

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1844.

No. IV.

Edwin Hall.

ART. I.—*The School: its objects, relations and uses. With a sketch of the education most needed in the United States, the present state of Common Schools, the best means of improving them, and the consequent duties of parents, trustees, inspectors, &c.* By Alonzo Potter, D. D.. Professor of Moral Philosophy in Union College. New York: Harpers. 1842.

THE world is full of good theories and excellent proverbs; and were the sentiments that are universally acknowledged to be just, and which have descended from age to age with the approbation of each, to be condensed in one mass, we should have a volume which the book of inspiration alone would excel. But if this record should appear in the shape of a mercantile account-book, with the practices of men entered on the page which contains their principles, we should in striking the balance, discover a fearful preponderance of the obligations over the credits.

To take a single caption of this imaginary ledger, what maxim is more common-place and threadbare than that the mind is the better part of man, and that the cultivation of its faculties is a higher and nobler object than any that relates to the body alone? Yet when we look at men in society, or catch their conversation, or observe the occupa-

lected. She has the same duty to perform with regard to slaveholders. As she would be called upon to censure a parent, who was unjust or cruel to his children, so is she called upon to censure her slaveholding members, should they be unjust and cruel to their slaves. The church is a society constituted by God, to be governed by certain rules, and invested with power to enforce by spiritual means, the observance of those rules upon its members. Of course those who do not comply with the rules, laid down in the word of God, as to their conduct, either as men, or parents, or masters, are justly exposed to the censure of the church, and the church is bound to inflict such censure. As to this point, we presume there is no difference of opinion. And if we could agree to act on these principles; that is, abstain from denouncing as a crime what God has not so pronounced; withhold our hands from the laws of the land, for which, as a church, we have no responsibility; and confine ourselves to teaching all classes of our members their duties, whether as parents, masters, or slaves, and enforcing the discharge of those duties by the power which God hath given to his church for edification and not for destruction, we should commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

ART. VII.—*A Debate between Rev. A. Campbell and Rev. N. L. Rice, on the Action, Subject, Design, and Administrator of Christian Baptism; also on the character of Spiritual influence in Conversion and Sanctification; and on the expediency and tendency of Ecclesiastical creeds, as terms of union and communion; held in Lexington, Ky. from the 15th of Nov. to the 2d of Dec. 1843. Reported by Marcus T. Gould, assisted by A. E. Drapier, Stenographers, Lexington, Ky. pp. 912, 8vo. Archibald Alexander*

THE debate, of which this volume furnishes a report, originated in a proposition made by a friend of Mr. Campbell to the Rev. John A. Brown of Kentucky. After a protracted correspondence, in which Mr. Campbell sought, disingenuously, to fasten the responsibility of taking the initiative upon the adverse party, the subject matter and the

order of debate were satisfactorily adjusted. The propositions discussed were the following :

I. The immersion in water of a proper subject, into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is the one only apostolic or Christian baptism. Mr. Campbell affirms, Mr. Rice denies.

II. The infant of a believing parent is a scriptural subject of baptism. Mr. Rice affirms, Mr. Campbell denies.

III. Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins. Mr. Campbell affirms, Mr. Rice denies.

IV. Baptism is to be administered only by a bishop or ordained presbyter. Mr. Rice affirms, Mr. Campbell denies.

V. In conversion and sanctification the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the word of truth. Mr. Campbell affirms, Mr. Rice denies.

VI. Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion, are necessarily heretical and schismatical. Mr. Campbell affirms, Mr. Rice denies.

Upon the first two points in debate, Mr. Campbell defended the ground assumed universally by the Baptist denomination. He entered into the controversy with all the advantage belonging to his position as the acknowledged leader of a considerable body of professing Christians.—The Campbellites, or as they call themselves, the Reformed Church, though little known in this part of the country, have a large number of congregations in the West, which all look up to Mr. Campbell as the great apostle of their faith. He presides over a collegiate institution at Bethany in Virginia, and possesses a high reputation for talents and learning. He was a member of the Convention which some years since re-modelled the Constitution of Virginia, and earned some distinction by the part he took in the proceedings of that body. For thirty years he has been before the public, labouring in his vocation as a reformer, preaching, writing books, editing a Monthly Magazine, and conducting public controversies. He has been learning the practice of a man of war from his youth up; and if not skilled in all polemic arts, it has not been for want of sufficient training. His opponent was a much younger man, and much less practiced in controversy. The adventitious circumstances were altogether in favour of Mr. Campbell; and yet we think every impartial reader of this volume must agree with us in the judgment that he was defeated upon all the

subjects in debate. On some points his overthrow was so signal and complete, that his discomfiture must be apparent even to himself.

