

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06824856 0

(Taylor)

ZHEF

MRS. TH. KNOW
MRS. S. V. V. HUNTINGTON

15 JUNE 1919



L. Ave Street
1st m H
2/12-10
0-10

APOSTOLIC BAPTISM.

FACTS AND EVIDENCES

ON THE

SUBJECTS AND MODE

OF

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

BY C. TAYLOR,

EDITOR OF CALMET'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.


WITH THIRTEEN ENGRAVINGS.

NEW YORK:

B. H. BEVIER, 102 NASSAU STREET.

1843.

He



ENTERED

According to the Act of Congress, in the year 1843, by
BENJAMIN H. BEVIER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern
District of New York.

DEAN, PRINTER, 2 ANN STREET.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY NOTICE,	5
SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM,	13
Origin of this Discussion.—Jewish and Christian Sympathies.—Feelings towards Children.—Consecration.—Institution of Baptism.—Tertullian.—Origen.—Tradition.—Origen's Family.—Distinction between House, Family, and Household.—Rules of Interpretation.—Οικος.—Οικια.—House.—Household.—Infants.—Οικος.—Lydia.—Cornelius.—Onesiphorus.—Philippian Jailor.—Stephanas.—Infant Baptism.—Church Membership of Children.	
MODE OF BAPTISM,	109
Importance of Truth.—Perversion of Terms.—Βαπτω.—Εμβαπτω.—Βαπτισμος.—Synonymous Words.—Baptism by the Holy Ghost.—Meaning of Baptism.—Corresponding terms in different languages.—Inferences.—Overwhelming.—Submersion.—Immersion.—Baptism in the sense of Overwhelm.—Staining.—Pouring or Affusion.—Sprinkling.—Washing.—“Doctrine of Baptisms.”—Anabaptism.—“Divers Baptisms.”—John's Baptism.—Baptism separate from Immersion.—Philip and the Eunuch.—Baptism in Abyssinia.—Metaphorical Scripture.—Cornelius.—Christian Baptism was Pouring.—Baptizing of persons naked.—Deaconesses.—Enon.—Υδατα πολλα.—Hebrew Christians.—Syrian Church.—Greek Church.—“Buried in Baptism.”—Baptism as signifying Death and Life.—Primitive Baptisteries.—Catacomb at Rome.—Ancient pictorial representations of Baptism.—“Chapel of the Baptistery,” at Rome.	
EXPLANATION OF THE ENGRAVINGS,	179
BAPTISMAL CEREMONIES,	201
CHAPEL OF THE BAPTISTERY,	215
CATALOGUE OF TEXTS,	219

FACTS AND EVIDENCES

ON

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE.

“All those things happened for **ENSAMPLES**, and they are written for our **ADMONITION**; that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and judgment.”

THE Author of these “Facts and Evidences on the Subjects and Mode of Christian Baptism” has concisely detailed the causes of his work in the preliminary paragraphs to the ensuing chapter on the “Subjects of Baptism.” But as that narrative only partially applies to the present edition of his very important volume, it is requisite to delineate the alterations which have now been made in the form of his original publication; especially as this edition is presented to the Christian churches, as altogether Mr. Taylor’s own researches and arguments—for the Editor did not deem it proper to append a single explanatory note, even where it might have tended to elucidate the subject.

For Mr. Taylor’s immediate and protracted investigation of Christian Archæology, in reference to the ordinance of Baptism, the result of which appears in this volume, we are indebted to a discussion between himself and a Baptist Deacon, respecting the evangelical authority

of the Baptist practice in prohibiting all persons from the Lord's Table, who have not been *submersed* according to *their* practice in adult age. The Baptist Deacon was perplexed by Mr. Taylor's "*Facts and Evidences.*" In conformity with his desire, Mr. Taylor presented him a "sketch of the argument," that it might be confuted, if any of the Baptist brethren could accomplish that work. But they all preserved a most profound and ominous silence upon the subject. After a long period had elapsed, several attempts were made to introduce the topic into the English Baptist Magazine, thereby to give the Baptists the most eligible and advantageous opportunity to rebut Mr. Taylor's "Facts," and to disprove his "Evidences;" but the editor and his consociates, *wisely* for themselves and their *exclusive* sectarian dogmas, sternly rejected every endeavour to elicit a public examination of the Baptismal controversy in that peculiar aspect within their own ecclesiastical boundary.

In consequence of their unalterable decision not to discuss the topic with Mr. Taylor, nor even to admit his statements into the Baptist Magazine, the editor of Calmet's Dictionary, in February, 1815, published a pamphlet, entitled "*Facts and Evidences on the Subject of Baptism, in a Letter to a Deacon of a Baptist Church; with Two Plates.*" That letter was restricted entirely to the *Mode of Baptism.*

About two months after, appeared the "Second Letter" to a Baptist Deacon, which was devoted to the *Subjects of Baptism.*

Those letters excited great interest on the part of the Pædobaptists, who were deeply impressed with the novel "*Facts*" and irresistible "*Evidences*" which Mr. Taylor had thus arrayed in favour of "Family Baptism," and against the exclusive interpretation of the words *ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜ* and *ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΣ*, which the Baptists have endeavoured to enforce in connection with the Christian ordinance. On the contrary, the Baptist brethren were extremely disquieted at the exhibition of Mr. Taylor's illustrations; especially as they had previously been adopted and virtually sanctioned by their great champion, Robert Robinson, in his "*History of Baptism.*" But they cautiously

abstained from any direct assault upon Mr. Taylor's theory, arguments and demonstrations.

Therefore, in June, 1815, the editor of Calmet's Dictionary published his "Third Letter to a Deacon of a Baptist Church," corroborating his opinions in reference both to the subjects and the mode of Baptism. He also united his two previous letters with it in the same pamphlet, and prefixed an Introduction narrating the circumstances through which his disquisitions were presented to general notice. He also included those essays which had been transmitted for insertion in the Baptist Magazine, but which the editor had excluded from that miscellany.

In April, 1816, another pamphlet was issued, entitled "*Three Additional Letters, being the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth, to a LATE Deacon of a Baptist Church.*" With the letters was combined an examination of Dr. Ryland's Candid Statement, which had also been refused by the editor of the Baptist Magazine. Those letters not only discussed the two primary topics of the Christian ordinance of Baptism, but they also introduced several other collateral themes.

From Mr. Taylor's prefatory notice to the "*Three Additional Letters,*" one paragraph is extracted.

"The former letters were published with a *bonâ fide* desire on the part of the Deacon to receive such answers as might effectually confute their contents. Upwards of a year has elapsed, and *no answer has appeared!* Under Providence, the Deacon has been led to change his religious connection. The present letters are published in compliance with requests, amounting to commands, from the most respectable quarters. Hence the writer enjoys the satisfaction, that whatever additional strength former arguments in favour of Pædo-baptism may derive from his views, not one of them is in any respect deteriorated, but retains its full force and effect with undiminished authority. Should any one think proper to examine these Letters, the author desires that FACTS may be met by FACTS; and while he intreats candour for himself, for his '*Facts and Evidences*' he desires neither grace nor favour."

Another year passed away, and with the exception of a short essay in the Baptist Magazine of March, 1817, "*no answer appeared!*" Mr. Taylor, therefore, in the latter part of the year 1817, published another pamphlet, which he denominated "*Concluding Facts and Evidences on the subject of Baptism;*" from the Introduction and Preface to which, the two ensuing paragraphs are selected.

"The arguments which have been adduced in this discussion of the question of Baptism have made considerable impression, not only on thinking Baptists, but also on the religious public. The more learned Baptists now confess that INFANTS are included in the term ΟΙΚΟΣ, *family*, as used in the New Testament; while it is curious to observe the difficulties to which those are reduced, who contend that infants are excluded from the term *Family*, and that the word must be restricted to adults. '*If our translators had employed the term FAMILY instead of the words House and Household, the sect of Baptists never would have existed!*'

"If the Letters, to which the present pages are the conclusion, had been announced as a treatise on Baptism, the writer would have been liable to well-deserved censure for their disorder and want of arrangement. From the very nature of the case, the *confidential conversations* between friends which have been recorded are unfavourable to logical order, and being desultory, are disadvantageous to the general argument. The first letter was written to be answered; and if, instead of a *resolution by the Baptist Committee to disregard it*, an attempt had been made to meet it, probably none of the succeeding letters ever would have appeared. Some service however has been done to truth by their arguments, and the religious world have received them in an extremely flattering manner. After perusing these pages, the reader is desired to consider and answer this question—'*When the Apostles say they baptized HOUSES and WHOLE HOUSES, did they not include infants in the sacred rite?*'"

From that period, the year 1817, it is believed that Mr. Taylor's "*Facts and Evidences on the Subjects*

and Mode of Christian Baptism," have been neglected by the Baptists; who judged that it was preferable, not to force out any more memorials of Christian antiquity, from a scholar who had devoted much of his time during half a century to researches connected with the history of the Redeemer's kingdom.

