From the Tennessee Baptist.

Your Thousand Dollars Earned.

MR. GRAVES:

Your advertisement offering $1,000 for a proof from the New Testament of Infant Baptism has been carefully perused, and if you are an honest man, you will fork over the cash to my agent, Mr. ———. I presume you will find the proof so plain, and so much to the point, that a committee of reference is not necessary; but if you are unwilling to pay the money without, I beg leave to name Rev. Dr. Edgar, Rev. Dr. McFerrin, and Dr. Winston of your church.

Now for the proof that infant baptism is taught in the New Testament, "Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." 1 Pet. 4:13. Yours, &c., S.

THE RECORDER.

RALEIGH, N. C.

FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1852.

Our readers will perhaps be surprised to notice on the outside of our paper of this week two articles which we have published before. A friend has kindly given us the paper on which to print a number of extra copies for gratuitous circulation. The papers thus printed we wish to contain articles calculated to be extensively useful. We wish that all may know what Baptists really believe.

Howell's Sermon on Baptism.

We copy from the Richmond Republican this excellent discourse. Our readers will not fail to give it a careful perusal.

REPORT OF A SERMON,

Delivered by the Rev. Dr. Howell, Pastor of the Second Baptist Church of this city, the 8th inst., to a large and attentive congregation, on the subject, "What is Baptism?"

It is useless for us to do more than invite public attention, to this able and eloquent discourse. It will be read with interest by all who know anything of the source from which it emanated, or are at all familiar with the subject of Baptism.

The Reverend gentleman, having announced his text, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ," Gal. 3 chap. 27th verse, spoke nearly as follows:

Baptism is the prescribed form in which you profess the religion of Christ. It is a rule of universal application, that the public participation in the distinguishing forms of any system of religion, human or divine, has ever in every nature, been regarded as the profession of that religion. He who offers the prescribed sacrifices to idols, is an idolator. The man who observes the prayers and ablutions enjoined by *Mohammed*, is a *Mohammedan*. In your baptism, you have professed and declared yourself a *Christian*.—This conclusion is sustained by the common sense and reason of all men. It is the great truth affirmed in the text. "Ye are *all* [professedly] the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,"—have intelligently and publicly, made a profession of the religion of Christ. He is the prince of life, and you have "*put on*" his distinguishing *livery*. He is the captain of your salvation, and you *wear* the uniform of his army. *None* entered the sanctuary as *members* of the churches in apostolic times, without such *personal profession*; and *all* who made it were firmly *united* in the Redeemer. By one Spirit ye are all baptized into one body.—There is, said Paul, neither Jew, or Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are *all one* in Christ Jesus." Baptism is therefore your formal profession of the religion of Christ. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ."

In the consideration of this subject three inquiries present themselves: 1 *What is baptism?* 2 *Who are to receive baptism?* 3 *What are the advantages and privileges which baptism confers?* To the *first* of these, I shall devote the present discourse. And before I commence the argument, I beg permission to make a remark respecting our brethren of the several pedobaptist denominations around us. To differ with them on this, or any other subject, gives me no pleasure. God knows I feel for many of them with whom I have the pleasure of an acquaintance, the sincere regard, both as men and as christians.—Most gladly would I concur with them in sentiment, were it possible to do so, and at the same time please and obey the Saviour. In this discourse, therefore, and in any others with which it may be my duty to follow it, nothing is further from my intention than the design to foster a sectarian spirit, or to widen the breach, already too capacious, between the christians of different churches. It is not my purpose to censure or condemn *others*. It is the right of every man in our happy country—a right of which *Baptists* in all ages, and in every nation, have been the firm and unwavering *advocates*—to decide, and act for himself in all that pertains to religion. He is accountable to *God only*, for his opinions, and his practice.—My purpose is to offer to all who are present here, the required explanations for *myself*, and my *brethren*, for what has been considered unnecessary singularity, and to defend the reasons for our proceedings in regard to the ordinance of baptism. With these preliminary observations, and soliciting your candid attention, and your earnest prayers, that we may all be led to the knowledge and belief of the truth, as it is in Jesus Christ, I proceed to the discussion of the first inquiry,

WHAT IS BAPTISM?

To this question I have given mature, protracted, and anxious investigation. I have had before me the light of the Bible, and of every period of the christian church. My object has been to determine my personal duty and obedience to Jesus Christ.—Long since I have arrived at the settled, the unwavering conclusion, and the more I study it the more I am confirmed in the assurance, that *the immersion in water of a true beleiever in Christ, by an authorized minister of the Gospel, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is christian baptism.*—This *is* christian baptism. This *alone* is christian baptism. For the sake of more perfect definiteness, however, I assume that *immersion is necessary to baptism*, and *where there is no immersion, there is no baptism*. The truth of this proposition is proved *by the meaning of the word* employed by the holy Spirit in the Bible to describe the ordinance; by the *metaphorical sense* of the rite, and by *the facts and doctrines* which baptism was instituted to represent and to teach.

