



THE
MODE
OF
CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

THREE SERMONS.

BY ^WGEORGE FOOT, A. M.

PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

IN GREENE, CHENANGO COUNTY, N. Y.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

CANOLL & COOKE, PRINTERS,

BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

1836.



SERMON I.

MARK 1. 9—10.

And it came to pass, in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.

And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon him.

It is frequently asserted that immersion was the primitive mode of baptizing: that John, the forerunner of Christ, baptized in this manner: that the Saviour himself was immersed: that the apostles and the evangelists adopted the same mode: and consequently that this is the mode which the scriptures sanction, and that *nothing else* is baptism. Far be it from me to exhibit my views on this subject for the sake of controversy. But as the doctrine already adverted to is advocated in the hearing of many of you, with all the exclusiveness usually attached to it, it obviously becomes my duty to show you *what the scriptures have said* on this subject, and *what they have not said*. It is of unspeakable importance to you to be able to decide whether there is sufficient evidence in favor of immersion as the exclusive mode of baptism to justify rearing an impassable barrier between the different branches of the church, which shall prevent their communing together at the table of their common Master. Where christians feel themselves bound to receive this ordinance, and do actually receive it, there is no small degree of guilt in those who thrust their brethren, who are admitted to be christians, from the table of Christ, *merely* because they are not agreed with respect to the *mode of its administration*.

There are three sources of error with respect to the mode of baptism.

1. The light in which John's baptism is regarded.
2. The ordinary meaning of the English words *into* and *out of*. The language of the text, and also the fact that Philip and the Eunuch are said to have gone *down into the water* and to have come *up out of the water*, are supposed to teach unde-

niably that there was an immersion in these cases. This, however, is improbable. These two cases, and the baptizing of the multitude by John in Jordan, are the only instances in the Bible in which it is said that any were baptized in a stream, or *went down into the water* for this purpose, or *come up out of the water*.

3. It has been assumed that "to baptize" means to *immerse* in all cases. This also is a mistake.

If it can be proved that these *are* errors, the way will be prepared to show that the Bible affords no evidence that God ever designed immersion to be received as the *exclusive* mode of baptism.

It is very remarkable that neither *immerse*, nor *immersion*, is found in the Bible. Now if the translators understood *immersion* to be the only mode of baptism, it is exceedingly strange that they have never used the word in any case. The word *plunge* is used but once, and that in a case which has no reference to baptism. In this instance "baptizo" to *baptize* is not used.

1. The first point which claims attention is this: What was the nature, and the design of John's baptism? Was it christian baptism, or was it not? The doctrine of immersion is founded mainly on the baptism of Christ by John. If John's baptism was not christian baptism, it is entirely improper to appeal to it as deciding the mode of administration in the christian church. As a rite of the christian church, baptism certainly had no existence before the days of John. "The law and the prophets were *until* John;" (Luke 16. 16.) or the previous dispensation extended to the time of his ministry.

When the priests and Levites inquired of John, "who art thou?" he tells them that he was sent to announce the coming of Christ, and to prepare the way before him. They inquire again, "why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" He answered, "I baptize with water:" I come not to introduce that sacred baptism which belongs to the Christ. He that cometh after me—"he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Compare John 1. 21, 25, 26, and Luke 3. 16. "And I knew him not, but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." John 1. 31. Here then is the explicit avowal of the design of John's baptism. It is that *Christ should be made manifest to Israel*. It is the unqualified declaration of John, therefore, that the baptism of Christ was essentially different from his own: and that the object of the latter was to bear testimony to Christ.

But how, you will inquire, did the baptism of John manifest Christ to Israel? From Mark 1. 5. you learn that there went out unto John "all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem; and were *all baptized* of him in the river of Jordan." At the same time, Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee and was baptized by him in Jordan. And the heavens were opened, and the Spirit like a dove descended upon him. And there came "a voice from heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Matt. 3. 17. As the people were expecting some stupendous event, "and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ, or not," (Luke 3. 15.) thousands, and perhaps millions, gathered about him. While anxiety with respect to the appearing of Christ was universally awakened, the Saviour came and was baptized: the Spirit descended like a dove upon him, and a voice from heaven proclaimed him the Son of God. God had taught John to expect this event; for, previous to this period, he had no personal knowledge of Christ; but here he is divinely designated as the promised deliverer. "*And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God.*" John 1. 33, 34. You perceive then how John's baptism manifested him to Israel. In the presence of all this multitude, congregated from all the land of Judea and from Jerusalem and from all the region round about the Jordan; did John announce him as the Messiah; the Spirit, seen by them, descending upon him, designated him as the Son of God, and the voice from heaven unequivocally declared him so. After this event you hear of John's baptizing in but one instance. You do hear his disciples, solicitous for the waning popularity of their master, tell him that Christ baptizes and all men come to him. John replies that this is the very fact which he had foretold, that Christ would be preferred before him. "He must increase, but I must decrease." But why was it thus, if John's baptism was christian baptism? Hence, the design of John's baptism was *to manifest Christ to Israel, and to prepare the way for his reception.*

2. That John's baptism was not christian baptism is evident from the fact that John baptized unto repentance, enjoining it on those whom he baptized, that they should believe on him who should come after him. They professed a readiness to reform their lives, and to believe in the Messiah when

he came. This is the exposition of the apostle Paul. "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him who should come after him; that is, on Jesus Christ." Acts 19. 4. The celebrated Robert Hall, a Baptist writer, has said, "the baptism of John was the baptism of repentance, or reformation, as a preparation for the approaching kingdom of God. All that he demanded of such as repaired to him, was to declare their conviction that the Messiah was shortly to appear, to repent of their sins, and resolve to frame their lives in a manner agreeable to such an expectation, without requiring a belief in *any existing individual* as the Messiah. They were merely to express their readiness to believe on him who was to come, on the reasonable supposition that his actual appearance would not fail to be accompanied with attestations sufficient to establish his pretensions. The profession required in a candidate for *christian* baptism, involved an historical faith, a belief in a certain individual, an illustrious personage, who had wrought miracles, declared himself the Son of God, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and rose again the third day." (Hall's works, vol 1. p. 294-5.) The faith required in christian baptism, therefore, is essentially different from that required by John.

Those who received John's baptism, therefore, were not believers in Christ. "All Judea and Jerusalem were baptized of him:" yet this very people persecuted the Saviour with unrelenting hatred during the whole period of his ministry; and, at last, crucified him in the streets of Jerusalem. The baptism of John was *not* believers' baptism. Those who received it, were the bitterest enemies that ever pursued the Lamb of God. With *wicked hands*, they crucified the Lord of Glory. And were *these* the men who had believed on his name, and embraced his salvation! Far from it.

If John's baptism was christian baptism, Christ could never have received it. He could not profess repentance, for "*he was without sin.*" For John, a prophet of the Lord, (Matt. 11. 9. and 14. 5.) to have enjoined it on him to repent, would have been a blasphemous reflection on Christ. It would have deceived the people with regard to his true character. Had he required of him that he "*should believe on him who should come,*" the requisition would have opposed his own testimony, and the voice from heaven, which declared Him to be the Son of God. Nor could he require of him this faith, as he did of all others who received his baptism, because he was himself the object of that faith; and to believe, would be nothing more than to

believe on himself, and enter into a solemn pledge ratified by baptism, that he would receive himself when he should come. The baptism which John administered to Christ, therefore, was *essentially different from that which he administered to others*.

You will naturally inquire, if John's baptism was not christian, nor believer's baptism, why did he baptize? The Jews regarded God as a holy Being, and they had been required, on several occasions, to purify, or wash themselves when he was about to appear to them. Thus, when he was about to descend on Sinai, he commanded Moses, "Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them *wash their clothes*, And be ready against the third day: for the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai." Exod. 19. 10, 11. When the priests were consecrated, they were brought to the door of the tabernacle, and washed with water. Exod. 29. 4. Whenever they approached the altar to minister, or entered the tabernacle, they were required to wash their hands and feet at the door, lest they die. Exod. 30. 20. The baptism of John was a ceremonial purification of the people preparatory to their reception of the Messiah and his doctrines, and also the seal of their pledge to believe on him. This was the reason why the Jews received it. Christ received it *as man* to fulfil the righteousness of the law, as the preparatory step to his entrance on the office of a priest which he came to fill: as the priests, the types of himself, were washed at the door of the tabernacle.

3. That John's baptism was not christian baptism, is evident from the fact that John did not baptize *in the name of the Trinity, nor even of Christ*. He "baptized *unto repentance*, saying unto the people that they *should believe on him who should come after him*." When Paul inquired of some who had received John's baptism, "have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" They answered, "we have *not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost*." Strange christians these, who had been baptized, and had not even heard of the existence of the Holy Ghost!! Paul, after explaining to them the nature of John's baptism, *baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus*. Acts, 19. 1—5. Here, then, is undeniable evidence that they were not baptized in the name of the Trinity, nor even of Christ; and, consequently, that John's baptism was not christian baptism.

4. The same truth is proved by the fact that Paul *baptized again* some who had received John's baptism. You find the history of this event in the 19th chapter of Acts. Paul found

at Ephesus certain disciples and "said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism." It is evident, then, that they had previously been baptized with John's baptism. "Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. And when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Here, then, they were baptized again by Paul. "And when Paul laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them." Some eminent Baptist writers have said, that Paul did not baptize them; he merely laid his hands on them, and imparted to them the Holy Ghost. This is a direct denial of the language of the Bible: "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Besides: it is virtually asserting that *Baptizo*, which is said *always* to mean "to immerse," means, in this case, nothing more than to lay on the hands, without any use of water in any manner whatever. The advocates of immersion can choose which difficulty they please. Either they were baptized again, or they were not. If they were, then men who had previously received John's baptism, were baptized again by Paul, and therefore, in the opinion of the apostle Paul, John's baptism was not christian baptism. If they were not, then it is conceded that *baptizo*, instead of meaning to immerse, in all cases, here means nothing more than to lay on the hands, without any use of water at all.

5. Baptists assert that baptism, even by immersion, is not christian baptism, unless administered by one who has himself been previously immersed: will they tell us who immersed John? There is not a particle of evidence that John was ever baptized at all. His baptism, then, according to their own principles, was not christian baptism; and this radical error extends throughout all the baptisms of their church from the period of its organization to the present day.*

* Rev. Roger Williams established the first Baptist church in America, at Providencè (R. I.) in 1639. Mr. Williams had been Pastor of the church in Salem, Mass. Mr. Ezekiel Holyman was a deacon of the same church. When the church in Providence was organized, Ezekiel Holyman re-baptized Mr. Williams. Then Mr. Williams re-baptized Ezekiel Holyman and ten others. This is the origin of the Baptist church in America, and, of course, of its baptisms. See Morton's Memorial of New England, Winthrop's Journal, and Backus' Church History.

6. Our final argument on this point is this: Christian baptism was not instituted *till after the resurrection of Christ*. The final charge of Christ to his disciples before his ascension, was, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Here is the institution of christian baptism in the name of the Trinity. The Holy Ghost was not *yet* given. They were commanded to tarry at Jerusalem until they should "receive the promise of the Father; which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized *with the Holy Ghost*, not many days hence." Acts 1. 4, 5. You perceive that this command suspends all further public duties, until the Spirit was poured upon them. "Ye shall receive power *after that* the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Acts 1. 8. Here, then, is their commission. But they are not to preach even in Jerusalem, nor to baptize, nor perform any public duty until the Holy Ghost descend.

It is evident, therefore, that John's baptism was not christian baptism, because he tells us himself that its object was to manifest Christ to Israel; it was a baptism unto repentance enjoining faith in a Messiah to come, in which the Saviour could never participate. John did not baptize in the name of the Trinity, nor even in the name of Christ. Paul baptized again some who had previously received John's baptism; and finally, christian baptism was not instituted till the ascension of Christ, and never administered till the day of Pentecost.

The baptism of Christ by John, then, goes not a step to settle the mode of baptism in the christian church, and ought not to have the remotest influence on its practice in the present day.

Although the text tells you that Christ was baptized of John in Jordan, the various usage of the words *in* and *baptize*, in the original, is such as to forbid the supposition that there was any immersion in the case. If the preposition has any other meaning, it *may* have that other meaning in the text. If *baptizo*, the Greek word translated "to baptize," does not always mean *to immerse*, it *may not* have that meaning in the text. We shall now shew how *baptizo* is used in the scriptures. The expressions "in Jordan," and "out of the water," will be examined in their proper place. In examining this subject, I appeal to the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, in the Greek language, because it was made by seventy-two Grecian Jews, who understood both the Hebrew

and the Greek. It was made nearly three hundred years before Christ, and, of course, before any controversy existed respecting baptism in the christian church. The manner in which these translators employ terms, must, therefore, have great weight in the present investigation. In seventeen instances in which the verb dip is used in the Old Testament, *baptizo* is thus translated but once. Naaman "went down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan." 2. Kings 5. 14. Here *baptizo* is translated dipped. This is the only instance. In the New Testament dip is used six times; but in none of these instances is *baptizo* used. You will now recollect that the words immerse and immersion are not in the Bible. Plunge is used but once; yet it is not *baptizo* that is thus translated. Dip is used twenty-three times, and in all these cases the verb *baptizo* is thus translated but once. It is never translated "to dip" in the New Testament. These facts alone are sufficient to show that the sacred writers never designed to use *baptizo* to signify uniformly to plunge, dip, or immerse. The Bible has never given it either of these meanings, except in a solitary case. How then can we honestly conclude that it means to immerse in all cases, when the Bible *never* gives it this meaning? How can we conclude that it means to plunge, when in the only instance in which plunge is used in the Bible, it is another word, and *not baptizo*, that is thus translated? How can we conclude that it means to dip, when in twenty-three instances in which dip is used, the word *baptizo* is used in this sense but *once*; and is *never* so used in the New Testament? How happens it that in the New Testament another word is employed to express dipping, in every instance? Now, if *baptizo* was understood by the apostles to mean *to dip*, why have they never employed it in this sense, when they had occasion to speak of dipping? Why do they always employ another word to express it? So exceedingly perplexing are these and similar facts to the advocates of immersion, that Dr. Judson has translated *baptizo*, "*to immerse*," in all cases, in the Bible which he has lately prepared in the Burman language, thus claiming the sanction of divine revelation in behalf of their *exclusive* doctrine of immersion; and intelligent Baptists are beginning to withdraw their support from the Bible Society because it refuses to grant aid in printing this *exclusive* Bible.