The first question discussed related to the mode of baptism. This subject Mr. Campbell professes to have studied calmly and conscientiously for thirty years, seeking light in all quarters, and especially reading with care the leading writers who differ from him. And he seems to present the confidence of his belief, after so thorough and honest an examination, adopted as that belief was in opposition to the views in which he had been trained, and maintained through the loss of the favouring breezes of popular applause which wafted his brethren pleasantly along, as affording some probable evidence of its truth. This plea comes with rather an ill grace from a man who stands at the head of a numerous sect whom he has succeeded in reforming out of sympathy with all other branches of the church, and into complete subjection to his will. The reluctance to part with opinions in which we have been educated may be overcome by other influences than the compelling force of truth. The ambitious desire to figure as the head of a sect, must lead to the adoption of some distinctive principles of separation, and to the establishment of some Shibboleth, some outward mark of discipleship and bond of union. Had Mr. Campbell attempted to correct what he believed to be errors, in the prevailing speculative belief, or to reform what he deemed abuses in the existing organizations of the church, he knows very well that he would have gained comparatively few disciples, and that over those few he would not have ruled with absolute sway. To gain the ends of a founder of a sect it was necessary that some outward symbol should be selected, which might be made indispensable to salvation.—Whether this be extreme unction, episcopal imposition, or total immersion, is in itself a matter of little moment. Any one of these might be made to answer the purpose, provided it be made of strict indispensable obligation. The necessity which Mr. Campbell felt was laid upon him of establishing a sect, included in it the necessity of yielding his early belief and adopting a creed suitable for his purposes. We can discern no presumption therefore in favour of his opinions from the fact that these were not the opinions in which he had been educated.

The first question debated had respect, as we have said,

to the mode of baptisms. But Mr. Campbell contends that there is, and can be no such question. He censures Baptist writers for having incautiously entertained it under this form, and thus conceded an important advantage to their adversaries. And he takes credit to himself for having, twenty years since, shown that the true question was respecting the action of baptism, and not the mode. That is, he contends that immersion is not a mode of baptism, but baptism itself. We must confess this strikes us as a puerility, beneath the regard of a grave and reverend inquirer after truth. It is precisely on a par with the imbecile foolery of those who think to make progress by arrogating to themselves the title of *the* church. There are those who, in defiance of the settled usage of language, affect to use the word churchman as the synonyme of episcopalian; but such an attempt to forestal argument by cant, we should have thought beneath the manly intellect of Mr. Campbell. The meaning of words is not to be settled by the pertness of clerical foppery, nor by the demands of sectarian bigotry. Mr. Campbell's great discovery, by which he at once takes possession of the whole ground, is really of no higher dignity or worth than the muttered charm by which the harmless lunatic fancied that he became the owner of the stars. The stars still shine for others, and so baptism is still administered by other hands and in other modes than that practised by Mr. Campbell, even as there are still other churches, in despite of the self-complacent assumption of the episcopalian.

The argument of Mr. Campbell in favour of immersion is not destitute of learning and ability. He appears to be well furnished with the facts and reasonings usually adduced in favour of the position he maintained. If he did not produce any thing new, it is because nothing new can be expected from any man upon a question that has already been so thoroughly discussed; and if he failed to establish his ground, it was because success was from the nature of the case impossible. Had he undertaken to prove that immersion was the primitive mode of baptism, or that it was the best mode, he might have hoped for success, but how could he anticipate any thing else than defeat in the attempt to maintain the extreme proposition that immersion is the only baptism. Let it be granted that the primitive meaning of the original term designating this rite is immersion, still this helps him on but a small way towards the establishment of his point.

What if this be its "literal, proper, original meaning," is it its only meaning? Is it never used in any other sense? If the word is capable of any other meaning, then it may have had this meaning in the institution of the rite? Mr. Rice has certainly succeeded in showing that there is not one instance in the Bible, where the word βαπτίζω is used out of connection with the baptismal rite, in which it can be proved to mean *immerse*, and that its general signification is *to wash*. The lexicographical argument is clearly in his favour.

We quote the summary of the arguments on either side, as given by the debaters in their closing addresses, each of them having previously spoken seventeen times. Mr. Campbell thus sums up his thirteen distinct arguments in favour of immersion.

I. I argued from the law of specific words, to which class *bapto* and *baptizo* belongs—showing from the philosophy of words indicative of *specific* action and from usage, that while such words retain their radical form they retain the radical idea. Thus in the case of *baptizo*, while ever we retain the *bap* we have the dip in *fact* or in *figure*. No proper exception was found to this rule.

