

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL 1849.

No. II.

ART. I.—*The Natural History of Man ; Comprising Inquiries into the modifying influence of Physical and Moral Agencies on the different tribes of the Human Family.* By J. C. Prichard, M. D. London : Baillere, 1843.

THE late decease of Dr. Prichard has given a death blow to the high hopes of farther contributions to the science of man, from his learned pen. If he had put forth no other work than this, it alone would have sufficed to give him an imperishable renown. The learning displayed in his work is not more remarkable, than the ability with which it is all brought to bear upon the particular subject before him, and the cool, quiet, and dispassionate manner, in which he conducts his inquiries, and grapples with the difficulties in his way. He has no preconceived, or pre-adopted theory to support. He takes mankind as they are, presenting certain phenomena. He seeks an explanation of these phenomena, which shall accord with philosophy, and pursuing a process of the most rigid induction, disdains to receive as conclusive aught that is not most thoroughly demonstrated; or as evidence, what a sound philosophy would reject

an institution founded, and through all its history conducted on principles of deep and essential malignity.

We do not hesitate to recommend Bishop K.'s book to all those faithful men, who are called to defend the truth in this land against papal superstitions and despotism. It will furnish them with powerful weapons of war. Its admissions are fatal to Popery.

ART. III.—1. *Baptism, with Reference to its Import and Modes.* By Edward Beecher, D.D. New York: John Wiley. 1849. 12mo. pp. 342.

2. *Infant Baptism a Scriptural Service, and Dipping unnecessary to its Right Administration; containing a Critical survey of the leading Evidence, Classical, Biblical, and Patristic; with special reference to the work of Dr. Carson, and occasional strictures on the views of Dr. Halley.* By the Rev. Robert Wilson, Professor of Sacred Literature for the General Assembly, Royal College, Belfast. London. 1848. pp. 534.

THE titles given above are those of the two most recent works of importance on the Baptist Controversy. The one first named treats only of the Mode, the other of both the Mode and the subjects of Baptism. But as Professor Wilson's work came to our hands after we had laid aside the former treatise for notice, we shall still confine ourselves to that branch of the subject which they treat in common.

Several considerations have led us to take a special interest in the labours of Dr. Beecher: the importance of the subject, the fact that the work has been done by a countryman of ours, and the additional fact that it has brought down upon him a shower of insolent vituperation as gratuitous as it is unchristian. We are no champions for Dr. Beecher; we disagree with him in some points; and he is well able to answer for himself: but we take pleasure in testifying that he has performed his task with the erudition of a scholar and the spirit of a Christian.

The First Part, occupying fifty-four pages of the present volume, originally appeared in the *Biblical Repository* of New

York, and was republished in Great Britain. Mr. Beecher did not regard the work as complete; but in this form it became the basis of Dr. Carson's reply. But before this reply came to hand, the author had gone on to publish his Second Part. This reply of Dr. Carson is a pamphlet of seventy-four pages, devoted entirely to a consideration of President Beecher's first two numbers, constituting the First Part, as now collected. The Third Part contains the first reply to Carson. The spirit of the Baptist champion seemed to call forth no rebuke from his brethren in this country. "Anger and wrath," say they, "evaporate in abuse. But no one will find this applied by Dr. Carson to his opponents." Now men will differ as to the standard of comity in writing, as well as in social parlance; but we might safely leave the matter to be determined upon a small *florilegium* of the Doctor's embellishments. He charges his American opponent with "perverse cavilling;" declares himself called "to put obstinacy to the blush, and overwhelm it with confusion;" and pronounces him guilty "of blasphemy." President Beecher's philosophy is "false, absurdly and extravagantly false;" "the only merit (he adds) this nonsense can claim is, that it is original nonsense." "Am I," he weakly cries, "to war eternally with nonsense?" "I am weary with replying to childish trifling." "It is sickening to be obliged to notice such arguments." Poor Mr. Beecher had ventured to speak of an argument as resorting to all manner of shifts. This is too much for Dr. Carson: "What shall I say of this? Is it calumny, or is it want of perspicacity?" His opponent is declared to give the lie to the inspired narrative; to be void of a soul for philological discussion. The result of the controversy is thus stated by Dr. Carson: "I have met every thing that has a shadow even of plausibility, and *completely dissected my antagonist*. Am I not now entitled to send purify to the museum as a *lusus naturæ*, to be placed by the side of its brother *pop?*"

President Beecher made a full reply to Carson. The only notice of this, so far as we have ever learned, was an answer of nine pages and a half. It was written for popular effect, and has been ridiculously lauded by the author's admirers in America. It is abundantly answered in the Fourth Part of the volume before us.

Dr. Beecher has shown himself in this work a most patient and well-informed philologist, and an acute and conclusive logician. This he does even in spite of the manner in which he chooses to present his argument, and which tends to render still more dry and repulsive a subject in itself of small attractions. It is a hard book to be read, though a valuable one to be consulted. We confess our preference for the time-honoured methods of the best English writers of giving their thoughts in flowing argument, and what the old authors would have called *discourse*; and we cannot comprehend why, in imitation of the least tasteful people on earth, we should sacrifice everything to ease of reference. The splitting up of material into minute portions, with abundance of Roman and Asiatic numerals, gives an appearance of great method, but not unfrequently produces the very evil which is deprecated. Unless a concordance is to be made to a theological work, we see no reason for renewing the device of Athias and Robert Stephens, and dividing it into *verses*. Dr. Beecher sometimes comes near this. The work is in four Parts: this is well, as these portions are divided as to time. The parts are divided into chapters, and also into sections; and the sections are sometimes subdivided into enumerated members. For example, the sentence: "The believer's spiritual death is to live," may be referred to, as on page 98, as Part I., Chapter II., § 33, Division 3 of that section, and Article 5 of the numbered sentence, on the above-named page. This is simply ludicrous, and tends more than any thing in the matter, or even style, of the author, to produce that heaviness with which we hear the work charged. In respect to style, Dr. Beecher is perspicuous and strong, and occasionally, when he forgets to count his steps, easy and vivacious, as some of our citations will serve to show.

The proposition which Dr. Beecher undertakes to prove is, that the word βαπτίζω, as a religious term, means not to dip, nor to pour, nor to sprinkle, nor to apply water by any specific mode, but to purify. It is important that this be constantly kept in mind, as otherwise the course of his argument must be sometimes obscure; such it seems to have proved, to writers on both sides.

To establish this position, Dr. Beecher argues first from John iii. 25, where the dispute between the disciples of Jesus and those of John was concerning "purification," that is concerning

“baptism.” That purification here means baptism, he argues from the whole context; and is sustained by all the fathers, as well as by Schleusner, Wahl, Vater, Rosenmüller, de Wette, Bretschneider, and even Ripley. He lays great stress on this as a classical passage in the controversy: “It was by means of this passage,” says he, “that the Holy Spirit, as I humbly trust, first gave me a true insight into the meaning of this word.”

This is confirmed, when we observe the expectation among the Jews, that the Messiah should baptize. Of this there is no Old Testament prediction, unless in those passages which foretell that he should purify. Though it might have been gathered that he should sprinkle or pour, it is nowhere intimated that he should dip. Yet the people expected him to baptize; that is, argues Dr. Beecher, to purify. Add to this, that the baptism of the Holy Spirit, in regard to its agent, subject, means and effect, demands the notion of purifying and excludes the notion of dipping; for the agent is the Divine Spirit, the subject is the human spirit, the means are spiritual, and the effect is purity; and in such relations the meaning *dip* is absurd. Think of the form, “I *dip* you *in* the Holy Ghost.”

Again, the end of baptism is to indicate sacrificial purification, or the remission of sins. Now, if we find the word used to denote such purification, we are confirmed in our rendering. It is precisely thus that we find it used. Baptism is a rite symbolizing the remission of sins, and is used as if synonymous with cleansing. Mark, i. 4; Luke, iii. 3; Acts, iii. 38. Dr. Carson, according to his favorite method when under logical pressure, treats this argument as “no more to the purpose than a treatise on logarithms.” The author replies by showing that without his distinction much of the language of the fathers on baptism would be unintelligible. “Sprinkling with blood is not an immersion, nor is it a washing, nor is it, in the common sense of the term, a purification, for blood of itself defiles. But the shedding of blood secures the remission of sins, and the sprinkling of blood is an expiation, that is, a sacrificial purification. And if it were not for this view, the language of the fathers, when they speak of sprinklings of blood as baptisms, could not be understood. But take this view, and all is plain. Indeed, it furnishes an argument against the sense immerse, of irresistible

power. And although this is not much to Dr. Carson's purpose, it is very much to mine."

