

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY  
AND  
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER, 1831.

---

ART. I.—BIBLICAL ELOQUENCE AND POETRY.

SACRED Poetry and sacred Rhetoric have both shared, but too largely, in that inheritance from the heathen classics which has at once so enriched and corrupted the literature of Christian nations. The inspired volume *alone*, in its *original* and divine perfection, remains incorrupt and unmarred. Its poets and orators alone are found guiltless of idolatry, of flattery, of selfishness, of disingenuousness, or vain-glory. Whether by their antiquity, the peculiar customs and exclusive laws of their country, their unlettered condition, or solely and directly by the Holy Ghost, they were all secured from those fascinations of a foreign style and false philosophy, and an impure mythological fancy, which so often bewilder and betray those who essay to catch their spirit and execute their purposes. Even those devout and venerable "Fathers" who learned sacred eloquence from inspired lips, and employed its powers in a cause as sacred, are too often found like magnanimous, but unwary physicians, inhaling death while giving life; or like generous conquerors of a barbarous land, conferring liberty and peace, but catching tyranny and war, teaching truth, but learning error, imparting the gifts and graces of heavenly wisdom and Christian love, themselves, while, too often lingering in wistful meditation beneath the unhallowed shades of Academus, or dwelling in unguarded speculation on the storied

We deprecate as the fittest work and the veriest curse of Satan, that lawless fury of the untaught tongue, which would set the world on fire of hell, and call it the flame of sacred eloquence. The unruled, reckless storm, which sweeps the main, is unlike the "doctrine

Which drops as the rain,  
And distils as the dew."

And equally unlike the "whirlwind and the storm" in which *Jehovah* hath *his* way.

---

#### ART. II.—REVIEW.

- Lectures on Infant Baptism, by Leonard Woods, D. D. Abbot Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary at Andover. Published and for sale by Mark Newman. Hogg and Gould, printers, pp. 222. 1829.*
2. *Essays on Christian Baptism, by J. S. C. F. Frey, Pastor of the Baptist church in Newark, N. J. Boston, published by Lincoln and Edwards, 59 Washington street, pp. 122. 1829.*
  3. *Infant Baptism a Scriptural ordinance; and Baptism by sprinkling lawful. By William Hamilton, A. M. Pastor of the 1st Presb. church, Newark, N. J. Newark, printed by William Tuttle, 1831.*

THE subjects and mode of Christian Baptism have long been matters of earnest, and not unfrequently, angry controversy; and from all appearances, the disciples of Christ will continue to be divided by their discordant views on this external rite. In other cases, Christians may differ in regard to matters of much more vital importance, and yet not break the sacred bonds of church-fellowship; but in this, although they may be perfectly agreed on every other point, they feel that they must separate from one another: for as baptism is the outward sign of Christianity, the badge of discipleship, and the door of entrance into the visible church, if one portion of Christians view another as unbaptized, they think they cannot recognise them as regular members of the visible church,

while they remain in this state; however sincerely they may esteem them as pious and orthodox, in all other respects. On this point, however, Baptists are divided among themselves; for while the majority adhere to the principle, that no unbaptised person can with propriety be admitted to the Lord's table, there is a respectable section of that denomination in England, and a few in this country, who maintain, that where there exists satisfactory evidence of piety, no one should be excluded from the communion of the church for want of regular baptism, when there are insuperable obstacles in the way of his receiving that ordinance, arising from his full persuasion that he has already submitted to it, agreeably to Christ's appointment. This question has been ably discussed, beyond the Atlantic, by men of the first abilities, in the Baptist denomination; and it must be confessed, that the subject is hedged in with difficulties. But we adopt the broad principle, that no barrier should be permitted to separate those who appear to be the disciples of Christ; and that all terms of communion which would exclude permanently, any one whom we cannot but acknowledge as a brother in Christ, are erroneous, inconsistent with the unity of the church, and ought to be relinquished. Whatever irregularity may seem to be connected with the practice of admitting to communion in the eucharist, those, who in our opinion, have not been lawfully baptised, is greatly overbalanced by the revolting principle, that we are bound to reject from our fellowship those whom we cannot but admit, that Christ, the head of the church, receives, and who, with no other baptism than that which they have, will be admitted into the blessed society of heaven. Our sentiments, therefore, harmonise with those Baptist churches who admit to their communion all real Christians; although, in their opinion, they may be unbaptised. The advocates of close communion, however, charge us with inconsistency, in censuring them for excluding Pedobaptists from the Lord's supper; and are in the habit of appealing to us, whether we would admit a person whom we knew to be unbaptised. Now we are prepared to say, that if any whom we esteem to be the real disciples of Christ, should be placed in precisely similar circumstances, we would not hesitate to receive them to the communion of the Lord's supper. In common, we acknowledge, that the regular order of Christian duties is, first to be baptised, and that we should insist upon this, if there were no

insuperable obstacle in the way: but if a Quaker, who appeared to be a genuine Christian, should say to us, that he was persuaded that it was his duty to attend on the Lord's supper, but that he could not see his way clear to submit to water-baptism, upon our principles, we would receive him as a weak brother, not to doubtful disputations, but in the arms of charity; for it never can be made appear, that baptism is, in the nature of things, necessary to a cordial remembrance of the death of Christ at the Lord's supper. And if a Christian, through ignorance or prejudice, is so situated that he cannot perform one duty, shall we prevent him from observing another on which he wishes to attend? It is surely sacrificing the substance to form, and edification to a mere point of order, to insist rigorously on the precedence of baptism in such cases; and especially, as the fact is, that the eucharist was celebrated before Christian baptism was instituted. But as this is contested ground, we shall dismiss this subject, and proceed to the work which we have undertaken.

The lectures of Dr. Woods, which stand at the head of this article, were originally a part of his regular course of instruction to his pupils; it may be expected, therefore, that the arguments are rather adapted to the capacity of the educated and improved part of society, than to the common people. This, we think, is one of the principal objections to this treatise. It is learned, discriminating, and candid; but it is not exactly suited to a large class of readers who need instruction, and are anxious to obtain satisfaction, on this point. In two respects, however, Dr. Woods has avoided the faults into which a large majority of Pedobaptist writers have fallen: the one is, the use of arguments founded on principles which are universally denied by Anti-pedobaptists; and the other is, that hateful spirit of acrimony which has been so freely indulged by most writers on this subject. When we express this censure of the spirit of writers with whom we agree in opinion, we do not mean to excuse those on the other side. Indeed, we can scarcely recollect any point on which there has been exhibited a greater defect of candour, and a more ill-judged ridicule, than by the opposers of infant baptism. We rejoice, therefore, that an example of moderation and kindness is now given; and cannot but hope, that as the writer occupies so high and conspicuous a station, it will be followed generally, by all

who may think it proper to discuss the subject; on whichever side they choose to take their stand.

