and principle of *family baptism*, would remain unaffected, and clearly established. Baptists, when giving an account of *their* administration of this ordinance, are not in the habit of speaking after the manner of the apostles.—They tell us of *individuals*, but not of *households*, or *families*. This discrepancy is worthy of note. If the practice of both were the same, we might look for *similar phraseology*. We presume to say, that if the same expressions that are employed by the apostles, in pointing out *family baptisms*, were used among the baptists relative to the *transfer of property*, there would be no difficulty in their minds concerning the *legality of infant children's claims!* But such are their strong derelictions in favor

of what their parents and leaders have taught them, that they cannot, or will not, see how, *house* or *household*, can include infants, unless they are *specified*! Well, be it so. Others can see, and be satisfied also.

12. PROPOSITION.—Infants and little children should be baptized, on account of the moral influence it has upon them, when attended with, or followed by, proper instruction.

TESTIMONY. It is truly diverting to hear the Baptists, in the strongest language, point out the *evils* and *dangers* attendant upon infant baptism. We give the following as specimens: "Now, I ask, what is the moral influence all this infant baptizing is *adapted* to produce in the minds of those involuntary members, either of the Greek, Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Methodist churches? The grace of God may prevent it in many instances—but the *natural tendency* of this system is to produce *disgust* and *alienation*, where all would be most desirous to secure respect and kindly feeling." And then follows more than a hint, that, from the same source, there is at least danger of establishing a national church "upon the ruins of our free institutions;" and nothing but the influence of the *Baptists* prevents this state of things! *Hinton's History of Baptism*. Wonderful *calamity*! Wonderful eyes that see it!! And wonderful cause that prevents it!!!

And the lynx-eyed Mr. Campbell is led to exclaim, "What an *immense weight of carnality, sensuality, and of varied wickedness*, would be severed from the Christian profession, by the annihilation of this rite of infant initiation!" *Campbell's Debate with Rice, page 305.* Surely the world will be grateful to these benefactors of mankind for giving the alarm, that these great evils may be avoided. But there are many others that view this subject in a different light altogether. They think, ~~that~~, that they can see no evils connected with infant baptism; and that it *may* result, and *does* result, in a great amount of good; when attended with proper instruction. And all objections urged against the baptism of infants, on the ground of *inefficacy*, may be urged against all outward rites, Jewish or Christian; and, especially against the rite of circumcision. If the latter was attended with good moral results, so is the former. It is true, that baptism has often been unproductive of good, when administered to children; but the same may be said of *adult* baptism. But the ordinance itself is not accountable for the failure. Many, very many children, dedicated to God in baptism, after being properly instructed in the nature and obligations of the ordinance, have inclined to religion, acquiesced in the order of God—recognized the propriety and validity of their early consecration—assumed, in person, all the obli-

gations consequent upon the act, and felt grateful to God and their parents, for directing their attention to this important subject. These things are *stated by thousands when arrived at adult age; and why not believe them?*

13. PROPOSITION.—Infants should be baptized, on account of the influence their baptism has upon parents.

TESTIMONY. What can be more directly adapted to encourage and stimulate the pious exertions of parents, in training their little ones for God, than the recollection that they have already consecrated them to God in baptism. With what humble gratitude and holy joy, do they behold that God has been pleased to affix the seal of the covenant to their offspring—to enter into covenant “with them and their seed”—to recognize their children as heirs of salvation, and place upon them the visible mark, or pledge, of his protection and grace—all these considerations presenting themselves to the parent’s mind, could not fail to produce, if rightly improved, a deep and abiding impression. This is the natural tendency of attention to this duty. By neglect and unbelief on the part of parents, the object and design may not be realized; and this is the case with all baptist parents. And whatever may be said concerning the religious instruction of children *without* baptism, and the good accruing to parents from this source, yet, to all the faithful

and obedient, there is an *additional* source of enjoyment and ground to hope for the future welfare of their children, when they give them up to God, in this holy ordinance. And certainly, the testimony of such, relative to their hopes and enjoyments, arising from this source, is *not to be overlooked*.

It is not simply that their children have been baptized with water that they rejoice; but in consequence of the greater probability of their seeking and obtaining the *grace* represented by baptism, if the proper instruction be kindly given them. How often have we seen the tear of love and gratitude flow down the cheek of parents at the baptismal altar? And who would deprive them of such a privilege—the privilege of consecrating their offspring to God in early life? Surely none who fully understand the nature, design, and utility of Christian infant baptism. We know that it is said, that when children are *grown*, they become *dissatisfied* with their early baptism. And why? Just because they either lack proper parental instruction, or some meddling Baptist has been assiduous in reiterating in their ears, “Infant baptism is an *innovation*—it is *unscriptural*—it is of *no use*.” But, otherwise, in *nine hundred and ninety-nine cases in a hundred*, *dissatisfaction will never take place*.

14. PROPOSITION.—Jesus Christ has commanded infants to be baptized, therefore, their baptism should not be neglected.

TESTIMONY. “Go ye, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Math. xxviii, 19. This commission, we conceive, contains authority to baptize infant children. Notwithstanding Mr. Carson, a celebrated Baptist, has said—“I will risk the credit of my understanding on my success in showing that, according to this commission, believers only are to be baptized. Here I stand entrenched, and I defy the ingenuity of earth and hell to drive me from my position.”—*Carson on Baptism, pages 275 6.*

A man may become “entrenched” in his own conceit and prejudice, when he is entirely destitute of argument. Bold *assertion* is a very common mode of disposing of questions amongst exclusive men; and there is not a syllable in the text on which to rest the assertion made by this baptist champion. The commission of Christ does not contain the words, Go and baptize believers—still less, Go and baptize believers only. The only command expressed is, to baptize the *nations*. It is generally acknowledged that “Go and disciple, or proselyte, all nations,” is a proper translation of the text; and that this was to be done by *teaching* and *baptizing*, is obvious. Matthew

E

says, "all nations," and Mark, "every creature." And if children are not included, as well as adults, it belongs to anti-pedobaptists to prove it, either by adducing other texts of scripture of a contrary import, or by showing that the circumstances under which the command was given, necessarily restrict its meaning. The first they do not attempt, and the second they will find to favor, rather than oppose, the universal application of the command.

This must have been the understanding the Jews had of the commission. For infant baptism prevailed among them prior to its divine institution by Christ. This is susceptible of the strongest proof; as well as that *proselytes* were admitted into the Jewish church by baptism, whether adults or children. *Maimonides*, the great interpreter of Jewish law, who flourished in the 12th century: ("Israel") says he "was admitted into covenant by three things, namely, by circumcision, *baptism*, and sacrifice.—Baptism was in the wilderness, before the giving of the law. Whosoever any heathen**** will take the yoke of the law upon him, circumcision, *baptism*, and a voluntary oblation, are required.—No man is a proselyte, until he be circumcised and *baptized*." And this fact was known even to heathens. For *Epicetus*, in about 109, says, "when a Jew assumes the sentiments of one who hath been

baptized and circumcised, then he really is, and is called, a Jew."

CALMET says, "The Jews require three things to a complete proselyte: *baptism*, circumcision, and sacrifice; but for women, only *baptism* and sacrifice."

Dr. WALL states that, "Whenever Gentiles were proselyted to the Jewish religion, they were initiated by circumcision, the offering of a sacrifice and *baptism*. They were all *baptized*, males and females, adults and *infants*."

STACKHOUSE declares, that "The custom of the Jews, *in all ages*, has been to receive their heathen proselytes by *baptism*, as well as by sacrifice and circumcision."

WITSIUS says, "When a Gentile becomes a proselyte of righteousness, three ceremonies are used, viz: circumcision, *baptism*, and sacrifice."

Dr. A. CLARK asserts, that "The apostles knew well that the Jews not only circumcised the children of proselytes, but also *baptized* them. The *children* and even *infants* of proselytes, were baptized among the Jews." And nearly all the most competent judges in the Jewish and Christian church, from Selden and Lightfoot down to Dr. Clark, regard the testimony to this historical fact, as abundant and conclusive. Even Mr. Booth, a distinguished *Baptist* writer, admits that "the *children* of proselytes were *baptized* along with their pa-

rents." And as the Jews were *accustomed* to the rite of baptism, we can account for the question propounded to John: "Why *baptizest* thou, then, if thou be not the Christ?"

We know that it has been said, that *faith* is referred to, or required, in this commission, and it cannot, therefore, include infants. Hence the Baptists will *emphasize*, "He that *believeth* and is *baptized*, shall be saved." And the conclusion is, that infants cannot believe, therefore, they should *not be baptized*. "Well, it is added, 'he that believeth *not* shall be *damned*.'" Then if it is required of infants to believe in order to be entitled to baptism, and consequently to *salvation*, surely a lack of this faith will secure their damnation! For, he that believeth not, *shall* be damned. Will the objector first shut them out of the *church*, and then out of *heaven*? But all the difficulty arises from the fact, that adults are put in the *premises*, and infants in the *conclusion*. The words *teach*, *believe*, and *repent*, refer to *adult persons*. They have nothing to do with *infant* baptism; and yet the commission of our Lord, we think, warrants us in baptizing them. It rather implies than excludes infant baptism. It commands all disciples to be baptized. Now a disciple is simply a *learner*. And infants are, strictly speaking, *learners of Christ*. To shut them out of the ordinance, is then to reject those

whom Christ has himself included. Well may *all nations*, then, be *discipled* and *baptized*.

If the baptism of infants is not forbidden in the word of God; if they have always been recognized as members of his church; if the seal of the covenant of grace and truth may be set upon them; if they were included in the promise made to Abraham; if they receive a title to eternal life through the atonement of Christ; if the seal is to be given to all nations indiscriminately; if it was the universal practice of the church, in early times, to baptize them, and was handed down to us from the times of the apostles; if none opposed their baptism for eleven hundred years after Christ; if Paul and Peter recognized them as eligible to Christian baptism; if whole families were baptized by the apostles; if their baptism exerts a happy moral influence upon themselves and their parents; and if, in the general gospel commission, God *commands* that they should be baptized—are we to be blamed for giving them up to God in holy baptism?

A thousand things are done, even by the baptists themselves, where there is not the tenth part of evidence to justify their conduct, that we have adduced in favor of infant baptism.—And yet the half has not been told. Our limits will not admit of a *full* exhibition of the testimony in favor of this practice. And we think that enough has been given to satisfy any

candid, reasonable mind, that infant baptism is not an innovation—a Popish relict—an unscriptural and dangerous thing.

God forbid that we should glory in error, or detract from the great truths of revelation.— And while millions are perfectly satisfied with the baptism they received in infancy; and while God sets the seal of his approbation upon it, and furnishes us with Scripture and rational argument, in favor of the dedication of our children to him in this Christian ordinance, we will glory in this; and are not to be driven from our position by all the sophistry and ridicule of the baptist world.

They have made the attack, and we shall try to defend ourselves. Not so much for the hope of conquering them, as a desire to present truth to others in its proper light. As we have already intimated, truth is of more value to us than conquest over an antagonist. And while we are contending about water baptism, let us not forget the all-cleansing baptism of the *Holy Ghost!*

PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

PART THIRD.

THE SCRIPTURAL MODE OF BAPTISM,

CHAPTER I.

DIFFICULTIES AND ABSURDITIES ARISING FROM THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ORDINANCE BY SUBMERSION.

As we have adopted the use of a common word, expressive of the *manner* of applying water in the ordinance of baptism, it may be proper here to say a few things concerning it. Mr. Campbell and his followers, object to the word *mode* in this connection; and he informs us that for about 20 *years*, he has been laboring to convince the world of the impropriety of its use! And he seems to think, that he has, at least partially, succeeded; and that the time will soon come when his favorite word *action* will be altogether substituted for *mode*. He *may* be successful in this attempt, but it is rather problematical. He supposes, doubtless, that the word *action*, will better apply to *his mode* of baptizing, than the word ordinarily used.—

Well, be it so. The word *mode* will suit us very well, especially as it means *form, manner, fashion, custom*. Mr. C. has endeavored to conform the *New Testament* to his *peculiar creed*; and we need not wonder that our *Lexicons*, and the use of common and appropriate words, should, by the touch of his wand, undergo a change also. Words must be adapted to his *new method* or *mode* of saving sinners. Common terms will not apply to his "*ancient gospel*," which originated in *Western Virginia*, only about 20 years ago! Very well. We wish to "*stand in the way*, and inquire for *the old paths*," and content ourselves to know, that the term we adopt is an appropriate, scriptural term, and never objected to by the church of God. We also remark, that, with a modern author, we prefer in general the use of the word *submersion* to that of *immersion*, as the former seems to express, more fully, *entire underwhelming*, than the latter, which *may* be only *partial dipping*. And, also, as the baptists *mean* submersion or underwhelming, when they speak of *their kind* of baptism; though their *theory* and *practice*, as we shall show hereafter, do not correspond. Nothing but putting men entirely out of sight, or completely *under water*, can meet their views of Christian baptism, so far as *theory* is concerned.

