

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

**A CANDID STATEMENT**

OF THE

**R E A S O N S**

**Which induce the Baptists**

***To differ in Opinion and Practice***

FROM SO MANY

OF THEIR CHRISTIAN BRETHREN.

---

A  
CANDID STATEMENT  
OF THE  
REASONS  
WHICH INDUCE  
THE BAPTISTS

TO DIFFER  
In Opinion and Practice  
FROM SO MANY  
OF THEIR CHRISTIAN BRETHREN.

---

By JOHN RYLAND, D. D.

~~~~~  
*Now I praise you, Brethren, that ye keep the Ordinances as  
delivered to you. 1 Cor. xi. 2.*  
~~~~~

London:

PUBLISHED BY W. BUTTON, 23, PATERNOSTER ROW;

*And Sold by*

BROWNE, HARRIS, AND JAMES, BRISTOL.

*Price Half a Crown.*

—  
1814.

---

**J. G. Fuller, Printer, Kettering.**

## **PREFACE.**

---

**T**HE following pages contain the substance of a Sermon, which I have delivered at different places, previous to the administration of the ordinance of Baptism. On these occasions, I introduced most of the critical remarks into the Sermon; but having enlarged their number, (to which I could have added many more,) I thought it best to subjoin them in the form of Notes. Other additions, that seemed to me of some importance, have been made. But I have not *left out* one ill-natured or sarcastic expression, having been always careful not to *bring in* any thing of the kind.

I simply wished to state my own views of the subject, that no one may conceive of them as either better or worse than they actually are. Let the reasons I have given for my opinions be impartially examined, that every one who reads them may either accede to them or reject them, as conscience shall dictate. I claim no right to judge for others, nor can I admit others to judge for me. But I am heartily willing, that they who think differently should state and defend their opinions with equal freedom. And if I had used hard names, invectives, sneers, or scurrilous epithets, I should have had no right to complain at their being returned.

But if our conviction be an object worthy of their pursuit, let our Brethren, who think us mistaken on either or both parts of this controversy, not throw out charges which our consciences cannot but repel; and let them not attempt too much, so as to treat all their predecessors on their own side as silly men, who knew not what they conceded, who scarcely understood the Greek language, or knew any thing of Ecclesiastical History; let

them have done with referring us to *Germany*, whence their own advocate, Dr. WALL, says, they learned *perfusion*,\* and afterwards changed it farther from the primitive mode of *immersion* into mere *sprinkling*. If the German Re-baptizers† were still alive, we should require them not only to shew that they had repented of their wild enthusiastic doings, but to be more completely *baptized* than they were, before we owned them as Brethren. But if all who agree with our Opponents on the subject of Pædobaptism, are to be reckoned as *their* Brethren, we could reproach them with a greater number of atrocious sinners, than ever bore the same nickname, which many of them are pleased to fix upon us.

Often as we have been charged with imtemperate zeal on this subject, it is remarkable that most of our principal writers have only *replied* to attacks first made on our Denomination; for example, Dr. GALE to Dr. WALL; Mr. STENNETT to Mr. RUSSEN; Dr. GILL to

---

\* WALL'S *Defence*, p. 403. † See Note K.

MAURICE, TOWGOOD, BOSTWICK, MAYO, &c. ;  
 Dr. STENNETT to Dr. ADDINGTON. And  
 but few have written against us without in-  
 termixing some such charges and insinuations,  
 that it is really hard to conceive how good  
 men could believe things that were so  
 incapable of proof. Mr. HENRY'S intimation  
 that we baptize naked was bad enough; but  
 Mr. ROBBINS, the Editor, must have been  
 still more culpable than the Writer himself,  
 as living at a time when the Baptists were  
 more generally known.

No doubt some upon our side have written  
 with too much acrimony; and individuals,  
 in the pulpit or out of it, may still use crude  
 and intemperate expressions. But, consider-  
 ing what poor human nature is, we may  
 conclude, it must be a very petty sect indeed,  
 that has no foolish or rash adherents.

I think I can safely affirm, that I have  
 ever endeavoured to promote a spirit of un-  
 feigned love, towards all real Christians; and  
 I believe most of my Brethren are like-minded.  
 Strange would it be, if an agreement with our



Episcopalian Brethren, in *six and thirty* articles, except two sentences, should not have more effect to unite us, than a disagreement on *three* articles and *two* clauses could have to divide us. Very few of my own Denomination have ever had more of my affection and esteem, than several of the Ministers of the Establishment; and as far as opportunity of intercourse would admit, I have felt the same disposition towards many in the Church of Scotland. Much friendship, generous friendship towards our Mission and the Ministers most active in it's support, has been shewn by many in both these Communities; and much from all classes of our Dissenting Brethren. Of my temper and conduct towards my neighbours, I shall say nothing. I will only affirm, that I never pulled for a proselyte in my life. When a respectable Christian Lady applied to me for Baptism, professing in all other points, (like Mr. TOMBS,) to approve of the Church of England, I could not consistently refuse to baptize one who appeared a true Christian, and desired it; but I dropped not a hint to unhinge her

mind, or draw her off from her connections. I have acted on the same plan with respect to other Denominations.

Some of our Brethren of the Pædobaptist persuasion, seem eager of late to renew the controversy, by reprinting pieces long ago answered, with a number of smaller pamphlets, &c. The most zealous of these opponents are either of those who profess to be very indifferent to all forms of Church Government, or such as are agreed with us as to the propriety of the congregational order of the Churches. Some in the former connection are much against all stiff consciences, which will not treat every point as quite indifferent, which they profess to consider in that light; while some of the latter class, appear the more violent against us, because we agree with them in *all* things but *one*. An artful attempt has been lately made to set us on disputing among ourselves, respecting *Strict* and *Open* Communion. I have practised the latter, not from motives of policy, which I should abhor in matters of religion, but from conscience, for nearly seven and forty

years; and my most intimate friends know that I have argued the point with them, although I respect their conscientious scruples on the one hand, as well as those of the Pædobaptists on the other. I say, "It is the Lord's table, and not mine; therefore I dare not refuse those whom he has accepted, (however mistaken they may be respecting the other ordinance,) unless he had commanded me." My Strict Communion Brother also says, "It is the Lord's Table, and not mine; therefore I dare not admit them, though I doubt not he has accepted them, unless I had his warrant." We agree in our premises, but draw a different inference. Both cannot be right in their conclusion. True. Nor could both sides be right in the controversy respecting the distinction of meats and days. But I think it the part of true candour to keep in mind what the Apostle said in Rom. xiv. 5, 6. Some who are like those described by Dr. WITHERSPOON, *fierce for moderation*, have no candour at all towards those whom they please to dub bigots; I wish mine to extend to all whom I believe to be conscientious, though I may think them

erroneous in their judgment. I have also seen cause to suspect, that they who are most severe upon the Strict Communionists, would not all of them be pleased, if my own opinion and practice on that head were embraced by all the Baptists.

I trust, however, we shall unite in labouring to promote fervent affection and brotherly kindness towards all who love our Lord Jesus, whether we can all shew it in the same way or not. But I confess I should not be thankful for that candour in which I could obtain a share only by entire silence in defence of what I really apprehend to be true. Zechariah exhorts us to love truth, even before peace, (viii. 19.) but, for the sake of spreading the truth, I wish to speak it in love.

In this Publication I have shewed my opinion: any one who thinks himself able, has a right to attempt a refutation; but if I remain unconvinced by his arguments, I shall not consider myself under any obligation to reply. I cannot now have much time

before me, and I chuse to spend whatever may remain chiefly in defending and promoting the far more important truths in which all real Christians are agreed.

As it seems a strange thing to me; that our Opponents are most eager to contend with us on that branch of the controversy which I suppose both sides would consider as least important, and wherein all the Eastern Christians, including the coldest regions of the Greek Church, are on our side; and as the most learned Pædobaptists in former times have acknowledged that all Antiquity is in our favour; I would just notice, before I close this Preface, the decided judgment of the first English Reformers in favour of *Immersion*.

I have mentioned the unauthorized alteration of the English Prayer-book, which, if it should be permitted generally to prevail, it may shortly be denied, that ever the Church of England preferred Immersion to Affusion, which she allowed only in case of weakness, or even to Aspersion, which

Dr. WALL justly affirms she never expressly permitted.

But, in the Library at Bristol, we have a Copy of THE booke of the common prayer and administration of the Sacramentes and ceremonies of the Church: after the use of the Church of England. LONDINI IN OFFICINA Edouardi Whitchurche. *Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.* ANNO. DO. 1549. *Menſe Junij.* in which trine Immersion is enjoined in these words:

Then the prieste shall take the childe in his handes, and aske his name: And naming the chulde, shall dyppe it in the water threſe. First dipping the right side: Seconde the left side: the thirde time dyping the face towarde the fonte: So it bee discretely and warely done, saying, &c.

It is also directed, that after Baptism the priest shall put upon the child his white vesture, commonly called the Chrysome, and say,

Take thys white vesture for a token of the innocencie, whiche by God's grace in this holy sacrament of Baptisme, is given unto thee: and for a spgne whereby thou arte admonished, so long as thou livest, to geve thyself to innocencie of living, that after thys transitory lufe, thou mayest be partaker of the life everlasting.

It is also directed, fol. cxxxi. The water in the fonte shall be chaunged every moneth once at the leaste, and afore any child be Baptised in the water so chaunged, the priest shall saye at the fonte these prayers following

**O** most merciful God, our saviour Jesu Christe, who hast ordeped the element of water for the regeneration of thy faythful people, upon whom beyng in the river of Jordan, the holy goste came downe in the likeness of a doobe: sende downe we besethe thee the same thy holy spirite to assist us, and to be present at thys our invocation of thy holy name: Sanctifie ✠ this fountain of baptisme, thou that art the sanctifier of all thinges, that by the power of thy worde all those that shall be

baptized therein, may be spiritually regenerated, and made the children of everlasting adoption. Amen.

O merciful God, graunt that the old Adam, in them that shal be baptized in this fountayne, may so be buried, that the newe man may be raised up agayne. Amen. &c. &c.

Many other evident allusions to Immersion appear in these prayers.

Also in CATHECHISMUS that is to say a shorte Instruction into the Christian Religion for the spunguler commoditie and profyte of children and pong people. Set forth by the mooste reberende father in God Thomas Archbishop of Canterburp,\* Primate of all England and Metropolitane. *Gualterus Lynne excudebat.* 1548. dedicated to King EDWARD VI. there is a Sermon, entitled, *An Instruction of Baptisme*, in which are the following expressions. fol. ccxv.

---

\* CRANMER.



“What greater shame can ther be, than a man to professe himselfe to be a Christen man, because he is baptised, and yet he knoweth not what baptisme is, nor what the *dyppying in the water* doth betoken?”—Again fol. ccviii. “By Baptisme we die with Christ, and are buried (as it were) in his bloude and death, that we shoulde suffer afflictions and death, as Christe himself hath suffered. And as that man, whiche is baptized, doth promise to God, that he will dye with Christe, that he may be dead to synne and to the olde Adam,” &c.—And fol. ccxxii. “Baptisme and *dyppying into the water*, doth betoken, that the olde Adam with al his synne and evel lustes, ought to be drowned and kylled by daily contrition and repentance, and that by renewynge of the holy Gost, we ought to rise with Christ from the death of synne, and to walke in a new lyfe, that our new man maye lyve everlastingly, in rightuousness and truthe before God,” &c.—He then refers to the 6th chapter of Romans, which he evidently understands as alluding to baptismal immersion.

Like quotations might be made out of *A brief summe of the whole Byble. A Christyan Instruction for all pursons yonge and olde, &c. translated out of Doutch into Inglysh by Anthony Scholaker.* "The dipping in the water signifieth unto us, that we are mortified of synne, of our owne wyll and of all fleshlye desire, and after this manner we are buried with Chryste in the fonte. And that we are *lifted up agayn out of the fonte*, signifieth unto us, that we are risen frome death, that is, drawn out of all sinne whiche might bringe us to death, in a newe spiritual life. And also that after this temporal Death, we shall rise agayne into everlasting life."

In WILLIAM TYNDALL'S *Obedience of a Christian Man*, printed by *John Daye*, 1573, p. 143, are these words: "The washing (of Baptism) preacheth unto us, that we are clesed with Christes bloudshedding, which was an offering and a satisfaction for the sinne of all that repent and beleve, consenting and submitting themselves unto the will of God. The *plunging into* the water signifieth

that we die and are buried with Christ, as concerning the olde life of sinne which is Adam. And the pulling out againe signifieth that we *rise againe* with Christ in a newe life full of the Holy Ghost, which shall teach us and guide us, and worke the will of God in us, as thou seest, Rom. vi."

In the Workes of the excellent Martyr of Christ JOHN FRITH, who was burnt in Smithfield, July 4. 1553. page 91, he observes, "The signe in Baptisme is the *plounging downe in* the material water, and lifynge up againe by the whiche as by an outward badge we are knowen to be of the number of them which professe Christ to be their Redeemer and Saviour." Again, in page 93, he says, "The signification of Baptisme is described of Paule in the 6 of the Romaines, that as we are *plunged bodily into* the water, even so we are dead and buried with Christe from sinne: and as we are *lifted again out of* the water, even so are we risen with Christe from our sinnes, that we mighte hereafter walke in a newe conversatiou of lyfe. So that these two things, that is to be *plunged in*

the water, and *lifte up againe* doe signifie and represent the whole pith and effect of Baptisme, that is the mortification of our olde Adam, and the rising up of our new man."