When however it was proposed in New York some time since to republish those letters, it was instantly discovered, that to issue the work in its original form would include all the disadvantages and imperfections to which the editor of Calmet's Dictionary, in the paragraph just cited, adverts. After due deliberation, it was therefore decided to remodel the work—neither to change Mr. Taylor's diction; nor to alter his arguments; nor to omit his "Facts and Evidences;" nor to interpolate any additional matter—but merely to condense his labours, to cancel his frequent repetitions and redundancies, to reduce the confused mode, in which the subjects are commingled and severed, into method, according to the general topics; and thus to give to his "Facts" their essential weight, to his "Evidences" their just preponderance, to his arguments all their force, and to his illustrations all their evangelical resplendency.

To accomplish this design, the work is subdivided into two general chapters.—I. The "*Subjects of Baptism*"—and II. The "*Mode of Baptism.*" To which is added the gallery of engraved representations of the manner in which the ordinance of Baptism was originally administered. Some of the engravings which Mr. Taylor had introduced are excluded, because they were merely duplicates of those which are exhibited at the end of this volume.

The desultory manner in which the letters were composed rendered it a very difficult task to "set in order," the arguments, criticisms, and incidental remarks and statements which are scattered from one end of an octavo volume of 330 pages to the other; and to bring them into such juxtaposition, that they may produce their legitimate effect upon the mind of the reader. But the attempt most carefully has been made, and this

volume now presents the "Facts and Evidences on the Subject of Baptism," in as consistent an arrangement of the materials as could possibly be effected, in conformity with the design of adopting the "*First*" and the "*Second*" Letters, as the text with which all the other portions of the work should be incorporated.

There were two great difficulties appertaining to the revision of the work, and its publication in the present form. The original was printed with such numberless errors, that for a London work, the incorrectness of the typography is a genuine anomaly—and the Letters also, having been published separately, contain not one particle of reference, by which the editor could be guided; thus involving great additional labour and perplexity. To remedy that defect, a catalogue in order of all the texts of Scripture explained in this discussion is now embodied; and a Topical Index has also been compiled, that directs to every distinct subject which is noticed throughout the volume.

The reader will remember that the ensuing work, as to its contents, is precisely the "*Facts and Evidences on the Subject of Baptism*," as they were at first presented by the "editor of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible." It having been decided that no additions should be made to the original work, some annotations, which might profitably have been subjoined, were excluded. Nothing is interpolated, except where from the dislocation of the paragraph or sentences, from one letter to the others, it was essential to insert the necessary connecting word or phrase, that the arguments, or facts, or inferences, or quotations might cohere.

With this explanation, the volume is submitted to the Pædobaptist Churches, with the full conviction that it contains more important information upon the "Subjects and Mode of Baptism" than ever yet has been published in the United States; and that as no person in Britain hitherto has attempted to disprove these "*Facts*," and to deny these "*Evidences*," during nearly thirty years, so the researches of Mr. Taylor will remain irrefragable proof amounting to moral demonstration; that the dogma which the Baptists

promulge—that *Βαπτω* and *Βαπτισμος*, when applied to the Christian ordinance, mean *plunging under water only*; and that *Οικος* and *Οικια*, when used in the Old and New Testaments, “*include only adults*,” is not more substantial than the “baseless fabric of a vision.”—Therefore, their practice in excluding from “the communion of the body and blood of Christ,” those believers whom at the same time they acknowledge to be “beloved of God, sanctified in Jesus, and called to be saints,” is an absurd and anti-evangelical perversion and infraction of the law of Christian charity—while their sectarian proscription of every disciple of the Redeemer, except the members of their own denomination, from the divinely appointed external institute of brotherly love, and the sacramental symbols of church-fellowship, is altogether opposed to “the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace;” and moreover, is a lamentable schismatic impediment to the extension and triumph of the gospel of Christ.

New York,
4 May, 1843.

SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

Origin of this Discussion.—Jewish and Christian Sympathies.—Feelings towards Children.—Consecration.—Institution of Baptism.—Tertullian.—Origen.—Tradition.—Origen's Family.—Distinction between House, Family, and Household.—Rules of Interpretation.—Οἶκος.—Οἶκτα.—House.—Household.—Infants.—Οἰκῆος.—Lydia.—Cornelius.—Onesiphorus.—Philippian Jailor.—Stephanas.—Infant Baptism.—Church Membership of Children.

THE occasion of the following illustrations of Baptism was this. A gentleman not a Baptist, who had recently married a lady from a Baptist Church, desired occasional communion with that Church. The Deacon pleaded a conscientious negative. The Pastor, less rigid than the Deacon, struck with his scrupulosity, requested his reconsideration of the subject, putting into his hands certain tracts for that purpose. During the Deacon's perusal of those tracts, the writer of these pages called on him. The Deacon had in his hands Mr. Booth's "Pædobaptism Examined." That work gave rise to a conversation which ended in saying—"Do not tell me of Mr. Booth; tell me of Scriptural authority. If you wish to understand the subject, consult Scripture." But on examination, Holy Writ was found to declare in favour of Infant Baptism! A sketch of the argument was submitted to those whom the Deacon respected as able casuists. It remained unanswered. After long waiting, it was supposed that an appeal to the Baptist denomination must meet with attention. While looking for an opportunity, an article by Dr. Ryland appeared in the Baptist Magazine, of which an examination was transmitted to the editor of that miscellany, which was disregarded. In a subsequent number of that work was inserted a challenge by the late Andrew Fuller in these words—"Why is it that Dr. Ryland's 'Candid Statement' is entirely kept out of view? Let its evidence be fairly met and answered, in the same

candid spirit in which it is written." In consequence of that challenge, some articles were sent, but they were returned, with a denial of insertion in the "Baptist Magazine."

These researches were intended to meet objections against "the communion of saints," and were strictly defensive. If any one should examine these pages with a view to their confutation, as they contain only "FACTS and EVIDENCES," the facts should be met with opposite facts: and these evidences by contrary evidences. For it is perfectly absurd to discuss any question argumentatively, till all the facts and evidences on which it rests are before us. The writer feels the necessity of beseeching the candour of the reader for himself—but as for his FACTS, they await every attack with firmness, and willingly brave the utmost efforts both of learning and of ignorance.

The argument is brought to this point.—The Old Testament writers use the term HOUSE, in the sense of *family*, with a special reference to INFANTS—the New Testament writers use the term *House* exactly in the same sense as the Old Testament writers—therefore; when the New Testament writers say that they "*baptized houses*," they mean to say, that they "*baptized INFANTS*."

Of all the arts of logic, there is none I admire more than a well-managed SOPHISM; a proposition that presents the semblance of truth, but is essentially *false*. Take an instance from Booth, which includes the very essence of the arguments against Pædobaptism. "To imagine that the first positive rite of religious worship in the Christian Church is left in so vague a state as Pædobaptism supposes, is not only *contrary to the analogy of Divine proceedings in similar cases*, but renders it morally impossible for the bulk of Christians to discern the real ground on which the ordinance is administered.—An unlettered man must become a disciple of those who are the humble pupils of Jewish Rabbis, of the writings of the Talmud; for it is thence only he is able to learn, that the children of proselytes were *baptized along with their parents*, when admitted members of the Jewish Church: and, thence also he must infer that *our Lord condescended to borrow of his enemies an important ordinance of religious worship for his own disciples*."—That our Lord condescended to borrow of John Baptist "an important ordinance of religious worship for his own disciples," is true; but I never knew before that John was an "*enemy*" of Jesus. If by "*enemies of Jesus*," the Jews of that age are meant, though I deny that our Lord

borrowed *Baptism* of them, since they practiced only *immersion*; yet I would ask, did not our Lord condescend to borrow of them in that important ordinance of religious worship, his sacred supper?—and can any unlettered man thoroughly comprehend that service without *some* acquaintance with Jewish learning? Can he so much as discern the “real ground” of the Apostle’s language, 1 Cor. v. 7. 8. “Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump—therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth?”—Who can adequately understand this reference, unless he have some acquaintance with the pains taken by the Jews to cleanse their houses from leaven? How many other things are there in Christianity, on which an unlettered man needs almost perpetual assistance?

Our Lord by birth, by nation, and by religious ordinances was a Jew. His gospel was first offered to Jews by descent; and Judaism was the *basis* on which the Redeemer founded his religion:—but it does not follow that the *spirit* of the two dispensations was the same. On the contrary, their differences are striking and essential. Some things, which Judaism held sacred and binding, the gospel held with a great latitude; and allowed the human will to follow its own determination concerning them.—Nothing could be more positively enjoined by divine authority, than the distinction of meats; yet the Apostle leaves it to the choice of converts to adopt it or not: Rom. xiv. 15; “God hath received him who eateth,” says he, although God had ordered such transgressors to be cut off. Neither was the distinction of days less authoritatively enacted; yet Paul dispenses with the observance in those who objected to it. What was this, but leaving in quite as vague a state as Pædobaptism supposes, most important points of the divine law?—or if Pædobaptism be left in the same state of liberty, how is it “*contrary to the analogy of Divine proceedings in similar cases?*”

There are other instances which affect the closest connections of the heart and life, and are more nearly related to the main purpose of our present inquiry.