II. *Baptizo*, according to *all the lexicons* of eighteen hundred years, signifies to dip, immerse, plunge, as its literal, proper, original meaning; and is *never found* translated by *sprinkle* or *pour* in any dictionary from the Christian era down to the present century. No example was given contrary to this fact. The gentleman laboured to construct exceptions from casual meanings, but found not one such rendering in all those lexicons.

III. The classics were copiously alleged in proof of all that argued from the lexicons. No instance was adduced from them subversive of the facts alleged from the dictionaries.

IV. All the translations, ancient and modern, were appealed to in confirmation of the above facts. From a very liberal induction of the ancient and modern versions, it did not appear that in any one case any translator had ever translated *baptizo* by the words *sprinkle* or *pour*; but that it had been frequently translated dip, immerse, &c. Of modern translations, I have examined many, and though this word occurs one hundred and twenty times, it is *never* translated by the words preferred by the Pedo-baptists.

V. My fifth class of evidence offered, consisted of the testimonies of reformers, annotators, paraphrasts, and critics, respecting the meaning of *baptizo*; selected, too, as under every branch of evidence, from the ranks of those whose practice was contrary to ours. This whole class, amongst whom were Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Witsius, Vossius, Vitringe, &c., declare that in the New Testament use of the word, it means to immerse, and some of them say, in so many words, "*never to sprinkle*."

VI. Our sixth argument consisted of the testimony of English lexicographers, encyclopædias and reviews, whose testimony sustains that of the reformers, annotators, and critics.

VII. Our seventh argument was an exhibit of the words in construction with *baptizo*—*raino* and *cheo*—showing a very peculiar uniformity never lost sight of in a single instance; showing that to sprinkle and pour have necessarily *upon* and never *in* after them: while *baptizo* has *in* or *into* after it, and never *upon*; an argument to which Mr. Rice made no reply whatever, and, indeed, no response to it could be given. It is, indeed, as I conceive, the clearest and most convincing argument in the department of philology, because it groups in one view the whole controversy on all the prepositions and verbs in debate. I believe it to be unanswerable.

VIII. Our eighth argument was deduced from the places mentioned in the Bible, intimating that much water was necessary. There is not one intimation in the Bible of ever bringing water to the candidates; but there are intimations of taking them out to rivers, and places of much water. Mr. R. could give no reason for going to the Jordan to wet one's fingers, or out of doors to baptize any one, if sprinkling had been the practice.

IX. The ninth argument was deduced from the first law of the decalogue of philology—which makes all true definitions and translations of terms convertible. Which, when applied to *baptizo*, clearly proves that in the New Testament it cannot possibly signify to sprinkle, pour, wash, or purify.

X. Our tenth argument was drawn from the principal objections of Pedo-baptists, showing that in these very objections there is farther evidence in demonstration of immersion.

XI. The eleventh argument asserted the overwhelming fact, that sprinkling common water, or pouring it on any person or thing, was never commanded by God under any dispensation of religion, for any purpose whatever. This unanswered argument is fatal to the whole plan of sprinkling advanced by Mr. Rice.

XII. Our twelfth evidence consisted of the allusions used by inspired men in reference to baptism; their comparing it to a *burial* and *resurrection*, to a planting of seed, and in making it a sort of antitype of water and the ark during the deluge.

XIII. My thirteenth, or last argument, the history of baptism and of sprinkling, you have just now heard. You have heard that all the Greek and Latin fathers from the very earliest antiquity—from the very age of the apostles, according to our historians;—and indeed the oriental church always—and the western church, for thirteen centuries, practiced immersion. What further evidence can any one desire! Now, as I have already stated, *if only one of these thirteen arguments be true and valid, immersion, and immersion only, is established forever beyond a rational doubt or contradiction.* Any one of them is enough! How irresistible, then, to the candid mind, the accumulated evidence of them all!"

Mr. Rice's review of the whole argument is more extended. It occupies a portion of two addresses. We give it with some unimportant omissions, which do not affect the current of the argument.