Could we be satisfied that *baptizo* generally or even frequently signifies any thing resembling immersion or plunging, there would be fewer difficulties to surmount in believing the doctrine. But, most unfortunately, in many instances, it has

no reference to baptism with water in any form. A fair and honest criticism can never lead to the conclusion that it means to plunge, or dip, in any case: much less that it always has this meaning when it speaks of baptizing. The words *immerse* and *immersion* I utterly reject, because the Bible does not use them.

Baptizo is used in the New Testament eighty times, and twice in the Old. In twenty of these, it has no reference to baptism with water. In seven cases, it is said that men shall be baptized with the *Holy Ghost and with fire*. It will not be pretended that there was any plunging into water in any of these cases. In four cases, it refers to a spiritual baptism. "As many of you as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death." Rom. 6. 3. "As many of you as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Gal. 3. 27. Now it will not be pretended that they were *plunged* into Christ. Yet this is the exact import of the expressions, translated according to the views of the advocates of plunging. "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether Jews, or Gentiles, bond, or free." 1. Corinth. 12. 13. The allusion here is to a union with the church, the body of Christ; and not to baptism by water.

In nine other instances it refers to the sufferings of Christ. "Can ye drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? Ye shall indeed drink of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with." Matt. 20. 22, 23. But what was this baptism? In a preceding verse you find that Christ told the disciples, "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be *betrayed* unto the chief Priests and unto the Scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles, to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him." This was the baptism to which he referred. Mark repeats the same expressions, with the same explanations. Mark 10. 38. In Luke, 12. 50. Christ says, "I have a baptism to be baptized with: and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?" Not one of these cases can refer to baptism with water. He had been baptized by John long before. Yet he speaks of having a baptism *to be* baptized with.

The point, therefore, is settled, that *baptizo* does not always imply that water is applied in any shape; and, consequently, *it is not true* that it always means *to plunge, or dip*.

There are two instances in which a different meaning is attached to *baptizo*, in Luke 11. 38. A Pharisee with whom the Saviour dined, " marvelled that he had not first washed,"

or baptized, "before dinner." What this washing, or *baptizing* was, you learn from Mark 7. 3, 4. "And when they" (the Pharisees and Scribes) "saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (that is to say with unwashed) hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not." "And when they come from the market, except they wash," *baptisontai*, be baptized, "they eat not." Yet this washing is called *baptizing*, and certainly does not mean *plunging* the body entirely into water. [See Appendix A.]

There are two Greek words translated baptism :

1. *Baptisma*. In the passages already quoted in which *baptize* means "to suffer," baptism means *suffering*. Here, then, are five instances in twenty in which baptism is used, in which it denotes suffering—consequently, baptism does not always mean *plunging*.

2. *Baptismos*, is used but four times. "And many other things they have received to hold, as the washing, or *baptism*, of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables," or couches. "For laying aside the commandments of God, ye hold the traditions of men, as the washing of cups and pots," (Mark 7. 4—8.) "which," viz. the service of the Temple, "stood in meats and drinks and divers washings," or *baptisms*. Heb. 9. 10. This word then is used to express the various washings in the Temple service. The same apostle speaks of "the doctrine of *baptisms*," (Heb. 6. 3.) as one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ. Who then will contend that either of these words means plunging the entire body into water, and nothing else, when the Bible uses both in a sense widely different? Can any man, then, affirm, with truth, that baptize and baptism always mean to plunge, or to dip, when the use which the sacred writers make of these terms, affords such abundant proof of the opposite character? No reader of the scriptures in the original, can fail to see that such a statement is hostile to truth and sober criticism, unless he closes his eyes against the clearest light. The evidence is so clear that no honest and intelligent mind can mistake it. Hence you perceive that whatever may be the import of the expressions, *in Jordan, into the water, and out of the water*, they can never be made to teach that plunging is the only mode of baptism, so long as *baptize and baptism*, which express the act of baptism, fail to prove it. These expressions, however, we shall examine in connexion with the cases of baptism on record, which they are supposed to illustrate.

SERMON II.

MARK 1. 9—10.

And it came to pass, in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.

And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon him.

We now proceed to show you, from the cases of baptism in the New Testament, and from the general usage of the language in which they are recorded, that there is no evidence that a solitary case of plunging, or dipping, is furnished us in the oracles of God.

Having already proved that John's baptism was not christian baptism, but essentially different from it; that it was designed merely to prepare the Jews to give the Messiah a favorable reception, and manifest him to them, and not to influence the practice of the church in later ages; it is manifest, that if he did baptize by plunging, it proves nothing. We have also shown you that in the eighty-two instances in which *baptizo* is used in the Bible, it is never translated *immerse*: it is never translated *plunge*: it is translated *dip* in but one case, and that having no reference to baptism. The evidence then that it does not mean to *plunge* or *dip*, in its general usage, is eighty-two times as strong as that in its favor; and the fact that it is never translated in either of these ways when it speaks of baptism, leaves not a shadow even of presumptive evidence in favor of the practice of *plunging*.

With these facts in view, we are prepared to examine the cases of baptism on record, and to show that it is erroneous to suppose that either *baptizo*, *into the water*, *out of the water*, or *in Jordan*, teaches the doctrine of *plunging*. Baptism, as we have already shown, does not necessarily, nor invariably, mean *plunging*. The first case of baptism on record, is that of John baptizing the multitudes *in Jordan*. At the same time Christ was baptized by him in Jordan. In both these cases *baptizo* is used, but from the remarks already made, you

will perceive that it does not necessarily mean that he plunged them in Jordan. On the contrary, you find in Matt. 3. 13. that "Jesus came from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him." The preposition *e*pi here translated *to*, never means *into* when it precedes the accusative case,* as it does in this instance. It means *upon, to, towards, by and through*. Here, then, it is *not* said, either in our translation or the original, that he went *into* the Jordan; but that he came *to* Jordan. Now, as this passage is entirely adverse to the supposition that he went *into* Jordan, and *baptizo* will not prove it, we are led to inquire, will the expressions *in Jordan*, and *out of the water*, prove it? We take the phrase *in Jordan*, *en to Iordane*, and we inquire, how is *en* used in the Bible? In the New Testament *en* is translated *at* more than an hundred times, and *with* an hundred and fifty. In Joshua 3. 8. the Lord said unto Moses, "and thou shalt command the priests that bear the ark of the covenant, when ye are come to the brink of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan:"—"en to Iordane." Here the priests are commanded to stand *in Jordan*, when they were explicitly charged to *stop* when they came to the brink of the water. Now, the Greek expression here is the same as when John is said to have baptized *in Jordan*, and to have baptized Christ *in Jordan*. It is *en to Iordane* in the three cases. Again, in the 13th, 15th and 17th verses of the same chapter—"and it shall come to pass, as soon as the soles of the feet of the priests that bear the ark of the Lord, the Lord of all the earth, shall rest in the waters of Jordan, that the waters of Jordan shall be cut off from the waters that come down from above." "And as they that bore the ark were come unto Jordan, and the feet of the priests that bore the ark were dipped in the brim of the water, (for Jordan overfloweth its banks all the time of harvest,) that the waters which came down from above rose and stood upon a heap. And the priests that bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground." Here it is said, that the feet of the priests were *dipped*; but *baptizo* is not here used. They were *dipped into the brim* of the waters, when they did but rest the soles of the feet upon the brim, or surface of the water. To dip into water, then, may mean, to touch the water. It has that meaning in this case.

The feet of the priests are said to rest in the waters of Jordan, and to stand in the midst of Jordan, and into the midst

* See Schrevelii Lexicon, Ed. London, 1717, and Winer's Grammar, p. 149.

of the waters of Jordan, when in the one case, the soles of the feet of the priests merely touched the brim of the water, and in the other they stood on dry ground. Yet in these cases, *en* is used, and in one of them *eis, into*. The meaning of *en* and *eis* in these cases is fixed by the 8th verse. There *epi* is used, as in Matt. 3. 13. and means *to*. "When ye are come, *epi, to* the brink of the water of Jordan." Now if it means *to*, here, while they did not go into the water, and yet stood *in* Jordan, then *en* does not prove that John plunged in Jordan, or that Christ was plunged in Jordan. He came, *epi, to* Jordan and was baptized. The multitudes were baptized *at* Jordan. When, therefore, John is said to have baptized in Jordan, can you righteously conclude that it means *to plunge*, and nothing else, when, the same words of the Bible, in reference to the same stream, mean the brink of the water, the brim of the water, and the channel where there is no water? If, then, *baptizo* does not prove it, and it is manifest that the phrase *in Jordan* does not prove it, where is the evidence that John plunged in any case? In Exod. 14. 29. and 15. 19. you are told that "the children of Israel went on dry land in the midst of the sea." In both of these instances *en* is used, and translated *in*. The expression, in Jordan, then, will not prove that those whom John baptized did not stand on dry ground in the channel, instead of being plunged in the water. *En* has that meaning in the passages just quoted, even when it is said they were in the midst of the sea. Why may it not have the same meaning when it is used in connection with baptism?

Besides: *en* is translated *with* in many instances in such close connection with baptizing, as to overthrow entirely the argument in favor of plunging. Thus—Matt. 3. 11. "I indeed baptize you *with* water—he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost and *with* fire." "John did baptize *in* the wilderness." Mark 1. 4. But did he plunge in the wilderness? There is as much reason from the usage of *en* to believe this, as that he plunged in Jordan. "I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost." Mark 1. 8. "For John truly baptized *with* water: but ye shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." Acts 1. 5. There are but four cases in which *en* is translated *in*, in reference to baptism: viz. in Jordan twice; in the river of Jordan, and in the wilderness: and the latter case can have no reference to plunging. On the other hand, there are ten instances in which *en* is translated *with*, when speaking of baptism. The evidence derived from this word, then, when used in connection with baptism, is adverse to plunging.

Now, if, as we have shown from the language of Joshua, in Jordan, and in the river of Jordan, mean at the brim, or the brink of the water, and *en* is translated *with* in ten, of the fourteen instances in which it is used in connection with baptism, what becomes of the doctrine of plunging? The fact of John's baptizing *in* Jordan proves nothing. (Winer's Grammar, p. 144.) In Matt. 12. 1. *en* is translated *at*. "At that time"—and also chap. 14. 1. and 18 1. "And there sat a certain man *at* Lystra impotent in his feet." Acts 14. 8. The Lord commanded Elijah to "hide himself, *en*, *by* the brook Cherith." So, "he went and dwelt, *en*, *by* the brook Cherith." 1. Kings 17. 3—5. In the language of the Bible it is seen to be as true that John baptized *at* the Jordan, as that he baptized *in* the Jordan: it is as true that he baptized *by* the Jordan, as that he baptized *in* it. Just as correctly may you say that Elijah dwelt *in* the brook Cherith; for *en* is used in this case. *En*, therefore, will not prove that he plunged.

But Christ came up out of the water. One fact must be obvious: If it cannot be proved that Christ went into the water, it cannot be necessary to shew that he did not come out of it. As there are but three cases in which *apo*, *out of*, is used in reference to baptism, we will briefly examine it. Matthew and Mark both say he went up out of the water. Luke, 1. 4. uses *apo* differently. "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost, returned *from* Jordan." Here *apo* is translated *from*. Neither the original writers, nor the translators, then, understood that it always means *out of*; for Matthew tells you, chap. 2. 13.—"then cometh Jesus *from* Galilee to Jordan." In the text, Mark tells you, "that Jesus came *from* Nazareth of Galilee." Now it should be observed that *apo* has only ten different meanings. They are from, by, after, before, in comparison with, on account of, through, of, out of, and without.* Mark 3. 8. "And a great multitude from Galilee followed him, and from Judea, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumea, and from beyond Jordan." *Apo* is used in all these cases. So Matt. 8. 1. "When he was come down from the mount." Matt. 1. 17. "And all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations. For from, let us now substitute out of. It will then stand thus: the generations out of Abraham unto David,

* For the meaning of all these prepositions, see Hachenberg Grammar, by Prof. Goodrich, page 245.

are fourteen; out of David until the carrying away into Babylon, fourteen; and out of the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ, are fourteen. So verse 21, "He shall save his people, *apo*, from their sins." Herod slew all the children "from two years old and under," or out of two years old. John warned the Pharisees to "flee from the wrath to come." Matt. 5. 42. it means *of*. "From him that would borrow of thee, turn not away." Rev. 12. 6. "the woman fled into the wilderness where she had a place prepared of God." Rev. 20. 9. "And fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them." 21. 2. "John saw the new Jerusalem descending from God, out of heaven." Acts 9. 18. it is said of Paul, "there fell scales from his eyes." For *of* and *from*, in all these cases, let *out of* be substituted, and how does it mar the language of scripture! To attempt to establish the mode of administering a divine ordinance upon the English translation of a word in two cases, when all other facts oppose such an application of terms; when the usage of the word is so various, and when the word itself is used, even in reference to baptism, in a sense entirely different, is very unsafe, and exhibits a pertinacity which is by no means commendable. Could it be proved that Christ was plunged, there would appear to be some force in the expression *out of*. As it is, it has none. John, therefore, did not plunge. Christ neither went into the Jordan, nor come out of it.