But such quotations might be multiplied without end. I therefore forbear; though I cannot help expressing my astonishment at the increasing reluctance of our modern Pædobaptists to admit, that *immersion* was the original practice, and continued so to be for many centuries after the introduction of Infant Baptism; and was also considered as far more significant than *pouring*, which alteration, occasioned by an inordinate stress being laid on the ordinance as *necessary* and *efficacious* for the forgiveness of sin, has in far later times, been changed into bare *sprinkling*.

The Divines of the Church of Rome have often urged this change, as they confess it to be, as an argument with Protestants, that if they allow the alteration of one ordinance from dipping to sprinkling, they ought also to acknowledge the same authority of the Church

respecting the other, as to withholding the cup from the laity.

Yet there have been those in that Community who have pleaded for the restoration of the original practice in Baptism. And I will here add one document, transcribed from the diary of the late excellent Mr. SAMUEL JAMES, pastor of the Baptist Church at *Hitchin*, in *Hertfordshire*, who died while I was preaching in his pulpit, exclaiming with his last breath, Victory! Victory! August 22, 1773.

“ 1751, November 21. Thursday.—The following remarkable passage was some time ago taken out of the newspaper, which I think deserves a place here, to be transmitted to posterity.”

“ Rome, August 7, 1751.—Last Monday was held in the presence of his Holiness, at the Palace of the Quirinal, a Liturgical Academy, at which several of the Cardinals and Bishops were present. Father Ferrari, a Jesuit, read a Dissertation in that grand

Assembly, on the ancient custom of baptizing  
 “persons by way of *dipping* or *immersion*,  
 “instead of sprinkling now in use, which was  
 “listened to with the utmost attention, and  
 “met with universal applause.”

“May this sacred Ordinance be restored,”  
 says Mr. JAMES, “to it’s primitive Institution,  
 “not only among Papists, but Protestants  
 “too! Amen and Amen.”

If I go any further, I fear I shall be  
 forced to express too strongly my surprise  
 at the possibility of Christians so shutting  
 their eyes to evidence, as I must confess  
 they seem to do on this head. Sprinkling  
 being once introduced, it must be excused  
 and defended at any rate. Surely if bathing  
 were as common in our country as in was  
 not only in the East, but among the old  
 Romans too, such a dread of immersion never  
 could have occupied the minds of men.  
 It is now thought incredible that there  
 should have been a bath in the Jailor’s  
 house, at Philippi; though our Missionaries  
 say, There is a very fine tank in the Jail

at Calcutta, and always is one to be found in an Eastern jail.

Well, my old neighbour Mr. OKELY, the Moravian Minister at *Northampton*, (who was baptized at *Blunham* in *Bedfordshire*, and who first pointed out to me one of the instances in JOSEPHUS of the use of the word βαπτίζω, in looking for which I found all the rest; and who retained his opinion on this subject, though he returned to his connection with the United Brethren,) once said to me, “ We must wait for the more general effusion “ of the Holy Spirit, in the latter days, and “ then the right use of this Ordinance will “ be restored, as well as other things, as “ surely as the trees will bud forth at the “ return of spring.”

Grace be with all that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen!

JOHN RYLAND.

*Bristol, Feb. 23, 1814.*

A

## CANDID STATEMENT,

¶c.

---

---

**A**S we are directed, by the Apostle Peter,\* to be ready to give an answer to every one that asketh us a reason of the *hope* that is in us, so would we wish to do the same as to every part of our religious *practice*; and we desire to do this also with meekness and fear. As, therefore, we are now assembled to attend to an ordinance of Jesus Christ, concerning which, not only many nominal, but many real Christians, think differently from ourselves, I would attempt to answer

---

1 Peter iii. 15.

B



for myself the question once proposed on this subject, to him who first introduced the practice of Baptism into the church of God. The inquiry is stated in

John i. 25.

*Why then baptizest thou?*

Such was the query propounded by the Jews to John, the forerunner of our Lord, who first begun the practice of immersing penitent believers in water, on which account he received the name of John the Baptist.

Though they who were sent were of the Pharisees,\* who for the most part rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of John,† yet an air of candour appears in this inquiry; which may justly remind us of some important remarks, which all should keep in mind. As

1. *That it is commendable for persons to examine into the reasons which can be assigned for any part of revealed religion.—*

---

\* John i. 24.

† Luke vii. 30.

John professed to act by a divine commission. His mission had been predicted by Isaiah the Prophet. Though the spirit of prophecy had long been withdrawn, yet there was room to expect that it would be granted again on the approach of the Messiah's appearance. The Jews therefore did well to examine, whether John were authorized to practise this new institution. But now the canon of scripture is closed, all parts of religion must be carefully examined by the written word; and no religious rite should be practised but what is enjoined in the New Testament. To that standard alone we appeal, and thereby we wish our principles and practice to be impartially examined. I remark further,

2. *That it is fair and candid, when persons are suspected of singularity or innovation in religion, not to take up with the report of others, but to inquire of themselves the ground of their conduct.*—This we request as a favour, or rather we think we may claim it as a right. We trust that He who searcheth all hearts will acquit us of any disposition to deviate from the practice of our brethren, were we not persuaded that

they have departed from the original appointment of our only Lawgiver, whose authority is paramount to all others, and whose directions we wish scrupulously to regard. For I observe once more,

3. *That we ought to admit nothing into our system of religion for which we have not divine authority, or for which we are unable or ashamed to assign a reason.*—Let us then diligently search the scriptures, earnestly imploring light and assistance from above; and make a point of yielding to evidence, and of obeying implicitly the revealed will of God, as soon as we can ascertain what he has commanded in his word.

I might also remark, that there would have been no occasion for proposing this inquiry, had it been admitted that any good man had a right to use inventions of his own in religion, without any express commission from above.

I also conceive, that this question would scarcely have been asked by the Jews, if Baptism had *already* been a common practice among them: and especially, that they

would, on that supposition, have felt no embarrassment, when our Lord put the query concerning John's Baptism, Was it from heaven, or of men? as they might at once have replied, 'Though not originally instituted of God, or enjoined by Moses and the Prophets, yet our fathers invented it, and he took it from them.' I cannot but consider this as an unworthy origin of a New Testament rite; and should expect that a regard for the honour of Christ would lead Christians to think it far more likely that the Jews took up their proselyte Baptism in imitation of the Christians, than that John and his beloved Master adopted a mere human invention. Well may several learned Pædobaptists reject this idea, which Dr. GILL has very completely refuted, by shewing that no such practice is referred to in the Jewish writings, earlier than the third Century.\*

Our Lord's words evidently imply that the institution of Baptism was not of men, but

---

\* See his Dissertation on the Baptism of the Jewish Proselytes, at the end of his, *Body of Practical Divinity*.

from heaven: nor would he otherwise have sanctioned it by his own example, saying, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." He expressly enjoined it to his disciples, saying, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, unto the end of the world. Amen." Without his authority, we durst not practise it; but having such a charge, we dare not, either neglect it, or deviate in any respect from the original institution of our only Legislator.

But as a diversity of opinions, concerning this ordinance, has long subsisted among professed Christians, and we are constrained in conscience to dissent from the general practice of modern times, many may be disposed to ask the reasons why we do not conform to the custom of our Brethren; and as the controverted part of the subject will be the least devotional, and we wish to have our minds intent on the great design of the sacred institution immediately before it's

administration; we will begin with assigning our reasons for this difference of practice. Or rather, we will attend to two previous questions before we answer that which is stated in our text. Thus we shall inquire, What is Baptism? Who ought to be baptized? and, Why is Baptism to be administered?

First, If it be inquired of us, WHAT IS BAPTISM? we must answer, that, in our decided opinion, *Baptism is immersion*; and that *Christian Baptism* is neither more nor less than an immersion of the whole body in water, solemnly performed in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Some, however, have *added* so much to this institution, as to leave all that we shall perform but a very small part. For example, In the Church of *Rome*, they consecrate the water, by pouring in oil, and using a certain form of prayer. The party is to be crossed on the eyes, ears, nose, breast, neck, and mouth; to be exorcised and exsufflated; to have consecrated salt put into his mouth, and spittle on the nose, ears, and mouth. Imposition of hands is

added, and anointing the breast and head with oil. The Church of *England* rejects all these additional ceremonies, except only the sign of the cross, once made on the forehead; but as this has no foundation in the word of God, we dare not imitate it; accounting all additions to the primitive institution unwarrantable. We consider the use of sponsors in Baptism equally unscriptural.

Other Christians, besides those of the Church of Rome and the Church of England *diminish* this sacred ordinance, by only sprinkling the person with a few drops of water, or at most using a partial application of it, to the face or head, instead of *overwhelming* the whole body, or *immersing* and as it were *burying* the person in water: nothing less than which, we conceive, can be properly denominated BAPTISM. This, we are persuaded, accords with the import of the original terms, as all the most eminent Lexicographers have acknowledged; and as a multitude of the most eminent Scholars and Divines of other denominations, notwithstanding the general <sup>Re-</sup>valence, in modern times, of another mode of administering this New Testament ordinance,

have ingenuously confessed. As the primitive verb βαπτω\* signifies to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerse*, and is often used in Greek Authors with reference to the dipping of cloth in order to it's being dyed; so the derivative βαπτίζω† is most evidently used in the same sense, of *immersing* or *overwhelming*. It is repeatedly used thus by JOSEPHUS, a writer nearly contemporary with the Apostles, and, like them, a Jew writing in Greek, which gives peculiar weight to his authority.‡ And many instances equally decisive may be produced from both Heathen Authors,§ and the Greek Fathers.

Our sentiment is also confirmed by the practice of the Greek Church, and of all the Eastern Christians to the present day; and

---

\* See Note A. for all the instances of βαπτω in the LXX and the New Testament, together with some few from Heathen Authors.

† See Note B. for all the instances of βαπτίζω and it's derivatives, in the LXX, the Apocrypha, and the New Testament.

‡ See Note C. for all the instances of βαπτίζω and it's compounds in *Josephus*.

§ See Note D. for instances from Heathen Authors.



by the testimony of Ecclesiastical Historians, as to the use of immersion, even in the Western Churches, for many centuries. We can find no appearance of any deviation from this mode among the early Christians, till an inordinate idea of the importance and efficacy of Baptism as essential to salvation, led some, about the middle of the third century, to baptize persons who were too ill to be immersed, by pouring water on them as they lay in *bed*; on which account this was called *Clinic Baptism*.\* This, however, was considered as so imperfect a Baptism, that they who had received it were judged inadmissible to office in the Church. Long after, it became more common to administer the ordinance by *Affusion*, and at last by mere *Sprinkling*; and hence only it is that Lexicographers have admitted this last as a secondary sense of the terms; of which I believe no one would ever have thought had not Christian Baptism been instituted, and afterwards gradually changed. Most European translations have adopted the Greek word only altering the termination; but the

---

\* κλινικος lying on a bed, from κλινη a bed, from κλινω I recline or lie down.

Gothic, the German, the Dutch, the Danish, and the Welsh, use terms of their own vernacular tongue,\* synonymous with the English word *dip*.

The English Rubric, the Church Catechism, the ancient fonts, and the very strong confessions of Dr. WHITBY,† Dr. WALL,‡ and very many Episcopalian Divines of the highest rank, prove that the Church of England *prescribes* DIPPING, and only *admits* of POURING in case of certified weakness. Some modern editions of the *Prayer-book*, in compliance with present custom, have altered the original expressions, but without any authority from the Hierarchy. It is now often pleaded that βαπτίζω may refer to any application of water, by *dipping*, *pouring*, or *sprinkling*; though the middle term is used merely as a stepping stone, to make a transition from

\* Gothic **ΔΑΠΝΙΣΑ**—German *taufe*—Dutch *gedoopt*—Danish *døbt*—Welsh *Bedyddio*; all which are allied to the Greek *δύπτω* I put under water, whence our English *dip*.

† See Note E.

‡ See his *Defence of the History of Infant Baptism*, pp. 142, 145, 404.

the former to the latter; most Pædobaptists in the present day, thinking no more of pouring than of immersing: but Dr. WALL charged Dr. GALE with a “notorious reproach and untruth,” for saying, *The Clergy continue in the constant use of aspersion, &c. and defend it in opposition to immersion.* Less than an hundred years ago, the ablest champion of Infant Baptism considered it as an injurious slander on the Established Church, to speak of her Clergy as practising “*Aspersion*, (which the Church does not allow in any case,) instead of *Perfusion*,” which he owns was permitted in case of weakness: but highly resents the supposition that it was supposed to be *indifferent*, when the preference was plainly given to immersion. Now, however, the change has become so much greater and more general, that I cannot but be surprised at most excellent Divines in the National Church, using language so opposite to that of their predecessors, and intimating, that she barely *allows* immersion,\*

---

\* Compare the language of the late exemplary T. ROBINSON of Leicester, *Christian System*, III. pp. 453, 459—with Dr. WALL, 142; Dr. WHITBY, Rom. vi. 4; Dr. TOWERSON, *on the Sacrament of Baptism*,

when no danger is likely to result, instead of enjoining it. While some of our Dissenting Brethren, of late years, go such lengths in denying the plain import of the term, the original use of immersion, the evident allusions to it in scripture, &c. as would compel us to suppose that all the writers of Lexicons were Baptists; that the Christians of the Greek Church did not understand their own language, and misled all that received Christianity immediately from them; and that even Catholics, Reformers, and Protestant Divines of all denominations, have made concessions on this part of the controversy, which indicate unaccountable weakness; unless we could suspect these more modern Divines of unaccountable rashness and pertinacity. If we are mistaken, we wish to be convinced of our error; but verily this is not the way to work conviction in our minds; nor yet the use of ludicrous synonyms,

---

*pp.* 51—58; Bishop HOADLEY'S *Works*, III. *p.* 890; BURKIT on Rom. vi. 4; Dr. HAMMOND on the same Text; LEIGHTON on 1 Peter iii. 21; Bishop BURNETT, *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*, *pp.* 374, 375; *The Church of England Homily on the Resurrection*; &c. &c. &c.

such as plunging, or ducking, &c. instead of immersion; nor the calling of names, or charging us with Anabaptism, or re-baptizing, when we never repeat the ordinance in the case of those that we think have received true and scriptural Baptism.