Moses forbade the “taking of the daughters of the land, unto thy sons for wives,—lest they make thy sons go a whoring after other gods.” Exod. xxiv. 16. He admits not the slightest ray of hope, “that thy sons may convert their wives to the worship of the God of Israel.”—He is tormented by fear; jealousy corrodes, and despair confounds him.—But what

says the Gospel in a similar case? With what a noble consciousness of superiority over all other religions, it commands the very contrary! "How knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt SAVE thy husband?—Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt SAVE thy wife?" 1 Cor. vii. 16. Hope triumphs here! Despair is banished! and the same feeling is cherished by another sacred writer, who strongly advises wives to exemplary conduct, 1 Peter iii. 1.; "that if any obey not the word, they may without the word be *won by the conversation of their wives.*"—Why did not these Apostles, like Moses, dread the heathenish consequences of such abhorrent connections? Because they served a dispensation of Grace, not of terror: they knew their master's mind:—"Whosoever is not against us, is for us."

We have a practical illustration and instance of the jealousy of Judaism in the conduct of the priest Ezra; who caused the "chief priests, the Levites, and ALL Israel to SWEAR, that they would put away their foreign wives—and they made proclamation throughout Judah and Jerusalem—and allowed only *three days*—and called the people over—after the house of their fathers, and all of them, *by their names*, and expelled their foreign wives, *even those by whom they had children.*" Ezra x. 3—44. But what does Christianity direct in similar cases? 1 Cor. vii. 12. "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, LET HIM NOT PUT HER AWAY. And the woman who hath a husband that believeth not, if he be pleased to dwell with her—LET HER NOT LEAVE HIM." What a noble triumph of the kindness of Christ over the severe correctness of the Mosaic law! The gospel disturbs no domestic harmony: it dissolves no happily formed connection: it finds the bands of love tied; and in the name of that God who is love, it sanctifies, and by sanctifying *strengthens* them.

It would be strange if this most sympathizing feeling, which studies the affections and love of the parents, were repugnant to their children. In this, the gospel is *opposed* to the law. Timothy was the son of a Jewess by a Greek father: Acts xvi. 1.; he had not received in his infancy the divinely appointed sign of the Abrahamic covenant, circumcision; because he was allied to the Abrahamic descent, by half-blood only. The balance between *holiness* and *unholiness* was equipoised in him:—the *unholiness* of his father prevailed against the *holiness* of his mother, and Judaical scrupulosity reprobated Timothy as UNCLEAN. Not so the

law of liberty; not so the attractive kindness of the blessed Jesus. The Apostle advises, whenever the balance is even between *holiness* and *unholiness*, to incline to the most favourable side: exclude none who do not exclude themselves. "For the *unbelieving* husband is, *has been*, his intercourse rendered *holy* to the believing wife, and the *unbelieving* wife is, *has been rendered holy* to the believing husband: else were the issue of such intercourse *unholy*, as under the law it was, but now under the gospel, it is *HOLY*." 1 Cor. vii. 14. Directly contrary to the dogmata of the Jewish Rabbins, contrary to the decisions of Ezra and of the prophets, and contrary to the case of Timothy.

Did this accord with the sentiments of our Divine Master? Did HE thus favourably regard and accept what his nation pronounced unclean? It was prophesied of him, that in his name should the Gentiles trust;—that he should not "break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax:"—that as "the good shepherd he should carry the lambs in his arms"—did his personal conduct justify the language of prophecy? Three of the Evangelists instruct us by instances of this; Mat. xix. 13; "Then were brought to him little children, that he should put his hands on them and pray; and *the disciples* REBUKED them. But Jesus said, suffer little children, and FORBID THEM NOT, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them." Mark x. 13. "he was MUCH DISPLEASED"—at the Jewish insensibility of his disciples. That Evangelist adds, "Jesus took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them." Luke describes them as *infants*. All the Evangelists agree in saying that our Lord compared his real disciples, those who enter the kingdom of heaven worthily, to such infants. What pious mind, by any reluctance in showing favour to *infants*, would incur the risk of this "MUCH DISPLEASED" of our blessed Lord? Nor is this the only lesson the disciples received from their Master, by means of little children: for he tells them explicitly, Mat. xviii. 3. "Except ye be converted, and become as LITTLE CHILDREN, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven:—whosoever shall offend, give occasion of scandal, or *cause to trip*, one of these LITTLE ONES who BELIEVE in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the depth of the sea." So then, these LITTLE ONES

were BELIEVERS in Jesus, and the severest punishment awaited whoever despised or dishonoured them.

A pious attention to LITTLE ONES has the promise of a blessing. Mat. x. 42. "Whosoever shall give a cup of cold water to one of these LITTLE ONES in the name of a DISCIPLE, shall in no wise lose his reward!" The LITTLE ONES then were capable of being DISCIPLES:—how in defiance to this text, can any insist, that when our Lord commands his Apostles to "go and DISCIPLE *all nations*," he absolutely excludes LITTLE ONES?

But the conduct of the Apostles, in repelling children from the affectionate arms of the condescending Saviour, was precisely according to their Jewish feelings. The old leaven of Judaism, with unabated fermentation, actuated the Pharisees: Mat. xxi. 15; "who when they saw the children crying in the temple, *Hosanna to the Son of David!* were SORE DISPLEASED; and said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? and Jesus answered them; have ye never read OUT OF THE MOUTHS OF BABES AND SUCKLINGS THOU HAST PERFECTED PRAISE?" A striking picture this, of the powerful distinction between the starched supporters of the law! and the mild, condescending, benign tendernesses of the Son of God.

After these repeated reproofs, admonitions, and instructions of their divine master, what could be the conduct of the Apostles towards *little ones*?—could *they* look with askance eye on children?—could *they* professionally sanctify to the service of God, such a man as Simon Magus, because he could make a credible profession of his faith—while they refused the token of Gospel devotion to little children who were *disciples* of Christ? Could they *baptize* an old conjuror, hardened in guilt by the confirmed habit of many years, and actually "in the gall of bitterness, and the bonds of iniquity," but repel from the sign of consecration to Christ, those BABES and SUCKLINGS, *out of whose mouths* GOD HIMSELF HAD PERFECTED PRAISE?—

The term consecration requires to be explained.—CONSECRATION is a setting apart from an ordinary or profane use or purpose, to which a person or thing has been accustomed—to a particular use or purpose—usually in relation to the Deity. The sign or mark of such consecration anciently was *anointing*. So Jacob *anointed* the stone at Bethel, Gen. xxviii. 18: so the implements of the tabernacle were *anointed*, Exod. xxix: Aaron was *anointed* to the priest's office; 1 Sam. x. 1, Saul and David were *anointed* to the regal office, 1

Sam. xiv. 1. Prophets also were *anointed*. But not all consecrated persons were *anointed*; for the daughter of Jephthah was consecrated, yet we cannot think she was *anointed*; and Samuel, who was consecrated from his infancy, was not *anointed*.

Now whatever, or whoever was set apart from a former character and destination, and received a new character and destination as marked by *anointing*, without violating the metaphor, might be said to *die* to former connections and self, and to begin a new life marked by new functions;—which is the very acceptance and import of baptism. For this purpose our Lord was baptized: not to put away sin; but to mark his passing over from his former life, in which he had paid *some* attention to worldly concerns, as appears from his subjection to his parents at Nazareth, Mark vi. 3: and from his being described as “*the carpenter*” by those who well knew his origin and previous deportment. But he enters on a new life—he commences a new character—he is publicly consecrated to the great purposes of his mission: Acts x. 38, he becomes “the man whom God had *anointed* with the Holy Ghost:” Acts iv. 27, “thine holy child Jesus, whom thou hast *anointed*.” His followers in some humble degree resembled him: for the Apostle John writes to those who had received an *unction*, anointing, from the Holy One, 1 John ii. 27: and who were taught by this *anointing*. With this doctrine Paul agrees, when he says, 2 Cor. i. 21: “He who hath *anointed* us, is God:—who hath also sealed us.” When were those disciples anointed, if not at their baptism?—and for what purpose, if not in token of their future devotion to the Christian name and profession? They were not anointed with oil; it follows, that baptismal water or the baptismal service became the sign or the occasion of their consecration; and this dedication to God is the most simple, most direct, and most perspicuous notion we can form of baptism.

Baptism was instituted from heaven by the ministry of John the Baptist. Did John the Baptist dedicate, or consecrate, those whom he baptized? Yes; for he caused them to pledge themselves to a new life and to devote themselves to the practice of holiness.

Did the Apostles, who followed John in baptism, follow him also in this? There can be no doubt of it; though by what form of words they consecrated or devoted those whom they baptized does not appear. I suppose it was in the name of the God of Israel, or Jehovah; of which I take the

subsequent form of "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," to be a more explicit rendering, for the use of the Gentiles, or in our Lord's words, "all nations." The Apostles had had long and extensive practice in baptism; for by them "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John." They were under the immediate eye of their master:—they were familiar with the subject:—they were habituated to the service:—they knew when, where, how, and to whom, to administer it. Very inconsistent therefore does it appear, to deny the *original* institution of a rite so long administered, previous to its enlargement and universal extension, as a *Christian* ordinance;—a rite which had been among the daily ministrations of the Apostles during several years.