"I wish now to review the argument on the whole question before us. Let us, then, have distinctly before our minds the proposition he

has undertaken to establish : viz. *that immersion of the person in water is the only apostolic or Christian baptism* ; and consequently all who have received the ordinance in any other mode are unbaptised, and are "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel !" This sweeping proposition he has sought to prove, mainly by the words *bapto* and *baptizo*. The whole controversy, as he admits, turns chiefly on the meaning of these words. To prove that they are specific terms, expressing definitely the *action* of immersing, he appealed—

1st. To the lexicons, ancient and modern, of which he quoted a large number. But mark the fact : I appealed to the same lexicons, and proved, that with almost entire unanimity, they define these words to *wash, cleanse, purify*, as well as to *plunge, sink, &c.* Some of them, both ancient and modern, defined them to *wet, moisten, sprinkle*. Now all admit that these words—*wash, cleanse, &c.* are generic terms, expressing *the thing done*, but not the *mode of doing it*. If then, it be true, as all the lexicons, ancient and modern, declare, that these words mean to wash, cleanse, &c., how is it possible for the gentleman, by them, to prove immersion ? Every one knows that washing, cleansing, purifying, may be performed in different modes. So the lexicons, instead of proving these words to be specific in their meaning, definitely expressing the action of immersing, prove just the opposite—that they are often used as generic terms, expressing washing, cleansing, purifying *in any mode*.

But the gentleman told us, *bapto* and *baptizo* meant to wash, to cleanse, &c., not in a proper or literal, but only in a *figurative* sense ; and he laboured faithfully to find *one lexicon* to sustain him in his position. He brought forward Stokius, who says, *baptizo* means to wash *tropically* ; but unfortunately for him I immediately proved by Ernesti and Stuart, that the *tropical* or *secondary* meaning of words is in a great many instances, their *proper* and *literal* meaning ; that very few words in any language retain their original meaning, much the larger number of them acquiring tropical or secondary meanings, which become proper and literal. Carson, whom the gentleman admits to be a profound linguist, also asserts, that the secondary meaning of *bapto*, (*to dye by sprinkling*,) is as literal as the primary meaning. And the lexicons, *en masse*, give to wash, cleanse, as *literal* meanings of *baptizo*.

Mr. Campbell has insisted, that *immerse* is the *primary, original*, and *proper* meaning of *baptizo*. But unfortunately again I proved, that the meaning of words is constantly changing—that few words retain their primary or original meanings. Moreover, the lexicons do give to *wash, to cleanse*, as the *first*, the *primary* meaning of *baptizo*, as used by the Jews and inspired writers. The lexicons therefore, though he so much relied on them, have all failed him. But, he says, they were all, Pedo-baptists, and were often in error ! Right or wrong, they give to these words precisely the definition for which I contend. *They are with me !*

2nd. His second appeal was to the *classics*. He had very learnedly taught us, that all specific words, having a leading syllable, retain their original idea, and therefore wherever we should find *bap*, as in *bapto*, we would also find the idea of *dipping*. He was again unfortunate. I turned to a few passages in the classics, and found *bapto* used to express the dyeing of a garment by the dropping of the co-

louring fluid, the dyeing of the beard, the hair, the colouring of the face, the staining of the hands, the colouring of a lake, &c., all by the application of the fluid to the person or thing, not by dipping. In all these instances, and others, we found the syllable *bap*, and even *bapto* itself, where there was no dipping, no immersing.

But, said the gentleman, *bapto*, in these instances, expresses not the dropping, smearing, &c., but the *effect*. The *effect*! The effect of what? The effect of dipping, immersing? No; for there was no dipping, no immersing in the case. It must, then, express the effect of *dropping, wetting, smearing*. Then where is the immersing? And if *bapto* will express the effect of the dropping of a colouring fluid, why not also the effect of a colourless fluid—wetting? Mr. Campbell responds again, these are *figurative* meanings of the word. No, says Mr. Carson, his profound linguist; they are as literal as the primary meaning. So that the classical usage of *bapto* cannot help the cause of immersion; and since *bapto* and *baptizo* are admitted to have the same meaning, at least so far as mode is concerned, *baptizo* must also be given up.

I, however, went with my friend to the classics to ascertain their usage in regard to *baptizo*. I found it, in four-fifths of the instances supposed to favour immersion, meaning *to sink*, and so translated by Mr. Carson, Dr. Gale, and by the gentleman himself! I found it constantly used to signify the sinking of ships, the sinking of animals and men under water, the flowing of water over land; and I proved that Dr. Gale, one of the most learned and zealous immersionists whilst commenting on one of these difficult passages in the classics, admitted that *baptizo* did not necessarily express the *action* of putting under water—the *very thing and the only thing* Mr. Campbell was labouring to prove by it!!! The Doctor had found a place in which *baptizo* was employed, where it was perfectly certain there could be *no action* of dipping, or of any other kind. I produced a passage from Plutarch, in which he spoke of a Roman general who, when dying of his wounds, baptized (*baptisas*) his hand with his blood, and wrote on a trophy. In this instance every one sees, at once, there could be no immersion—nothing more than a *wetting* of a finger or writing instrument. Yet the hand was baptized. I produced also a quotation from Hippocrates, where he directed, concerning a blister-plaster, that it should be baptized (*baptizein*) with breast-milk and Egyptian ointment.