In regard to the second article prefixed to this paper, we have little to remark. There is nothing peculiarly offensive in the style and spirit of the writer; unless we should except a more than common degree of egotism. But, really, Mr. Frey should have allowed himself more time to prepare on a subject which involves much ecclesiastical and biblical learning; and he might have furnished, if not stronger arguments, yet such as were more original, and more pertinent; for upon a careful examination of his work, we find scarcely any thing which is not extracted from the work of the Rev. Abraham Booth. We are much inclined to respect the sound evangelical principles, and solid learning of Mr. Booth; but we have ever been of opinion, that his parade of citations from eminent Pedobaptist authors was a very useless labour. Those very authors, notwithstanding they are made to speak against the cause which they maintained, were all firm believers in the doctrine of infant baptism, and in the validity of the rite, performed otherwise than by immersion. It can answer little purpose, therefore, to gather up declarations which may be found in their writings, to establish a point which none of them believed. It is evident that Mr. Frey knows very little of the learned authors whom he cites; and surely such an array of testimonies cannot be appreciated by the great mass of the people on whom he wishes his book to produce an effect. Perhaps, if our author had perused and impartially weighed, Dr. Edward Williams' able answer to Booth, he would not have laid so much stress on all the arguments which he employs. If we have any judgment in matters of this sort, the answer of Dr. Williams, on the subject of *positive institutions*, is completely satisfactory; and if any reader should wish to see an able discussion of this point, we would refer him with confidence to the first part of the first volume of Williams' Reply to Booth. The fallacy in the arguments of Booth and other Anti-pedobaptist writers on this point is, the application of a principle which is true as it relates to the being and essential parts of a positive rite, to all the circumstances which attend its administration. The very definition of positive duties shows, that they owe their existence, and consequently their obligation, to an express command. For example, neither circumcision, nor the passover, would have

been duties obligatory on the church, if God had never published a law injoining their observance. It is also freely admitted that whatever is essential to the right performance of such duties must be distinctly revealed; otherwise, men would not be able to comply with the divine will. Thus also, baptism and the Lord's supper owe their existence as duties incumbent on Christians, to the positive command of Christ, who only has the power of legislating for his kingdom; and the law establishing these ordinances, must be so far explicit as to inform us, what the actions are which we are required to perform. As in the former, we need to be told that baptism is the application of water to the human body, in the name of the adorable Trinity, and in the latter, that bread and wine must be received in remembrance of Christ. But when the writers on the other side insist, that in regard to the age of the persons who may partake of either sacrament, or in relation to the mode in which water should be applied, or the attitude and time of receiving the Lord's supper, we must also have an express direction, they attempt to establish a principle which cannot be sustained by a reference to the positive institutions recorded in the Bible; and which, indeed, is inconsistent with the practice of the Baptists themselves. For first, in regard to the sex and age of the persons whose duty it was to partake of the passover, the law enjoining the observance says nothing: although, in regard to circumcision, these things are expressly and definitely fixed. If, however, it should be alleged, that the subjects of the passover are clearly designated, since it is expressly commanded that no uncircumcised person should partake of this ordinance, we answer, that it is not said expressly, whether females who were excluded from circumcision, were required to eat the passover; and again, it is not expressly determined in the law, whether circumcised infants, or children in minority, might partake of the passover. If it should be urged, that the true subjects were well known at the time, or that they can now be determined by legitimate inference from what is said: this is the very thing for which we contend, but it is a complete relinquishment of the principle, to establish which, Mr. Booth has taken so much pains. It was doubtless known, when the passover was instituted, who were the proper subjects of the ordinance; but how did the Jewish church ascertain this a thousand years afterwards? It may be answered, that they knew it by the uni-

form and uncontradicted tradition and practice of the church. No doubt this was the fact: and it is all that we ask to determine the proper subjects of baptism. But if another ground be taken, and it be asserted that the persons who were required to eat the passover can be ascertained by a fair construction of the law itself, we are perfectly willing to admit it, although the proof is not so easy as some seem to imagine; but this does not amount to an express command. It is not said that females of the Hebrew nation should eat the passover, and the law did not oblige them to attend on this feast, as it did the males. It is not said, that infants might partake of this ordinance, nor are they expressly forbidden; and we maintain, that it is as difficult to determine the proper subjects of the passover, as it is of baptism, on the principles of the Pedobaptists. All that we require to prove the right of infants to this ordinance, is the liberty of giving a reasonable construction to the law authorizing baptism, and reasoning by fair inference from what is expressly revealed. The very same method which must have been pursued by the Jews living after the return from captivity, to prove that their children had a right to eat the passover, or that they had not—for this point is even now warmly disputed—is the one which the judicious Pedobaptist now pursues, to prove that the children of believers are properly admitted to Christian baptism. But if the Anti-pedobaptist should insist, that the principle of the necessity of an express command should be applied to the passover, and will exclude infants from that ordinance as well as from baptism, we reply, that it will be found very difficult to reconcile this construction with the facts of the case; for the paschal lamb was required to be eaten by each family apart, or by two or more united, when each consisted of few members. It is also to be recollected, that the unleavened bread, which formed a part of this ordinance, must have been eaten by all, for not a crumb of any other bread was permitted to exist at the time. Moreover, there is no express command requiring females to eat the passover, and the fact can only be established by inference. And in regard to communion, although the precise age and sex are fixed by the statute, yet there are other circumstances necessary to the performance of the rite, concerning which the law is silent. For example, it is not said by whom the operation should be performed, which in other ordinances of an analogous kind, is considered of essential importance.

But the requiring of an express precept to determine every question which may arise respecting the proper subjects of a positive rite is repugnant to the practice of the Baptists themselves, in the admission of females to the Lord's supper; for it cannot be said truly, that there is any express command authorising this. It is indeed alleged, that they are included under the term "man," which we do not deny; but we say that this can only be established by exegetical reasoning, reasoning of the very same kind as that by which we undertake to show that infants are included under the comprehensive phrase, "all nations;" or by which we endeavour to prove, that when children are called "holy," they must be considered as baptised persons, or as proper subjects of baptism. After all the evasions of this argument which have been resorted to, it stands as a firm and unanswerable objection to the doctrine of Booth and others, respecting the necessity of an express command to authorise the admission of persons to a participation of positive institutions.

The third treatise, the title of which stands at the head of this article, has been published more recently than either of the others; and although not professedly an answer to the work of Mr. Frey, was probably suggested by that publication, as the author, the Rev. William T. Hamilton, is the pastor of the first Presbyterian church, in Newark, N. J. where the former gentleman resided when he published his *ESSAYS ON CHRISTIAN BAPTISM*. This is a sensible well-argued discourse, and places the subject on its true basis. It is, moreover, written in a good spirit, without the least acrimony, or any recourse to personalities. The plan of the author, who seems to have studied the subject with care, is, to establish the following propositions: 1st, "Before the advent of our Lord, God had a true church on earth; and for many ages that church had subsisted under a regular organization, provided in the Abrahamic covenant.

"2d, The Abrahamic covenant is still in force, and consequently, the Christian church is but a continuation of the Jewish.