By his final instructions, our Lord extended the application of this rite commensurate with his commission to the Apostles for preaching the gospel, TO ALL NATIONS. No longer, said he, confine your teachings to Judea, to Samaria, to Galilee; carry them over all the earth, wherever are souls to be saved. No longer consecrate to the true God, by the rite of baptism, the inhabitants of this land only: include all men in your Christian affection, and dedicate them to the name and honour of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; whether "Jew or Gentile, Barbarian or Scythian, bond or free: that the religion of the cross may be all, and in all." What special enactments could the Apostles need for their direction, after years of practice, guided by their Lord himself? What cases of nice discrimination could they now require instructions how to treat—they who had received his commands on the subject, Mat. xxviii. 19. "Teach ALL NATIONS, as you have taught the Jews: baptize ALL NATIONS, as you have baptized the Jews;" is their unlimited commission.

Those who were baptized by John and by the Apostles, were VOLUNTEERS. They left their houses, and *came* and solicited the rite; but all might come to the Jordan who pleased. Those who staid at home declined the rite: no force compelled them to come:—was it possible that there should be any repulsive force acting against those who did come?

"Thy people shall be WILLING, in the day of thy power." Luke xvi. 16; they "*pressea*" into the Kingdom of Heaven; Mat xi. 12, they "*took it by force*:" Did those, who thus vehemently solicited consecration to God, restrict that consecration to their own persons? Did Jewish parents, who knew that "*the children of proselytes were baptized with their*

parents," never think of bringing their own children to be baptized with themselves? Did those volunteers from among the heathen, who knew that children were consecrated to some of their gods by baptism,—but who dedicated their own persons to the sacred Trinity— withhold from the Christian rite, those whom they most earnestly desired should be kept from the pollution of idolatry—Ephes. vi. 4; and "brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"? Or rather, did they not, by the earliest possible consecration of them to the Holy Trinity, *forestall* their forcible consecration to idols? Did they not by anticipation render impossible that which they so much dreaded?

Is it asked, "why then did not our Lord ENACT that *all* young children should be baptized?" I answer, because the gospel was no local, national, or partial religion, like the Jewish; but was to be promulgated all over the world. It was to be received by choice; but Jews had no choice whether they would be born of their nation, or not. When *one* parent only was a Jew, the issue was pronounced *unclean* by the Jews, as Timothy was; but in those days, the gospel might be received by *ONE* parent only, the other remaining an idolater during many years. The believing wife might desire to devote her child to the Holy Trinity: "NO; says the unbelieving husband, THE CHILD IS MY PROPERTY; AND I FORBID THAT;" or says the believing husband, "I earnestly wish to consecrate to my Lord and Saviour this increase of my family."—"I OPPOSE THAT WITH ALL MY MIGHT," says the unbelieving wife. What broils, what bickerings, what contentions, what animosities must inevitably have followed wherever the gospel had entered a family by means of *one* of the married parties only, had the Saviour strictly enjoined the baptism of babes and sucklings, as an act of obedience to him! What a struggle it must have produced in every family, and in the most virtuous and upright bosoms, between *DUTY* on one hand, and *IMPOSSIBILITY* on the other!—between the desire of submission to Christ, and the opposition of conjugal authority, supported by the public laws and the public force! Our Lord's infinite wisdom knew the human heart. He was the author of peace, and lover of concord. Never did he violate the bonds of natural affection—he sanctified a marriage by his presence, but he hated divorce and putting away.

To domestic considerations we add the troubles of the times, and the persecuted state of the Church, 1 Cor. vii. 29. If the apostle felt himself constrained to advise those who

had wives, to conduct themselves as though they had them not; did not the same cause influence those who had children, when the name of *Christian* was death? Hundreds of Christian children, and tens of thousands of half blood might remain unbaptized, against their parent's wishes; enforced by hard necessity. We cannot adequately sympathize with Christians under the terror of Roman persecution, and the violence of heathen priesthood. Hence the necessity of some acquaintance with Church History, beyond the limits of the New Testament: and the necessity for some to teach "plain unlettered men:" and the guilt of those who never instruct their hearers in what would contribute so greatly to their knowledge, edification, and comfort.

On all who came to Jordan, John conferred baptism:—since whoever received his rite stood pledged to repentance and holiness. On those who desired baptism from the apostles, they bestowed it. Their practice demonstrates their principle. The history of the Christian Church has preserved instances in proof of this proposition; for we read of several, when Christianity was extensively promulgated, who were baptized in adult years. Those were in the same situation as the children who were left at home when their parents travelled to the Jordan to John: or as those children who in the wilderness, under Moses, did not receive circumcision, because the perils of time and place forbade the safe performance of the rite. These were afterwards circumcised in adult years, Josh. v. 2—7; from the necessity of the case; though in strict compliance with the Divine law they ought to have been circumcised on the eighth day after their birth. Now these instances of adult baptism, recorded in Church History, demonstrate that Christian parents "were not under bondage."—Divine benevolence "preferred mercy to sacrifice." But that same Church History unequivocally proves the baptism of little ones to be a Christian practice: and we accept its testimony on *this*, with equal confidence.

Late in the second century, and within a hundred and fifty years after the churches were planted by the apostles, A. D. 200, Tertullian wrote against infant baptism. Now he could not have written against a custom which did not exist; nor unless it prevailed. His reasons are sophisticated by "the spirit of bondage" of the ancient law. They are marked by that disposition to dread and despair which characterized the Mosaic dispensation.—He argues—"Give to them who *ask* thee, but CHILDREN cannot *ask*: Do not forbid them to *come* :

therefore let them stay till they can *come* : let them *come* when they are grown up—when they understand—when they are instructed whither it is they are about to come : let them be made Christians when they can know Christ.” For reasons equally valid, UNMARRIED PERSONS ought to be *kept off* from baptism, who are likely to be visited by temptation—as well those who never were married ought to be *kept off*, on account of their coming to maturity ; as those in a widowed state, by reason of the loss of their conjugal partners. Add the thousand reasons which deter persons engaged in the multifarious concerns of life, in middle age,—and the inevitable infirmities and weaknesses, mental and bodily, of old age—and baptism is postponed till doomsday. A hopeful method of establishing the Church of Christ !

But Tertullian had a shorter way of confounding the popular practice, could he have availed himself of it. He omitted the STRONGEST ARGUMENT that possibly could be employed against the object of his aversion, had truth allowed him to use it : the very battering-ram of destruction against Infant Baptism, could he have wielded it. “This practice is a NOVELTY : it dates but of yesterday : it was UNKNOWN to Christians fifty years ago : it was UNKNOWN to the first churches : it was UNKNOWN to the Apostles.” He *would* willingly have said this, for this must have condemned the practice conclusively. Not another word was necessary : but he COULD NOT. He might twist a few texts out of their perpendicular, in support of his principles ; or he might go so far as to hazard a slight fib ; but on a downright falsity the Christian Father would not venture ; although intent on suppressing Infant Baptism.

I know not which speaks most loudly, the SILENCE of Tertullian, notwithstanding what he would have said, or the *affirmation* of his contemporary Origen, who expressly ascribes the practice of infant baptism to the Apostles. Origen had many advantages not then common :—he was of Christian descent ;—his father was a Christian martyr ; his grandfather, and great-grandfather also were Christians. Could a family so early Christianized be ignorant what had been the primitive rites and customs of the Apostles, and the apostolic churches ? Origen’s words are these—“*The Church received from the Apostles the INJUNCTION, or tradition, to GIVE BAPTISM even to INFANTS.* According to that saying of our Lord concerning infants—and *thou wast an INFANT when thou wast baptized*—their angels do always behold the face of my Father

who is in heaven." We have these explicit passages in a translation and abridgement of Origen's works from Greek into Latin; and if the testimony of Origen had stood OPPOSED to infant baptism, we should never have heard one word on the disadvantage of having his work in a translation only, or any imputation on the competence or correctness of his translator, Rufinus.

We justify the practice of the primitive churches, for whatever opinions might obtain in different places, or whatever difference in administration, no instance of reproof from the Apostles is recorded. The Corinthian church transgressed in the administration of the Lord's Supper. By the admonition addressed to them on that occasion, succeeding ages are taught. It were but a dubious specimen of Christian charity to regret, that some occasion of reproof on the subject of baptism did not occur among the churches, by which we also might have been instructed; but from this silence it is clear, that *this* Sacrament had not, in the days of the Apostles, been misunderstood or misapplied.