3d. The gentleman's third appeal was to the *translations*; and he informed us, they were almost, if not quite all, in favour of immersion.

He commenced with the venerable old Peshito Syriac, the oldest and one of the best translations in the world, made, if our immersionist friends are to be believed, before pouring and sprinkling were known. I happened to have the Syriac Testament and Schaaf's lexicon. I proved, that Schaaf defined *amad*, (the Syriac word by which *baptizo* is translated,) by the Latin phrase *abluit se*—he washed himself; and all admit, that *abluo* is a *generic term*, signifying to *wash, to cleanse in any mode*. I further proved, that Schaaf, Castel, Michaelis and Buxtorf could find not one instance in the New Testament, where *amad* means to *immerse*, and but one in the Old Testament; and even in that neither the Hebrew word nor the Greek of

the Septuagint has that meaning. I proved by Mr. Gotch himself, the gentleman's own witness, that *amad* is used in the Bible in the general sense of washing—*abluit se*. I also stated, (and it has not been, and will not be denied) that the Syriac language has a word (*tzeva*) which properly means *to dip*, but which is never used with reference to Christian baptism. *The old Syriac is with us translated BAPTIZO, not to immerse, but to WASH, CLEANSE without regard to mode.*

I then turned your attention to the *old Italic version*, and the *Vulgate*, translated by the learned Jerom; and in both these venerable versions we found the word *baptizo* not translated by the Latin words *mergo, immergo, &c.*, but *transferred*, just as in our English version. In the only instance where Jerom translated the word, he translated it by *lavo*, to wash—a generic term. Mr. Campbell told us, that *baptizo* was understood by the Latins to mean *immerse*, and therefore was not translated. This was immediately disproved by showing, that they frequently baptized by pouring and sprinkling, and with entire unanimity regarded baptism thus performed as valid and scriptural—nay, that many really believed, that John the Baptist administered baptism by pouring. *The old Italic and Vulgate, therefore, must be abandoned.*

I then turned your attention to the Arabic version, of highest authority, and stated, (and it has not been denied) that it employs in translating *baptizo*, the same word in form and signification as the Syriac. I appealed to the Persic version, which is admitted to have translated *baptizo* by a word meaning *to wash*. I further appealed to the Ethiopic, the Sahidic, the Basmuric, the Arminian, the German, the Swedish, the Danish, the Anglo-Saxon, Arias Montanus, the Geneva Bible, the French, the Spanish, Tyndale's translation, proving by Mr. Gotch, the gentleman's own witness, that a number of them translated *baptizo* by generic terms, signifying *washing, ablu-tion*, and declaring myself prepared to produce the others, and to prove that they do not countenance the idea, that it means definitely *to immerse*. *And now I ask, has the gentleman given evidence that any one respectable translation, ancient or modern, translates this word TO IMMERSE?* No, and I venture to say, he cannot. THE TRANSLATIONS MUST BE GIVEN UP. His third strong-hold has been taken!

4th. He was very slow, indeed, in getting into the Bible, and thus far, has passed over it very superficially. In regard to *bapto*, I stated the fact, that although it occurs in the Bible *more than twenty times*, it does not express an immersion in more than four or five instances. *This fact Mr. Campbell has not denied.* I have produced examples in which it means a partial dipping, wetting, smearing;—examples also in which it is used in connection with *apo* (*from*), and of necessity signifies *to wet or moisten by means of*. I turned to the passage in Dan. iv. 33, where Nebuchadnezzar was said to have been *wet from* (*ebaphe apo*) the dew of heaven. The gentleman, however, will have it, that by some strange figure of speech, he was *immersed from* the dew!!! I turned to Rev. xix. 13, and proved, in the face of the repeated assertions of my friend, that *bapto* was here translated *to sprinkle* by the old Syriac, the Ethiopic and the Vulgate versions, and that the learned Origen, in giving the sense of the passage, substituted *rantizo* for *bapto*. But the gentleman guessed, that there was another reading. What evidence does he furnish? Is there any copy of the New Testament having another reading? No. Does Origen give another? No—he only gives the

meaning of the passage. There is absolutely no evidence. Still the Bible itself must be altered to sustain immersion! This same Origen, moreover, used *baptizo* in the sense of *pouring*. The altar, he said, was baptized when water was *poured* upon it by the order of Elisha. *This is high authority.*