1 *That immersion is always necessary to christian baptism, is proved by the sense of the word used in the Bible to describe the ordinance.*

The word employed invariably, in some one or other of its forms, is *baptizo*. To ascertain the sense of this word we necessarily have recourse to the Lexicons. What do they teach? Take up Schrevilius, Robinson, Donnegan, Groves, take up any Lexicon or all of them, and you will find that they define the word to *dip*, to *immerse*, to *bathe*, to *submerge*, to *sink*, to *wash*; and *metaphorically*, to be plunged into a flood of calamities and afflictions.—But no where do you find in a single instance, that *baptizo* means either to *sprinkle* or to *pour*. If then the sense of the word is to decide the form of the action baptism is to dip, or to immerse; and since neither *sprinkling* nor *pouring* is ever used to define the word, neither *sprinkling* nor *pouring* ever conveys its meaning. It is impossible that sprinkling or pouring can be baptism. Permit me here, and at once, to set at rest the fanciful notion that *baptizo* is a generic word, and denotes, without respect to *mode*, or inclusive of all *modes*, any application of water. I will do this, not only by proving the perfect definiteness of the word, which will appear more fully hereafter, but also by the *highest pedobaptist authority in America*. Professor Chas. Anthon, of Columbia College, N. Y., is an *Episcopalian*. He has edited most of our classical school books, published a Classical Dictionary, &c. Dr. Parmly of New York, addressed him thus, under March 23, 1843.

"In conversation with Dr. Spring last evening, he stated that in the original, the word baptism, which we find in the New Testament, has no definite or distinct meaning—that it means to immerse, sprinkle, pour, and has a variety of other meanings, as much the one as the other—and that every scholar knows it; that it is the only word that could have been selected by our Savior, having such a variety as to suit every one's views and purposes. May I ask you if your knowledge of the language from which the word was taken, has led you to the same conclusion?"

Dr. Anthon answers in these words, under date Col. College, March 27, 1843.

"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 to immerse; and its secondary meanings, *if it have any*, all refer in some way or other to the same leading idea. Sprinkling &c. are entirely out of the question."

This (and much more to the same effect might be presented) silences forever the supposition that the word is generic—indefinite, and irrespective of mode, or inclusive of all modes—means any application of water by immersion, or sprinkling, or pouring.

Let it be further remembered that *baptism* is itself exclusively a *figure*, a *symbol*, a *form*, a *mode*. Now if you take away the form, or mode, nothing is left; you take away the thing. Baptism, therefore, invariably denotes mode, and nothing but mode.

Whence, I may now ask, how we get the word *baptizo?* It is derived from the root *bapto*. These two words are therefore considered by many as synonomous. This however is *plainly a mistake*.—Their *primary* meaning is the same, but sameness proceeds no further. *Derivatives* in philology, are always, as you must be aware, designed to modify their *primitives*, and thus to express what is intended, *more definitely* than the sense of the primitive would admit. Were it not so, what would be the use of derivatives? They would in any language be a profitless encumbrance. Such is the exact difference between *bapto* and *baptizo*, a difference that naturally and materially affects the question at issue, and ought to be maturely considered. *Bapto* is never in a single instance, applied to the ordinance of baptism. I desire that you shall especially note this fact, since meanings are often brought from *bapto*, which you are told belong to baptism. This is not true, since it is another word, and not of the same meaning.—You hear men talking of *baptism* as meaning to *smear* and to *dye*; and of the baptism of a lake with the blood of a frog. In every one of these and all similar cases, the word is *bapto*, which is never used to express christian baptism. *Baptizo* is *exclusively* used when a christian baptism is spoken of; and I here deliberately assert, and I know what I am about, that in the whole Greek language, *baptizo* has no meaning, which as Prof. Anthon says, may not be resolved into dip, or immerse. If the truth of this declaration is disputed by any scholar, let him bring me the passage by which it may be disproved, from the *Septuagint*, from the *New Testament*, from any of the *Greek classics*, or from *Greek Fathers*. If I am wrong the passage can be produced, and the fact proved; but it never has been done, and I know very well it never can be done. The meaning of *baptizo* never can be expressed by any act short of immersion. And here I must express my surprise to find that on this subject, some of our pedobaptist brethren, whose learning and religion would seem to justify the expectation of more candour, are in the habit of misrepresenting *Dr. Carson*. In his learned work on baptism, he arrives at the results I have now stated; after which *they* make him say, in the assertion that *baptizo means exclusively to immerse he knows that all the Lexicons and commentators are against him.* I have within a few days past, re-examined his work, and find that he says no such thing. His language is this, p. 79 edt. 1823—

"*Baptizo to the utter exclusion of bapto*, is applied to the christian rite. *Bapto*, the root, I have shown to possess two meanings, to *dip* and to *dye*. *Baptizo*, I have asserted, has but one signification. It has been formed on the idea of the *primary* meaning of the root, and has never admitted the secondary. Now, *both these things* have been mistaken by writers *on both* sides of the controversy [Baptists and Pedobaptists.] It has been generally taken for granted that the *two words* are equally applicable to baptism; and that they *both equally signify to dye*.—Both of them in a *secondary* sense are *supposed* to signify to wash, or to moisten. I do *not* admit *this* with respect to either. I have already proved this with respect to *bapto*; the proof is equally strong with respect to *baptizo*. My position is that *it always signifies to dip; never expressing anything but mode.* Now as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in *this* opinion, it will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons."