"3d, Infant membership in the church, once established of God, never revoked, still remains.

"4th, Under the Gospel dispensation, baptism is substituted in the room of circumcision, as the seal of God's covenant."

These propositions the ingenious author sustains with great



force of argument, and, we think, conclusively, in favour of infant baptism. In some minor statements respecting the Abrahamic covenant, we are disposed to dissent from the opinions of the writer; but upon the whole, we are of opinion, that he has performed his work well, and deserves the thanks of the church, for adding one more to the many able defences of infant baptism, which we have in possession. Mr. Hamilton also discusses the subject of the proper mode of administering baptism; for however indifferent this may appear to many, yet our Anti-pedobaptist brethren consider it an essential point. With them there is no baptism without a complete immersion of the whole body in water. Against this opinion our author argues concisely, but with much force. We cannot, however, agree with him when he says "there is indeed a word in scripture, βαπτω, which properly signifies *to dip*, or immerse, and had that word been used by our Lord, dipping in water would have been the only proper mode of administering the initiatory ordinance of the church. But our Lord uses *baptise*, (βαπτίζω,) which is a different word, the proper meaning of which seems to be, *to wet, to cleanse* by wetting, or to wash, &c." Now, in our opinion, this criticism on the words βαπτω and βαπτίζω, is inaccurate, but as we intend to give a dissertation on this subject, in its proper place, we waive all further discussion at the present.

The whole controversy respecting the proper subjects of baptism may be reduced to two questions: the first relates to the interpretation of the law for the baptising of the nations, and the other is a question of fact—what has been the practice of the church ever since the command was given?

All authority for administering this ordinance to any subject, must be derived from the original command of our Lord to his disciples, when he commanded them to "go and teach (disciple) all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things which I command you." If we take the words πάντα ἔθνη, without limitation, they will include all human beings of every age, sex, and condition: for nations consist of all sorts and conditions of men. But all acknowledge, that these words should be considered as limited by what precedes them. And here the interpretation depends very much on the meaning of the word μαθητευσατε, which in our version is rendered "teach," which certainly is not the precise meaning of the

term. Μαθητεω is derived from the noun μαθητης, a *disciple*, and properly signifies, *to make a disciple*. It is alleged, indeed, that disciples can only be made by teaching, and therefore, it is all the same whether we render the word by "teach" or "disciple;" but this representation is not accurate, for it is one thing to form the relation between a scholar and master, and another to teach the disciple thus constituted. It is true, that the making of disciples always has relation to teaching, and is in order to instruction; but in the order of things the disciple is made before he is taught. And although this may seem to be a trifling distinction, it is of importance in this case, where infants and minors are concerned. There are two methods of making disciples among men, according to the age and condition of the persons discipled. A teacher, who is in search of scholars, either makes an agreement with the persons who are desirous of learning from him, or he contracts with the parents or guardians of such as are under age: and this last is the most common method of obtaining disciples, because most of those who are put under the tuition of teachers, are not competent to enter into engagements for themselves, on account of their tender age. In both cases, however, the disciple is made before lessons are given: the difference is, that in the one case the scholar becomes such by his own act and engagement; but in the other, he becomes a disciple by the act of those, who have the right to engage in his behalf. And the very same thing is true in regard to the church. All persons who are of mature age and capable of judging and acting for themselves, become disciples by their own consent: from reasons which are offered they are persuaded to receive Christ as their master, and to take upon them the badge of discipleship. But in regard to young children, if they are made the disciples of Christ, it must be by the act of their parents and guardians; and there is no good reason why they may not enter their little ones into the school of Christ, as well as into any other school, if this can be shown to be for their benefit. But it is asked, what reason can there be for making those disciples who are incapable of being taught? To which we answer, that if this incapacity were permanent, the thing would be without profit; but children soon become capable of learning some lessons in the school of Christ. If they are capable of going astray from the womb, and speaking lies, they are also capable of being taught to love

and obey their Creator, and if Christ will permit them to come unto him, and reckons them as a part of his kingdom, we ought to be thankful for the privilege of consecrating our children to his service. Moreover, children are called disciples by the apostle Peter in his speech at the council of Jerusalem against Judaizers, for he says, "Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither we, nor our fathers were able to bear." To return, then, to the interpretation of the commission of Christ, it appears, that although the phrase "all nations" is limited by the foregoing command "to disciple," yet, upon a fair construction, this does not exclude the infants of those who are themselves the disciples of Christ. The command requires that they who are baptized should be "discipled," but as children are capable of being made disciples in the school of Christ, as in other schools, there is no evidence arising from this word for the exclusion of infants from the Church.

But in all cases, the interpretation of laws requires, that we take into view the existing customs and opinions of the people to whom they were given; for, in all legislation, to avoid prolixity, many things are taken for granted, as well understood at the time, and principles long established are recognized as still in force, though not explicitly mentioned. If a command had been issued, to make proselytes to the Jewish community, and to circumcise all the people who applied for admission, the existing laws and long established usages, in regard to this rite, would have rendered it superfluous to specify the precise time, and the persons who were proper subjects of the ordinance; for all were acquainted with these things.

And on supposition, that proselytes were ordered to be made, and instead of circumcising them, the command was to baptise them by way of initiating them into the Church, it would be reasonable to proceed on the same principles as in the former case, unless some change of principle was announced, or some alteration signified. The Baptists attempt to evade the conclusion from their premises, by alleging, that the Christian Church is an entirely new society, and by no means a continuation of the old system; and, therefore, there can be no legitimate reasoning from the one to the other. But the principles here asserted cannot be proved by Scripture. Up to the very time when the commission was given, the Jewish Church existed; and although much had been said re-

specting an enlargement of this body, so as to embrace all nations; yet no intimation was given, that the general principles of membership in the Church thus enlarged, would be essentially different from what they had ever been; and much less was there any intimation given, that the children of believers, who had ever been included with their parents, in the covenants which God made with them, should henceforth be cast off, and no longer form any part of that visible society of which Christ is the King.

But there is a well authenticated fact which adds unspeakable force to these considerations; and which, if it be admitted, renders it almost impossible to interpret the commission in any other way than as including the children of believers. I refer to the practice of baptising proselytes to the Jewish religion, which had long been in use. The invariable custom was, as we are informed by all the Jewish writers who mention the subject, when the master of a family was proselyted, not only to circumcise all the males, agreeably to the law of Moses, but also to baptise the whole family, male and female, adults and infants. This custom, however it came into use, we consider as satisfactorily established by testimony which cannot be resisted, without affecting the general principles of historical credibility: and is opposed by no counter testimony whatever. And, moreover, as baptism was the distinguishing badge of the Christian's profession, against whom the unbelieving Jews entertained the most deadly hatred, it never can be a probable, or even a credible supposition, that they would falsely pretend that baptism was a rite practised from time immemorial by their forefathers, in all cases when proselytes were made, unless this had indeed been the fact. And this will appear still more incredible, when we consider the nature of the testimony which they have given, in which there is a minute and circumstantial account of the whole process; of the kind of trial made of the sincerity of the candidates; of the profession required; and of the ceremonies of administration, both in the case of males and females, of parents and children. Our limits do not admit of the exhibition of the testimonies in favour of Jewish proselyte baptism: the inquisitive reader will find them at large in Maimonides, in Wall's History of Baptism; in Lightfoot's Works; and in Dr. Hammond's Treatise on Baptism. Taking for granted, then, the fact, that proselytes were all baptised when added to the Jewish Church, and that this custom was well known to every

body; for about this period of the Jewish history, proselytism had become very common. Some time before the birth of Christ, the whole nation of the Idumeans had embraced the Jewish religion, rather than leave the country which they had seized; and Josephus informs us of many remarkable facts on this subject; particularly, how Helena, queen of Adiabene, and her son became proselytes to Judaism, and were exceedingly zealous in promoting their adopted religion.

