

A DEBATE

ON THE

ACTION OF BAPTISM,

BETWEEN

T. H. BLENUS, of the Christian Church,

AND

W. E. ARCHIBALD, of the Presbyterian Church.

Held at Rawden, Hants Co., N. S., October 28th, 1878.

REPORTED BY W. H. FRY, CORPORAL, 97th REGT.

PREFACE.

THE reader need simply be informed that the following is a discussion held by T. H. Blenus, of Christian Church, and W. E. Archibald, of Presbyterian Church. The several speeches were reported as uttered, and with but slight alterations are given as delivered; no new arguments have intentionally been inserted in the revision, or any departure from the original plan of discussion. The debate is published at the urgent request of many who were present, as well as many who were not. The disputants each claim to be alike sincere and conscientious, in what he has brought forward and it is now committed to an enlightened public. A candid unprejudiced reading, and consideration of arguments on both sides, is requested.

T. H. BLENUS.

W. E. ARCHIBALD.

REPORT

OF A MEETING, ASSEMBLED AT RAWDON, HANTS COUNTY, N.S.,
BEFORE WHICH THE QUESTION :

"Does the word *Baptizo*, as used in the New Testament Scriptures, in connection with the ordinance of baptism express immersion in water, in the sense of putting under and drawing out of the water," was debated.

MR. T. H. BLENUS, AFFIRMATIVE.

" W. E. ARCHIBALD, NEGATIVE.

" J. MINARD, M. D., AS MODERATOR.

The Moderator announced that each of the disputants would be allowed to speak for half an hour, affirmative leading.

Order having been called, Mr. Blenus rose to address the meeting and spoke as follows :

MR. BLENUS :—

Mr. Moderator, Ladies and Gentlemen :—I am called upon, in the first place, to place before you the proposition which we have met here to discuss to-day.

I affirm :—"That the Greek word *Baptizo* as used in the Scriptures, in connection with the ordinance of baptism, means to immerse in water in the sense of putting under the water and bringing up out of the water."

MR. ARCHIBALD :—I deny that it does so.

MR. BLENUS :—I am pleased to-day to see so many here. There are various reasons I might give why I am pleased, suffice it to say as an especial reason; that it is always a pleasure for a speaker to have a large and intelligent audience to address. It is much more so on this occasion when the theme is so important a one—a subject connected with the word of God—I know there are many persons, and no doubt there are some present here to-day who disapprove of discussion or controversy on the word of God. We do not ourselves believe in controversy in connection with the word of God that has any other object in view than the evincion of truth and the exposure of error. Such we hope and trust is our object to-day. Now, we may say many things to-day and use many terms connected with the original text of the scriptures etc., that many of you no doubt, will not be able, at first, to understand. We expect to explain as lucidly as possible every term thus used. I shall have to read and quote, from various authors, the most illustrious and well-known commentators, but in all this I shall endeavor to explain myself in as few and simple terms as is consist-

ent with perspicuity. I shall, in the first-place, take up the word *Baptizo*—now I affirm:—

- (1.) That *Baptizo* is not a radical but a derivative word that is, it is a word derived from another word, and the word from which it is derived is called the stem or root word—for Ex., take the root word *dip*—we have the derivatives *dipper*, etc.
- (2.) The root of *Baptizo* is *Bapto*, and is never in the New Testament applied to the ordinance of baptism.
- (3.) In the common version *Bapto* is translated both in its simple and compound form, *always* by the word *dip*.
- (4.) We also find that *Baptizo* is not once translated by—*dye*, *stain*, or *colour*.
- (5.) *Baptizo* with its derivatives is the only word used in the New Testament to indicate the ordinance of baptism.

Now these foregoing facts are indisputable, and on this question are volumes of evidence themselves.

Again, *Baptizo* indicates a specific action, and consequently, as such can have but one meaning. *Baptizo*, being a derivative word from *Bapto* receives its meaning from that root. Now, according to the usage of all languages, both ancient and modern, derivatives legally inherit the *specific* and not necessarily the *figurative* meaning of the root, for instance, take the word *dip* as before used and we have as derivatives—*dipped*—*dipper*—*dip-needle*—etc., and wherever we find the radical or root syllable we find the radical idea. Now I shall next call your attention to the word *Bapto*. It has some 700 flexions besides numerous derivatives—we shall simply take the indicative mood through one tense and through one person; *Bapto*—*ebapton*—*bapso*—*ebapsa*—*ebaphon*—*bapho*—*bebapha*—*ebephaphen*. Its derivatives are *Baptizo* and its regular flexions are more than 700 including all of mood, tense, participle, person, number, gender and case, and from these spring *Baptismos*—*Baptisma*—*Baptisis*—*Baptisteers*—*Baptomai*—*Baptisomai*—*Baptos*—*Baptistevion*—*Bapha*—*Baphikos*—*Bapheis*. Now these different words with their several modifications and flexions number about (2000) two thousand, and through them all we have the root-syllable, and hence, the retaining of the root meaning.

Now, for the sake of comparison, let us take another Greek word, *Raino*—I sprinkle—it has nearly as many flexions and derivatives as *Bapto*—viz.:—*Raino*—*Rainomai*—*Rantizo*—*Rantismos*—*Rantisma*—*Ranteer*—*Rantis*—*Rantos*—with their some two thousand flexions and these all exhibit the root *Rain* or *Ran* and with it the root-meaning *sprinkle*. Now it is philologically impossible to find the root *Ran* in *Bap*—or *Bap* in *Ran*, and just as impossible is it to find *sprinkle* in *dip*, or *dip* in *sprinkle*. There are men here, no doubt, who have the power and means of examining these statements—and I, for my part, am perfectly willing that this should meet the critical eye that it should go before our best class-

ical scholars, who have perhaps given it far deeper thought, and mined it more minutely than I have, and I am positive every scholar will tell you the same as I have already told, and have y

In ancient times, the Greek grammarians were accustomed to arrange words, as they were, in a tree-like form. They took as the root of the tree, the radical word, then next they represented its nearest derivatives by the stems, branches other ramifications, and so on, thus showing, by means of root, trunk and branch the total assimilation of the derivatives to the radical form. Now, it would be impossible, as you all know, to find—in their primitive forms—an oak tree growing out of the root of a fir, or a fir growing out of the root of an oak, apple branches from a poplar—in its first state—and so it is with words through all their inflexions from the radical form. You can, I know, perceive, from what I have said, the wonderful order running through all this arrangement, and can easily imagine that there is a meaning in it all.

We will, now, leave *Bapto*, the root,—having shown that *Baptizo* is derived from it, and how its meaning must, according to the usage of language, be retained—and come to *Baptizo* itself.

My first argument will be based upon the Greek Lexicographers, the most ancient, the most learned and the most competent witnesses in this case. I will only quote from the best of those. I do not deny that there are many learned men at this present day who are equally as learned and to whose opinions weight must be attached, and whom we must acknowledge as standard authorities, but I wish to commence from the fountain head and work down to our own day. Now, you will know from experience, that when one wishes to find the meaning of a word, with which he is unacquainted he will turn to some standard author—by standard author I mean one who has studied the usage of his language and whose acquirements have made him master of it. Surely this is, and must be, a strong argument in my favor. Philology is the most inductive of all sciences and by its aid we can unravel language otherwise inexplicable. With regard to, standard authorities I would also add; that the meaning of a word is ascertained by the usage of those writers and speakers whose knowledge and acquaintance have made them masters of their own language. From these vouchers we get most of our knowledge of Holy Writ, and of all that remains of ancient literature and science—in this controversy I shall only quote the most ancient, the most famous, and the most impartial lexicographers. I shall begin with:—

Walterus, A. D. 1537, he gives as the meaning of *Baptizo*—*immerse*; he gives this as a first specific meaning. Just here I would like to ask if it does not seem strange indeed, that Jesus Christ should have spoken—as some would try to make us believe—in such ambiguous language that when he gives a specific command he uses a word that means—immerse, dip, sprinkle or pour? I think no one will thus thoughtfully dare to impeach the Saviour. I believe that the Saviour *could*, that he *would*, and that he *did* find and *did* use a word with a specific meaning for a specific action.

I shall next quote:—

Stephens, A. D., 1572. *Baptizo*—immers; *submerge*, *bury in water*, *bath* in *water*.
Scapula, A. D., 1579. *Baptizo*—immers; *submerge*, *bury in water*, *wash*, *bath*.
George Pasor, A. D., 1637. *Baptizo*—*Baptize*, *merge*, *bath*.
Leusden, A. D., 1671. *Baptizo*—*Baptize*, *merge*, *bath*.
Schleisner, A. D., 1791. *Baptizo*—*immers*, *dip*, *plunge in water*.
Domergan, *immers* *repeatedly into a liquid*, *submerge*, *sod*, *submerge*.
Parson, *immers* *often*, *submerge*; *hence* *moisten*—*wet*.

I will now summon Liddell and Scott, perhaps, the most widely used standard Greek Lexicon in the world is that of Liddell and Scott—as the meaning of *Baptizo* they give:—

(1.) *To dip repeatedly*—*sink*—*bath*. (2.) *Have water*. (3.) *Baptize*. At one time this Lexicon had partly as a meaning of the word *Baptizo*—*moisten*, and *bath*, but scholars have compelled them to throw these out, being unable to sustain them by a single quotation. I would just remark here that you will notice my quotations are principally from those who are pedobaptists.

I will next quote:

Greenfield, who says, *Baptizo* means *immerse* *immerge*—*submerge*—*sink*—*wash*—*cleans*—*baptize*.

Next we come to:—

Robinson, who gives its meaning as, *immerse*—*sink*—*orchestrate* by *nothing*—*with one's self*, *bath*—*baptize*.

We next will quote the celebrated Charles Anthon, LL.D., an Episcopalian and professor of Latin and Greek, for years in Columbia College, New York. He says *Baptizo*—*Primarily*, means *Dip* or *Immerse*—*Secondarily*, *if it has any reference to the same thing*.

I have here the copy of a letter written by this same Professor Charles Anthon, to Dr. Parinly, of New York, on this subject. I will read it:—

"COLUMBIA COLLEGE, March 27th, 1843.

My Dear Sir,—

"There is no authority whatever for the singular remark made by the Rev. Dr. Spring, relative to the force of *Baptizo*. The primary meaning of the word is to *dip* or *immerse*; and its secondary meanings, *if it ever had any*, all refer in some way or other to the same leading idea—sprinkling etc., are entirely out of the question. I have delayed answering your letter in the hope that you would call, and favor me with a visit when we might talk the matter over at our leisure. I presume, however, that what I have written will answer your purpose.

"Yours truly,

CHARLES ANTHON."

The Dr. Spring referred to in this letter of Charles Anthon's had made the remark that *Baptizo* had no definite or distinct meaning that it meant to *sprinkle*—*immerse*—*pour* and had a variety of other meanings.

We now pass on to, Rev. George Campbell, D. D., President of Marischall College, Scotland. He is a Presbyterian, and in his "Preliminary Dissertation to the Gospel," declares that the original Greek word *Baptizo* means *immers*, *immersion*.

We next summon one of the most learned the most authoritative, and the most distinguished Presbyterian preacher of his day, the justly honored Thomas Chalmers, D. D., LL. D., who lately, scholarly, and independently in his "Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans," expresses himself on Rom. VI. 4 thus—"The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion." You will notice our mode of warfare is designed to have some weight in this discussion as we are turning the very best and most powerful guns in the Pedobaptist camp upon themselves—sifting their backs with their own rod—quoting not Liddell's of the present day—but men whose credition have handed their names down to posterity.

Lastly,—at head for a time—let me call your attention to the Rev. Moses Stuart, D. D., Professor for years in Andover Theological Seminary—a congregationalist. He says—"Baptizo and *Baptizo* mean to *dip* *plunge* or *immerse into any liquid*" (see "mode of Bapt. pp. 51.") also in his "Biblical Repository" for 1833, p. 298, he says, "*Baptizo*, *Baptizo*, means to dip *plunge* or *immerse into any liquid* all *heterophores* and *critics of any mode are agreed in this*."

I shall now briefly notice and call your attention to some of the most illustrious of the ancient classical authors—those certainly must be regarded as competent judges of their own language at the time in which they lived. This has already been done for us to a great extent by A. Campbell, Dr. Cate, of England; Dr. Carson, of Ireland, and Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, whose names and from whose writings I have already quoted.

Time will only permit me to give a specimen of the classical, literal, and figurative uses of the word *Baptizo* and its root *Bapto*.

- (1.) Plutarch, vol. X p. 18. "Then *plunging* (*baptizo*) himself into the lake Copias."
- (2.) Strabo, lib. 6. In speaking of a certain lake near Agrigentum says—"Things that elsewhere cannot float *do not sink*" (*baptizant*); and in book 12, giving an account of a certain river he says—"If one shoots an arrow into it, the force of the water resists it so much, that it will scarcely sink" (*baptizant*).
- (3.) Polybius, vol. III, p. 311, ult., here applies the word to soldiers passing through water as *immersed* (*baptizant*) up to the breast.
- (4.) Horace, Ode, L. 392. As when a smith *dips* or *plunges* (*baptizant*) a hatchet or huge pole-axe into cold water viz.—to harden it.

Herodotus, in Euterpe—when speaking of an Egyptian who happens to touch swine, says—“Going to the river, he dips himself (chaphe eanton) with his clothes.”

Xenophon, Anab. II. 2-4 describes the Greeks and their enemies as sacrificing a goat—a bull—a wolf—and a ram and *dipping* (baptontes) into a shield (filled with their blood), the Greeks a sword and the Barbarians a spear, in order to make a treaty that could not be broken.

Plutarch, Parall. Grace. Rom. p. 545. In telling of a trick or stratagem, resorted to by a Roman general, in order, to insure victory, says—“He set up a trophy, on which *dipping* his hand into blood (eis to aimā—baptizas) he wrote this inscription etc., etc.

Diodorus Siculus, edit. Heyne iv. p. 118. Whose ship being *sunk* or *merged* (baptistheises).

Plato, De. Repub. iv. p. 637. Represents dyers who wish to make a permanent color as first choosing out wool, sorting, and working it over, and then they *plunge* it (baptousi) viz.—into the dye-stuff.

Plutarch, *Overwhelmed* with debts (*bebaptismenon*).

You will notice by the foregoing quotations, that I have confined myself in general to the derivative word *Baptizo*, as, this is the word that is used in the Scriptures to denote baptism and not *Bapto*. As I told you at the outstart *Bapto* the radical word is never used in the New Testament in reference to the ordinance of baptism.

I shall now ask your attention to the use of this word as found in the Bible.

Baptizo—is found I believe but twice in the Old Testament—first in II. Kings, v. 1. and is there translated, “Then went he down and *dipped* himself seven times in Jordan.” This was the way Naaman went and obeyed the command given to him by the prophet “to go wash (*lousoi*) thyself seven times in the Jordan.”

The second time (*Baptizo*) is used in the Old Testament is in Isaiah xxi. 4, and is translated “My iniquity *overwhelms* me” (me baptizei).

I anticipate, in the case of Naaman, that according to my respondents own wording of his position in this debate and in his letter to me, that he has a difficulty here, that Naaman could not have done what the Bible says he did do, viz. :—‘dip himself seven times’—as he would have us believe *Baptizo* if it does mean to immerse means to go down and stay there. Still the Bible says he *dipped* himself seven times, and I believe it.

In the apocryphal books of the Old Testament *Euptizo* is used but twice. In Judith chap. xii. 5, it is said “she went out by night and *washed* (chaptizeto) herself in the camp at the fountain of water.” Did she go the bottom and stay there? Did she sprinkle herself? (which in itself would be a ridiculously

absurd expression). No, the Scripture says “*washed* herself,” and uses the same expression as in the instance of Naaman dipping himself.