The churches, says Origen, acted upon *tradition*: *Traditionem, Παράδοσιν*. What is the meaning of the word *tradition* in the Apostolic writings, and those of the early fathers? We are accustomed to affix to it the notion of a mere rumour unsupported by documents, and therefore liable to perversion;—but this is directly contrary to the import of the word among the first Christians. The Apostle writing to the Thessalonians, ii. 15, exhorts them to "hold the *traditions* they had been taught, whether by word, or *by our epistle*." He makes no difference between what he had written, and what his authorized agents reported in his name: and he calls his own epistles, *traditions*. The first epistle to the Corinthians is a collection of *traditions*; for it was delivered to the church at Corinth, by Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus, in the name of Paul. It is a series of instructions communicated by second hands; it is composed of *written traditions*; and supposing that Paul added *verbal instructions* on some points to Stephanas and his brethren, these became *unwritten traditions*, when they were reported by those Christians to their constituents, the Corinthian church. This "Instruction," 1 Cor. xi. 2, is rendered *precepta*—*traditiones*, in Latin: in English, *directions*. *Instructions*, Doddridge. *Injunctions*, Parkhurst. *Ordinances*, in our public version, *traditions*—"tradition, which ye received of us." So then, the apostle calls his own teachings, *traditions*, 2 Thess. ii. 15; iii. 6, *instructions*,

directions, injunctions, or ordinances. Origen uses the word in the same sense. "The church," says he, "received from the Apostles, the *tradition, injunction, direction, instruction, or ordinance, to give baptism to infants.*" This is very credible in itself, on the authority of the relator; but it becomes much clearer, by a closer examination of the facts of the case.

It is certain from their own testimony, that the Apostles took care to establish means of conveying their *directions* or *injunctions* to succeeding generations: for such clearly is the import of the Apostle Peter's language, 2 Peter i. 15; "I will endeavour, that after my decease, you make mention of these things;"—and thereby perpetuate the remembrance of them. This is perfectly coincident with Paul's directions to Timothy, 2 Tim. ii. 2; "The things which thou hast heard from me, *δια, for the purpose of instructing* many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." If the Apostles were so careful, there can be no doubt, but the primitive Christians their successors were also equally anxious to be informed respecting whatever accounts, of the conduct of Christ, and of his Apostles, were in preservation among them. Irenæus, born A. D. 97, describes his anxiety to acquire information from his master Polycarp: "*I remember his discourse to the people concerning the conversations he had had with John, the Apostle, and others who had seen our Lord; how he rehearsed their discourses, and what he heard them who were eye-witnesses of the Word of Life, say of our Lord, and of his miracles and doctrine.*" This proves that Polycarp had diligently inquired from those who could tell him, concerning our Lord and his doctrine. He had made himself master of whatever was to be known. It proves also, that such *traditions* were *repeated by him in his public discourses to the people*; the best of all possible modes of instruction. Moreover, these discourses made the deepest impression on the memory of Irenæus; for he did not forget them to his dying day. In this he was not singular. Thousands of other hearers, equally desirous to know, were equally attentive and equally affected. The same desire animated Origen; because for the purpose of acquiring such knowledge, he visited the churches planted by the Apostles in *Cappadocia* and *Arabia*, in *Grecce* and *Rome*; while the main part of his life was spent in *Syria* and *Palestine*, the seat of the first churches; where he could not fail of acquiring an intimate acquaintance with their constitution,

manners, and practice. He was a native of Alexandria in Egypt.

Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, who had been the disciple of John the Apostle, lived long, and might bear his testimony to the truth seventy or eighty years after the death of John;—but to avoid cavil, I take the generations in the family of Origen, and of those “faithful men” to whom Timothy gave charge, at *forty years* only; and because Origen’s father was martyred, I take him for *twenty-five years* only. It appears then that the testimony of Paul, of Timothy, of Timothy’s “faithful men” and of “others also” instructed by them, reaches downward to the year 180. Origen was born in 185; add his father, *twenty-five years*; his grandfather, *forty years*; and his great-grandfather *forty years* also, and we are brought to the year 80, when Mark the Evangelist had been dead only *twelve years* at Alexandria. Mark knew the practice of the Apostles. He would select his “faithful men” to transmit his instructions to his church in subsequent years. John was still living, for twenty years, in case any difficulty had arisen. The intercourse by sea from Ephesus to Alexandria was direct: but from Alexandria to Crete, the intercourse was almost daily. There was Timothy, or Titus, or some one of their “faithful men,” living contemporaries with the Origen family for nearly *a hundred years*! Is it possible that under such circumstances, the practice of the Church derived from the Apostles, in a matter of daily occurrence, could be forgotten? Could it be perverted, abused, counteracted? Could a rite totally new, unfounded, diametrically opposite to Apostolic injunctions, be established and prevail? Where was Timothy? where were his “faithful men?” Not at their duty, if such abominable transgression could be suffered and announced and acted on, as derived from the Apostles themselves!

What is it short of impossible to imagine that Origen had been imposed upon—he who travelled for the express purpose of acquiring information, who visited the Apostolic churches, and resided among the chief of them—that he should not know the Christian observances in his own family, from his father, his grandfather, &c., derived from Mark the Evangelist? Were this a question on a fact of modern history, said to have occurred a hundred, a hundred and twenty, or a hundred and fifty years ago, would you not deem the evidence sufficient to establish your belief?—Such is the tes-

timony of Origen in reference to injunctions for infant baptism, derived from the Apostles.*

We shall now support the affirmation of Origen, that "the Church received from the Apostles an injunction to confer baptism on infants," by inquiring whether any traces of such practice by the Apostles themselves, or by any one of them, are preserved in Scripture? The FACTS of that question are our immediate object.

The import of that language in which such facts are transmitted is not to be decided by the conceptions of "an unlettered man, with the New Testament only in his hand"—at the distance of nearly two thousand years from the original writer, in point of time, and several thousand miles from his

* CONTEMPORARIES AND DESCENT OF THE
ORIGEN FAMILY.

A.D.			A.D.
	JOHN <i>Apostle.</i>	PAUL, 67	MARK, <i>Evan.</i> 63
			Origen's great-grandfather 80
96	Polycarp, disciple of John.		
97	Irenæus born.	TIMOTHY, 97	
101	JOHN dies.		
116	Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. Rev. ii. 8.		Origen's grandfather 120
		<i>Faithful men,</i> 140	
		2 Tim. ii. 2.	Origen's father 160
170	Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, disciple of Polycarp, mentions "reborn infants."		
		<i>Others also,</i> 180	
		2 Tim. ii. 2.	ORIGEN born 185
			Origen's father martyred 202

There can be no doubt that many Apostolic persons were living in Egypt, who had daily intercourse with Judea;—that many of the Jewish Christians, after the destruction of Jerusalem, settled among their countrymen at Alexandria; and that from these, as well as from other Christians, in Greek churches, Origen obtained correct information respecting all Christian rites, occasional or constant. This Table shows only the contemporaries with his family from indisputable authority.

country ;—but from those of a *Greek* man, able to peruse the New Testament, who must know what was included in the current language of his age and country : more properly still, from those of Theophilus, to whom Luke dedicated his work, and who certainly understood the full sense of what the sacred writer addressed to him.

Whoever is acquainted with any language besides his own, knows well, that with whatever skill a translation from a foreign tongue be executed, it will be liable to imperfections in the application of words, either as to meaning or to spirit. Valuable as our public version of the New Testament is, it could not escape this defect, which is inherent in the very nature of language ; and I have never yet seen those passages of Scripture set in a just light which support the testimony of Origen.

A precept or practice referring to the baptism of children might naturally be expected in connection with the mention of children ;—or with such particulars as imply the presence of children, and demonstrate their participation. Parents without children are not to the purpose, however numerous. Children without parents, the circumstances of the Gospel history do not warrant us to expect. If such occur, they are doubly worthy of notice ; but in general, we expect to find children in company with their parents, children of various ages, especially in numerous families. Families imply children. Families are composed of children in every stage of life.

To express the presence of children, our language formerly employed the term *house* ; but modern correctness adopts another usage of the word.

The English term *house* means a building or residence. *Outhouses* are buildings somewhat removed from the family, usually inhabited by inferior persons, the servants and assistants. *House* is also used metaphorically, to denote successive generations of men allied by consanguinity. By the addition of a syllable, *house* imports the attendants or principals ; their whole establishment of every description, their HOUSEHOLD—whoever *holds*, belongs, or appertains to their house.

Οικος, *House*, has the following meanings ;—the temple of the Lord ; the temple of an idol ; a royal palace ; the palace of a great man ; a military establishment ; a college or place of learning ; a private dwelling ; a cot, hovel, hut, or shed ; a bird's nest, and perhaps a mere roosting-place ; a nation ; a

family descent through ages ; a private family, contemporaries ; the celestial state ; the vehicle of disembodied spirits in the celestial state ; the church of God on earth ; the persons of believers on earth ; a tent ; a parlor ; a chamber and retiring rooms distinct from the temple. Is it possible, that these *twenty* senses of this word can be thoroughly examined and fully understood, as it has been said, in the short space of a "single hour?" We must seek for knowledge as for silver in a mine—we must dig for it, as for hid treasure. One instance in proof of this is the extent of research demanded by this single word, if we determine thoroughly to understand it.

In our inquiries after truth, it is of great moment to establish the rules which are to guide us—and by the following rules we should attempt to elucidate Scripture:—

I. *Every word should be taken in its primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning, unless there be something in the connection, or in the nature of things, which requires it to be taken otherwise.*—II. *Whenever by the connection of a term, or by the nature of things, we are obliged to depart from the primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning of a word, we should depart as little as possible from that meaning, and even with reluctance.* The necessity of this rule on the word *Baptism* is evident ; for though to the English reader it imports *purification*, yet the Greek scholar knows that it is metaphorically taken to denote *corruption*.—III. *Whatever is expressed in Scripture is conclusive argument ; and whatever is not expressed is not conclusive.* Hence, we must examine and ascertain the proper meaning of the terms *Οικος* and *Οικια*.