In this opinion? In what *opinion* of Dr. Carson is it in which he has the lexicographers and commentators against him? It is—1st—that *bapto* is not equally *with baptizo* applied to the christian rite—but this fact is now given up to Dr. Carson by all scholars; 2ndly—that *baptizo* has not the secondary meaning of *bapto*, to dye or color; 3rdly—that *baptizo* has no secondary meanings; and 4thly, that it means mode and nothing but mode. Do not the lexicons all define *baptizo* in its primary sense, to dip, to plunge, to immerse? Certainly they do. Then here they agree with Dr. Carson. Do they ever define this word, to pour, or to sprinkle? Never in a single instance. Here also they all agree with Dr. Carson. In what then were they *against* him? In the alleged *secondary* and *remote* meanings, which they admitted and Dr. Carson denied. These are the facts. What do they amount to? They relinquish nothing whatever. Dr. Carson was a good, a great, and a learned man. He has passed from the world. I trust these facts will protect his memory against any misrepresentation hereafter, such as that which I have here been called upon to correct.

I now remark that the word employed to express baptism is thoroughly definite and unambiguous, and that word which of all others most fully and perfectly conveys the idea of immersion, and fixes it as the baptism appointed by Christ. Such is the rich variety, copiousness of the Greek language in which as every one knows, the New Testament is written, that a different term is used for every conceivable form of the application of water for any purpose, whether profane or sacred, as *raino, rantizo, cheo, encheo, nipto louo bapto, baptizo, pluno, agnizo, cathairo*, and others. Some of these words express different actions; and others the same action with regard to different objects; but all are employed to describe the *use of water* for different purposes. It is inconsistent with any reasonable conceptions of the wisdom and benevolence of God, to presume for a moment, that in his holy word, respecting the teachings of which it is so necessary that we should have correct ideas, that the Holy Ghost did not use words with the utmost precision of import. When God commands it is necessary, if we obey him, that we shall know what he means.—Among so many words in the most perfect language ever spoken by man, is there not one definite enough to describe the action of baptism in such a manner that we shall certainly understand precisely what it is which is enjoined, and thus avoid the heart burnings and litigations, which have so long agitated and divided the people of God? Did the Holy Spirit in dictating his revelation, design to leave upon our mind an *indefinite impression?* This would have been the case had he, as our Pedobaptist brethren tell us, intended to confine baptism to *no particular mode*.—That he did not so design is certain. If he had he would not have adopted *baptizo* lest immersion should have been understood as the action demanded; nor would he have employed *cheo* lest pouring should have been supposed to be that action prescribed; nor would have chosen *raino* lest sprinkling should have been presumed obligatory. He would certainly have given us some word having reference to the effect rather than the action. Was such a word at command? Most certainly it was. At once our thoughts recur to *agnizo* to purify and *kathairo* to cleanse, in any manner of applying water. But Jehovah *did not* adopt an *indefinite* term; he did not therefore, command an indefinite action. The word he adopted always convey the idea of immersion; consequently God will regard immersion only as christian baptism.

We may be assisted in our investigations as to the sense in question if we look into the various ancient *versions* of the scriptures into different languages, and ascertain how the words which relate to baptism have been there rendered. Beginning with the Syriac which was made in the *second century*, and coming down to that of King James, now in common use among us, it is a remarkable fact that in *every* language, except in the Sclavonic, with its six dialects, in all of which it is rendered to cross, *baptizo* is translated by words which mean to immerse; and never in a *single* instance by a word which means either to *sprinkle* or to *pour*. This fact only developed within a few years past, is most significant.—If baptism ever means to sprinkle or to pour, is it credible that it would not have been indicated in some one or another of these numerous versions?—Look also, if you please, into our *common version*.—This was made you are aware, exclusively by Pedobaptists. Examine it carefully, and then tell me whether the *translators* did not regard the word in question as perfectly fixed and definite. How did they prosecute their work? The question is worthy of your examination. You can readily look into it *yourself*. You may, by the help of a concordance, easily find every passage in the Bible in which the words *dip, pour, sprinkle* and *wash* occur in English; and then if you know even the Greek letters, and a little of the grammar, you can see the form and know the sense of the corresponding Greek words in the New Testament, and the Septuagint translation of the Old. I will briefly state what you will find to be the results.

1. In the English Bible you will find the word *dip* in a multitude of passages. In all these, with one single exception, the original Greek word is either bapto or baptizo. This one exception is in Genesis 37:31. in which it is said that Joseph's brethren took his coat, and *dipped* it in the blood of a kid.—Here the word translated dipped is EMOLUNAN, which means stained, smeared, or daubed. Mark if you please, the precision of the original. The idea in this place, is not to dip, but to smear or daub, and the Septuagint so expresses it.

2. You will learn that the word sprinkle, in some of its forms, may be found in many passages, and *never* in a single instance is the original word bapto, or baptizo. It is raino, or its derivative rantizo, and some others. Here again you see the careful particularity in the use of words by the inspired writers; and especially that the translators *never* rendered the word which means to baptize, by the word sprinkle.