In Sirach, xxxi. 25. We have the expression *baptizo meous apo nekron*. He who is cleansed from a dead carcase and toucheth it again, what doth he profit by his *washing* (*too louree auton*). According to the law, Numbers xix. 19, the unclean was never cleansed until he bathed himself in water—hence no exception, has been found as yet.

Professor Moses Stuart, gives all the places where *Eupto* is found in the Greek Septuagint. It is found in Lev. iv. 6—ix—xiv. 6—xiv. 51—xi. 32, and in these places it is, translated *dip* and *plunge*. In Num. xix. 18; Dent. xxxiii. 24; Josh. iii. 15; Ruth ii. 14; I Sam. iv. 27; II. Kings viii. 15; Job ix. 31; Psalm lxxviii. 23; in these places it is translated *dip*, excepting once when it is translated *plunge*, and amongst the things dipped and plunged, are vessels, mattresses and persons.

Of the eighteen or, at the most, nineteen times where *Bapto* occurs in the Old Testament—it is once translated *color*, twice *wet*, twice *plunge*, thirteen or fourteen times *dip*.

So we see our Pedobaptist friends will certainly feel somewhat cautious of trying to prove anything but immersion from the Old Testament use of the Greek words *Bapto* or *Baptizo*.

In the New Testament, we find *bapto* with its compound *embapto* used six times, *Baptizo* eighty times, *Baptismos* four times, *Baptisma* twenty-two times, and *Baptistes* fourteen times, in all one hundred and twenty six times. In the common version *Bapto* and *embapto* are always translated *dip*, *Baptizo* is twice translated *wash*, *Eaptismos* is three times translated *washing*, *Baptisma* and *Baptistes* are never translated but transferred and anglicized the former into *baptism* and the latter into *baptist*. They are never in any instance translated by any of the words, *sprinkle*, *pour* or *purify*. I call upon my respondent to meet this argument and confute it if he can, I hope when he rises to address you that he will notice the arguments I have produced.

Before I close this part of my argument—and having plainly shown to you the specific meaning of the word under discussion—I shall quote what Sir William Blackstone has truly said, in connection with the proper way of understanding the meaning of a command or law. See Blackstones, com. vol. I. sec. 2., “The words of a law are generally to be understood in their *usual* and most *known* signification, not so much regarding the propriety of grammar as their *general* and *popular* use etc.”

Dr. Jonathan Edwards, one of the greatest of American Presbyterian theologians, has truly said “In words capable of two senses, the natural and proper is the primary and therefore *ought* in the first place chiefly to be regarded.”

To similar effect, declare, Sherlock, Dr. Cumming as quoted in Booth’s, “Defence of his Pedobaptism, examined” vol. 3., London 1792, pp. 253-256.

The Moderator here called time.

MR. ARCHBALD:—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—You have heard a great deal this afternoon about *baptizo* being a derivative from *bapto*, but in a somewhat longer coat. Now in order to show the true position of these words I wish to draw your attention, for some moments, at least, to the writings of that celebrated scholar Dr. Dale, I will not attempt during this discussion, to refer to any minor authority on this question—this much controverted theme would, perhaps, be more appropriate—but I will produce evidence of an undeniable character, for such all will admit Dr. Dale's work to be. He is recognized, by all the learned staff of America, to have settled this point for us. Not he alone but, other learned men will uphold me in the view of the question I am, at present, discussing. With regard, to this book, from which I am about to read, it ranks with such works as "Edwards upon the will," likewise we are also told by many of the leading periodicals of America that it is a marvel of research upon the subject dealt with. It is like Blucher at Waterloo—it just comes in to win—it is really an extraordinary book that I will cull from, to show you that my rendering of *baptizo* is the correct one. I will now proceed without further introduction, to the General Results of this work, p 360.

- (1.) That *bapto* and *baptizo* are *absolute equivalents*, is an error maintained through two centuries of controversy, but at length abandoned by all.
- (2.) That *bapto* does not mean, *to dye*, is an error now left without a defender. It is instructive to remember that all cases of *dyeing* were once, controversially, treated as cases of *figure* in which dipping was always present in fact or imagination.
- (3.) That *baptizo* means *to dip repeatedly* is an error thoroughly exploded. Lexicons still give this meaning, but lexicographers must take a great deal on trust, or on a necessarily imperfect examination. Thoroughly developed usage is supreme.
- (2.) Other errors remain to be corrected.
 - (1.) That, *bapto* primarily, is sternly adherent to the modality of *dipping through all its usage* is an error to be corrected. Why not accept, to moisten, to wet, to wash, without modality as well as to dye. These are the natural outgrowths of *dip* as are to color, to stain, to gild, to glaze, to temper to tincture, the legitimate language offspring of *dye*.
 - (2.) That *baptizo* is but a reappearance of *bapto* in a little longer coat is an error. That any language should give birth to a word which was but a bald repetition of one already in existence, is a marvel which may be believed when proved. Besides, when the relationship be-

tween these words was settled it was affirmed that *bapto* had but one, and that a modal meaning; this is now abandoned, and an additional meaning without modality is admitted; surely in view of so great a change, the relationship between these words calls for a review.

- (3.) That, *baptizo* expresses a definite act of anykind, is an error needing connection. The current of controversy has set toward the proof, or disproof of certain acts, *to dip, to plunge*, on the one side; *to sprinkle, to pour*, on the other. The controversy has proved to be both unsatisfactory and interminable. It would, still continue to be so, if prolonged through three thousand years instead of three hundred. The idea that any form of act is justly involved in the controversy, is but a phantom of the imagination. There is no form of act inherent in *baptizo*. It claims the agency of a band of servitors whose name is legion.
- (4.) That any word expressive of condition can be self-limited, as to the form of the act effecting such a condition, is an error. *Bapto* secondary, demands for its object a dyed condition. It has no form of act of its own. It asks no specific act. It accepts and cordially affiliates with *dip*, or drop, or press, or smear, or sprinkle, or pour, &c., &c. *Baptizo* demands for its object conditions:—(a) A change in its present condition, introducing it into a condition of *complete intusposition*. This word, like *bapto*, has no form of act of its own, it asks for none, it accepts indifferently of any, of all competent to meet its demand. (b) It demands a complete change of condition, physical, or spiritual, competent to the task. Hot iron made to pass into a cold condition; intoxicating wine made to pass into a mindsobering condition; a defiled man made to pass into a purified condition; a sober man made to pass into a drunken condition; a wakeful man made to pass into a deeply somnolent condition; are all exemplifications of *baptism without intusposition* in fact, and without any evidence of intusposition by figure. The varied acts and agencies inducing these baptisms show that there is no limitation in these directions.
- (5.) That *baptizo* has any responsibility for the form of the act effecting primary baptism, or for the MANNER of applying the agency securing secondary baptism, is an error:—Dr. Carson says, 'to dye (*baptizein*), by sprinkling is as legitimate as to dye by dipping.' Because, coloring matter applied by sprinkling effects a dyed condition does *bapto*, therefore, mean to sprinkle, or has it anything to do with the mode of applying the color? To merse—*baptizein*—to place in a condition of intusposition by sprinkling, is as legitimate as to do it by sinking; but does *baptizo* therefore, mean to sprinkle, or has it any responsi-

bility for the act by which the intusposition was effected. To inverse baptizō—to bring into a new and completely changed condition, by sprinkling (as, for example, bringing an impure man into a state of complete purity by sprinkling this water), is as legitimate as any other conceivable method; but shall we treat as under baptizo and its condition to ally it with the mode of applying the water, with which it has nothing to do? It is enough for any word to perform one duty well. When baptizo has, with all fidelity secured appropriate condition for its object, do not impose upon it the alien and impracticable duty of performing, also, the act by which that condition is effected.”

I have endeavored to direct your attention to the terms baptō and baptizō as given in Dr. Dale’s, *Classic Baptism*, for the purpose of showing that all its claims for itself is condition, and that an imbridgeable gulf is fixed between them in meaning.

I will now draw your attention for a short space of time to the meaning of this word among other great authors. Our Brother has said, that, he would bring up all Pseudo-Baptistical works, he would array their great guns and fire them on us; well let that be so, but just remember that there are as great guns to be fired from this side and thus, make things lively with a cross fire. Now, in order to show this, let us see what the immersionists and others say upon this much controverted point. Dr. Dale, p. 93, states:—“The word baptizō necessarily includes in its signification dipping, and that Christ by commanding to baptize has commanded to dip only.” But the words are severely written by the very learned Dr. when he flatly contradicts himself for on turning to p. 186 we find him writing: “Although the genius of our language may oblige us sometimes to render baptizō to wet, to wash, or to dye, &c.” How this learned Dr., can declare that the word has but one meaning on page 93, which is *dip*; and yet say almost with the same breath that the genius of the language constrains, he avers, to translate it by wet, wash, or dye, I will leave with you to solve.

Further, we have Dr. Cox who on p. 46 of his work says:—“The idea of dipping is in every instance conveyed.” Then again Dr. Carson states p. 55, “My position is that it signifies to dip never expressing anything but mode.” Notice likewise what he says on p. 19, of his work. “Baptizo has two meanings, the primary to dip; the secondary to dye. *Baptizō* in the whole history of the Greek language has but one. It not only signifies to dip, or immerse, but it never has any other meaning.” Where is mode and nothing but mode in the word immerse when such a person as Morrell, p. 166, affirms that, Dr. Cox, states, “a person may be immersed by pouring; were the water to ascend from the earth it would still be baptism were the person wholly covered by it?” Where then I ask is mode, and nothing but mode? It vanishes before such testimony as this.” Further Dr. Carson, even on this point, contradicted him-

self for on p. 11, he says:—“When baptizō is applied to an object lying under water, but not actually dipped, the mode essentially denoted by it is as truly expressed as it is in any other instance of its occurrence.” You will notice this discrepancy, I leave you to ponder on it for yourselves. I will not attempt to waste the time of such an intelligent audience as the one I have the pleasure of addressing; but to the question. How, Dr. Carson, can say that an object lying under water—notice the word *lying* i. e. *undisturbed*—expresses the mode of dipping, I am at a loss to understand, and it is another point which I must leave with you for solution. Again, Dr. Fuller on p. 29 of his work states:—“My position is that baptizō means to immerse, it matters not how the immersion is effected.” Further on, on p. 31, he says:—“Suppose a man should lie in a baptistry while it is filling, the pouring would not be immersion, yet an immersion would take place if he remained long enough.” Here we have immersion produced by pouring, but does pouring ever produce dipping or plunging? No! it never does; hence mode vanishes. To the number of Baptist writers who have surrendered mode and taken refuge under the term immerse, which simply expresses a change of condition may be mentioned Dr. Conant, p. 60, He affirms “that the idea of emersion is not included in the Greek word baptizō.”

Dr. Fuller says:—“It matters not how the immersion is effected whether by pouring or otherwise.” I have called your attention to the words used by different authors on this subject, viz.:—“immerse and dip,” now just look at and examine them and you will easily see for yourselves that a gulf of immeasurable width divides the words immerse and dip. Dr. Conant, informs us that the act of immersion is not the meaning of the word baptizō, for he uses seven terms to define it and these he acknowledges are only a ground idea of it. For he states:—“It appears that the ground idea expressed by this word is to put into or under water or other penetrable substance, so as to submerge, or entirely immerse, and that this act is always expressed in the literal application of the word and is the basis of its metaphorical use. This ground idea is expressed in English by synonymous terms, that is in the ground idea and the various connections where the word occurs, to immerse, immerge, submerge, dip, plunge, engulf, sublate. What position has mode with Dr. Conant? It has none; for the very terms which express such he states does not accurately define the word baptizō, but simply expressing a ground idea, which can only mean condition. More authors could be quoted from, who would uphold me in my view of the momentous subject now before this audience, but these will suffice. Having learnt what the most eminent baptist writers have said upon this theme, and having shown you that there is a difference in the words baptō and baptizō, which if time would permit we could prove—conclusively prove—beyond all doubt the great unfathomable difference between them. I myself have quoted from various baptist authors who have themselves acknowledged the difference between them. Now we will do well friends to proceed to the examination of the difference between the words dip and immerse. I casually referred to this before but will now examine them in detail.

In order that you may see the difference between them, first permit me to ask what is the English equivalent for *baptizo*? Dr. Dale, p. 83, says:—that immerse simply “expresses condition characterized by inness of position,” and this may be seen to be the true import of the word from the following passage found in Virgil’s *Æneid*, Lib. 3.-605.

“*Spargite me in fluctus restoque immergite ponto.*”

“Cast me in the waves and immerse me in the deep.”

Here the word immerse simply expresses a change of condition, as a result from the action expressed by the verb, *cast*. Who will be bold enough to say that the word immerse in this passage, means to dip? The word immerse as used by Virgil in these lines, shows that there is something found in the word dip which cannot be found in the word immerse. Does the word immerse express the action? No. It expresses simply and purely, that the person “*was cast*” into the water, and then he uses the word immerse to show that the person is overwhelmed by the water which are entirely two different things. Did the word *immergite* take the person out of the water? No. For it is as much the part of the dippers contract to take out of the water as it is to put in; which is not as we have seen included in the word immerse. Never have I found dip given as a meaning for immerse in any English Dictionary, I have seen, and I have examined all the Standard Dictionaries such as Webster, Walker, Johnson, Worcester, Nuttall &c. On the other hand I have found *immerse* given as a meaning under dip and this I consider shows without doubt, that, that which is dipped is immersed, but that which is immersed is not dipped; and this I maintain proves that there is a wide difference between the words dip and immerse.

Dr. Dale gives *merge* as the primary meaning of *baptizo*, thus showing that there is a great gulf, which is fixed, between these two words dip and immerse, a gulf which cannot be bridged, and he proceeds to carry this reasoning down in the languages from which the respective synonyms are taken. He takes, for example (Dale 213,) the word *merge* and the English equivalent *merge*; mark, not the word *immerse*, but *merge* and thus by the process of reasoning developed in that work shows that the word *baptizo* is quite different from the word *bapto*, and that *dip* and *immerse*, are also essentially and radically different. But our object was not to distinguish between these two terms in a classical sense, it was to refer to the New Testament usage of the word *baptizo*. If the New Testament cannot afford us with an explanation of the term *baptizo*, then the word of God is incomplete, but if the word *baptizo* is illustrated and explained in scripture, let us take its interpretation and not the workmanship of man. Further if the word of God does not explain *baptizo*, I must acknowledge it is incomplete, but we do find that it is explained even as are the words sanctification, justification, &c. There is no word of importance that is not explained, at least, that I can find. The word of God lays down definitely the law and the testimony and it is by that we must abide. Permit me at this point to ask my brethren here, what is the New Dispensation? It will greatly

depend upon what we will get as the meaning of the word *baptizo* as defined on the occasion. That is to say, the New Kingdom, as far as, I can learn from God’s word, was formed when the disciples were indued with power from on High. When did that take place? It was a few days after Christ had taken his departure from earth and ascended on High, and when we are told in the New Testament Scriptures, the disciples were in an upper chamber, waiting to be endued with power. And we are told that in order that they might be endued with it the word *baptizo* is used and my brother says that it means dip, then it stands to reason that the disciples must have been dipped on the occasion. Were they dipped? If so who dipped them? This question is unanswerable, as is also this one. How could they be dipped sitting for we do not read that they arose when they were baptized.

Further, I have shown you that there was a great gulf fixed between immerse and dip. But here the word immerse is excluded just as well as the word dip, that is if we admit the word immerse to be synonymous with dip. Allow me to ask where are we told in the passages before us that the spirit descended and filled the house. We are not aware that it did so, as it was simply the sound that filled the room. It may be said, in this connection, that it is impossible to speak of the spirit being poured out; to this I would just say that nothing is impossible to God. We are likewise told the Israelites were baptized; were they dipped when walking on the dry ground? What does Dr. Carson say on this subject; “That they got a dry dip.”