Hence, it is merely gratuitous and unscriptural exhortation when our Baptist brethren say, "Follow the example of Christ. Go down into the water, and come up out of the water." The doctrine that Christ was baptized as an example to men, is one of the traditions of men, and belongs not to the oracles of God. Christ's baptism was not believers' baptism; and to follow the example of Christ, "ye must be God's," having no need of faith, or repentance; and the doctrine that you follow the example of Christ, annihilates believer's baptism. Besides; it is equally necessary to follow the example of Christ in other respects. You must be born in a manger; be circumcised according to the law; flee into Egypt; be baptized in the Jordan; preach the Gospel, and perform miracles. You must heal the sick and cast out devils and raise the dead. You must be crucified; buried in a tomb; rise from the dead, and ascend into heaven. You are not at liberty to adhere to this one event in his life, and disregard all the others. It is said that "baptism is the act of entering upon a christian profession. Christ was baptized as our ex-

ample." Then Christ, according to this statement, made a profession of his faith, and entered upon a christian profession at the age of thirty years, the precise age which his example designates for you: So that you must be baptized and make a profession of your faith, neither before, nor after, you are thirty years of age. The doctrine, then, in its legitimate results, is irreverent; and it opposes the practice of every christian church, not excepting even the advocates of the doctrine themselves.

Our Baptist brethren often say, "believe and be baptized:" as though this was a positive command of Christ. There is no such command as this in the Bible. The only expression which resembles it is this: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Now if this passage proves any thing, it proves that no man can be saved unless he is baptized; and thus baptism is made a saving ordinance, and as essential to salvation as faith. From the connection, in which the expression stands, the time and circumstances in which it was uttered, it is evident that Christ referred to the baptism with the Holy Ghost. This is also evident from Luke 24. 46—49. and Acts 1. 4, 5. If the baptism was a baptism with water, then all who are baptized, are saved; and all who are not, are damned. Then Simon the sorcerer has gone to the glories of heaven; (Acts 8. 13. &c.) and Hymeneus and Philetus and Alexander, whom Paul "delivered unto Satan," are gone to the kingdom of God. 1. Tim. 1. 20. and 2. Tim. 2. 17, 18.

The only remaining case in which any man is said to have gone down into the water, or to have come up out of the water, is the case of Philip and the Eunuch, recorded Acts 8. 38, 39. "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit caught away Philip," &c.

Here, two new words are used, viz. *eis*, *into*, and *ek*, *out of*. But this passage does not prove that the Eunuch was plunged. Most unfortunately for the argument, in the next verse, *eis* is translated differently in two instances. "But Philip was found *at* Azotus; and passing through, he preached in all the cities till he come *to* Cesarea." Here, then, the next verse does as decisively prove that *eis* means *to* and *at*, as the passage under consideration does that it means *into*; and it is remarkable that in this chapter *eis* is translated to and unto, no less than six times. It has, in common usage, no less than fifteen different meanings, viz. *to*, *in*, *into*, *towards*, *against*, *upon*, *after*, *on account of*, *with*, *by*, *among*, *of*, *from*, *about*,

because of.* Thus, Ephesians 5. 32. "I speak concerning Christ, and concerning the church." In this passage it means concerning in two instances, although translated but once. Luke 22. 39. "And he went—*eis*, to the mount of Olives." Verse 65. "And many other things blasphemously spake they against him." Acts 9. 1. "Saul yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the church." Here it is translated against, in both cases. 1. Corinthians, 10. 31. "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Here to, is its meaning. Now shall we take a solitary case in which it is translated into, when speaking of baptism, (and it is the only case) and say it teaches that the Eunuch was plunged, when it frequently means to, and unto, and is used in various other senses? It is infatuation to reason thus.

The same word is used in Exodus 14. 22. "And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea, on dry ground." Verse 23. Pharaoh and his host pursued them "into the midst of the sea." Here, also, into the midst of the sea, means on dry ground: for you read in the 28th verse that "the waters returned, and covered the chariots, and the horsemen and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them." The phrase, the waters returned, prove that into the sea, in this verse, means "on dry ground."

We do not deny that into the sea, and in the sea, sometimes mean into the water, and in the water. "Pharaoh's chariots and his host, hath he cast *into* the sea. His chosen captains also are drowned *in* the Red Sea. They sank *into* the bottom, as a stone: They sank as lead *in* the mighty waters: The horse and his rider hath he thrown *into* the sea." Exod. 15. 2, 4, 5, 10. Here was, undoubtedly, a plunging. Pharaoh and his host were *plunged*. Thus the expression *into the water*, sometimes is only a figure, denoting destruction, and great distress. So, Psalm 69. 2., "I sink *in* deep mire where there is no standing: I am come *into deep waters*, where the floods overflow me." Mark 5. 13., "The herd of swine ran violently down a steep place *into the sea*, and were choked *in the sea*." In the one passage, *into deep waters*, means great distress; and in the other, *in the sea*, and *into the sea*, mean absolute destruction. Yet here *eis* and *en* are both used.

In Joshua 3. 15. you are told that "the feet of the priests were dipped *into the brim* of Jordan." Here *eis* is used, and it means to touch the water with the *soles* of the feet. In this

* For the meaning of all the prepositions used, see Schleusner's Lexicon.

case the strongest language is used—"dipped into." Yet the feet of the priests were dipped into the *brim* of the water; the soles of their feet, merely, rested in the waters of Jordan.

In the 11th verse God says, "the ark of the covenant of the Lord of all the earth, passeth over before you *into Jordan*." Yet the ark was not plunged *into* Jordan, but borne on the shoulders of the priests, who passed over on *dry ground*. Joshua, chap. 4. 5., "commanded twelve men to go before the ark into the midst of Jordan, and take up twelve stones." But *eis* here means into the dry channel, and not into the water. The channel is sometimes used to denote a river, and also the sea. Thus Israel passed over Jordan on dry ground; the priests stood in the midst of Jordan; the twelve men took up the stones in the midst of Jordan where the channel was dry. So Isaiah, 11. 9. "The knowledge of the Lord shall fill the earth, as the waters cover the sea." Here the channel, or bed, is called "the sea;" the waters are called by their appropriate name, and the waters are said to cover the sea.

When, therefore, it is said that Philip and the Eunuch went down *into* the water, it may mean nothing more than that they went *to* the water. This they undoubtedly did. In verse 36, it is said they came *unto* a certain water. Here *epi*, unto, is used, as in Matt. 3. 13., and Joshua 3. 8., which never means *into* before the objective case. They came *unto* a certain water, and they went down from the chariot, in which they were sitting, *eis*, to the water, and after that, he baptized him; for the act of baptizing is mentioned as distinct from going down into the water: for, if the baptism consisted in going down into the water, then they were *both* baptized, because it is said "they went down *both* into the water, *both* Philip and the Eunuch." They *both* came out of the water. "And when *they* were come up out of the water." There is precisely as much evidence, then, that Philip was plunged, as there is that he plunged the Eunuch; and the proof is derived from the same expressions, which are said to prove that the Eunuch was plunged. The force of the evidence, in favor of plunging, drawn from this case is annihilated, by the fact that it proves *too much*.

If the advocates of plunging still insist that *eis* means *into* in all cases, we wish them to adhere to this statement in a few instances: In John 10. 39, 40., it is said that Christ escaped out of the hands of his enemies, "and went away again beyond Jordan, *into* the place where John at first baptized, and there he abode; and many resorted *unto* him," or *eis*, *into* him. From Mark 1. 4. you learn that "John did baptize in the wil-

derness." The place where John first baptized was in the wilderness. But as this statement is wholly adverse to plunging, our Baptist brethren say, "he preached in the wilderness, and baptized in Jordan." Now if *en* means *in*, in all cases when speaking of baptism, either John plunged *in* the wilderness, or, on the other hand, "the Saviour of sinners, in his flight from their rage, plunged himself *into* the Jordan," the place where John at first baptized, and there, beneath its waters, he ABODE, and multitudes resorted unto him. And *many* believed *into* him there." Thus, baptizing in the wilderness is baptizing in Jordan; and baptizing in Jordan, is baptizing in a place beyond it; and believing on Christ, is believing *into* him.

The same preposition *eis* is used when the apostle says that the Israelites were all baptized *unto* Moses, *in* the cloud and *in* the sea. "*Eis ton Mosen*," *into* Moses. Three millions of people plunged into Moses!! In Acts 19, certain disciples say that they were baptized, *eis*, into John's baptism: that is, plunged into John's baptism, and not into water. In 2 Kings 2. 6., Elijah said to Elisha, "the Lord hath sent me, *eis*, into Jordan." In John 20. 4. you are told that John came first to the sepulchre. Here *eis* is used; while the next verse explicitly asserts that "he entered not in." Now, can any candid mind conclude that this preposition always means *into*, when used in connection with baptism, in view of the various senses which we have shown it to have in the scriptures? It certainly goes not a step to prove that baptism was ever administered by plunging. It would be very unwarrantable to assert that plunging is the mode, from the fact that *eis* is used *in a solitary case* in the Bible, in connection with baptism, while this word has a great variety of other meanings in every Greek author in existence, and in almost every chapter in the Bible.

Nor is there any evidence of plunging, in the phrase "they came up out of the water." Here *ek* is used. It means out of, from of, by, after, with, without. It is translated from, one hundred and two times in the first five books of the New Testament, and out of, seventy-seven. In Rev. 8. 10. it is said, "A star fell from heaven, called wormwood, and many men died of the waters, because they were made bitter." Here *ek* is translated from in one case, and of in another. So James 2. 18., "Show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works." Here the same word is translated without and by. Rev. 15. 2. it is translated *over* four times. "And I saw—those that had gotten the

victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his seal, and over the number of his name, standing upon the sea of glass." Rev. 16. 11. it means *of* and *because of*: "And they blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains, and because of their sores, and repented not of their deeds." Rev. 17. 6. it means *with*: "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Matt. 3. 17. And, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, this is my beloved son. Here *from* is its meaning. In Joshua 4. 8. you are told, that the people took up twelve stones out of the midst of Jordan; and verse 3. "out of the place where the priest's feet stood firm," i. e. "on dry ground," 3. 17. Chap. 4. 17. Joshua commanded the people, saying, come ye up out of Jordan. 18. The priests came up out of Jordan. The people came up out of Jordan on the tenth day of the first month. The twelve stones which they took up out of Jordan did Joshua set up in Gilgal. Here are five instances in which *ek* is translated out of, when the people had not been in the water, except the soles of the feet of the priests had rested in the brim of the water. In proof of this, Joshua set up the twelve stones in Gilgal, that their children might know, that here, "Israel passed over Jordan on dry ground." *Ek*, then, even when translated out of, in reference to a river, often means from the dry channel, where the individual has not touched the water. Now, as this is the only instance in which *ek* is used in connection with baptism, you perceive that it cannot be made to teach the doctrine of plunging, unless you are prepared, at every hazard, to assume the point, in opposition to the general usage of the term. There is, therefore, not the least evidence of plunging in the case of the Eunuch. It would be just as proper to affirm that all Israel were plunged in Jordan, because they went down into Jordan, and came up out of Jordan, because *eis* and *ek* are there used, when God himself has explicitly told you that the "soles of the feet of the priests" alone were dipped into the brim of the water, while all the people passed on dry ground, as to say that the Eunuch was plunged, because he is said to have gone down into the water, and to have come up out of the water. If *eis* and *ek* will not prove a plunging in the one case, they will not in the other. Just as truly may you say that John outran Peter and came first into the sepulchre, because *eis* is used, as to say that the Eunuch went into the water, because *eis* is there used, when God tells you explicitly that John entered not in. Thus, we have divine authority, in one case, at least, for translating *eis*, *to*.

Having critically examined all the cases in which *dip* is used in the Bible, it appears that it is used in the Old Testament in sixteen instances. In one of these, *baptizo* is thus translated. In another instance *molimo* is used, which, in every instance in which it is used in the New Testament, means "to defile." In the remaining fourteen cases, a verb is used which usually means "to tinge;" "to wet;" as when it is said, "the soles of the feet of the priests were dipped in the brim of the water." Plunge is used but once, and denotes a violent action. Job 9. 31, 32. "If I wash myself in snow water, and make myself never so clean, yet shalt thou plunge me in the ditch, and mine own clothes shall abhor me." From the connection, it is evident, that to "plunge in the ditch," is only a figurative expression, denoting the deep defilement which the eye of God beheld in him. And that this case has no bearing on the mode of baptism, you will perceive, from the fact that *baptizo* is not the verb here translated plunge. Both the meaning and the language of this passage, therefore, demonstrate that it can have no reference to baptism.