We say then, admitting the existence of such a practice, when Christ issued his command, to "go and disciple, that is, proselyte all nations, baptising them," could the disciples understand his words, in any other way, than as authorising the baptism of the same description of subjects, as were usually baptised when proselytes from the heathen were made? If they had been accustomed to see not only the males circumcised, of whatever age they might be, but also to see females and infants uniformly baptised, as well as males and adults, would they not conclude, that in making proselytes to the Christian religion, as the same rite was prescribed, the same subjects would still be brought under its administration?

The construction of our Saviour's commission for which we plead, is the more remarkable, because it accords with all previous dispensations of God towards believers and their seed; and more especially, with the gracious promises made to Abraham, in which he repeatedly includes his seed; "I will," says he, "be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee." And as a sign and seal to this gracious promise, he gave him the sign of circumcision, which Paul assures us was a seal of the righteousness of his faith. Now, to suppose, that the apostles would not have considered the children of believers as included in this commission, would be to suppose that they had been specially instructed to pursue a course contrary to every thing to which they had been accustomed; but we find no hint of any such instructions in the discourses of Christ: we must, therefore, conclude, that they would think, and that the risen Saviour intended them to believe, that the relation between the children of the faithful and the Church, was not essentially altered; but that, as heretofore, believing parents saw their beloved offspring included in the bonds of the covenant, as well as themselves, so now, they were not cast out of the Gospel covenant, but were still entitled to the same privileges as formerly; and that of course, this endearing relation should still be recognized by administering to them that sacrament,

which marks the connexion of all disciples with the body of Christ. Otherwise, children under the Gospel are not in as favourable a state as under the law; but who can credit this? Surely Christ has not by his Gospel deprived any persons of privileges which they were possessed of before he came. This simple argument we have never heard satisfactorily answered; and our belief is, that it does not admit of such an answer: for if our children are cast entirely out of the Church, under the Christian dispensation, then certainly the believers of the Old Testament enjoyed one privilege, of which we are deprived; for if any should ask "what profit was there of circumcision?" we answer, "much every way."

But Christ did not come to abridge any real privilege, but to enrich and enlarge his Church with much greater advantages, in all respects, than it had ever before enjoyed. When therefore he said, "Go *disciple* all nations, baptising them," we are persuaded that he intended to suffer little children to come unto him as well as others, and that he will still, by the ministers of his Church, condescend to take them into his arms and bless them.

And this view of the subject corresponds with all that we find recorded in the New Testament respecting the Christian Church; for in the epistles to the churches we find children addressed as well as parents; and these children were still in their minority, for the duty of obedience to parents, is expressly enjoined. Besides, the blessing of Abraham has come now on all his spiritual seed; and one part of that blessing was, that God promised to be the God of his seed; and we have no doubt that every true believer is an heir of this gracious promise; so that we may say unto all such, as Peter said to the converts of Jerusalem, "The promise is unto you and to your children."

Again, as under the Gospel dispensation, called by Jeremiah, "the new covenant," all will ultimately "know the Lord from the *least* unto the greatest;" when children will be pious from their earliest years, it would be altogether unsuitable to have such children excluded from the Church, until they were of sufficient age to make a profession for themselves. God has provided that the Church shall be a school for the rising generation, where by their prayers and instructions they may grow up in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

It appears to us, that one great end of the institution of the Church was for the sake of communicating the truth of the

gospel to the next generation, that they in their turn might hand it down to other generations which may succeed, until the end of the world. And we cannot but think, that receiving children as bearing this relation to the Church, is not only a comfort to pious parents, but a strong motive to stir them up to faithfulness and diligence in the religious instruction of the rising race. And while we highly esteem the piety and holiness of many of our Baptist brethren, we are persuaded, that they are more deficient in what relates to the careful training of children in the knowledge of God and in habits of devotion, than in any other point; and that this is precisely the effect of their error—as we must esteem it—which is practically most pernicious. But we are conscious that this is delicate ground, and therefore we content ourselves with merely dropping a hint, where we might adduce a multitude of facts. Every thing connected with the baptism of children, when seriously administered, tends to make a salutary impression on the minds of parents; and their early dedication to God in a solemn covenant transaction, is a handle which may advantageously be taken hold of, in dealing with their consciences, and exhorting them to choose the paths of piety.

But the question of fact may be considered independently of all other considerations. Baptism is a visible, public transaction, and is therefore as capable of proof by testimony, as any other fact. If we had no sacred records, we could still prove by the concurrent testimony of all ages, that the Church has existed as a society for 1800 years, and that she has celebrated divine worship during all that period, on the first day of the week. We can prove, by undoubted testimony, because it is altogether uncontradicted, that the eucharist has been observed through the whole period of the Christian Church's existence: and also that the ordinance of baptism has ever been in use in the Church; and that this ordinance has always been administered by the use of water, and in the name of the Holy Trinity. It also admits of the clearest historical testimony, that females, as well as males, have ever been the subjects of Christian baptism. And no fact in ecclesiastical history is more certain, than that, in the beginning of the fifth century, the baptism of infants was so universally practised, that men of learning and extensive travel, in the east and west, had never heard of a sect, even of heretics, who questioned it. So firmly was this practice established, and so universal the belief of its apostolic origin, that when the de-