Permit me to ask you, who was able to take such a large body as they were and dip them into a cloud, or the Red Sea? There are none able for the undertaking there is no proof that they were dipped and yet we are told that they were baptized. Were they immersed? No! Was the cloud overhead? No! For we are told that the cloud went behind in order that it might give them light but the Psalmist comes to our rescue and says:—“The clouds poured out water.” Ps 77.-17. Now, if the Israelites were baptized at all they were baptized by the pouring rain. The point in question is were they dipped, or were they not?

Now, let us turn again to the New Testament. Was Paul dipped when baptized? If so could he have been dipped while standing upon the spot. Now, in relation, to this we are told that immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales and he received sight forthwith and arose (*anastus*) and was baptized. Here it is said, “there is evidently something omitted by the sacred historian,” let us see if we can solve it. Now, you will understand, that whenever the action is not to be performed on the spot where the individual stands, then it is always expressed and is not left for us to supply and understand. For instance, Acts 9.-11, “Arise go into the street which is called straight and enquire.” Here he had to arise and go as directed, because otherwise he could not perform that which he was ordered to do, he could not execute it on the spot. In like manner, we can read and exemplify the following text:—Acts 9,

39, "Then Peter arose and went with them." Acts 10, 20, "Arise and get thee down and go with them." Now I ask could he perform the act indicated on the spot? No. In every such case we have the participle *anastas* used, and in such a case *go* follows it, thus showing clearly that there was a verb following the preposition *anastas* in these cases.

Now, let us turn, to a few examples to show the action performed on the spot as we find in the case of Ananias. "And the young man, arose wound him up and carried him out." Acts 5, 6. Here we find that they wound him up a person, on the spot, and carried him out. Again, we find in Acts 11, 28. "there stood up one of them Agabus and signified." Acts 13, 16. "Then Paul stood up and beckoning with his hand said."

Now in each of these cases there is no verb following *anastas* either expressed or understood, to show that the action was performed elsewhere, and this we find to be the case with the proceeding extracts and from this I maintain that in all such cases the action was performed on the spot. Turn to Acts 22, 16, and there we find, "arise be thou baptized." If the inspired writer meant to say that Paul left the room and was baptized, why not give some hint about it as in the other cases, you might ask is it not implied in baptizo. I answer; No. That unless it is an action in itself it cannot imply that, and we are simply told that he arose.

Mr. Archibald here resumed his seat, time being called by the moderator.

Mr. BLEXUS—

Mr. Moderator, Ladies and Gentlemen:—My Respondent has made a hard attempt to establish an argument in his favor by splitting hairs with Drs. Conant, Carson, and Gale, and by giving you a number of somewhat unintelligible readings from Dale's Classic Baptism. My arguments based on the meaning and use of the word under discussion he has steered wonderfully clear of. He has tried to show you that Dr. Gale, has contradicted himself by saying first *Baptizo* means to dip, and then telling us it also means *wet*, *wash*, or *dye*, now how do people generally wet-wash or dye articles? The answer of any candid man will forever banish the slightest shadow of a contradiction on the part of Gale. —I shall not stop to notice such futile reasoning.—I want to pass to almost the last argument used by my respondent. I refer to that of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost. Now I am confident, that Mr. Archibald must believe with me that it was the spirit of the Apostles that was baptized by the spirit of God. Now, Mr. Archibald says if *Baptizo* means to dip they must have been dipped in the spirit and asks who dipped them! I have already quoted sufficient authority to prove satisfactorily to you that, things dipped—or immersed, or overwhelmed in anything would occupy one and the same condition or position.

Now if the spirit of the Apostles was overwhelmed with the spirit of God would they not as regards their spirits be in a spiritually immersed condition? Mr. Archibald will not deny this; he has labored hard to try to make you think there is a great gulf between the words *dip*—and *immerse*; but in this he takes direct issue himself with the very best of the Lexicographers—such as Stuart, Anthon, Schleusner, and many others. My respondent, has next referred you to what the Apostle calls the baptism of the Children of Israel in the cloud and in the sea; and has referred to it as a dry dip. Now, the Scripture informs us they were baptized *in the cloud* and *in the sea*, that is, the two things combined to overwhelm or immerse them for this meaning of the word *Baptizo*, see Isaiah xxi. 4, "My iniquity overwhelms me," (me baptizei), here, Mr. Archibald, will find another *dry dip*.

Again he, I fear stoops to quibble on the idea of their being in the cloud, and says the cloud was behind. Now, Paul says, baptized "*in the cloud* and *in the sea*." Mr. Archibald, has also quoted Psalm 77-17, to show, I presume, that the Children of Israel were either poured or sprinkled. Read the passages more carefully and you will see that Sinai, rather than the Red Sea is the place referred to by the Psalmist. Let us try and keep things in their proper places.

The next circumstance he introduces is the circumstance that Paul was commanded, "To arise and be baptized," and we are asked the question was Paul dipped? What would you think if, on the other hand, I should argue that some, in fact, the majority of those who pour ask the candidate to kneel down—hence because Paul was commanded to arise he could not have been poured, there would be no argument in such quibbling. But my respondent thinks he must have been baptized on the spot, because we find in the connection no account of his having left the room or place where he was and thinks that if Paul had left the room and gone to the water—something would have been said about it—we feel thankful that Paul *himself* has said something about it; in writing to the Romans, he says, vi. chap. verses 3-4, "Know ye not that, 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 etc."

Being the affirmative speaker in this debate, it was the part of my opponent to notice and confute my arguments, but either unwittingly or otherwise he has avoided taking issue (with but one or two slight exceptions) with the arguments produced in the introduction of this discussion. He has quoted for nearly the whole time of one speech from "Dr. Dale's Classic Baptism;" to what purpose! Not that it seems, to prove any particular action, but rather to substantiate the idea that *Baptizo*—the word used by our Saviour and his Apostles to convey a particular and specific action—is so ambiguous in its meaning and use, as to render an arrival at any definite and particular meaning an impossibility. Now, as Jesus Christ must have intended some particular action to be performed by his ministers, and submitted to by the people in the command to baptize them—it follows that he either did select such a word, or

that he could not, or that he would not—certainly no believer in the Lord Jesus Christ will for a moment entertain either of the last conclusions, to do so would be impeaching the love and power of the Saviour. I repeat therefore what I have already said, that I believe that he *could*—that he *would* find such a word and that he *has done* it—and that *Baptizo* is that word.

I shall now pass on to bring to your notice my next argument in favor of my position. Which shall be the English versions of the Scriptures, but particularly of the New Testament by English translators—and I have been privileged to see a great number of them, some have translated the whole—some a part of the original into the English.

There are in the London Hexapla, first published by Baxter in 1841, the six most prominent English versions, viz.:—Wickliffes, A. D., 1380; Tyndale, 1584; Crammer, 1539; Geneva, 1557; Anglo Rheinish, 1582; Authorized, 1611; besides these six versions, more than as many more of much recognized respectability, viz.:—Doddridge's, Thompson's, Wesley's, Penn's; the Anonymous; Campbell's Four Gospels; McKnight's Epistles; Stuart's version of the Romans and Hebrews, besides some others of lesser fame.

Now, of these 14 versions, not including some others I might mention, not one has ever translated any word of the *Bapto* family by the words *sprinkle*—*pour* or *purify*. I take this opportunity of calling my opponent to notice this argument. It is not based upon mere assumption nor bare assertions, nor yet upon the evidence of one individual—but upon the opinions of the ablest and best translators and commentators.

Our next argument shall consist in the main in examining the opinion of some of the early Reformers. At the head of these, we must place Martin Luther. In the Smalcald Articles, as drawn up by Luther, he says,—“Baptism is nothing else than the word of God with immersion in water.” Again he says, in Op., vol. I. 336, Baptism is a Greek word and may be translated immersion, as when we immerse something in water, that it may be wholly covered; and although it is almost wholly abolished, for they do not dip the children only pour a little water on them, they ought nevertheless to be wholly immersed and then immediately drawn out for that the etymology of the word seems to demand.

Washing of sins is attributed to Baptism, it is truly indeed attributed, but the signification is softer and slower than it can express, baptism, which is rather a sign both of death and resurrection, being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized to be altogether dipped into the water as the Word doth mean and the mystery doth signify.”

Next, Calvin, Institutes, Lib. IV. sec. xv., “The word *Baptizo*, signifies to immerse and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church.”

Grotius, says:—“That this right was wont to be performed by immersion and not by perfusion, appears both by the propriety of the word and the places chosen for its administration, etc. We have also Alstedius, Witsuis, Baddaens, Ewing, Leigh, Bossuet, Vossius, Venema, Bloomfield, Augusti, Buttmann, etc., and all these with many others bear testimony to the meaning of the word *Baptizo*. Before I dismiss this I will quote what Dr. Carson tells us the Edinburgh Reviewers says on his work: “They tell me that it was unnecessary for me to bring forward any one of the examples to prove that the word signifies to *dip*,—that I might have commenced with this as a *fixed point universally admitted*.”

I remarked, when this discussion commenced, that I would quote none but the highest authorities, and I see that my friend has not denied that the primary meaning is *dip*, but has quoted Dr. Dale, to show that it has a secondary meaning, which is, sometimes also used in this connection. How can we translate and trace the word according to the analogy of laws, as I have elsewhere quoted, unless we take the primary or first signification of the word? If allowed to take any word approximate to it and fly off at a tangent, we can, almost, insert any words that render the idiom, or other peculiarities, of a language complete, and thus from the same passages often have directly opposite ideas. My next argument, in confirmation of my rendering of *Baptizo*, is derived from the words used in construction with it. With the word *Baptizo* we almost invariably find the prepositions, in Greek, *en* and *eis*. Prepositions meaning *in* and *into*. While with the verb *Raino*, to sprinkle, we have the preposition *epi* used; this preposition means *upon*, but mark this, these words never interchange their prepositions. Here we have a class of words that have a certain class of prepositions, and these are *en* and *eis* with *Baptizo*; *epi* with *Raino*, and I wish you to keep this in mind through this discussion.

Again, does the word *Baptizo*, as has been asserted, convey in its meaning the idea of putting under water, without raising up again. I will just examine this for a few moments and crave a patient hearing from you while doing so. I will take the case of Naaman, II. Kings v, 14. If the meaning of our friend is to be taken, Naaman the Syrian leper could not have done what the Scripture says he did. “Then went he down and dipped (*Baptizo*) himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God.” Now we are told, shortly before this, that he was ordered to wash (*lousai*), and then we read that he dipped, thus showing that the words wash and dip, here mean, the same thing. Also, in Judith xii. 5, we find “She went out by night and washed (*ebaptizeto*) herself. But we deem what has been already said and quoted on this point sufficient. Now again, we appeal to the word of God—we find that baptism was first administered in rivers. The first baptist—during his public ministry spent much of his time on the banks of the river Jordan.—“Thither resorted to him all Judah and Jerusalem and were baptized of him in Jordan confessing their sins.” Notice, they were not baptized *upon* Jordan, nor *with* Jordan, nor was Jordan baptized upon them, but they were baptized

in Jordan. Our English *in* is but the adoption of the Greek *en*. The Romans, borrowed their *in* from the Greeks, and we borrowed our *in* from the Romans and all these *ins* are of one and the same signification and construction. *In* does not mean—*at*—*with*, or *by*, except by figure. It is literally *in*. *In* the house is not *at* the house, *with* the house or *by* the house, but literally *in* the house. Now as the preposition *epi*, does not bring the Jordan upon them, and as *eis* and *en* place them in the river; *ek* and *apo*, is by necessity established as helping the baptized to emerge from the river.

The Greek preposition *en* meaning *in* occurs in the New Testament 2660 times. Of this immense number of times it is translated in our common Testament 2045 times by the English word *in*. I might add here that this has taken an immense amount of time and trouble to find out, but this is only one of an immense number of things which must be sought for and computed by those who wish to arrive at the truth of anything. Now of this immense number of times, it is in 2045 times translated by *in*. In the 4 Gospels alone, the Greek preposition *eis* occurs 795 times, of these, it is translated by *into* 372 times, and by *to* for *into*, more than one hundred times; and of 273 times *unto* and without destroying the sense, it might be translated in these cases, *into*; thus making, in all, 500 out of 795 occurrences. It is wonderfully strange, I say it earnestly and fearlessly, that with Pedobaptists, *eis* can mean *in* or *into* except when connected with *Baptizo*. Why change it here and tear it from its primary meaning? How would this sound? "The righteous shall enter *at* (for *into*) life eternal." "The wicked shall be cast *at* Hell;" "Jesus went *at* Heaven." In fact, *eis*, will take a Pedobaptist into anything on the universe, except into water.

We will now pass on for a few moments to examine the baptisms of John. We are told that John baptized at Enon because there was much water there. One would think that ought to silence every doubt or cavil on the question. Some have tried to establish the fact that there was not much water there, only a few rivulets, and, at last, when forced to admit the possibility of pools collecting from the rivulets, they set about finding some use for the rivulets, other than that for the ordinance of baptism. They even go so far as to say, that: all the dromedaries and camels of Arabia, carrying the people to John's tent, quenched their thirst at the rivulets, while the humane John always kept a basin of water on his table for the purpose of baptizing. That John pitched his tent near to Enon for the sake not of baptizing (as the Scriptures say he is there for) but for the sake of watering the caravans that flocked to his baptism. Such nonsense! Does not the passage of Scripture itself, refute this absurd talk. Does the scripture not read that John *baptized* at Enon for a given reason—and we have no idea that he meant, therefore, any other reason; hence the baptizing and the reason must fairly and honorably go together, *polla ludata*, the Greek for much water is used by the Apostle John in his writings, no less than five times, all requiring *much water*. The voice of God too, is

compared to the sound of many waters; does this mean little rivulets? Suppose, for example, that a miller erected a mill near a creek or river because there was much water, who would most honor the miller's understanding and foresight, he that affirms he settled there for the sake of watering his flocks, or for the motive power to drive his mill?

There is another thing I would like to call your attention to. It is this, concerning the baptism of the 3000 on the day of Pentecost. It is alleged that Peter could not immerse so many in one day. There is not the least difficulty in the case. If Peter were the only Christian on the spot before the baptizing commenced, it could be done in a few hours. He could immerse ten or twenty, and authorize them to immerse others, and so on, till the whole was accomplished. But there were twelve apostles, and more than one hundred disciples, hence this objection vanishes. It is further alleged that a sufficient supply of water could not be obtained in Jerusalem, in which to immerse. But the objection has no force whatever with those who are acquainted with Jerusalem. This city was well watered by a great number of public and private pools. The brook Kedron, also, was near it. Besides this we have the evidence of Josephus who declared, in his history, that there was a sufficiency of water for one and a half or two millions.

We will now turn to our Saviour's baptism, Matt. iii. 16., "and Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water, &c." The verb here in the original is *anabaino*, this is a compound of *ana* and *baino*—meaning going up, or mounting, being followed by *apo*—it is strengthened and is consequently translated *went up out of*. Again, look at Mark i. 10:—"And it came to pass in those days that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized of John *in* (not *at*) Jordan. (Here we have the preposition *eis* for *en*, as in Luke xi., 7-10)—"And straightway coming out of the water, &c." Here also we have the verb *anabaino*—going up, used again with *apo*, as in Matt. iii. 16. By these prepositions we see that Christ not only came to John at Jordan to be baptized, but also that he must have gone down into, or he never could have come up out of Jordan.