1. PROPOSITION.—Submersionists are not agreed among themselves as to what the mode of baptizing should be.

TESTIMONY. If it be absolutely essential, that a certain mode should invariably be observed in the administration of baptism, why, we ask, have not the Scriptures placed the matter in such a plain light, that there can be no mistake about it—no difference of opinion amongst those who have access to the divine records? This they have not done. Consequently, there is amongst mankind a difference of opinion, and also of practice. And this seems all well enough, if we do not place too much stress upon the mode, so as to make the character, or utility of the baptism, depend upon the *amount of water* used, or the *manner* of its application. But why do baptists, or submersionists, disagree among themselves? The Greek church baptize both by affusion and immersion, but they contend that *trine* immersion is absolutely necessary. The “Tunkers” (*Dippers*, usually called Dunkards,) insist on entire triple immersion by a *forward* motion of the subject; but in the judgment of Mr. Campbell, this mode is nugatory, inasmuch as it does not resemble the *burial* of Christ. Hence, he says, “we must dip only once, and the motion must be *backwards*.” Now, should not the advocates of these conflicting practices, at least adjust their

own disputes, and settle down upon some one specific mode, before they can reasonably expect us to renounce our present views, and adopt theirs? Their disagreement among themselves presents a difficulty in regard to exclusive submersion in any form.

2. PROPOSITION. No Scripture precept, or command, can be found authorizing submersion.

TESTIMONY. Baptists require a precept or command, in favor of infant baptism, in order to satisfy them, and why may not we require of them the same for settling the controversy concerning the mode? Could this be done, much time and labor would be saved, and we should be brought to see eye to eye. But this is a Herculean task. It never *has* been done—it never *will* be done. No where is it said, go and *immerse*, or *submerge* the nations. In no place in the Bible is it said, “he that believeth and is *submerged*, shall be saved.” No, no! This language would sound novel, coming from the sacred page. Not a single precept or command could be construed into such a meaning, without an obvious wresting from their original import. This has been done for the support of a bad cause, but it is a fearful undertaking.

3. PROPOSITION.—Those who practise exclusive submersion, evidently place more confidence in baptism, than the author of the ordinance designed.

TESTIMONY. We are aware that many may, and doubtless do, confide too much in their baptism, when administered by affusion; but it is not so common for them to do so, as it is for submersionists. Hence, we frequently hear them say, "what *good* will a *little water* do, sprinkled upon the face?" Now this interrogation, (with many other similar ones,) is founded upon the notion, that it is the *water* that washes away sin. And as we are universally *polluted*, there must be an *underwhelming* in the cleansing agent. The great and important matter, therefore, is the "*going down into the water*," which, according to Mr. Campbell, is the "*converting act*." With this view of the subject, who would not place implicit confidence in baptism? Surely Jesus Christ never authorized us to rely so much upon the ordinance of religion, as to lose sight of religion itself. If any people are to be found upon the face of the earth who hold that baptism is *essential to salvation*, you will find them amongst those who reject every mode but *submersion*.

4. PROPOSITION.—Those who hold to, and teach the doctrine of submersion, do not themselves, in all cases, practise it fully.

TESTIMONY. This proposition may, at first view, appear to carry falsehood or misrepresentation, upon the very face of it. But, to us,

there is nothing plainer. And we have often wondered, that the baptists did not see the discrepancy between their creed and their practice, and give up one or the other. It is acknowledged by them, as well as others, that ordained ministers are the *administrators* of the ordinance of baptism, (and *any* of Mr. Campbell's disciples *may be* administrators!) And that it is their duty to put the candidate *entirely under water*, in order to make the baptism complete. There is no getting round this. According to their own teaching, the candidate *must be* as completely *buried* out of sight—buried *under the water*—as the Saviour was in the sepulchre. And this must be done by the man that is authorized to administer the ordinance. Now, what minister or layman, amongst the baptists, does this? The very fact of its being customary, uniformly customary, for the candidate to *wade into* the water, (except in cases of sickness,) and thereby immerse a *part of himself*, proves, that the *administrator* baptizes only the *remaining* part. Hence, if *entire* immersion, by the administrator, is necessary to baptism, not *one* in ten thousand amongst baptists are *baptized*.

5. PROPOSITION.—Those who are baptized by submersion are no better Christians than others, baptized differently.

TESTIMONY. If Christian baptism be as im-

Portant as it is represented in the Holy Scriptures, and especially as necessary to salvation as represented by modern baptists, it certainly is calculated to exert a favorable moral influence upon its proper subject. And the influence will be good in proportion to the nearness with which we approach the correct *mode*.— This being the case, it will be perfectly natural to compare the piety of those who practise *opposite* modes, though it may be a delicate, unpleasant task. Now, “we would not of our goodness *boast*,” but we appeal to the truth-telling page of history in support of the assertion, that Protestant Pedobaptist churches do exhibit as truly and as extensively, the genuine signs of *orthodoxy* and *vital godliness*, as do the Baptist churches in this, or any other country. And until they can exhibit evidence, that their piety far transcends ours, we must claim that we are to be placed on an equality, at least, with them. And is not this the case? (Whence) are baptists more *zealous*, *devoted*, and *self-sacrificing*, than their neighbors, who practise affusion?— They cannot be pointed to by the wisest heads. We conclude, therefore, that, either baptism does no good to its subjects, or else it is not essential by what *mode* we are baptized; seeing that baptists can present no better specimens of Christian holiness and zeal than pedo-baptists. And they *can choose* which dilemma they please.

78 MODE OF BAPTISM.—MODERN SUBMERSIONISTS

6. PROPOSITION.—Submersionists are small in number when compared with pedo-baptists, which we cannot account for, if submersion alone is baptism.

TESTIMONY. When the Bible is withheld from the people, in whole, or in part, *error* may find more adherents than truth. This we find to be the case in Catholic, Mehommedan, and Pagan countries. But that error, in regard to a Christian ordinance, in Christian lands, plainly taught in the Holy Scriptures, should have a greater number of adherents by far, than truth, is a problem not easily solved. But even Catholics, though their system of religion is fraught with error, on other points, nevertheless agree with a majority of protestants in regard to the mode of Baptism. These comprehend a population of perhaps *one hundred and thirty millions*. The protestant church is said to contain some sixty millions of members, and of all these not one-sixth part practise submersion. Uniting, therefore, the Greek church in the estimate, (amounting to more than half the number of Catholics,) who baptize children, and *unite the two modes*, the number who hold to plunging, compared with those who consider affusion more correct, is in the ratio of perhaps *less than a million to nearly two hundred millions*, or as *one is to two hundred*. Is not the difference in numbers, therefore, too great to afford a plausible argument in favor of submersion? Let it be considered also, in connection

with this fact, that among those who practise, and contend for affusion, not only the most pious, but *learned men* are found; at least, they will compare with any others spoken of in history. We therefore do not lack, either *numbers, piety, or talent*, on the side of Pede-baptism.

7. PROPOSITION.—Modern submersionists have departed from the practice of the submersionists of antiquity.

TESTIMONY. It is a fact well authenticated by history, that as early at least, as the third century, and in subsequent ages when baptism by submersion became more prevalent, that the candidate for baptism was, *irrespective of age or sex*, divested of all clothing; that is, they were baptized in a state of *perfect nakedness*.

DR. MILLER says, "No exception was allowed."

DR. STUART says, "It is notorious, and admits of no contradiction, that baptism of those days of immersion, was administered to men, women and children, naked as Adam and Eve before the fall."

CYRIL of Jerusalem testifies the same thing, "as soon as ye came into the baptistry, ye put off your clothes."

ROBINSON, the baptist historian, says, "Let it be observed, that the primitive Christians *baptized naked*. Nothing is easier than to give

proof of this by quotations from authentic writings of the men who administered baptism.—*There is no historical fact better authenticated than this.*”

JAMES BASNAGE, than whom no man understood church history better, is quoted by Robinson, and says, “When artists *threw garments over pictures of the baptized*, they consulted the taste of spectators more than the truth of the fact.” And Basnage might have added, that *all* the truly ancient representations of baptism which he had ever seen, represented the candidate as absolutely naked.

Dr. WALL remarks, that “The ancient Christians, when they were baptized by immersion, were *all baptized naked*, whether men, women, or children.”—Hist. of Bapt. vol. ii, page 311. Now, if baptists regard the example of early Christians, and place so much confidence in the *mode* of baptism, why do they not *follow that example*? If they contend for submersion at all, why not for the early preparations for it? And why not add the sign of the cross, the oil, the spittle, &c.? Never will they be consistent, on this subject, while they *pretend* to have Scripture and early Christian example on their side, as long as they *change the practice or mode*, according to their own fancy.

8. PROPOSITION.—Baptism by submersion is calculated to diminish devotional feelings on the part of the candidate.

TESTIMONY. In many instances, submersion gains the entire ascendancy over the devotional feelings of the candidate; for there is an involuntary effort to regain his feet before he has been submerged, which requires the minister to make two successive efforts to effect a complete immersion, and presents him in the attitude of an adversary to the candidate—the latter struggling for freedom, and the former for control.—It is obvious that many, very many, who deeply imbibe the doctrine of exclusive submersion before hand, still, at the moment of baptism, experience so much *agitation* and *alarm*, as utterly to preclude that sense of religious obligation and devotional awe, that should wholly pervade and possess the mind. Witness the hurried, convulsive respiration—the stifled sigh—the violent palpitation—the alarm depicted upon the whole visage—the spasmodic grasp of the candidate on the arm of the minister—these are common symptoms which give evidence of a resistance in the human frame and temperament to such treatment of the body; and proclaim, also, the mind of the candidate is occupied with anxious thoughts of safety, and not with devotional solemnities of religion.—This is one reason why so many hesitate for a long time, before they can consent to be immersed, though they have been taught that this alone is Christian baptism. To be perfectly passive on this subject is a very difficult thing.

F

Now we consider these are some of the great difficulties in the way of submersion; and that a God of infinite goodness does not require us to submit to them, in the observance of a *Christian ordinance*.

9. PROPOSITION.—The doctrine of exclusive submersion has been, and is still, used as an instrument for proselyting, or increasing the number and influence of some particular sect.

TESTIMONY. We are aware that baptism administered in any way, may be abused, and employed as an instrument for advocating the interests of a religious party. But why is it, that almost every new fangled religion imposed upon mankind, in these modern times especially, has connected with it an everlasting harangue about *immersion*, IMMERSION? With *Campbell* at the head of one party, *Jo Smith* at the head of another, and *Miller* at the head of a third, we behold a *water engine* formed for gaining adherents to their respective creeds. (We give these as specimens, or examples).—And certain it is, that such impositions would gain but little headway in the world, was it not for the *plausibility* and *sophistry* employed, to make submersion alone baptism; and connect with it, the idea of *damnation without it!* The *command must be obeyed*, the *cross must be borne?* How often do we hear these uttered by the baptists!

10. PROPOSITION.—Submersion is a mode not adopted to the condition and circumstances of all mankind; and therefore, cannot correspond with the universal application and benevolent designs of the gospel.

TESTIMONY. The evidence designed to establish the truth of this proposition, may be drawn from three sources: 1. The difficulties arising from *climate*. 2. Baptists have been careful to keep within prudent latitudes. 3. Candidates before baptism do not always possess sufficient *health* to admit of submersion.

In those regions traversed by the 60th parallel of latitude, the temperature is such, that wells are frozen to a great depth, and for the most part of the year water can be obtained only by melting snow or ice. In the region of the Esquimaux, the lakes and standing waters, unless deep, are generally in winter *frozen to the bottom*, and continue frozen from seven to nine months of the year. "In Greenland, Lapland, and the coldest countries of this region, brandy and mercury freeze during the winter. During the winter, the inhabitants of the coldest parts remain crowded together in small huts, the whole inside of a hut, or ship, is usually lined with ice, formed from the vapor of breath, which must be cut away every morning. The inhabitants of Siberia stop the openings of their houses with ice, and use it instead of glass. If the cold air suddenly enter the house, the vapors fall in a shower of snow. Every part of

the body must be covered in going out, or it is instantly frozen. The air when breathed, seems to pierce and even rend the lungs. The cup often freezes to the lips, if it be touched when drinking. The provisions must be cut with hatchets and saws, and the beams of houses are split by the frost, and rocks are rent with a noise like that of fire-arms."