Our idea is confirmed by scripture examples, and the circumstances attending the Baptisms there recorded, as well as by the avowed signification of the institution, of which I shall take more notice by and by. They that went out to JOHN were baptized of him in Jordan,\* whither JESUS came to be baptized,† and when he was baptized he went up straightway out of the water.‡ MARK says, they were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins;§ and observes that JESUS came from Nazareth, and was baptized of JOHN *in* Jordan.|| The Evangelist JOHN observes, that JOHN was baptizing in Enon near to Salem, because there was much water there.¶ If in these instances

---

\* Matt. iii. 6. † v. 13. ‡ v. 16 § Mark i. 5. || v. 9, 10.

See Note F. for the import of the Greek prepositions.

¶ See Note G. respecting *ὕδατα πολλά*.

the word *sprinkled* had been substituted for *baptized*, the discordance would be evident; but substitute *immersed*, and the whole is in perfect harmony. The same may be said of the following instances. The Ethiopian Eunuch, who had doubtless water with him when travelling through a desert country, did not propose being sprinkled with it, but when they came unto a certain water on their way, he said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be immersed? and commanding the chariot to stand still, they went down both into the water, both PHILIP and the Eunuch, and he immersed him; and when they were come up out of the water, PHILIP was taken from him, but the Eunuch went on his way rejoicing.\* When SAUL of Tarsus had an interview with ANANIAS, instead of having water brought to him to sprinkle him, he arose and was immersed.† At Philippi, the jailor brought PAUL and SILAS out of prison, and when they had spoken the word of the Lord to all that were in his house, he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes, and was immersed, he and all his, straight-

---

\* Acts viii. 26, 36, 38, 39. † Acts ix. 18.

way; and then he brought them again into his house, and set meat before them, &c.\* The narrative accurately marks the change of place three times over.

The very significant expression, "Buried with him by Baptism into death," and the allusions to the change of raiment necessary in consequence of immersion, have been noticed by the most eminent Divines, who never were numbered with us, but whom the force of truth compelled to acknowledge their correspondence with the original administration of Baptism.

On this part of the subject, if the Eastern Christians be included, we are with the majority. Dr. WALL expressly acknowledges the alteration of the way and manner of administering Baptism. "The way that is now ordinarily used we cannot deny to have been a novelty," says he, "brought into this Church by those that had learned it in Germany or at Geneva. And they were not contented to follow the example of pouring a quantity of water, (which had

---

\* Acts xvi. 30—34.

“there been introduced instead of Immersion,) but improved it, (if I may so abuse that word,) from pouring to sprinkling; that it might have as little resemblance of the antient way of baptizing as possible.” He complains therefore of Dr. GALE, for entering so much upon the manner of baptizing in his *Reply to his History of Infant Baptism*, as being a dispute with which Dr. W. had but little concern, “wherein,” says he, “he knew that the examples of scripture and other antiquity, and the full persuasion of that people and of all the Eastern Churches to this day, is on his side; and I had the disadvantage to plead for a way of Baptism, of which the best I could say, was, that it is sufficient for the essence of Baptism; but could not deny the other, (except in the case of the danger of health,) to be the fittest.”

Let this suffice as an apology for our opinion and practice on the first part of the controversy.

I proceed to give an answer to those who would inquire,



Secondly, WHO OUGHT TO BE BAPTIZED?—  
 We dare not baptize any but such as make  
 a credible profession of repentance towards  
 God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ,  
 bringing forth fruits meet for repentance.

But, to take no notice of the Popish  
 Baptism of bells, nor of adults baptized by  
 constraint, or from whatever motive; there  
 are many who plead for *Infant Baptism*,  
 which has not only prevailed very extensively  
 but was confessedly introduced early into the  
 Christian church: though there is as early  
 proof of Infant Communion prevailing for a  
 time, and it may be defended by just the  
 same arguments.\*

But we never could find proof that it  
 was so from the beginning, or that Infant  
 Baptism or Infant Communion are either of

---

\* See Dr. WALL'S *History of Infant Baptism*, p.  
 517; who affirms it prevailed in the West for about 600  
 years, and that nearly half the Christians in the world  
 still continue that practice. See also, *An Essay in  
 favour of the ancient Practice of giving the Eucharist  
 to Children*, by the Rev. JAMES PIERCE, of Exeter.  
 1728.

them agreeable to the will of Christ, or are authorized by the New Testament.

If it be asked, What children should be baptized? our Brethren are not agreed among themselves. Some say, the children of Church Members, some, the children or grandchildren, of believers. Good Mr. BOSTON spends above a hundred pages in discussing this point; but most of our Pædobaptist Brethren in the present day, readily baptize any child whose parent desires it. Many ignorant people in the Establishment hastily send for the Minister if the child be in danger of death, as though the christening of the child would be a passport to heaven. And I have known the child of a Baptist sprinkled at the desire of a relation, by a Dissenting Minister, while the father was from home.

But we can find no hint of Infant Baptism in the New Testament, though they make mention of children on occasions of much less importance, as when the Tyrian Christians, with wives and *children*, accompanied Paul to the sea-side, where they knelt down and prayed. No mention is made of the Baptism of children at the day of Pentecost, but only

of those who *gladly received the word*; nor yet at Samaria, but “when they *believed* PHILIP preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both *men* and *women*.” When PETER preached at the house of CORNELIUS, and the Holy Spirit fell on all them who heard the word, PETER asked, “Can any one forbid water that these should be baptized, who have *received the Holy Spirit* as well as we? and he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.” At Corinth also, “CRISPUS, the chief ruler of the synagogue, *believed* on the Lord, with all his house; and many of the Corinthians, hearing, *believed*, and were baptized.”

Our Pædobaptist Brethren catch at the sound of *households*, as though it were certain *four* households could not be found, without including young infants. But it is attested, that all the house of CRISPUS believed. And as to the Philippian Jailor, we are assured that PAUL and SILAS “spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to *all* that were in his house,” and after he and all his were baptized, “he rejoiced, *believing* in God with all his house.” The household of STEPHANAS consisted of

such as addicted themselves to the *ministry of the saints*, and to whom PAUL, within a very short time after their baptism, exhorted the Brethren to *submit* themselves. And as to LYDIA, who had crossed the Ægean sea on a trading voyage, she seems to have left her husband and sucklings, (if she had either,) at home, for her house contained only *brethren*, (probably men-servants,) whom Paul *comforted* before he left the city.

As to our blessed Lord's having children brought to him, that he might *touch them*, that expression of MARK (x. 13.) induces us to think they had some bodily disorder of which to be healed; and at all events, he did not baptize them, for another Evangelist assures us, that JESUS did *not baptize* personally, *but his disciples*. He said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." We admire his condescension, and would do all in our power to bring our children to Christ, by prayer and by instruction, as soon as they are capable of receiving it: and we rejoice in hope of finding great part of heaven filled with such as died before they were capable of exercising their rational

powers; but we dare not baptize them, unless he had commanded us.

Nor are we convinced of the propriety of Infant Baptism, by PETER's saying to the Jews, "The promise is to you, and to your children;" because, though the whole verse is seldom quoted by our Brethren, yet we have read what follows, viz. "and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." We consider the last clause as equally limiting each of the foregoing clauses. The invitation, or conditional promise, belongs to all indefinitely, who hear the gospel; the absolute promise to those alone who actually obey it, under the influence of the Holy Spirit. But the children of the Jews were particularly mentioned on this occasion, because the wisdom and goodness of God, who foresaw the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, and the subsequent miseries of that devoted nation, would yet afford encouragement to any individual, who between the rejection of the race of Israel and their general conversion in the latter days, should be led to seek forgiveness, through that precious blood, which his fathers had shed without the gates of the city. The

argument some have founded on 1 Cor. vii. 14. is not satisfactory to us; because whatever holiness is ascribed to the *child*, is equally ascribed to the *unbelieving parent*. If, therefore, the former had a right to Baptism, the latter had at least an equal right; and the elder impenitent children as much as the youngest, if they could only be induced, without any personal, vital religion, to submit to the external sign. We think an easy clue is to be found to the explanation of this passage, by considering the strictness of the Mosaic Law, which forbad any matrimonial connection between Jews and Heathens: hence arose a query of great importance, proposed by the Corinthians to PAUL, how far the like rule was binding on Christians? He decides, that the unmarried should marry only in the Lord; but that if a converted heathen had been previously married to one who continued unconverted, the converted party was not obliged to put away the unconverted, who was willing to stay: the marriage was to be held lawful and valid, else the children must also have been put away; just as the Jews, in the days of Ezra, took counsel to put away all the strange *wives*, and *such as were born of*

*them.* (x. 3.) That regulation was suited to the state of the church when confined to one small country; but a gracious God did not see fit to enjoin the same regulation to be rigorously observed when his gospel was about to be spread among many nations, inasmuch as the consequences of enforcing it would have been so awful to multitudes of outcast children. Dr. GILL, in his commentary on the place, brings strong evidence to prove, that the phrase, "The unbelieving husband is sanctified *to* (not *by*) the wife," &c. is used for the very act of marriage, as it often is in the Jewish writings.

We cannot understand the propriety of looking into the book of Genesis for directions as to a New Testament ordinance. Nor can we feel the force of arguments drawn from the Abrahamic Covenant and the rite of Circumcision. Many evils have arisen to the Church, from a perverse imitation of the Old Economy under the Christian Dispensation.\* If the Apostles had had the

---

\* See VERSCHAIR'S *Oration on the Inconvenience and Evils arising from a perverse Imitation of the Old Economy*: translated by the Rev. JOHN BIRT, of *Hull*.

same ideas with modern Pædobaptists, respecting Baptism as coming in instead of Circumcision, it seems incredible that neither JAMES at the council of Jerusalem, (Acts xv.) nor PAUL in his Epistle to the Galatians, should have thought of introducing one hint of this nature; though it would have been extremely pertinent to the occasion, had it been true. We know that our Lord was circumcised, and yet baptized; and we suppose all the Jewish Converts were. And if TIMOTHY was circumcised after he was baptized, this must have been still more inconsistent with the notion that we reject. The rite which is now abrogated, left on the natural seed of Abraham an indelible mark, and confirmed their title to an earthly inheritance; but no previous profession of personal religion was required, even of adults, to authorize their reception of it: and our Lord's language, in John vii. 22, 23, seems scarcely to be reconciled with the idea of its being purely of a religious nature. While the spiritual nature of the Gospel Church induces us to conclude, that none ought to be admitted to its peculiar ordinances, but those that make a credible profession of personal piety.



To reply, therefore, positively to this question, *Who ought to be baptized?* We think in our consciences that none ought to be admitted to this ordinance, any more than to the table of the Lord, but such, as in the judgment of charity, are partakers of true repentance and vital faith. *If thou believest with all the heart thou mayest* be baptized, but not otherwise. If you cordially believe the equity of God's *claims*, who demands the whole heart for himself, and universal conformity to his law, in your disposition and conduct towards others; and the justice of his *charges* against sinners, as having deserved eternal death; with the truth of his *declarations* concerning all mankind, as having sinned and fallen short of the glory of God; if you cordially believe his *testimony* concerning his Son, as the only propitiatory sacrifice for sin, whose blood cleanseth from all sin, and who is able to save to the uttermost all them that come unto God by him; if you believe the *invitations* of the gospel, so as to obey them; believe the *promises*, so as to embrace and rely upon them; and the *discovery* of future happiness, so as to be willing to live on earth as a stranger, and to make your whole life a

pilgrimage towards heaven; if your faith so respect the gospel, as to believe all that it implies and all that it contains with *approbation*, and an *appropriation* of the general truth to your own circumstances; then you may be baptized: but unless we have room to hope this is the case, we dare not baptize you. If you have repented, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and thus while your faith lessens your dread of personal suffering, a view of the vicarious sufferings of the Lamb of God increases your conviction of your demerit, and your consequent humiliation; and the love of Christ constrains you to depart from iniquity,—then we must conclude that you have been taught to “say that Jesus is the Lord, by the Holy Spirit,” and can have no objection to your being baptized.

Such, my Brethren, are our answers to these two first questions. You will, we trust, all examine the scriptures for yourselves. If you judge us mistaken, I hope you will not censure us more severely than comports with that fallibility which we all acknowledge: to our own Master we must stand or fall.

I come to to inquire, Thirdly, WHY IS BAPTISM TO BE ADMINISTERED?