"These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." John i. 28. This text is frequently used as an argument against immersion, by asserting that here we have John baptizing in a house. Now, Bethabara is not a house at all, but a town or village. See Judges vii. 24. "and Gideon sent messengers throughout all Mount Ephraim, saying come down against the Midianites and take before them the waters unto Bethabara and Jordan. Then all the men of Ephraim gathered themselves together, and took the waters unto Bethabara and Jordan."

Here, then, we have an account that the children of Israel took the fords of the Jordan, the lower ford was at Bethabara. Bethabara was a town or village on the east bank of the ford. Its name means "house of the ford."

In relation to immersion I would here relate some anecdotes, the first of which was told some time since by Mr. Knapp, in connection with his own work. Amongst some candidates for baptism and membership, awaiting examination, was a young man from the Emerald Isle. After hearing the experiences, and asking the usual inquiries of the others, our Irish friend was asked to relate, as near as he could, the Lord's dealings with his soul. He related a very clear and satisfactory experience, including his impressions on land and sea, among civilized and uncivilized nations, which was listened to by the committee with an interest manifested alternately by smiles and tears. Then came the question from the pastor, "My brother, you are aware you have presented yourself for membership, to a church which contends there is but one physical baptism, and that is by immersion, and that this ordinance is a prerequisite to the privileges of the Lord's Supper. Now, we wish to know if you heartily and conscientiously agree with us in our views of baptism and communion?"

Said the candidate, "I do, sir, most heartily and sincerely. I have been a sea-faring man since I was 15 years old, and I never sign the articles till I read them and accept them."

"But," continued the pastor, "you are aware many learned and godly men, who have studied the scriptures all their lives, practice sprinkling in place of immersion, what right have we to set up our opinions on this subject in opposition to their convictions and practices,—may not you and I be wrong in our interpretation of baptism?"

With the blood mounting to his face, as though we were trying to sprinkle him; with a rich Irish brogue and trembling with emotion, he exclaimed:

"You see that tumbler of water on that table there?" "Yes." "Well, when you can lead a man down into a tumbler of water, and bury him in a tumbler of water, and then lead him up out of a tumbler of water, I will believe Jesus, my Saviour, may have been sprinkled or baptized from a font, but till you can do that, all the Doctors of Divinity in the world cannot convince me that sprinkling is baptism."

"Brethren of the committee, have you any questions to ask upon the ordinances?" "None."

A missionary once presented a bible to a young Indian, who possessed a fair knowledge of the English language, and exhorted him to read it, believe it, and obey its commands. The book was received and read as requested. Some time afterward the Indian met the preacher and said to him:—"I want you to go with me to the river, I want to be baptized." "I can baptize you without going to the river," said the minister. "Where," enquired the red man. "Here," replied the preacher. Said the Indian in surprise, "I don't see how you can baptize me where there is no water." "We can have water brought for the purpose," responded the minister. But the young man was perplexed,

he could not understand how they were to baptize him after the water was brought. The minister then explained to him that they could baptize him "by pouring a little water on his forehead." "Is that baptism?" "Yes," replied the minister. Not yet quite satisfied, the young man again replied, "Well, if that is baptism, you have given me the wrong book."

MR. ARCHIBALD:—

It has been stated by the gentleman on my right, that I produced some arguments in favor of a separation between *Bapto* and *Baptizo*, without proving my assertions. Now, I am not going to take up time by reading from the various authors, who substantiate what Dr. Dale has stated to be the difference of the terms. In his work (*Classical Baptism*) are collected together all the authorities of importance within the last thousand years, he has taken all that the leading men on both sides have said with regard to this, until he has proved conclusively that there is a separation between *Bapto* and *Baptizo*. So much for that, if more is required of me, I can give it. It has likewise been said that anything short of a primary meaning of a word, is in a manner, useless with regard to a New Testament ordinance. Let us apply the test. In regard to the Lord's Supper we have the word *Deipnon*, which means, according to the classical usage of the word—the principal meal of the day. Is the word here used in its principal sense? No. And so this argument fails.

I must next turn to the Septuagint as your attention has been drawn to Naaman, and you have been told that Naaman went down and dipped himself in Jordan. If he did, he did it on his own responsibility, for there was no such command given him; that is, if I understand the word of God and the things directly pertaining thereto. Now, I maintain in the first place that Naaman did not dip, because he was not commanded to dip, and again I say he did not dip, for it was impossible for him to dip himself.

With regard to the first of these points, I affirm that Naaman was not commanded to dip himself, but simply to wash and Elisha sent a messenger unto him saying; *Go and wash*. (Heb. *Rakhats*—to bubble up, to pour out, to wash) in Jordan seven times. No one will for one moment, doubt but that Naaman fully understood the instructions given him by the Prophet; likewise all know that if he acted in anywise contrary to such, he could not expect to be cured. Now, as I have stated before, Naaman was ordered to *wash*,—simply to *wash*—himself seven times in Jordan. In order to see this, turn with me to the word which is used in the Septuagint to express the Hebrew term, Heb. *Rakhats*, and we find it to be *louo*, to wash, to wash the body, to wash oneself. Where, is the term dip? It is not given. Then where is the command to dip? It is not to be found. A detailed explanation of this word might be given which would materially strengthen my point, but I must reluctantly forbear

from quoting various authors, whose works are within your reach, to confirm my point, and show from the usage of *louo* that persons were washed and yet not dipped.

We have, amongst many others, Hippocrate's Greek Lexicon, by Galen, who lived 164, A.D. We have this quotation there, *louo ou monon to louein, allakia to aion an* which was given as a medical prescription, and here we find that *louo* denotes not only to wash or bathe, but also *ainan* to moisten, foment, pour, or sprinkle. And according to Erotianus, who was a Greek, and lived in the 2nd Century, giving the leading signification of *ainan* as to foment. Was this dipping? No. There is nothing whatever like it or contingent to it in this word. Thus in the evidence of men, to whom Greek was vernacular, and whose professional studies made them thoroughly acquainted with the writings of Hippocrates, we are supplied with solid grounds for affirming that, in the usage of that distinguished author, the sense of dipping did not belong to *louo*, either directly or by implication. In the age of Homer, the vessel for bathing went by the name of *asaminthos*, and among the Greeks, of a somewhat later age, it was called *puolos*. Occasional references are also found in the writings of both periods to the act of *going into* the bath, and *coming out* of the bath. Let us in order to show what was done in the bath, hear from the excellent dictionary of Greek and Roman antiquities published some years since, under the able superintendence of Dr. Smith. He says, 'It would appear from the description of the bath administered to Ulysses in the palace of Circe, that this vessel *did not contain water itself*, but was only used for the bather to sit in, while the warm water was being poured over him, which was heated in a large cauldron or tripod, under which the fire was placed, and when sufficiently warm was taken out in other vessels, and poured over the head and shoulders of the person who sat in the *asaminthos*. Where is dipping in the case before us? "From this pregnant instance the advocate for dipping may learn an instructive lesson. It is no proof of immersion, that a party is represented as *going into the bath*, and coming out of the bath! (Wilson on Infant Baptism, 157.) This brings to my mind that if Naaman went into the water with all his clothes on to wash, would dipping effect it? According to the common acceptance of the term, it would not. Therefore I ask; was he dipped? I answer unhesitatingly, No; he was not dipped. Neither do we find in the whole Bible, a place where a person is needed to dip in order to purify himself, nor of a person being dipped, except in the case of Naaman and he was not, for as I have shown, he was not commanded to do so. There is no other instance in Scripture, not even in the case of the leper, where a person was cleansed by dipping. You who are familiar with the word of God, know well how lepers were cleansed. You also know that to constitute the act of washing, according to the ordinary usage of the word, there must be a rubbing process. Are we told that Naaman rubbed himself? Even suppose, we admit for a moment that he dipped himself? Further, with regard, to the word *louo*, let us again turn to Dr. W. Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities; he says:—"On ancient vases, and on which persons are represented bathing, we

never find anything corresponding to a modern bath, in which a person can stand or sit; but there is always a round or oval basin (*louterion*) resting on a stand (*upostatou*) by the side of which those who are bathing, are represented standing undressed and washing themselves."

Here we read of bathing, but where, I ask, was the dipping? In support of this—bear with me a little further. I will again quote from Wilson on Infant Baptism, 159:—"An interesting wood cut was taken from one of the vases in Sir W. Hamilton's collection; and its value is greatly enhanced by the fact that, in this instance, the word *louas*, has inscribed on it the term *damosia*—public, showing it to be no private concern, but one of the ordinary public baths of Greece." I might go on to show right down from the times of antiquity, till a more recent age, that according to the Greek custom, they did not dip themselves in order to wash, but in all cases the water was applied.

Now, let us turn to my second objection to Naaman being dipped, namely, it was impossible for Naaman to dip himself. What do we understand from the word himself? Do we not understand that the whole person of Naaman was dipped? Surely we do. Then, I ask you, if he dipped himself, how could he lift himself out of the water, in order to dip himself into it? I say it was utterly impossible for him to do so unaided. If he did lift himself up, he must have had some rope and tackle to do it with, had he such? You may be led to say that a part is equal to the whole (laughter) and that he having dipped a part was entirely dipped. Again, I say it was utterly impossible for Naaman to have raised his whole physical form out of the water and dip himself into it. Thus admitting this for a moment to explain it, let us picture the circumstance, of his going to the waist into the water, then all from the waist down was immersed, was it not? Now, if it were already immersed, how could that half of Naaman's body be dipped into an element it was already in? All this may, however, enable us the better to understand the true signification of the term *tabal*, it is synonymous with *Baptizo*, and it is used as such in several places. Let us hear what Mr. Baines, who is considered to be a very good authority, says with regard to it.

"The Hebrew word *tabal*, which is rendered by the Greek word *Baptizo*, occurs in the Old Testament in the following places and in none other, and from a careful examination of these passages, its meaning among the Jews is to be derived. From these passages it will be seen that its radical meaning is not to sprinkle or immerse. *It is dip*, ordinarily for the purpose of sprinkling, or for some other purpose." * * * * *

In Fuerst's Hebrew and Chaldean Lexicon, we find the following under *tabal*—to moisten, sprinkle. Secondary meaning—to dip, immerse.

Now, if we are to carry out what we have heard from the other side,

namely, no secondary meaning is of any value, we must abandon the word dip, and take up moisten or sprinkle. Further, Furest states:—

"The fundamental signification of the stem is to moisten, to besprinkle."

According to Mr. Barnes it is dip anything you choose, into an element, to do something else, such as when the priest dipped into the blood, &c., or whatever else it is in order to carry out the broad idea of *tabal*. You have also heard somewhat of Baptism by Purification this evening, and that it was accomplished by *Bapto*. Now, notice what is said in Mark's Gospel VII, 1-5. We are there told that the Pharisees found fault with the disciples because they eat with "unwashed hands."

Let us now turn to our Saviour's baptism, we are told that He went into the water. I do not, for one moment, deny that He was in the water—far be it from me to deny such, although much can be said on both sides. Now, permitting that He is in the water, how was He baptized? I ask who baptized Him. Let John come to the rescue and tell us how he baptized Christ, and you are told by him that he baptized Jesus *with* water. Now, surely if John says he baptized the Lord with water, we cannot for a moment think that he dipped him in the water. Is the word from which it is translated never rendered *in*? Yes it is. Let us see how and when *en* is translated by the word *with*.

Whenever the word *en* is used to mean or indicate time, it is translated *in*, as *in* the day of Judgement, there the word *en* is used for time, also in all cases of locality by *in*.

With reference to our Saviour's baptism, how is this word to be taken? is it to be taken as a place? then if it is, He was placed in such a place, irrespective of motion; but there is nothing whatever in the passage indicative of motion, so this theory must fall through. Likewise in regard to time, I say, that it cannot be so applied. It must always be rendered, in the various positions of God's word, *with water*, when used to express instrumentality. In order to show this I maintain it would just be as absurd to say, "I strike in a rod," as it would be to say that "I baptize in water," because water is just as much the instrument used and applied to the person as the rod.

Now turn with me to Acts 1, 5. "For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Here, in this case, we have the translation given to us "*with water*." Apart, altogether, from the preposition which is used in Matthew's gospel, we have the same rendering given, showing that *with water* is the only admissible translation.

In the gospel according to Mark, 1, 9., we are told that when Christ came to him, *eis*, in Jordan; it might be said that He was dipped, but there you will admit that the word *Baptizo* of itself does not express motion, and in order that there might be motion in the word, it must have an adjunct, or some other qualifying word, and whenever an adjunct is so used it is translated *in*.

Now, in order to show you that even when there is no motion in the verb, where the preposition *eis* is used in the various portions of scripture, and where the rendering into is totally inadmissible with the existing syntax, turn to Acts 21-13, where we find—for I wish to found all my data, as far as possible, on the scriptures—at Jerusalem. Here no action was expressed, and consequently *eis* is rendered at Jerusalem. Mark, well not into Jerusalem.

Again turn to Acts 23, 11, "For as thou hast testified of me *in* Jerusalem," not *into* Jerusalem "so must thou bear witness also *at* Rome," not *into* Rome.

Again compare the following texts:—Acts 21, 13, "I am ready to die (*eis*) at Jerusalem." John 21, 4, "Jesus stood (*eis*) on the shore." John 9-7, "Go wash (*eis*) in the pool of Siloam." Hear, what Dr. Carson says on this, "My doctrine is, that the motion is implied in a verb which is understood, and is not properly communicated to a verb that has no motion in itself. It is absurd to suppose that the same verb can designate both rest and motion. It is impossible both to stand and move at the same time. What I say is, when *eis* is construed with a verb in which there is no motion there is always a verb of motion understood, and which is not expressed, because it is necessarily suggested." Again he says on page 239, "The account of the Evangelist not merely asserts that Jesus went into the water, but that when in the water, he was baptized or immersed into it."

Here we have the Dr. taking the preposition *eis* from the verb *Baptizo* and connecting it with the verb *went* understood and thus disposes of it. He is seemingly unconscious of the fact that the preposition is already disposed of and he again joins it to the verb *Baptizo* thus compelling it to do double duty. This error against the rules of syntax I most strenuously oppose. Admitting the fact that the preposition *eis* takes Christ into the water, what will *Baptizo* do, which is of itself inexpressive of motion? It will do nothing, but John comes forward to the rescue and declares that he baptizes *with* water, not *in* water. Thus we have evidence given us from the word of God itself, and this is confirmed by the same construction used to express the baptism on the days of Pentecost. With regard to those who were baptized on the day of Pentecost, none who are acquainted with the history of the place, will affirm that there was not a sufficient supply of water, as historians inform us that there was abundance of water in cisterns under ground. But what will these cisterns do for us, in order that the disciples might baptize their candidates? Could they dip them in? No. They could easily plunge them into the cisterns, but how could they get them out again, that is the question. They must of necessity have had apparatus similar to that used in taking Jeremiah out of the dungeon. Had they such apparatus? No; neither, have we any reason to believe that the disciples dipped on that occasion. But permitting that it was possible for the disciples to dip their candidates into such cisterns, can we for a moment believe that the authorities of Jerusalem, who were opposed to the teachings of the accursed Nazareens, as they called them, would allow the disciples to dip them into the

water which the Jews used for drinking and other purposes? Neither are we to understand that they left the place where Peter was preaching, for it was there baptism was performed. True there were various pools such as the pool of Siloam, the pool of Bethesda and others, likewise the brook Kedron which flowed outside of the city; mark, *outside of the city*. We are not told that they used such. As your attention has already been drawn to the Eunuch's baptism let us turn to it. Acts 8:38, "and he commanded the chariot to stand still and they went down both into the water, both he and the eunuch and he baptized him. "It is evident that Philip was speaking to the Eunuch on the matter of baptism for we have the Eunuch declaring, "Lo! here is water; what doth hinder me from being baptized." But does the chariot stop there? No. The chariot goes on. How far it went on from the time that the Eunuch saw water and the time they stopped we know not; all that we are told is that the Eunuch made such an affirmation. It is only when the Eunuch declared his belief in Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, that the command was given to the charioteer to stop. Now, that the chariot is standing, are they in the water? No! They have still to go to the water. Admitting that they went into the water, was the going into the water baptism? No. For if it was, then they were both dipped, but we are told that, after they were in the water, Philip baptized him.