nial of it would have relieved the Pelagians from much embarrassment, in their controversy with the orthodox, yet they ventured not to call it into question, and rejected with abhorrence the very notion of withholding baptism from children. In regard to the universality of the belief and practice, as far as authentic history goes, there is no room for a difference of opinion. And the same is the fact, without one solitary exception, from this time until the eleventh century, when the Petrobrussians arose in France. Let us then take our stand at the commencement of the fifth century; and finding the whole Church then of one mind, and following one practice, the question occurs, how can this state of things be accounted for? On pedobaptist principles, it is exactly what would be expected; but on the principles of the Baptists, we venture to affirm, that, turn which way they may, it is a fact for which they never can give a satisfactory explanation. It amounts to nothing to adduce the superstitious opinion of Tertullian, and to disparage the testimony of Origen on account of the supposed depravation of his writings; or to produce examples of the adult baptism of a few persons whose parents were Christians; for it is most certain, that this universal prevalence of infant baptism could not have been introduced between the time of Origen and Augustine, without exciting much attention, and creating much controversy; and, in that case, the means of this extraordinary change in the subjects of one of the sacraments of the Church, must have been well known to such men as Augustine, Pelagius, Cœlestius, &c. Infant baptism must have been long the undisputed practice of the Church, to place its origin beyond the knowledge of these learned and inquisitive men. Indeed, it will be found extremely difficult to assign for it an origin sufficiently early, to account for the acknowledged facts, without going up to the very times of the Apostles. For suppose, that early in the second century this corruption had commenced, it would take a long time to bring about a change in the practice of the Church scattered over the whole world. Besides, the bishops of the Churches, in this period, lived so near the times of the Apostles, that they could not but know that this was an innovation; and they were not men of that character who would wilfully corrupt the institutions of the Church. Many of them were martyrs, and sealed their testimony to the religion received from the Apostles, with their blood. But supposing, that the change commenced early in this century, we must



allow a long period before the primitive apostolical practice would be entirely obsolete. In some places, the innovation would have been resisted, and controversy would have arisen, of which some vestige would have been left in the writings of the Fathers of that period; and even if the writings which recorded these facts should have perished, in the lapse of ages, yet they could not have been unknown in the third and fourth, or even the fifth century. It is now above 300 years since the reformation commenced, but who is at a loss to know what the practice of the reformers was on this subject?

But let us ascend higher, and see whether there are not other testimonies which corroborate the fact, that the practice was as universal in the middle of the third as in the beginning of the fifth century. Both Origen and Tertullian were born and educated in the second century; now, it is true, the former dissuades from the practice of baptism under certain circumstances, and for certain reasons, which do not apply exclusively to infants. The whole matter is, that he believed that sins after baptism were rarely remissible; and, therefore, that the safest course for those exposed to many temptations was, to defer their baptism until the danger was over; a practice which unhappily obtained much prevalence after this time, for the very reason which induced him to advocate the postponement of baptism in the case of infants. But we think it must be evident to every impartial mind, that Tertullian does not speak as a man would have done who saw a new and corrupt practice introduced into the Church. Indeed, he himself would not object to baptism in any of the cases specified, if there should be danger of death. The testimony of Tertullian is therefore in favour of the fact of the common practice of infant baptism.

But why is the testimony of Origen rejected; which is as clear and explicit as it could be, not only that this was the custom of the Church, but that it was a practice derived from the Apostles. It is true, the original of many of Origen's works is lost, and we read them in the Latin version of Rufin or Jerome; but what motive could either of these men have had for interpolating passages respecting the baptism of infants? There was no dispute in their day respecting this matter; and although the former has been accused of altering Origen for his own purposes; yet surely he would not have done so without any motive whatever; and as to Jerome, his fidelity as a

translator has never been questioned, and one of the testimonies of Origen is found in a work translated by this father.

But we have in one body, a cloud of witnesses, as early as the middle of the third century, whose testimony ought to set this question at rest. I refer to the Synod of Carthage, when Cyprian, the martyr, attended, and from whom we have an account of the proceedings of the council, in relation to this subject. There existed no dispute respecting the baptism of infants, which induced the council to consider this subject. Such a state of things would show that the practice was not universal. But the case was, that a certain presbyter, whose name was Fidus, consulted the council, whether the baptism of infants should be deferred until the eighth day, as in the case of circumcision, or whether children might rightly be baptised at any age after birth. The Synod, consisting of sixty-six bishops, took up the subject deliberately, and decided without any diversity of opinion, that there was no need to wait until the eighth day; but that baptism might be administered at an earlier period, as properly as on the eighth day. Then every circumstance combines to render the testimony as strong as possible. The council is not called to discuss the point, whether infants ought to be baptised, for even if they had been unanimous, yet their discussion of this point would show, that there were those who doubted it, which rendered such a decision necessary: but the proof is far stronger than it would have been in that case, for no one doubts respecting the practice itself; but one man doubts whether it might be administered before the child was eight days old. And on this point the Synod were unanimous. Certainly, then, no one of these persons had ever entertained a scruple respecting the validity and propriety of infant baptism. Only reflect, then, that sixty-six bishops, with St. Cyprian at their head, called together from a large extent of country, are perfectly unacquainted with any dispute respecting the baptism of children, but all assume it as a thing undisputed; and this in the middle of the third century. If we found it difficult to reconcile the ignorance of Augustine and Pelagius of the origin of infant baptism with the theory which makes it an innovation, what shall we say of Cyprian and his synod, who lived so much nearer the times of the Apostles?

To us it appears, that when we find a universal prevalence of a practice at a period so early, and find no account of any controversy on the subject, and all men acting in regard to it

as a thing undisputed, and some of them expressly referring it to an apostolic origin, the inference is inevitable, that such a practice must have come down from the Apostles. But if our views of the fact of infant baptism are correct, may we not expect to find some vestige of the practice in the sacred writings? doubtless this is not unreasonable. But if the same principle of admission was pursued by the Apostles in planting the Christian Church, which had always been customary in the Jewish Church, there would be found little occasion to mention the subject, unless incidentally, in their writings. But if an entire change was made in regard to this matter, then the most explicit directions ought to be expected. The truth, therefore, is, that instead of calling on the pedobaptist, to produce an express warrant for infant baptism, the call should be on him who rejects infant baptism, to adduce some express command to cast them out of the Church, and deprive them of their former privileges. But while we maintain, that an express precept or example ought not to be required of us for infant baptism; yet, we are of opinion, that the fact may be inferred, with no small probability, from the cases of baptism which are recorded in the New Testament, and from incidental remarks in the epistles of the Apostles.

If our opinion respecting the existence of proselyte baptism is well founded, we may expect to find the Apostles acting in conformity with it, when the head of a family was converted by their preaching. Accordingly, we have several instances of household baptism on record; and while we do not pretend to prove positively that there were young children in all, or any of these families, yet we maintain, that the way in which the sacred historian speaks of these transactions, is exactly such as would have been adopted, supposing it to have been customary to baptise the household of proselytes to the Jewish religion, and accords exactly with the supposition, that all who were in the house, and over whom the head of the family possessed entire control, were baptised: but the mode of relating these transactions is altogether inconsistent with what we should have expected, if the Apostles had acted on the principles of our Baptist brethren, and had baptised none but adult believers, each on the profession of his own faith. In this latter case, there is small probability that every adult member of the family, would, in every instance on record, have become believers; but not to insist on this, if every individual had been baptised on profession of his own faith, why

do we not hear of such profession in the case of the children and domestics, as well as the master and mistress? why should they be spoken of as "households," since, upon this theory, they were not admitted into the Church in this capacity, but as individual believers? But, on the other hand, how exactly does this language comport with what we suppose to have been the true state of the fact? When the Apostles received into the Church men and women who had no families with them, as on the day of Pentecost, when the strangers from many nations were converted to the number of three thousand; or, when the people of Samaria, who went out to hear Philip, believed, and were immediately baptised, we hear nothing of households; but when the Apostles came into private families, and the head was made a convert, in every instance, upon his professing his faith, he and his household were baptised; not a part of them, but all of them; and, yet we read of no profession of faith made by any one but the master or mistress of the family. In the case of the jailor of Philippi, it is said, indeed, in our translation, that "he believed with all his house;" but this is not entirely correct, for *πεπιστευκως* is, literally, "he having believed, rejoiced with all his house," or, as some choose to render it, "through all his house." It was natural for the members of this family to feel sympathy in the joy of the head, who was delivered from so great distress; but there is no evidence in the history, that any one believed but himself. If so, why do we not read of the pungent convictions of the others as well as of the jailor himself?