In six instances *dip* is used in the New Testament. Matt. 26. 23. and Mark 14. 20. "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." Luke 16. 24. "Send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue." John 13. 26. "He it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop he gave it to Judas Iscariot." Rev. 19. 13. "And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood." These are the only cases in which *dip* is used in the New Testament. So that to dip, in the language of the Bible, means only to wet or to tinge. Yet in the twenty-two instances in which dip is used, *baptizo* is thus translated but once; while on the other hand, the other verb, translated dip, is never used to denote baptism. Now, if the Saviour and the apostles designed that baptism should be administered by plunging or dipping, why did they not use the verb which elsewhere means to dip and to plunge, to express it? Why have they used the verb *baptizo*, which has this meaning in but a solitary case in the whole Bible!!! If they designed us to understand that dipping or plunging was the mode, why did they not employ the very verb which the seventy employed, nearly three hundred years before, to express plunging and dipping? Now, the Saviour and apostles were acquainted with the Septuagint. They quote from it more frequently than from the Hebrew. Yet, in speaking of baptism, they seem studiously to avoid even the mention of the verb which signifies to dip and to plunge,

while they employ this very verb, in every instance, to denote dipping, just as the seventy had done before them. And we call upon the advocates of plunging to bring forth their strong reasons on this point, or to abandon their entire system.

The next case of baptism on record is that of the three thousands in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Acts 2. 41. "Then, they that gladly received the word, were baptized; and, the same day, there were added to them about three thousand souls." This statement does not intimate that they were plunged. The verb baptizo, which states the fact of their baptism, does not designate the mode, as we have already proved. That they were plunged is exceedingly improbable, from the fact that there was not time to baptize so many in this manner. At the third hour, when the Spirit began to descend, their enemies said, "these men are full of new wine." Peter replied, "these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day," or nine o'clock. Peter continued to preach a long time, after which they were baptized.

To avoid this difficulty with respect to time, it has been said, that the twelve apostles and the seventy disciples, were all engaged in baptizing, making eighty-two to administer baptism. But this statement is a gratuitous assumption. It cannot be proved that the seventy were in Jerusalem at this time, much less that they baptized any man. From Acts 1. 13, 14, and 26. you learn that the eleven apostles were there, and Matthias, who succeeded Judas in the apostleship. "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren." "The number of the names together, were about a hundred and twenty." But it is not stated who composed this number, besides those specifically mentioned. From the 21st verse, it appears that certain men had associated with them, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among the disciples. The seventy disciples certainly were not present at the last supper. The hundred and twenty did not include all those who believed on Christ: for Paul tells you, 1 Cor. 15. 6. that Christ, after his resurrection, "was seen of above five hundred brethren at once." So that the entire company of believers certainly were not present; whether the seventy were there, or not, is mere conjecture. But if we admit that they were present, and that they baptized, the greater the number, the greater is the difficulty in supposing that they were plunged. Where did they find water, in which eighty-two could plunge? There is no evidence that they

went out of the city; nor if they did, that there was any stream or lake nearer than the Jordan, which was twenty-five miles distant. They did not, therefore, baptize them out of the city.

Jerusalem was built on a rocky, limestone hill, and was poorly supplied with water. The only waters in, or about it, were the Gihon, or Siloam, which is also called En-Rogel, which was but a little rill issuing from the rock. Here they could not plunge. 2. The fountain Etom, which was supplied with water which Pilate brought in aqueducts a distance of fifteen miles to supply the city, and from which the water used about the temple was taken. Yet it is not certain that this was done prior to this pentecost, at which the three thousand were baptized. 3. There was the brook Kidron which "generally has but little water, and often none." Into it, by means of a drain, all the blood and filth of the sacrifices were poured. Here, surely, they would not plunge at such a period as the feast of Pentecost, if it had been possible. 4. There was the Pool of Bethesda, supplied by water issuing forth between the stones of the northern wall, "which stealeth away almost undiscovered."—(Calmet.) Here the sheep offered in sacrifice were washed before they were slain. No man would have thought of plunging here at such a time as the Pentecost. Nor would the Jews who crucified Christ only fifty days before, and persecuted Peter and John a few days after this event, have suffered them to plunge in the lavers, or brazen sea, or in any of the vessels of the Temple. Where, then, did they find places to plunge three thousand? Hence you perceive that their baptism by plunging is improbable. There was no place near the city, in which it could *decently* be done. The language in which their baptism is recorded, does not prove it, and all the circumstances of the case oppose the supposition. The assertion, then, that they were plunged is equally destitute of proof and of probability.

Another case of baptism is recorded in 1. Cor. 10. 1, 2. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea, and were all *baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.*" Here it is said that all Israel were baptized, *eis*, unto Moses *in the cloud and in the sea.* Baptizo is here used. *Eis* and *en* are also used. Now if *baptizo*, *eis* and *en* denote plunging, they will have that meaning here. This is the only instance in which the three words are connected, when used to record a case of baptism. Unfortunately, however, they are said to be baptized *into Moses* and *not into wa-*

ter. With regard to this passage of Israel through the sea, God says, Exod. 14. 16., "The children of Israel shall go on dry ground," *eis, into, or, "through the midst of sea ;"* and in verse 22., "And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea on dry ground." Hence, although the apostle uses baptizo, they certainly were not plunged in the sea, but passed over on dry ground. *In the sea, therefore, means on dry ground.* Nor can you safely infer from the fact that they are said to have been baptized *en, in the cloud* that they were plunged, or encircled in the cloud. Verses 19. and 20. leave no ground whatever for such an inference. "And the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them. And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel." The cloud, therefore, did not surround them, but it stood behind them. It was between them and the Egyptians. They were not plunged in the cloud, nor in the sea. This the history of the event plainly denies. How, then, were they baptized ?

The 77th Psalm will explain it. "The waters saw thee, O God ; the waters saw thee ; they were afraid ; the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water." They were baptized, therefore, by water poured upon them from the clouds. This Paul says was baptizing. The 15th and 20th verses prove that this language was originally applied to Israel when they crossed the Red Sea. "Thou hast with thine arm redeemed thy people, the sons of Jacob and of Joseph. Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and of Aaron." There is, then, one case of baptism by *pouring* on record, while of plunging there is not one.

In John 3. 23. you are told that "John was baptizing at Enon near to Salim, because there was much water." Here, it is supposed, that the expression "because there was much water," decides that plunging was the mode, because much water was necessary. As the advocates of plunging contend that *en to Iordane* means to plunge in Jordan, *en Amon*, will for the same reasons, mean that he plunged in Enon ; that is, in the village of Enon, and not in the much water. For the passage does not say that he baptized in much water, but in Enon. Now it will not be contended that he baptized without water. But the passage under consideration will certainly prove this, if you contend that John plunged in this instance. The phrase, much water, should undoubtedly be translated many waters ; and it is so translated in Rev. 14. 2. and 19. 6., the only remaining instances in which it is used in the New Testament. Salim, near which Enon stood, was situated near

the foot of the mountains of Gilboa, an exceeding dry and barren mountain. Hence there could not be any considerable stream. The expression, many waters, is in strict accordance with this fact. There were, undoubtedly, many rivulets, or small streams. These were necessary for the refreshment of man and beast. The Jordan was but a few miles distant; and if much water, or deep water, had been his object, he would undoubtedly have gone to the Jordan. The reason why he baptized in Enon, then, is obvious. He chose a spot where *pure* water issued from the mountain, from regard to the comfort of man and beast, rather than the abundant waters of Jordan. The situation of Enon, then, affords proof that there could have been nothing else than small rivulets or springs. The fact that there were many waters, then, affords no evidence that John plunged; and the fact that he baptized in Enon, while nothing is said of baptizing in the waters, leaves no room for doubt that John did not baptize by plunging, in this instance.

Paul was baptized, by Annanias, in the house of Judas, in the city of Damascus. Acts 9. 18. Cornelius, with his friends, was baptized in his own house. Acts 10. 47. There is no evidence that they went out to a river, or lake, for this purpose. This would have been a material fact, had it actually occurred; and the apostles would not have failed to mention it. If they designed to teach that plunging was the mode, the statement that they went out to a stream for this purpose, would have settled the question forever. In the latter case, Peter inquires, "can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Peter proposed this question to the believing Jews who were present. Dare any of *you*, as disciples of Christ, affirm that it is not proper to baptize those Gentiles, "who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" God recognizes them as his people, and seals them with the promised Spirit. Why, then, should we refuse them the seal of his covenant?

The Jailer was baptized by Paul in the prison at midnight. Acts 16. 33. He did not go out of the prison for this purpose; for you find, from the next verse, that he brought them into his own house after he was baptized. Prisoners were sometimes kept in the house, or the private apartment of the keeper, within the walls of the prison. The Roman law provided that the keeper who suffered a criminal to escape should suffer the same punishment, which the prisoner deserved. (Jahn's Arch. sec. 249.) Such punishment had been inflicted upon the keepers when Peter escaped. Acts 12. 19. "And

when Herod had sought for him, and found him not, he examined the keepers and commanded that they should be put to death." The Jailer shows that he understood the severity of the law; for "he drew his sword and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had fled." The Jailer, then, would not have brought them out of the prison. Moreover, the apostles refuse to go out, even when the magistrates sent orders for their release. Paul replied boldly, "they have beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, and cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily, let them come themselves and fetch us out." Is it credible that these men crept away to a river at midnight to baptize? There is not the least evidence, therefore, that they went out of prison. All the circumstances oppose the supposition; and he must be endowed with an unusual share of credulity who can believe it.

Some of the advocates of plunging assert that cisterns, or baptistries were constructed in prisons, and other buildings, for the purpose of baptizing. But will they point us to the page of the sacred oracles, which settles this point? Did the Roman government exercise such foresight as to perceive that a cistern in the prison of Philippi would be needed for such a purpose? Admitting that they did, had these Romans who put Christ to death, and who now imprisoned the apostles for preaching the Gospel, benevolence enough, thus to countenance christian baptism by providing conveniences for it? Had Cornelius, a Roman Centurion, or the Government of idolatrous Rome, either foresight or piety enough to provide a pool in his house for the purpose of baptizing? The supposition that they did this, implies that they were friends to the apostles, and disposed to receive the Gospel, and that they anticipated the outpouring of the Spirit on this very spot.

There are other cases of baptism on record. But we need not refer to them. They furnish no additional light with respect to the mode, and the same general principles which we have exhibited are applicable to them. Hence, the Bible affords no evidence that baptism was ever administered by dipping or plunging in any case; and the language of the scriptures, correctly interpreted, can never be made to teach the doctrine. And if the Bible does not teach it, we are not bound to receive it on any inferior authority.

There is one other mode of expression which claims attention, viz: "buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen through faith of the operation of God." Coloss. 2. 12. "Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death."

Rom. 6. 4. Now if we suppose these passages to teach that plunging is the mode of baptism, the language interpreted as the Baptists claim, in other cases, will stand thus: "plunged with him in baptism, in which also ye are raised by faith of the operation of God." *En* is used in both cases. If *en to Iordane* means in Jordan, *en to baptismati* will mean in baptism; that is, we are plunged with him, not in water, but in baptism; and in that baptism are raised by faith of the operation of God. Or, briefly, ye are plunged in baptism, but raised by faith. The other passage will stand thus: plunged with him by baptism into death. Ye are plunged not into water, but into death; and this not by the minister, but by baptism: and thus baptism becomes an ordinance fatal to Christ and to all who receive it. The principles of interpretation which so mar the scriptures must surely be wrong.

Neither of the passages speaks of a baptism with water. Baptism in both these instances "is introduced as a sign of our being dead and buried to the principles and pursuits of the present world; and by faith in Christ, raised as into a new world." Fuller's works, vol. 2, p. 469. To be baptized into his death, "means the being baptized into the belief of his death." Hall's works, vol. 1, p. 371. "When we are baptized, we take upon ourselves, the obligation to die to sin, in a spiritual manner, as Christ died and was buried bodily." Knapp's Theol. vol. 2, p. 525. These expositions, are admissions of able men who were advocates of plunging. Christians believed in a Saviour who was crucified, buried, and raised again. As the design of all this was to destroy sin, they are said to be baptized into his death: to be crucified and buried with him: to be planted in the likeness of his death, that they might be raised in the likeness of his resurrection, and walk in newness of life: that the body of sin might be destroyed, and that they should not serve sin, but live with Christ. Christ called his own sufferings a baptism—"I have a baptism to be baptized with." In Isaiah 21. 4. baptizo is used in the same sense. "My iniquities baptize me," which our translators read thus: "Fearfulness affrighted me." So Josephus, who was cotemporary with Paul, says of the bands of robbers who broke into Jerusalem, "they baptized the city," that is, they filled it with violence and slaughter. Baptizo, then, is used by Christ and Isaiah and Josephus to denote suffering and death: and as Christ died to destroy sin, the same term is used to denote the dying of Christians unto sin.