MR. BLENES:—

I will now take the last argument my respondent has advanced, namely; about the cisterns of Jerusalem being underground. We all remember, I am sure, the story of the lame man (see John 5) who wished to go to the pool of Bethesda, and I don't think that we read that he went under ground to get there, at least the scriptures do not tell us so. In this connection, and to show the utter futility of my respondent's argument concerning the pools, &c., I will give you a detailed list of the pools, &c., with their length and breadth. There were pools at Jerusalem, covering from a quarter to $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres; 8 that had names besides others unnamed, covering over 15 acres in all. Over 2,000,000 of people could assemble at Jerusalem, and there was at those times no scarcity of water; and in confirmation of this we are told by Josephus that $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions perished in the siege by Titus.

Now, it was on an occasion when Jerusalem was filled with strangers that this wonderful baptism was performed, and still our friend, here and others, tell us that the apostles could not have found water. I will now turn again to the subject of the pools. Bethesda 22 rods long, 8 wide; Solomon's Pool, 15 x 6; Pool of Siloam, 53 ft. x 18 ft, with a smaller pool; Old Pool, 20 rods x 13; Pool of Hezekiah, 15 x 9; Lower Pool of Gihon, 36 rods x 16 rods, and we are

told that in the days of the Apostles it covered over 4 acres; and with all this water, irrespective of cisterns, tanks, &c., they could not immerse the 3000!

Mr. Archibald has said that I cannot maintain the point that Naaman was dipped. Just turn with me to 2 Kings, v. 14, and we find there that he *dipped* himself seven times in the water. Mr. Archibald says he did not. Mr. Archibald says he did not because he could not. The Bible says he did; hence he must have had the ability. My friend tries a little quibble here by saying he did certainly not dip himself, because he never was commanded to dip—but certainly the very idea of his dipping, as the scriptures assert, shows plainly what was understood by the expression, wash, in the Old Testament, and only tends to strengthen my position, and beautifully agrees with the ancient Jewish custom of washing the body on certain occasions. My opponent's arguments on this point are certainly unworthy of the source from which they originate. He tells us that in the meaning of the word wash, a rubbing process is necessary. Paul was told to "arise and be baptized and wash away his sins"; what about the rubbing process in this instance?

It certainly seems hard work for my friend to have to go to all the trouble to quote from antiquity,—vases and woodcuts—to show us that anciently men and women did not have to dip themselves to wash or cleanse the body, and then after all his trouble to find the Spirit in the word of God saying Naaman *dipped* himself." But we find him ere he closes getting things a little mixed in his argument, trying to prove the absurdity of Naaman dipping himself, he asks:—"Do we understand that the whole body of Naaman was dipped," and answers, "certainly we do"—we feel pleased that at last candor seems to have compelled the admission. The remainder of our friend's argument is rather puerile for our notice. Next, we come to the baptism of the Eunuch by Phillip. The questions here are 1st, Whether Philip and the Eunuch went down *into* the water, or only *to* it. 2nd. Whether the facts in the case afford any evidence that the Eunuch was immersed. The determination of the first question depends upon the exact force of the Greek expression in the original *katabasin eis to hudor*, and *ambasin ek to hudatos*. Now, if the latter expression means "they went up out of the water," then the former necessarily means "they went down into the water." There are two methods of enquiry by which to determine whether they went into the water. (1.) The direct method which depends upon the meaning of the words supposed to declare the fact. (2.) The indirect method which determines whether they went into the water, by determining whether they went out of it. We are told by objectors that the Greek proposition *eis*, usually meaning in or into, often means *to* or *at* when used, as here, with the Greek verb *katabaino*. For instance, "Jesus went down to Capernaum." "Jacob went down to Egypt." "They went down to Attalia." "They went down to Troas." "He went down to Antioch." "Going down to Caesarea." Now, in the instances above quoted, let me ask any candid hearer, to answer, do you understand, from them, that the person

or persons have just gone to or at the city limits or outskirts, or actually into the city. When I say I am going down to Halifax, do I actually mean that I intend going only to the outside limit of the corporation, or actually into the city? The answer is evident. Now, for a few examples from the New Testament to show how it was used and how understood. Rom. x. 7, "Who shall descend into the deep." (*e's-abussou*)—literally into the abyss. Mark xiii. 15, Let him that is on the housetop not go down *into* the house" (*katabaino eis*.) Again, Ephesians iv. 9, "Now that he ascended, what is it; but that he also descended first *into* the lower parts of the earth (*kateba eis*.) Luke xviii. 14. "This man went down into his house justified (*kateba eis*) rather than the other. The instances thus cited from the New Testament, where these words are used together, show that in every single instance the expression means to go down into—by our first method of enquiry, therefore it is settled that Philip and the Eunuch went down into the water. Another objection is often raised, by saying that the Greek verb *anabaino*, is never employed in the sense of emerging from a liquid substance. Now, it is a fact, and one known to every scholar, that in every single occurrence of these two words in connection; in the New Testament, they mean to go up out of. Let us examine a few texts and see for ourselves. "And the Jews' passover was nigh at hand, and many went out of the country, *up to* Jerusalem before the passover to purify themselves." John xi. 35. "And Joseph also went *up* from Galilee *out of* city of Nazareth." Luke ii. 4. "And the smoke of the incense which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended *up* before God *out of* the angel's hand. Rev. viii. 4, besides several other passages, such as Rev. ix. 2; xi. 7; xiii. 1; xvii. 8. In Rev. xiii. 1, John says, "I stood upon the sand of the sea and saw a beast (*ek tas thellassas anabainon*) rising up out of the sea." The expression in question does, without a single exception mean to go up out of. Philip and the Eunuch therefore went up out of the water; hence they must have first gone down into the water, and by both methods of examination our conclusion is settled. Another objection is sometimes raised, namely, that as they both went down into the water, and both came up out of the water, they must have both been baptized; and yet Philip was baptized before. Against such quibbling as this I must protest. What are the facts of the case. Philip did not baptize the Eunuch till he got down into the water, and the baptism was completed before they commenced to come up out of the water, and here notice this, that the simple act of walking down into the water prior to Philip baptizing him, can not be considered any part of the act of baptism itself.

The next case to which I would draw for the second time your attention is the baptism of Saul of Tarsus. An objection is raised that here we have an instance where an individual was told "to arise and be baptized." Let us see, what the Apostle himself has to say about it. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Here we have Paul speaking of himself together with the Christians to whom he is

writing, says "they were buried by baptism." In this connection we will summon some of the most learned Annotators and Commentators to tell us what they think of this passage, in Romans vi. 4-5. The first is, *Barnes*, a celebrated scholar and commentator; commenting on this passage says, "It is altogether probable that the Apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion."

Wall, one of the most celebrated of Episcopalian Church Writers, says, "As to the manner of baptizing then generally used, the texts, John iii. 23; Acts viii. 38; produced by every one who speaks of these matters are undeniable proofs that the baptized person went ordinarily into the water and sometimes the baptist too. We should not know from these accounts whether the whole body of the baptized was put under water, head and all, were it not for the two later proofs, which, seem to me, to put it out of the question. One that Paul does twice in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a burial, the other the customs of the Christians in the near succeeding times, which being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally or ordinarily a total immersion."

Archbishop Tillotson, an Archbishop of great notability in the Church of England; commenting on the same passage, says:—"Anciently those who were baptized were immersed and buried in the water to represent their death to sin and then did rise up out of the water to signify their entrance upon a new life and to these customs the apostle alludes."

Another Episcopalian, *Samuel Clark*, on the same passage says:—"In the Primitive times the manner of baptizing was by immersion or dipping the whole body into the water and the manner of doing it, was a very significant emblem of the dying and rising again referred to by Paul in the above mentioned similitude."

Doddridge, a Congregationalist, remarking on the same, says, "It seems the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the matter of baptizing by immersion."

George Whitefield, says, "It is certain that in the words of our text, Romans vi. 3-4, there is an allusion to the manner of baptism which was by immersion, which is what our own church allows."

John Wesley, the celebrated founder of the Methodists, in his notes on the New Testament in referring to this passage, says, "Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

This from such a celebrated man,—a man whose memory is cherished by all here present, whose works you are all, more or less, acquainted with; an example of godliness all might try to emulate, the writer of books all might read, and teach their children to do likewise—is surely of weight. I know full well you all place confidence in him, and I know also that with many of you it is of a higher order than that which you will place in me.

Let me turn again to other writers of eminence and see what they say on this same question.

McKnight, a celebrated Presbyterian commentator says:—"Planted together in the likeness of his death. The burying of Christ and of believers, first in the water of baptism, and afterwards in the earth is fitly enough compared to the planting of seeds in the earth, because the effect in both cases is a reviviscence to a state of a greater perfection." Many others of the most celebrated divines could be brought as witnesses on this point; such as Grotius, Beza, Bloomfield, Koppe, Rosemiller, and others all testifying that this passage in Romans, plainly refers to the ancient mode of Baptism by immersion, and these men are all from the Pedobaptist ranks.

A minister from the United States, a few days ago in conversation on this subject with myself said, "That if he were discussing with Pedobaptists on this subject the very strongest arguments he could possibly use, would be their own acknowledgments—and candid comments on Holy Writ—and it is true that the best, the most learned and the most well-known writers in Pedobaptist ranks candidly admit immersion to be the primitive mode of baptism and thus practised for centuries." These men were well aware that their scholarship was at stake—and although many of them think baptism a matter of indifference notwithstanding we find the best and most learned agreed as to its signification and primitive meaning, we shall before we have done with the discussion call up as witnesses many more to thoroughly substantiate the position I have taken.

Before I conclude my argument on this point, I will again quote from that most distinguished Presbyterian preacher, the justly honored Thomas Chalmers, D. D., LL. D. Boldly and independently he expresses in his "Lecture on the Epistle to the Romans" chap. vi sec. 4. "The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion and though we regard it as a point of indifference, whether the ordinance, so named, be performed in this way, or by sprinkling, yet, *we doubt not* that the prevalent style of the administration in the Apostles days, was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water. We advert to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses—Jesus Christ by death underwent this sort of baptism, by an immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection. We by being baptized into his death are conceived to have made a similar translation. In the act of descending under the water of baptism to have resigned an old life; and in the act of ascending, to emerge into a second or new life along the course of which, it is our part to maintain a strenuous avoidance of that sin, which, as good as, expunged the being that we had formerly, and a strenuous prosecution of that holiness which should begin with the first moment that we are ushered into our present being; and be perpetuated and made progress toward the perfection of full and ripened immortality." The next case which will occupy our time for a few minutes will be that of the Phillipian jailer, as found

in Acts xvi. 25 to end of chapter. Here we have an account of the Jailer bringing Paul and Silas out of the prison, and when he was told what he must do, in answer to his question, we find him being baptized, after which he brought them into his house. Now he was not baptised in the prison, for we are told that he brought them out prior to his baptism. He was not baptized in his house, because, he did not take into his house till after he was baptized. Had Paul desired to sprinkle, or pour, the Phillipian Jailer, no doubt he could have done so in the Jail, or in the house—but we find them brought (not from the inner prison simply into the outer prison, the scripture says nothing of the kind) out and after baptism taken into the house.

I shall again call upon my respondent to notice the arguments I have adduced—he, as yet, has utterly failed to, in the slightest instance, set aside the voluminous testimony produced. He seems to labor hard to establish something, but you cannot but perceive that his great labor seems to be, to teach you that the Bible does not mean what it says. When it says *dip*, it cannot mean *dip*, it must mean something else.

My time is nearly up. I have still more than ninety other authorities to quote, of undoubted fame, to strengthen what I have already said.

The meeting here adjourned till 6 P. M.

ADJOURNED MEETING.

Order having been called, MR. ARCHIBALD rose and spoke as follows :

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen :—

Again we are met to discuss this important subject. You will observe, those of you who were here before we adjourned, that I did not make one statement or call on any one of the Lexicographers. My opponent has quoted a number, and I also wish to quote one or two. Under the word *Baptizo*, we have several meanings, and among others baptize, that is sufficient for me. That word baptize is sufficient, for we have the English lexicographers defining that term for us, that is for those who do not understand, it or are not acquainted with the Greek terms ; if you will apply yourselves to Webster or Walker, &c., you will there find that which will substantiate what I have said on this question.

We have Robinson's Greek Lexicon to the New Testament, and in it he says :—"In the New Testament usage it is to wash, to bathe, to cleanse by washing, to wash ones hands, to perform ablutions, its secondary meaning, to baptize, to administer the rite of baptism."

Coming next to Scapula we have him giving the definitions *tingo*, *abluo*, *lavo*, *immergo*, *haurio*. Now, note this, it is said that the first *tingo* is the exact equivalent of *baptizo*.

Dr. Smith, Examiner of London University, an undoubted authority on such matters, thus defines these terms for us :—

- (1.) *Tingo* :—To moisten, wet, bathe, color, tinge, dye, paint.
- (2.) *Abluo* :—To wash off or away, to purify, to cleanse by washing.
- (3.) *Lavo* :—To wash, bathe, moisten, wet, bedew, wash away.
- (4.) *Immergo* :—To dip, to plunge, sink, immerse, thrust in.
- (5.) *Haurio* :—To draw out, drain, spill, shed, breathe.

Here we have all these several meanings to ponder on, but especially the first *tingo* which is the most approximate in signification to the word *Bapto*. We have also Dr. Carson,—let me give you his scholarly opinion on this point—he says :—"The word *Baptizo* means mode and nothing but mode," as I have said he is a scholar and is obliged to confess after saying this, "that all the lexicographers are against me." Now, think you that Dr. Carson, would make such a statement as this if he was not sure of the fact. He knew well what he was about when he said that.

Having given you one or two statements on this word, let me draw your attention to the New Testament again. I wish to bring your attention to the time when the New Kingdom was established. "Wherein the old things are passed away and all things have become new." There must have been a moment when this change took place.

When did this change take place? I answer, and say that it took place when the disciples were endued with power from on High.

Now those disciples were baptized and I ask you were they dipped? Yet the word *Baptizo* is used. Then we have here been ushered into the New Kingdom by *Baptizo*, and it cannot be expressed by *Bapto* or any such terms. They were ushered into the New Kingdom by the Spirit. We cannot deny the fact that the disciples were baptized, yet they were not dipped into the spirit; but, we must acknowledge that they were baptized with the spirit, as if to fulfil the words of the Saviour: "Ye will be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Now, my opponent in this controversy has just said that they were overwhelmed and that it is an equivalent term to dip. No friends, they were not dipped and though he took the word immerse they were not immersed, if that term is used as equivalent to the word dip which we have disposed of. Let us learn from Dr. Conant, who has produced the ablest work on the Baptist side of the question, Carson not excepted, and what does he say. He says, "That the word *Baptizo* does not imply emersion that is, the word *Baptizo* puts a person in the water but nowhere does it take the person out of the water." As a scholar he is obliged to acknowledge such, and, I ask you what took place if it did not take place when the Holy Spirit ushered the disciples into the New Kingdom, in order that they might be initiated into this New Kingdom. I ask of you what other place does the water take? I say it takes the same place as the spirit when water is applied to those who are baptized into the visible kingdom. I ask how the disciples could be received? The proposition of our Brother is that those who are baptized according to the Christian baptism are dipped.