Now, can it be supposed that submersion is practicable in such a country as this? For most of the inhospitable year, the whole country is bound in "thick ribbed ice." And how, we demand, could a supply of water be obtained during the severe season? Could the people furnish it by *baths*? Could they endure the process? Certainly not. And yet in these regions of terrible frost dwell *millions* of human beings.

Woodbridge's M. Geog. p. 145.

But allowing the abstract possibility (and this is the utmost that candor can demand, or truth concede) of practising submersion generally, during the winter season, in Labrador, Lapland, Siberia, Iceland, Greenland, and other countries lying within the polar and frozen regions, where the mean annual temperature is often below, and seldom much above freezing point, still there will be found none presumptuous enough to pretend that such a requisition, which for the inhabitants of those countries would bear any analogy to the mild and merciful character of gospel institutions. Let not

the reader dismiss this argument with a leering suspicion of its candor or its justice. Can it be doubted that the condition of this portion of our race, now under consideration, forms a fair and necessary exception to the universal practicability of submersion. According to Humbolt and others, not less than *eight millions* of human beings inhabit the *polar and frozen regions*. To these must the gospel be preached, and gospel ordinances administered as well as to us. But to the administration of submersion, nature has interposed a barrier for two-thirds of the year,—a barrier, which, to them, would render submersion more galling than the bloody rite of circumcision. But we must take into the account, also, the fact, that about *one-eighth* of the entire population of our earth inhabit regions north of our own latitudes, where winter extends through *six to nine months* of the year. And even with us, there may be reckoned six months of the year, wherein submersion cannot be performed without great inconvenience, and producing those unpleasant and even painful sensations of body which are altogether at variance with the analogy of New Testament institutions, and possess no imaginable power to improve the heart.

The reader will now perceive, that our baptist friends are fairly and irretrievably lodged in one of the following conclusions, viz: either God has established a Christian ordinance of

universal and perpetual obligation, which, during most of the time, from year to year, by the unalterable course of nature, is rendered either totally impracticable, or at least, oppressively burdensome to a large portion of the human family; or, that exclusive *submersion is not of divine appointment!* They can take their choice of the two difficulties. Either of them will show the propriety of the following remark of Prof. Ripley:—"among those who always practise immersion, the mention of such difficulties only provokes a smile, and it serves only to show how empty is mere theory when contrasted with facts."

2. But *facts* are against the baptist hypothesis. The universal practicability of submersion has never yet been proved; and boasting and exulting on the subject, are altogether premature. And happy for the theory of baptists, that they have always kept themselves within *prudent latitudes*.

In this they have done wisely. While other Protestant sects of Europe have extended their lines far north into Norway and Lapland, the baptists have prudently kept themselves mostly confined within Germany, the southern part of Poland, and some of the northern States of Austria. They have sent out missionaries to India, Africa, and among the aboriginies of North America; but we have never seen the experiment of a *Baptist* church rising up in Labra-

dor, Siberia, Greenland, or Central Russia.— Doubtless they would not ‘smile’ at the ‘difficulties of immersion,’ nor deem them altogether ‘imaginary’ in these regions. The practice of *warming* the baptismal water in Russia, by the Greek church, is the legitimate offspring of necessity, but cannot be carried into the coldest climates for want of *fuel, fonts, and suitable houses*. In these regions it is not only impracticable to administer the ordinance at all, (if submersion alone is baptism,) but according to Mr. Campbell’s theory, *there can be no remission of sins! Hence, no salvation!!*

3. But the inapplicability of submersion to all men, under all circumstances, also appears from the fact, that the candidate does not always *possess sufficient health* to admit of baptism in this way.

How large a proportion of our race are actually laboring under chronic diseases, which for months and even years together, deprive them of the power of being immersed! Those who repent and obtain pardon upon their death beds, not having been previously baptized, though they may afterwards linger for weeks, or even months, are forever denied the privilege of Christian Baptism.

And the Baptists are not willing to admit with CYPRIAN, bishop of Carthage, about the middle of the third century, ‘that those in a weak state of health did not permit them to be washed in

water, were yet sufficiently baptized by being *Sprinkled*;' and 'that the virtue of baptism ought not be estimated in a carnal manner, by the quantity of external apparatus;'—though the nature of the gospel ordinances, and the condition and circumstances of mankind, would decide in the affirmative.

Now, if submersionists cannot agree about the mode; if there is no command authorising submersion; if too much confidence is placed in the ordinance when thus administered; if submersion makes men no better than affusion; if those who practise it are comparatively small in number; if they have departed from ancient usage; if submersion diminishes devotional feelings, and is used for proselyting; and is not adapted to the location and condition of all mankind, which we think abundantly proved, it is not at all reasonable to suppose that submersion originated with a God of infinite benevolence.

CHAPTER II.

THE PHRASEOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE ON THE SUBJECT OF BAPTISM, DOES NOT FAVOR THE DOCTRINE OF EXCLUSIVE SUBMERSION,

1. PROPOSITION,—The English word *baptize* cannot be defined so as to favor exclusive submersion.

JOHNSON says, "Baptize, to christen." *Park-*

hurst says, "To baptize, to immerse in, or to wash with water, in token of purification from sin, and from spiritual pollution." *Walker* says, "Baptize, to administer the sacraments of baptism, to christen." Let these examples suffice to fit the meaning of the term. Such testimony ought to satisfy reasonable people. But Mr. Campbell has ascertained that these men, and all others, who do not define the term to suit his creed, have been governed either by their own peculiar views, or the common custom of the churches! See his Debate with Rice. Surely this is a grave charge to bring against these lexicographers, who were giving definitions, not for themselves, but for the world; and who would not risk their reputation, in assuming responsibilities relative to the meaning of words, without knowing what they really meant, and whence they were derived, even if it should please the pedobaptist. Poor subterfuge, Mr. C.

2. PROPOSITION.—The Greek word BAPTIZO, when used in a ceremonial, or ritual sense, does not mean submersion exclusively.

TESTIMONY, Was it not for the use which baptists make of this word, in perplexing the minds of the illiterate, we might *apologize* to the reader for its introduction here. But since it has been asserted, so frequently, that *baptizo* means *immersion alone*, we shall take the lib-

erty of presenting the testimony of undoubted authority, and then leave all to judge for themselves. The reader will understand, that the word *baptizo* is the Greek word uniformly used in the New Testament to express Christian baptism; and that it has been defined by Mr. Campbell and others, to mean *immersion alone*; but the lexicons will not sustain them in this partial and sophistical interpretation. That the definitions of this word, favorable to truth, and fatal to Mr. C.'s system of salvation, have been *suppressed*, can easily be discovered by a reference to his Debate with Mr. Rice. Some of the very authors quoted by Mr. C. are made to say that *baptizo* means, *primarily*, to *dip*, to *immerse*, to *immerge*, to *plunge*, and these alone, are shown by Mr. Rice, to define the word also to mean, *cleanse*, *wash*, *wet*, *purify*, *bathe*, &c. But let us attend to their own language.

SCAPULA, a learned, foreign lexicographer of 1579, thus defines "*baptizo*: to dip or immerse, to *dye*, to *cleanse*, to *wash*."

HEDERICUS defines *baptizo* "to dip, immerse, to cover with water, to *cleanse*, to *wash*, to baptize in a sacred sense."

STEPHANUS of 1572, defines it thus: To dip, immerse, as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing; to merge, submerge, to cover with water, to *cleanse*, to *wash*.

SCHLEUSNER defines *baptizo*, not only "to

plunge, immerse, but "*to cleanse, wash, to purify with water.*"

PARKHURST defines it: "To immerse in or wash with water in token of purification."

ROBINSON defines it: "To immerse, to sink; for example, spoken of ships, galleys, &c. In the New Testament, *to wash, to cleanse, by washing—to wash one's self, to bathe, to perform ablution, &c.*"

BRETSCHNEIDER, said to be the most critical lexicographer of the New Testament, says that *baptizo* means properly "*often to dip, often to wash; then simply to wash, to cleanse.*" Only one definition restricts the meaning to immerse.

SCHRIVELLIUS defines it: "To immerse, to baptize, to cleanse, to wash."

GROVES—"To dip, immerse, immerge, submerge, plunge, *to wash, cleanse, purify.*"

SUIDAS defines *baptizo*, not only to sink, plunge, immerse, but *to wet, wash, cleanse, purify, &c.*"

WAHL defines it, "first—*to wash, perform ablution, cleanse; secondly, to immerse, &c.*"

GREENFIELD defines it, "to immerse, immerge, sink, and in the New Testament, *to wash, perform ablution, cleanse; to immerse.*"

These are the principal lexicons, ancient and modern; and with what remarkable unanimity do they testify that the word *baptizo* signifies not only to sink, dip, plunge, &c., but *to*

wash, to cleanse, to purify." These words express the *thing done*—the application of water to the *subject*, but not the *mode* of doing it. And consequently the mode in which baptism was administered cannot be determined by the word. The connection and circumstances must determine this. Therefore the word *baptizo*, when used ceremonially, does not prove *exclusive submersion*. But lest it may be thought that evidence is scarce on this point, we will add the testimony of several of the *Greek* and *Latin critics*, and *eminent theologians*.

AINSWORTH, in his *English and Latin Dictionary*, defines *baptizo*, "to wash any one in the baptismal font, or to *sprinkle* on him the consecrated water."

LEIGH defines it "a kind of washing, as by plunging; and yet it is taken more loosely for any kind of washing, where there is no dipping at all."

BUCK says that "its radical, proper, and primary meaning is to *tinge*, to dye, to wet, or the like, which primary design is effected by different modes of application."

COLL defines *baptizo* "to baptize, to wash, to *sprinkle*."

PASSOR defines it "to immerse, wash, *sprinkle*."

CONLOR defines it by "*immersion, washing, sprinkling, or wetting*."

PISCATOR says, "*Baptizo* signifies not only

to be dipped, but also in any other way to be tinged, or rinsed."

ZELENUS says, "Baptism signifies dipping and also *sprinkling*."

WALKER in 1678 says, "I find nine Latin words used to express the import of *baptizo*, viz. *mergo*, *immergo*, *tingo*, *intingo*, *lavo*, *abluo*, *madefacio*, *purgo*, *mundo*; to immerse, to tinge, to color, to *sprinkle*, to wash, to moisten, to purge, to cleanse,"

ZAUCHIUS says, "Baptizo doth as well signify to dye, and simply to sprinkle as to immerse."

BUCANUS says, "Baptizo signifies to immerse, to tinge, to wash."

MALDENOT says, "With the Greeks *baptizo* signifies to dye, to wash, to wash oft, and as Tertullian says, to tinge, wet, or dye."

BONAVENTURE says, "*Baptizo* in Greek, signifies as much as *lavo* in Latin, that is, to wash, or *sprinkle*."

PETER MARTYR says, "Baptizo signifies not only to dip, but in any way to tinge or wet."

VORILONG says, *Baptizo* in Greek is the same that *lavo* is in Latin. Properly speaking, it signifies nothing except washing."

WHITAKER says, "The word *baptizo* signifies not only to immerse but also to tinge, to wet."

ALSTEDIUS says, "The term baptism signifies both immersion and *sprinkling*."

MASTRICHT says, "Baptism signifies washing, either by sprinkling or dipping."

TERTULLIAN, in the second century, says, "That baptizo means not only to immerse, but also to *pour*."

PARÆUS says, "Baptism, with the Greeks, any washing or cleansing, whether it be done by dipping or *sprinkling*."

URSINUS renders Baptismos *washing*, as well as dipping."

TRELACTIUS says, "Baptism, according to the etymology of it, signifies commonly, any kind of ablution or cleansing."

PETER LOMBORD says, "Baptism signifies intinction, that is, washing of the body."

WOLLEDIUS says, "Baptism signifies dipping and *sprinkling*, and by consequence, ablution or cleansing by washing."

DANEUS says, "Baptism signifies not only immersion, but also lotion and ablution, and not only are they baptized who are wholly dipped in water, but they that are tinged, or wetted with water."

THOMAS AQUINAS says, "Baptism may be given not only by immersion, but also by *affusion* of water, or *sprinkling* with it."

FEALTY says, "Christ no where requireth dipping, but only baptizing; which word Hesychius, Stephanus, Scapula, and Buddæus, those great masters of the Greek tongue, make good by very many instances out of the classic wri-

ters, importeth no more than ablution or washing."

CALVIN says, "Whether the person baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or not, or whether water be only *poured* or *sprinkled* upon him, is of no importance."

WALL says, "The word baptizo in Scripture, signifies to wash in general, without determining the sense to this or that sort of washing. And the word baptize is applied in Scripture, not only to such washing as is by dipping into the water the thing or person washed, but also to such as is by *pouring* or rubbing water on the thing or person washed, or some part of it."