3. The word pour you will find of very frequent occurrence in our translation, and not in one single instance is the original bapto or baptizo It is when pouring simply is intended, invariably *cheo* and its cognates.

4. *Wash* often occurs, as you will see, where reference is had not to the whole, but to a part of the person, as the eyes, the face, the hands, the feet, and other parts of the body. Not in one case of this kind is *bapto*, or *baptizo* found, but the word is always *nipto*. When *wash*, with the signification of *bathe* occurs, the original word is always *lone*. The penitent woman is said to have *washed* the Saviour's feet with her tears. The Greek word here is not *bapto*, nor *nipto*, nor *lono*, but *brecho*, which means to *wet*, or to moisten. In three passages however, two in the gospels, and one in the epistles, *i. e.*, Mark 7:4, Luke 11:38. and Heb. 9:10—we have the word *wash* denoting to *dip*; and here we have in the original, either the verb *baptizo*, or the noun *baptimos*. The language of our version is this:—"And when they come from the market except they *wash* they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the *washing* of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables." And "He [Christ] went in, and set down to meat [with a Pharisee.] And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first *washed* before dinner." These are the two passages from the Gospels; and the commentators agree that these *washings* so far as the *persons* were concerned, were immersions. Dr. Adam Clarke, for example, a *Methodist*, referring to them says. "They simply dipped or plunged them [*i. e.* their hands] into the water." But with regard to furniture, the purifications of cups, pots, tables, couches, and other articles, what shall we say? We are told that these tables especially, were large wooden structures, or benches ten or twelve feet long, and two or three broad and could not have been immersed. On this subject, I remark that these gentlemen gratuitously, to make out their case, depart from the *best authorities* on Jewish antiquities. These authorities tell us that the tables, &c., were pieces of leather spread out on the floor, from which the people ate in a crouching posture, as they now do in many places in the east. These surely, *could* easily have been bathed, or immersed. But however this may have been, I will give you the very words of the *law of God in the premises*. The Jews professed to be governed in their obediency by his law. They did then, in the case, what the law commanded them to do. And now what was that? The law is recorded in Leviticus 11:32, &c.—thus: "Whatsoever vessel it be [which is polluted] wherein any work is done, it shall be *put into water*, and it shall be unclean until the even, so shall it be cleansed"—by being put into the water. The same law—in Numb. 31:23—is repeated and amplified. It is thus expressed.—"*Every thing* [tables, and all] that may abide the fire, ye shall make to *go through* the fire, and it shall be clean; yet it must be purified by the water of separation. And *all* that abideth not the fire, ye shall make *go through* the water." Such was the *washing* of furniture, cups, tables, or couches, and all other articles. It was done by immersing them either in fire, or water. The law of God demanded this. Shall our friends suppose it was not done and construct an argument too upon this supposition? They surely were immersed. Thus we have at once, disposed of two of these passages which have been presumed to be doubtful. One other remains—that contained in the epistle to the Hebrews. Its reading is as follows:—"Which stood only in meats and drinks, and *divers washings—diaphorois baptismois*—and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation." Upon this text, however, I need say very little, since it is given up to *us* by most of our brethren. It is translated by the most learned Pedobaptists themselves, among whom I beg you to examine Grotius, Whitby, McKnight, and others, thus—"Divers *immersions*, and ordinances concerning the flesh."

This rapid survey of our present version shows that the translators, Pedobaptists as they were, did not conceive themselves at liberty to violate the principles, I have now sketched. The words used in the original both of the Old and New Testament, were employed with great precision. Out of several hundred instances, they did not, but in *three* cases, even attempt to render baptism by any other word than to immerse, in these three they use the word *wash*, with the idea of dipping. But never in a single instance, did they render *baptizo*, in the Greek, by *sprinkle* or *pour* in English! It is impossible therefore, that sprinkling, or pouring, or any thing else but immersion, can be baptism; because the word used by the Holy Spirit to describe the baptism enjoined upon you by our Lord Jesus Christ always means immersion, whether used by writers, classical, or sacred; because even our translators of the common version of the scriptures, although all pedobaptists, never rendered it as synonymous with sprinkle or pour; and because, to baptize, and to sprinkle, and to baptize and to pour, are altogether different actions. Immersion therefore, and immersion only is Christian baptism. So much for the sense of the word.

2. We now proceed *to the second* branch of the argument. That immersion in water is essential to Christian baptism, is also proved by the *metaphorical* sense of the ordinance. Upon this part of the subject you need be detained but a very few moments.