I deny that they are dipped. I affirm that they are not dipped. I have already indicated that the disciples were not dipped, and I ask you, how could they dip others in order to initiate them into the New Kingdom, when they were not dipped themselves. But, you may be led to say how do you explain that passage in Romans 6, "Buried with Christ in Baptism." Friends, if you have read this passage before, you will be able to see the reason, and understand why Saint Paul uttered these words. First, you will see that he wanted to show the power of sin and that of grace. Secondly, the difference between the saved and the unsaved. This was St. Paul's object if we understood the passage correctly, for we read in the 3, 24 verses :—"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." We can here see that the baptism into Christ's death was but the result of the baptism into Christ. "That so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ." Mind it is not two baptisms my dear friends, but one, the two

conditions, resulting from one baptism. Then comes the third condition, namely—burial, resulting from the baptism in Christ. We read 'buried with Christ in baptism.' The three results, then, are briefly, first ; baptism to Christ ; second—baptism with death ; third—burial as a result. We are told, that they were "buried with Christ in baptism." Now, let me observe for a few minutes somewhat on the second condition. I have stated that the second condition cannot, that is fairly, be construed into an emblem of the death of Christ. There must be a resemblance between an object and an action, where there is no resemblance we have, properly speaking, no emblem whatever. I ask where is the resemblance between dipping and the death of Christ. The Lord died on the Cross ; persons are said to be dipped to symbolize the death of Christ ; had the Lord been *drowned* instead of being *crucified*, there might have been a resemblance to the death of Christ. Are not Christ's sufferings spoken of elsewhere as floods that drown their unfortunate victim ? No. For the baptism description of Christ's sufferings is of itself, a figure so that we cannot convert a figure into a figure, or a symbol into a symbol. Dr. Carson has settled that point with all sensible men for ever.

Further, let us observe a few things concerning the burial, which is the third condition. We are not to interpret this passage as a symbol of burial, for if it is taken as such, it must be threefold—death—burial—resurrection. If burial with Christ is an emblem of His death, how can it be an emblem of His burial. For the death of our Saviour preceded His resurrection, and we have seen it is not an emblem of His death, and how, I ask of you, can it be an emblem of His burial ; if it is not an emblem of the reality, how can it become an emblem of that which is but an inference of the reality itself. I say that it cannot be so ; you will be ready to ask me the question—what does this burial with Christ teach ? It teaches a living union with Jesus. For did Paul say, "As many as were baptized into the name of Christ, were baptized into His death ?" Not at all ; what he says is, "as many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into His death." Now, we are told how this union takes place in Col. 2. 12 : "By the faith of the operation of God." Paul further explains this to be a spiritual baptism, I Cor. 12-13 : "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body."

Again, he informs us in Gall. 3-4 :—"For as many of us as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." "Now that we are one with Christ by baptism, we are said to be dead." Rom. 8, 10-11 :—"If Christ be in you the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness. It is then that Paul could say, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me."

How does this change take place ? In Col. 2. 11, "without hands in the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Paul explains this in

Rom. 8. 11, "But if the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken (or make alive) your mortal bodies by His spirit that dwelleth in you." It cannot refer to water baptism, if so, then all are saved by it. Simon Magnus was baptized ; was he saved ? If so, how can we explain the condition as described by Peter of the above named individual, who was said to have believed, was baptized, yet described the Apostle as being, "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity, whose heart was not right in God's sight."

I ask you to explain this matter and show what results must follow to those who are baptized by water, if buried with Christ, refers to water baptism. Then all those who are dipped must necessarily arise from under the water to newness of life. Let us apply the test. Do all those who have been dipped exemplify in their after life the results expressed by the Apostle in Rom. 6-4. No, all those who are baptized by dipping do not show in their after lives that the change expressed by the apostle has taken place. Thus showing plainly that there is a living union, and that we are one with Christ, that is, that we are dead with him, buried with, and said to be raised with him, and we say that these terms are not emblematical terms of Christ's death, burial and resurrection as I have endeavored to show but an actual union.

MR. BLENUS :—

Mr. Moderator, Ladies and Gentlemen :—Mr. Archibald has at last consented to have something to do with the Lexicons, but when he comes to them he uses the Greek Lexicons very sparingly—takes the word baptize as a meaning of Baptizo and then runs off to some English lexicon to see what baptize means—why does he not go to the Greek Dictionary and there find its meaning—for the simple reason I presume that 99 times out of every hundred it would be against him. This certainly is not a very scholarly way to ascertain the true meaning of any word. But I have quoted sufficiently from ancient classical writings as well as from the best lexicographers to give without the shadow of a doubt the true meaning of *Baptizo*.

What my respondent has said in his last speech concerning the meaning of *Baptizo* makes him take direct issue with the lexicographers.

What are we told by *Liddell and Scott* ! We are told that *Baptizo*, means (1.) To Dip repeatedly, to sink, to bathe. (2.) To draw water. (3.) To baptize.

Greenfield, gives :—Immerse, immerge, submerge, sink, wash, cleanse, baptize.

Robinson, gives :—Immerse, sink, wash, cleanse by washing, wash one's self, bathe, baptize.

Bretschneider, gives :—Dip or bathe frequently, bathe, wash, immerge, submerge.

If my time was not so limited, and I have still about 100 select authors of the eminent and learned of the different commentators. I might quote from all bearing witness to the truth of immersion, being the action commanded by the Lord Jesus Christ and practiced by primitive christianity. I will read the names of some of those as I will not have time to read what they have written.

These are, McKnight, Whitefield, Wall, Archbishop Tillotson, Archbishop Seeker, Samuel Clarke, Burkill, Olhauser, Conybeare, Houson, Hammond, Bishop Smith, The Westminster Assembly, Tyndale, Hoadly, Storr, Hatt, Luther, R. Newton, Baxter, Chalmers, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Myssen, Apostolical Constitution, John Damascenes, Athanasius, Basil, Justin Martyr, Theodosius, Dionysius Aeropagus, Council of Toledo, Photius, Gelasius, Archbishop Cranmer, Scudder, Pictetus, Nicholson, Manton, Augustine, Bengellius, Goodwin, Doddridge, Wells, Whitby, Adam Clark, Edwards-Edinburgh Reviewers, Bloomfield, Suicer, Bingham, Bishop Sherlock, Warburton, Leighton, Mathias, Rosenmuller, Jasper, Frankins, Turretin, Theophylact, Leo, Tholuck, Weiner, Lange, Jortin, Supermille, Burmanns, Peter the Martyr, Albert Barnes, Estius, Brauns, Berge, Rheinhard, Burnett, Cayeton, Cave, Davanant, Fell, Queenstadt, Starke, Locke, Knapp; all these bishops, commentators, divines, archbishops, and eminent scholars, with many others of all ages, churches, and creeds say that baptism means a burial, and nearly all say so, because such was the ancient practice.

My friend has labored hard in his speech to tell you what he thinks of Rom. vi.—but when he is done, with you, not one of you can tell how he fixed it; he certainly cannot well understand it himself. I have already quoted in my other speeches much on this point, still I have as much more to bring forward.

Dr. Koppe, says of Rom. vi. :—"This reasoning depends on a certain peculiar usage which men used to practice, namely: the rite of immersion in the waters of baptism."

J. C. Walfuis, a learned German critic, says:—"Formerly immersion in water furnished a sign of burial in baptism."

Dr. Philip Schaff, says:—"The New Testament comparisons of baptism, with the passage through the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 1, 2), with the deluge (1 Peter iii. 21), with a bath (Eph. v. 26; Titus iii. 5), with a burial and resurrection (Romans vi. 4; Col. ii. 12), and finally it was the universal usage of the churches of antiquity to baptize by immersion (as the oriental churches and also the Russian-Greek do to this day), and wetting or sprinkling was only allowed in cases of urgent necessity, as with the sick and dying."

Dr. DeWitt, speaking of baptism, says:—And so was the rite according to Romans vi. 4.

John D. Michaelis, says:—"Also the explanation which Paul gives of baptism (Romans vi. 3-4) sets clearly before us, immersion, and cannot be applied to sprinkling with water."

Dr. Tholuck, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle, says of buried by baptism (Romans vi. 4):—"For the explanation of the figurative description of the baptismal rite, it is necessary to call the attention to the well-known circumstance that in the early days of the church persons when baptized were first plunged below and then risen above the water—to which practice, according to the direction of the Apostles, the early christians gave a symbolical import."

John G. Rosenmuller.—This celebrated German scholar, says on Romans vi. 4:—"To baptize is to immerse, to dip, the body or part of the body which is to be baptized going under the water. Immersion in the water of baptism, and the coming out of the same, was a sign that the old life had been abandoned, and that the new one in the opposite direction established. Hence it was customary for those baptized to be spoken of on the one hand as dead and buried, on the other, as resuscitated again into a new life. The learned rightly admonish us that on account of this mystical sense of baptism, the rite of immersion ought to have been retained in the Christian Church."

Archbishop Tillotson says:—"Anciently those who were baptized were immersed and buried in the water to represent their death to sin, and then did rise up out of the water to signify their entrance upon a new life. And to these customs the apostle alludes in Romans vi. 3-5."

Dr. S. Clarke says:—"We are buried with Christ in baptism &c. In the primitive times the manner of baptizing was by immersion or dipping the whole body under water. And this manner of doing it was a very significant emblem of the dying and rising again referred to by St. Paul, on the above mentioned similitude."

Dr. D. Whitby says:—"It being so expressly declared here, and in Col. ii. 12, that we are being buried with Christ in baptism by being buried under water, and the argument to oblige us to conformity to his death, by dying in sin, being taken hence, and this immersion being religiously observed by christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our church; and the change of it to sprinkling, even without any allowance from the author of this institution. It were to be wished that the custom might be again in general use."

Dr. T. Sherlock says:—"Baptism or immersion in water, according to the ancient rite of administering it, is a figure of our burial and of our conformity to his death, and so signifies our dying to sin and walking in newness of life."

Wm. Burkitt on Romans vi. 4, says:—"The apostle, no doubt, alludes to the ancient way and manner of baptizing persons in those hot countries, which was by immersion, or putting them under water for a time, and then raising them up again out of the water, which rite had also a mystical signification representing the burial of our old man, sin, in us, and our resurrection to newness of life."

Dr. Wall, after quoting several passages as "undeniable proofs that the baptized persons went ordinarily into the water," says:—"We should not know from these accounts whether the whole body was put under water, head and all, were it not for two latter proofs which seem to me to put it out of the question, one that St. Paul does twice in an allusive way of speaking call baptism a burial; the other the customs of the christians in the near succeeding times, which being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally or ordinarily a total immersion."

Dr. George Hill says:—"The apostle Paul (Romans vi. 4, 6) illustrates this connexion by an allusion drawn from the ancient method of administering baptism. The immersion in water of the bodies of those who were baptized is an emblem of that death unto sin by which the conversion of christians is generally expressed; the rising out of the water, the breathing in the air again. After having been for some time in another element, is an emblem of that new life which Christians by their profession are bound, and by the power of their religion are enabled to lead."

Dr. James McKnight, in his note on Romans vi. 4, says:—"Christ submitted to be baptized, that is, to be buried under the water by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future resurrection. In like manner the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial and resurrection."

Albert Barnes, in his note on Romans vi. 4, says:—"It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." Likewise Beza, Calvin, George Campbell, Chalmers, and a host of the most eminent Presbyterians, bear united and unequivocal testimony to the same truth."

We have also—*Dr. Doddridge*, in his comment on Roman vi. 4, says:—"It seems but the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to baptizing by immersion, as most used in those early times."

Moses Stewart, on Romans vi., says:—"Most commentators have maintained that the original word has here a necessary reference to the mode of literal baptism, which they say was by immersion, and this they think affords ground for using the image employed by the apostle, because a burial under water may be compared to a burial under the earth."

Let us next hear the leading men in the Wesleyan Church.

John Wesley, in his note on Romans vi. 4, says:—"Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

Adam Clark, on Romans vi. 4, says:—"It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under water."

Joseph Benson, in his note on Romans vi. 4, says:—"Therefore we are baptized with Christ. Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

To the above we might add the testimony of learned and eminent men in different ages, and in different communions, since the apostles' days.

John Frith, a learned divine, the companion of Tindal, and who suffered Martyrdom at Smithfield, July 4th, 1533, says:—"The signification of baptism is described of Paul in the 6th of Romans; that as we are plunged bodily in the water, even so are we dead and buried with Christ from sin; and as we are again lifted out of the water, even so we are risen with Christ from our sins, that we might hereafter walk in a new conversation of life. So that these two things—that is, to be plunged in the water and lifted up again—do signify and represent the whole pith and effect of baptisms, that is, the mortification of our old Adam, and the rising up of our new man."

I have quoted all this to show you, that Christ, and all the others of whom we read in the New Testament, were put under water. Our brother has vainly sought to make us believe otherwise; I say vainly for who can doubt that anything but immersion was practiced after hearing this long list of noted authors, say that "they must have been immersed" that is placed under water and then brought up again.

If this will not suffice to prove my point, I will call, for every one he calls to prove the reverse, five; because I know from research, and that has not been a little, that such was the custom and even is now among those of the Greek Church in the East.

MR. ARCHIBALD:—

Mr. Moderator, Ladies and Gentlemen:—You have heard a great deal of what other men say about this question "buried with Christ in Baptism" and I am compelled to say that if I have the correct words here this evening, he (Mr. Blennus) has the opposite. Dr. Clarke, states in his comments on the New Testament:—"It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion—the whole body being put under the water, which seemed to say the man is drowned, is dead, and that he came up out of the water he seemed to have a resurrection to life, the man is risen again, he is alive. He was therefore supposed to throw off the old Gentile state, as he threw off his clothes, and of assuming a new character, as the baptised of John put on new or fresh garments; I say it is probable that the apostle alludes to this mode of immersion, but it is not absolutely certain that he does say so as some do imagine, for in the next verse, our being corporate with Christ by baptism is also denoted by our being planted, or rather grafted together in the likeness of his death and Noah's Ark floating upon the water and sprinkled by the rain of Heaven is a figure corresponding to baptism, 1 Peter 3, 20, 21. But neither of these give us the same idea of the outward form as burying.

Drowning among the ancients was considered the most noble kind of death, some think that the apostle may allude to this." We have John Wesley speaking somewhat in the same strain. Dr. Currie when discussing this same question, and in a somewhat analogous case, gives us these remarks and quotations:

"No lexicon gives immerse, or dip, as a meaning of *Baptizo*, in Greek earlier than Polybuis, B. C. 165; next comes Diodorus Siculus, B. C. 66 to 32; next Strabo, B. C. 54 to A. D. 54; and still later Josephus and Plutarch."

"Permit me to ask, what was the rendering of *Baptizo* before Polybius, B. C. 165; Diodorus Siculus, B. C. 66 to 32, &c.?"

It has been stated in your hearing that, that it does not refer to this point but, that it means to refer to water baptism.