None of us would pay any deference in this case to the authority of the Pope, nor of any Ecclesiastical Assembly who should prescribe rites of their own invention; or so decide on the interpretation of scripture as to deny liberty of conscience to others. Nor would we regard unwritten *tradition*, though this has been assigned by many as a sufficient and as the only ground for baptizing infants.\* Nor would *custom*, however introduced, or of the longest continuance, have weight with us.

But we attend to this ordinance solely because our blessed Lord has enjoined it. He honoured it at it's first institution, being himself immersed in Jordan, as a pledge of his resolution to yield himself up to those overwhelming sufferings, which he had in prospect, knowing that after being plunged into the deepest sorrows, and buried in the earth, he should emerge and rise again to

---

\* See Note H. respecting the German *Formula ad Interim*

die no more, and ensure a joyful resurrection to all his redeemed. Though he did not baptize with his own hands, yet he encouraged his disciples to baptize while he was still with them. And just before his ascension, he gave them a commission to preach his gospel among all nations, and baptize those that should believe their testimony. This commission could not refer to the Baptism of the Spirit, which it was not in the power of man to impart, but to Baptism with water; and accordingly the Apostles acted upon it. We need not repeat the instances recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, to which we have already referred. PETER spoke of the evident reception of the Holy Spirit, not as superseding the need of water Baptism: but as an evidence that no one could lawfully forbid it. But it might have been justly forbidden, had not Christ authorized it's use.\*

Why then do we baptize any persons? Not because of their descent from pious parents, nor because they are better than others by birth. Relation to Abraham would

---

\* See Note I.

entitle to Circumcision, but cannot give a right to Baptism. JOHN therefore said, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have ABRAHAM to our father: but bring forth fruits meet for repentance." These are requisite to justify admission to a New Testament institution. We do not baptize any, because we conceive the act of man can constitute them "Children of God, members of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven." To the Baptism of Infants, considered simply as expressive of their dedication to God, and the parents' desire that their children may be the Lord's, we only object, Who has required this at your hands? Where has the scripture authorized the application of water in the name of the Trinity, to speechless unconverted babes? But to the sentiments which the terms above mentioned naturally convey, we have far more strenuous objections. We would not for all the world foster such presumptuous hopes in the minds of our children, for fear of being accessory to a most fatal delusion.

We understand, however, full as little what some Calvinistic Dissenters can mean, who

either talk of *putting* their children into the Covenant of Grace, or of baptizing them because they *are* in it. What is intended by these expressions? If there be *no* distinction, as some Calvinists suppose, between the Covenant of Grace and the Covenant of Redemption, how can any be said to be in it who are not finally saved? And if there *be* a distinction between them, as many of our old Divines used to maintain, wherein does it consist? Allowing the difference, I suppose it must be this: The Covenant of *Redemption* is a solemn federal agreement between the Father and the Son, wherein it was promised that the Son should see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied; or that his obedience unto death should be certainly rewarded with the eternal salvation and happiness of all his elect. While the Covenant of *Grace*, as distinguishable from that of Redemption, is God's solemn engagement to give all the blessings resulting from Christ's mediation to every penitent believer, or to every one who actually returns to God in the name of Jesus. Now if this view be correct, a man may be secretly interested in the Covenant of Redemption, who is not yet in the Covenant

of Grace; but no one can be interested in the Covenant of Grace, who was not given to Christ in the Covenant of Redemption.

But the manner in which our Brethren often speak of the Covenant, is to me unintelligible. *Who are in it?* and *What is secured to them by it?* Are all the natural seed of Believers? For how many generations? We hope ADAM was in the Covenant of Redemption and of Grace; we are sure NOAH was. Did the relation of CAIN to the former, or of HAM to the latter, secure their salvation? Or does relation to a believer now, secure the salvation of his children without conversion? Or does it secure their conversion also? How then can any descendant of godly NOAH perish? I have heard of strange things said by individuals; but let every man bear his own burden. I utterly dislike all sweeping, promiscuous censures. But I must confess I cannot understand the meaning of our Pædobaptist Brethren.

The covenants with NOAH, with ABRAHAM and his natural seed, and with Israel at Sinai, were all subservient to that Covenant

of Grace, and attended with some manifestation of that plan of redemption, which are now more fully displayed; but I cannot think it correct to call either of them *the* Covenant of *Grace*. I should expect every Calvinist to allow, that none are in the Covenant of Redemption but the *elect*; and if the Covenant of Grace be viewed as distinct from it, none are in that but actual *believers*. I cannot conceive how any should be said to be in the Covenant of Grace, who may after all, perish for ever.

Roman Catholics have talked of Sacraments working grace by the very deed performed. Strange things are said of the efficacy of Baptism,\* in the interim of CHARLES V. Section *De Baptismo*. And things full as strange are ascribed to it by Bishop TOMLINE,, and many of the High Church Divines, who deny that any other

---

\* *Hoc igitur Sacramentum abluit nos, sanctificat, justificat: hoc Sacramentum facit, ut consequamur remissionem peccatorum nostrorum originalium atque actualium.* This Sacrament washes, sanctifies, and justifies us: this Sacrament causes us to obtain the remission of our sins both original and actual.



regeneration is to be expected but what takes place at Baptism. While far more judicious and evangelical theological writers speak not only of the possibility, but strongly intimate the probability of renewing grace accompanying the sprinkling of an infant. Surely if this frequently occurred, we might expect to see some instances of children's discovering a holy propensity as soon as they could speak. Gladly would we yield to evidence, if such facts could be ascertained; but really we know not where to look for them.

With respect to those whom we baptize, we cannot search the heart, and may be mistaken in our judgment, as PHILIP was respecting SIMON, and as the strictest Independents may be respecting those whom they admit to the Lord's Table; but we dare not baptize any of whom we do not hope that they are already born of God; or that they have been renewed in the temper of their minds; that they are penitent believers, whom the love of Christ constraineth to confess him before men, in the way which he hath appointed.

As to the persons now about to be baptized, if I may be allowed to speak for them, I would remark, that

1. They mean, as by a solemn act of worship, to acknowledge the Triune Jehovah, as the only living and true God; and, as their own act and deed, to devote themselves to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

And may I not plead, that if any one among them was baptized in his infancy, and if what was then done for him, without his knowledge and consent, and of which he knows nothing but by report or by register, was really valid; yet surely the error of his doing it a second time, can hardly appear a very heinous mistake; since he is not about to devote himself now to another, but to God in Christ?

2. They mean hereby openly to confess their pollution and guilt. They are about to be baptized with the Baptism of Repentance, professing to be overwhelmed with shame for their inexcusable revolt from God. They are come to a place where

much water is, that they may, by being washed all over, indicate a deep conviction of their entire pollution, and need of universal cleansing. They are about to be immersed in that element, beneath which, if they were to continue but a short time, death must ensue; and they are willing all this assembly should consider it as a confession, that they know themselves to be worthy of death. They could not escape being plunged into endless misery, were it not that with God there is *abundant pardon*: nor could they be fitted to enter into his holy habitation, without *abundant purification*.

3. They mean, by attending to this institution, to avow their faith in Christ's death and resurrection. He was delivered for their offences, and they are about to be planted together in the likeness of his death, being buried with him by Baptism into death: he also was raised again for their justification, and they hope to be planted together in the likeness of his resurrection. Thus Baptism doth now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, to which our faith is therein directed. Not the putting away the filth of the flesh; but the answer of a

good conscience towards God, is the thing to be regarded here. Were you to ask each of these Candidates, How do you hope to be saved? I am persuaded all would reply, Only by the vicarious sufferings of the Son of God. He was immersed in sorrow, he was overwhelmed with the wrath of God due to our sins, that we might hereafter bathe our souls in seas of heavenly bliss. Yes, Brethren! I invite you to come and see, in a lively emblematic representation, where your Lord lay. "I have an immersion to undergo," said he, "and how am I straightened till it be accomplished." In this ordinance, you hope for that communion with him, of which infants are absolutely incapable. They can have no mental fellowship, such as we trust you will now enjoy, with him in his sufferings, nor in his resurrection.

4. The persons about to be baptized, wish to be considered by all the spectators as hereby declaring their desire to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness; to put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man which is corrupt, according to the lusts of error; and to be renewed in the spirit of their mind; and to put on the new

man, who after God is created in righteousness and the holiness of truth.\* Probably the custom of putting on *white* raiment after Baptism, (from which *Whit-sunday* obtained it's name, when Baptism was chiefly administered at that period,) is less ancient than the times of the apostles; but a *change* was always needful: and though some most respectable modern Pædobaptists seem very averse to admit allusions to immersion, and the necessary change of raiment consequent upon it, in the passage just cited, as well as in Rom. vi. 3—4, and Col. ii. 12, yet concessions enough to fill a volume, might be produced from their predecessors of every denomination, whom the force of truth constrain to acknowledge their evident reference to the primitive mode of administering this ordinance. See to it, my dear friends, that you are not only right in your judgment concerning the outward sign, but never lose sight of the thing signified; and be concerned to verify the import of this solemn profession to the end of life.

---

\* Ephes. iv. 22--24.

5. The persons about to be baptized, wish now to signify their separation from the world.

One of our chief objections to Infant Baptism is this, that it unites the church and the world. Many truly religious people, no doubt, attend to it in a serious way. Though they can shew us neither command nor example for it in the New Testament, nor any such argument as brings conviction to our minds, yet they satisfy themselves, as supposing it may be justified by some remote consequence of scripture. But are not the children of these believers confessedly baptized into *one body* with the children of profligates and debauchees; of irreligious Protestants, and superstitious Papists, all the world over. Originally it was said, "Know ye not, that as many of us as were baptized into Christ, have *put on Christ*?" But if Wisdom were now to stand in the street, or take her station in the chief place of concourse, in any principal city of our land, and examine how far this expression was applicable to all that pass by, could she indeed determine of the hundreds that would come under her eye in a few hours, all

these except a few Quakers, and children of Baptists who have not yet made a public profession of religion, have evidently *put on Christ?* In what a low and diluted sense must the phrase be used, to bear such an application! Oh what Members of Christ are these! What sign is there that they are actuated by his Spirit? How many of them would ridicule the idea? To what sort of a heaven must they be heirs? A heaven to suit their taste, must be such a place as the glorified Jesus could not bear to enter! Was it so from the beginning? Surely not! PAUL would never have said, "They have put on Christ," of whom he could not also say, "He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit;" or "Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of CHRIST, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tablets of stone, but in fleshly tablets of the heart."

If it be asked in reply, Do we then never baptize hypocrites? Doubtless we do, but not knowingly. The Apostles also did, and our Independent Brethren admit such to the table of the Lord; but when they are detected we exclude them from our churches.

While this was the practicé of the primitive church, the Apostle's words were pertinent; notwithstanding some tares were mixed with the wheat: but we cannot think his language applicable with any propriety to all the inhabitants of what is called Christendom.\* I only add,

6. They who are now to be baptized would thus testify their faith in the resurrection of the body, and their hope of eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

An emblem of death, my dear friends, is before you. But forasmuch as Christ has suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the like mind. Fear not to descend into this watery grave; you will soon emerge from thence. And when death itself shall be encountered, fear not; for Jesus will be with you. You are about to resign yourselves now into the hands of your Pastor; who having immersed you for a moment in the name of our blessed Lord, will easily and instantly raise you out of the water. That

---

\* See the account in the *Evangelical Magazine*, Feb. 1814, p. 72, of the way of putting on Christ in high life.



Lord, who knows what death is, who died a violent, shameful, cursed death, for your sakes, will be with you when you walk through the valley of the *shadow* of death, which the light of his countenance shall turn into the morning of glory; and he will, with a word, raise up your bodies at the last day, transformed into the likeness of his own glorified and immortal body, in which he now sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

I trust you will ever remember, that you are baptized, not to make zealots for a party; but in consequence of an overwhelming sense of obligation to your blessed Redemer, you punctually obey him in this one point, as a pledge of your readiness to obey him in every thing. As you would not deviate from a punctual conformity to his will, in a case where you are exposed to reproach for singularity, so will you carefully comply with those numerous and still more important directions, wherein all his real followers are agreed as to the meaning of his word. You are about to be baptized, not that your Baptism should be forgotten as soon as it is over; but that you may ever remember that

the vows of God are upon you, and that you are bound to follow the Lamb, whithersoever he goeth. This day's work is but the commencement of a public profession of ardent attachment to Him that loved you and gave himself for you. Ever consider your Baptism as a memorial of permanent and eternal obligations.

Surely, my hearers, it must appear to the unprejudiced, that Baptism is a noble and significant Institution. It demands, therefore, your serious examination into the proper *mode* of it's administration; the proper *subjects* to whom it should be administered; and the important *ends* for which it was appointed. If you find our sentiments on these particulars agreeable to the divine word, and you possess the scriptural requisites to entitle you to claim it, surely it ought to engage your ready submission. It would be ungrateful indeed, to neglect an acknowledged command of Christ, under a notion that obedience to it is not essential to salvation. You would not take it well of a beloved child, who should say, 'I understand my Father's will, and am aware that he has given me directions with which I

could easily comply; but as he will not disinherit me if I should neglect one of his injunctions, and I do shew my love to him in other ways, I shall not scruple disobeying him in this one particular.' Surely if any of us thus requite the Lord, we shall act a part that is both foolish and disingenuous.