A *metaphorical baptism* is defined by Lexicographers, as we have seen, thus—"oppressed, or overwhelmed with affliction; plunged in a flood of affliction." Regarding such baptism our Saviour said to some of his disciples—Matt. 20:22, Mark 10:38—"Can ye be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Dr. Lightfoot, a Presbyterian divine, in exposition of this passage remarks—"Baptism among the Jews, as it was performed in the coldest weather, and the persons were kept under the water for some time, was used not only to express death, but the most cruel kind of death." The intimation of the Redeemer is that he should be *overwhelmed* in calamities. This was the baptism described. Again in another passage he says, conveying the same idea—Luke 12:50—"I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished!" He alluded to the approaching scene of Gethsemane, and Calvary. In these he was "plunged in a flood" of suffering. Such is the metaphorical baptism of the *Bible*. The word occurs in the same sense in *the classics*. *Josephus* also, in his wars of the Jews—B. J. 4. 3. 3—employs it. Speaking of the bands of robbers who had, in its defencelessness, found their way into Jerusalem, he says—"*Hesteron baptisa ten polin*."—Afterwards they baptized the city; they overwhelmed it in confusion and suffering; immersed it in calamities. In these expositions we have the sense of metaphorical baptism. Shall I ask you whether such a cruel death, such overwhelming sufferings, such a flood of afflictions, can be expressed by sprinkling or pouring a few drops of water on the head of a child, or a penitent? You know that it cannot. Immersion only is adequate to express the idea. The *metaphorical* was, of course, taken from the *literal* baptism. They must resemble each other. If so, then there can be no literal baptism without immersion.

3. We now proceed, in the *third place*, to prove that immersion is essential to Christian baptism, *by the great facts and doctrines* which baptism was designed to represent, and to teach.

Baptism was *designed* principally *to represent* and commemorate the *burial* and *resurrection* of Jesus Christ, as the *Lord's Supper* was his *sufferings* and *death*. Upon this point the proof from the word of God is full and explicit. "How," asks an apostle, "Shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" [Christ died for our sins, and was buried, and rose again; we by faith in Christ, are dead to sin.]—"*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. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also [raised] in the likeness of his resurrection." In other words; as Christ was buried in the grave, so we are buried in the water of baptism; and as Christ arose and come out of the grave, so we arise and come out of the water of baptism. Our representing his burial necessarily brings us to represent his *resurrection*. "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death," [buried as he was,] we shall also *arise* in baptism "in the likeness of his resurrection." Knowing this, that our old man"—sinful nature—"is crucified with him"—crucified in the body of Christ who bore our sins upon the cross—"that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him, knowing that he being raised from the dead, dieth no more." We also, if we are indeed dead with him to sin, and alive with him to righteousness, die no more, and therefore live to the glory of him who died for us, and rose again. And as a man when he is buried, leaves all the scenes and pursuits of his former life, so having been buried in baptism to our old life of sin, we live a new life of holiness by faith in the Son of God. These are the *great facts*, as stated by Paul and the other apostles, which baptism was designed *to represent* and commemorate. They are among those amazing acts of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which he redeemed us from death and the grave. These acts, God intended to keep ever before us, and they are therefore set forth anew in every instance of christian baptism. Such baptism can therefore never take place without immersion.

But christian baptism also teaches us great and important doctrines. You teach by pictures—so here—Carson, p. 25. "Baptism marks in a figure, the way in which we become *partakers of the benefits* of Christ's death. This is by our being, by a divine constitution, one with him. His death is a proper atonement for us, because we die with him, so that in reality his death is regarded by the law of God as our death. This is not necessary in all cases of substitution. To have a *debt* discharged by another, there is no necessity to become one with him. But it is not so in *crime*. Justice is not satisfied unless the criminal himself suffer. And by the divine constitution, that makes believers one with Christ, they are all considered as having died with him. The *criminals* have suffered, since he *who* suffered is one with them. These are the glorious doctrines held forth in our baptism; (taught as by a picture) our union with Christ in his death, his burial, and his resurrection. I now remark that *this union must appear* in our baptism or it is no baptism. I will sustain this fact by the argument of an Apostle himself, on a colateral topic.

The Corinthians celebrated as *they* imagined, *the Lord's Supper*; but Paul tells them plainly, that that *ceremony* was *not* the Lord's Supper! But why? They ate and drank together, the bread and the wine. Yet it was not the Lord's Supper. It was not Because they departed from the original model in the form of its administration. In that form used by them, could not be discerned the Lord's body—his sufferings and death. This destroyed the ordinance. So Pedobaptists themselves regard similar desecrations now. The Papists administer the Lord's Supper in what they call the mass. After various superstitious ceremonies, the Priest gives the people the wafer, and he himself drinks the wine. Do our pedobaptist brethren believe that this is the Lord's Supper? Would they participate in it as such? Certainly not. Now if the Lord's supper is vitally vitiated when it *does not* show the Lord's *death*, and therefore is not the Lord's supper; it is equally true that that is not baptism which does not show his burial and *resurrection*. Can his burial and resurrection be shown by sprinkling, or pouring? Never. Sprinkling and pouring can therefore never be baptism. Immersion is essential to baptism.

These deductions might, were it necessary, be strengthened by many other arguments equally conclusive. We might adduce the constantly recurring declarations, that in the days of the Apostles, baptism was administered in rivers, and in other places where there was "much water;" and we might refer to the fact, that in its administration, they went down into the water, and came up out of the water, none of which is necessary, or observed in sprinkling, or pouring. All these and numerous other facts render if possible, the certainty still more certain, that where there is no immersion, there is no scriptural baptism. But time does not permit; and I proceed to observe, that we are sustained, singular as the fact may appear, in the conclusions now submitted, by the best and most learned pedobaptist writers *themselves*, of all classes. Do you demand the proof of this assertion? You shall have it, and to any extent you desire.