Again, in the case of Lydia, the Lord opened her heart that she attended to the things spoken by Paul, and straightway she and all her house were baptised. There is not the least hint that any one of her family believed besides herself. If they had been baptised on the profession of their own faith, this important circumstance would scarcely have been omitted; but when we hear, that "her household were baptised," without the least intimation, that any of them had their hearts opened, or believed: what is more natural than to think, that the family was baptised on the faith of its head; and that the very same practice was pursued by the Apostles, as in the case of families proselyted to the Jewish religion?

We read also, that Paul "baptised the household of Stephanas;" now, why mention so constantly "households," if the custom was not to bring persons into the Church by house-

holds? But if the Apostles did receive the household in every case where the head of the family was converted—and so the fact is as far as stated in the record—it is reasonable to think, that whole households were introduced into the Church with the parents, or heads of the family. To give this argument the force of strong probability, it is not necessary to prove that there were infants in these households, though undoubtedly that is more probable than the contrary; but all that is requisite is, to prove, that on the profession of the head of a family his household was baptised; and of course infants were baptised if found in the house. When these facts are considered in connexion with what has been said relative to the custom of Jewish proselyte baptism, we cannot but think, that the argument which they furnish for infant baptism is very strong.

And the probability that the infants of believers were baptised by the Apostles is rendered still stronger, by what Paul says of them, 1 Cor. vii. 14.—“Else were your children unclean, but now are they HOLY.” Baptised persons are constantly in the New Testament called *ἅγιοι*. The true import of this word is not so much, persons inwardly holy, as externally consecrated; whatever, whether animate or inanimate, that was consecrated to the service of God, especially those things dedicated by some solemn ceremony. Now it has never been shown how children could be called “holy,” in any other sense than as being consecrated to God, which must have been by the rite of baptism. To us then it appears, that this text contains as plain an example of infant baptism, as there is in the New Testament for female communion. That it does not signify that the children were *legitimate*, is sufficiently evident from the fact, that this word “holy” never signifies “legitimacy” in the whole Bible; and because the validity of marriage, on which legitimacy depends, has no connexion with faith. The opinion of the ancient expositors was, that by “holy” in this place, we should understand “baptised persons.” It is common with many to represent this as a relative or federal holiness, of which children partake in virtue of their being included in the covenant with their parents: but to us it seems much more simple, and more agreeable to the genuine import of the word, to consider it as designating those persons who were consecrated to God by baptism.

In regard to the *mode* of baptism, or rather what consti-

tutes baptism, as it relates to the external ceremony, the controversy has been as warm as that respecting the proper subjects. For while, on the one side, it is maintained that any application of water to a suitable subject, in the name of the Trinity, is baptism; it is, on the other side, confidently affirmed that immersion alone can with propriety be called baptism; and that any other application of water to a human body is no baptism: so that if, in all other respects, the rite was administered agreeably to the Divine appointment, this essential defect would nullify the whole transaction; and the person thus washed or sprinkled, must be baptised again by immersion, before he can be considered as having complied with his duty.

We beg that it may be kept distinctly in mind, that the question at issue, is not whether baptism may lawfully be administered by immersion; but whether there can be no valid baptism in any other mode.

To aid us in coming to a correct conclusion, we would observe that the whole controversy, as it appears to us, must turn upon two points: first, the true import of the word employed in the command of our Saviour; and secondly, whether the thing intended to be signified by baptism, is essentially connected with the mode of applying water in its administration.

On the first point, almost all Baptist writers have expressed the utmost confidence, maintaining, with one accord, that the primitive, radical, and proper meaning of the word βαπτίζω, is to immerse; and that we have no more right to change the action commanded, than to change the element directed to be used. Now, if the word is never employed with any other signification, the conclusion is sound, and no application of water to the body ought to be considered, or called by the name of baptism. Just as if a man was commanded to *immerse* his whole body in a pool or river, he could not be considered as obeying the order, if he only washed his face and hands, because the meaning of the word *immerse* is definite, and expresses only such a use of water as takes place when the body is surrounded by that element on every side. The abettors of this opinion, however, have failed to prove that the word βαπτίζω, is thus definite and limited in its meaning. Some eminent Pedobaptist writers have indeed conceded the point; and the Baptists have fully availed themselves of these concessions, as appears by the quotations of Mr. Booth from

authors of this description; some of which are brought forward by Mr. Frey, in his *Essay* now under review. While we do not deny that this word often signifies *to dip*, we maintain, that it is also frequently used with much greater latitude, and may mean any application of a body to a liquid, by which any portion of the liquid, however small, is imbibed. In confirmation of this position, we appeal to all the Greek Lexicons of credit: in these βαπτίζω is explained as meaning, not only *to dip*, but *to wash, to stain, to dye, &c.* And we have fully satisfied ourselves, that the primary, radical sense of this word is, not *to immerse*, but *to dye*; that *to dip* is a secondary signification, derived from the circumstance that dying was usually performed by immersing the substance to be coloured, in a vat: that, nevertheless, the word is by no means confined to dying by immersion, but with equal propriety signifies the staining or colouring of a thing, in any other way, even where the idea of dipping is out of the question.

*To Baptise*, therefore, in its primary, literal meaning, is *to dye or stain* any substance, by imbuing it with colouring matter. And as there is an analogy between applying a body to a colouring liquid, and the application of water for cleansing; so the use of water, by dipping, pouring, or sprinkling, came also to be called by the name of baptism.