That is just the thing we contend for. We know that there is a burial and a resurrection but it is not a burial under water nor a resurrection out of water. If that is granted all is granted. That is spiritual baptism is a real burial and a real resurrection to the newness of life not effected by water. Having gained such vantage ground; I wish now to draw your attention to what was said before we adjourned, with the regard to the prepositions. It was just as absurd to say baptism without water as to say with *Bath-darna*. I wish you to notice that there is a difference between the prepositions. You will observe that in this case that when *en* is indicative of place or when it has reference to a place, it can only be translated by *in* and it would be quite as absurd to say with such and such a place as it would be contrary to common sense and judgement to say I strike you in a rod. We must keep these prepositions in their place and as I said before we adjourned with regard to these that their use was threefold, namely first place—second, time—third, instrument, and we must not take one for the other. For instance *en* governs dative of time in Math. 12, 42. It governs dative of place John 1, 28 and dative of instrument Rev. 12, 5, 19, 21. It was stated that *eis* always express motion into water but I say that it is used in other senses when it simply means *to or from* Math. 17, 1, 9. Here we have the word into used but can we think for a moment that they were dipped into the mountain. My time is drawing to a close. However, I wish to draw your attention for a few moments to the baptism of Cornelius as that has not been referred to. Acts 10, 45, 48.

Paul reasons thus "Can any man object to these receiving the baptism of water seeing that the Holy Spirit has been poured out or fallen on them as on us at the beginning." Surely not, for if they had been baptized with the reality itself, namely, spiritual baptism; why deprive them of that which is but the emblem of such. Thus showing the distinction dear friends that the disciples were baptized *with* the Spirit not *in* the Spirit. My friend here brings to my mind that the Spirit overwhelmed them. True, I grant that, but the point in question is whether they were dipped and if they were not dipped in this case by the translation of the word *Baptizo* how can you I ask, translate it dip in

another place without making a contradictory statement. Not at all, we cannot do it, and although they were overwhelmed by the spirit descending (or being poured out upon them) they were baptized by the out pouring of the spirit and not in the spirit. Acts 19, 47. "Can any man forbid water." In the language of this verse "Can any man forbid water" there is implied that the water is to be brought to Peter and not he to go to it. In order, to see this fully, let us turn to the words of our Saviour Luke 18, 16 "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not." Can we understand anything else from this expression of our Lord than that he wished the children to be brought to him. Now we will place these two passages together. Peter says, "Can any man forbid water?" Christ says, "Forbid them not."

Here we can all see that the same idea is expressed in both verses; in the one children is brought, in the other water, and the same language is used by both namely, "forbid water," "forbid them not." Now that the water was brought to where Peter was and not he to go to it, as those who dip have to do, I would ask in what then was Cornelius dipped? It is evident that there was no baptistry in his house as at that time baptism was quite a new thing. However this may be Peter does not leave us in doubt concerning the mode by which he baptized Cornelius for he translates the word *Baptizo* himself for us in Acts 11, 15, 16, and surely we must give him credit for knowing something about the language he used. We have already seen that the disciples were baptized by the Holy Ghost, but not dipped; that John baptized *with* and not *in* water. It is evident, I know to every candid mind, that he would not translate it one way and practice from the same word in quite another mode. But who would charge the apostle with inconsistency in his teachings. Therefore, as Paul was no dipper by doctrine; he was no dipper by practice. Let us turn to the baptism of the jailor, Acts 16, 33. I affirm in this connection that the jailor was baptized in the prison.

The jailor, put Paul and Silas into the inner prison (v. 24) and took them out (30), simply from the inner prison. Observe that (32) does not teach that they left the prison in order to speak the word of the Lord to all that were in his house for the word used is *oikia*, which means, the whole premises, prisoners included, and differs very essentially from *oikos*, which is used in the 34th verse to mean the jailor's family. I say that these words do not imply that Paul or Silas went into the jailor's house in order to speak to them and this is the more evident from the 33rd verse. "He took them," where he took them to we are not told, but as I say it is evident that Paul and Silas did not leave the prison from the message which they sent back to the Magistrates verse 37, "let them come and fetch us out." Now, I ask, could the great apostle say so without being a hypocrite if he had stolen out of prison the night before.

Who amongst us will charge this great apostle with duplicity! None, consequently we must take his rendering, which I maintain to be the correct one. The jailor did not leave the prison because it was against the law and he

would have suffered death by doing so. Could any one think that Paul would encourage a man to do what he would not do himself and this he must have done if he left the prison. Further it is evident that the jailor and his family was baptized at the place where Paul had his stripes washed from the word straightway (*parachremata*, on the spot) and that we have seen was in the prison. The question may be asked, were there no cisterns there? True, there might have been a cistern in the prison. I have myself seen cisterns while abroad formed like a jar, having a narrow mouth widening out as it descended. It is also true that Paul *might* have put them into such a cistern easy enough, but how could he get them out again; that is the question. He must have had an apparatus similar to that used to raise Jeremiah from the dungeon. The thing resolves itself into this question. Had Paul any such apparatus? I answer, No, for if he had, mention would have been made of it.

Apart from this have we not seen that Paul was baptized standing, and if he was baptized standing, how could he baptize others by dipping. These things do not agree together so that if Paul baptized according to the manner in which he was baptized and if he baptized the jailor and family in the prison at midnight, he did not, we are led to conclude baptize them by dipping.

MR. BLENUS:—

Mr. Moderator, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I am sorry to hear Mr. Archibald somewhat impeach what I quoted concerning John Wesley on Rom. vi. I say now again—that in his Common Rom. vi.—“Buried with him” Wesley says “alluding to the ancient practice of baptizing by immersion.” Will Mr. Archibald deny this?

MR. McDONALD:—

I believe that John Wesley uses the word “manifestly.”

MR. BLENUS:—

I quoted, I believe, what he says in his notes on Rom. vi.—I did not, nor have I any intention of misrepresenting him.

MR. BOND:—

Will the brother please read it again? (Mr. Blenus here read the extract as before given.)

MR. BOND:—

The brother will oblige by reading a little further on.

MR. BLENUS:—

I have only this extract of the work with me.

MR. BOND:—

The brother has not read enough. (Call of order.)

MODERATOR:—

Silence and let the discussion proceed.

MR. BLENUS:—

I am astonished at any man attempting to deny the correctness of a plain well-known and simple quotation. If John Wesley published the quotation I have made, and in the same breath contradicted it, I will admit his evidence would not be worth much. But he did no such thing, neither do I think any one can on this point charge Wesley with vacillation.

It seems my respondent is in some trouble about *Egizio* necessarily being connected with water in its use.

I have already shown from the classical usage as well as the Biblical usage of the word that you can immerse or baptize a man in—sand—in water—in earth—in oil, or in trouble—but of course in Christian baptism we are commanded to be immersed in a certain element—water.

Next, our friend runs back on the case of the Phillippian Jailor, and treats us to a long list of old arguments, nothing original or sensible in them. Then on to the case of Our Lord speaking of the little children. Why all this is known from beginning to end by every child who attends school. In these cases the words used are self explanatory, there is no ambiguity about them, and I will not waste your time by talking of things you all understand perfectly well already. He has referred to Dr. Curry, I will put Neander against Dr. Curry and see who the world will say is the best Church Historian and to whom they will most trust in this place. I will, in the first place, quote Mosheim and others and see what they say about the ancient practice of baptism.

Now, let us examine the writings of a few of the most eminent Church historians. I will first quote “Mosheim,”—the learned Church historian, here are his own words:—“The Sacrament of baptism was administered in this (the 2nd) century without the public assemblies in places appointed and prepared for that purpose and was performed by the immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font. Those adult persons who desired to be baptized (among the Collegionists) received the Sacrament of baptism according to the ancient and primitive manner of celebrating that institution—ever by immersion.” NEANDER—a (Lutheran,) celebrated Church Historian, says, “Baptism was originally administered by immersion.—To this form many companions of the apostle Paul alludes, the immersion being a symbol of the dying the being buried with Christ, emersion being a symbol of the resurrection, as the two parts in the death of the old man, and a resurrection to a new life. In respect to the form of baptism in conformity with the original symbol performed by immersion as a sign of an entire immersion into the Holy Spirit of being entirely penetrated

by the same. It was only with the sick where the exigency required it that any exception was made and in this case baptism was administered by sprinkling." to these we can also add the testimonies of Dr. Wm. Schaff, (a learned Lutheran,) Dr. Dewitt, Dr. Grotius, John Frith, Geriter, Cusebins, Dr. Fowerson, all Pedobaptist divines telling us plainly that immersion was primitive baptism. Next, let us examine the history of some of the Eastern churches,—Deylingius—informs us that the Greek Church, "retain the rite of immersion to this day." Ludolphius—informs us such is the practice of the Ethiopians.

Venema, says:—"The Greeks immerse the whole man in the water." They certainly can understand their own language.

Barnabas:—"Consider how he hath joined both the cross and the water together; for this he saith, 'Blessed are they who putting their trust in the cross, descend into the water'." * * * * *

Again, "We go down into the water, full of sin and pollutions; but come up again bringing forth fruit; having in our hearts the fear and hope which is in Jesus."

Hermes, writing about A. D., 95, speaking of baptism and backsliders, says:—"They are such as have heard the word, and were willing to be baptized in the name of the Lord; but, when they call to mind what holiness it required in those who professed the truth, withdrew themselves." Again, "Before man receives the name of the Son of God, he is ordained to death; but, when he receives that seal, he is freed from death, and delivered unto life: now, that seal is water, into which men descend under an obligation to death, but ascend out of it, being appointed unto life."

Justin Martyr. About A. D., 140, *Justin Martyr* wrote "An apology for Christians; addressed to the Emperor, the Senate, and People of Rome."

In this work, he describes the doctrines and ordinances of the Church of Christ; and, on baptism, has the following passage:—"I will now declare to you, also, after what manner we, being made new by Christ, have dedicated ourselves to God; lest, if I should leave that out, I might seem to deal unfairly in some part of my apology. They who are persuaded and do believe that those things which are taught by us are true, and do promise to live according to them, are directed first to pray and ask of God, with fasting, the forgiveness of their former sins; and we also pray and fast with them. Then we bring them to some place where there is water, and they are baptized by the same way of baptism by which we were baptized: for they are washed (*en to hudati*) in the water in the name of God the Father, Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit."

Tertullian, A. D., 204:—"Because the person, [to be baptized,] in great simplicity . . . is let down in the water, and, with a few words said, is dipped." *Homo in aqua demissus, et inter pauca verba tinctus*. Again, when speaking of the vain anxiety to be baptized in the Jordan,—"*There is no difference,*

whether one is washed in a sea or a pool, in a river or in a fountain, in a lake or in a channel; nor is there any difference between them whom John dipped in the Jordan and those whom Peter dipped in the Tiber" *Quos Joannes in Jordane, et quas Petrus in Tiberi tincti*. He also uses the words, "*In aqua mergimur*," i. e. we are immersed in the water.

Gregory Nazianzen, A. D. 360:—"We are buried with Christ by baptism, that we may also rise again with him; we descend with him, that we may also be lifted up with him; we ascend with him, that we may also be glorified with him."

Basil, A. D. 360:—"En trisitis k doudasai, &c. By three immersions, the great mystery of baptism is accomplished."

Ambrose, A. D. 374:—"Thou wast asked; 'dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?' Thou saidst, 'I do believe,' and wast immersed: that is, thou wast buried, (*mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es*). Thou wast again asked, 'Dost thou believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and his crucifixion?' Thou saidst, 'I believe,' and wast immersed again, and so wast buried with Christ."

Cyril, of Jerusalem, A. D. 374:—"As he, *enduoaron en tois hudasi*, who is plunged in the water, and baptized, is encompassed by the water on every side; so they that are baptized by the Spirit are also wholly covered all over."

We now turn our attention to sprinkling or pouring. They have never been substituted in the Eastern or Greek Churches for immersion, but immersion still continues to be practised—sprinkling or pouring never was introduced into the Western Churches till the 13th century.

John Calvin, in his comments on John iii. 5:—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God," says—"From these words it is lawful to conclude that baptism was celebrated by John and Christ by the immersion of the whole body."

The Church of England prayer-book, which can be seen by almost every one in the community who may wish to see it—gives the direction to the Minister "that he shall dip the person in water or pour water upon him,"—(dip is given the preference). In the direction for the public baptism for infants, it says "that the child shall be dipped, unless it be certified that the child is too weak to endure it. In that case, it shall suffice to pour water upon it." By this it will be seen that the mode of the Episcopal Church is immersion.

Professor John Young, speaking of the Hellenistic or N. T. Greek, says:—"Had the Evangelist and apostles written in a language materially changed from that spoken by Greeks generally, they would have given mysteries and enigma to the world which no scholarship could have solved. The Greek language like every other living tongue passed through various changes in its dialect and idioms in the course of its history. The N. T. Greek does not differ more materially from that of Xenophon than Xenophon differs from the dialects of Homer."

Now the argument here is this:—The original Greek writings fell into the hands of the Greek Church at a very early day and she has kept the practice of immersion to the present day, proving conclusively what idea the Greek Church gleaned from *Baptizo*. It has changed many other customs why has it not also changed this. It embraces nearly all Greece and Russia, with a membership of nearly one hundred millions—Russia is a cold country to immerse in, but they will use nothing else for baptism.—But besides the above conclusive testimony. We also have the Ancient Fathers, viz:—Barnabas, Hermas, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, who lived in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries, bearing witness, that in their day immersion was universally practised.

Again we have numerous versions and translations of the Bible—beginning with the 2nd Century and extending down to the present time; among these the Syriac, Arabic, Persian, Ethiopic, Armenian, Gothic, German, Danish, Swedish, Dutch, Anglo-Saxon (of the early fathers of the 8th Century,) Vulgate, French, Italian and many others, nearly every one of these that translates the verb *Baptizo* at all, gives a word that means to immerse and not one of them by a word that means sprinkle or pour.

Again *President Shannon*, says:—"I found in the Greek Testament and Septuagint 'dip' used twenty-one times.—In all these it was a translation of *Bapto* or *Baptizo*, except once where Joseph's brethren smeared or daubed his coat in blood *emoluben* is here used. Sprinkle is used twenty seven times—never once as a translation of *Bapto* or *Baptizo*; in twenty cases it was a translation of *Raino*, or some of its derivations. In three cases where scattering ashes was meant I read *proo*. In three cases where pouring was meant, I read *proscheo*, and in one case spattering blood on the lintels of the door *proschuis*. Pour I found 119 times, but never has a translation of *Bapto* or *Baptizo*, but as a translation of *cheo pseudo*. Wash I found 32 times where reference was had to a part of the person, and not once as a translation of *Bapto* or *Baptizo*. I found wash in the sense of bathe 23 times, everytime a translation of *luo*. In Luke, Mary is said to have washed the Saviour's feet with her tears here *Brecho* to moisten, is used. Now, from all this we see the accuracy of the Greek. Where we find dip we find *Bapto* or *Baptizo*, but never for pour or sprinkle. Then can a command given to us by the apostles in so exact a language mean indifferently pour, sprinkle, or immerse, when these actions are so carefully separated by the Greek.

Our next argument will be based upon the law of substitution. That is the meaning of any word will make good sense when substituted in the place of the word itself. Now for example let us read Mark i. 5. "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem and were all immersed (Baptized) of him in the river Jordan." (Now read inserting sprinkle or pour in place of Baptize). A man can be immersed in debt—in oil—in water—in spirit—in grief—but he cannot be sprinkled in any one of these (grammatically). John could not sprinkle these men and women in Jordan,

neither could Philip sprinkle the Eunuch even after he got with him down into the river—he could immerse him.—By saying sprinkle or pour, we change a most beautiful and emblematical command into a monstrous absurdity and impeach the knowledge of our Saviour and his apostles. My opponent has labored hard to try to show that *Baptizo* can be translated by a secondary meaning when used to express a direct—particular specific command which is a futile attempt indeed, unscholarly and contrary to all legitimate rules of interpretation and translation.—He has also failed utterly to establish: as he has tried to do, a gulf between the significations dip and immerse, when used in a christian baptism connection.

I have advanced authorities whom he has not yet attempted to answer, evidently because he well knows them to be incontrovertible—you have heard what the most sensible and the most erudite men of all ages have said upon the subject.