BEZA says, 'They are rightly baptized who are baptized by *sprinkling*.'

OWEN says, 'Baptism is any kind of washing, whether by dipping or sprinkling.'

FLAVEL says, 'The word baptize signifies as well to wash as to plunge. A person may be truly baptized who is not plunged.'

TILENUS says, 'If we regard the etymology of the word baptism, it signifies dipping, and also *sprinkling*.'

KECHERMAN says, 'Baptism signifies either immersion, or washing, or *pouring*.'

DÆDERLAIN says, 'The power of the word baptizo is expressed in washing or performing ablution, on which account we read of the baptism of cups, pots, tables, &c. Mark, vii.'

LIGHTFOOT says, 'The word baptism does

not always denote immersion, but sometimes washing only, or even *sprinkling*.'

MORUS says, 'To baptize is in a solemn manner to immerse one in water, or to *pour* water upon him.'

COGSWELL says, 'Baptizo signifies to wet with water partially as well as totally, and by *sprinkling* as well as by immersion. The words immerse and immersion are not to be found in the Bible.'

J. WICKLIFFE says, 'Nor is it material whether persons are dipped once or three times, or whether water is poured upon their head.'

LYNWOOD says, 'Dipping is not to be accounted of the essence of baptism, but it may be given also by *pouring* or *sprinkling*.'

MUSCULUS says, 'It is free for the church to baptize either by dipping or sprinkling.'

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY affirm that 'Baptism is rightly administered by *pouring* or *sprinkling* water upon the person.'

DR. DODDRIDGE, who it is said, had strong partialities to immersion, says, that 'baptizo may signify any method of washing, and is sometimes used in Scripture for washing things which were not dipped in water; but on which it was poured, as Luke xi, Mark vii.'

DR. ADAM CLARKE, whom the baptists sometimes claim as favoring their views, says, 'Were the people *dipped* or *sprinkled*? For it is certain that *bapto* and *baptizo* mean both.'

POOL says, 'Baptizo does not always denote immersion; but sometimes washing only, or even *sprinkling*.'

BARNES says, 'Baptizo signified *originally* to tinge, or dye, to stain.'

Professor STEWART, after a full examination of the meaning of baptizo, says, 'I do consider it quite plain, that none of the circumstantial evidence [in the Bible] proves immersion to have been exclusively the mode of Christian baptism, or even that of John.'

President DWIGHT, that most acute Greek scholar, says, 'I have examined almost one hundred instances in which the word *baptizo* and its derivatives are used in the New Testament, and four in the Septuagint, and to my apprehension it is evident that the *primary* meaning of the word baptizo is *cleansing*.' Again he says, 'According to the great body of learned critics and lexicographers baptizo means originally to *tinge, stain, dye, or color*; and when it means *immersion* it is only in a *secondary* sense.'

LATHROP says, 'In the New Testament we find a clear and direct evidence, that the word baptizo signifies to *pour* and *sprinkle*.'

HEMMENWAY says, 'Washing or wetting is the first and original import of baptism.'

Mr. R. WATSON says, that "if the advocates of immersion could prove *what they have never been able to do*, that plunging is the *primary*

meaning of the term, [baptizo] they would gain nothing, since in Scripture it is notoriously used to express other applications of water."— See *Watson's Theological Institutes*.

Dr. S. MILLER says, 'Now we contend that this word [baptizo] does not, necessarily, nor even commonly, signify to immerse, but also implies to wash, to *sprinkle*, to *pour* on water, and to tinge or dye with any liquid; and, therefore, accords very well with the mode of baptism by *sprinkling* or *affusion*.'

Mr. P. EDWARDS says of the word *bapto*, 'That it is a term of such latitude, that he who shall attempt to prove from its use in various authors an absolute and total immersion, will find that he has undertaken that which he can never *fairly* perform.' And then adds, 'If there is a manifest failure in trying to prove the doctrine of immersion from the original word *bapto*, the word *baptizo*, confessedly derived from it, must have a less definite, and less forcible sense than the original.'

Dr. WATTS says, That 'the Greek word *baptizo* signifies to wash away any thing properly, by water *coming over it*; now there are several ways of such washing, viz: *sprinkling* water on it in a small quantity; *pouring* water on it in a larger quantity; or dipping it under water, either in part or in whole.'

BURKITT says, 'In baptism, a few drops of water *poured* upon me, doth signify to me all

the *benefits* of my Saviour's death and resurrection as fully as if with Jonah, I were plunged into the main ocean.'

JOHN WESLEY, whose learning and candor will not suffer by comparison with any of those mentioned above, and who has been quoted by Mr. Campbell and others as favoring the doctrine of exclusive immersion, says, 'The words *baptize* and *baptism* do not necessarily imply *dipping*, but are used in other senses in several places.' He also says, 'With regard to the mode of baptizing, I would only add, *Christ no where, as far as I can find, requires dipping, but only baptizing*: which word, many most eminent for learning and piety have *declared*, signifies to pour on or *sprinkle*, as well as to dip. The editor of Calmet mentions *eighty* examples in which the word *baptizo* implies *less than submersion*. See *Kurts on Baptism*.

This list might be greatly enlarged, but with the candid it is unnecessary; and these are sufficient to show, that no *enlightened baptist* will be heard again to utter these slanderous words; 'no *learned* and *candid* man can be found, who will say that it has any *other* meaning than to *dip* or *plunge*.' Or that all the definitions given to baptizo, which do not mean *immersion* are *secondary* or *figurative*. Be it remembered, also, that Mr. Carson, a celebrated baptist

author, says, that *bapto* signifies *literally* to dye in any manner. (p. 64.)

3. PROPOSITION.—The term *BAPTO*, whence *baptizo* is said to be derived, does not favor the doctrine of exclusive submersion.

TESTIMONY. To settle the definition of this word, it will only be necessary to give the authority of a few learned authors. Some testimony has already been furnished, incidentally, in connection with what has been said concerning the word *baptizo*.

SCAPULA defines the word *bapto*, immerse, to plunge; also, to stain, dye color; also, to wash.'

HEBERICUS says, it means 'to immerse, to plunge, to dye, to wash.'

COULON defines it 'to immerse, to dye, to cleanse.'

URSINUS—'To dip, to dye, to wash, to sprinkle.'

GROVES—'To dip, plunge, immerse, to wash, to wet, moisten, sprinkle, to steep, imbrue, to dye, &c.'

SCHRIVELLIUS—'To dip, to dye, to wash, to draw water.'

DONNEGAN—'To dip, to plunge into water, to submerge, to wash, to dye, to color,—to wash, &c.'

From the foregoing definitions we perceive that immerse is not the only sense in which

bapto is used; which is all we wish to prove. These authors will suffice to show with what degree of truth Mr. Campbell asserts, in a note in his garbled and deformed Testament, that baptizo is a word that 'all lexicographers translate by the words immerse, dip, or plunge; not one by sprinkle or pour.' And also by what authority he excludes every other meaning from *bapto* but his favorite one. In addition to the above, let it be remembered, that *bapto* is translated *to sprinkle* by three of the oldest and most valuable versions of the Bible ever published, viz: the *Peshito Syriac*, the *Ethiopic*, and the *Vulgate*. And that *Origen*, the most learned of the Christian fathers, in giving the substance of the passage in Rev. xix, 13, substituted *rantizo*, to sprinkle, for *bapto*. [See *Rice's Debate with Campbell*.] Mr. Rice mentions *nineteen* versions in all, that either transfer the word baptizo as our translators did, or translate it by a word unfavorable to immersion.

In view of all the foregoing testimony, must we not conclude, that submersionists can claim no support from the signification of terms so various and extended in their meaning?

The *Greek prepositions* supposed to favor immersion, will be noticed in connection with passages where they occur. We wish the reader to understand distinctly, that the Greek word *bapto* is never used in the Scriptures in

reference to the ordinance of baptism. It cannot, therefore, afford any evidence in favor of the baptist theory. And it is most seriously doubted, after all, whether *bapto* is the *root* of *baptizo*. If so, why did not the inspired writers sometimes use the *root*, as well as the *derivative*? But if we admit that *baptizo* is derived from *bapto*, the baptist cause gains nothing by it, as this word is susceptible of various significations, as well as the one said to be derived from it. *Question*—Is not *baptizo* itself a *root*, and not a derivative? Some Greek scholars are of the opinion that it is. Our English word baptism is derived from the Greek word *baptisma*, and baptism is derived from *baptizo*. Does not this place the latter in the position of a root? See Edward's *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, p. 181.

CHAPTER III.

NO EXAMPLES OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM RECORDED IN SCRIPTURE, AFFORD SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE OF SUBMERSION. ALL FURNISH, AT LEAST, PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF BAPTISM BY AFFUSION.

1. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be inferred from the baptism of the multitudes by John.

TESTIMONY. In John iii, 23, it is stated that 'John also was baptizing in Enon, (literally, the fountain of On, which flowed in several streams,) near to Salem, because there was *much water there.*' We do not give this as a Christian example of baptism, but because here is one of the immersionist's strongholds. For he can see no reason for why John should baptize where there is *much water*, except for *plunging* his converts! But, be it remembered, that in Judea springs were rare, and water scarce. That which was needed for domestic purposes, had daily to be brought from the nearest rivers and fountains, in pitchers, by the women; which rendered the supply scanty, and entirely insufficient to quench the thirst of the multitude, and the daily ablutions of the Jews. For Matthew says, (chap. iii; 5, 6) 'Then went out to him *Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized* of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.' And Mark informs us (i; 5) 'that there went out unto him *all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized* of him.' And Luke says, (iii, 21) 'And when *all the people* were baptized,' &c. While Josephus informs us that there were so many, who followed John, that Herod feared an insurrection, and caused him to be beheaded. Now, we would ask, if *much water* was not needed for other purposes than *immersion*, where there is such a multi-

tude? No evidence, therefore, can be gathered from the expression *much water*, (or *many waters* as it should be rendered) in favor of immersion. But it is said, that John baptized *in* Jordan, and *in* Enon. Be it so. This does not prove that he was literally in the waters of Jordan, (and if it did he might have baptized by affusion.) For we read in one place, that he baptized *in* (Greek *en*) Jordan, and in John i, 28 it is said—"These things were done in Bethabara, *beyond* Jordan, where John was baptizing." Bethabara was probably a small village near the Jordan, (literally a *house of passage*.) How, then, could John baptize literally *in* Jordan, and *in* Bethabara, *beyond* Jordan? The preposition *en* here doubtless means, as in many other places, *near to*. Thus both passages are reconciled.

A word of such ambiguous meaning as the Greek preposition *en*, can never aid the cause of Submersionists. The learned define it, *in*, *at*, *near to*, *by*, &c., and it refers to *place*, and not to the mode of baptism. And as the streams of that country were generally turbid, the place selected by John was more on account of the *quality* than the *quantity* of the water. It is estimated by Mr. Hibbard, that John continued his ministry only about *ten months*. Then, allowing two weeks for preaching before he commenced to baptize—deducting 20 days lost on account of foul weather, and 43 Sabbaths

wherein it was unlawful for ~~him~~ to baptize, and we have left, in all, 227 days in which we may suppose John exercised the functions of his ministry. Now, the population of Palestine in those days was at least *six millions*. And, as "*Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, were baptized of John, confessing their sins,*" giving a reasonable limitation of the *general* terms employed, we must conclude that John baptized at least *one half* of the entire population of Palestine. It would then follow that he baptized, in all, *three millions* of persons! The conclusion, therefore, is that John must have baptized, in one hour, two thousand two hundred and two, (as he could not, without a miracle, have labored more than six hours per day, especially if he stood in *three feet* depth of water.) in one minute, thirty-six, and a little over *one* every two seconds!— But considering the number much less, baptized by John, do we not see the utter impracticability of his taking them one at a time, and plunging them under water? Is not the probability strong in favor of *affusion*? But let it be remembered, that if Submersionists could prove that John plunged his subjects, yet nothing would be gained. For it is well known that John's baptism was not *christian* baptism.— The reasons are the following:—

1. Christian baptism is administered in the

name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.—This John did *not* do.

2. The Christian dispensation recognizes the kingdom of God as being in us, but John preached a kingdom *at hand*, and required faith in a *Messiah to come*.

3. The apostles *re-baptized* some of John's disciples, in the name of the Lord Jesus, Acts xix, which they would not have done if John's baptism were christian baptism.