This view of the meaning of the word accords with the use of it in all the instances in which it is found in sacred or profane authors; whereas, if the meaning of the word is restricted to immersion, there are numerous passages which cannot be rendered intelligible. We cannot, without great constraint, give this signification to the word in many passages of the New Testament. In Mark, vii. 2, 3, 4, *νίπτω* and *βαπτίζω* seem to be used convertibly, to signify the washing of the hands: "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash (*νίψωνται*) their hands eat not, holding the tradition of the elders: and when they come from the market, except they wash, (*βαπτισωνται*) they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing (*βαπτισμους*) of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables (*couches*)."  
Now to us it seems clear, that the Evangelist here uses both the verb and the noun to express what is in the context, expressed by the verb *νίπτω*, which signifies *to wash*, in any mode. Dr. George Campbell, it is true, supposes that two distinct actions are signified by these two words; and that

besides washing their hands, when they returned from market, they baptised, or plunged themselves in water: but there is no need of this supposition; and it is altogether improbable in itself, that all the Jews, every time that they returned from the market, dipped their whole bodies in water. Very few of them could have had the convenient means of practising immersions so frequent, and as their visits to the markets might be repeated, the practice must have been very burdensome. Besides, the "Baptism of *pots and cups and tables*" by immersion, must have been inconvenient, and to most persons impracticable; as the tables here mentioned were their beds or couches, which, being large and unwieldy, could not have been immersed even in a commodious bath.

Again, when it is said, 1 Cor. x. that the Israelites "were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and the sea," it cannot easily be conceived how they were immersed in the cloud and the sea, since the cloud overhung them, and they passed through the sea dry-shod. There might have been a sprinkling on this large host from the cloud, and a spray of water on each side, but there could be no immersion of the whole body in water.

Another clear proof that Baptism does not always signify immersion, is derived from Heb. ix. 10, where we have the phrase *διαφοροις βαπτισμοις*, "divers baptisms;" properly *different kinds of baptism*. Now if baptism might be of different kinds, then certainly all baptism does not consist in immersion; as there would, in this case, be but one kind. That immersion only is not here signified by the word, is evident from the rites to which the Apostle refers in the Mosaic service. These were ablutions with water, and sprinklings of blood; and although bathing was frequent in the sacerdotal ablutions, yet we do not find that, in any of these bathings, total immersion was commanded or practised. Indeed, it is not probable that the laver was deep enough to admit of the immersion of the whole body. These "divers baptisms" appear to us to include all the ceremonial washings and purifications by water and by blood; and therefore the word cannot mean immersion alone. That the word ever signifies, in the New Testament, a complete immersion, is rather taken for granted than proved. John did indeed Baptise at Enon, because there was much water (*πολλα υδατα*) there; but considering the multitudes who attended his ministry, and the distance which many of them must necessarily



have come, there can be no difficulty in conceiving reasons why he should choose a well-watered place for the exercise of his ministry, without supposing that much water was used for baptism. In that hot country, a place abounding with springs would be very desirable for the refreshment of the people and their cattle; and besides the Jordan, it does not appear that there are any waters in that region suitable for the immersion of such a multitude. John, moreover, might baptise in such a manner as to need an abundance of water, without dipping under water all who come. No mode seems to have more probability attached to it, as the one anciently used, than the leading of the person into the stream, and then profusely pouring water on his head: this would be much more convenient than immersion, and much more quickly performed. On this hypothesis, the expressions "going down into the water," and "coming up out of the water," are as significant as if we should suppose the subjects to be totally immersed; and this borrows light from the fact, that the administrator is said to have gone down into the water, and to have come up out of the water; while no one dreams that the minister plunged himself over head in the stream.

There are some expressions which are thought clearly to teach, that in apostolical times baptism was administered by immersion: such as Rom. vi. 3, 4. Colos. ii. 12, where we read "buried with him in baptism"—which, it is contended, can signify nothing else than immersion. Supposing that there is here an allusion to the mode of baptism, it would only follow that this mode was commonly practised, but by no means that it was the exclusive mode. When, however, we come to consider the usual mode of burial among the Jews, and especially the particular circumstances of the burial of our Lord—which event is supposed to be here referred to—there is so little analogy between such a burial and dipping a person under water, as to make it hard to believe that this was in the mind of the Apostle when he wrote. This leads us to remark, what is the opinion of many judicious men, that there is in these words no allusion whatever to the external mode of baptism, any more than there is to crucifixion; but that as baptism signified and sealed the believer's entire death to sin by the death of Christ, so believers are said not only to be crucified with him, but buried with him in baptism. In support of this opinion, the reader is requested to peruse attentively what Dr. Woods has said on this subject; where he will

also find some important exegetical remarks from the critical pen of Professor Stuart. Upon the whole, we are inclined to adopt this exposition, as best agreeing with the context, and the circumstances of the case.

It cannot be certainly proved from any of the cases of baptism mentioned in the New Testament, that the ordinance was administered by immersion; but it may be conceded, that in some of them this is more probable than the contrary, from the language employed in the description. This probability, however, is more than counterbalanced by the strong improbability that this was the mode in other cases, where the circumstances are recorded. Let it be granted, as probable, that John baptised in Jordan by immersion, and that Philip baptised the Eunuch by immersion; still the impartial reader must acknowledge, that in the baptism of the three thousand, and of the people at Samaria, of the gaoler and his family, of Cornelius and his family, and of Paul, some other mode was used. And let it be remembered, that a demonstration that immersion was sometimes used, does not in the least militate with our opinion, so long as it cannot be proved that this mode was the only one used.

We have already expressed our opinion, that the primary signification of the word βαπτίζω is not *to immerse*, but *to dye*. This opinion, though not new, is acknowledged to be at variance with that of most of our lexicographers, and will therefore demand particular confirmation. We regret that our limits will not admit of a minute and extended investigation of this point; for we feel satisfied that the evidence for our opinion might be made to appear so strong, as to win the assent of all impartial judges. We shall be able only to touch the subject lightly.

We take it for granted that there is no marked difference between βαπτίζω and its root βαπτω, as to their signification. Some have taught that the root signifies *to dip*, but that the derivative should be taken as a diminutive, and consequently should mean something less than *dipping*: while others have held the very reverse, and asserted that βαπτίζω has the force of an augmentative. There is no authority for either of these opinions; and although the Greeks might have perceived a shade of difference in the literal meaning of these words, we are, at this day, unable to discover any. We shall therefore consider them as synonymous. It is, however, worthy of special remark, that βαπτω, in none of its forms, is ever ap-

plied to Baptism; and that the derivative βαπτίζω is never used in the New Testament but with some relation to a religious washing, except when taken figuratively.

There are two methods of ascertaining the radical, primitive signification of a word. The first is to trace it through all its ramifications and compounds, and catch the idea which is common to them all. The other is to examine all the passages where the word can be found, and to consider that as the radical meaning which will suit the connexion in every instance. According to both these methods of investigation, the result will be that the primitive, literal meaning, both of βαπτω and βαπτίζω is *to dye*. For let any scholar turn to the root βαπτω in such a Lexicon as that of Scapula, (where words are etymologically arranged,) and he will there find the following derivations: βαμμα and επιβαμμα, *a tincture or dye*; βαψις, *the act of dying*; βαπτος, *dyed*; βαπτρια, *a female dyer*; βαπτικος, *that which may be dyed*; βαφη, *a colour, a tincture*; βαφικος, *that which relates to dying*; βαφεις, *a dyer*; αβαφος, *not dyed*; αιμοβαφης, *dyed in blood*; ακροβαφης, *dyed on the top*; δρυοβαφης, *dyed with oak*; κισσωοβαφης, *dyed with ivy*; κροκοβαφης, *dyed with crocus*; πολυβαφης, *died much*; διβαφος, *double-dyed*; χολοβαφης, *died with bile*; χρυσοβαφης, *tinged with gold*.