I am quite sorry that we are not to be permitted to carry the discussion beyond this evening, as I have much more I should like to lay before you. But ere I close the affirmative of this proposition I shall give a brief account of the origin and progress of sprinkling and pouring as used by some for Christian baptism.

MR. ARCHIBALD :

Mr. Moderator, Ladies and Gentlemen :—With regard to what has been said concerning baptized unto "death with Christ" by my brother, the point contended for is gained by the concession made that it does not refer to water baptism. Our brother did not say that the children were to be forbidden to come, that is the children were brought to Christ and not Christ to them; this was just acknowledging the point I wanted to gain. All I wanted to affirm from such was that the water was brought and not Peter go to the water, as those who baptize by dipping have to do. Likewise he brought no proof that the jailer left the prison and he said nothing with regard to them leaving the prison, or the difference between the words used to express house. Further he does not mention anything with regard to the laws of the prison forbidding them to leave it. Likewise we had substitution brought before our minds. To this I will but briefly refer. It was stated that it would be absurd to say sprinkling in the river Jordan instead of dipping in the river Jordan. Now I would like to ask why the term sprinkling is less appropriate than the term dipping to express the act of baptism as performed in the river Jordan, when we remember that the term *en* on that occasion governs its object in the dative of locality and not that of instrumentality.

Now, let us turn to what is recorded of John baptizing at Aenon (John 3:23.) We are told that he baptized there on account of their being much water there. Why is it called Aenon? You all know that places as a rule get their names from some physical appearance, or configuration of the land, or in honor of some distinguished person, or some particular characteristic of the place; thus we know that Beaver Bank is called so from the beavers in olden times constructing dams and running over the banks; Halifax so called in honor of the Earl of Halifax; Annapolis, which was formerly called Port Royal, is now so called in honor of Queen Anne. So we find that other places get their names not by hazard or chance, but by some peculiarity of the place. Why did the Hebrews call this place where John was, Aenon; they might have called it by another name, but let us see what it means—the word Aenon means many springs, and this place abounded in springs and thus we see the reason for its name. Why did John go to Aenon? Why did he not go somewhere else why was it necessary for him to go there. Was it because he had camels. Well that might be the cause, I don't say it was so, but this I do say, that John went there because there was much water. He would not have left much water and gone to a place where there was only a few springs. Thus showing that he was leaving abundance of water and going to where but a small quantity existed. Therefore he might have gone to Aenon to sprinkle, but he would not go to dip for he had plenty of water for dipping in Jordan, and in order to show that there were many springs or that it was not a great lake as we might be led to suppose from the reading; John says, in Greek *hubatapolla*—that is the Plural—*many* waters, not *much* waters, and this corresponds exactly with the term given by the Jews to this place showing that the place abounded in many springs. These two terms agree exactly one with the other. I shall endeavor to show that even admitting that there was a great lake there, John could not dip in such unless he stated one thing and practised another. We have not had it fully explained or cleared up to our minds, that John baptized in water and as I have endeavored to bring before you time and again that when *en* is employed to govern its object in the dative of instrumentality it cannot possibly at the same time govern the dative of place, why such reasoning is absurd. I wish you to notice the difference between the word when meaning instrument and place, to do such an absurd thing is to pervert the divine words of Scripture and if we keep the word in its place, as we must do in accordance with existing syntax &c. We are compelled to translate it with *with* and not *in*.

What John says, is "I baptize *with* water," and not *in* water. It is just as absurd to say I strike *in* a stick. That is a parallel phrase and the same construction is in one as in the other. We have likewise had something brought before our minds with regard to the eunuch. The eunuch we are told went into water and came up out of the water. Admitting that he went into the water, was he baptized when going into it. No he was not for then the eunuch must have been baptized also, for they both went into the water. How far they went into the water we are not told. Now permitting that the eunuch was up

to the waist in water how much I ask, was left of him to be dipped? Evidently only half the body. And according to the immersionist theory the whole body must be dipped under the water. Was this done in the case of the eunuch? We will hear more of this. We have heard this evening that if the word sprinkle was substituted instead of the word baptize in the New Testament there would be but one edition published. I would state here that if the word dip was substituted in the place of the word baptize it would be a flat contradiction of the word *baptize* in the New Testament.

MR. BLEXUS:—

I would just say that versions have been published and the word immerse is used.

MR. ARCHIBALD:—

I recalled the word immerse because I know there were editions that had the word immerse substituted for baptize, if the word dip was substituted, it would be a flat contradiction of the word baptize. For as I have shown in one instance in the New Testament it is absolutely absurd to use it in that condition. I will refer you to some authorities that lived a few years after the apostles. We have Oregon who lived 17 years after Polycarp, who was a disciple of Christ and surely should have known its translation; likewise Oregon was a Greek by birth and wrote in Greek. He translates 1 Kings 18:33, "Elijah baptized the wood of the altar," and still we are told that water was poured on the altar on that occasion.

Again, let me refer to what Dr. Walker, says in his doctrine of baptisms. A Jew while travelling in the desert with a company of Christians was converted, fell sick and desired baptism. Not having water they sprinkled him thrice with sand in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. He recovered and his case was reported to Polycarp, who decided that the man was baptized if he had only water poured on him again. The formula of baptism could not be repeated as he was already baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Now, Polycarp was for many years a disciple of the apostle John, and must have known the apostle practice. The mode was pouring and he refused again to pronounce the name of the Trinity. He knew no such thing as rebaptising those who had once received baptism. In *Suidas* the great treasury of the Greek tongue, it is rendered by *Malefacio* (to wet or moisten), *luo*, *abluo* *purgo*, (to make clean to cleanse), *munio*.

Now we have Dr. Smith giving the meaning of *luo*; to which I have already referred. Therefore, when Dr. Smith assents to such, he knows no doubt what he was about, else he would not have asserted such.

MR. BLENNER.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies and Gentlemen :—I have quoted Paul in Romans vi. to show you how he looked upon the subject of baptism—when he says, “we are buried with him by baptism into death,” and to show you that it is also entirely evident that Paul here is alluding to Christian Scriptural baptism in water. To prove this I quoted over thirty of the very ablest and best commentators of nearly every age since the Apostles’ days. Now, after I had done all this, when my respondent arises he tells you that I have conceded that in this passage (Rom. vi. 4, 5,) there is no allusion whatever to water baptism. I made no such concession and am sorry that although enough has been said on that point to satisfy the most exacting, that my respondent unwittingly, or otherwise, has grossly misrepresented my arguments. But they will speak for themselves—Paul in Romans vi. does *emphatically*, as I have proved, refer to immersion in water.

In regard to the Phillippian Jailor he has said that I have brought no evidence that Paul and the Jailor left the prison. I shall now read the account found in Acts xvi. 29, 30, “Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas. And brought them out and said ‘Sirs, what must I do to be saved’”. Here now the Scripture affirms that the Jailor brought them out. Now, if my respondent is a believer in the Bible why not believe this account of the “beloved physician,” they were certainly brought out for that simple reason as Holy Writ declares it,—but because it is against my opponent, he tries to dwell upon some far-fetched ideas of prison-rules, or some other ridiculous absurdity.

My respondent is again in trouble about Philip and the Eunuch,—well it is no wonder.—The scripture tells us “they both went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch” and he baptized him—and “when they came up out of the water” etc.—This certainly is very much against my opponent; and it is in beautiful harmony with the even tenor of the Bible. Mr. Archibald, labors hard at every place where baptism is spoken of, to try to show that it does not mean what the simple rendering tells us, it does mean.

He has also referred to the circumstance, that if the word *dip* should be substituted for baptize in the New Testament, there would be often a flat contradiction of terms. Let my friends substitute *immerse* for baptize and in every instance he will find the sense complete and the construction grammatical—now I am not particular which of the words he uses as long as the burial takes place.

The Bible teaches for baptism a burial in water.—Now, my opponent splits a hair before he can get anything to work with.—Every scholar knows that there are no two words in any language that are *exactly* synonymous.—Now the verbs *dip* and *immerse* are synonyms, and it matters little which is used, as long as the idea of a burial in is conveyed; but let him substitute *sprinkle* or *pour* or any of their synonyms in the place of baptize, and he will at once see that it gives

us the most ridiculous nonsense.—Would my friend be willing to translate the New Testament, and everytime baptize was used, substitute sprinkle or pour? Would he as a scholar be willing to do this? I can answer for him. He would not—for the simple reason that he could not, the Scriptures would not admit of the change—while editions of the New Testament have been and are now being issued with the word *immerse* in the place of the word baptize and are recognised as correct translations of the original.

He also quotes 2 Kings xviii. 33, to show that here we have a bullock baptized (according to the translation of Origen), but he forgets to tell us that four barrels was twice filled to accomplish it—plainly showing a complete submersion or overwhelming in water, even although poured on the thing commanded.

He has also referred unto the sprinkling of sand on an individual who was sick, and water not being procurable,—before I close I shall have something to say on this point in the history of sprinkling. But, before I leave this part of the discussion I will here say—I challenge my opponent to produce from the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation one single instance where sprinkling or pouring mere water on any person or thing, for any moral ceremonial or religious use was ever done.—It was never done by the authority of God since the world began.—Notice the expression *mere water* or *water alone*.

Next, I shall briefly notice the history of sprinkling. 1st, I shall quote the “Edinburgh Encyclopaedia” Article on baptism :—“The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner, Pope Stephen II. being driven from Rome by Adolphus King of the Lombards in 753, fled to Pepin who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. Whilst he remained there the monks of Cressy in Brittany, consulted him whether in case of necessity water poured on the head of the infant would be lawful—Stephen replied that it would—but though the truth of this fact be allowed—which, however some Catholics deny—yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted only in *cases of necessity*. It was not till the year 1311, that the Legislature in a council held in Ravenna declared immersion, or sprinkling to be indifferent.—In Scotland, however, sprinkling was never practised in ordinary cases till after the Reformation, about the middle of the 16th century, from Scotland it made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized in the “Established Church.”

Next, we will quote Dr. Wall, acknowledged to be the most learned and able of Pedobaptists, who gives us a volume of evidence in one paragraph in his book entitled, “History of Infant Baptism” Part II. chap. 9. He says,—“France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health and in the public way of administering it. They (the assembly of divines at Westminster) reformed the font into a basin. This learned assembly could not remember, that fonts to baptize in had been always used by the primitive christians long before the beginning of Popery, and ever since churches were built, but that sprinkling for

the common use of baptizing was really introduced (in France first and then in other Popish countries) in times of Popery. And that accordingly all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is or has formerly been owned—have left off dipping of children in the font—but that all other countries in the world which have never regarded his authority do still use it, and that basins except in cases of necessity were never used by Papists or any other Christians whatever till by themselves.

What has been said of this custom of pouring or sprinkling water in the ordinary use of baptism is to be understood only in reference to the Western parts of Europe—for it is used ordinarily nowhere else.—The Greek Church, in all the branches of it still use immersion and they hardly count a child, except in cases of sickness, well baptized without it.—And so do all other Christians in the world except the Latins.

That which I hinted before is a rule that does not fail in any particular that I know of viz :—All the nations of Christians that do now or formerly did submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling.—And though the English received not this custom till after the decay of Popery, yet they have since received it from such neighboring nations as had begun in the time of the Pope's power. But all other Christians in the world, who never owned the Popes usurped power—do and ever did dip their infants in the ordinary use" so says Dr. Wall.

We also have recorded in Eusebius, page 114, that Novatian A. D., 251 or 253, had water poured all over him in bed, about eighty years after this time when other sick and feeble persons were beginning to prefer this method introduced by Novatian so far as all authentic records inform us, a decree was issued called "The 12th canon of the Council of Neocaesarea" against such pourings and sprinklings, prohibiting persons so poured or sprinkled upon from any participation in the honors of the ministry or priesthood.

Again the very best and authentic Church historians inform us that for full thirteen centuries the whole religious world practised immersion with the exception of invalids and pretender of inability to endure cold bathing.

Bonaventure, in A. D., 1160, speaks of sprinkling in France as becoming an ordinary practice.—"It made very little progress in Italy, Germany or Spain till the 14th and 15th centuries."

We see then from these authentic witnesses, besides volumes of other evidence, that would time and space permit could be adduced—that sprinkling water on men, women, or babes is without any authority from Old Testament or New Testament Neither the Jewish religion nor Christianity ever required or approved it

In the history of Christianity the whole world Eastern or Western, with the exception of a few sick and dying persons, practised immersion during the long

space of 1300 years. I challenge anyman in the face of Church history or any other authentic history to disprove this.

License to practise affusion was first granted by the Pope of Rome, in 1311. Calvin next gave a law to his branch of the church authorizing the same.

This was first carried into Scotland, then into England after the reign of "Bloody Mary," and finally imposed upon the people much against their own conviction and inclination at first.—But why follow the history of sprinkling and pouring further. We could fill a large volume with concessions—candid and truthful acknowledgements from the most illustrious Pedobaptist names of Christendom, but that on our part would be a work of supererogation,—after such men as Moehem, Waddington, Geisler, Neander, Brenner, Cave, Taylor, Baxter, Usher and Grotius, and after such admissions upon the part of Stuart and Wall—we might and could summon a hundred others to repeat the same story and reiterate the same facts. I have not quoted the Mahomedan Koran to prove that they so rendered and understood baptism yet I could have done so. Nor have I quoted Milton or any of the old poets to prove from their sayings and allusions that they all admitted immersion to have been found either in *Baptizo* or in its history.

I shall now leave the matter for the careful consideration of those who have listened so patiently. The subject we believe to be an important one—because it involves one of Gods express and direct commands to be obeyed. Our Saviour doubtless had before him some specific action when he commanded his disciples to "Go teach all nations baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit" This action the Bible certainly both in its record of teaching and practise plainly sets forth. As the evidence I have adduced which is but a tithe of what could be brought forward—plainly proves.

MR. ARCHIBALD :—

With regard to the ancient practice of dipping, I have here a church history by Dr. Schoff, and in it he tells us that there was no baptistry or chapel where this ceremony might be performed till the 4th century. This is the latest and best church history extant and it is also stated that if baptism was performed by dipping in early days, they would have provided places for its performance long before the 4th century. This is the last opportunity I will have of speaking on this question, therefore, let me endeavor to sum up all that has been said both for and against the mode of administering the ordinance of Christian Baptism by dipping.

Our Brother has taken the affirmative, I the negative, of the following proposition :—"That *Baptizo* does dip a person in water when used to express the New Testament Ordinance of Baptism. How can he affirm that *Baptizo* means

dip and nothing but dip and yet acknowledges that the disciples were baptized, when being initiated into the New Kingdom *without being dipped*, I leave with you to untangle. Having seen, therefore, that dip is out of the question in one case, it must follow that all must have been, and ought to be, initiated into the New Kingdom in the same manner. It has also been brought before your mind that those who in reading the New Testament can come to no other conclusion than, that those who are baptized were baptized with dipping; simply from the fact that we read of some going into the water; John baptizing at a place where there was much water, and being "buried with Christ in baptism." With regard to some going into the water, I have shown, that the baptism was essentially a different and distinct act. I have shown that John baptized with water, and Mr. Blenus himself has acknowledged that "buried with Christ in baptism," does not refer to water baptism. With this light on the subject, from what portion of the Scriptures can an enquirer learn that dipping is taught in the scripture?

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—I have thus from my stand-point clearly shown to you that the word *Baptizo* does not mean to dip. Mr. Blenus himself has acknowledged that it does not signify this in one place, therefore I maintain that it cannot do so in another. Hence the proposition that the word *Baptizo* dips a person as applied to the New Testament ordinance of Baptism into water is completely refuted, for if it were not then would the word of God contradict itself.

FINIS.