The conclusion, therefore, is plain to all, that those who imitate John in his baptism, follow not in the footsteps of the apostles, and receive not christian baptism! But it has been asserted that in the German translation, John the Baptist is called *John the Dipper*. This is without foundation, yet, were it so, it would puzzle submersionists to tell whether he *dipped the people in the water*, or *dipped up the water and poured it upon the people*! Many of the ancients believed that John baptized by pouring. In A. D. 390, Aurelius Prudentius represents him as pouring water on the persons in the river. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, about the same time represents him as baptizing by pouring water. And Bernard, when speaking of the baptism of our Saviour by John, says—“*The creature poured water on the head of the Creator.*”

2. PROPOSITION.—The evidence derived from the circumstances of Christ's baptism by John, does not favor submersion.

TESTIMONY. On this point we remark, 1. That our Lord's baptism differed from John's baptism; for John baptized *unto repentance*," and Jesus had no sins of which to repent. John baptized, saying, that they should "believe on him that was to come after him," that is, on Christ, but Christ could not exercise faith on himself, much less on himself yet to come.

2. Christ's baptism was not the same as christian baptism. For it has always been an essential part of christian baptism that its subjects receive the ordinance in the name of the Holy Trinity, according to the institution of our Lord's own command.

3. Men were to receive christian baptism in connexion with instruction, in order to make *disciples* of them. And who will affirm that this was the object of the baptism of Christ?—He could not be dedicated to his own service—he could not become his own disciple! But, says the baptist, "Christ was baptized to set us an *example*." What inspired writer says this? If so, why did he delay this illustrious example until he was *thirty years* old? And why did he not give some *direction* relative to this matter, as he did in the holy Eucharist? But not a word is left on the occasion of his baptism, to imitate him, or follow his example. To follow Christ, according to his command, means holy living, and self-denial, but is not to be applied, in its interpretation, to his public acts, such as

circumcision—~~for~~ forty days—walking on the sea—raising ~~the~~ dead—casting out devils, &c. Then whatever our Lord's baptism may mean, it can neither be one with John's, or the christian baptism.

4. The great probability is that Christ was baptized by affusion, and not immersion. For it appears that his baptism was the ceremonial introduction into the Priesthood. And in the following particulars his case was analagous to the Aaronic Priests. 1. They were eligible to the priestly office when thirty years old, and initiation followed. So our Lord was baptized "when he began to be about thirty years old," and this, doubtless, was his initiation ordination to the Priesthood.

2d. The Aaronic Priests were initiated into office by a divinely appointed person. So Christ went to "*John, the son of Zacharias, the old Priest who perished at the altar, and who was set apart to go before the face of the highest.*"

3d. The priests were *washed*, or sprinkled with water at the gate of the tabernacle. So was our Lord washed with water—yes, *he was baptized with water.*

4th. The priests were annointed with oil immediately after their consecration by washing. And it is said of Christ, "*God hath annointed him above thy fellows,*" his fellow priests; they were annointed with *oil*, our great High Priest

with the oil of gladness, for "the Father giveth not his Spirit by measure unto him." When was this anointing? When he was baptized and came from the water, "*When lo! the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him.*"

5th. The priests were approved in the presence of all the people, for no invalid, or man of bad moral character could be a priest. So also was Christ after his baptism, "*And lo! a voice from Heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*" Now these coincidences clearly show his regular initiation into the priestly office. And when we turn to Ex. xi, 12, and Lev. vii, 6, we find that the Jewish priests were "*washed,*" or baptized, by *pouring*, or *affusion*. Therefore, our Saviour must have been baptized in the same way.—Hence it is said that John baptized "*with water,*" which would be at least an awkward expression in reference to submersion.

As to the *place* where our Lord was baptized, "*in Jordan,*" it is equivalent to "*at Jordan*"—*at* being a frequent sense of the Greek preposition *en*. Or it may signify that the water of Jordan was made use of by John for baptizing, however it might be applied, for we might *wash* ourselves in a river without *plunging* ourselves into it. Or it may mean that John baptized *in the bed* of the river. For Maundrell says, that

"After having descended the *outer-most bank*, you go *a furlong* upon a level strand, before you come to the immediate bank of the river." Any of these views of the import of the phrases, "in Jordan," "in the river of Jordan," used plainly with the intention to point out the *place* where John exercised his ministry, will sufficiently explain them, without admitting that John baptized only by submersion.

Hence, Mr. Wolfe, the missionary to Mesopotamia, says that the sect of christians there call themselves "the followers of St. John the Baptist, who was the follower of Christ." As to their *mode* of baptism, they informed him that "The Priest, or Bishop, baptizes children thirty days old. They take the child to the banks of the *river*; a relative or friend holds the child near the surface of the water, while the priest *sprinkles* the element upon the child, and with prayers they name the child."—(Journal, vol. ii, p. 311.) Mr. Wolfe asks, "why do they baptize in rivers?" Answer, "Because St. John the Baptist baptized *in the river Jordan*." Thus, we have in modern times *river baptism without immersion*. Yet, after all this testimony, our baptist brethren cannot acknowledge baptism in the case, without a complete *underwhelming*! Nevertheless, we are satisfied that our Saviour was baptized by *effusion*, though could it be shown plainly that he was *immersed*, yet, we should not feel bound to fol-

low his example in this respect, as his was the *christian baptism*, but a baptism to initiate him into the priestly office. And thus, according to his own words, it behoved him, in connexion with John, God's officiating high priest, "*to fulfil all righteousness.*"

3. PROPOSITION.—The baptism of the Eunuch, by Philip, affords no proof of submersion, but contrawise.

TESTIMONY. The account of the Eunuch's baptism reads thus:—"And they went down, both, into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him."—*Acts viii, 38.*—Here the baptist feels himself "entrenched;" and to him, "*going down into the water,*" and coming "*up out of the water,*" signify *submersion*, and nothing else. Now taking the passage as it stands, there is no proof of submersion whatever; for if the question be proposed grammatically, who went into the water? the answer is *both*. Consequently, if *into* means *immersion*, then were both immersed to a certainty, which would be a little too much to prove. Yea, it could not mean *baptism* at all, for the Eunuch was baptized *afterwards*. This is acknowledged by the baptists, when they are pointed to the result of laying so much stress upon the prepositions *Eis* and *Apo*, *into* and *out of*, in this connexion. Which throws us back upon the meaning of the word *baptize*.—But we have already shown that the word im-

plies an application of water to the subject, without reference to the *amount*. But still, submersionists will contend that *into* and *out of* convey to their minds the idea of going *under* the water! Well, if so, there would be no impropriety in saying, when our Saviour went *into* the mountain, he went *under* it, and when Christ entered *into* Jerusalem he went *under* the city—when Paul went *into* Damascus, he went *under* it—and when Christ entered *into* a ship, and passed over and came *into* his own city, it should read, he entered *under* the ship, and passed over, and came *under* his own city. Such nonsense would necessarily arise from making *into* mean *under*.

Pedo baptists admit that the original should sometimes be rendered *into*; but we contend, also, that it sometimes means *to* and *unto*, as well as *into*, and is often so translated in the Scriptures. And we may with all propriety read the text under consideration thus:—"they descended *to* the water, and ascended *from* it."

But taking it as we find it in our version, and admitting that they, both Philip and the eunuch, went down into the water, what can the submersionists gain by it, since they might have gone down the bank of the stream, waded into the water, and there the ordinance of baptism be administered, either by *sprinkling* or *pouring*. This has been done in modern times.—The author himself once baptized a man while

kneeling in the water. Yet it was by *pouring*. And a bystander might, when relating the circumstance, say in all truth and propriety: "They went down both *into the water*, both Mr. G. and the candidate; and he *baptized* him; and afterwards, they both came up *out of the water.*" Who can see any inconsistency in this language, though there is not even an indication of *submersion*? The ordinance was administered by *affusion* in this case, and we think that all the circumstances connected with the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch, go to prove, that he was baptized by affusion also. For, 1st, Philip met the eunuch in a road that led through a *desert*, (verse 26,) implying that no streams could be found there. And the geography of that country shows, that no river, nor even a creek, runs through that region. *Dr. Cave's Life of St. Philip*, vol. 2, page 113.

2. Philip explained the 52d and 53d chapters of Isaiah, which are here expressly mentioned. He found these words in the prophecy: "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations."—Philip, of course, must have told the eunuch that the blood of Christ was shed to wash us clean from sin, for this is the leading idea of the prophecy on which the eunuch was meditating. He must likewise have spoken of his faith in Christ, of becoming a member of his church, and announcing and sealing the fact by

H

baptism, for it was always expected of the Jewish and Gentile converts that they should make a profession of faith preparatory to submitting to this ordinance, (hence the eunuch finally said, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,') and hence we understand how the eunuch could mention *baptism*. Philip may have told him that as water cleanses the body, so the blood of Christ effects a spiritual cleansing; that hence, baptism was full of meaning—that it was a sprinkling;—noting too the word 'sprinkle' in the prophecy. The eunuch was convinced, and coming 'unto a certain water, (perhaps a small spring gushed forth in the desert, as is sometimes the case,) he was baptized, and in all probability by sprinkling.

The phrase '*sprinkle many nations*,' in the prophecy, read by the eunuch, was the only one from which he could possibly learn, that it was his duty to be baptized, and accords with the command of the Saviour, Math. 28; 19: 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all *nations*, baptizing them.' The directions of Philip must have corresponded to these declarations and commands, and his practice, in administering the ordinance, accorded with the conceptions of the eunuch's mind, when reading the prophecy,—'So shall he *sprinkle*, or *baptize many nations*.'

4. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be inferred from the baptism of Noah and his family.

TESTIMONY. In 1 Pet. iii, 20, 21, it is said, 'While the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us.' This is the only figure spoken of in Scripture in reference to *baptism*.—The question to be decided is, whether the circumstance here recorded favors the idea of *submersion* more than that of *pouring*. God says in Gen. vii, 4, "For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights," and in Gen. xi, 12, he says, 'all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.' The 7th verse informs us that Noah and his family had entered into the ark before the water fell upon the earth; and in the 18th, we learn that the ark went upon the *face* of the waters, not *under* the water. Neither the *ark* nor *those in it* were *immersed*, but were borne *above* the waters, and the *figure* was certainly that of *pouring*; for as the water *descended* and *fell upon the ark over them*, it properly *prefigured* or *represented baptism by pouring*, but surely could have no resemblance to *immersion*! The water did not fall on them,

as in the case of the Israelites when God sent the rain to *confirm* them, but it fell *over* them, constituting thereby the *figure* of the *Christian baptism*! If it be said that they were *in* the ark, and therefore *immersed*; we may suppose, according to this, that when a person is baptized by *pouring* in a house, it amounts to an *immersion*! A *poor* subterfuge, rather than *none*!!

Thus we see that all the facts of the case oppose the immersion theory, and clearly establish baptism by *pouring*. So that if we are to be *saved* by *baptism* as Noah was saved by *water*, we must be saved by being *kept out of the water*, and not by *being put into it*. Noah was a preacher of righteousness, a hundred and twenty years before he entered the ark, consequently was not saved by that means from the guilt of sin; and as those who were *immersed* on that occasion were *drowned* and *lost*, as well as those who were *immersed* in the Red Sea, we necessarily arrive at the conclusion, that the Scriptures no where teach that *baptism* is *submersion*, or that *submersion* is *baptism*. And the fact that the apostle declares, that the baptism mentioned is 'not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,' shows that something more is requisite to *salvation*, and this he plainly shows to be 'the *resurrection of Jesus Christ*.'

5. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be shown from the baptism of the Israelites in the cloud and in the sea

TESTIMONY. Of the Israelites, it is said, that they 'were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' 1. Cor. x, 2.

Mr. Campbell says, that the mere circumstance of their being surrounded with water, and covered with a cloud, is called their baptism.' [See Debate with Rice.] But St. Paul tells us, that they '*were all baptized.*' How dares Mr. C. say 'it was a *figure only*?' And if this be so, why did not Paul say that the Israelites were *figuratively baptized*? Again it is not true, that they were 'surrounded with water and covered with a cloud.' For Moses informs us that the 'Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and the waters were divided.' Does this mean that there was water all *around* them, both *before* and *behind* them? It is also not true, that the cloud was *over them* so as to constitute an *overwhelming*. For Moses declares, that before the waters were divided, the cloud had passed from '*before their face and stood behind them:* And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel, and it was a cloud of darkness *to them*, but it gave light by night to these: so that one came not near the other all the night.' Ex. xiv, 19, 21. So we see that Mr. C. contradicts both *Paul*

and *Moses*; and hesitates not to say, with some degree of modesty, it is true, 'I don't think that a *drop of water fell on them*,' while it is recorded in the 77th Psalm, 'The waters saw thee, oh God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid: the depths also were troubled. The clouds *poured out water*; the skies sent out a sound: thine arrows also went abroad; the voice of thy thunder was in the heaven; the lightnings lighted the world; the earth trembled and shook; thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known. Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron.' And Josephus adds his corresponding testimony in the following language: 'As soon, therefore, as the whole Egyptian army was within it, the sea flowed to its own place, and came down with a torrent raised by storms of wind, and encompassed the Egyptians. Showers of rain also came down from the sky, and dreadful thunders and lightnings, with flashes of fire.' Page 61. The *object* of sending the rain is stated by David: 'Thou, oh God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst *confirm* thine inheritance when it was weary.' Ps. lxxviii, 9. The Israelites then, were *really*, not *figuratively* baptized, yet they were neither really nor figuratively *immersed*! But will not the grammatical structure of the passage in Cor. fairly convey the idea of *two* distinct times of baptism, one 'in

the cloud' and the other 'in the sea.' Neither of which could have been submersion. The first was when God sent 'a *plentiful rain*, whereby he *confirmed* his inheritance.' This was being "*baptized in the cloud.*" And the second was, doubtless, when sprays of the sea were blown over them, by the 'strong wind that prevailed all night.'