In Heb. ix. 10, the phrase, divers baptisms, is obviously taken in a generic sense to denote Mosaic purifications of any kind. Now it is remarkable, that no immersions of bodies are any where enforced under the Levitical law. The Hebrew word for dip is never used, but always that for wash, or purify; this escapes the English reader, who here naturally but incorrectly thinks of immersion. The early immersions under the law were those of vessels, sacks, skins, &c.: to these we cannot suppose Paul to have had reference. These Levitical purifications involved no necessity of dipping. They include cleansing by water, cleansing by blood, and even cleansing by sprinkling the ashes of a heifer. Heb. ix. 13, x. 22. A happy citation is made from Ambrose: "Per hysoppi fasciculum adspergebatur agni sanguine, qui mundari volebat *typico baptisate*."

The argument from Jewish purifications in Mark vii. 4-8, and Luke xi. 38, is well presented. In these the obvious sense of βαπτίζω and βαπτισμός is cleanse and cleansing. "It is no more likely that a want of *immersion* offended the Pharisee, (Luke xi. 38,) in the case of Christ, than it is that this was the ground of offence in the case of the disciples, Mark vii. It does not appear that Christ had been to the market. Nor is it likely at all that an immersion was expected as a matter of course before every meal, even on coming from a crowd. The offence in the case of the disciples, was that they had not washed their hands. An immersion was not expected of them, though they had been in crowds. Why should it be of Christ? Kuinoel, on this passage, well remarks, that the existence of any such custom of regular immersion before all meals, cannot be proved."

Dr. Carson becomes more sturdy and amusing than usual, in regard to the baptism of couches. He says that he will maintain immersion until its *impossibility* is proved, and suggests that the couches might be so made as to be taken to pieces for this end! He has proved—he says—the meaning of the word: the Holy Ghost affirms that the couches were immersed and to call this absurd, is to charge the Holy Ghost with uttering an absurdity."

Dr. Beecher's position, then, in regard to the Biblical argument, is this: if we admit that in the days of Christ, καθάριζω

was the import of βαπτίζω, taking all the texts of the New Testament together, then have we no right to affix to it a modal signification.

From the Biblical, the author proceeds to the Patristical argument; and here, as we think, the chief merit of his work appears, in the fulness, fairness, erudition, and hermeneutical skill which are displayed. So far as we are informed, there is no other writer on baptism who has gone so deeply into an original investigation of the Fathers; and much as Carson and others may deprecate this branch of the argument, it proves to be one with which they can ill cope. Availing ourselves of Dr. Beecher's own *status quæstionis*, we may thus exhibit what he proposes to establish by the inquiry. The question is not whether βαπτίζω sometimes means to immerse; this is admitted. It is not whether the Fathers do not so use it, both literally and figuratively. It is not whether they considered immersion, in common, as proper. But the question is, whether the Fathers directly declare that βαπτίζω has the meaning to purify, in the ordinance of baptism. To follow the author into all the details of his argument on this important point, would be too much like invading his copyright; we shall, however, indicate the train of his reasoning, though, in one or two essential particulars, we think his zeal has hurried him into violent constructions.

The main proposition is, that the word, as religious, means, to purify. The proposition, in regard to the Fathers, is, that their *usus loquendi* can be best explained by this meaning. For instance, this shows how 'regenerate,' and like words, came to be used for 'baptize.' It shows the origin of Baptismal Regeneration. And Dr. Beecher does not ascribe the origin of the usage of ἀναγεννάω, as a synonyme of βαπτίζω, to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but the latter to the former.

There is philological proof that the word was often used by the Fathers in the sense of 'purify.' The earlier Christians do not use the word βαπτίζω so often as some synonyme derived from the senses just named; fixing the mind of the reader, not on dipping, but on cleansing. And this is the more signal, when we observe how the Baptists are driven by their hypothesis so completely to the opposite extreme, that Dr. Carson denies point-blank that baptism contains any reference to

cleansing! The Fathers often use the term in the ritual and Levitical sense, and in such connexions as to exclude every meaning but that of cleansing. They sometimes, in describing the rite, use *καθαίρω* or *καθαρίζω* alone. Thus Gregory Nazianzen says: "Thou shalt see Jesus purified (that is baptized) in the Jordan, with my purification, (i. e. baptism,) or rather, sanctifying the waters by his purification."

In order to account for the alleged early prevalence of immersion, and thus to remove a presumption against the author's meaning, he enters upon an argument against the popular assumption, favoured even by Professor Stuart, that if the Fathers did immerse, they must of course have believed that the word means to immerse. On the other hand, in full consistency with the meaning purify, Dr. Beecher ascribes the prevalence of immersion to oriental usages, and the habits of warmer regions; to a false interpretation of Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12; and to a very early reverence for forms. To feel the force of the last cause, we have only to look at the veneration, and almost idolatry, with which the more ignorant Baptists, especially in the South, regard the going into the water.

There are some decisive cases, in which it is absurd to assign any other meaning than that which is proposed. Such a one is the well known baptism of blood, whether applied to Christ or the martyrs. If Dr. Beecher is right here, the Fathers apply the word to the *act of making an atonement by shedding blood*, even where no one is ever spoken of as immersed, or even, he thinks, as sprinkled. "Our probation," says Origen, "extends not only to stripes, but to the shedding of blood; for Christ, whom we follow, shed his blood for our redemption, in order that we may leave this world, washed in our own blood alone; for it is the baptism of blood alone which renders us more pure than the baptism of water. Nor do I say this presumptuously, but the Scripture authorizes it, by the statement of our Lord to his disciples: 'I have a baptism to be baptized with which ye know not.' You see, therefore, that he called the shedding of his blood a baptism." In several of the instances cited, the Greek preposition used renders the idea of immersion impossible.

It was common to speak of martyrs as having received a baptism of blood. This was called a baptism, not because the

martyr was immersed, for in fact he was not, unless in the rare instance of his being drowned. There is no thought of that which is the fixed idea with modern formalists, namely of dipping. "It is so called simply because, by suffering, by effusion of blood, he secures the forgiveness of sin." Hence the expressions, baptism *by* martyrdom, *by* suffering, and *by* blood, not immersion *in* martyrdom, &c. It is cleansing. So Gregory Nazianzen says: "it is more august than the others, because after it the martyr is no more polluted." So Augustine:—"Similes Christo martyres, quos post, aquam veri baptismi sanguis baptista perfundit."

"I do not indeed affirm that they did not, any of them, at any time, use it as a religious term to denote *immersion*. To say this intelligently, would require a certainty that every usage of it by the Fathers had been seen, which, in my case, certainly is not true. But I must say, that even if such cases can be found, they will not disprove my position. They can only prove inconsistent usage; and this I have already admitted would be nothing strange, and might even be expected in writers so numerous and so various. Still, when I consider the extreme power of the usage which I have proved, when I find it clearly and decidedly, even in the eleventh century, I am inclined to believe that a general perception of the true sense was not lost or obscured, till the Greek language itself sank in the ruins of the Eastern empire; and that the present state of opinion has been produced by party spirit, and by the mistakes of learned men to whom the Greek was a dead language, and who, being familiar with the style and usage of classic Greek, as that which holds the earliest and primary place in the modern systems of education, have allowed it to expel the true spiritual and sacred sense of the word, and, in place of it, to introduce a merely physical, and, too often, barren and profitless external act."

After the full and learned proofs of Dr. Beecher, it is scarcely credible that this is the very portion of his work, concerning which Dr. Carson says in his answer: "He does not appeal to the use of the word by the Fathers, but to other words applied by the Fathers to the same ordinance."

The early and decidedly predominant idea of the rite, according to Dr. Beecher, was that it was the appointed and almost the only means of obtaining remission of sins. Its name might therefore be expected to indicate this idea; and so it does, in the sense of purifying, but not in the sense of immersing. The words with which βαπτίζω is interchanged show the same acceptance of the word. They are, λούω, ἀγιάζω, ἀγνίζω, ἀναγεννάω, *purgo, mundo, emundo, lavo, abluo, diluo, eluo, perfundo*; toge-

ther with the corresponding nouns. At the same time very little disposition is shown to use equivalents of immersion. When immersion is definitely spoken of, the word is not generally βαπτισμός, but καλύψεις. "Why is this," asks the author, if βαπτισμός never means any thing but immersion?" Indeed, this word is so constantly employed for the rite, that when in a certain case there is a deviation from the common use, and βαπτισματά is employed for the dippings, a note is deemed necessary by Zonaras, informing the reader that βαπτισματα here means καταδύσεις; as if to say, βάπτισμα is not here used in its common sense of purification, but denotes *the act of immersion*.