ΟΙΚΟΣ.—The first passage recommended to consideration is this, Ecclesiasticus xxix. 28.

"The first indispensables for human life are water, and bread, and a wrapper for the body, and—*oikos*—a HUT, to conceal the shame of the party. Better is the life of a poor man under the shelter of a shed, or log-house, than delicate fare at another man's. Be it little or much, hold thee contented : and thou shalt not hear reproach cast on thy—*oikia*—residence. It is a miserable life to go from *oikia* to *oikia*—from residence to residence : and where thou dost not own even a hovel, thou shalt not open thy mouth. Thou mayest receive food ; thou mayest receive drink ; bestowed with an ill grace ; and bitter words upon it. "Come, *HOUSELESS*, help spread the table ; and hand me up the dish, that I may eat,—Go away, *HOUSELESS*, from before a man of fashion ; my *oikia*

—whole establishment—all my lodging room is engaged : a brother grandee is coming to enjoy my hospitality.”

It is evident, that *oikos* here describes the meanest shelter possible, and that *oikia* implies an extensive establishment or capacious premises. They are in absolute OPPOSITION to each other. The compound word *par-oike*, imports “not possessing a hovel of the meanest kind:” and it is so used with an inexpressible opposition, by the apostle, Eph. ii. 9. “Now therefore, ye are no more strangers, but fellow-citizens with the saints : no more, *παροικοι*, HOUSELESS vagrants—but inmates of the royal palace—of the household of God.” The apostle could not find a stronger term than *par-oike*, to denote in what a forlorn state the heathen had been ;—nor a stronger opposition, to denote their present happiness, as believing Christians.

The structure cannot be too slight that is marked by the term *oikos*. It signifies a bird’s nest* in the “Geoponics,” edited by Niclas, more than once. *Domus* is so used by Lucretius at the opening of the first book :

“Frondiferasque domos avium, camposque virentes.”

This will remind the reader of the Psalmist’s expressions, Psalm lxxxiv. and civ. 17: “the sparrow hath found a house.” “As for the stork, the fir-trees are her HOUSE :” her roosting place.

It is impossible to reduce the import of the term *oikos* lower ; but we shall see the distinction yet more strongly in the investigation of *oikia*.

OIKIA.—In further proof that *oikia* implies spacious premises, consult the simile ; “For, as the architect of a new *oikia*—extensive residence—must take care of the whole structure, in all its various parts ; so, to stand on every point, and to go over things at large, and to be curious in particulars, belongeth to the *Archigetes*, the first author of the story :”—not to those who abridge it. 2 Maccabees ii. 20.

* Nor is this idea uncommon in reference to persons in other languages besides the famous *oikiscos* of Demosthenes, in Greek. There is a pretty antique *basso relievo* representing a group of children, in a bird’s nest, looking out for their parents. The Welsh have a poem by Jolo Goch, who passed the following encomium on a lady :

Her children come in pairs ;
A beautiful NEST of children !

An *oikia* then resembles a history at large, including all particulars ; and treating on every point specifically.

The same extensive import of *oikia*, is satisfactorily expressed in the history of the Magi, Matt. ii. 11, who visited the Babe at Bethlehem. There was no room in the inn, says the Evangelist : his mother therefore retired to the *stable* :—“ And the wise men came into the *oikia*—premises—out-houses or *stable*, where the young child was, and found him and his parents.” This *oikia* cannot possibly denote the dwelling-house ; it *must* denote out-houses.

Whoever is acquainted with a tanner’s business knows that it requires considerable space, and various and large out-buildings. So the *oikia* of Simon the tanner at Joppa, Acts x. 10 ; his establishment was by the sea-side. The men who were sent to Peter inquired for the establishment—*oikia*—of Simon, Acts xi. 11, 17 ; and stood before the *gate*—not the door of the dwelling-house, but the *gate* of the tanner’s yard. The premises therefore included the dwelling-house, on the top of which Peter had his vision, and the offices, yard, &c., around it.

This is also strikingly apparent to the slightest attention, in the history of Peter’s deliverance, Acts xii. 12. Having considered, he came to the *oikia*—premises of Mary the mother of John—where many were gathered together, praying. Peter knocked at the door of the *gate*—not the door of the dwelling-house, but of the outer *gate*—and a damsel named Rhoda went out to listen ; and when she knew Peter’s voice she opened not the *gate* for joy, but running in ——. It seems, then, that Mary’s dwelling-house standing across a courtyard, somewhat removed from the street, preserved that privacy which the case required ; as passengers could not hear the devotions offered. The outer *gate* of the courtyard had a smaller door ; and the whole was strongly fastened. Rhoda ran across the courtyard to the outer *gate*, where she knew Peter’s voice, and immediately ran across the courtyard back again.

If the *out-houses* and courtyard include the *house*, it is clear that they are distinct erections. They are *divisible*, and may be separated. That the idea of *divisibility* is attached to this term in the New Testament, is evident from the language of the apostle, 2 Tim. ii. 20 ; “ In a great *house*—not *oikos*, but *oikia*—there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth ; and some to honour and some to dishonour.” The whole of this passage imports

divisibility. So says our Lord, John xiv. 2: "In my Father's house—not *oikos*, but *oikia*—are many mansions." Many mansions imply *divisibility*; and premises extensive, spacious, wide, large, broad, infinitely beyond the feeble comprehension of mortal man.

The Evangelists frequently express the same fact in different terms, and denote the same identical object by different appellations; in the case of the Paralytic, Matthew ix. 6, Mark ii. 11, and Luke v. 24, ALL three say, "take up thy bed, and go to thine *house*—*oikos*. The Pharisees are charged with "devouring widows' *houses*," Matt. xxiii. 14, Mark xii. 40, Luke xx. 47,—ALL read *oikia*, not *oikos*. Though there are variations among the evangelists, in the phraseology forbidding a man to regard the property in his *oikia*, yet not one of the sacred writers substitutes *oikos* for *oikia*. In the course of a long history, in which we have the words from the mouths of different speakers, not one stumbles on this interchange of *oikos* and *oikia*—but every speaker preserves the distinction. I allude to the history of Cornelius, Acts x. xi. The dwelling of Cornelius is called his *oikos*, by the servants of Cornelius, by Cornelius himself, and by Peter twice, Acts xi. 12, 13. On the contrary, the dwelling of Simon is called *oikia*, by the angel, by the evangelist, by Cornelius, and by Peter. How is it that no interchange occurs here, if the words be interchangeable? Luke was a good Greek writer, and well aware of the difference.

With all these distinctions and diametrical oppositions, are these terms *interchangeable*, in their proper acceptation? Is a hut interchangeable with a great house? Is the same term that signifies the fragile materials and small dimensions of a bird's nest, interchangeable with that which denotes the heavenly seat of Almighty power and glory? Is the careful distinction preserved by the evangelists, the merely casual result of accident?

But *oikos* is a *masculine* noun, while *oikia* is *feminine*. How long have nouns masculine and feminine been interchangeable in Greek? Are *prince*, *princess*; —*jew*, *jewess*; —*tiger*, *tigress*, &c., interchangeable in English? That they denote the same genus and species is certain; but as terms in language, they are not interchangeable.

Neither can a *part* be the same as *the whole*, or be interchangeable with it. That *oikos* really is *part* of *oikia* is the testimony of Hesychius; and of Biel, repeating him.

HESYCHIUS. οίκος, αλιγη οικια, *oikos*, a small *oikia*. Odys-

sey, *Φ.* 16;—*καὶ μέρος τι τῆς οἰκίας*, also a certain *part* of the *oikia*. *Il. Z.* 490. *Od. A.* 356. Penelope was really within the building when she was commanded to go into the *oikos*, which is described as an upper and retired apartment. *καὶ τα ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ*, and the substance or property within the *oikia*.—*Od. B.* 48.

In the Evangelists, the property of a householder is described as deposited in the *oikia*; for the person who is said to be on his *house-top* is directed not to go down to *take any thing* out of his *oikia*, *Matt. xxiv.* 17; or as Mark expresses it, *xii.* 15, “Let him not go down into his *oikia*; neither let him enter therein—which implies some distance to be passed over, and marks a strong distinction; for whoever was on his *house-top*, was already *in* his *oikos*: therefore he could need no caution against “entering therein.” *Luke xvii.* 31, speaks of “his stuff—his property—in the *oikia*,” which is strictly and remarkably conformable to the passage in Homer.