The Jews, when baptizing Proselytes, if they were slaves,

always stated whether they gave them their freedom, or retained them as slaves. If they were retained in servitude, they were baptized as the servants of the master to whom they belonged. Stuart on Rom. 6. 3. To this fact Paul alludes, when he reproves the Corinthians for saying, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ." "Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" 1. Cor. 1. 12, 13. Hence, to baptize into Christ, is to baptize in the name of Christ; and baptism in the name of the Trinity is a solemn pledge that those who are baptized will be the servants of God, ratified by baptism as the seal; and to be baptized into Christ, is to be transformed into his moral likeness by the Holy Ghost. That this is the meaning is evident from 1. Cor. 12. 13. "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles; bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one spirit." This baptizing is said to be by the spirit: and they who have received it, are said to be united to the body of Christ, or the church, by drinking into that one spirit. Now let us take this broad principle and apply it to the case under consideration. The apostle inquires: "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid; for how shall we who are dead to sin live any longer therein?" This is the point to which his entire argument is directed.—"We profess to be dead to sin; let us not practice it." Know ye not that so many of you as were baptized into Christ," or into the name of Christ, "were baptized into his death?" Ye who have been baptized by the Holy Ghost, have professed and promised to die unto sin. "Therefore we are," not merely dead with him, but also "buried with him by baptism unto death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Here is a perfect antithesis, the last member of which speaks of a spiritual resurrection to "newness of life;" and consequently the first clause, viz: buried with him by baptism into death, must have the same moral meaning. By our baptism by the spirit, of which baptism with water is the emblem, we are dead with Christ; and as effectually alienated from our former career of sin, as he that is buried in the grave is from all worldly things; that we should lead a new life, being raised by faith from death in sin. "For if we have been planted in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." We can discover no "likeness" to the death of Christ in baptism. Had he died by drowning there would have been a resemblance. Nor is there any likeness of his burial. He was buried in a rock, and not in the water. He was buried three

days, which is by no means imitated in baptism. As Christ died for sin, dying unto sin may be regarded as the likeness of his death. Christ has furnished an exposition of the principle which the apostle is here illustrating : " Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone ; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." He was speaking of his own death, which was to give life to the world. Christians die unto sin ; and are thus " planted in the likeness of his death." Yet being dead, like the corn of wheat, they are raised to a new life." This figurative expression, " Planted with him," in this connection as explained by the Saviour, has great beauty and force. As the corn of wheat cannot vegetate unless it be planted, and as the germe will not spring up except from the putrefaction of the other parts, so man can never be raised " in the likeness of his resurrection," unless he be first " planted with him," that is, dead unto sin. But to plant in the water would be an emblem of destruction. "Knowing this that our old man is crucified with him, or *like him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin : " for he that is dead is freed from sin. This exposition is confirmed by the 11th verse. " Likewise reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." There is, then, no more evidence that Paul here speaks of plunging in water, than that he speaks of dying, being crucified with Christ, and rising with him from the grave ; and he must possess a morbid sensibility with respect to divine truth, who seeks to wrest so important a truth as that contained in the passage under consideration, in order to make it teach his exclusive doctrine of plunging.

The passage in Colossians has the same meaning. As the last member of the antithesis, viz : " In which also ye are risen with him, or *like him*, through faith of the operation of God," is a moral resurrection, a resurrection by faith, so the burial with him by baptism, must be, not an actual baptism, but a spiritual dying ; dying unto sin. This text is explained by that which precedes it. " In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ."

This circumcision made without hands, Paul tells us in Rom. 2. 29, is " the circumcision of the heart," and it is made by the spirit of God. Both verses are explained by the next.

" And you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." The meaning of the entire

group of passages, is this: being dead to sin, and united to Christ by the Holy Spirit, it is your imperious duty to lead a holy life. It is wresting the scriptures, then, to apply either passage to sustain the doctrine of plunging. Just as properly may you seize upon the verse which precedes, and say it teaches in unqualified language that men must now be circumcised.

Hence, when our Baptist Brethren require those who have been regularly baptised in *any other way*, and who have been regular communicants in other christian churches to be re-baptized as the condition of admission to their communion, they actually set at nought all the ordinances of Jesus Christ administered by others, and in the spirit of genuine self-complacency, lay claim to all the piety on earth. When they cast out from their church those, who, in the true spirit of christian fellowship, commune with other churches which do not practice plunging, as they have repeatedly done, because they hold communion with the *uncircumcised*, they assume a power with which the scriptures invest no body of men. Christians are all members of one body; and no body of men has a right to forbid them to participate mutually in the vital streams which nourish all the parts of that one body, any more than it has to rear a wall of separation between them in heaven.

Baptism is the external seal of God's covenant with men. It represents purification of heart by the blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost, and is to be administered with water, in the name of the sacred Trinity. The quantity of water used, be it more or less, does no more affect the validity of the seal, nor of the ordinance, than the quantity of bread and wine which you receive at the Lord's table affects the validity of that symbol. As it is the emblem of cleansing by the Holy Spirit, and the blood of Christ, that mode of baptizing is nearest the truth which best corresponds with the manner in which the Holy Spirit is bestowed. And as the spirit is poured upon the world, and this is called *baptizing with the Holy Ghost* as God has promised to "*rain down righteousness*," and to "*sprinkle many nations*," and as the blood of Christ is called *the blood of sprinkling*, and Christians are said to have their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, it is evident that sprinkling, or pouring better accords with the thing signified than any other mode. Yet, you are not authorised to forbid the man who has been plunged to approach with you the table of the Lord. If a christian, he has the thing signified, and is in covenant with God; and if water has been applied in the name

of the Holy Trinity, by the proper authority, he has also the seal : and you say to him, " stand by thyself, I am holier than thou," at your peril. " For whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the depths of the sea," is the tremendous decision of him who spreads the table with his own body and blood.

SERMON III.

ISAIAH 52. 15.

So shall he sprinkle many nations.

The text is a figurative expression, denoting the manner in which God bestows spiritual blessings upon the world. As the word of God explicitly declares that the hearts of men are renewed by the Holy Spirit, poured upon them, and by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ; and as the sign must always correspond with the thing signified, there is reason to believe, that *sprinkling* and *pouring* are the modes of administering christian baptism which the scriptures sanction.

To establish this point is the object of this discourse.

It has already been proved that none of the cases of baptism, on record, afford any evidence in favor of plunging; and that the language in which they are recorded, is wholly adverse to the supposition that this was the primitive mode. The supposition, then, that this is the only scriptural mode, is an unwarrantable assumption.

In order to make it appear that baptizo means "to plunge, or dip," it is said that bapto, its primitive, has this signification. Now we deny that bapto means, in all cases, to plunge entirely, according to the practice in baptism.

Thus, Levit. 14. 15, 16. "The priest shall take some of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand. And the priest shall *dip* his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand." The experiment will show that it is impossible to plunge entirely the finger in the palm of the hand. In cleansing a house infected with the leprosy, the priest was commanded to take two birds, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop, and to kill one of the birds in an earthen vessel over running water. Verse 51. "And he shall take the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain bird, and in running water, and sprinkle the house seven times." Now if the quantity of blood in the bird was *much* larger than its own body, a plunging might take place. If not, it was impossible. But sprinkling was the

act of cleansing. The house was not *dipped* in the blood and water. They were *sprinkled upon* the house. Of Asher it is said, Deut. 33. 24. "Let him dip his foot in oil." But the foot is not the whole body. In Joshua 3. 15. you are told that "the feet of the priests were *dipped into* the brim of the waters of Jordan." But the 13th verse tells you, it was only "the soles of the feet." So in 1 Sam. 14. 27. "Jonathan put forth the end of his rod and dipped it in the honey-comb." Yet when reproved for violating the royal mandate, he says, verse 43d, "I did but taste a little of the honey with the end of my rod." Mark 12. 20. "It is one of the twelve that dippeth with me in the dish." Matt. 26. 23. "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." John 13. 26. shows that it was neither the entire person, nor the hand, that was dipped. "And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot." Luke 16. 24. "Send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue." In all these cases, *bapto* is used to denote wetting or tinging.—[See Appendix B.] But it does not denote plunging, entirely, in one of them. These are but a small portion of the cases which might be adduced; but they are sufficient to show that *to plunge entirely*, is not even the common meaning of *bapto*; and consequently, that it is far from being true that it always has this signification. Of course, then, *baptizo*, its derivation, does not always mean "*to plunge*."

The verb *baptizo*, as we have already shown, does not mean to wash, except in two instances. Other words are used to denote washing; and yet they are *never* used to express dipping or plunging. Consequently, *baptizo* has merely a figurative meaning, precisely in accordance with the figurative signification of baptism, which it is used to express. Hence, as *baptizo* is translated dip but once, in all the eighty-two instances in which it is used in the Bible, and wash but twice, and that to wash the hands; and as it is not employed to denote plunging in any case, and as other words *are* employed to express dipping, washing, and plunging, it is manifest that neither of these is its primary meaning. Its primary meaning is to baptize, by applying water. Now if it should be demonstrated, that the language of the Bible, and all the types designate sprinkling as the mode, then it must be conceded, that sprinkling is baptizing.*

* The Baptist Register, the organ of that denomination in this portion of the country, *profanely* says, that "*baptizo*" may as well be translated to eat a roasted goose, as to "*sprinkle*." This is, indeed, elegant criticism!!

Nipto is uniformly translated *to wash*, in the old Testament and the New. It denotes washing parts of the body ; as the hands, the feet, the face and the eyes. This partial washing, then, does not imply plunging, as is manifest from the manner in which the washing is performed. To wash the hands, the feet, the face and the eyes, does not imply plunging the whole body. The mode of washings, expressed by this verb, then, is settled by the nature of the washings of which it speaks. Yet this verb has a figurative signification, and refers to the purification of the heart by the blood of Christ. The Saviour said to Peter, " If I wash thee not, thou hast no part in me," and he undoubtedly referred to the cleansing of his heart. So the washing of hands expressed by this verb denotes innocence. Matt. 27. 24. " Pilate took water, and washed his hands in the presence of the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person." To this partial washing the Saviour referred when he said to Peter, " He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." Now that he spoke of cleansing of heart, is evident from his own language. " And ye are clean, but not all ; for he knew who should betray him." There is still one foul heart, uncleansed by the grace of God, among you. *Nipto*, then, when it refers to spiritual cleansing, denotes a partial washing.

Pluno is also translated " *to wash*." This verb is used in the scriptures when they speak of cleansing the garments. But it does not designate the mode. It is also used figuratively to denote cleansing from sin. Thus, Psalm 51. 2. " Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity." But when it denotes purification from sin, it is a partial washing. Jer. 4. 14. " O Jerusalem, wash thy heart from wickedness. *Louo* also is translated to wash. Generally this verb is used to denote washing the body in order to remove defilement. Thus Luke says concerning Dorcas ; Acts 9. 37. " When they had washed her they laid her in an upper chamber." So the Jailer, Acts 16. 33, took the apostles and " washed their stripes." It evidently denotes *bathing* to remove pollution. Hence it is used figuratively to signify purification from sin." Acts 22. 16. " Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Here *baptizo* denotes the act of receiving baptism, while *louo*, " to wash" is the emblem of the removal of sin. Rev. 1. 5. " Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, to him be glory and dominion forever, and ever." Hence, there is no word either in the Old Testament or the New, which signifies " to wash," that furnishes any evidence, from its general usage, of washing, or purifying by plunging. They

all speak of washing parts of the body, and a partial, or total bathing by the application of water;* and they are all used figuratively, to denote cleansing in the blood of Christ, and by the Holy Spirit. And when the church is said to be cleansed with the washing of water by the word, and men are said to be saved "by the washing of regeneration," or the washing of the new birth, "even the renewing of the Holy Ghost," *Loutros* is used to denote that they are purified by the blood of Christ, and the cleansing of the Holy Ghost, as water purifies the body. Hence, the manner in which the blood of Christ, and the Spirit of God are applied to cleanse the heart, will settle the mode in which water, the emblem of cleansing, should be applied in baptism. The words which express the ordinary washings clearly indicate this, from the fact that they are all used to signify purification from sin; and when thus employed, they denote a partial washing.

None of these verbs can be shown to denote cleansing by dipping or plunging; and in their figurative application to signify cleansing from sin, they certainly convey no such idea. *Bapto* does not mean to cleanse. When used in connection with cleansing, it signifies "to dip:" then the blood, or water, or oil, or whatever is used for the purpose, is *sprinkled* upon the thing to be cleansed. Especially is this the case, when such cleansing has a spiritual, or a typical meaning. So *baptizo*, in the only instance in which it is translated *dip*, does not denote cleansing. The washing of Naaman in the Jordan was the *special condition*, on which a miraculous cure was to be effected. But there is evidently no reference to baptism here, because the prophet said to him, "Go," *Lousai*, "bathe"† "thyself in Jordan seven times." "And he went down and *dipped* himself in Jordan seven times." The argument drawn from the use of all these words, therefore, is directly and powerfully in favor of sprinkling, as the mode of baptism.

In Exodus 24. 58. you find that, when Moses was about to ascend into the mount, he built an altar and offered burnt-offerings, and peace-offerings. And he took half the blood, and put it in basins; and half the blood he *sprinkled* upon the altar. And he took the book of the covenant and read it in the audience of the people; and they said, all that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the

* Levit. 15. 10, 11 and 27, *Nipto* means "to rinse" the hands: *Louo* "to bathe;" and *Pluno* "to wash" the clothes. So *Louo*. "to bathe" the flesh. 16. 24, 26, 28.