From all the facts in the case, we learn, 1. That the Israelites were all *baptized* with water. 2 That they were not *plunged* nor *dipped* either into the cloud or the sea. 3. That they were not even *surrounded* by water, for the waters were *divided* so as to be on their *right hand* and on their *left*. 4. That cloud was not over them while in the sea, for it had passed from *before* and stood *behind them*. 5. That either *before* or after their passage through the sea or both, there was an action of the cloud which Paul denominated *baptism*. 6. That this baptism was not by *submersion*, but by *pouring* or *sprinkling*. 7. And that all the evidence of the untenable theory of the baptists is found in the *drowning of the Egyptians!*—Here was submersion with a vengeance!

6. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be shown from the baptism of the 3000 persons on the day of Pentecost.

TESTIMONY. The shortness of the time for the performance of the baptisms, renders it ex-

ceedingly impracticable or improbable. It is said in Acts, 'That the apostles came together at the third hour,' or nine o'clock. Besides the discourse delivered on the occasion, in which they 'testified and exhorted *with many words*,' must have occupied considerable time. And here are three thousand souls awakened, converted, believe in Christ, and conclude to be baptized. All these transactions could not have passed in less than four hours. Five hours now remained; and three thousand were to be baptized by twelve men. Allowing for the time lost in repairing to the water, and making the necessary preparations, were each of the apostles to be constantly employed, but a little more than one minute could be allotted for the baptism of each candidate. Is it then probable that they were *submerged*? Another difficulty would arise from the *scarcity of places* in which to immerse in the neighborhood of Jerusalem.—The probabilities are, therefore, all in favor of their *baptism by aspersion*!

7. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be shown from the baptism of Paul.

TESTIMONY. In Acts ix, 18, it is said, 'And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized.'

From this account we see not the shadow of

evidence in favor of submersion; but baptism by affusion is obvious. Paul was in the city of Damascus, in a private dwelling. He had been sick for three days. Then Ananias went into the House where Paul abode, and having put his hands upon him, addressed him in the name of the Lord Jesus, and '*immediately* there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight *forthwith*, and arose, and *was baptized*. His baptism must, therefore, have taken place immediately after his recovery, and in the very room where Ananias first saw him. We have no account of his leaving the house in quest of water. (If this is asserted by the baptists, they will be put to the test to prove it.) And as he could not conveniently be immersed in the room, he must have been baptized by *sprinkling* or *pouring*. This will appear also from the fact that the words '*he arose* and was baptized,' indicate, at least, that instead of being plunged into the water, he stood on his feet and received the ordinance. And the following examples will show that the Greek makes the argument stronger than the translation. *Anastas* is the word employed by Luke and Ananias, to express Paul's rising to his feet. And in Math. xxvi, 62, it is said, 'the high priest arose (*anastas*) and said unto him, answerest thou nothing?' Did not the priest stand on his feet? And in Mark xiv, 57, we read, 'there arose (*anastantes*) certain, and bear

false witness against him.' Also in Acts i, 15, 'And in those days Peter stood up (*anastas*) in the midst of the disciples,' &c. And in Acts xiii, 16, we read, 'Then Paul stood up, (*anastas*,) and beckoning with his hand, said,' &c. These passages show the common use of this word, that it is constantly used to express the act of rising to the feet. And the account of Paul's baptism leads us to the conclusion, that there was no delay; but having *risen up*, he was baptized.

8. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be proved from the baptism of the jailer.

TESTIMONY. The account is found in Acts xvi, 33. 'And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his straightway.' There is nothing in this account favoring the idea of submersion. But for the following reasons we think that affusion was the mode. 1. All the parties were in prison. 2. They did not leave the prison-house. 3. Paul refused to go out of the prison the next day, when he might have left. 4. He could not, as a conscientious man, have left the prison, in a clandestine manner, at midnight, with the jailer and his family, in search of water to immerse them. 5. It does not appear that there was any convenience in the prison for immersing. And 6. We know that water was brought to wash the stripes of

the apostles; and therefore it is more than probable, that with part of that very water that was brought into the prison, the jailer and his family were baptized by *sprinkling* or *pouring*.—All the probabilities in the case are pointedly against the idea of submersion.

9. PROPOSITION.—The baptism of Cornelius and his kinsmen gives no countenance to the doctrine of submersion.

TESTIMONY. 1. It is not said that they were submerged. 2. They were in the house of Cornelius, verse 24. Peter also 'went into the house, and there found them assembled, verse 27, 2. It does not appear that they left the house. 3. They did not go to a river, to 'much water,' nor 'into water.' 4. They were evidently baptized in the house where the Holy Ghost fell on them. The expression of the apostle favors this view: 'Can any man forbid water?'—that is, *to be brought*; not, 'Can any man forbid these persons to go to a river, or to a pond?' Which doubtless would have been the form used, had he designed their being dipped in a river or in a pond. To say that the apostle intended to ask, 'Can any forbid water *to be used*, or the *use of water* for immersion?' is to make the apostle express himself as if some then present really doubted the propriety of using *water*. as the element in baptism, whereas, it

is evident on the face of the record, that he designed to convey no such idea. Who can forbid water *to be brought*, doubtless is the meaning of the apostle. 5. They were, therefore, considering all the circumstances of the case, beyond all reasonable doubt, baptized, not by submersion, but by *sprinkling* or *pouring*.

If the baptist can find no proof of submersion in the examples we have referred to in the foregoing chapter, to find an example is a hopeless case. All the facts and probabilities are against their theory. And the further we advance in the investigation of this subject, the more we see the practicability and consistency of pedobaptists in administering the ordinance of baptism by *affusion*.

CHAPTER IV.

NO INCIDENTAL TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE CAN BE FOUND THAT FAVOR EXCLUSIVE SUBMERSION.

Every passage of Scripture where baptism is incidentally mentioned, is susceptible of a rational exposition, without giving the least shadow of countenance to the doctrine of submersion. The whole force of evidence from this source, as in all other cases, is on the side of pedobaptism, whatever may be the pretensions of those whose endless cry is, *water! water!!*

1. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be proved from Rom. vi, 4.

TESTIMONY. No text has been quoted more frequently by baptists, than the one found in Romans, where the apostle says, 'Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death.' It is taken for granted that the word *buried* in the text means submersion. And it is somewhat diverting, to see so many read this passage through baptist spectacles! Yet, the following will show their inconsistency. 1. The scope of the apostle's address, in this chapter, nor the passage itself, requires us to suppose that the apostle alludes at all to the outward form of baptism. This was not embraced in the author's intention. His whole object doubtless was to show, by a strong figure, that salvation by grace implies a moral death to sin. 2. The *burial* spoken of is not a *physical* but a moral one.—Hence, it is said to be a 'burial unto death.' If the *burial* be a physical one, then also must the *resurrection*, which is its proper antithesis, be a physical resurrection. But if the burial be taken in a purely *moral* sense, then also must the resurrection be a moral one,—a resurrection of the moral man from the death of sin to a life of holiness. Again, if the burial referred to means submersion in water, we may with all proprie-

ty read the passage thus—‘Therefore we are buried with him by baptism *into the water*; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also, having been *raised out of the water*, should walk in newness of life.’ But he who walks in newness of life must have experienced a spiritual resurrection; and a spiritual resurrection necessarily implies a spiritual *death*. Hence the apostle says, ‘Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also *LIVE with him*.’ And again, ‘Reckon ye also yourselves to be *dead* indeed unto *sin*, but *alive* unto God.’—Thus we see the propriety of placing the words ‘burial into death,’ and ‘newness of life,’ in contraposition. We conclude, therefore, that the phrases, *dead to sin; dead with Christ; buried with him by baptism into death; buried with him in baptism; baptized into his death*,—are terms which we understand as synonymous, with this exception, the allusion to a burial gives energy to the expression. 3. That the apostle does not allude to the outward form of baptism is evident from the fact that he uses a *mixture* of figures designed to set forth the same doctrine.

For instance, in verse 4, he speaks of our being ‘buried with Christ by baptism into death;’ in v. 5 of our being ‘*grafted* together in the likeness of his death;’ in verse 6, of our being ‘*crucified* with

Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed.' Paul illustrates our death with Christ unto sin, first, by an allusion to the *import* of baptism; secondly, by a metaphor taken from grafting, and thirdly by a crucifixion. Now if we take the *burial* in a *literal* sense, so must we also the *grafting*, and the *crucifixion*. But if these mean or represent our death unto sin, and living connection with Christ by faith, then surely the phrase being 'buried with Christ by baptism into death,' has no reference to the outward form of baptism, much less the *mode* of baptism. Especially, as there is not found, in one solitary instance, over the entire range of Scripture history, the most distant approach to the idea of a burial and a resurrection, where emblematical washings are spoken of. Is not, then, this *water* burial and resurrection of the baptists of doubtful origin and interpretation? But if we should admit that the apostle designed to teach the *mode* of baptism in this passage, (which we are far from doing,) by comparing it to the burial of Christ, it would by no means serve the intended purpose of the baptists. For in the Saviour's burial there was no subterranean immersion, as imagined by them. The body of the Saviour was evidently laid in a stone cell, above ground, and therefore, the figure in question does not serve the turn of submersionists. The apostle says, '*we are buried*,' not *we shall be*, or *have been* buried with him!

2. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be proved from Col. ii, 12.

TESTIMONY. This text is similar to the one just noticed, and affords as little evidence in favor of submersion. 'Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God. The whole context so plainly proves that the phrase 'buried in baptism' is figurative, that we need spend but little time with it. It means that as a man literally dead and buried, is cut off from all temporal connections and indulgences; so the baptized man is really, or at least by profession, dead to sin, and in this way made conformable to the death of Christ in its great design and efficacy, which are to purify to himself a peculiar people, dead to the world, dead to carnal ambition, and secluded from every unhallowed practice. And mark, when a man is plunged he rises from the water by *physical* power, whereas Paul here says, 'risen *through the faith of the operation of God.*' Consequently, he cannot allude to submersion.

3. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot receive any support from what Paul terms baptism for the dead.

TESTIMONY. Paul's language is, 'Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?' This, like all other passages touching baptism, has been drag-

ged in to support the submersion theory.—Hence Mr. C. translates it, ‘immersion for the dead?’ But the obvious meaning of this passage is, if Christ be not raised from the dead, then those who are baptized by his authority are baptized for the dead. Paul says, ‘if Christ be not raised your faith is vain.’ Our acts are performed for the *living*, and not for the *dead*. So that our baptism in the name, and by the authority of Christ gives evidence of our faith in the resurrection. ‘How then,’ says the apostle, ‘say some among you that there is no resurrection.’ But whatever may be the import of this passage, it does not in the least favor the idea of going under the water.

1. PROPOSITION.—No argument can be drawn from the phrase “One baptism,” to favor submersion.

TESTIMONY. It is thought by some that this phrase favors the idea that baptism must invariably be administered in *one mode*. But three things are necessary to be accomplished, before this phrase can serve the baptist cause. 1. They must prove that this ‘one baptism’ is *water baptism*. 2. They must prove that the ‘one baptism’ means only *one mode* of administering it, and 3. That the mode in which it is to be administered is *submersion*. Then, and not till then, can they claim this passage as auxiliary to their cause.

5. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be proved from Heb. x, 22.

TESTIMONY. 'Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' The phrase, 'bodies washed with pure water,' is synonymous with *submersion* with the baptist. But the following are worthy of special note: 1. No man can prove that the apostle here means water baptism. 2. *Washing* may take place without plunging us under water. For the Saviour said, when he held a *basin* of water in his hand, 'If I *wash* thee not thou hast no part with me.' Certainly he did not *plunge* the disciple in the basin! We read of the '*washing* of regeneration, (not the *plunging* of regeneration!) and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he *shed on us*.' Titus iii, 5. 'And thus shalt thou do unto them to *cleanse* them; *sprinkle* water of purifying upon them.' Num. viii, 7. 'Thus we see that *washing* in these cases is not performed by submersion, but by *sprinkling*, or being *shed on us*. 3. And should it be proved that these words refer to water baptism, baptists have still a difficulty to meet. The apostle says, having 'our bodies washed with *pure water*,' whereas it is well known, that those who practise submersion, frequently make use of *impure, muddy* water! And until they cease this *practice*, consistency would say, cease to bring in

this passage in support of your doubtful theory! Let it be observed, that the apostle does not say washed *in* water, but *with* water.