But, however clear this subject may appear to myself, I dare not call in question the sincerity of many who are differently minded. When I reflect on the early introduction of various errors into the church, and consider the influence of education, the power of prejudice, and the deficiency of all our knowledge, I feel quite averse to judge others, and am as willing they should think for themselves, as I am unwilling they should think for me. I feel a disposition cordially to esteem all those, who agree with us in the truths signified by this ordinance, though they may differ from us as to the administration of it. May the only contest among Christians be, who shall shew that he is not merely sprinkled with the spirit of love, but as it were immersed therein. We are sure many of our brethren will have

no objection to this spiritual immersion;\* and pray God we may all of us enjoy it.

Let those of our own persuasion, who have been already baptized, reflect frequently on their former solemn engagements, and stand to the surrender they once made of

---

\* Some, however, cannot bear the very introduction of the term, or the least allusion to our sentiments. Hence one complained of my saying to young Ministers of our own persuasion, in my Sermon at Devonshire Square, "What avails the observance of a more scriptural and significant mode of administering the ordinance, if it's end be not kept constantly in view? It is not the baptism of *adults*, but of *believers*, for which we plead: let them who profess to have believed, be urged so to walk as to prove they abide in him whose name they bear. Let them live the life of faith, and fight the good fight of faith. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Were the Greek term translated, I am persuaded it should be rendered, He that believeth and is *immersed* or *overwhelmed*, &c. Overwhelmed with what? with water? Yes, that is the sign, and thus only we think the ordinance should be administered. But what is the thing signified? He that is overwhelmed with a sense of obligation, of guilt, of danger, of gratitude, of love; he that is immersed in the Holy Spirit shall be saved. We had rather have the thing signified without the sign, than the sign without the thing signified; though we think both should go together." pp. 28, 29.

themselves to God. Why were you baptized if you did not mean to be wholly the Lord's? If you did not feel a filial affection for the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as your Father who is in Heaven? If you did not feel your obligations to the Redeemer, and mean to be subject to him in all things? If you did not take the Spirit of God for your sanctifier, and desire to be led by him continually? Why were you washed in much water, if you did not intend to acknowledge universal pollution, and to express your desire after universal purity? Why did you in this ordinance commemorate Christ's death and resurrection, if you did not think **Sin** to be worthy of **Death**, and that it needed a great propitiation, requiring the Lamb of God to be sacrificed as your Passover that the stroke of justice might be averted from you? Why were you planted together in the likeness of Christ's death, and of his resurrection; if you do not wish to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness, and to walk henceforth in newness of life? Why were you immersed and as it were buried in water, but to denote that you had taken leave of the world, and set your

affections on things above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God?

Oh remember, that the vows of God are upon you; follow Christ in every thing wherein he is imitable: yea, follow him, if called to it through the most overwhelming trials; he will lead you safely through fire as well as through water, and bring you out into a wealthy place. The Forerunner has for you taken possession of heavenly mansions. Well may you go on your way rejoicing. Amen.

## NOTES.

---

### Note A. page 9.

The verb βαπτω, with its various inflexions, occurs in the LXX in the following places :

Exod. xii. 22.—ye shall *dip* a bunch of hyssop in the blood, &c.—Gr. βαψαντες—dipping, ye shall strike it, &c.

Lev. iv. 6.—the priest shall *dip* his finger in the blood, and sprinkle it, &c. βαψει—και προσρανει.

— iv. 17.—the priest shall *dip* his finger, &c.

— ix. 9.—he *dip*t his finger in the blood, &c.

— xi. 32.—every vessel, &c. it must be *put into* water, &c. εις υδωρ βαφησεται.

— xiv. 6.—he shall *dip* them, and the living bird, in the blood of the bird, &c.

— xiv. 16.—he shall *dip* his right finger in the oil, &c.

— xiv. 51.—he shall *dip* the cedar, hyssop, scarlet, and the living bird, &c.

- Num. xix. 18.—A clean person shall take hyssop, and *dip* (βαψει) in the water, and sprinkle (a very different word, περιρρᾶναι,) upon the tent, &c.
- Deut. xxxiii. 24.—Let Asher *dip* his foot in oil.
- Josh. iii. 15.—the feet of the priests were *dipped* in the brim of the water.
- Ruth ii. 14.—*dip* thy morsel in the vinegar.
- 1 Sam. xiv. 27.—Jonathan *dip*t the end of his rod in an honeycomb.
- 2 Kings viii. 15.—Hazeal *dip*t a cloth in water.
- Job ix. 31.—yet thou shalt *plunge* me in the ditch.
- Psa. lxxviii. 23.—thy foot may be *dipped* in blood, the tongue of thy dogs, &c.
- Dan. iv. 33. } Nebuchadnezzar *wet* with the dew of  
 — v. 21. }       heaven.\*

The LXX use the adjective βαπτος once.

Ezek. xxiii. 15,—*dyed* attire upon their heads.

*Heb.* טְרֵיטֵי טַבָּלִים dyed turbans.

In the New Testament the verb βαπτω occurs thrice. .

- Luke xvi. 24.—that Lazarus may *bapt* (or *dip*) his finger.
- John xiii. 26.—he to whom I *bapt*ing the sop, &c.  
 i. e. *dipping*, no doubt.
- Rev. xix. 13.—clothed with a vesture *bapt*ed in blood,  
 i. e. *dipped* in it.

---

\* Whoever has read Mr. MAUNDREL'S Account of the Eastern Dews, would not wonder at his being said to be drenched, soaked, or *immersed*, in dew.



The compound verb *εμβαπτω* is used three times.

Matt. xxvi. 23. } he that *inbapt*s (i. e. *dips*) his hand  
 Mark xiv. 20. } with me in the dish.  
 John xiii. 26.—and *inbapt*ing (or *dipping*) the sop.

*Βαπτω* is thus used in Heathen Authors.

HOMER.—As when a Smith, to harden an iron hatchet or pole-ax, *βαπτει dips* it in cold water.

*Odyssey*, ix. line 392.

PLATO uses the word several times in one paragraph. *Οι βαφεις, επιδαν βουληθωσι βαψαι ερια*, The *Dyers*, when they are minded to *dip* wool, &c.—*ουτω δε βαπτουσι*, and so they *dip* it, &c. *De Republica*, Book iv. p. 637. Or, *Serranus's Edition of Plato's Works*, Vol. II. p. 429.

LYCOPHRON.—The child *βαψει shall plunge* his sword into the viper's bowels. *Cassandra*, ver. 1121.

EURIPIDES.—Go, take the water-pot—and *βαψασ' dip* it in the sea. *Hecuba*, Act iii. ver. 609.

THEOCRITUS.—Every morning my servant *βαψαι shall dip* me a cup of honey. *Idyllium* v. ver. 126.

The boy let down a capacious pitcher, making haste *βαψαι to dip* it. *Idyllium* xiii. ver. 47.

MARCUS ANTONIUS.—A conqueror in that noble strife of mastering the passions *βεβαμμενον immersed* entirely in justice. (*penitus justitia imbutum*.)

Lib. iii. p. 37.

The mind *βαπτεται is imbued* by the thoughts, *βαπτε dip* or *imbue* it, therefore, in the constant meditation of such thoughts. Lib. v. p. 85. Glasgow edition.

DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS.—One *plunging* βαψας his spear between the other's ribs, who at the same instant pushed his into his enemy's belly.

Antiq. Rom. lib. v. p. 278.

---

Note B. page 9.

In the LXX, βαπτίζω occurs but twice.

2 Kings v. 14.—Naaman *dipped* (or baptized) himself in Jordan seven times.

Isa. xxi. 4.—The clause rendered in the E. T. *fearfulness affrighted me*, is in the LXX, *Iniquity baptizes me*, i. e. *overwhelms me*.

Βαπτίζω is used twice in the Apocrypha.

Judith xii. 7.—she *washed* (bathed or immersed) herself in a fountain. εβαπτίζετο.

Eccles. xxxiv. 25.—He that *washeth* himself from a dead body. (He was to bathe himself in water. See Num. xix. 19.) βαπτιζομενος απο νεκρου.

The verb βαπτίζω is used more than seventy times in the New Testament, with reference to this ordinance: and twice besides in a figurative sense with respect to overwhelming sufferings.

Mark x. 38, 39.—Are ye able to be immersed with the immersion wherewith I shall be overwhelmed?—and, With the immersion wherewith I shall be overwhelmed shall ye be immersed.

Luke xii. 50. I have a Baptism wherewith to be baptized, &c. which Dr. CAMPBELL renders, "I have an immersion to undergo," &c. Read his note.

It is also used with reference to the Israelites passing *through* the sea, and *under* the cloud, 1 Cor. x. 2. when they were baptized into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea; as it would have been madness to follow him into such a situation, had they not been assured of his divine mission. See Exod. xiv. 29. xv. 8.

And with respect to the Pharisees wondering that our Lord had not bathed before dinner. See CAMPBELL, on John xiii. 10.

The noun βαπτισμα occurs about twenty times, always with reference to this ordinance.

The noun βαπτισμος four times.

Mark vii. 4.—The Immersion of cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables. See Dr. Gill on the place.

— vii. 8.—The tradition of men, as the immersion of pots and cups.

Heb. vi. 2.—The doctrine of immersions, and laying on of hands.

— ix. 10. Only in meats and drinks and divers immersions, i. e. Immersions on different occasions prescribed by the law.

Βαπτιστης, Baptist, or the Immersor. A title given to John about fifteen times.

---

Note C. page 9.

### JOSEPHUS,

Whose authority must be of singular weight, as being nearly contemporary with the Apostles, and, like them, a Jew writing in Greek, repeatedly uses the word βαπτισμα.

Describing the purification of the people at Sin, he says, "When any persons were defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes into spring water with hyssop, and (βαπτισαντες) baptizing, i. e. *dipping* or *immersing*, part of these ashes into it, (ερραινον) they "sprinkled them with it." Lib. iv. c. iv. § 6. p. 146.

This quotation clearly shews the difference between baptizing or dipping, and rhanizing or sprinkling.

He says, concerning the ship in which Jonah attempted to flee from the presence of the Lord, "The ship was about to be baptized, (βαπτιζεσθαι,) i. e. sunk or "overwhelmed."

Antiq. lib. ix. c. x. § 2. Hudson's Edition, Vol. I. p. 419.

He uses the same word twice concerning the death of Aristobulus, the brother of Mariamne, who was drowned at Jericho, according to Herod's order, by certain Greeks, who enticed him into the water to swim, and then, under pretence of play, βαπτιζοντες ουκ ανηκαν εως και πανταπασιν αποπνιζειν, baptizing, i. e. immersing, or putting him under water, they did not leave off until they had quite suffocated him.

Jewish Antiq. Book xv. Vol. I. p. 666.

He mentions the same event in his Wars of the Jews, Book I. c. xxii. § 2. "The young man was sent to Jericho, and there, according to his order, being *immersed* (βαπτιζομενος) in a fish-pond, he came to "his end." Vol. II. 1012.

N. B. Archbishop USHER uses a word on this occasion, which being now become ludicrous, is sometimes *chosen* to describe our practice, (especially by such of our Brethren as are most violent for candour,) "*ducking* him "as he was swimming, as it were in sport and jest," &c. Should not our Brethren be *certain* that their Lord was

not immersed, before they prefer this low synonym to immersion ?

JOSEPHUS, in his Life, speaking of his own voyage to Rome, and providential deliverance when shipwrecked, says, “βαπτισθεντος γαρ ημων του πλοιου, for our own ship “being baptized (or overwhelmed) in the midst of the “Adriatic Gulph, we being about the number of 600 “persons, swam all night, and at day-break about 80 “were taken up by another ship.”

Hudson's Josephus, II. 905.

He uses the same word figuratively in two other places.

In the Wars of the Jews, he says, “Many of the “noble Jews, as though the city was on the point of “being *overwhelmed*, (βαπτίζομενης,) swam away, as it “were, from the city.” Vol. II. 1105.

Again, speaking of the Heads of the Robbers getting into Jerusalem, he says, “These very men, besides the “seditions they made, *baptized* the city, (εβαπτισαν την “πολιν) i. e. *overwhelmed* it, *plunged* it into ruin, or “were the cause of it's utter destruction.”

Vol. II. 1169.

The same Author uses επιβαπτίζω figuratively, for totally overwhelming.

So, speaking of the sons of Herod, he says, “This, as “the last storm, (επιβαπτισεν,) *epibaptized*, or *utterly overwhelmed*, the young men, already weather-beaten.

Vol. II. 1024.

And when the inhabitants of Jotapata urged him to stay there, they pressed him not “to leave his friends, “nor, as it were, to leap out of a ship enduring a storm,

“into which he had come in a calm. For the city must  
 “be *epibaptized*, or *utterly overwhelmed*, (ἐπιβαπτισειν)  
 “no one daring to oppose it’s enemies, if he, who kept  
 “their courage up, should depart.” Vol. II. 1132.

---

Note D. page 9.

Βαπτίζω occurs in the following passages from Heathen Authors.

ESOP’S Fables, Oxford Edition, 1698. p. 88. Fable 156, The Ape and the Dolphin.—“the dolphin vexed at such  
 “a falsehood, βαπτίζων αὐτον ἀπεκτεινεν, *immersing* him,  
 “killed him,” i. e. by plunging him into the water. Let  
 any child judge what the word means here.