† *Louo* is translated "to bathe," Levit. 17. 15, 16, and *Pluno*. "to wash" the clothes.

blood," that is, the blood in the basins, "and sprinkled it on the people, and said, behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." Here the *sprinkling* of blood was the ratification of the covenant of God with his people. Paul tells you in Heb. 9. 19. that Moses took the blood of goats and calves, *with water*, and scarlet wool, and hyssop and sprinkled both the book, and all the people; saying, "this is the blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined unto you." The mode of sprinkling in this case was the same as in cleansing a leper, and a house infected with the leprosy. To this mode of cleansing; to this type, there is undoubtedly an allusion when it is said, "forthwith came there out *blood and water*" from the side of the Saviour which the soldier pierced. There is another allusion to the same mode of cleansing, when the Saviour said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Here the type and the thing typified are blended in the same expression, having reference to a change of heart. Who, then, can indulge a doubt whether these cases of sprinkling, to which we have referred, were types of cleansing in the blood of Christ, when *blood with water* was sprinkled upon the unclean; when *blood and water* came forth from the side of the Saviour, and a new birth by *water and the spirit* is made the only way of salvation; and especially when the apostle Peter tells you, (1. Pet. 1. 2.) that christians are chosen through sanctification of the spirit, unto obedience, and the *sprinkling of the blood of Christ*? The apostle John seems to have so understood these allusions when he said, (1. John, 5. 6.) "This is he who came by water and by blood; not by water only, but by water and blood: and it is the spirit that beareth witness." He evidently refers to John 19. 34. "And forthwith came there out blood and water;" and Heb. 9. 22. "Without the shedding of blood, there is no remission." At his baptism the voice from heaven, and the spirit bare witness that he came as the Lamb of God to make atonement for sin by shedding his blood. Hence, the water of his baptism, the descent of the spirit, and the shedding of his blood, denote the same work; viz., purification of heart. This is also denoted by the issuing of blood and water from his side, when it was pierced.

Again: 1. John, 5. 8. "There are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." He here alludes to the gift of the Holy Ghost. Acts 2. 2. 4. John 15. 26. and 2. Cor. 1. 22. As the Father bare witness of the necessity of purification, by his

laws, and all the types; the Son bare witness by his life and doctrines, and the Spirit, by attesting his mission as divine; so the Spirit, by its effects, and baptism with water, and the shedding of his blood, unitedly attest the necessity of the new birth. Here they "agree in one;" i. e. unitedly attest the same truth. Hence baptism with water is as much an emblem of the new birth as the outpouring of the spirit, or the shedding of the blood of Christ. So Ezekiel doubtless understood it when he said, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." A new heart also will I give you. The connection of water with the blood, and the spirit, as emblems, clearly shows that it should be applied in the same way; that is, by *sprinkling* or pouring. Baptism, therefore, the seal of the new covenant, already ratified on God's part, by the shedding and *sprinkling* of the blood of Christ, the atoning victim and the peace-offering which Divine Mercy has provided, should be administered by *sprinkling water*, as the solemn ratification of the covenant on our part. Plunging in water would be an utter departure both from the type and the thing typified.

In Exod. 29th, you find the account of the consecration of the priests. The first step was, to bring them to the door of the tabernacle and wash them with water. Then, the anointing oil was poured upon their heads. A ram was then slain, and its blood was sprinkled on the altar. "Then thou shalt kill the other ram, and take of his blood and put it upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of their right foot, and sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle it upon Aaron and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him." The priests and the altar, therefore, were consecrated by the sprinkling of blood.

As all Israel were washed as the preparation for meeting Jehovah at Sinai, and also for the reception of the law; and as the law was ratified by sprinkling blood and water upon the book and the people, so the priests were washed at the door of the tabernacle; the altar on which they were to offer sacrifices was consecrated with blood; then the blood of the same victim was taken from off the altar, which, with the anointing oil, was sprinkled upon them, to make atonement for their sins, and consecrate them to their priestly office; and they thus became the type of Christ, baptized with water, at his entrance upon his priestly office, and consecrated with his

own blood, and the anointing of the Holy Ghost. And as this consecration was made with reference to the forgiveness of sin through the sacrifices which they offered, so Christ was consecrated with reference to the blessings resulting from his death. As *sprinkling* was the mode of induction in the case of the priests, who were types of Christ, there is reason to believe that Christ was *sprinkled*; and as the blood of Christ is *sprinkled* upon his people, baptism, the symbol of his blood, and of the benefits which result from it, should be administered by *sprinkling*.

When Hezekiah came to the throne, he repaired and purified the house of the Lord; seven bullocks, and seven rams, and seven lambs, and seven he-goats were brought "for a sin-offering for the kingdom, and for the sanctuary, and for Judah. So they killed the seven bullocks, and the priests received the blood, and *sprinkled* it upon the altar; likewise when they had killed the rams they *sprinkled* the blood upon the altar; they killed also the lambs, and sprinkled the blood upon the altar." 2. Chron. 29. 22. In the days of Josiah, the people kept the passover. "And they killed the passover, and the priests *sprinkled* the blood from their hands." 2. Chron. 35. 11. When Israel were about to leave Egypt, they killed the paschal lamb, and *put* the blood over the door, and upon the two side posts of the door, that the destroyer might pass them by. Exod. 12. 7. Now Paul decides that the blood of the paschal lamb was *sprinkled* on the posts of the door.—Heb. 11. 28, "Through faith he (Moses) kept the passover and the *sprinkling* of blood, lest he that destroyed the first-born should touch them." Paul also decides that the passover was a type of Christ. 1. Cor. 5. 7. "For even Christ *our passover*, is sacrificed for us." And this he says, not to Jews, but to Gentiles; so that the expression is not a mere accommodation to Jewish prejudice. The *sprinkling* of the blood of the passover denoted the protection which God extended to Israel on that dark and fatal night in which he destroyed the first-born of Egypt, from the first-born of the captive in the dungeon, to the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne. The *sprinkling* of the blood of Christ denotes the protection of his people in that more dreadful night when he shall destroy all the wicked of the earth. The killing of the paschal lamb was a type of the shedding of the blood of Christ; and the *sprinkling* of its blood prefigured the *sprinkling* of his blood upon his people. If, therefore, sprinkling blood was the mode under the law, *sprinkling* with water, the element which the gospel requires, should undoubtedly be the mode under

the gospel. It denotes the protection, and pardon, and salvation of christians through the blood of Christ; and hence the mode of applying water in baptism should be by *sprinkling*.

In all these passages in which *sprinkle* is used, the Greek verb thus translated is *Proscheo*. *Proscheo* is also translated "to pour." Deut. 12. 27. "The blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out upon the altar of the Lord thy God." Now *Proscheo* is the same with *Ekcheo*, "to pour out." They are derived from the same root, and the only difference between them is, that *Pros*, in composition, denotes the object to which the blood or water is applied; while *Ek* denotes the source whence the blood or water is poured. In every other respect they are the same verb. *Ekcheo* is used to express the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. "And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh. And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids will I pour out my Spirit in those days." Joel 2. 28, 29. Peter quotes this expression in the same language; Acts 2. 17, 18; and in the 33d verse, explains this marvellous event: "Therefore he, (Christ) being exalted by the right hand of God, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath shed," or poured forth, "this which ye now see and hear." This is the fulfilment of the promise: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost *not many days hence*." Here, then, pouring is called baptism; and that pouring is expressed by a verb that means to sprinkle. In confirmation of this position, you find *Epicheo* frequently translated to pour; and it is the same verb, having *Epi* in composition; while the original verb *Cheo*, always signifies, to pour. Hence you find *Epicheo* used, Luke 10. 34. The Samaritan "bound up his wounds, *pouring* in oil and wine." You find, also, both *Proscheo* and *Pericheo* translated to *sprinkle*, in 2. Chron. 29. 22. [See Appendix D.]

In Zech. 12. 10. Jehovah says, "And I will *pour out* upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, a spirit of grace and supplication." Malachi 3. 10. I will "*pour you out* a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it." Acts 10. 45. "And they of the circumcision were astonished—because that on the Gentiles the gift of the Holy Ghost was *poured out*." Titus 3. 6. "which (that is, the Holy Ghost,) he *shed* or *poured* on us abundantly." In all these cases, *Ekcheo* is used to signify, *pouring out* blessings; a spirit of grace and the Holy Ghost; and this outpouring is expressed by a verb translated *sprinkle* in numerous instances. This verb, then, in all its forms, denotes the application of blood, and water, and spiritual blessings, and the Holy Spirit, to the

person or thing; and not the dipping of the person or thing into these. Yet this very application, by pouring or sprinkling, the apostle Peter declares to be a baptism with the Holy Ghost; and this is what Joel and Peter predicted: "I will pour out my Spirit," and "ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Joel 2. 28. and Acts 1. 5. Hence, as *sprinkling* was the mode of purifying, under the law, *in all cases*, when men were purified, and these *sprinklings* were types of cleansing by the blood of Christ, and as these sprinklings are expressed by the same word that expresses the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and this outpouring of the Holy Spirit is called baptism, it is therefore undeniably true, that *sprinkling is the mode of baptism which the scriptures sanction*. This is true, especially in view of the fact, that the blood of the sacrifice, sprinkled upon the people, is called the "blood of the covenant; and that the blood of Christ, whose death ratified the new covenant, is called the "blood of sprinkling." Heb. 12. 24. Paul uses *Proschusis* in the same sense: "By faith he kept the sprinkling of blood. Heb. 11. 28.

To this conclusion, it is objected, that on the day of pentecost, the Spirit filled the house where the apostles were assembled. This, however, the apostle does not say. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind; and it filled all the house where they were assembled." Acts 2. 2. By referring to the original, you will find that the *sound* filled the house, while the Spirit is not mentioned. The verb translated *filled*, is connected back to the preceding verb translated *came*, which proves, unanswerably, that *the sound* filled the house, and that *it* is supplied by the translators. The 4th verse tells you that they were all *filled* with the Holy Ghost. The idea, then, that they were *plunged* in the Holy Ghost, or encircled in it, is a perversion of the Bible. *Filling* with the Holy Ghost, is a very different thing from *plunging*, or being encircled in it.

But there is still stronger evidence that sprinkling is the scriptural mode of baptism. *Raino* is another verb, which means to sprinkle. In Levit. 14. 7, 16, 27, 51. the priest was commanded to *sprinkle* blood and oil on the leper to cleanse him; and blood and water on a house infected with the leprosy. In chap. 16. 14. Aaron was commanded to *sprinkle* the blood of the sin-offering for himself with his finger. Verse 17. he was commanded to *sprinkle* the blood of the sin-offering for the people with his finger. In Numbers 8. 7. Moses was commanded to cleanse the Levites by sprinkling water of purifying upon them. From Levit. 4. 6, 17. you find that

when a priest sinned, one of the other priests was commanded to dip his finger in the blood of the sin offering, and sprinkle it seven times before the Lord, and before the veil of the sanctuary; and when the whole congregation sinned, the mode of making atonement was the same. Thus the prophet says, in the text, speaking of the effects of the death of Christ, "So shall he sprinkle many nations." In all these cases, *Raino*, in some of its forms, is translated *sprinkle*, except in the text; and in that case, the Hebrew verb is the same as in the other instances. In the same sense, the prophet Ezekiel says, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you." Ezek. 36. 25. Here *Raino*, to sprinkle, is used; and the prophet employs sprinkling clean water, as the symbol of a change of heart. This is evident from the next verse. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." So Isaiah, 45. 8. speaking of the blessings of the gospel, says, Let heaven above rejoice; and let the skies rain down righteousness; or sprinkle down righteousness. The same verb, therefore, which means "to sprinkle," when speaking of ceremonial cleansings, is also used to express *sprinkling clean water*, the symbol of a change of heart by the grace of God, and the pouring out of righteousness upon the world under the gospel. What can be the meaning of this striking coincidence, unless it be to demonstrate that sprinkling is the emblem of purification of the heart? Hence it is evident that baptism, the symbol of the new birth, and the seal of our covenant with God, should be administered by sprinkling.

Rantizo is used in the same sense, and translated *sprinkle*. Levit. 6. 27. "When there is sprinkled of the blood," of the sin-offering, "upon any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place." So the Psalmist prays: Psalm 51. 7. "Purge," *Rantieis*, thou wilt sprinkle "me with hyssop and I shall be clean;" in allusion to the cleansings by sprinkling with hyssop. Thus it is said, in Numbers 19. 13. 20. that he who was defiled, and did not purify himself, should be cut off from Israel, "because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him." In order to cleanse any one who was defiled by touching a dead body, or a bone, or a grave, or one slain in a field, and to cleanse a tent, in which a man had died, which was thereby defiled, together with all the persons and things which were therein, the priest was commanded to take a red heifer, without spot or blemish, and kill her without the camp; and to take of her blood, and sprinkle

it with his finger before the tabernacle seven times. He was commanded to cause her to be burned without the camp. Hence Peter says of christians, that they are redeemed "with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1. Peter 1. 19. Paul applies this figure to Christ. Heb. 13. 11, 12. "For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." The priest was then directed to cause the ashes to be gathered up, and laid in a clean place, to be kept for the congregation, as a water of separation, or "sprinkling:" (Septuagint.) "It is a purification for sin."—The law was, that whosoever was defiled, and did not purify himself, "that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation, or sprinkling, was not sprinkled upon him." To cleanse one who was defiled, the law was, "he shall take the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel. And a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon all the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave. And the clean person shall *sprinkle* upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day." Num. 19. 4, 13, 19. Here the verbs *Raino*, and *Rantizo* are used interchangeably, to express the same thing. This fact affords valid evidence that they have the same meaning.