BIEL, *THESAURUS*;—“*οἶκος*, domus, tentorium, templum, conclave, familia. *Gen. ix.* 21. *xxiv.* 67. *Num. ix.* 15. *Deut. v.* 30. *Ez. xxxii.* 14. *1 Chron. xxix.* 19. *Gen. vii.* 1. *1 Kings vii.* 1, 6, 8, 9. et confer. *Luke i.* 27. et *PROCHENIUM* de *Styl. N. T.* § 120. *2 Kings xxiii.* 8, 13.—*Filii*; *1 Chron. ii.* 10. *Jer. xvi.* 14. *Amos iii.* 1. *Zeph. i.* 9. cubiculum. conclave. *Jer. xxxv.* 4. *Jer. xxxvi.* 10, 12, 20, 21. et confer *LUD. DE DIEU* ad. *Act. 1.* 13. Sic et *Josepho de Bell. Jud. vi.* 6. conclavia circa templum structa vocantur *οἶκοι*. Eodem sensu vox legitur in illo *Poetae, Odys. A. v.* 353,

Ἄλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἴσθα τι ταυτῆς ἐργα κομίζε.

Sed abi in conclave, et tuarum rerum curam habes.

Quo respiciens *HESYCHIUS*, *οἶκον* interpretatur *μέρος τι τῆς οἰκίας partem* quandam domus.”

“*Oikos*. house, tent, temple, parlour, family, inner chamber. The *cænacula*, or retiring rooms, built around the temple were, called *οἶκοι*. In the same sense the word is employed in the *Odyssey*. *Book i.* 358.—But go into your *parlour*, and mind your own business.—On which authority, *HESYCHIUS* interprets *οἶκος*, a certain *part* of a house.”

This notion of a retired apartment, or appropriate division of a large building, expressed by the term *οἶκος*, frequently occurs. Even the abode of Jupiter on Olympus seems to

have conformed to it : for we find, Iliad A. 532. 3, 4, 5, that the gods had a great hall, *δῶμα Διός*, in which they met to hold councils, to dine, and to sup : but after supper, they retired *ἔβαν οἰκονδε ἑκάστος*, *ad suam quisque domum*, each to his own *oikos*, his division of the common palace ; for Olympus was common to all the gods : and in this, Homer took his description from a well-known custom of his time. The Labyrinth of Egypt, *Herod.* lib. i. cap. 148, is an instance in point.

The same idea of a separate retired apartment is conveyed in later ages by this word : for Eusebius informs us, *Vita Const.* lib. iii. c. 10, that the council of bishops at Nice was held in a large HALL—*oikos*—of the royal residence—*τῷ μεσαιτατῷ οἴκῳ Βασιλείων*. This he expresses in another place by “the great Hall in the palace”—*οἶκον μέγιστον ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις*,—or *οἶκος εὐκτηρίου*—an *oratory*, or place of prayer :—not a temple, not a separate building—but an apartment in the palace itself, destined to sacred service : not accessible to all the world ; but, as becomes a place of prayer, retired from the noise and bustle of the palace.

If then *oikos* be a SMALL *oikia*,—if *oikos* be a PART OR DIVISION in an *oikia*,—if it be an *upper* part, an elevation, while the *oikia* extends *in breadth*, how can these nouns be interchangeable ? And if *small* and *large*, a *part* and *the whole*, *height* and *breadth*, be not interchangeable—then the argument of the Baptists fails ; and with it falls their whole system.

It is unnecessary to say much on the *figurative* acceptance of the terms, in reference to living persons—to families. Our second rule of interpretation imports, that we keep *as nearly as possible* to the proper meaning of a word, notwithstanding it be taken metaphorically ; according to the positive affirmation of Aristotle—that *oikos* is a society of *free persons*, whereas *oikia* is composed of both *bond* and *free*—and consequently, it includes the *oikos* which forms a part of it. The *part* cannot be the same as *the whole*, or interchangeable with it.

It was common in the East for a son, though married, to continue in his father's house for years ; and such an instance we have, in which it is not possible to exclude young children from the import of the term *oikos* in the sense of *family*. “In word and deed honour thy father and thy mother ; that upon thee may come blessings from all men. For the blessing of a father establisheth the *oikous*—*houses*—of sons : while the curse of a mother rooteth up foundations.”—Ecclesiasti-

cus iii. 9.—The blessing of a father has no effect on brick and mortar; the term therefore *must* mean a *family* of *young* children; for such infantine prattlers are the delight of a grandfather.

Lycophron calls an adulterer *οικοφθορῶν*, “the corrupter of *oikos* :” meaning, not merely the seducer of wives, but the corrupter of the *blood*—of the *family descent*, by introducing a spurious brood. All the women in Penelope’s household, *oikia*, as well as the dozen that Ulysses dangled on a rope, might have been seduced by Penelope’s suitors, without affecting the fidelity of their mistress in the least. On the other hand, had Penelope *alone* been unfaithful to her husband Ulysses, the chastity of all her attendants would have been no compensation to him.

The Latin writers Dumenil. Lat. Syn. *Domus* use the word *domus*, house, in the same sense. And there is the same distinction between *domus—us*, *domus—i*, as between *oikos* and *oikia*.—The modern Italian preserves it strongly; for *casa* is a *house*, but *casone*, with an additional syllable, forming the termination, is a *great large house*.

So, speaking of families, Juvenal says—

Evertere DOMOS totas optantibus ipsis
Dí faciles ————— Sat. x. 7—

“The too easily acceding gods’ overturn houses — *descent of families*—by granting the wishes of their principals, in behalf of their children.” He speaks also of a house—*family*—descent, disgraced by adultery: *Dedecus ille DOMUS sciet ultimus*. Ib. 342.

CHILDREN are the *primary* objects of—*oikos—house*; but *oikos* includes connections by marriage; the son-in-law, and the daughter-in-law, with *their* children—the *family-descent*. I know but one text where it expresses *family-ascent*: yet nothing can be clearer than the consanguinity marked by the term, even in that text; 1 Tim. v. 4, “If any widow have *children* or *grandchildren*—which is the meaning of the word rendered *nephews*—let them learn to show piety in *their own family*, *τον ιδιον οικον*, and to requite their parents.” Exactly coincident with this, is the expression of Pindar—Ode xiii. *οικον τριζολυμπιονικαν*, “the *house* thrice victor in the Olympic games :” meaning, the *family* of Xenophon, to whom the ode is addressed:—Xenophon, his father Thessalus, and his grandfather Ptæodorus. Is it possible, knowing this,

that it was intended to *restrict* the term *oikos* to children—to children “ONLY and ALWAYS?” If so, what could be meant by introducing a quotation from Aristotle, importing that “*Oikos* is a society connected together according to the course of nature, for long continuance?”—Any sense impoverishes the sentiment, unless by “every day” *all the days of life* are intended. It was so understood by Cicero, who has very elegantly distributed the argument of Aristotle, where he describes the progress of a *family*, *De Off. lib. i. c. 17*: “The first social connection, he says, is the conjugal: then that of children: these constitute a *domus*—house or family common to all. This is the commencement of a city, as it were, the plantation of young trees—the succession-plot of the common weal. Then follow the union of brothers and their families; of sisters and their families: and when one house cannot contain their numbers, they form other houses. After these follow relations by marriage they have the same family descent, the same family recollections, the same family rites, and the same family sepulchre.”*

This society extends from the cradle to the grave: from the original parents, perhaps to *second cousins*: and to this relation it may, possibly, be traced in Scripture. But what is there here inconsistent with the idea that *children* are the *primary*, and usually the *immediate* object of the term *family*? Is it not according to Nature to place them *first*? and does not Cicero himself, as well as Aristotle, follow that course in this very passage, wherein he traces consanguinity and affinity to their utmost extent?

Now in all this, where are servants or slaves admitted? Is the relation of master and slave “*according to the course of nature*?” Can we separate the idea of children—*young children*—*infants*, from the terms “*house of Israel*—*house of Jacob*—*house of Judah*—*house of David*?” Surely not: for without descents by *infants*, what becomes of the nation?—

* Nam cum sit hoc natura commune animantium, ut habeant lubidinem procreandi, prima societas in ipso conjugio est: proxima in liberis: deinde una domus, communia omnia. Id autem est principium urbis, et quasi seminarium reipublicæ. Sequuntur fratrum conjunctiones, post consobrinorum sobrinorumque: qui cum una domo jam capi non possint, in alias domos, tamquam in colonias, exeunt. Sequuntur conubia et affinitates: ex quibus etiam plures propinqui. Quæ propagatio, et suboles, origo est rerum publicarum. Sanguinis autem conjunctio, benevolentia devincit homines et caritate. Magnum est enim eadem habere monumenta majorum, eisdem uti sacris, sepulcra habere communia.

Now if we cannot separate the idea of children from a nation, from a *long* descent, how can we separate it from the families composing that nation, from an *immediate* descent—from any one link in the chain of descent?—If, then, children of all ages be the *primary* and *immediate* object of the term *family*, according to the course of nature, according to the *general* and *established* use of the word, it rests with those who undertake to confute this proposition, to show convincing cause for denying this import of the term; but especially where the term occurs in Scripture, connected with *baptism*. They are bound to show, in the instances of Cornelius, of the Jailor, of Lydia, of Stephanas, of Crispus, and of Onesiphorus, to which add those of Aristobulus and Narcissus, with the *many* believers who formed the church of Corinth, that there neither *were*, nor *could be young* children in any ONE of these instances.—If this be thought too much trouble, the purpose may be answered with equal certainty, by merely proving that the *families* of the Bishop, the Deacon, and the young women, in the epistle to Timothy, cannot include young children—*infants*.