ORPHEUS, in his Argonautics, line 510. p. 78.—  
 Ἄλλ’ ὅτε Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοὴν βαπτίζετο Τιταν—But when the  
 Sun *immerses* himself in the water of the Ocean.

ANACREON, White and Miller’s Edition, 1802. p. 92.  
 γθ. ascribed in some editions to JULIAN the Egyptian.  
 In an old edition there is a Latin translation by the  
 celebrated PHILIP MELANCTHON.

“Platting a garland once, I found Cupid among the  
 “roses:—taking hold of him by the wings, Εβαπτισ’ εἰς τον  
 “οἶνον, I *immersed* him, or *plunged* him into wine, and  
 drank him up with it,” &c.

An old verse has often been quoted from PLUTARCH,—  
 Ἀσκος βαπτίζη, δύναι δὲ τοι συθμισ εἶσι—The bladder may  
 be *dipped*, but never drowned, or it may be immersed,  
 but it cannot be kept under water.

POLYBIUS, speaking of a sea-fight between the  
 Carthaginians and the Romans, says, “They *immersed*

“(or sunk) βαπτίζον, many of the vessels of the  
“Romans.”

BASIL, the Christian Father, speaks of “suffering with  
“those that were *immersed* or plunged in the sea.”  
(βαπτίζομενοις.)

GREGORY NAZIANZEN.—“That we may not be  
“*immersed* or sunk with the ship and the crew.”  
(βαπτισθομεν.)

POLYBIUS.—“Such a storm suddenly arose, through  
“all the country, that the ships were baptized or  
“*immersed* in the Tyber.”

POLYBIUS, III. c. 72. (See Elzivir's Livy, Book xxi.)—  
“The infantry crossed it with difficulty, baptized or  
“*immersed* up to their breasts.”

PORPHYRY, speaking of Styx, the fabulous river of  
hell, says, “The person that has been a sinner, having  
“gone a little way into it, is *plunged* or *immersed* up  
“to the head. βαπτίζεται μεχρι κεφαλης. p. 282.

STRABO uses, μεχρι ομφαλου βαπτίζομενων. *Immersed*  
up to the middle.

DIODORUS SICULUS.—“Many land animals, carried  
“away by the river Nile, being *immersed* are destroyed;  
“others escape, fleeing to higher places.”

PLUTARCH uses this word figuratively, speaking of  
Otho's “being *immersed* or *overwhelmed* or *sunk* (βε-  
“βαπτισμενος) in debts of fifty millions of Drachmæ.”

PLATO speaks of his “knowing the youth to be  
“*overwhelmed* or *immersed* in sophistry.”

STRABO.—“ But the Lakes near Agrigentum have  
 “ indeed the taste of sea-water, but a different nature,  
 “ for it does not befall the things which cannot swim  
 “ *to be immersed*, (βαπτίζεσθαι,) but they swim on the  
 “ surface like wood.” *Geography*, l. ix. p. 421.

He speaks of a river, in another place, whose waters  
 are so buoyant “ that if an arrow be thrown in,  
 “ μολλις βαπτίζεσθαι it would scarcely be *immersed*, or  
 “ would hardly *sink*.” l. xii. p. 309.

He mentions also a lake on the top of which bitumen  
 floats, in which a man cannot be *immersed*, βαπτίζεσθαι  
 but is borne up by the water. l. xvi. p. 1108.

DION CASSIUS.—“ Such a storm suddenly pervaded  
 “ all the country, that the ships that were in the  
 “ Tyber were *immersed* or *sunk*. τα πλοια τα εν τω  
 “ Τιβεριδι βαπτισθηται. Book xxxvii. § 57. Vol. I. p. 148.

(2.)—“ how would not his ship be *immersed* or *sunk*  
 “ βαπτισθειη, by the multitude of our rowers ?”

Book l. § 18. Vol. I. p. 617.

(3.)—“ they were either *immersed*, (εβαπτίζοντο,) their  
 “ ships being bored through, or,” &c.

(4.)—“ these from above *immersing* (βαπτίζοντες) or  
 “ sinking them (i. e. the ships) with stones and engines.”

Book l. § 32. Vol. I. 647.

DIODORUS SICULUS.—“ most of the land animals, if  
 “ they are intercepted by the river, are destroyed, being  
 “ *immersed*.” βαπτίζομενα.

lib. 1. § 36. Vol. I. p. 43. Amsterdam, 1746.

(2.)—τους δε ιδιωτας ου βαπτίζουσι ταις εισφοραις. But  
 the common people they do not *overwhelm* with taxes.

lib. 1. § 67. Vol. I. p. 85.



(3.)—της δένειως βυθισθεισης, in the Text, “whose ship being sunk.” In the Note, “βαπτισθεισης being *immersed*, is the Coislilian reading, which is sufficiently elegant. See Polybius I. 51.” lib. xi. § 15. Vol. I. 417.

(4.)—“the river being borne on with a more violent stream, (πολλους εβαπτισε,) *immersed* or *overwhelmed* “many.” lib. xvi. § 80. Vol. II. 143.

HELIODORUS.—“killing some on the land, and *immersing* or *plunging* (βαπτιζοντων) others into the “lake, with their boats and their little huts.”

Ethiopia, lib. i. cap. xxx. p. 55.

(2.)—“perceiving that he was altogether abandoned to grief, and *overwhelmed* or *immersed* in calamity.”—τη συμφορα βεβαπτισμενον. Lib. ii. cap. iii. p. 65.

(3.)—“since the things you met with have *overwhelmed* “you. (εβαπτιζεν. *Casus tui obruebant ac demergabant.*” lib. v. cap. xvi. p. 227.

*Life of Homer*, ascribed to DIONYSIUS HALICARNENSIS, “Homer speaks of the whole sword being so *immersed* “(βαπτισθεντος) in blood as to grow warm with it.”

*Opuscula Mythologica*, p. 297.

ARISTOTLE uses this word when speaking of the Phenicians that dwell at Cadiz, “who sailing beyond the “pillars of Hercules came to certain uninhabited lands, “which at the ebb are used not to be *immersed* or “covered over with water, βαπτιζεσθαι, but when the “tide is at the full, the coast is quite inundated.”

*De mirabilibus*, p. 735.

LUCIAN represents Timon the man-hater as saying, “if any one being carried away by a river should stretch “forth his hands to me for aid, I would push him down

“when *sinking*, βαπτίζοντα, that he should never rise  
“again.” Vol. I. p. 139.

The two most diminutive instances produced by Schwarzzius are these :

ÆSCHYLUS.—“*Immersing* his two-edged sword in  
“slaughters.” Doubtless by *plunging* it into their  
bodies, not by holding it before a small puncture to  
be sprinkled.

ARISTOPHANES, in PLATO, says, “I am one of  
“those who were *baptized* yesterday.”—meaning, who  
drank much, or as an Englishman would say, who had  
well soaked ourselves, or were *immersed* in wine.

An instance has been quoted against us from HOMER’S  
Βατραχομυομαχία, or Battle of the frogs and mice, where  
it is said of the death of the frog Crambophagus,

εβάπτετο \* δαίματι λιμνη πορφυρεω,

And the lake was tinged or dyed with purple blood: or  
it was *overwhelmed* with blood.

But let the burlesque nature of the poem be considered,  
where every thing is heightened to the most extravagant  
degree, and the gods are introduced as consulting about  
this tremendous war, and the word *immerse* would not be  
too strong for the Poet’s design. The heart of this  
gigantic and heroic frog was so full of blood, that it made  
the lake so red, that a solid body dipped in blood could  
not have been redder.

But one passage is produced from ORIGEN, on which  
more stress is laid than on all others, in which he speaks

---

\* This is from βαπτω not from βαπτίζω.

of the wood of Elijah's sacrifice as being *baptized*, though the wood was certainly not *dipped* in water, but four barrels of water *poured* upon it three times over. Very true. But read the account in 1 Kings, xviii. 32—35. consider the object of the prophet to prevent all possibility of collusion, and then say if ORIGEN had written in English, might he not have used the word *immerse* with propriety, and without rendering it's usual meaning ambiguous? Also, would not any of our opponents think such a three-fold soaking as bad as even a trine immersion?\*

References to immersion in the Father's might be produced without end.

I will only mention one, in CHRYSOSTOM, on Col. ii. 12. *εταφη ημων ο πρωτος ανθρωπος*, says he, *εταφη ουκ εν γη αλλ' εν υδατι*. Our first (or former) man is buried, he is buried not in earth, but in water.

Surely if these instances will not suffice, we must despair of settling the meaning of any word in a dead language; and if English should be as long disused as Greek, it may by and by be questioned if the English Baptists themselves intended by pleading for *immersion*,† to insist on the propriety of putting the whole body under water.

No man can have a greater respect than myself, for my dear and venerable friend Mr, SCOTT, whom I

\* The Reviewer in the *Evangelical Magazine* for 1813, p. 461, refers to a passage in ARISTOTLE. Why did he not insert the whole passage from Dr. GALE, pp. 116, 117?

† All that the Reviewer of Mr. BOOTH says, respecting Dr. GALE's confession that βαπτω does not always import a total immersion, applies equally to the English word *dip*. See Dr. GALE, p. 140.

consider as the best *practical Expositor* of scripture that ever I read; but I think if he were to re-examine the subject, and consider all the evidence here produced, he would hardly attribute it to our regarding "Jewish traditions more than either the language of scripture or the Greek idiom," that we contend that *Baptism* always signifies *immersion*. See Note on Matt. iii. 6.

On the most impartial consideration, I am compelled in my conscience to believe, that there never was a word in any language with which so much pains, management, and violence was ever used, to deprive it of it's original meaning, as hath been employed with βαπτω and βαπτίζω. And I verily think, that if Christian Baptism had never been instituted, or never been altered, there is no word in the Greek language, whose meaning would have been less disputed.

ISAAC CAUSABON, at the end of *Whitaker's Greek Testament*, London, 1633. referring to Matt. iii. 5, 6, has these words, "*Hic enim fuit baptizandi ritus, ut in aquas immergerentur: quod vel ipsa vox βαπτίζειν declarat satis, quæ non significat δύνειν, quod est fundum petere cum sua pernicie, ita profecto non est επιπολαζειν. Differunt enim hæc tria, επιπολαζειν, βαπτίζειν, δύνειν. Unde intelligimus, non esse abs re quod jampridem nonnulli disputarunt, de toto corpore immergendo in ceremonia baptismi: Vocem enim βαπτίζειν urgebant.* For this was the ancient rite of baptizing, that they should be immersed in water, which even the word βαπτίζειν sufficiently declares; which does not signify δύνειν, which is to sink fatally to the bottom;\* so certainly it is not επιπολαζειν, to

---

\* Yet JOSEPHUS, POLYBIUS, DION, STRABO, DIODORUS, and HELIODORUS sometimes used it in this sense.

“ swim on the top. For these three differ, *επιπολαζειν*, “ *βαπτιζειν*, *δυνειν*, to swim on the surface, to immerse, “ to sink to the bottom. Whence we understand, that it “ is not without ground, that some have disputed long “ ago, respecting the immersion of the whole body in “ the ceremony of Baptism: for they urged the word “ *βαπτιζειν*.”

I close with a remark of Dr. CAMPBELL. “ Another “ error in disputation, which is by far too common, is “ when one will admit nothing in the plea or arguments “ of an adversary to have the smallest weight. I have “ heard a disputant of this stamp, in defiance of etymology “ and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New “ Testament *Baptize*, means more properly to sprinkle “ than to plunge, and in defiance of all antiquity, that the “ former method was the earliest, and for many centuries “ the most general practice in baptizing. One who argues “ in this manner, never fails, with persons of knowledge, “ to betray the cause he would defend; and though with “ respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed “ as well as arguments, sometimes better; yet a candid “ mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood, “ even in support of truth.” *Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence*, p. 480.

Some of our modern Pædobaptists are determined however, that no one shall detect *them* in making the *least* concession, on either branch of this controversy; and they maintain that no concession is of any avail as to the meaning of the term, or the practice of the primitive church, unless the person who makes it, immediately alters his practice, and even though he retain his Pædobaptist sentiment, yet refuses to baptize any child except by immersion. Dr. WALL, Dr. CAMPBELL, and *hundreds* more of their greatest scholars, according to these gentlemen, will have hard work to vindicate their

integrity. We leave *them* to settle this controversy. We conceive that the force of truth constrained them to make concessions, which the force of custom prevented them from carrying into practice.

And here I beg leave to introduce an extract from a letter, which I received from a friend to whom I had sent most of these examples, on which he remarks in the following manner:—

“I think I may fairly take it for granted, that you have determined the *proper* meaning of the terms in dispute, even though it had never been determined before. But it is asked by the Reviewer of Mr. Booth's Apology, ‘Can it be proved that Baptism is immersion *only*? What if it could not? Almost all words, through the poverty of language, are used in different senses: but this does not prove that the primary, obvious, and ordinary sense of a word is to be set aside without necessity, in favour of one that is secondary, metaphorical, or allusive. It is a rule admitted by the ablest writers, that EVERY WORD SHOULD BE TAKEN IN IT'S PRIMARY, OBVIOUS, AND ORDINARY MEANING, UNLESS THERE BE SOMETHING IN THE CONNEXION OR IN THE NATURE OF THINGS WHICH REQUIRES IT TO BE TAKEN OTHERWISE.\* If this rule were regarded, whatever may be said of the term βαπτίζω meaning not immersion *only*, but also perfusion, it would make no difference as to practice. The terms *eat* and *drink* have their figurative meanings as well as *baptize*. Sometimes

---

\* See this principle avowed and defended by fifteen learned Pædobaptist Divines, amongst whom are the names of OWEN, SHERLOCK, TAYLOR, ALSOP, EDWARDS, HORSLEY, VITRINGA, and DODDRIDGE. BOOTH'S *Pædobaptism Examined*. Vol. I. pp. 70.—79.

they are expressive of *excessive indulgence*, and sometimes of *spiritual enjoyment*, or the receiving of divine truth into the mind. What then? No one regards these applications in determining the mode of celebrating the Lord's supper; but eats and drinks according to the primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning of the terms.