Now it is a remarkable coincidence that Paul should use *Rantizo* in the same sense. "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death—they which are called, might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of a testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no force at all while the testator liveth. Whereupon, neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people; saying, this is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. He sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without the shedding" or pouring forth "of blood, there is no remission.

It was necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these ; but the *heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices* than these." Heb. 9. 15—23. [See Appendix E.] As Moses ratified the first covenant by shedding and sprinkling blood and water ; so Christ, the author of the new covenant, has ratified it by the shedding of his own blood ; and as, under the law, the patterns of heavenly things were purified by the sprinkling of blood, so Christ has purified the heavenly things themselves by sprinkling the blood of better sacrifices upon them. Hence the apostle speaks of having *a conscience purged by the blood of Christ*, and "having our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and our bodies" "*Leloumenoi*," washed "or bathed with pure water." Here is an evident allusion to baptism. *Louo*, as we have shewn, means "to bathe." So the Jailer *bathed the stripes* of the apostles. It does, then, signify a partial application of water. Therefore baptism, the seal of our covenant with God, should be administered by *sprinkling*. Baptism, also the symbol of purification by the blood of Christ, purifying the *heavenly things*, should be by sprinkling. Thus administered, it corresponds both with the ancient types, and with the thing typified : but when administered in any other way, all correspondence is destroyed.

Again : Paul refers to the cleansing with the "water of separation" when he inquires: "If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh ; how much more shall the blood of Christ—purge your consciences from dead works," &c. Heb. 9. 13, 14. The sprinkling of the ashes of the heifer, then, was a type of purifying by the blood of Christ, and the apostle here uses *Rantizo* "to sprinkle." Now if you look back to the 9th verse, you find that Paul is speaking of the "first tabernacle," with its utensils, which was the "figure for the time then present ;" that is, the type of things under the gospel; the pattern of heavenly things. Its service "stood in meats and drinks, and divers washings, *baptismois*, baptisms. What these washings were you have already learned. The priests were washed when they entered upon their office; and washed their hands and feet as often as they entered into the tabernacle ; these were the *sprinklings* of blood and water to purify the unclean, and all the utensils of the tabernacle. The washing of hands, and of cups and of pots and other vessels, did not belong to these washings. The Saviour rejects them as the traditions of the elders. "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For lay-

ing aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of cups and pots; and *many other* such like things do ye." Mark 7. 7, 8. Hence the washings already referred to are the *baptismoi*, baptisms of which the apostle speaks. "But Christ being come an high Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands—neither by the blood of goats and of calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls, and of goats and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works, to serve the living God!" Heb. 9. 11—14. The sprinkling the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of the heifer are specifically mentioned by the apostle in connexion with *baptismoi*. Hence it cannot be denied that sprinkling is baptism. It is in vain to deny, in order to avoid this conclusion, that *baptismoi* is ever used to denote christian baptism. It is so used, Heb. 6. 2. "Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and faith towards God; of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgement." The *doctrine* of baptisms, then, is one of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, and *not* of Moses. It is classed with other truths, all of which are elementary principles of the gospel. An inspired apostle, then, has decided that sprinkling is baptism.

In Num. 19. 13. 20 and 21, you find that he who was defiled by touching a dead body, and was not purified by sprinkling the ashes of the heifer, mingled with water, was to be cut off from Israel," because the water of sprinkling was not sprinkled upon him." Here *Rantismos* is used to signify sprinkling. It is very remarkable that Paul should employ this word in the same sense. Heb. 12. 24. "Ye are come to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel." Here is the type and the thing typified expressed by the same word, translated *sprinkling*. As Moses was commanded to dip hyssop in the blood of the paschallambin *basins*, and sprinkle it upon the posts of the door, (Exod. 12. 20.) as he sprinkled blood from the basins upon the book and all the people; (Exod. 29. 6. 8.) as Aaron was commanded to take blood once every year, on the great day of atonement, and enter

into the holy place, "and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy-seat;" (Levit. 16. 14.) and as Christ "entered with his own blood into the holy place;" (Heb. 9. 13.) and as that blood is called the blood of sprinkling; (Heb. 12. 24.) there is reason to believe that *the sanctuary is the place* where baptism should be administered; and that it is administered in the scriptural mode when water in a vessel is brought to the place of worship and *sprinkled* upon the person to be baptized. In this manner it corresponds both with the type and the thing typified.

In 1. Pet. 1. 2, Christians are said to be "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the spirit unto obedience, and the sprinkling of the blood of Christ." Here *Rantismos* is used again. [Appendix E.] In this expression, therefore, the outpouring of the spirit for the sanctification of the people of God, which Peter calls baptizing with the holy Ghost, and the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, the shedding of which, he calls a baptism, are used to denote the same work, i. e. purification of heart. Here both types are blended together, in reference to the same work. Why, then, should not baptism, the type and the seal of that work, be administered by sprinkling, that it may perfectly accord with the thing signified?

It is evident, therefore, that as the shedding of the blood of sacrifices, was a type of the shedding of the blood of Christ; as the sprinkling of blood and water was the mode in which the covenant with Israel was ratified, and the unclean were purified, baptism, the seal of God's covenant with men, and the symbol of redemption through the blood of Christ, should be administered by sprinkling. There is *not one instance* in which a thing to be purified, under the law, was dipped in blood. Whatever the modes of washing with water might have been, blood was always the type of redemption by Christ, and was always sprinkled upon the person or thing to be cleansed. Hence baptism by plunging is not countenanced in a solitary instance; nor is there any vestige of such a practice in the Bible.

To avoid the force of this argument, it has been said, "Baptism is *not* a type of cleansing; but the act of initiation into the Church."* Into what church, then, did John introduce the Jews whom he baptized? Surely not the Jewish, for they were in it already by circumcision. He did not admit

* John Bunyan, although a Baptist, says: "Baptism makes thee no member of the church, neither particular, nor general; nor doth it make thee a visible saint." Bunyan's Works, vol. 3d, p. 286.

them to the christian church ; for, as such, it had no existence till the day of Pentecost. Into what church were Paul, and the Jailer, and Cornelius, and Lydia, and the Ethiopian Eunuch initiated ? To what church did the twelve disciples of John, whom Paul re-baptized at Antioch, belong ? With what church was Christ the head and corner-stone of the church connected by baptism ? There is no allusion to a connection with any church by baptism, in the scriptures. Besides, this evasion unfortunately opposes the plain declaration of the apostle, 1. Pet. 3. 21. Speaking of the saving of Noah in the Ark, he says, " The like *figure* whereunto, *even baptism*, doth now save us; (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." As the saving of Noah in the Ark prefigured the salvation of believers by Christ, in former days, so baptism *now*, which is the *anti-type*, doth also save us, through the resurrection of Christ, purifying the conscience and not the body. Here baptism, the anti-type, is the sign, used instead of the thing signified. An inspired apostle, then, has decided that baptism is a symbol of cleansing by the blood of Christ; and to deny it is to deny a plain statement of the Bible.

You will now enquire, perhaps, why then was Christ baptized, and how was it performed ? Christ was a Prophet. " A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you." Prophets received their commission directly from God; and there was no ceremony of induction into office.

The apostle calls him our " great High Priest." Heb. 4. 14. A priest was to be washed with water, and sprinkled with oil and blood. Christ could not be inducted by the priests by the sprinkling of blood. The sprinkling of blood always denoted personal guilt to be removed. Christ was without sin. The office of prophet he filled while on earth. To the office of Priest, he was inducted, only in part, by the baptism of John. Being a Priest, it was necessary that he also have somewhat to offer. Hence he " offered himself without spot to God." " But now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. 9. 26. By the will of God, " we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once ;" and enter into the holiest by the blood of Christ, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh." Heb. 10. 19, 20. Christ " entered by his own blood into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Hence the blood of Christ consecrated, and qualified

him to officiate as priest ; and at the same time procured redemption for us. From Numbers 4th, you learn that no person was suffered to minister about the tabernacle until he was thirty years old. The Levites were purified, and entered as novices or apprentices at twenty-five years of age : but were not suffered to have charge of the tabernacle till they were thirty. When Christ was baptized he began to be about thirty years old. But why this explicitness in regard to his age, if it does not refer to his entrance on his priesthood ? He was baptized by John according to the law, as the ceremonial cleansing for the office of priest.

This exposition of the nature of Christ's baptism by John is corroborated by the consideration that *John was a priest*, by regular descent from Aaron. From Luke 1. 5. you learn that Zacharias, his father, was a priest "of the course of Abia," or Abijah, 1. Chron. 24. 10. From the following verses, you perceive that he was *burning incense* in the temple, when Gabriel appeared, to announce to him that John should be born, and to reveal his character as the harbinger of Christ, "to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." John, being more than thirty years old, must have been consecrated to his priest's office ; and in baptizing, he officiated as priest to prepare the people for the reception of the gospel, as Moses purified Israel, by washing, to meet God at Sinai, and to receive the law. John, being a priest, might initiate Christ into his priesthood ; and as Christ is said to be about thirty years old, *it is certain that he did so initiate him by baptism.* This view is confirmed also by the fact, which has been already proved, that John did not baptize him with the baptism which he administered to others. John, as a prophet, could not fail to understand something of the import of the prophecies respecting him ; and God had instructed him with regard to his character, and designated him as the promised Messiah.—Christ's baptism, then, was a ceremonial washing, according to the Jewish law respecting the priests. It was this to which the Saviour referred when he said, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."

To this exposition it is objected, "Christ could not be a priest, because he belonged not to the sons of Aaron." This, however, is a misapprehension. Heb. 7. chap. will correct this mistake. In the 11th verse, you are told that there was no "perfection," or *actual pardon of sin* by the sacrifices offered by the Levitical priesthood ; and therefore it was necessary that another priest should arise, after the order of Melchisedec, and *not* after the order of Aaron. "For the priesthood

being changed, there is made of necessity a change of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah: of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood. And it is yet far more evident; for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. For he testifieth, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." Prophecy had designated him as a priest. "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent: Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." Psalm 110. 4. "The commandment going before," or the Mosaic ritual, was annulled, because it was unprofitable, and made no actual reconciliation of the sinner to God. But the bringing in of a better hope, that is, the gospel, did. The other priests were priests by inheritance, and constituted such without an oath. Christ was made a priest by the oath of God. Christ was the surety of a better covenant which was ratified by his blood. Other priests were not suffered to continue, by reason of death. Christ's priesthood was unchangeable. He had no need, like other priests, to offer sacrifices for his own sins. They were imperfect and sinful. He, a perfect priest, consecrated for evermore. These are some of the points of difference between his priesthood and that of the other priests. Now the apostle says, (Heb. 8. 4.) "If he were on earth *he should not be a priest*, seeing there are priests that offer gifts according to the law." Christ, then, did not fully enter his priestly office while on earth; but has entered with his own blood into the *heavenly tabernacle* to atone, and make intercession for his people. And this act was the completion of his consecration to his priestly office.

Christ was also a king. Kings and priests were anointed by pouring oil on their heads. Hence he is called the anointed of the Lord. Oil was also sprinkled on the garments of a priest; and it is worthy of remark, that the Greek verb which denotes pouring the anointing oil, is the very word that denotes the out-pouring of the Spirit. In the 2d Psalm Jehovah says, "I have set my king on my holy hill of Zion;" and in Psalm 45. 6, 7. David says of him, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom, is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows;" that is, above all the kings and priests who had been anointed before him. In Isaiah 61. 1. you find

a similar prediction respecting him: "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek." When Christ returned to Nazareth, after his baptism, he went into the synagogue, and read this prediction in the hearing of his countrymen, and said: "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Luke 4. 21. "And they wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth." Peter said to Cornelius and his friends, "The word which God sent unto Israel preaching peace by Jesus Christ; (he is Lord of all;) that word, ye know; which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power."—Acts 10. 38, 39. Two facts are here disclosed: John did not preach the gospel. The preaching of the gospel was commenced by Christ in Galilee, after the baptism which John preached. This fact places John's ministry in a new light; and exhibits it as preparatory to the manifestation of Christ, according to his own statement.