6. PROPOSITION.—Submersion cannot be shown from the baptism of Lydia by the “river side,” recorded in Acts, xvi, 15.

TESTIMONY. The circumstances recorded concerning Lydia’s baptism give no countenance to submersion. It is true that it took place ‘by the river side,’ but this does not prove that she was put *into* the water, or *under* it. Query, would our baptist friends be satisfied with baptism ‘*by the river side?*’

We have now noticed all of the most important passages in the New Testament, where the ordinance of baptism is incidentally referred to, and not one of them favors the doctrine of submersion. No, not one. But in every instance, the circumstances go to show that baptism was uniformly administered by affusion. And it seems quite obvious that none can derive any evidence from this source in favor of submersion, but those who look through the glasses of ignorance or prejudice. *Preconceived* opinions generally find something in the word of God to give them plausibility. But the safest way is always to let the Scriptures form our opinions in religious matters, and then we shall escape the influence of error. And if all had taken the Bible for their text-book on the sub.

ject of baptism, much time and ink, and paper, would have been saved; and much controversy and unchristian feeling would have been prevented. But men must needs cling with great tenacity to the notions received from their teachers, or forefathers, without carefully comparing them with the standard of truth. The Bible will correct the errors of the head, and divine grace will correct the errors of the heart. One tells us that we are to be baptized *with* water, and the other baptizes *with* the Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER V.

MORE DIRECT TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF BAPTISM BY AFFUSION.

Notwithstanding much impartial and incidental testimony is presented in the preceding pages in favor of baptism by affusion, yet we deem it proper to add a short chapter, in which more *direct* testimony may be found. Their peculiar views are sustained (if sustained at all) by *inferential* testimony. And we think that the greatest amount of this kind of evidence is to be found on the side of pedo-baptism. Yet we think that "we have a more sure word of prophecy" on this subject. So that we may be led to understand both the will of God, and

our own duty. And surely God's own method of baptizing unequivocally teaches how the ordinance should be observed by us.

PROPOSITION.—Baptism is to be performed *with* water, and not *in* water.

TESTIMONY. John says, 'I indeed baptize *with* water,' which corresponds with the baptism of Christ, which is to be '*with* the Holy Ghost.'

In the Holy Ghost is not only an awkward mode of expression, but absolutely in opposition to all the expressions found in Scripture indicative of the Holy Spirit's influence, as we shall soon show. And the application of the agent or element to the subject, seems more reasonable than to apply the subject to the element.

He shall plunge, dip, immerse, submerge or *bury* you *into* the Holy Ghost, is language that is well adapted to the baptist theory, but neither the scriptures, reason, or common sense will justify the use of such phraseology in reference to the operations of the Holy Spirit upon the human soul. And if Jesus Christ baptizes *with* the Holy Ghost, surely we may baptize *with* water; and if so, it must be done by affusion.

2. PROPOSITION.—Pouring, or sprinkling, is God's own method of baptizing, and should be copied by us.

TESTIMONY. Of this Joel prophesied, and

Peter confirms it when referring to the fulfilment. Compare Joel ii, 28, 29, with Acts ii, 17, 18—33.

‘This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel : And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit,’ &c., ‘having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. Again, Acts xi, 15, 16, ‘And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell* on them as on us at the begininng. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.’

It appears perfectly clear that the Holy Spirit was *poured out, shed forth, fell on* all them, and that this is called *baptism*, which shows distinctly that the agent that washes the body, or cleanses the soul, should be applied by affusion. The foregoing expressions give us to understand, that there can be no analogy between God’s manner of baptizing, and that of submersion. There are other expressions used by the inspired writers which are synonymous with these, and strengthen us in the belief that there must be an application of the agent to the subject—Viz : He shall *send* the Holy Ghost—*from on high*. I saw the Spirit *descending from Heaven* like a dove, and it *abode upon* him.—Suddenly there *came from heaven*, and *appeared unto them* cloven tongues.—For as

yet he was *fallen* upon none of them.—Ananias put his hands on Paul, that he might be *filled* with the Holy Ghost.—God *anointed* Jesus of Nazereth with the Holy Ghost.—*Giving* them the Holy Ghost, even as unto us.—The Holy Ghost, which he *shed* on us abundantly.—The Holy Ghost *sent down* from heaven.—*Sealed* with the Holy Spirit of promise.

These passages give us then, as synonymous with *baptism*:—*sending down, coming, giving, falling, shedding, pouring, sitting or abiding, anointing, filling, and sealing*. And not one of them expresses, or hints at the idea of *plunging*. Thus we find that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was conferred by the *descending* of the baptismal element. And when water baptism is administered by us, the element must be applied in the same way. This agrees with the analogy of faith, the analogy of language, and is perfectly appropriate, decent and significant.

Much more might be said upon this prolific subject, but our limits will not admit of additional remarks on this prominent part. As we have carefully pursued the investigation, we are more than ever convinced of the truth of the following propositions:—

1. That our Baptist friends do not carefully, and without prejudice examine both sides of the question, and therefore are not prepared to understand fully the grounds on which pedo-

baptists build their faith and practice. This is exemplified in the author's own experience.— Having once been a violent opposer of infant baptism, and an unyielding opponent of all modes save submersion. But *investigation*, despite of all his early ignorance and prejudice, has convinced him of his former errors, and of the truth of pedo-baptism. And in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, we think that this will be the result with all who will lay aside their baptist glasses, and earnestly seek to know the truth.

2. That the proper subjects of baptism are all that belong to the great family of Christ, or are recognised by him as his children—whether adults or infants. And therefore, what God hath joined together no man should put asunder.

3. That Christian baptism is not to put away the filth of the *flesh*, but the *answer* of a *good conscience* before God. And therefore should neither be neglected, nor made to take the place of that grace which it is designed to represent, or be the means of securing.

4. That there is not a solitary *command, precept, example or phrase* found in Scripture to justify the administration of the Ordinance of Baptism by submersion. Consequently, he that practices submersion acts without authority from the word of God. As Mr. Carson says, here we stand *entrenched*, and challenge proof to the contrary.

5. That all of the evangelical Churches that agree in baptizing by affusion, have ample support from the Holy Scriptures, the example of early christians, and the voice of reason and rational argument, which should induce them to persevere in the good and right way—that is, baptize *with* water.

PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

PART FOURTH.

BINDING OBLIGATIONS OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

BAPTISM SHOULD NOT BE NEGLECTED.

Quakers and infidels are not the only persons within the precincts of Christendom, that take upon themselves the responsibility of neglecting the ordinance of baptism. By some it is thought wholly non-essential, and by others, that it may be observed or not, just as the feelings or fancy of the candidate, or parents, may dictate. While some are of the opinion that water baptism is a continuation of the old Jewish prosolyte baptism, and is to be administered to none but Pagans, Mahomedans, or others, who did not previously receive christianity as the true religion.

All who feel disposed to deny the perpetuity and binding obligations of this ordinance, are

requested to consider the following propositions :—

1. PROPOSITION.—The apostles understood their commission to include water baptism.

TESTIMONY. On the day of pentecost Peter preached unto the multitudes, and said ‘repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.’—Acts ii, 38. ‘Then they that gladly received his word were *baptized* ;’ verse 41. ‘And when they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they *were baptized*, both men and women ;’ viii, 12. ‘And they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he *baptized* him ;’ verse 38. It is also said of Saul, after being instructed by Ananias, ‘he received sight forthwith, and arose and *was baptized* ;’ ix, 18. These examples, which show that the apostles understood the commission of their Lord, ‘go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them,’ in a literal sense. Water baptism must, therefore, be binding on all that would be Christ’s disciples, when it is possible to attend to it.

2. PROPOSITION.—To baptize with the Holy Ghost is the prerogative of Christ alone, and therefore could not be accomplished by the apostles.

TESTIMONY. 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptized with the Holy Ghost;' John i, 33. 'For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence;' Acts i, 5. 'And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance;' ii, 4. Now, we ask what man would dare to claim authority to baptize with the Holy Ghost, or to bring men under a Divine influence? And yet this power must be claimed, unless we admit that Christ commissioned his disciples to baptize with *water*.

3. PROPOSITION.—The baptism of the Spirit did not supersede the baptism of water.

TESTIMONY. 'Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we. And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord:' Acts x, 47, 48.

If water baptism was not requisite to distinguish them as christians, why administer it to those on whom the 'Holy Ghost fell'? Why should the apostle Peter direct their attention to water baptism, as soon as they believed in the Lord Jesus? Surely he held christian baptism in higher estimation than many professed christians in these modern days of improvement.

4. PROPOSITION.—The Christian law of baptism could not have been derived from that of Jewish prosolytes.

TESTIMONY. Many Jewish prosolytes were baptized by the apostles. Among these were the Etheopian eunuch, Cornelius, and others. This proves either that the christian administrators knew no such custom, (which is not probable) as prosolyte baptism, or that they re-baptized those who had received it.

CHAPTER II.

OBLIGATIONS UPON US AFTER BAPTISM.

1. PROPOSITION.—It is enjoined upon ministers, parents, and guardians, to attend to the religious instruction of baptized children.

TESTIMONY. We have seen that it is the duty of those who have children under their control, to dedicate them to God in this divine ordinance. A duty, however, too often neglected. And as they cannot be profited without the appropriate instruction, this duty cannot be neglected without incurring God's displeasure, and the danger of having the blood of souls required at our hands in the day of retribution.—*The nature, design and importance of the ordinance should be impressed upon their minds*

as soon as they are capable of receiving instruction.

2. PROPOSITION.—The obligations taken upon ourselves, as adults, at the time of our baptism should ever be kept in view.

TESTIMONY. At our baptism we pledged ourselves solemnly, in the presence of witnesses, 'to renounce the *devil* and *all his works*; the vain pomp and vanities of the *world*, and to keep God's holy *commandments* all the days of our lives.'

And this solemn pledge assumes all the binding obligation of an *oath*, or *vow* before God. Consequently, if we violate our baptismal obligations, we are found false witnesses in his sight, and must necessarily fall under his disapprobation. And how many are guilty of such violations! How very few, in the different churches, regard constantly the vows that are upon them! If God had been as unfaithful to his promises as we have been, what confidence could we have in his word?

3. PROPOSITION.—We are under obligation to trust in God, that he may sanctify the ordinance of baptism to our good, and the good of our children.

TESTIMONY. 'The ordinance is his own.—He has commanded us to observe it; and promised that all things shall work together for our good, if we love him. And, of course, we now look for the faithful fulfilment of his promise, if

we only attend to our duty in the exercise of confidence and trust. Faith in God will never fail to secure his blessing upon our souls, and upon our offspring. And we are as sacredly bound to exercise faith in God, through the merits of his well beloved son, as we are to be baptized, or attend to any other duty. 'He that cometh unto God must *beleive* that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.'

"Faith lends his realizing light,
The clouds disperse, the shadows fly;
The invisible appears in sight,
And God is seen by mortal eye."

Faith always looks beyond the watchman—beyond the means of salvation—beyond the ordinances of religion. When faith is exercised, there is *trust* in Christ's merits, *confidence* in God's promises, and *resignation* to the divine will.

CHAPTER III.

SOME OF THE ABUSES OF BAPTISM.

What doctrine, what precept or what ordinance of revelation, has not been perverted or abused? And will not this abuse bring down the divine displeasure on those who thus trifle with the goodness of the Great Author of these?

The origin, the nature and the design of the ordinance of Baptism all declare, that it must not be trifled with, but that the most rigid performance of the duties imposed upon the subjects of it, is constantly demanded.

The ordinances may be spiritual and heavenly, and yet through earthly and carnal lusts and affections, the benefit of them may be so wholly lost, that God may be displeased with us for the abuse of them, rather than pleased with us for the observance of them.

It is to be feared that baptism has been quite as much abused by professed christians, as the great privileges bestowed upon the Jewish nation were by that people. Let us take heed to this matter. Let us consider our perversions and abuses of christian baptism, and then look for the remedy.