Early Christians took much interest in the question, "Why was Christ baptized?" Now, it is full of meaning, that, in discussing this, they do not try to answer the question, "Why was he *immersed*?" but solely the question, "Why was he purified?" So in speaking of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, they do not speak of it as an inward, *spiritual immersion*, but as an inward, spiritual purification. In none of the Fathers, says our author, is found the strange, incongruous and modern idea of an internal and spiritual immersion into the Holy Spirit and fire. Thus, also, the baptism of tears, often mentioned by the Fathers, is a *purification* by tears, not an *immersion* in tears. "The tear of prayer (says Nilus) is a good wash-basin of the soul."

"To conclude, the idea of purification is, in the nature of things, better adapted to the name of the rite, than immersion. It has a fitness and verisimilitude in all its extensive variety of usage, which cause the mind to feel the self-evidencing power of truth, as producing harmony and agreement in the most minute, as well as in the most important relations of the various parts of the subject to each other. This is owing to three facts: 1. The idea of purification is the fundamental idea in the whole subject. 2. It is an idea complete and definite in itself in every sense, and needs no adjunct to make it more so. 3. It is the soul and centre of a whole circle of delightful ideas and words. It throws out before the mind a flood of rich and glorious thoughts, and is adapted to operate on the feelings like a perfect charm. To a sinner desiring salvation, what two ideas so delightful as forgiveness and purity? Both are condensed into this one word. It involves in itself a deliverance from the guilt of sin, and from its pollution. It is a purification from sin in every sense. See § 12. It is purification by the atonement, and purification by the truth,—by water and by blood. And around these ideas cluster others likewise, of holiness, salvation, eternal joy, eternal life. No word can produce such delight on the heart, and send

such a flood of light into all the relations of divine truth; for purification, in the broad Scripture sense, is the joy and salvation of man, and the crowning glory of God. Of immersion, none of these things are true. Immersion is not a fundamental idea in any subject or system. 2. By itself, it does not convey any one fixed idea, but depends upon its adjuncts, and varies with them. Immersion? In what? Clean water or filthy? In a dyeing fluid, or in wine? Until these questions are answered, the word is of no use. And with the spiritual sense the case is still worse; for common usage limits it in English, Latin, Greek, and, so far as I know, in all languages, by adjuncts of a kind denoting calamity or degradation, and never purity. It has intimate and firmly established associations with such words as luxury, ease, indolence, sloth, cares, anxieties, troubles, distresses, sins, pollution. We familiarly speak of immersion in all these, but with their opposites it refuses alliance. We never speak of a person as immersed in temperance, fortitude, industry, diligence, tranquility, prosperity, holiness, purity, etc. Sinking and downward motion are naturally allied with ideas which, in a moral sense, are depressed, and not with such as are morally elevated. Very few exceptions to this general law exist, and those do not destroy its power. Now, for what reason should the God of order, purity, harmony, and taste, select an idea so alien from his own beloved rite, for its name, and reject one in every respect so desirable and so fit? Who does not feel that the name of so delightful an idea as purification must be the name of the rite? And who does not rejoice that there is proof so unanswerable, that it is?"

The second chapter of the First Book is occupied with an exegesis of those vexed passages, Romans vi. 3, 4, and Colossians ii. 12. Our passing over this, is not from our undervaluing the importance of the argument, or the ability of the author, which is peculiarly evinced just here; but because the chapter does not admit of easy abridgement, and because it is not necessary to the chain of the reasoning.

Thus far the argument had proceeded, in its original form, and this was the part of it which first attracted the notice of Dr. Carson. The general results may best be stated in the author's own words:

"1. There is a baptism, infinitely more important than the external baptism, and of which the external baptism is but a sign.

"2. In the spiritual baptism, a believer is actually purged from sin and guilt, by the Holy Ghost. In the external, the forgiveness of sins is openly announced to him, on the assumption that he has repented and believes, as he professes.

"3. The person baptized is regarded as calling on the name of the Lord for forgiveness, and the baptizer as announcing his forgiveness in the name of the Lord. Acts xxii. 16.

"4. In the case of internal baptism, there is no such external use of the name of God, but a real forgiveness resulting in actual union to Christ. Hence,

"5. The form—*βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς ὄνομα Χριστοῦ*—is adapted to express the external baptism; *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Χριστόν*, to express the internal baptism, that actually unites to Christ.

"6. To this view, all facts accord. For in every instance where *ὄνομα* is used, there is internal evidence in the passage to prove that external baptism is meant. Matt. xxviii. 19, Acts ii. 38, Acts viii. 16, Acts x. 48, Acts xix. 5, Acts xxii. 16, 1 Cor. i. 13, 15."

"It appears, then, that the whole subject turns on three points: 1, the import of *βαπτίζω*; 2, the significance of the rite; 3, early practice. On each, the argument in favour of immersion rests on a *petitio principii*. 1. It is assumed as improbable that *βαπτίζω* can mean *purify*, without respect to mode, if it also means, in other cases, *immerse*. The falsehood of this assumption has been shown, the existence of an opposite probability proved, and the meaning *purify* clearly established by facts. 2. The improbability of *internal* baptism in Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12, has been assumed, and external baptism has also been assumed without proof. It has been shown that the external sense, and not the internal sense, is improbable, and that against the external sense there is decisive proof. It has also been assumed that the practice of immersion by the Fathers and others, is proof of their philology, and that, therefore, they must have regarded the command to baptize as a command to immerse. The falsehood of this assumption has also been clearly shown. The result of the whole is, that as to the *mode of purification* we may enjoy Christian liberty; and that immeasurable evils attend the operation of those principles, by which many are now endeavoring to bring the church upon exclusive ground. There is no objection to immersion, *merely as one mode of purification*, to all who desire it. But to immersion as the *divinely ordained and only mode*, there are objections, deep and radical. We cannot produce unity by sanctioning a false principle; our Baptist brethren can, by coming to the ground of Christian liberty. The conclusion, then, to which I would kindly, humbly, affectionately, yet decidedly come is this: Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

In the remaining parts of his labour, a less rigid method is observed by Dr. Beecher, as he was constrained to choose his position with reference to the assaults of the adversary. Dr. Carson's reply was a pamphlet of 74 pages, devoted entirely to the first two numbers of Dr. Beecher, which had been published in England under a mistaken impression that they were complete. It is no part of our plan to exhibit Dr. Carson's system to which frequent reference has been made in our pages. In

his reply he treats Dr. Beecher with an unmannerly contempt, which we rejoice to find our countryman meeting with a keen but gentlemanlike composure. Dr. Carson here as everywhere else begs the question, and assumes that he has proved that βαπτίζω means dip, and only dip. His induction of instances, as our author says, is far too narrow, if his purpose is to prove that it indeed means any thing else; especially as the word and its derivatives "occur in the writers of ecclesiastical Greek ten times, not to say a hundred times more frequently than in all the classic Greek writers taken together." There is no evidence that Dr. Carson has ever read the Greek Fathers on this subject; yet hear him, in his usual strain: p. 448. "Immersion is the only meaning of the word in every instance in the whole compass of the language." p. 449, "I tell Mr. Beecher it never signifies to purify." But here Dr. B. has a right to be heard for himself:

"Incredible as it may seem, yet it is true, that on an assumption so totally devoid of proof, on such a mere *petitio principii*. Dr. Carson's whole argument against me is based. Having *thus* found out and ascertained the meaning of the word, he calls it "the testimony of the word known by its use," p. 451: "the authority of the word." p. 452, and gravely informs us, p. 459, that "probability, even the highest probability avails nothing against testimony;" and p. 464, "to allege probability against the ascertained meaning of a word, is to deny testimony as a source of evidence, for the meaning of testimony must be known by the words used." But what is this testimony? Is the word βαπτίζω a living intelligent being? Is it conscious of its own meaning? Has it testified to Dr. Carson as to its universal use? If not, and if Dr. Carson has seen but a few out of the multitude of its usages, how dares he to call the little that he has seen, the universal, absolute, and exclusive sense of the word, and then to personify it, as a witness in a court of justice, swearing down all probable evidence by direct testimony? Never was there a more perfect illusion than such reasoning as this. It is neither more nor less than proving the point in question by incessantly and dogmatically assuming it. For until he has first assumed without proof, that he has "found" or "ascertained," that βαπτίζω means immerse, and nothing else, "in every instance in the whole compass of the language," even in those cases which he never saw, how can he make the word testify to that point?