The immortal Martin Luther, as quoted by Dr. Du Veil—on Acts, 8, 3—remarks—"The term baptism is a Greek word. It may be rendered a *dipping*, as when we dip something in water, that it may be entirely covered with water. And though that custom be utterly abolished among the generality, for neither do they entirely dip, but only sprinkle with a little water, [their children] nevertheless they ought to be wholly immersed, and presently drawn out again. For the etymology of the word seems to require it. The signification of baptism is [as just now stated] that the old man of our nativity which is full of sins, which is entirely of flesh and blood, may be overwhelmed with divine grace. The manner of baptism therefore, should correspond with the signification of baptism, that it may show a certain and plain sign of it." What Baptist could better have expressed his own sentiments than it is here done by the most distinguished of the reformers. To this day, although practically rantists, all the best German critics maintain the same doctrine. Another example.—The great John Calvin, the father of the Presbyterian church, in his Institutes of Religion, as translated by Allen—vol. 4, ch. 15, p. 343—remarks—"The word baptize signifies to immerse, and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church." In several other places this profoundly learned man maintains the same important truth. Particularly in his commentary on John 3:23, and on Acts 8:38, he says—"From these words we perceive how baptism was administered by the ancients; for they immersed the whole body in water." I could multiply hundreds of instances of similar pedobaptist testimony, but I forbear.

4. But it is necessary before I close this discourse, that I should refer even if it be but very briefly, to some *objections* which have been urged against the conclusions to which you have now been conducted.

The prepositions with which baptizo is connected in scripture, are supposed by some to turn aside the force of the word and forbid the idea that baptism was in all cases by immersion. Indeed we are told that there is a *rule* in Greek—it has lately been discovered—that in all cases in which motion *into* an object is expressed, the preposition *eis* is doubled, occurring in the sentence in connection with the verb, and also with the noun; and if the preposition is found but once in the sentence, then the motion is only *to*, and not into. The argument founded upon, this supposed rule, is that, since, in most of these cases of baptism described in the New Testament, where it is said, they went into the water, there is but one preposition, the sense must be that they went only *to* the water, and therefore could not have been immersed! Were all who hear me on this occasion, unprejudiced Greek scholars, I would not say one word in reply. I presume you are not all of this class, and I therefore remark, in the first place, that there is no such *rule* in the Greek language, classical, or sacred. It is true that in the Greek, the preposition is sometimes doubled in the sentence, but much more frequently it is *not* doubled. So the preposition is sometimes doubled in a sentence in English; but is motion *into* a thing, not therefore expressed by *one* preposition? Certainly it is. And so also it is in Greek. Does the occasional occurrence of such a form constitute a rule? Surely not. I can give you fifty instances in the New Testament, in which motion *into* the object is certain, and yet there is but one preposition in the sentence which expresses it. In Matt. 9:17, it is said—"Neither do men put new wine into old bottles, else the bottles break &c." Here is but one *eis*. Jesus said, &c., Matt. 26:32—"I will go before you into Gallilee," only one preposition. Again John 13:5, "He poureth water into a bason, and began to wash his disciples feet"—only one *eis*.—You must see that there is no such *rule*.

I remark, in the second place, that to *me* it appears that *every one* must know, who has thought, or read at all on the use of prepositions, that their meaning is subordinate to that of the principal words in the sentence where they occur. If it is said only of your friend that he went *to* the river, we should have no proof that he went *into it*. But if it is said he went *to* the river, and bathed, we at once know that he went *into* the stream. So in relation to *from*, and *out of*. Were you informed that a gentleman having been immersed, came from the water, you would not doubt his having been in the water. So much in relation to the preposition *eis* connected with baptism, and which so fully expresses *into*. Respecting *en*, and *ek*, and *apo*, *they* do not, and in the very nature of things they cannot weaken in the slightest degree, the force of the word used by the inspired writers to describe the form of baptism. It is still immersion, and nothing but immersion.

2. It is alleged that Paul must have been baptized in the house, and standing upon his feet, and therefore could not have been immersed. But why such a supposition as this? Acts 9:18—22:16, Annanias said to him: "Arise and be baptized"—"and he arose, and was baptized." But does Luke say he was baptized in the house and standing? Certainly not—but only that he arose as a *preparation* for baptism. The rising was one thing, and baptism was another thing. This is a common form of expression. Christ said to his disciples, "Arise, let us go hence." He said to Paul when stricken with blindness on the road to Damascus: "Arise, and go into Damascus."—this objection also is as you see, utterly baseless.

3. As an other objection to our conclusion it is alleged that the three thousand persons baptised on the day of penticost, could not possibly have been immersed for two reasons;—The first is that there was not a sufficient number of *administrators* to have performed the work in one day; and the second is that water in sufficient quantities could not have been found in Jerusalem, and its vicinity.