“The method taken to prove that baptism is not immersion *only* is that of resorting to it's metaphorical or allusive meanings. Thus the case of Nebuchadnezzar is alleged, who in the Septuagint is said to have been *baptized* with the dew of heaven, when he could have been only “wet” with the dew descending upon him. Thus also in the poem called *The Battle of the Frogs and the Mice*, a lake is represented as being *baptized* with the blood of one of the combatants, in which there could be no immersion. But, as a writer in *The Monthly Review* observes of these instances, “The word is to be understood rather *allusively*, “ than *really*, rather *relatively* than *absolutely*. If a body “ had been baptized or immersed, it could not have been “ more *wet* than Nebuchadnezzar's; if a lake had been “ dipped in blood, it could not have put on a more “ bloody appearance.” *Monthly Review* for May 1784. p. 396.

“In all the applications of the term in the New Testament I believe it will be found to contain the idea of *plenitude* or *abundance*. This is the reason why the sufferings of Christ are called a baptism; and why the term is used to express the condition of the Israelites when enveloped in the cloud and in the sea. It was from the *plenitude* of the Asiatic dews on Nebuchadnezzar, and not from the circumstance of their *descending* upon him that he is said to have been baptized. It was the *abundant* communications of the Holy Spirit to the disciples at Pentecost, and not their being *poured* upon them, that furnished the reason of their being called a baptism.

“The house was *filled*”—and they were “all *filled* with the Holy Spirit.”\*

“You have observed very properly, “If the English were to become a dead language, and were as long disused as Greek, by this method of treating words, it would by and by be questioned if the English Baptists intended, by pleading for immersion, to insist on the propriety of putting the whole body under water.” To attempt from the figurative application of a term to set aside it’s literal, obvious, and ordinary meaning; or to represent such applications of it as altering or diminishing it’s force, is to *nullify the use of language*.

“The FRIENDS, were they so minded, might make out as good an argument for silent meditation, to the exclusion of eating and drinking the Lord’s Supper, as the Pædobaptists do for sprinkling. ‘The question is,’ they might say, ‘whether *eating* and *drinking* denote the ‘receiving of food and liquids into the body *only*; or whether they be general terms, the meaning of which is to *devour*, to *imbibe*, to *corrode*, to *absorb*, or to *receive truth into the mind*. The words are evidently ‘used in the last sense in John vi. 54; and as we are not ‘partial to modes and forms, it is in this sense that we ‘understand and practise them.’

“In this way we might undertake to prove that because the prancing of a horse is called *plunging*, therefore plunging does not mean immersion *only*; or because a slight and cursory view of a subject is called *dipping* into it, therefore, dipping does not mean immersion *only*; or because a machine for letting down water suddenly upon the head is called a *shower-bath*, therefore bathing does not mean immersion *only*; or because excessive

---

\* Acts ii. 2, 4.



grief is expressed by being "*drowned* in tears," therefore drowning does not mean immersion *only*; or because a person in a violent perspiration is said to be *immersed*, therefore immersion does not mean immersion *only*! If this be not placing it beyond the power of language to express the simple idea of immersion, I should be glad to be informed what is.

"Nor would it nullify the use of language only, but render some of the most important doctrines incapable of proof from the language of scripture. It is actually in this way that the adversaries of the atonement and of endless punishment, proceed in endeavouring to undermine those doctrines, and in the same way they *might* undermine the eternity of God and of future happiness, and salvation by grace only. It is true, the terms *everlasting*, *eternal*, &c. are applied to the existence of God, and to both future life and future punishment; but we may be told that though these terms mean unlimited duration, yet not unlimited duration *only*, for they are also applied to that which is limited. It is also true that salvation is ascribed to grace, and that the ordinary meaning of grace is favour to the unworthy; but we may be told that this is not it's *only* meaning; for "the grace of God" is said to have been upon one to whom the idea of unworthiness could not attach: though, therefore, the term may mean favour to the unworthy, yet this is not it's *only* meaning. And though a *sacrifice* in it's proper meaning includes the idea of atonement, yet it may be said it does not mean atonement *only*, for the word is applied to our prayers and praises.

"This is the kind of reasoning by which our opponents think to dispose of the plain statements in the New Testament, of persons *going into*, and *coming out of the water*, of being baptized *in Jordan*, &c. &c. It is

after what they have achieved in this way that they stand up and ask, "Can it be proved that any one person in the New Testament was immersed? Can it be proved that any person baptized, was so much as in the water at all?" Verily, if we allow them their method of reasoning, it cannot . . . . . nor scarcely any thing else, however clearly revealed in the word of God.

"To set aside the literal, ordinary, and obvious meaning of terms, in favour of their secondary, metaphorical, and allusive applications, is to set aside the rule in favour of the exception. It is a suspicious circumstance too that these criticisms should be employed on a translation of the New Testament, made not by Baptists, but by Pædobaptists. A practice founded on them may suit those whose habits lead them to place implicit confidence in the opinion of some great man; but it will not satisfy intelligent and conscientious inquirers."

---

Note E. page 11.

See Dr. WHITBY'S Annotations on Rom. vi. 4. It being so expressly declared here, and Col. ii. 12. that we are buried with Christ in Baptism, by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin, being taken thence; and this immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our church; and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of it's institution, or any license from any Council of the Church, being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify his refusal of the cup to the Laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use.

## Note F. page 14.

And now as to the Greek Prepositions, which are said to be so indeterminate,—Let him that readeth understand the meaning of *εις*, from all these passages where it occurs.

- Matt. vi. 6.—enter *into* thy closet, &c.  
 — viii. 32.—*into* the herd of swine,—*into* the sea.  
 — xiii. 47.—a net cast *into* the sea.  
 — xiii. 50.—*into* the furnace of fire.  
 — xvii. 15.—he falleth *into* the fire, and oft *into* the water.  
 — xviii. 30.—cast him *into* prison.  
 — xxv. 46.—*into* everlasting punishment,—*into* life eternal.  
 Luke xxiv. 51.—carried up *into* heaven.  
 John v. 7.—put me *into* the pool.  
 Rev. xviii. 21.—cast a stone like a great millstone *into* the sea.  
 — xix. 20.—*into* a lake of fire.

If these will not suffice to justify our Translators, in the days of James I. in translating Acts viii. 38.—*κατεβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ*—they went down both *into* the water, after it had been previously said, (ver. 36.) *ἦλθον ἐπὶ τι ὕδωρ*—they came *to* a certain water; I can produce abundance more, from the New Testament, the LXX, Josephus, and all the Greek Authors I ever saw.

The LXX use *εις* in Gen. vii. 13, 15. *into* the ark,—xxxvii. 20—24. *into* some pit,—xl. 3. *into* the prison, the place where Joseph was bound,—Jonah i. 12, 15. *into* the sea,—ii. 3. *into* the depth of the heart of the sea, &c. &c. &c.

Yet I have known a most excellent man so influenced by the fear of immersion, as to shun all similar examples of this use of the Preposition, except *εισινααι εις το ιερον*, and then, instead of rendering it simply, to enter *into* the temple, he gives it this odd, circuitous rendering, “properly to arrive *at* it, so as completely to get within it.”

When JOSEPHUS (I. 615.) charges POMPEY with entering into the inner part of the temple, it has been supposed that he ventured into the Holy of Holies; but if the Preposition be as vague as our modern opposers of immersion would persuade us, the Jewish Historian, who says, *παρηλθε γαρ ΕΙΣ το εντος ο Πομπειος. κ. τ. λ.* may only mean that he stood *at* the edge of it without the veil.

That *εις* is sometimes used in a different sense, we do not deny; but never, that I can find, so as to occasion an ambiguity or uncertainty. When our translators say of our Lord, he went up *into* a mountain, the impossibility of sinking into the earth can be no occasion of rendering it doubtful what is meant by going down *into* the water; and I believe the Greek Preposition is as determinate as the English one.

The Preposition EN is equally decisive, as may appear by the following examples:

Matt. vi. 9.—*Πατερ ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις.* Our Father who art *in* the heavens.

— viii. 32.—*απεθανον εν τοις υδασιν.* they died *in* the waters.

John i. 10.—*Εν τω κοσμω ην.* He was *in* the world.

— iii. 13.—*ο ων εν τω ουρανω.* who is *in* heaven.

1 Tim. iii. 16.—*in the flesh, in the Spirit, in or among the gentiles, in the world, in or into glory.*

LXX. Gen. xxxvii. 29.—Ρουβην ουχ ορα τον Ιωσηφ εν τω λακκω. Reuben did not see Joseph *in* the pit.

The learned Dr. CAMPBELL, though a Pædobaptist, renders Matt. iii. 11. I baptize you *in* water,—he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire. His note on this text (II. 360.) is well worthy the notice of our opponents.

The Vulgate render it *in aqua, in Spiritu sancto*. “ Thus also the Syriac, and other ancient versions. All “ the modern translations from the Greek which I have “ seen, render the words as our common version does, “ except Le Clerc, who says *dans l'eau—dans le Saint* “ *Esprit*. I am sorry to observe that the Popish trans- “ lators from the Vulgate have shewn greater veneration “ for the style of that version, than the generality of “ Protestant translators have shewn for that of the original. “ For in this the Latin is not more explicit than the “ Greek. Yet so inconsistent are the interpreters last “ mentioned, that none of them have scrupled to render “ εν τω Ιορδανη, in the sixth verse, *in Jordan*, though “ nothing can be plainer, than that if there be any “ incongruity in the expression *in water*, this *in Jordan* “ must be equally incongruous. But they have seen that “ the preposition *in* could not not be avoided, without “ adopting a circumlocution, and saying *with the water* “ *of Jordan*, which would have made their deviation from “ the text too glaring. The word βαπτίζειν, both in “ sacred authors, and in classical, signifies, *to dip, to* “ *plunge, to immerse*, and was rendered by TERTULLIAN, “ the oldest of the Latin fathers, *tingere*, the term used “ for dying cloth, which was by immersion. It is always “ construed suitably to this meaning. Thus it is, εν “ ὕδατι, εν τω Ιορδανη. But I should not lay much stress “ on the preposition εν, which, answering to the Hebrew “ ך, may denote *with* as well as *in*, did not the whole

“ phraseology, in regard to this ceremony, concur in evincing the same thing. Accordingly the baptized are said, *αναβαινειν*, to arise, emerge, or ascend, ver. 16. *απο του υδατος*, and Acts viii. 39. *εκ του υδατος*, from or out of the water. When, therefore, the Greek word is adopted, I may say, rather than translated into modern languages, the mode of construction ought to be preserved so far as may conduce to suggest it’s original import. *It is to be regretted that we have so much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgments to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer. The true partizan, of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the Spirit by that of the party.*”

Dr. CAMPBELL’S Notes on John ix. 7. and xiii. 10. are well worthy the attention of every impartial critic.

EK before a consonant, EZ before a vowel denotes properly *out of*.

Acts viii. 39.—*δτε ανεβησαν εκ του υδατος*. when they were come up *out of* the water.

So HERODOTUS says of the crocodile, *εκβη εκ του υδατος*, it cometh *out of* the water. Glasgow edition, 1761. I. 76. It may also be found in *Collectanea Majora*, p. 18.

Rev. xiii. 1.—a beast rising up *out of* the sea.  
 — ix. 1, 2, 3.—A star falling *from* or *out of* heaven  
 —a smoke *out of* the pit\*—and *out of* the smoke came forth locusts.

---

\* Greek *εκ του φρεατος*—lit. out of the well, i. e. *το φρεαρ της αβυσσου* the well of the abyss.

ΑΠΟ or ΑΦ' is often redere*d from*, and often used as equivalent to ΕΚ or ΕΞ *out of*, as appears by these examples which follow.

Luke viii. 2.—αφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἐπὶ ἐξελήλυθει. *out of* whom went seven devils.

— xxii. 71.—ἀπο τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. *out of* his own mouth.

LXX. Psa. xl. 2.—καὶ ἀπο πηλοῦ ἰλῆος. *out of* the miry clay.

ΞΕΝΟΦΩΝ.—εμαχοντο ἀπο νεῶν, they fought *out of* the ships.

He uses the following expression also:—λαμβάνομεν δεῦτε ἐκ τῆς γῆς οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀπο τῶν οἰκιῶν. we took nothing *out of* the land, nor *out of* the houses. It is manifest that here ΕΚ and ἀπο are indifferently used, as synonymous words.

CALLIMACHUS also in his Hymn to Apollo, line 110, uses this Preposition thus:

Ἄγροι δ' οὐκ ἀπο πάντος ὕδωρ φορεῖνσι Μελισσαι

The Cretans do not bring water to Ceres *out of* every river.