"And yet this is his all-subduing argument in every case. First, by his canons of trial he makes the sense immerse possible, and then brings forward his witness, βαπτίζω, to testify that it has but one sense in the whole range of the Greek tongue, and that one immerse. He compares, p. 449, the meaning that he claims, to a client, *whose title to the whole estate is in*

evidence. P. 451, "The couches were immersed, because the word has this signification and no other." P. 450, "To deny this is to give the lie to the inspired narrators. The word used by the Holy Spirit signifies immersion, and immersion only." P. 453, "In fact, to allege that the couches were not immersed, is not to decide on the authority of the word used, but in opposition to this authority, to give the lie to the Holy Spirit. Inspiration employs a word to designate purification of the couches which never signifies anything but immerse. If they were not immersed, the historian is a false witness. This way of conferring meaning on words is grounded on infidelity." Again: "When the Holy Spirit employs words whose meanings are not relished, critics do not say that he lies, but they say what is equal to this, that his words mean what they cannot mean. [This is a respectful way of calling him a liar.]"* I had said, Bib. Rep. April, 1840, p. 359,† "The question is not: Will we believe that the couches were immersed, *if the Holy Ghost says so*, but this, *Has he said so?*" and I decided that he has not. This, according to Dr. Carson, is a respectful way of calling him a liar. Now, in reply to all this, I totally deny Dr. Carson's whole ground work, in general, and in particular—in the whole, and in all its parts. There is no such testimony of the word βαπτίζω, as he alleges. Is is all a mere fiction of Dr. Carson's, sustained by no evidence but his own unproved assertion. It is a mere dream. Does Dr. Carson allege passages in which the meaning immerse clearly occurs? I do not deny the meaning in those cases: in other cases I do deny it, and claim that there is satisfactory evidence of another sense. And am I to be answered by such a mere figment as an alleged testimony of the word as to its own use in all cases in the whole language, when in fact all that this testimony amounts to, is Dr. Carson's unproved assertion? And on such grounds as these, am I to be charged with giving the lie to the Holy Spirit? And yet, this is the whole foundation of Dr. Carson's argument against me. His whole logical strength lies here. This mere petitio principii, dressed up in all shapes, and urged with unparalleled assurance, figures from beginning to end of his reply. In this consists its whole heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and life. It has no energy that is not derived from this.

"Such, then, are Mr. Carson's principles—such is his system, and such the mode in which he applies his principles."

In his defence, Dr. Beecher is led to introduce additional testimonies, and even new topics, of much interest. Among these we would point out the whole discussion on clinic baptisms, and the application of the term to acknowledged sprinklings; likewise the beautiful and conclusive passage from Proclus, which we have never before seen quoted, in which he says (in

* This sentence is omitted in the last edition of Dr. Carson's reply to me.

† See § 14.

the person of John the Baptist,) "How shall I, who am under sentence of condemnation, purify, i. e. acquit my judge?" πῶς βαπτίσω τὸν κριτὴν ὁ ἰπεύθυνος. Let any one try the rendering, "How shall I immerse my judge?" The general argument is also strengthened by various new considerations. For instance, there is no resemblance between the operations of the Holy Spirit and immersion. The Holy Spirit illuminates and purifies. "Immersion as such does neither. It signifies mode, and nothing else—and it may pollute as well as purify." Dr. Carson is driven to say that the baptism of the spirit "denotes excess, and nothing but excess." Dr. Carson asks, "Is not the resemblance in the effects?" Dr. Beecher answers, "No: the effects of the agency of the Holy Spirit in his work, are to illuminate and purify. The effects of immersion as such are nothing definite. The effects of immersion in dye, are to colour, in filthy water to pollute, in clean water to purify." No wonder Dr. Carson finds it necessary to take the extreme position: "The immersion of the whole body is essential to baptism, *not because nothing but immersion can purify*, but because immersion is the thing commanded, and because that, without immersion, there is no emblem of death, burial, &c." And he admits that "if mere purification were designated by baptism, *sprinkling* or *pouring* might have been used as well as *immersion*." Nothing could better show the value of the position taken by Catholic Christians, against immersionists.

But we must leave this interesting volume, with a renewal of our declaration, that we regard it as one of the most valuable contributions of our day to the literature of this controversy. Such we believe it to be, even for those who may dissent from many of its conclusions, or be slow to admit its main proposition. From the necessity of the case, the form of the work lacks unity; as the author was constrained to meet Dr. Carson in his successive attacks, and thus to go several times over the same ground. It would be an acceptable work, if Dr. Beecher, neglecting the particular treatises in reply, would digest the whole matter of these several works (for such they really are) into a single conspectus of the subject.

The work of Professor Wilson next demands our notice. The author is Professor of Sacred Literature for the General Assembly, in the Royal College of Belfast. His treatise indi-

cates his claim to the title of a learned divine and able controvertist. Without going so much into the minute philological inquiries as Dr. Beecher, to whose preceding labours he is however much indebted, he is much warmer and more popular in his mode of presenting the subject; avoids the complicated and distasteful divisions and subdivisions of his fellow-labourer; and is not only often entertaining in a high degree, but sometimes eloquent. His plan includes both the Mode and the Subjects of Baptism; but it is to the former that our attention shall be principally directed.

In the first ten chapters, Professor Wilson is engaged in settling the meanings of βάπτω and βαπτίζω. Admitting that the relation of βάπτω to the religious ordinance is indirect and remote, he regards it as important, and with a most ungentle hand, takes to pieces the Baptist exposition of Dan. iv. 30, and v. 21, where Nebuchadnezzar's "body was *wet* with the dew of heaven." He shows that the Baptist writers have signally failed in their attempts to confine the original of these passages to a modal application, and above all to the mode of immersion; that the Septuagint renderings do not countenance the doctrine of an exclusively modal sense in the original; since in two of the five instances in which the Chaldee verb occurs, the Greek translator does not render it διπ, but uses a term which, it is admitted on all hands, has no reference whatever to mode; and that Dr. Carson's method of explaining the figure is forced and untenable. From this he passes to the secondary sense of βάπτω, that is, *to dye*. Here Dr. Carson is found opposed to his brethren. Herodotus speaks of "*dyled* or coloured garments," without any specification of mode. Aristotle applies the verb to cases where dipping is out of the question; as when he says: "But *being pressed*, it *dyes* and colours the land." Hippocrates, describing the effect produced by the application of a certain liquid, says—"ἐπειδὴν ἐπιστάζει, ἱμάτια βάπτεται"—"the garments are *dyled* when it *drops upon them*." Not (as Carson pretends) that Hippocrates "employs βάπτω to denote dyeing by *dropping* the dyeing liquid on the thing dyed," but that he employs it to denote dyeing without any reference to mode, except by another verb. As a favourable specimen of Professor Wilson's lively style and searching exegesis, we insert his commentary on the never-to-be-forgotten death of Crambophagus:

“In the *Batrachomyomachia*, the *Battle of Frogs and Mice*, a mock-heroic poem, falsely ascribed to Homer, depicting the sad fate of one of the champions, called Crambophagus, who fell mortally wounded, the poet says—v. 218—

Κάδδ' ἔπεσ' οὐδ' ἀνένευσεν ἐβάπττετο δ' ἄματι λίμνη—

Not to dwell on the trifling circumstance that Dr. Carson mistakes both the name and genus of the fallen combatant, this passage affords occasion for advertng to the somewhat curious history of what may be styled a traditi-
 onary mistranslation. So far as we have been able to trace the genealogy of the blunder, it originated with Dr. Gale,—no very uncommon event in the life of that learned author—and it has since been honoured by the patronage of scholars, who greatly excelled the doctor, if not in the extent of their literary attainments. at least in their character for acuteness, and general critical ability. Gale renders the passage thus;—‘He *breathless* fell, and the lake was tinged with blood.’ Whether the correctness of this rendering was challenged from the days of its author, till the appearance of Dr. Carson’s treatise on Baptism, we are not aware; but in that publication it was slightly modified, as follows:—‘He fell, *and breathed no more*, and the lake was tinged with his blood.’ The next leading name in countenancing this singular version, is that of Dr. Halley, whose renderings generally evince the accuracy of sound scholarship; and who, in regard to βαπτίζω, has publicly brought against Carson the charge of ‘following Dr. Gale with good heart through mistranslations as well as correct versions.’ Yet, with all his known talent and acquirements, he has adopted in substance the version, and in terms the mistake of Dr. Carson. Here are the words:—‘He fell, *and breathed no more*, and the lake was *baptized* with his blood.’ The substitution by this author of *baptized* for *tinged*, which is the reading in the version of his predecessors, will not be considered an improved rendering of the verb ἐβάπττετο.