Let us briefly examine both these reasons. Regarding the former, a little simple arithmetic will work wonders. Three thousand persons divided between the twelve apostles, would give to each apostle two hundred and fifty. I find by my own experience that, proceeding with the utmost deliberation, I usually baptize three in a minute. But suppose the apostles baptized only two in a minute, they would have baptized the whole in a hundred and twenty-five minutes—that is, in two hours and five minutes. If they baptized *three* in a minute, the twelve apostles alone baptized the whole three thousand in one hour and twenty minutes. But let it be remembered that besides the twelve, there were present *seventy disciples* authorised to baptize, making in all, eighty-two administrators. Now divide three thousand between eighty-two ministers, and you give to each about thirty-six, all of whom could have been baptized with the most perfect deliberation, in *less than fifteen minutes*. This case then, presents not the least difficulty. But suppose it did present an *insuperable* difficulty, and it could be proved that three thousand, instead of being baptized in fifteen minutes, could not possibly have been baptized in a whole day. What then? The argument *lies against the statement of Luke* that so many were baptized, and not against immersion, as the mode of their baptism. But how so? I answer every one knows who has witnessed, or administered the ordinance, that in *a given time*, as many, and with the same ease, can be *immersed* as can be *poured upon* or *sprinkled*.—But the idea that so many could not have been baptized on that day is wholly fanciful.

2. The second reason consists in the supposition that water in sufficient quantities could not have been obtained in or about Jerusalem, to baptize so many persons. What! A city with at that time propably more than a million of inhabitants, within whose walls was annually collected nearly the whole nation, whose religion required daily ablutions; a city in which in a million of inhabitants bathed every day, and not with water enough to baptize three thousand; a city in the midst of which, and near it, were six immense reservoirs with easy descent, expressly for bathing purposes as the pool of Bethesda, the King's or Solomon's pool, the upper pool, the pool of Siloam, the pool of Hezekiah, and the lower pool of Gihon; all within a few minutes' walk, and two at the place where the conversation occurred, some covering four acres of ground; a city which although on high grounds, was surrounded by mountains, and consequently, as are all such places, well supplied with water; that such a city should not contain water enough to immerse a few hundred people is a dream, which it would seem, never could have found admittance into any but a distempered imagination. No my brethren, for any such purposes there never could in the holy city, have been any want of an abundance of water. And I will state here, once for all, that men have never been known to live, they never will live, where there is not an ample supply of water for all domestic and religious purposes. Hence all those fanciful *suppositions* that water for baptism cannot be found in great deserts, such as Zahara, and at the poles, have nothing to do with the argument. Who lives permanently, in the lands of the Zahara, or amid the thicked ribbed ice of the poles? Where there are no resident people there is no occasion for baptism.

3. It is again objected, that baptism could not always have been administered by immersion, because the Jailor of Phillippi must have been baptized in the house, where this form of the ordinance could not have been observed. Let it be admitted for the sake of the argument, that the Jailor was baptized in the house and what then? Do we not know that in all eastern houses, prisons as well as others, baths were invariably found, for religious and other purposes? This fact has been again and again demonstrated. There was not the least impediment then, to the baptism of the Jailor and his family in the rooms of the prison. But why suppose that the Jailor was baptized in the house? Does the narration justify the conclusion? Let us look at the passage, Acts 16, 29—34. They were you remember in the inner prison when alarmed by the earthquake, and attendant events—"Then he [the Jailor] called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and *brought them out* [here they left the inner prison] and said, sirs; what must I do to be saved? And they said, believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shall be saved, and thy house. [Now they were out in the passages.] And they spake unto *him* the word of the Lord, and [they spake the word of the Lord] to all that were in his house. [Here we find the Apostles in the Jailor's house, or the part of the prison where his family resided.] And he [the Jailor] took them [the Apostles] and washed their stripes, and was baptized he and all his straightway. And when he brought them *into* his house. [This is the second time the Jailor brought them into his house. They therefore took him and his family out of his house to baptise them, and after the baptism returned.]—And he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." The Jailor was therefore, *not* baptized in his house. This event occurred at midnight. If sprinkling or pouring was ever used in baptism, this was a proper occasion for it, and if certainly would have been done there in the house. But they went out of the house to baptize them. Why? Most surely because immersion and not pouring or sprinkling, was required. This whole narrative is therefore inconsistent with the idea that any thing but immersion can ever be regarded as baptism.

4. Some figurative allusions found in the scriptures to baptism, are thought to have an important bearing on the subject. We refer to *them* briefly.

"The long suffering of God," says Peter—1 Pet. 3. 20—"waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto baptism doth even now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." In the exposition of this text, which is supposed to authorize sprinkling, or pouring for baptism, I have to offer three remarks. In the first place, it is a figure; and a figure must necessarily differ in some respects from the thing which it represents. Secondly, the preservation of Noah and his family in the Ark, from the consequences of the deluge, was as nearly like an immersion as any figure could be like the thing that it represents. They as Christ was in the tomb, where Paul tells us "he was buried," were enclosed in the Ark. In this fact consists the metaphor, and not as some imagine, in the sprinkling of the rain upon the Ark. If the sprinkling or pouring of the rain upon the Ark was the baptism, it was the Ark which was baptized, and not the people in the Ark. And thirdly, as Noah and his family obtained a temporal salvation in the Ark, so we obtain a spiritual salvation in Jesus Christ, of whose resurrection from the dead baptism is a representation. This undoubtedly is the true exposition of the passage. It is admitted to be such even by Pedobaptists of the highest authority. If it is so, it forbids the notion that any can ever be admitted as baptism but such an immersion as incloses the whole body in water as thoroughly as Noah and his family were enclosed in the Ark.