The same Author, in his Hymn on the Bath of Minerva, l. 45, 46, says,

Σήμερον ὕδροφοροὶ μὴ βαπτετε. σήμερον Ἄργος  
Πίνειτ' ἀπο κρανῶν, μὴδ' ἀπο τῶν ποταμῶν.

To-day ye water-bearers do not *bathe*; To-day Grecians, Drink ye *out of* the fountains, and not *out of* the rivers.

(which includes also an example of the verb *Bapto*.)

HERODIAN, Book I. ch. 14. uses ἀπο in the same sense, speaking of the Palladium, as taken out of Troy,

τὸ τῆς Παλλαῆας ἀγάλμα κομισθὲν ἀπο Τροίας. The image of Pallas brought away *out of* Troy.

p. 46. Stædelius's Edition, 1662.

The Preposition might indeed be rendered *from* in most of these passages, but the signification is evidently the same with *out of*.

---

Note G. page 14.

John iii. 23, is rendered by our translators, "because there was much water there. But our brethren, afraid that this expression should countenance the idea of immersion, allege that *ἕδαρα πολλά*, would be more literally rendered, many waters, or, as one of them explained it, small streams; as if these latter words might have been given as the rendering of the Greek. Thus it is insinuated, that though there were such small springs as would suffice to give drink to a multitude of people, or even to their cattle, yet they would never suffice for the purpose of immersion.

It is true that *ἕδαρα πολλά* is plural, and denotes literally *many waters*, but that it does not mean *small streams* is evident, from all the other places where it is used in the New Testament. It occurs only in the Revelations written by this Evangelist. See Rev. i. 15. "his voice as the sound of *many waters*." Let this description of the appearance of our Lord be compared with the appearance of the glory of the God of Israel, in Ezek. xliii. 2.—See also Rev. xiv. 2. and xix. 6. where the united chorus of all the inhabitants of heaven is said to have been "as the voice of *many waters*, and as the voice of a great thunder," or, in the latter place, "as the voice of mighty thunderings." That sound which resembles mighty thunderings, may resemble the sound



of a cataract, or the roaring of the sea, but cannot resemble a tinkling rill. The same term is used respecting the Antichristian Harlot, Rev. xvii. 1. who sat upon *many waters*, which are explained, in the 15th verse, as the emblem of peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues. A representation not taken from such small streams as a stranger could hardly find; but evidently from the situation of old Babylon, near the confluence of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Jer. li. 13. "O thou that dwellest upon *many waters*, &c."

The fact is, that ὕδατα πολλὰ is evidently an Hebraism, the word for waters in that language being in the Dual from מַיִם, and having no singular, always is connected with a plural adjective; as מַיִם רַבִּים many waters, מַיִם חַיִּים living waters, מַיִם אַדְרִיָּים mighty waters, מַיִם נְכוֹרִים mighty waters, מַיִם טְהוֹרִים clean waters, &c. &c.

The corresponding Phrase מַיִם רַבִּים occurs often in the Old Testament. Ezek. xliii. 2. has been noticed already. Look at the following passages, and try Mr. MENDS'S explanation. Psa. xviii. 16. He drew me out of many waters, or *small streams*.—Cant. viii. 7. *Many waters* cannot quench love, (i. e. *small streams* cannot!)—Psa. lxxvii. 19. Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in *many waters*. (E. T. the great waters.)—xciii. 4. The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of *many waters*, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea.—Isa. xxiii. 3. It is said of Tyre, By *many waters*, (E. T. great waters,) the seed of Sihor, the harvest of the river is her revenue, &c. Let our Brethren search if they can find an instance of מַיִם רַבִּים being used as synonymous with small streams.

## Note H. page 28.

In the famous temporary Edict drawn up in the year 1547, by the command of Charles V. Emperor of Germany, to allay the disputes between the Romanists and the Reformers, till a general Council could be called, *tradition* is expressly stated as the ground of Infant Baptisin. See the *Formula ad Interim*, inserted at length in CALVIN'S Works, Vol. VIII. p. 264, in which are these words. "Habet præterea Ecclesia traditiones, a Christo et Apostolis, per manus Episcoporum ad hæc usque tempora delatas: quas qui convellit, is negat eandem columnam esse et firmamentum veritatis. Hujus generis sunt Baptismus parvulorum et alia. i. e. The church, moreover, has traditions, handed down to these times, from Christ and the Apostles, through the hands of the Bishops: which whoever would overturn, he must deny the same, (viz. the church,) to be the pillar and ground of truth. Of this sort are the Baptism of little ones and other things." This Section is entitled *De Auctoritate et Potestate Ecclesiæ*, or, Concerning the Authority and Power of the Church. An account of the *Interim* may be found in Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History II. 62.

---

 Note I. page 29.

I might have entered more largely into the evidence that Baptism is to be considered as a standing ordinance in the church, and I did so once or twice when I preached this sermon. But it is scarcely worth while to do so in print, as the respectable people, who differ from us on this point, seldom read what others say upon the subject. However, I should not have been disposed to do this, before I considered the *mode* in which it should be

administered, and the persons who are the proper *subjects*; but should think it proper to state *what* I defended previous to my entering on the general defence. Especially as upon examining the objections made to this institution, I find the celebrated *Apologist* of those who deny it's continuance affirms as follows:

“ If the etymology of the word should be adhered to, “ it would militate against most of our adversaries as well “ as against us; for the Greek word *baptizo* signifies “ *immergo*, that is to *plunge* and *dip in*; and that was “ the proper use of Water-Baptism among the Jews, and “ also by John and the primitive Christians who used it; “ whereas our adversaries, for the most part, only sprinkle “ a little water upon the forehead, which doth not at all “ answer to the word Baptism. Yea, those of old among “ the Christians that used Water-Baptism, thought this “ dipping or plunging so needful, that they thus dipped “ children. And forasmuch as it was judged, that it might “ prove hurtful to some weak constitutions, sprinkling, to “ prevent that hurt, was introduced: yet then it was “ likewise appointed, that such as were only sprinkled, “ not dipped, should not be admitted to have any office in “ the church, as not being sufficiently Baptized. So that “ if our adversaries will stick to the word, they must “ alter their *mode* of sprinkling.” BARCLAY'S *Apology*, p. 440.

And with respect to the *subjects*, he says, “ If Water- “ Baptism be ceased, then surely the Baptizing of Infants “ is not warrantable. But those that take upon them to “ oppose us in this matter, will have more to do, as to this “ latter part: for after they have done what they can “ to prove Water-Baptism, it remains for them to prove “ that Infants ought to be Baptized.” p. 444. And in the margin he declares, *The Baptism of Infants a human Tradition*.

I likewise observe that his most plausible objections are grounded upon those *abuses* of Baptism against which we wish to guard as well as he, or any of our FRIENDS who are like-minded with him: as the *undue stress* laid on the mere external work, as though that could constitute even those to whom it was administered without their own knowledge or consent, members of Christ's mystical body; which we not only deny as to speechless babes, but also warn all those who apply for Baptism on their own profession, that they should examine themselves, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, remembering that Baptism is subservient to our salvation only through the resurrection of Christ, to which it leads our faith, and reminds us of our obligations to walk even as he also walked. Certainly the benefit to be derived from Baptism depends on its being, not barely a putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God. Nor have we the least objection to admonishing all those whom we thus assist in publicly devoting themselves to the Lord, in the very words of Mr. BARCLAY, That "the continued and habitual professing of faith in Christ, and a holy life answering thereunto, is a far better badge of Christianity than any outward washing." p. 442.

The Baptists have been often accused of laying an undue stress on this ordinance. I dare not affirm that it is impossible to find any who wear our name, who have been guilty of this fault; but certainly I know of no Baptist who ever said such strong things of the *necessity*, much less of the *efficacy* of Baptism, as many Pædobaptists have done. And let it be remembered that it is our very principle, that a man must *first* be in a state of salvation before he has a right to Baptism.

MR. BARCLAY objects, that the Baptism mentioned in the Epistles cannot be understood of Water-baptism, because of the necessary fruits and effects of it, which

are *three* times particularly expressed by the Apostle Paul: as,

- (1.) Rom. vi. 3, 4.—That so many of them as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death,—being buried with him by Baptism into death, that they should walk in newness of life.
- (2.) Gal. iii. 27.—For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.
- (3.) Col. ii. 12.—They were buried with him in Baptism, and are risen with him him, through the faith of the of the operation of God.

Now if none have a right to be baptized except those who have been made partakers of vital faith, and if this ordinance were to be administered to none but those who make a credible profession, this language would be very proper, notwithstanding the possibility of our being occasionally mistaken in some individuals, as even the Apostles sometimes were.

If I could hope that those Friends who deny the perpetuity of this Christian Ordinance, as well as that of the Supper of the Lord, would pay any regard to what may be said by a person of a different Denomination; and if I could so express the fears which have been excited in my mind, by the little knowledge I have had of them, I would beseech them seriously to examine, whether the bulk of that Denomination, who have laid aside the forms of worship which we think Christ has prescribed, are not as much in danger, or more, than any other class of Christians, of resting in a mere lifeless formality, respecting such externals as have no immediate reference to religion? and, whether too many among them are not equally inattentive to the work of Christ *without* them, and to the special operations of his Holy Spirit *within*.

Happy exceptions I trust there are; and a general regularity of conduct, and a most commendable spirit of benevolence, render them highly respectable in society; but as to conformity to the world, it is a very subtle evil, consisting more in the mind's being engrossed by worldly things than in the mere external appearance and habit of the body. And for our acceptance with God, an entire dependance on the sacrifice of Christ is absolutely requisite, which if it be sincere will be manifested by our walking not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. As many as walk according to this rule, whether they follow with us or not, peace be upon them, and upon the Israel of God.

---

Note K. Preface, page vii.

I cannot but regret that our Brethren, who think us mistaken in rejecting Infant Baptism, are not more conscientiously scrupulous in the use of means to enlighten and convince us of our error. But really I have long been tempted to think, that their cause will hardly admit candour into alliance with it, especially among those that make the highest pretensions to a share in the funeral of bigotry.

While many of this description are pleased to nickname us *Anabaptists*, or *Re-baptizers*, (though we never baptize those whom we believe to have been truly baptized before,) and we have often been taunted with our pretended descent from the madmen of Muntzer; a late attempt has been made to identify us with those fanatics, by re-publishing Dr. ROBERTSON'S account of them, under the title of *The History of the BAPTISTS*. So then, if it might seem illiberal to give their name to us, they will attempt to identify us with them, by giving them

our usual appellation. Is this reconcileable to liberality or to justice?

It may be worth while, however, to insert the following extract from a letter sent by Dr. GILL to Mr. RYLAND, sen. of Northampton, received July 1771.

“ As to the turbulent factions in Germany, these were  
 “ begun by Pædobaptists, though afterwards joined by  
 “ some called Anabaptists, on whom the whole blame  
 “ was laid, men of bad principles and scandalous lives;  
 “ and the Pædobaptists have been told over and over  
 “ again, that we disallow the men, their principles, and  
 “ practices, as much as they do: and the man that will  
 “ upbraid us with these things after all this, discovers  
 “ more the malignity of his heart, than the weakness of  
 “ his head. Our confessions of faith, both of the par-  
 “ ticular and the general persuasion, throughout the  
 “ last century and this, shew that we believe civil  
 “ Magistracy is an ordinance of God, and that all  
 “ Christians ought to obey the Civil Magistrate in all  
 “ things lawful, and our behaviour has been always  
 “ agreeable to our principles, so that we may claim to  
 “ ourselves the character of being the quiet and peaceable  
 “ in the land. In what plots and conspiracies, insur-  
 “ rections and rebellions against the present family have  
 “ any of us been engaged? When it is well known  
 “ multitudes of Pædobaptists have been concerned in  
 “ them. It would be thought hard if we should impute  
 “ all the massacres and murders of the Papists, who are  
 “ all Pædobaptists, to the body of that people; even all  
 “ committed in France and Savoy, in the Netherlands,  
 “ in Ireland, and elsewhere; and yet all this may be  
 “ as justly retorted upon *them*, as the distractions in  
 “ Muntzer upon *us*, excited by a people who never had  
 “ any connexion with us, and with whom we neither agree,  
 “ nor they with us; as not in their political principles,

“so neither in their religious ones, *no not in Baptism itself, which as it is affirmed they administered by sprinkling, and not by dipping.* See my *Divine Right of Infant Baptism disproved.*”\*

What would our Brethren say, if we were to endeavour to throw an odium upon the practice of Pædobaptism in general, and to involve them therein, by asking such questions as the following?

Who perpetrated the Massacre of Paris? Pædobaptists. Who executed the Irish Massacre? Pædobaptists. Who committed all the atrocious crimes that attended or followed the French Revolution? Pædobaptists. Yet hundreds of such questions might truly receive the same answer. And what are these things to them? Just as much as the madmen of Muntzer are to us, and no more. Though it must be confessed, that they are all baptized into *one body* with them, considering their Baptism as valid; which we should deny to the Muntzer Anabaptists.

---

\* In reply to an American Pamphlet, which appeared in 1746. The Reply was printed in Dr. GILL's *Sermons and Tracts*, II. 274; and is now prefixed to Mr. IVIMEY's *History of the English Baptists*.



## *ERRATA.*

---

Page 24, Note, line 1.—For *VERSCHAIR'S*, read *VERSCHEIN'S*.  
— 32, line 5, 6.—For *unintelligible*, read *unintelligible*.