“Now the blunder which disfigures the works of these learned authors, and which has been handed down by tradition from the great ancestor of modern Immersionists, consists in absolutely mistaking one Greek verb for another. The act of *breathing* they all understand to be expressed by a term which has no more connection with breathing than it has with walking or flying. Not a syllable is uttered by the writer of the mock-heroic poem, respecting the *respiration* of his little, cold-blooded hero; and, indeed, the true nature of the case, had it been known to such a man as Dr. Carson, might well have abated the nuisance of his sarcasm, and disposed him in view of his own fallibility, to extend a measure of indulgence to the ignorance and mistakes of weak brethren.

“The attempt of Professor Stuart, to translate this formidable Greek sentence, cannot be regarded as much more successful. His version runs thus:—‘He fell, *without even looking upwards*, and the lake was tinged with his blood.’ There is at least something novel in this translation, but the *new*, we apprehend, is not *true*. Whether it is a common practice with frogs, when mortally wounded, to *look upwards*, before they expire,

my acquaintance with natural history does not enable me to determine; and I am equally at a loss to discover how an author, of Stuart's varied and exact scholarship, could present such a specimen of his acquaintance with Greek literature. The upward look of a dying frog would be a study for a painter!

"We are prepared to exhibit, in contrast with these mistranslations, the correct rendering of the passage. The verb is ἀνένευσε, which Gale, Carson, and their followers, evidently mistook for ἀνέπνευσε, and Stuart referred to the root νέω, while in reality it is compounded of ἀνά *up*, and νέω *to swim*: and thus plainly signifies to *swim up, rise to the surface*. Accordingly, the true meaning of the original becomes equally manifest and natural,—'He fell, *and rose no more*, and the lake was tinged with blood;' or, as the poet Cowper has expressed with equal elegance and fidelity to the Greek—

'So fell Crambophagus; and from that fall
Never arose, but reddening with his blood
The wave, and wallowing,' &c.

Even in this decisive example Dr. Gale still contends, in defiance of the established principles both of literal and figurative interpretation, that βάπτω retains at least hyperbolically the modal sense of immersion. This untenable view is met by Carson with unsparing and indignant exposure. 'What a monstrous paradox in Rhetoric,' he exclaims, 'is the figuring of the dipping of a lake in the blood of a mouse!'—[Frog, he should have said.] 'Never was there such a figure. The lake is not said to be *dipped in* the blood, but *dyed with* the blood.'

In Ezekiel xxiii. 15, the "images of the Chaldeans, portrayed with vermillion," are represented as "exceeding in *dyed attire*—παράβαπτά—upon their heads: "βάμμα is so used in Judges v. 30; (according to Brenton's version of the lxx.) "there are spoils of dyed garments for Sisera, spoils of various dyed garments, dyed embroidered garments." In the Syriac and Ethiopic versions of Rev. xix. 13, it is remarkable that the "vesture dipped in blood"—βεβαμμένον—is rendered by terms which signify to *sprinkle*; and it is still more remarkable that Origen, citing the verse from the Greek text of his day, employs ἐξέβαπτισμένον. This, however, is not urged as in favour of the modal sense of sprinkling.

A convincing argument is next derived from the fact that this secondary meaning has wrought itself into the structure and very syntax of the language. The argument is Dr. Halley's. Not only is the verb used for dyeing, but the construction is so varied as to make, not the thing coloured, but the colour itself, the object of the verb; as when we say "he dyes blue."

The argument from the derivatives of βάπτω, has long been familiar to us, and has been presented in our pages. It might have been set forth more extensively in this work, with an increase of strength for the general argument. "Dr. Carson introduces as immediate derivatives from βάπτω, the terms βάπτισις, ἀβάπτιστος, and ἀβάπτιστον, all of which the acquaintance of a school-boy with the elements of Greek etymology will enable him to trace, not to that verb, but to its descendant βαπτίζω. Such points are doubtless minute, and may not affect essentially the great questions of the baptismal discussion; yet they supply the best weapons for cutting the sinews of a contemptuous dogmatism, and routing from the field all abusive, perhaps unfounded assumptions of superior scholarship."

The chastisement of Dr. Carson, and his American endorsers and flatterers, as administered in the close of the fifth chapter, is as heavy as it is condign: but we must hasten to the examination of the principal term, βαπτίζω. Professor Wilson enters largely into the relation of the two verbs; their difference in meaning; the question whether the second is a diminutive, frequentative, causative, or continuative: points which attract but little of Dr. Beecher's attention, and from which Professor Wilson himself derives only the conclusion that the sense of the verb is to be derived, not from its form, but from the *usus loquendi*. Some principles are laid down which deserve rehearsal. First, the meaning of βαπτίζω, or of any other word, in the very early literature of Greece, is of subordinate moment in determining its New Testament use. Secondly, the verb has not necessarily the same specific meaning in the Hellenistic Greek of profane authors, and in the language of the New Testament: the word λόγος is a remarkable instance. Dr. Carson, among his unexampled boastings, has asserted it to be his own practice, in tracing the evidence for *mode*, to begin with the classics, and end with the hour of the institution. When we come to make an enumeration of the authorities which he has produced, we find that they "amount to *fourteen*, of which, startling as must be the announcement, no fewer than *seven* lie beyond the prescribed boundary!" Thirdly, the author holds the testimony of the Fathers, and of later writers generally, as to the meaning of βαπτίζω, to be exceedingly valuable. Acquaintance with the Greek Fathers enables the student

of Scripture to understand and appreciate more fully the style of the New Testament; and when they make indirect allusions to the sense of the term, (as when it does not apply to the sacrament,) we may justly ascribe much value to this testimony; especially as it often runs counter to the formalities of mode already prevalent in the church. These principles are laid down to fix the chronological boundaries of the evidence to be produced.

The whole remainder of Professor Wilson's work, so far as the mode is concerned, is taken up with evidence as to the meaning of βαπτίζω. He begins with the classics, and proceeds to Josephus, the Septuagint, and the Apocrypha, preparatory to an examination of the New Testament. With the same view he discusses λούω and its related nouns, and discloses the modes of bathing usual in Greece and Egypt. He goes more fully into the New Testament evidence, including an inquiry into Jewish proselyte baptism, and the washings of the Pharisees. In all this extensive and learned investigation, that which we most desiderate is any one clear, categorical assertion of the meaning to be made out: we are left to gather it from the analysis. In this particular, we are bound to say, Dr. Beecher possesses a decided advantage: he never leaves us in any doubt as to the precise point to be established. It will not be expected that we should follow Mr. Wilson through all the paths of his learned labour. We intend, however, to glean after him for some handfuls which our readers may enjoy.

The assertion of Dr. Carson, repeated usque ad nauseam, is that βαπτίζω means to dip, and nothing but to dip. This is here shown to be utterly incapable of proof from the classics; where the term is applied indiscriminately to the immersion of an object in the baptizing substance, and to the bringing of the baptizing substance on or around an object. Thus, as Professor Wilson says, the hand of a dying warrior is baptized when it is dipped into blood; cattle are baptized when the overflowing of the river overtakes and destroys them; and the sea-coast is baptized when the full tide pours in upon it the periodical inundation. In doing this, he shows how often Baptist authors shrink from translating βαπτίζω *dip*, just as they deny all their own principles by not calling themselves Dippers. It is a remarkable fact, stated by Professor Wilson after Dr. Halley, that

Hippocrates has employed βάπτω about *one hundred and fifty times* to denote the modal ΔΙΠ, and its derivative βαπτίζω for the same specific purpose only once, if, indeed, that one occurrence belongs to the genuine text.