1. PROPOSITION.—Many baptized persons are guilty of wordly mindedness.

TESTIMONY. Baptism has with many become a mere compliance with custom, for the sake of secular advantages. Hence they only think of it as a matter of family festivity; a matter in which they must avoid singularity. The service itself has been disregarded, and not understood at all by them. Spiritual blessings have never been thought of by them. Consequently, their children, after baptism, are not duly reminded

L

of their standing in God's church, nor their privileges through faith, and their responsibility impressed upon their minds. And what can be the issue of such baptisms but a mockery of God, and his increased displeasure for their irreverence and carnal mindedness? God give us grace to see the wickedness of our hypocritical acts of religion, and repent, ere it be too late to find forgiveness.

2. PROPOSITION.—Trusting in the formal act of religion, while destitute of the power, is another error of many baptized persons.

TESTIMONY. How many church members are extremely tenacious in regard to the form of godliness, while they are not only *destitute* of its power, but utterly *deny* it. They think it respectable to keep up an outside show of religion. This is expected by their neighbors. It gives credit to their character. It is popular to be externally religious, and the popular tide carries them along. It would be thought infidel in them not to belong to the church, and doubly so not to be baptized, or to neglect the baptism of children. Besides, they think there must be some goodness in doing it—it is taking some trouble for religion, and God will reward them for this goodness. And all the while their minds are full of covetousness and pride, and their ways sinful and vile. With what power God speaks of his abhorrence of such

inconsistency ! The strongest and severest things that the Saviour ever uttered were against such formalists, among the Scribes and Pharisees. Let all such, in the different churches, repent of their broken baptismal vows. Let them know themselves converted, and then shall they be prepared to teach others. Perhaps there are none who magnify the outward service more, and trust in it, so as to destroy the very nature and design of baptism, than those who deny infant baptism, and practice *immersion* alone.

3. PROPOSITION.—Baptism is also abused by holding superstitious notions concerning its nature.

TESTIMONY. Notwithstanding the testimony of the bible, and the church, to the contrary, as well as the testimony of reason, many place a superstitious confidence in the bare act of baptism, as if *baptism* and *regeneration* were the same thing. And until this false notion is laid aside, no good can result to those holding it, from an observance of the ordinance. It is passing strange that the same persons who take this view of the subject, will, notwithstanding, contend that baptism represents the burial and resurrection of Christ. Both of these hypotheses are evidently false in the extreme. And one error is pretty sure to lead to another, and two errors cannot make one truth.

With what fondness and complacency do the baptists dwell on the idea of being "buried un-

der water," just as if it had an internal saving efficiency, a sort of necromantic power to change and renovate the sinner, and as if those who submitted to it were necessarily regenerated christians! This is their great turning point, the mighty lever in religion, whereby men are transformed into disciples of Christ, and all is made secure for time and eternity! Thus, submersion is put for regeneration, and water is represented as the soul's all-healing agent, instead of the blood of Christ. The water, the *water*, the **WATER**, seems to be "the one thing needful." Many of the baptists, we know, reject and abhor the heresy of baptismal regeneration, but it seems naturally to have grown out of their own theory and practice, in regard to baptism, which lead the weak and uninformed to consider submersion as a kind of talisman, always connected with a saving blessing. All this arises, doubtless, from an abuse of the ordinance. And it is the undue stress laid upon baptism by submersionists, that induces them, frequently, in places where God is pouring out his spirit upon the people, to introduce the ill-fated doctrine of submersion, crying "the river, the river!—you must all be 'buried under the water,' if you wish to enter the kingdom of heaven!"

Oh how many revivals of religion, have been arrested in their progress or put a stop to altogether, by this everlasting cry of water!

THE CONTRAST.

ERROR.

Without *immersion* it is impossible to please God.

TRUTH.

Without *faith* it is impossible to please God.

ERROR.

It is not our faith in Gods promise of remission, but our *going down into the water*, that obtains the remission of sins.

TRUTH.

Therefore being justified by *faith*, we have peace with God. All that *believe* are justified.

ERROR.

Immersion alone is that act of turning to God.

TRUTH.

By the *fear of the Lord* men depart from iniquity. Take with you *words*, and turn unto the Lord; say unto him, Take away all iniquity and receive us graciously.

ERROR.

Immersion saves us by burying us with Christ, raising us up with him, and so our consciences are puri-

TRUTH.

By *grace* are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Not by works of righteous-

<p>fied to serve the living God.</p>	<p>ness which we have done, but according to his <i>mercy he saved us</i>, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he <i>shed on us</i> abundantly through Jesus Christ our Lord.</p>
--------------------------------------	---

ERROR.

But one thing we know, that none can rationally and with certainty, enjoy the peace of God, and the hope of heaven, but they who intelligently, and in full faith, are born of water, or immersed for the remission of sins.

TRUTH.

Knowing that tribulation worketh patience, patience experience, and experience *hope*, hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us. He that *believeth* on the Son of God hath the *witness* in himself.

ERROR.

Immersion is the *first act* commanded, and the first constitutional act.

TRUTH.

Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.

ERROR.

There are two things equally incomprehensible—to wash garments *white* in blood, and to wash away sins *in water*.

TRUTH.

Washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanses *from all sin*. And washed us from our sins in his own blood.

ERROR.

Christian *immersion* is the *gospel in the water*.

TRUTH.

I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the *power of God* unto salvation, to every one that believeth.

ERROR.

In this *water* will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

TRUTH.

Upon this *Rock* will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

This contrast, between truth and error, might be extended to a great length, but this will suffice to show the extreme absurdities connected with some of our modern systems of salvation. The errors are mostly given in Mr. Campbell's

own words, and *truth* in the language of inspiration.

And it is a glorious consideration, that truth must ever triumph over error. So may it be now, henceforth and forever !

CONCLUSION.

We have now said all that we intended upon the subject of Christian Baptism, and shall close with a few reflections.

1. For ordinary readers, we think that all has been said in the foregoing pages, to establish them in the truth, and encourage them not to place too much confidence in water baptism, nor neglect it altogether.

2. Mankind are prone to run into extremes on almost every subject, especially in regard to the ordinances of religion. And it is obvious that, while modern submersionists have made baptism the supreme good, others, in combatting this foul heresy, have inclined either to speak lightly of the ordinance, or utterly neglect it.— We should avoid making it necessary for salvation, or altogether non-essential. If it cannot, as a means of grace, put away the filth of the flesh, it can answer a good conscience before God.

3. The *abuse* that has been heaped upon the ordinance has, doubtless, had a discourageing influence upon many minds. But religion itself may be, and has been abused. But this should

induce its friends more carefully to live up to its requirements. And though this ordinance of religion may be brought into disrepute, by an everlasting harangue upon a *particular mode*—submersion, and that for the remission of sins, yet let the friends of Christ fearlessly contend for the truth, and “walk in all ordinances and commands of the house of God blameless.”

4. Let all be careful to secure that which is represented by water baptism. ‘Thousands, no doubt, settle down in security, on the ground that they have been dedicated to God in this holy ordinance, while the *inner* man has never been renewed. They trust in the shadow, while the substance they know not. And this evil we think more or less prevalent in all the churches. Having done many wonderful works, and prophecied in the name of Christ, will not suffice in the last day, if we are not known to have been pure in *heart*. Whatever we may lack beside, let us know that we are baptized with the *Holy Ghost*.

5. The time will finally come when, in regard to all essential matters, the watchmen upon the walls of Zion shall see eye to eye. And when all ignorance, and prejudice, and unkind feeling shall be done away; and a difference of opinion, and in our forms of worship, shall not be the means of our denying to each other the right to true discipleship. When all shall contend for and seek to enjoy an evidence of God’s

approbation, and to promote harmony among all christians, and the honor and glory of the Great Head of the Church.

6. All the types, ordinances, and outward forms, connected with the christian organization on earth, will soon be lost in eternal *realities*. And all the privileges we here enjoy should be employed in reference to the "eternal weight of glory" that awaits the faithful, at God's right hand. No clouds and darkness there encompass the throne. No mists of error becloud the human intellect. In Heaven we shall see the foundation of *Truth*, of *Life*, of *Light* and *Love*. And all the inhabitants being *partakers* of the same, their songs shall be mutual, and their joys complete. And while they rise above, transcendantly above all that earth can grant, God, through the merits of his well-beloved Son, shall receive the honor, and the glory, and the praise of man's salvation—world without end. AMEN!

ERRATA:

PAGE 33, line 18, omit the word "not."

" 37, line 9, for "Son," read "*Law*."

" 51, line 3, for "XI," read "XL."

" 66, line 19, for "Israel, says he," read "*says : Israel was.*"

" 77, line 21, for "whence," read "*where.*"

" 101, top line, for "baptizo," read "*bapto.*"

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Correspondence,	V
Recommendations,	VI
Dedication,	VII
Preface,	VIII
Introduction,	XI

NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

Different opinions—Methodists—Presbyterians—Prot. Episcopalians,	14
Lutherans,	15
Catholics—Quakers,	16
Disciples,	17
Socinians—Universalists,	19
Opinions sustained—Baptism a sealing ordinance,	“
Testimony of Chrysostom—Bassil,	21
Of Austin—Cyprian—Baptism a pledge of Discipleship,	22
Baptism a Sacrament—a proof of Christianity,	23
Contradictions and absurdities—Immersion and its effects the same—Immersion the climax of purity,	25
How Christ cannot be retained—burial of Christ not represented by baptism,	26
Scripture contradicted,	27
Salvation by water,	28

ELIGIBLE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

Penitents eligible to baptism,	31
--------------------------------	----

Baptism a means of grace,	32
Believing adults—false theory of faith,	35
Divine aid necessary—Justification by faith alone,	37
Faith defined,	38
Infants eligible to baptism,	39
Not forbidden in scripture—Infants recognised as church members,	40
Seal of truth to be set upon infants,	43
Infants included in the promise—Infants under gospel provisions,	44
All nations to be sealed—Universal practice of the Church,	46
Infant baptism not opposed for eleven hundred years,	53
Ephesian Children,	56
Peter's doctrine,	57
Families Baptized by the Apostles,	58
Infants profited by Baptism,	61
How parents are benefitted,	63
Discontent by Baptist instruction,	64
Infant Baptism commanded	65
Proselyte Baptism,	66
Faith not required of infants,	68
Recapitulation	69

MODE OF BAPTISM.

Difficulties in Immersion,	71
The word <i>mode</i> considered	"
Why the term Submersion adopted,	72
Submersionists disagree,	73

Submersion not Scriptural,	7
Submersion too much confided in,	"
Submersion not always practised by Baptists,	75
Submersionists no better than others,	66
Submersionists comparatively few	77
Submersionists depart from ancient practice	79
Submersion prevents devotion,	80
Submersion used for proselyting,	82
Submersion not adapted to all men,	83
Recapitulation,	88
Scripture phraseology on Baptism,	"
Baptise—defined,	"
<i>Baptizo</i> —defined by Sixty-six authors,	89
Does not favor exclusive Submersion,	95
<i>Bapto</i> —defined,	100
Examples of Baptism considered,	102
Baptism of the multitudes,	"
Baptism of the Saviour,	106
John's Baptism not Christian,	107
Christ's Baptism initiatory,	108
River Baptism without submersion,	110
Baptism of the Eunuch,	111
Baptism of Noah and his family,	115
How we are saved by Baptism,	116
Baptism of the Israelites,	117
Not a figurative Baptism,	"
Not plunged,	119
Baptism of the three thousand,	"
Probabilities in favor of aspersion,	120
Baptism of Paul,	"

Baptized by sprinkling or pouring,	121
Baptism of the jailer,	122
Baptism of Cornelius and his kinsmen,	123
Incidental texts referring to Baptism,	124
Buried <i>by</i> Baptism into Christ's death,	125
Being <i>planted, grafted, crucified,</i>	126
Buried with Christ <i>in</i> baptism,	128
Baptism for the dead,	"
One Baptism,	129
Bodies washed with pure water,	130
Baptism of Lydia,	"
Testimony in favor of affusion,	133
Baptism to be <i>with</i> water	"
Affusion God's method of baptising,	"
Joel's prophecy and Peter's preaching,	134
Inferential Propositions,	136

BINDING OBLIGATIONS OF BAPTISM.

Baptism should not be neglected,	139
Water Baptism referred to in the commis- sion,	140
Baptism of the Holy Ghost,	"
Does not supersede water baptism,	141
Law of baptism strictly christian,	142
Obligations after baptism,	"
Baptized children to be instructed,	"
Obligations to be remembered,	143
We are to trust in God,	"
Abuses of Baptism,	144
Baptism not to be trifled with,	145

CONTENTS.**159**

Many trust in the formal act,	146
Superstitious notions,	147
Revivals injured by the cry of <i>water</i> ,	148
THE CONTRAST,	149
CONCLUSION,	152

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 06364 2063

**DO NOT REMOVE
OR
MUTILATE CARD**