The other fact is, that Christ was anointed with the Holy Ghost, both as king and priest. At the moment when John baptized him, the Holy Ghost descended and remained upon him. His baptism by John, therefore, was a purification for the priesthood; and at the same time he was anointed as king and priest with "the oil of gladness," and with the Holy Ghost. Hence the apostle traces this event to the baptism of John, as the time of its occurrence, "after the baptism which John preached." As you find all the other steps in the consecration of a king and priest, connected with his baptism, viz: anointing with *oil of gladness* and the Holy Ghost, and a consecration in his own blood, the conclusion that his baptism by John was a ceremonial washing, preparatory to his entrance on the office of priest, is irresistible. And this conclusion is strengthened by the fact, already proved, that he *was not baptized with the baptism which John administered to others.*

As to the mode in which he was baptized, there is but one solution which is countenanced by the types; for as John did not preach the gospel, his baptism sustained no relation to christian baptism. Moses ratified the first covenant by taking blood and water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkling both the book and the people. He *sprinkled* the tabernacle and all its vessels, and also the priests. John came to announce the coming of Christ, and the establishment of the new covenant, or the gospel; and to administer to them the

pledge that they would receive the Messiah and his doctrines. As all bloody rites were to be abolished by the gospel, he took water, probably by dipping hyssop in it, and sprinkled it upon the people. In this way he could baptize easily the multitudes that resorted to him. In this way the apostles could easily baptize the three thousand in Jerusalem. This was the mode previously adopted by Moses in a similar case; and it would readily denote cleansing in order to meet the "Lord from heaven," and at the same time become a seal of their pledge to receive him and his doctrines, when he came, as Israel pledged themselves to obey the law already given. No other mode was sanctioned by ancient usage. No other mode would correspond with the pouring, or sprinkling of the Holy Spirit, nor with the sprinkling of the blood of Christ.—No other mode was countenanced by any type that preceded John, or found any thing corresponding with it in the spiritual cleansing under the gospel. [See Appendix F.]

Now could we find such evidence in favor of *plunging* as the mode of baptism; did we see all the types of the law pointing to it, as we do to sprinkling; did we see in the cleansing by the blood of Christ, and in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit such perpetual allusions to it, as we do to sprinkling, we would cheerfully embrace it. But so long as there is not even an allusion to it, and not a case on record, can be made, by fair criticism, to teach it, we must be permitted to dissent utterly from the doctrine, that plunging is the only scriptural mode of administering baptism; and he sadly mistakes the evidence on record who indulges, for a moment, the belief that it is the only mode of baptism which the scriptures recognize. [See Appendix G.]

APPENDIX.

A.

The mode of washing was this: water was poured upon the distended fingers from a water-pot. The hands were raised so as to let the water run down to the elbows. Water was then poured upon the elbows, and ran off from the fingers. In some cases they dipped their hands in water. (See Jahn's Arch. sec. 320.) Yet these washings are expressed by *Baptizo*.

This verb is used in a variety of senses. Sometimes it means "to wet." Thus Polybius says, "the footmen crossed over, being wet," *baptizomenoi*, "scarcely up to the breast." It means "to wash." So Sirach says: "he that washes himself," *baptizomenos*, "after touching a dead body, and touches it again, what availeth his washing?" This is a manifest allusion to the sprinkling of the ashes of the heifer upon the unclean. Hence *baptizomenos* here means *to sprinkle*. Sirach. 34. 25. Holofernes "washed herself," *ebaptizeto* "at the fountain of water." Judith 12. 7. It also means "to oppress." So Diodor. Sicub. says: *baptizein idiotas tais eisphorais*: to oppress the people with taxes. So *Baptizetai di' upno*: He is oppressed with sleep. So Justin Martyr. *Bebaptizmenos amartiais*: "Laden with sins." It means "to suffer." Heliodorus says: "*te sumphora bebaptismenos*;" Suffering from misfortune. Plutarch, concerning the education of boys, says: "The mind is strengthened by moderate labors, but, *baptizetai*, "suffers from those which are excessive." So in Mark 7. 4, "when they come from the market, except they wash," *baptizontai*, "they eat not." For *baptizontai* some ancient manuscripts read, *rantizontai*, "to sprinkle."—[See Schleusner's Lexicon.

Nipto is generally used to signify washing the hands. In this passage in Mark, *aniptoi* "unwashed," is used. So Homer's *Iliad*, B. I. 449, uses *chernipsanto*, "to offer sacrifice." "The priest sprinkled the altar with meal and water; he sprinkled also those who were present. This water was called *chernips*, because they washed their hands in it. Hence *chernipsanto* is used to denote ablution, and offering sacrifice."—[See Potter's Antiq. vol. 1, p. 227.

B.

There is but one case in the New Testament in which *bapto* can possibly mean to *plunge*: Rev. 19. 13. The angel was "clothed with a vesture dipped in blood." This may mean *stained* only. There is but one in the Old Testament: 2 Kings 8. 15.—"Hazeal *dipped* a cloth in water." This probably means merely to *wet*. In seven cases, hyssop and scarlet wool, and cedar wood, a bird, or the finger, are said to be dipped in *oil*, or *water*, or *blood*, which is then *sprinkled*, in order to purify. In one case the priest dipped his finger in blood and put it on the horns of the altar. In another, Moses dipped hyssop in the blood of the paschal lamb, and put it upon the posts of the door. The other cases are dipping the foot in oil; *the feet in the brim* of the water; the sop in vinegar; the foot in blood; and the end of a rod in honey. Hence there is not a case in the Bible in which it can be shown that *bapto* means to *plunge* entirely into any thing. It may or it may not have that meaning in two cases. In one case it means to plunge in the ditch. *Baptizo*, then, does not derive its meaning to *plunge*, or *dip*, as Baptists pretend, from *bapto*. Rev. 19. 13. Schleusner translates *bebamenon, tineta*; "tinged," or "stained." Hence, *Ælion* uses *Baphe*, the noun, to signify "colouring." "The old man praised old age; but tried to hide his grey hairs by colouring." *Baphe* Gr. R. p. 73.

So in Daniel 4. 30. and 5. 21. The body of Nebuchadnezzar "was wet, *Ebaphe*, with the *dews* of heaven." We are not aware that dew falls in sufficient depth in any country, to *plunge* a man in it. Yet *Ebaphe*, derived from *bapto*, is twice used to express *wetting with dew*.

Homer in his battle of the *Frogs and Mice*, uses *bapto*. Cowper thus translates the passage:

"So fell Crambophagus, and from that fall
Never arose, but *reddening with his blood*
The wave, and wallowing in the strings and slime
Of his own vitals, near the bank expired."

The Greek stands thus: "Ebapteto d' aimati limne porphureo." So that the lake was *dipped* or *coloured* with the blood of a frog.—[See Homer's *Batrach*.

D.

Diogenes Laertius uses *Pericheo* "to pour." Lucian uses "*Pericheousi aimā*," "to pour blood" upon the altars; and *Eneckeon nektar*, "I poured out nectar. Apollodorus uses *cheo* in the same sense: "Jupiter," *cheas*, "pouring out much rain from heaven." So Strabo, uses *Procheo*, *procheomenon aimatos*, "pouring out blood." Diodor. Sic. uses *Eischeomenon*, "flowing." G. R. p. 58, 94, 117, 129, 149, 173.

Hence it is evident that *cheo*, and all its compounds, have substantially the same meaning. [See also Appendix G.]

E.

Schleusner decides that *Rantizo* is used in the same sense as *Kathairo* and *Katharizo*, "to purge." Thus: Christ gave himself for the church, "that he might sanctify and *cleanse* it, with the washing of water by the word." Ephes. 5. 26.—Washing by water here, is the emblem of cleansing of heart through the influence of truth. As this cleansing is effected by the Spirit, and through the blood of Christ; and as the Spirit is *poured out*, and the blood is *sprinkled*, sprinkling is the mode denoted by *Kathairo*. So Heb. 9. 14. "How much more shall the blood of Christ *purge*" *Katharizei*, "your conscience from dead works." In the preceding verse Paul had used *Rantizonsa*, sprinkling, when speaking of the ashes of the heifer, with which *Kathairo* corresponds. Hence, "how much more shall the blood of Christ" *Katharizei*, "purge your conscience" by *sprinkling*. This very form Paul uses: Heb. 10. 22. "Having your hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience."—*Kathairo* is so used, Psalm 51. 7. "Sprinkle me" *Rantieis*, and *Katharisthesomai*, "I shall be clean." Again: Heb. 9. 22, 23. "And almost all things under the law are purged with blood." The preceding verses teach you that Moses *sprinkled* the book and the people, the tabernacle and its vessels. The *patterns of things in the heavens* were purified, *Katharizesthai*, with these *sprinklings*, but the heavenly things with better sacrifices. *Katharizesthai* is understood here, and denotes the *same mode*, but with the richer blood of Christ. As *Rantizo*, to sprinkle, is twice used in the preceding verses, with which *Katharizo*, also twice used, exactly corresponds; and as *Kathairo* and

Katharizo, both denoting *purification of heart*, thus correspond with it, it is evident that baptism, the symbol of purification, should be administered *by sprinkling*. As a seal of the covenant this should be the mode.

F.

The Hebrew verb translated *Baptizei*, Isa. 21. 4. is "bi-eth," which never signifies to use water in any respect, but "to frighten; to fall upon suddenly; to terrify." Neither the Hebrew nor the Greek, then, means to plunge. In 2 Kings 5. 14. the Hebrew is "*tabal*," "to dip; to tinge;" Hence, in one of the two cases in which *baptizo* is used in the Old Testament, the Heb. verb is the same verb which is translated *bapto*, "to dip, to tinge." This Heb. verb *tabal* is translated by *bapto* Ex od. 12. 22.—Levit. 4. 6.—9. 9.—14. 6, 16, 51.—Num. 19. 18.—Deut. 33. 24.—Ruth 2. 14.—Josh. 3. 15. 1 Sam. 14. 27.—2 Kings 8. 15. &c. We have shown in Note B. that *bapto* does not mean to plunge or *immerse*. There are but two cases in which it can possibly have that meaning; nor can it be proved to have that meaning in those cases. Hence, as *baptizo* in 2 Kings 5. 14. the only instance in which it is translated "to dip," is the translation of *tabal*, "to dip," the same Hebrew verb translated *bapto*, it is evident that *baptizo* cannot be proved to mean *to dip*, in the sense of immersion in any case. Both *tabal* and *bapto* are used to express "wetting, or tinging," hyssop, or scarlet wool, or the finger in blood, or oil, or water for the purpose of sprinkling. This usage is common in the Old Testament. "*To dip*," in the sense of wetting, or staining, is its invariable meaning in the New Testament. We have also shown (Note A.) that *baptizo* means "to oppress," "to suffer," "to wet," "to sprinkle." And one of the Hebrew verbs translated *baptizo*, means "to frighten." Hence, neither *bapto*, nor *baptizo*, nor the corresponding Hebrew verbs, ever mean *to plunge*, or *immerse*. There is just as much evidence in favor of this meaning, as there is that the lake was plunged in the blood of Homer's Frog; or Nebuchadnezzar's body in the dews of heaven.

G.

By examining the following list, which exhibits the Hebrew verb, with its literal meaning; the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew and the English, it will be seen that the force of the Heb. verbs sustains this mode of reasoning :

		<i>Septuagint.</i>	<i>English.</i>	
1. Heb. verb. <i>Zarak.</i> " To scatter, to sprinkle."	{	Exod. 24. 8.	'Kataskedase'	'sprinkled.'
		" 29. 16.	Proscheeis	sprinkle.
		2. Chron. 29. 22.	Prosechean	sprinkled.
		" " 35. 11.	do	do
		Exod. 29. 21.	Raneis	sprinkle.
		Levit. 6. 27.	{ Rantisthe Epirrantisthe }	sprinkled.
	Ezek. 36. 25.	Rano	sprinkle.	

The Heb. *Zarak* is translated *Kataskedao*, *Proscheo*, *Raino*, *Rantizo* and *Perrantizo*, "to sprinkle." Hence, all these Greek verbs are seen to have substantially the same meaning. Yet *Raino* is used by Ezek. 36. 25. to express figuratively the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, while Paul uses *Rantizo* to express sprinkling the heart, and sprinkling the blood of Christ. From the force of the Heb. verb and the use which Paul makes of *Rantizo*, and *Rantismos*, the noun, it is manifest that the sprinklings under the law were types of sprinkling with the blood of Christ.

		<i>Septuagint.</i>	<i>English.</i>	
2. Heb. <i>Shaphak.</i> " To pour, to pour out, to shed."	{	Levit. 4. 25.	Ekcheei	poured out.
		Deut. 12. 27.	Proscheeis	pour.
		Exod. 29. 12.	Ekcheeis	pour.
		Joel 2. 28, 29.	Ekcheo	pour.
		Zech. 12. 10.	Ekcheo	pour.

Here *Ekcheo* and *Proscheo* are translations of the Heb. *Shaphak*, and have the same meaning, while *Proscheo* generally means "to sprinkle:" and these verbs which are translated "to pour," "to sprinkle," and "to shed," also denote the outpouring of the Spirit.

		<i>Septuagint.</i>	<i>English.</i>	
3. Heb. verb. <i>Nazah.</i> "To sprinkle."	{	Levit. 16. 14, 15, 19.	Ranei	sprinkle.
		Exod. 29. 21.	Raneis	sprinkle.
		Num. 19. 18. and 8. 7.	Periranei	do.
		Levit. 4. 6, 17.	Prosranei and Ranei }	do.
		Isa. 52. 15.	—	sprinkle.

Nazah, then, "to sprinkle," is translated Raino, Periraino, and Prosraino, as Zarak is by Raino and Rantizo, and Prosheo "to sprinkle;" while Shaphak is also translated Prosheo, and Ekcheo "to pour out." Hence they are used interchangeably, as are the Greek verbs also, to denote sprinkling, and pouring out in sacrifices, the sprinkling of the blood of Christ upon the heart, and the outpouring of the Spirit, and spiritual blessings from heaven. There can be no doubt, then, that sprinkling under the law was a type of purification by the blood of Christ; and that baptism, the emblem of regeneration, should be applied in the same manner.

12 1845