The following paragraph explains itself. It relates to a *Life of Homer*, attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus :

“In the Sixteenth Book of the Iliad, v. 333, the poet says of Ajax slaying Cleobulus,—“He struck him on the neck with his hilted sword, and the whole sword was warmed with blood”—Πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι. On the latter clause of the sentence Dionysius remarks :—“In this he expresses greater emphasis, ὡς βαπτίσθεντος οὐ τῷ τῶν ξίφους ὡς τε θερμάνθηται,—as the sword being so baptized as to be even warmed.”—*Vit. Hom.* 297. Dr. Carson has borrowed from Dr. Gale the following translation of this passage :—“In that phrase, Homer expresses himself with the greatest energy, signifying that the sword was so dipped in blood, that it was even heated by it.” Dr. Halley is indignant at this laxity of paraphrase, as an utter misrepresentation of the sentiment of Dionysius. “Will it,” he asks, “be credited, that there is not a word about dipping in blood in the original? Dr. Carson says, that one of his opponents is as guilty of forgery, as if he appended a cipher to a one-pound note. I do not say his version is a forgery, because I dare not say it is wilful; but I do say it is a falsehood. * * * Dionysius says that the sword was so baptized; and the obvious inference is, with blood, To introduce the words ‘dipped in blood,’ on the authority of Dionysius, is as scandalous a misrepresentation (truth compels me to use this language) as I have ever detected, where such things are too common, in polemical theology. I ask again, is Dr. Carson to be trusted without his authorities? In instances like this, his refutation would be to print the original on the same page as the translation.”—p. 478.

In weighing the evidence from the Septuagint and Apocrypha, the author finds occasion to introduce a learned and highly interesting excursus on the word Λούω, of which Dr. Carson had asserted that it always, unless with a regimen in the context, involves bathing of the whole body. This is effectually disproved by Professor Wilson; and in the process of doing so, he presents some valuable information as to ancient baths. There is no proof that immersion was common in Greek bathing.

“In the excellent *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, published some years since, under the able superintendence of Dr. W. Smith,—a work practically illustrating the advantages of division of labour,—the article on *Baths* presents us with the following clear and important statement respecting the mode of using the ἀσαμίνθος,—“It would appear, from the description of the bath administered to Ulysses in the palace of Circe,

that this vessel *did not contain water itself*, but was only used for the bather to sit in, while the warm water was poured over him, which was heated in a large cauldron or tripod, under which the fire was placod, and when sufficiently warmed, was taken out in other vessels, and poured over the head and shoulders of the person who sat in the ἀσαμίνθος." From this pregnant instance the advocate for dipping may learn an instructive lesson. It is no proof of immersion, that a party is represented as going into the bath, and coming out of the bath. In the case of Ulysses, the descent and ascent are both distinctly recorded; while the author expressly informs us that the ablution was performed by pouring or affusion, and not by immersion"

"In the *Dictionary of Antiquities*, already quoted, it is broadly asserted, that so far as this important class of witnesses is concerned, not even a solitary testimony has been discovered, tending to identify the ancient mode of bathing, with that which is so generally prevalent in our own times. We extract the words:—'On ancient vases, on which persons are represented bathing, we never find any thing corresponding to a modern bath, in which persons can stand or sit; but there is always a round or oval basin, (λουτήρ or λουτήριον,) resting on a stand, (ὑποστατον,) by the side of which those who are bathing, are represented standing undressed, and washing themselves."

"The common practice in Greece is incidentally, though very strikingly, referred to by Plutarch, in his Ethical Treatise against Colotes. After stating that you may see some persons using the warm bath, others the cold, he adds,—Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ψυχρὸν, οἱ δὲ θερμὸν ἐπιβάλλειν κελευούσι,— "For some give orders to apply it cold, others hot." The force of ἐπιβάλλειν strongly corroborates the views which we advocate, and indeed constitutes an independent attestation. It appears to be borrowed from the ordinary mode of administering the bath, by pouring water upon the person. The prevailing practice has become as it were ingrained in the Greek language; and, accordingly, the term employed by Plutarch instantly calls up before our minds a lively portraiture of the παραχύσεως, dashing or pouring the water upon the parties who surrounded the λουτήρ. The value of this testimony is greatly enhanced by its exact correspondence with the representations on the Greek vases, thus supplying one of those undesigned coincidences, which carry conviction to the candid mind, in a manner equally pleasing and impressive."

The New Testament evidence is the most important, and accordingly occupies by far the largest space. It is arranged under five classes, viz: "I. Occurrences of βαπτίζω, and its derivatives, which do not apply to the ordinance of Christian baptism. II. Occurrences in which these terms denote 'the baptism of John' or of Jesus, and the intimately related baptism with the Holy Spirit. III. Figurative applications, including strictures on the principles and reasonings of leading Baptists;

writers, in the interpretation of such passages as 1 Cor. x. 1, 2; and 1 Peter iii. 21, 22. IV. Refutation of some of the principal objections of the Immersionists. V. Subordination of mere mode to the spirit and substance of the ordinance, as indicated by the expression, 'baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

As to the tabernacle rites, it is alleged, after Godwin, "that no terms which any Hebrew scholar will pretend had the signification of dipping, are ever used, in reference to the ceremonial purifications of the person." Yet these are the "divers baptisms" of our Baptist friends. As to the baptism of cups and couches, and the like, it is well maintained by us, that immersion is in the highest degree improbable. Lightfoot maintains that the baptism of couches was by sprinkling, and the term is identified with simple washing in the Syriac version and by the leading Orientalists and commentators. "Dr. Carson must have the couches dipped; and he will take them to pieces, if requisite, rather than permit any part to escape the plunge bath. When Origen refers to Elijah, commanding his attendants to *baptize* the altar, if the historical reference had perished, we doubt not that our Baptist polemics would have made out a case for immersion, altogether satisfactory to themselves. But we know, and Origen knew, that *the baptism consisted in pouring water upon the altar.*" In regard to the place in Luke xi. 38, Dr. Campbell translates thus: "But the Pharisee was surprised to observe that *he used no washing* before dinner." Gale and Carson here disagree; the former confines baptism to the hands of our Saviour, the latter of course claiming that the Pharisee expected his guests to dip the whole body. Dr. Wall charges Dr. Gale with "giving up all the cause at once." Josephus relates that the Essenes bathed themselves in cold water before dinner. Josephus was a Pharisee: and had immersion formed part of the ritual, especially of Pharisees, he would scarcely have named it as the peculiarity of a small sect. The evangelist's meaning, urges Carson, is plain. "With all its alleged plainness," replies Wilson, "the two greatest champions of Baptist views, Gale and Carson, cannot agree about the ablution which the Pharisee expected our Saviour to perform."

The Baptism with the Holy Ghost is ably treated by Mr. Wilson. "Jesus shall baptize you," his forerunner had said,

“with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” We have the fulfilment of this, from the pen of inspiration, and are thus enabled to ascertain whether baptism with the spirit exemplifies immersion. Upon the record of this fulfilment our author finds the following proposition: “*That on the day of Pentecost, there was baptism, but no immersion.*” Dr. Carson affirms explicitly, that “on the day of Pentecost, there was a real baptism in the emblems of the spirit.” “The disciples,” he further informs us, “were literally covered with the *appearance* of wind and fire.” He tells of “the wind descending to fill the house that the disciples might be baptized in it.” “They were surrounded by the wind, and covered by the fire above, they were, therefore, buried in wind and fire.” Professor Wilson rejoins: “Only think of a man *covered* with the *appearance* of wind! Is there a particle of meaning in the language? But this does not form our main objection. When Dr. Carson represents the wind as descending to fill the house, apart altogether from the philosophy of the case, we would gladly learn the Scripture authority for such representation. Does the Bible state that the house was filled with wind? Is the sacred writer responsible for the airy *baptisterium*, which immersionist genius has constructed?” Dr. Carson says “their baptism consisted in being totally surrounded with the wind, not *in the manner* in which the wind came.” To which Professor Wilson replies: “If language have meaning, here is a baptism without regard to *manner* or *mode*, and admitted to be so by an author whose fundamental position is, that ‘*βαπτίζω* never expresses *any thing but mode!*’” Every one, as the author justly observes, feels that there is a marked difference between dipping in water, and baptizing with water. Again, to baptize with water is both sense and grammar; to dip with water would be regarded as barbarous or unmeaning. Yet we need only mark the forms, ‘I baptize with the spirit,’ and ‘I baptize with water:’ to be convinced that the word is employed with a latitude of meaning which forbids us to force the sense of dipping on a reluctant construction.