Another passage of similar character, 2 Cor. 10. 1. "Moreover brethren I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our Fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The argument constructed from this text is, that the Hebrew Fathers were all baptised, but that they were not all immersed, and that therefore, immersion is not necessary to baptism. But does this argument state the fact? A moment's reflection will I think, convince you that it does not. In what were all the fathers baptised? *In* the cloud, and *in* the sea. How were they baptised? By passing *through* the sea, and *under* the cloud. Is not the likeness this figure bears to immersion about as near as it could be, and still remain a figure? Dr. Whitby on this passage justly remarks—"They [the Israelites] were covered with the sea on both sides—Exod. 14, 22—so that both the cloud and the sea had some resemblance to our being covered with water in baptism. Their going into the sea resembled the ancient manner of going into the water, and their coming out of it their rising out of the water."

5. Another figurative allusion requires our attention. It is the baptism of the Spirit. The Spirit is said to have been poured out upon the people at Pentecost, and its reception was the baptism of the Spirit. It is therefore concluded that pouring water on a person may be baptism. Let us examine the narrative, Acts 2. 1—4. "They were all with one accord, in one place. And suddenly there came a *sound* from heaven [mark it was a sound] as of a rushing mighty wind, and it [the sound] filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it [the likeness of fire] sat upon each of them. And they were all *filled with* the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit [with which they were filled] gave them utterance." Is this the action the pouring out of the Spirit, *into* them, until they are filled with it, which is to be imitated in the baptism of water. If so, then neither sprinkling, nor immersion, nor even pouring is baptism. But the water must be poured into the candidates until they are filled with water, as the disciples were filled with the Holy Ghost! Into such absurdities those who obstinately pursue error are always liable to be led. The simple and plain truth on this subject is, that the baptism of the Spirit is the act of putting men under the influence of the Spirit; and the baptism of water is the act of putting men under the water. "We are buried with him in baptism, wherein we are also risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

The notion pretty generally prevails, I believe, among our Pedobaptist brethren, that baptism is designed to represent the work of the Spirit in regeneration. John teaches us otherwise. Speaking of the work of redemption.—He says that to its truth and efficacy, there are *three* that bear record in heaven, the Father, the word [or Son] and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And to the same great facts.—There are three that bear witness in earth; the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." By the Spirit, the water, and the blood, all the commentators, agree in understanding the Holy Spirit, baptism, and the Lord's supper. The Holy Spirit bore testimony to the truth and efficacy of redemption, at penticost and still does so in every recurring conversion;—baptism bearing witness in representing his burial, and resurrection,—the Lord's supper in representing his suffering and death—All three agree in one testimony. Those who make baptism an emblem of work of the Spirit in regeneration err egregiously, since—

1. Baptism is a concurrent witness with the Spirit of the sufficiency of Christ, &c.

2. If baptism were a witness to the Spirit, then one of Christ's witnesses would be removed.

3. If baptism bears witness to the Spirit, then one witness bears witness to another witness.

4. If baptism bears witness to the work of the Spirit in regeneration, then John was wrong, Christ has but *two* witnesses. The other bears witness to the Spirit.

5. If baptism bears witness to the Spirit these three witnesses do not agree in one testimony.

But John was right; and if so, it follows that all that doctrine which makes baptism a sign and seal of the work of the Spirit in regeneration is wrong, and can only lead men into hurtful errors.

None of these figurative allusions therefore, shake at all our conclusions. Indeed, they have plainly a contrary effect.

Such, I believe, are all the objections to our arguments on the subject, considered of any weight I have treated them calmly and fairly, and instead of casting any doubt upon them, they actually strengthen and confirm the conviction that immersion and immersion alone is christian baptism.

These briefly, are our reasons, my brethren, for the firm belief that the immersion in water of a true believer in Jesus Christ, by an authorised administrator, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and this alone, is christian baptism. This conclusion, we have seen, is amply sustained by the meaning of the word, by the metaphorical sense of baptism, by the great facts and doctrines which the ordinance was designed to represent and teach, and by the places, and circumstances attendant upon its administration. We have in addition to our proofs in the promises, also examined the strongest objections to our conclusions and we find them wholly destitute of force, indeed they add to the assurance that our opinions are immoveably true—that they never can be shaken.

It remains only that we make a brief practical application of our subject, in two respects, and we have done.

1. In the first place, you who have not been immersed have never been baptized at all.

I do not, by the plain statement of this obvious fact, mean to shock you, or to reproach you, but simply, and with affectionate deference to assert what is true and important. A man who understands the real state of the case, will not reply to me that a majority of the learned world disagree with us, as to the mode of baptism taught in the Bible; nor in the propriety of the *practice* of exclusive immersion. This question of *majorities* has in cases of religion, with me, no force. If the opinions of a majority must be right, then you all be papist since they are much