I have also examined the Bible and Jewish usage of *baptizo*. It occurs first in 2 Kings v. 10—14, where Naaman the leper, was directed to go and *wash* seven times in Jordan; and he went and *baptized* seven times, as the prophet directed. The command was to *wash*, not to *immerse*; and he obeyed it. Accordingly Jerom, notwithstanding his prejudices in favour of immersion, here translated *baptizo* by *lavo*—a generic term, signifying to *wash*, without reference to mode. In this instance the word cannot be proved to mean *immerse*.

Baptizo occurs also in Judith xii. 7. She went out in the night, in a military camp, and *baptized* herself at (*epi*) a fountain [or spring] of water. Both the language and the circumstances here prove that she did not immerse herself, but applied the water to her person by pouring or sprinkling.

It occurs again in Ecclesiasticus, where a man is said to be *baptized* from the dead, or after touching a dead body; and the question is asked, what will his *washing* profit him, if he touches it again? We examined the law relative to this cleansing, and found *sprinkling* commanded, as the most important part of it, but no immersion required. The gentleman could not find time to reply to these arguments! Here we have two clear examples of the use of *baptizo*, in the sense of cleansing by pouring or sprinkling. These examples are particularly important, as showing the sense in which the word was employed by the Jews, in relation to their religious washings.

Baptizo occurs again, in a literal sense, in Mark vii. 4, 8, where the Jews are said to have baptized themselves (*baptisontia*) when they came from the market. Mr. Campbell's translation of this passage, I have proved not to be a translation, but a strange perversion of the original Greek. He throws out some two Greek words, translates a conjunction, an adverb, and a verb in the third person, plural number, by a preposition *by*, a participle *dipping*, and adds the word *them*, (referring to the hands,) which is not in the original! And he makes the little adverb *puyme* mean "*by pouring a little water upon them!*" But the gentleman has not found time to defend his translation, or to attempt to prove that the Jews immersed themselves, their hands, or their couches! But let it be understood, that in the stereotyped edition of his New Testament, *baptizo* is made to mean the washing of *the hands*. If the washing of the *hands* is baptizing the *person*, (for such is the meaning of *baptisontia*,) surely the application of water to the *face*, through which the soul looks out, may be regarded as a baptism.

Baptizo again occurs in Luke xi. 38; and here I find it in Mr. C's translation rendered "*used washing.*" This, however, we are told, happened by a mistake of the compositor, and the error having escaped notice through several successive editions, is now *stereotyped!* It was truly a remarkable oversight! But the gentleman has not attempted to prove that the Pharisee wondered that the Saviour had not *immersed* himself before dinner! Here, then, we have some four examples of the use of the word in the sense of *washing the hands*, (which, amongst the Jews, we know, was generally done by pouring water on them,) and of purifying tables or couches, which was doubtless performed in the same way.

The last example of the use of the word, in a literal sense, not in relation to Christian baptism, is in Hebrews ix. 10, where the ceremonial law is said to consist in "*meats, and drinks, and divers baptisms.*" There are in the law, *divers baptisms*; but there are not *divers immersions*. I have repeatedly asserted, that not in one instance was personal immersion required by the Le-

vitical law; and I called on the gentleman to show one. He has not done it. In this passage, the word *baptism* evidently includes all the ablutions of the Jews, the most important of which were required to be performed by *sprinkling*.

After a careful examination of all the passages in the Bible, where *baptizo* is used in a literal sense, not in relation to Christian baptism, we have found no one instance in which it can be proved to mean *immerse*; indeed, in every case but one, which might be considered doubtful, it is evidently used to signify washing or purification, *by pouring or sprinkling*. The conclusion is not only fair, but most obvious, that as appropriated to the ordinance of Christian baptism, it has the same meaning.

5th. I have appealed to the usage of the Greek and Latin Christians, in regard to *baptizo*. We have seen that Origen, the most learned of them, speaking of the altar on which Elisha directed the priests to pour several barrels of water, says, it was *baptized*. Here is a baptism, the *mode* of which we can all understand. We know that the water was *poured* on the altar; and we know that Origen says, it was *baptized*. And if an *altar* was *baptized by pouring*, why may not a *person* be baptized in the same way? This is high authority. Origen was a native Greek; he was a Christian; and he was an eminently learned man. Yet he certainly uses the word *baptizo* to signify the pouring of water on the altar. The gentleman did not find time to tell us how this altar was immersed! I think he did intimate that Origen did not employ *figures* very correctly!! But it will not answer to make a figure of twelve barrels of *literal* water, poured on a *literal* altar. If this was not a *literal* baptism, where will you find one?