The train of arguments from the instances of N. T. baptisms, considered in their circumstances, is well presented. “Convinced as we are” says he “that the verb is employed again and again, where there is *no dipping* and *no possibility* of *dipping*, we distinctly maintain not only that circumstantial evi-

dence is admissible, but that it cannot be lawfully refused." The places, the circumstances, and the numbers are here brought into view. Why go to Jordan, they triumphantly demand, unless immersion were necessary? Why was the blind man, we ask in turn, sent to the pool of Siloam to wash? Was so large a collection of water needed for his eyes? "The argument for immersion founded on the *places*, has always appeared to us to be feebleness personified. Yet that Baptists do allege this consideration in their own favour is unquestionable. How stand the facts of Scripture history? Out of nine or ten localities specified in the New Testament, as the scenes of the administration of baptism, *only two, Aenon and the Jordan, possessed a liberal supply of water.* This fact will be found to grow in importance, the more it is pondered, especially in connection with the efforts of Baptist writers to turn it to the account of immersion. Had the Scripture instances uniformly associated the ordinance with "much water," or had this condition been realized in the majority of cases, their argument would have been plausible, if not convincing. But the divine record presents the reverse of all this. *Much water is the exception, little water the rule.* The ordinance could indeed be administered in the river Jordan, and at the many streams of Aenon; but so simple was the rite, that its performance appears to have been equally convenient in a private house, a prison, or a desert. If, then, the volume of the Jordan is requisite to pour vigour into the Baptist argument for immersion, how sapless and feeble must that argument become, when its nutriment is drawn from the stinted supply of a prison, or the thirsty soil of a wilderness? The very stress laid on the small minority of instances apparently favourable to immersion, certifies for the strength of the opposing view, which claims for its basis the decided and overwhelming majority." A happy argument is presented in regard to another oft-contested passage:

"The next passage claiming our attention is 1 Peter iii. 20, 21, in which the sacred writer, referring to Noah's ark, says,—“Wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water. The like figure, whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” In the original, baptism is styled the *ἀντίτυπος*, corresponding in its effects to the preservation of Noah and his family, which thus occupies

by implication the place of the τύπος or type. How is immersion to be extracted from this language? Does the passage contemplate any resemblance whatever between the *mode* of Noah's preservation by water, and the mode of Christian baptism with water? In the sacred records generally, is the relation between type and antitype of a character so clear and definite, that in regard to the particular example before us, the actions to which these terms are respectively applied, do necessarily exhibit *modal* correspondence? Ho must be a bold expositor who will undertake to found the supposed necessity upon the *usus loquendi*, as ascertained by the most extensive induction: and if there is no general principle to rule the case, it simply remains for the interpreter to ascertain the meaning, under the guidance of the ordinary laws of exegesis.

“That the safety extended to Noah and his family by water, typified the salvation of the Christian by the baptism of the text, is evidently the substance of the Apostolic statement. In both instances, there is deliverance, and both employ the instrumentality of water. These are indisputable points of resemblance; and they abundantly warrant the application of the terms type and antitype. Our opponents, however, are strong for *modal* similarity. “What!” exclaims Dr. Carson, “Noah not immersed, when buried in the waters of the flood? Are there no bounds to perverseness?” Such sentiments are singularly extravagant, as well as unfounded. The fancy of a modern may dip Noah in the waters of the deluge;—it may paint his immersion and burial, as the ark floated gallantly on a shoreless ocean. Very different is the picture presented in God's word. The Apostle speaks of Noah as *saved by water, not immersed in water*. There was burial, indeed, and there was immersion, but not for Noah and his family. Noah and his family formed the merciful and solitary exceptions to the immersion and burial of the antediluvian world. Had the Apostle traced an analogy between baptism and the drowning of the ungodly, with what triumph our opponents would have founded upon that analogy their doctrine of exclusive immersion. But when baptism takes for its type, not the destruction of mankind at large, but the safety of Noah, then are they forced to help themselves out of a difficulty, by recourse to figures and fancies designed to meet the exigency of the case. Where do the Scriptures speak of Noah's immersion in water? Nowhere. The patriarch was saved by water—not by immersion in water, but by a divinely appointed means for preventing his immersion. Besides, had mode been prominent before the mind of the Apostle, in his reference to the flood, and to Christian baptism, we should have expected mode to influence his subjoined explanatory statement. When, for instance, he speaks of *baptism now saving us*, had mode stood as high with him as it does with our opponents, he would have necessarily added, “Not the dipping into water,” &c.—Whereas his exegetical words are, “Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,” thus evincing, in the clearest manner, that his whole train of association in the passage contemplated merely the cleansing properties of water, as symbolizing spiritual purification.”

The twelfth chapter, upon the evidence from the Fathers, is meagre compared with the elaborate discussion of the same topic by Dr. Beecher. These two able writers, while they succeed in demolishing the argument of Dr. Carson, are not agreed as to the precise ecclesiastical import of the term βαπτίζω. While Professor Wilson argues against a modal signification, in opposition to Carson, he seems to us to argue for a modal signification, in opposition to Beecher. We have already mentioned his singular reserve, in assigning the one fixed meaning of the word. We should probably not misrepresent him, if we said it was to *wash*; though he favours the admission of an original reference to the idea of *overwhelming*. He maintains with earnestness that circumfusions, pourings and sprinklings were all baptisms. In regard to the fundamental proposition of Dr. Beecher, namely, that in religious and ecclesiastical use, to baptize is to purify, he rejects it utterly. Without entering upon this controversy as umpires, we cannot but express our judgment, that Professor Wilson has devoted too little space in his large and able volume, to the argument of Dr. Beecher, whose eminent standing, in regard to the philology of this question, might claim for him a less summary treatment. We shall however quote what Professor Wilson says on this point, awaiting the further settlement of the controversy between them.

“We are able to produce what we conceive to be decisive instances of the use of βαπτίζω, where there is and can be no immersion; but never, even in a solitary instance, have we encountered it in the sense of purification. That meaning, as it appears to us, cannot be extracted from the verb, without recourse to questionable analogies and reasonings, which betray a larger measure of theological ingenuity than of philological acumen. The case on behalf of purification, we think, therefore, might be equitably disposed of by the Scottish verdict of ‘not proven,’—thus leaving the way perfectly open for the reception of any new evidence, which its advocates may have it in their power to bring forward. That their writings contain some striking illustrations, of the sense for which they contend, is freely admitted; but we are not aware that they have hitherto succeeded in *proving*, by clear examples, the existence of that sense, and thus constructing a legitimate basis for their illustrations.

“We have been led to view the question in a considerably different light. Purification, in our judgment, is not baptism; though it may be, and often is, the immediate result of baptism. A contrary result, however, far from being impracticable, we find occasionally exemplified, as in *Aquila's* translation of

Job x. 31, Ἐν διαφθορᾷ βαπτίζεις με, 'Thou baptizest me in corruption.' One such instance, even apart from the obvious nature of the case, proves that the result will be defilement or purification, according to the character of the baptizing element. Consequently, if we would avoid the absurdity of attaching opposite meanings to the same term, we must employ the verb to denote simply the *process*, without including the *result*, which is necessarily implied in purification. With this distinction, the usage of the Greek language appears to be strictly harmonious. Whether the baptizing element overwhelms its object, or simply opens to receive it, or presents any other variety of application, a certain process takes, which may issue in great diversity of result, the result to be collected from the context or the general circumstances of each occurrence. Now, the question arising on the passage before us is, What process did the writer design to indicate by the expression, *baptism from a dead body*? If we rest the answer on the historical basis furnished in the book of Numbers, we should say that sprinkling and bathing were combined in this ceremonial baptism. As this answer, however, may be misunderstood, it is requisite to add a word of explanation. The baptism, then, we observe, may include the entire cleansing process enjoined in the Mosaic law, without involving the false principle that the verb *denotes* the two distinct acts of sprinkling and bathing. Such a double sense would be utterly incompatible with the universally admitted laws of language. On the condition already specified, the verb must refer generically to the process of applying water for the purpose of cleansing, while the details of the process demand the use of other terms, by which they may be appropriately designated. The man is baptized from a dead body,—that is, water is employed for his cleansing; but the mere baptism does not inform us of the manner of application. That information we derive from the law, in this case made and provided, which exhibits the process in detail. And that this ceremonial baptism includes all use of water, which the law demanded, seems manifest from the conclusion of the verse, where the writer asks, 'Of what avail is his washing? The baptism and the washing are not indeed strictly synonymous,—still both comprehend, though under different aspects, the entire process of this ritual cleansing. This view is sustained by the judgment of Schleusner, in his Lexicon of the Septuagint, who renders the words—βαπτίζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ,—*qui abluit se a mortuo*: and also by Robinson: and what is of more importance, the construction, and all the circumstances, historical and ceremonial, are favourable to it, while the opposing evidence consists in the pertinacious assertion of the exclusively modal sense of βαπτίζω."