This list might be considerably increased, but we think that no one who is capable of judging in this case, will easily avoid the conclusion to which we ourselves have come. And we believe, the same result would arise from an examination of all the passages in the Greek classics, where this word, in any of its forms or branches, is used. We have time to mention only a few. The first, is the famous passage in the BATTLE OF THE FROGS, v. 212. Where it is said εβαπτετο δ' αιματι λιμνη, *the lake was dyed, or stained with blood*.

Aristophanes, in Pluto, Act II, scene 5, has these words, ουθ' ιματιων βαπτων, *not with dyed garments*.

Again, speaking of the actors colouring, or staining their faces with wine lees, his words are βαπτομενος βατραχειοις; and he also speaks of βαπτος ορνις, *a coloured bird*.

Aristotle, in his book *De Coloribus*, says: "All these things by means of heat and moisture enter the pores των βαπτομενων, *of such things as are dyed in them*:" and *De Animalibus*, speaking of a certain colouring substance, he says, "When it is pressed, βαπτει και ανθιζει την χειρα, *it dyes and stains the hand*."

Plutarch, in his *Life of Lycurgus*, says, "He forbade βαφικην, *the art of dying*:" in another work, "That which is naturally black, is not βαπτον dyed." And speaking of a certain Roman general, who was wounded he says, "He set up a trophy, and βαπτισας, *having tinged* his hand with blood, he wrote an inscription with it."

Plato, *De Republica*, describing the method of dying, says, "They cull out the finest wool, and prepare it with great care, that it may take the grain, then βαπτονσαι, *they dye it*; but" says he, "substances not prepared in this manner, no matter in what dye (βαπτη) they are dyed," &c. Again, "Our aim, with regard to soldiers, is to cause them to receive the laws as the cloth receives βαφην, *the dye*."

And in the first Epistle of Lysis we have, "As οἱ βαφεις, *the dyers* first cleanse and wash *the clothes*, τα βαψιμα των ιματιων, *about to be dyed*, that so they may take a more durable colour βαφην."

Thus also Xenophon, in his *Anabasis*, speaking of the younger Cyrus, says, "εβαπτισεν his sword in blood," that is, he stained his sword with blood.

In fact, there are few instances in which the meaning of this word does not bear some analogy to the art of dying; and therefore the Latin authors commonly translated it by the word *tingo*. And it is not difficult to understand how it acquired the meaning of immersing, as the common method of dying was the dipping of the substance to be coloured, into the liquor impregnated with the dye-stuff.

We should have thought it unnecessary to take so much pains in ascertaining the primary signification of this word, had not so much stress been laid upon it by those who maintain that immersion, is the only proper mode of baptism; and had not the thing been misunderstood by many of our best philologists, who have followed one another in asserting that the radical meaning of βαπτω, is *to dip*.

There still remains one inquiry, before we dismiss the mode of baptism. It is, whether the mode of immersion is necessary to express, or to express forcibly, the thing represented by baptism. The Baptists strenuously maintain the affirmative; asserting, that by this rite is exhibited the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, of which the ordinance cannot be an emblem, unless performed by immersion. We object to this representation, and deny that there is any authority in the word of God, for considering baptism as a figure of Christ's burial and resurrection. The principal emblematical

signification of baptism, is undoubtedly the purification of the soul by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. The being "born of water" is an external sign of being "born of the Spirit." Now the operations of the Holy Spirit, in the regeneration and sanctification of the soul, are often represented by distilling, sprinkling, pouring; &c. but never, that we recollect, by dipping. As far then as the action of baptizing is significative of something internal and spiritual, the argument is greatly in favour of the other usual modes of applying water to the subject, above that of immersion. And let it be observed, that even if it could be proved that immersion was the mode of baptism practised by John, and by the Apostles; yet if there is nothing in this mode connected with the thing intended to be represented in the ordinance, we are under no obligation to follow that particular mode. In other analogous cases, we do not feel ourselves bound to imitate every circumstance in the mode of attending on a divine ordinance, if it is evidently a thing merely indifferent, which may be as well performed in another way. Thus, although, we know that the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the evening; in an upper room; with unleavened bread; in a recumbent posture; yet we feel at liberty to deviate from all these circumstances, because we are persuaded that they enter not at all into the essence of this sacrament: but were circumstances which arose out of the common customs of the country, or from the time and occasion of the institution. So also, if it was customary to administer baptism to men stripped of their clothing, in a country where bathing was customary with all ranks, we should not feel obliged to follow them in this. And if baptism was originally administered by totally immersing the subject in water, in the warm country of Judea, why should we think it needful, scrupulously to imitate this in colder regions, and where habits and customs are different—unless we had reason to believe that something was intended to be taught by the immersion of the subject. If it can be shown that this action was practised, and also that it was not an indifferent circumstance, but significant, we shall then acknowledge that it is important to administer baptism in this way. Otherwise, the manner of applying water in this ordinance, appears to us to be as much a matter of indifference, as the colour of the wine, or the quality of the bread, or the attitude of the participant, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. It is evident, that there is no greater need of much water, to represent the operations of the

Spirit in regeneration, than of much bread or much wine, to show forth the death of Christ. Besides, if the advocates for dipping are so precise, as to require that the ordinance be performed in this mode only, they should be able to show us how the immersion ought to be performed; whether in a river, or in stagnant water; with the face turned upward or downward; three times, as ecclesiastical history informs us was done in the ancient Church, or only once. In all these respects different modes are practicable, and it does not appear why they are not as important as the circumstance of covering the body entirely with water by immersion.

We therefore, think, that when this matter shall be impartially considered, and well understood, we shall have no further controversy about the mode of baptism; except to insist that it be with water, by an authorized minister, and in the name of the Trinity.

---

ART. III.—REPLY OF DR. COX.

*To the Editors of the Biblical Repertory.*

RESPECTED BRETHREN:

AN apology is perhaps due to you and your readers, for attempting a reply, to your review of my sermon, contained in your number for April, 1830, at this late period. I will tell the truth, whether it become my apology or accusation. At that time I was so employed with parochial cares, as well as the general business of the cause in which we are in common engaged, that after a cursory glancing at what it pleased you to say, I laid the number aside, till a less hurried interval might furnish me with the opportunity of doing some justice to it. I was well aware that a matter so interesting, so absorbing indeed in its intrinsic importance as I view it, would not brook to be lightly despatched; and could not be suffered to assert its own gravity, without pressing out certain duties that justly claimed the precedency. Accordingly, I have never read your review till this same month of August, 1831, and am too straitened now for time adequate to the occasion. If this appear strange, the solution is a glorious one: I have been more and more engrossed as a christian pastor in home duties. Souls, literally by hundreds, have, within the year,