Origen, let it be remembered, is the same man who substituted *rantizo* for *bapto*. If he understood his vernacular tongue, (of which, however, Mr. Carson expresses a doubt!) it is certain that *baptizo* expresses the application of water by *pouring*.

But Origen does not stand alone in thus using this word. I have proved that Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, and others, employed it to express the flowing of the tears over the face, and of a martyr's blood over his body. My friend has been profoundly silent concerning all these quotations! If the Greek fathers understood their vernacular tongue, *baptizo* means pouring and sprinkling, as well as dipping.

I have also appealed to the Latins, and have proved, that Cyprian and sixty-six bishops, early in the third century, declared baptism administered by sprinkling or pouring, valid and scriptural, and to prove it, appealed to Ezekiel xxxvi. 25, "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you," &c. Did they not believe, that *baptizo* expressed the application of water by sprinkling? If they had not, they would not have appealed to Ezekiel, nor have decided as they did. Observe, they said, let not those who have received baptism by pouring, so far mistake as to be *baptized again*. *The usage of the word baptizo by the Greek and Latin fathers sustains my position, and refutes that of Mr. Campbell.*

6th. I have proved another important fact, viz: that when immersion came to prevail among the Greeks and Latins, they employed *baptizo* to denote the ordinance, and selected other words to express the mode of performing it by immersion. The Greeks used *kataduo* and *katadusis*; and the Latins, *tingo*, *intingo*, *mergo*, *immergo*, &c. If *baptizo* expressed definitely the *action* of immersing, as Mr. Campbell contends; how shall we account for the indisputable fact, that they selected other words to express that action, and employed *baptizo*, when no such action was performed! *I have the authority of the Greek and Latin Christians against my friend, Mr. Campbell.*

7th. I have appealed to the *history* of baptism, and proved that the first

writer of any respectability who mentions immersion, is Tertullian, in the beginning of the third century; and he speaks of trine immersion, with sign of the cross and other superstitions. The gentleman will not practice according to Tertullian, but subtracts from his testimony, till it suits him. On the same principle I may subtract a little more from it, and it will suit me. But I have found sprinkling practiced and universally admitted to be valid and scriptural baptism, earlier than immersion can be found. I mentioned the case of the Jew who fell sick in a desert, and, having no water convenient, was sprinkled with sand. The bishop decided, that he was truly baptized, if only water was poured on him (*purfenderetur.*) *The history of the ordinance sustains us.* For if, as history teaches, our baptism is valid and scriptural; if it has ever been so recognized from the earliest ages of Christianity; the doctrine for which the gentleman is contending is proved, so far as history is worthy of consideration, to be false. And if so, there is not only sin in excommunicating all who do not practice immersion, but something like a profanation of the ordinance by a repetition of it in case of such as have been validly baptized. The Pedit-baptist concessions of which he boasts, do not touch the validity of our baptism; but the concessions of the old Greek and Latin immersionists place him in an unenviable position.

I must close this discussion by stating *the facts* which more directly prove, that baptism by pouring or sprinkling is valid and scriptural.

1st. Christian baptism is a significant ordinance, in which water is used as an emblem of spiritual cleansing—of sanctification. Hence it is frequently called a *washing*, as I have abundantly proved.

2d. When God first selected a mode of representing spiritual cleansing, he selected *sprinkling*. The ablutions of the Levitical law, the mode of which was prescribed, were required to be performed by *sprinkling*. No personal immersion was required. This fact cannot be disproved. If, then, sprinkling was once the most appropriate mode of representing spiritual purification; why is it not so still? Can a reason be given?

3d. The inspired writers never did represent spiritual cleansing or sanctification by putting a person under water, either figuratively or literally. No exception can be produced. If, then, immersion was not then a suitable mode of representing sanctification; how can it be so now?

4th. The inspired writers did constantly represent sanctification by pouring and sprinkling. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean. A new heart also will I give you," &c. Here the prophet represents a new heart by sprinkling. We do the same thing in administering Christian baptism. The apostles used the same mode of expression, "Having our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." If you would represent emblematically the sprinkling of the heart; would you not sprinkle water?