This is not in our view an answer to Beecher, nor is it by any means as clear as we could wish. Indeed it may be taken as a specimen of a turgid and roundabout way of writing, which is rhetorical without being eloquent, and which too much prevails among our brethren north of the Tweed. The above cited sentence about Aquila may serve to show how obscure a

plain thing may be made by big and unusual diction. This fault co-exists with great occasional pungency and strength. Before laying down the elegant volume which contains Professor Wilson's labours, we must, notwithstanding our little stricture, express the pleasure with which we have perused it. A more readable, indeed a more delightful work, on a philological topic, we have never opened: it has a flow and *abandon* which remind us of the Bentleys, Warburtons, and Giffords, of a day which has gone by; especially in the castigatory parts where the principal opponent has a little of his own measure meted out to him. This as the author declares is not from any adoption of the *lex talionis*. The awkward and humiliating exposures which are made of more than one author are demanded by the cause of truth; and the tone and temper of sundry Baptist writers appeared to call for sharp animadversion. "If a writer is found constantly arrogating to himself superior scholarship, and vast powers of discrimination, and haughtily denouncing as insanity or nonsense, whatever may cross the path of his own favourite dogmas,—if with an air of learned infallibility he characterizes, as uncritical and illiterate, the production of able and highly educated men, and divines well instructed in the kingdom of God,—does it not become a public duty to turn the lamp upon himself, as he stumbles and falls in the thorny path of Greek syntax?—does it not become indispensable to guard the churches and the world against the blunders which mix themselves up with the *lettered* and oracular announcement of principles and their applications?"

The spirit of our opponents is probably familiarly known by as many of our readers as have ever been involved in this controversy. Dr. Carson, besides exemplifying it in the highest degree, seems to have had the property of inspiring others with it, especially in America. On the 28th of April, 1840, the Baptist American and Foreign Bible Society passed the following resolution: "Resolved, That by the fact that the nations of the earth must now look to the Baptist denomination ALONE for faithful translations of the word of God, a responsibility is imposed upon them, demanding for its full discharge an unwonted degree of union, of devotion, and of strenuous, persevering effort throughout the entire body." Moved by Prof. Eaton, seconded by Rev. H. Malcolm. In their report, they calumniously de-

clare, that the translations of all other denominations are "versions in which the real meaning of the words is *purposely kept out of sight.*" They assert "that the British and Foreign Bible Society and the American Bible Society have virtually contrived to obscure at least part of the divine revelation." And a gentleman named Eaton says, Report, p. 79: "Never, sir, was there a chord struck that vibrated simultaneously through so many Baptist hearts from one extremity of the land to the other, as when it was announced *that the heathen world must look to THEM ALONE for an unveiled view of the glories of the Gospel of Christ.*" "The sad error," says Professor Wilson, "against which this thunder is mainly levelled, consists in the admission of the words *baptism* and *baptize*, instead of *immerse* and *immersion*, into the great majority of translations of the New Testament. Mark the consistency of these men! They charge us with using *baptism*, as the veil of the original, not its vehicle; yet they call themselves *Baptists!* their churches the *Baptist* denomination!! their Bible Society the *Baptist* Bible Society!!! In the name of common sense and consistency, let them purge themselves of this banned term, before they proceed to the purgation of our Bibles. Let them stand before the public as *Dippers*, the *Dipping* denomination, and the *Dipping* Bible Society; and having thus cast the beam out of their own eye, they will bring a clearer vision to the task of pulling the mote out of a brother's eye. We cannot imagine that the meek framers of the resolution intended a reflection on the learning of Pædobaptist Christian communities. In view of the comparative amount and value of their own contributions to the cause of Biblical literature in its various departments, including translations of the Scripture into different languages, it would, we presume, savour more of foolishness than temerity to form so ludicrous an estimate of their own attainments. O, no—they possess too much discretion to place themselves in such an attitude; and we must, therefore, look for some other explanation of their exclusive fitness to supply the nations of the earth with correct versions of the Word of God. How is it that Baptists ALONE are competent to this stupendous undertaking? The reason is, that in their own lowly estimation, Baptists, and none but Baptists, are sufficiently honest and conscientious to translate intelligibly those passages of Scripture which relate to the

baptismal ordinance. It is not pride of learning, but pride of conscience, that prompts them to announce to the world that all except themselves are disqualified for executing *faithful* translations of the Bible."

The same spirit was manifested when Carson's Reply to Beecher appeared. The American Baptist Publication Society say: "We frankly confess, that the more we read on the Baptistal Controversy, the more our charity compels us to struggle against the conviction that forces itself upon us, that on this subject *it is not light* that is most wanted, but *religious honesty*." The italics are theirs, as Dr. Beecher states in making the quotation. The scheme which engenders such is not good. This question of form, as the author last named has said, has proved unfortunate.

"It is injurious to the Baptists, for it has injured them. Among them are eminently pious men, but a bad system has ensnared and betrayed them. How else can we account for it that they should have dared solemnly and formally to arrogate to themselves that they are **DIVINELY AND PECULIARLY SET** for the defence of **THE GOSPEL**, and that the heathen world must look to them alone for an unveiled view of the glories of **THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST**. Has it then come to this? Take away immersion, and is the gospel shorn of all its glories? Yea, is the gospel itself annihilated? Is immersion the gospel? What more can the most bigoted defender of baptismal regeneration and sacramental sanctification say than all this? But do our pious Baptist brethren mean all this? No! a thousand times, no. They know and feel, as well as we, that immersion is not the gospel! These facts only show, what all experience has shown, the danger of holding a system which makes a mere form of so much moment in practice, as to outweigh holiness of heart and of life. In spite of all reasoning and professions to the contrary, it will, as a general fact, concentrate on itself a disproportioned, an unhealthy interest, narrow the range of Christian feeling, chill it and check its expansion, and derange and distort the intellectual perceptions of the mind. Men of uncommon native nobleness of character, as Robert Hall, or men of great piety, may hold these tendencies of the system in check. But multitudes will not. Taught to regard themselves as distinguished from the rest of the Christian world by a form, the spirit of formalism, will have scope. The pernicious idea of divine favouritism, on the ground of forms, will grow up, and this will breed arrogance, censoriousness, exclusion, and the spirit of proselyting in its highest degree. Nor do I speak of tendencies merely; these tendencies are embodied in public official results. How else can we account for it that even evangelical Baptists, not Campbellites or Mormons, but even evangelical Baptists, have dared to arrogate to themselves a peculiar divine appointment to defend and promulgate the gospel of Christ, and

have dared to charge two leading Christian Bible Societies, the American and British and Foreign, as "virtually COMBINING TO OBSCURE a part, at least, of divine revelation," and to say, that in the translation of other denominations, "the real meaning of the words is PURPOSELY kept out of sight?" Is it no injury to pious men to be so ensnared and deluded by a false system, as to say and do such things as these? These are not the promptings of their Christian hearts, for that they have Christian hearts I will not doubt. No; it is the poison, the delusion of a false system that has done this."

ART. IV.—*A Memoir of the Life of James Milnor, D. D., late Rector of St. George's Church, New York.* By the Rev. John S. Stone, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Brooklyn. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau-street, New York. pp. 646. Svo.

THAT incorrigible wit, Sidney Smith, once maintained, among the many facetious paradoxes which have made his name unclerically famous, that it was a great disadvantage to read a book before reviewing it, because it prejudiced the mind! Happily for us, we had read the book at the head of this article before we had any thought of reviewing it, and furthermore we had no inveterate prejudices to be shocked by it. We have found it a very readable and instructive volume, which kept up our interest unflagging to the end; and we think it will amply repay any one who can command the leisure to peruse it. The biographer has executed his task well. Favourably known to the religious community by his *Life of Bishop Griswold*, an evangelical prelate, and by his exposition of the true nature of the Sacraments in his anti-puseyistic work, "*The Mysteries Opened*," he has in this production satisfied all the reasonable expectations of the public. Besides his sympathy with evangelical opinions, a long and intimate acquaintance with Dr. Milnor peculiarly fitted him for his task; and we opine that he was the young student and preacher in whom Dr. Milnor took so parental an interest, and whose correspondence is occasionally given in the Memoir.

It has been the aim of the biographer to let Dr. Milnor tell his own story as much as possible in his own words, supply-