5th. I have stated another very important fact—that from the time when Christian baptism was instituted, we find not one instance on record of the apostles going after water for the purpose of baptizing. Philip and the eunuch were not going in search of water, but came to it, on their journey. Tens of thousands were baptized by the apostles in a country, having few streams of water of any considerable depth; yet they were always able to baptize the many or the few without delay, whenever and wherever they professed faith—in the crowded city, in the country, in the desert, in the prison, night or day. And in no one instance is it recorded, that they went one step out of their way after water! This is indeed most unaccountable, if immersion was then practiced; but if the apostles baptized as we do, the history of their baptisms is just such as we should have expected.

6th. Paul, I have said according to the obvious meaning of the language

employed, was baptized in a city, in a private house, standing up. Ananias came and found him blind and enfeebled, and said, "Arise (stand up) and be baptized;" "and he arose and was baptized." Just so Pedo-baptists, who practice pouring or sprinkling, write; and thus our immersionists friends do not write. We certainly write as Luke wrote, whether we practice as he did or not; and immersionists do not write as he wrote. It is indeed remarkable, that those who write as he did, differ from him in practice; whilst those who do not write as he did, do yet imitate his example.

7th. I derive an argument for our practice from the three witnesses, the water, the Spirit and the blood, 1 John v. 8. The blood of Christ cleanses from all sin. The Spirit sanctifies the heart. The blood is called "the blood of sprinkling;" the Spirit is represented as *poured out, shed forth*, and the water, the emblem of spiritual cleansing—how should it be applied? Surely by pouring or sprinkling. Thus these three witnesses most strikingly agree; and the scriptural representation is uniform and constant."

We make no apology for the length of this extract, as it contains, within a small compass, so complete a refutation of the arguments usually adduced in favour of immersion as the only mode of baptism. We cannot find a single position taken by Mr. Campbell which is not here completely wrested from him.

We have not space to follow the debate through the other subjects discussed, nor would it be easy to present a distinct view of the kind of argument pursued on either side. An oral discussion conducted as this was, in which each of the debaters after half an hour, gives way for a reply from the opposite party, must necessarily at times run off into minor details to the detriment of the main argument. Its constant tendency is to become a war of posts, which is sometimes pursued to an extent not demanded by the general objects of the campaign. Each of the disputants on this occasion complains of the other for seeking to divert attention from the general issue by unimportant accessories; and occasionally the calm tenor of the argument is disturbed by personal recriminations. Mr. Campbell however is much more abundant in his outcries against the relevancy of his adversary's arguments, continually complaining that he cannot bring him to the point, that he will not prove any thing, that he confines himself to dogmatic assertion, and that instead of doing he contents himself with boasting of what he has done. He shows on more than one occasion an evident disposition to taunt and irritate his opponent, apparently for the purpose of diverting him from the argument. If we may form a judgment from the temper and bearing of the disputants, as to which of them felt that his cause was making successful progress, the decision would clearly be given in favour of Mr. Rice. He appears throughout

more self-possessed, and is more direct in his arguments and replies. He does not run off, as Mr. Campbell frequently does, into vague, general declamation. Mr. Campbell betrays a continual sensitiveness as to the verdict of the audience at each stage of the discussion, and is obviously thinking of himself often when we might expect him to be absorbed in his subject. Mr. Rice, though his argument partakes occasionally too much of the character of the "*argumentum ad hominem*," does not intrude his own personality upon us; he is disinterestedly intent upon his end, and hence his directness and force. The friends of the truths which he aimed to defend have we think, much reason to be satisfied with his conduct of the controversy.

ART. VIII.—*The Pilgrim's Progress. By John Bunyan. With Explanatory Notes, by Thomas Scott, D. D. And a Life of the Author by Josiah Conder, Esq.* Embellished with twenty fine engravings. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Paul T. Jones, Publishing Agent. 1844. pp. 554.

By an unfortunate oversight we neglected noticing this sumptuous volume in our last number. It is an honour to the American press, to American artists, and to American taste. And we may add to the Presbyterian Board. The price, even in its costly binding, is only four dollars. Of course it would be impossible to sell such a book at such a price, had not the expense of publication been defrayed by private liberality. We highly appreciate the feeling, which induced the friends of the Board, to place such a work of art, within the reach of so large a class of readers. Illustrations, and pictorial embellishments, when below the taste of the reader, are not only disagreeable but injurious; when above it, they tend to refine and elevate. The educational influence, therefore, of handsome books, when widely disseminated, is of no small importance. They are a luxury, which it is generous and salutary to extend beyond the circle of the rich. No better selection of a work to present to the Christian public in this elegant form, than the PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, could perhaps have been made. A household book wherever the English language is known. One of the wonders of genius; a book which charms the