OIKIA — *Oikia* includes, besides the family, slaves, servants, or attendants.—“As the sun rising in mid-heaven is a good wife to her household,” *Oικιας*.—Ecclesiasticus xxvi. 16; and iv. 30. “Be not as a lion in thy *oikia*, and frantic among thy *servants*!”—Here a parallelism is intended. The term *frantic* is parallel to *lion*; and servant is parallel to *oikia*, or *household*.—2 Maccabees iii. 30. “But if any one, old or young, shall conceal any Jew, he, with all his *household*, *παροικια*, shall be put to death with the most ignominious torments.”—Here the master is distinct from his servants, and both family and servants are threatened by the edict; because servants are privy in cases of concealment: and the intention of this edict was to deter universally.

We have a passage in which, without falsifying history, it is IMPOSSIBLE to include the family in the term *oikia*, Phil. iv. 22. “All the saints salute you, especially those who are of Cæsar’s HOUSEHOLD,” *οικιας*. Not one of Cæsar’s *family*, then, was at this time converted to Christianity; though some of his household attendants, servants or courtiers, were. The names of several are on record, and apparently mentioned in Scripture.

The conclusion therefore is, as in the instance of Noah’s family, that the servants are OF NECESSITY excluded from the *oikos*; and in this instance of Cæsar’s *oikia*, the family is ex-


cluded, OF EQUAL NECESSITY. These terms cannot be regularly and grammatically INTERCHANGEABLE. In this, the metaphorical or figurative acceptation of the terms coincides completely with their primary and proper import. The terms *oikos* and *oikia* when used *figuratively* are not regularly and grammatically *interchanged* in Scripture language.

The Septuagint translation justifies the general principle.

Jacob was a plain man dwelling in tents. Sep. οἰκῶν οἰκίαν. Two manuscripts, the Aldine edition, and Cyril. Al., read οἰκῶν ἐν οἰκίᾳ. He *oikosed* IN the *oikia* of his father. He occupied a portion of the general establishment of Isaac; enjoyed the patriarchal and patrimonial tent. This is another instance of *oikia* being much more extensive than *oikos*: and is a proof that *tents* were known under the general appellation of *houses*; as they are at this day, among the Arabs.

Exodus i. 21. *He made them houses.* Sep. ἐποίησεν ἑαυταῖς οἰκίας.—Aquila, ἐποίησεν ἑαυταῖς οἰκούς.—Symmachus, ἐποίησεν ἑαυταῖς οἰκίας.—Theodotion, ἐποίησεν αὐταῖς οἰκούς.—Gr. Ven. ἐποίησεν οὐν ἐκεῖναν δόμος, δόμους.—The meaning is well explained by a Greek scholiast in Caten. Nicet. τοιοῦτον ἐστὶ το, ἐποίησεν ἑαυταῖς οἰκούς, τουτ' ἐστὶν ἠϋξήσεν αὐταῖς το γένος. The writer's thought is, that inasmuch as the midwives had assisted the Israelite women, rendering them mothers of children, therefore the Lord assisted the midwives, and rendered them in return mothers of numerous families. The Greek scholiast employs *oikos* in such a manner that having in his mind the idea of the parturition of the midwives, he becomes an additional and effectual evidence for the acceptation of the term, *oikos*, in the sense of *family* or issue of the body—INFANTS.

The term *House* in the sense of family is metaphorical; and is derived from the term *House* in the original sense of a *Building*; not a tent, but a fixed, permanent, and lasting residence. Now as we always can recur to the proper use of the term, and as it is used metaphorically in several languages, and as there is a corresponding similarity between the original object and the significative appellation, our inquiries into its meaning must be satisfactory. Therefore I present the plan of a *house* in ancient Greece, sufficient for every purpose of illustration.



Here is the separation of the out-houses from the principal dwelling. It is evident that the house cannot be said to include the grounds and out-houses: the *house* might be *built up* or pulled down, enlarged or diminished, without affecting the out-houses. But the out-houses include the house:— and the whole may be expressed by one comprehensive term—establishment, premises, residence or place.

Such is the *proper* and real application of the term *house*. Our present object is to trace the conformity of the *metaphorical* application of the term to this reality. There cannot be equal authority on this subject to that of Aristotle. In writing on the polity of cities, Aristotle thus defines a House. "A HOUSE is a Society or Companionship connected together according to the course of nature, for long continuance. Such a Society is called by Charondas, '*those who eat from the same cupboard,*' or pantry; but it is called by Epimenides, the Cretan, '*those who sit around the same fire-side;*'"—Or, as Du Val, the editor of Aristotle supposes, "*those who sit around the same table.*" Such a Society, says Aristotle, is an OIKOS, or HOUSE.—Aristotle, Pol. Lib. i. c. 2.*

* Societas igitur in omnis vitæ dies constituta, Naturæ conveniens

But the old Grecian distinguishes between οἶκος, *House*, οἰκία, *House-HOLD*, exactly as Scripture distinguishes. Speaking of a city, he says, Polit. Lib. i. c. 3, "In order to obtain a clear idea of the parts of which a city is composed, it is necessary that we should previously explain what an οἰκία is. For every city is composed of connected οἰκίας : and further, an οἰκία is composed of several parts ; and these placed together in their stations, constitute the οἰκία. But a COMPLETE οἰκία comprises the servants and those who are free."* By "*free*" Aristotle means, the Master and his family : one who is capable of citizenship ; one "among those who are free by nature."† He afterwards expatiates on this definition, speaking of the wife as being "*free*;" not as among barbarians, a slave ; and of the children, as being "*free*." He says, "There is but a slight difference between the skill required to govern a great οἰκία—*House-HOLD*—and that required to govern a small city." Nothing can be clearer, than that the term *oikos*—*House*—EXCLUDES the *oikia*—*out-houses*, or *House-HOLD* ; but the term *oikia* includes the *House*.

If Aristotle had met with the term *house* in reading the New Testament, what would he have understood by it ?—or rather, what would any "unlettered Greek man, having only the Greek New Testament in his hand," have understood, when reading in his native language—"We baptized Lydia, *with her society connected together according to the course of nature for long continuance*."—"We baptized the Jailor, *with ALL those who eat from the same cupboard as himself*."—"I baptized those who sit around the same fireside with my valued friend Stephanas"—or, "I baptized those who sit around the same table with my honoured friend." A Greek reader *must* have under-

et consentanea, DOMUS est : cujus societatis participes et consortes, δημοσπινοῖς Charondas appellat, id est, eodem panario, seu ex eadem apotheca victum sumentes : nos convictimus appellemus : Epimenides autem Cretensis ομοκατοῖς, id est, uno et communi foco seu fumo utentis : dicamus, si placeat, contubernaleis.

* Ἐπει δὲ φανερόν ἐξ ἡμεῶν ἢ πόλις συνέστηκεν, ἀνάγκη περὶ οἰκονομίας, λέγε περὶ οἰκίας, εἰπεῖν πρότερον. πᾶσα γὰρ πόλις, ἐξ οἰκῶν συγκροτεῖται οἰκίας, λέγε οἰκονομίας, δὲ μέρη, ἐξ ὧν αὐτῆς οἰκία συνίσταται· οἰκία δὲ τελείη, ἐκ δουλῶν, καὶ ἐλευθερῶν. Quando autem perspicuum est quibus ex partibus constet civitas, necessario de Domo prius dicendum est. Omnis enim Civitas ex domibus et familiis componitur. Domus porro partes sunt, ex quibus Domus constituitur ; at Domus perfecta atque integra, ex servis et liberis constat.

† ἢ ἡ μὲν γὰρ, ἐλευθερῶν φύσει. ἢ δὲ, δουλῶν ἐστὶ. Civilis est liberorum natura : herile imperium verò, servorum.

stood this term—*house*—in a very extensive sense : including not only ALL the children, in every stage of life but *something more*.

But the elegance of the last definition, though conjectural, “*those who sit around the same table*,” reminds me of the exquisite comparison of the Psalmist, Psalm cxxviii. 3—“*Thy wife shall be like a fruitful vine, by the side of thy house ; thy children like olive plants round about thy table.*”

Though writing in Greek, the Apostles were Hebrews by descent ; and perfectly familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures, and with the Hebrew language, as spoken by their nation. Beyond a doubt, they used the term HOUSE in the same sense as it is used by the Old Testament writers ; hence we have only to consult Moses and the Prophets, and rest our inquiry on their answer.

According to the Hebrews, the *metaphorical* derivation of the term *House* was from the circumstance of a dwelling-house being BUILT UP of stones. A *metaphorical* House, therefore, a FAMILY, was a building of *living* stones. Now which are the proper *living stones* to *build up* a family or *house*?—are they the seniors or the juniors?—Is the *infant* born to-day, or the man of a hundred years old who dies to-morrow?—And here I will not allow you to say, “the term *house*, as used in the Old Testament, implies the ELDERS of the family, *strictly* and *properly* ; but the infants *accidentally*, and *improperly*.” I affirm on the contrary, that the *direct*, *straight-forward*, *explicit*, and *unquestionable* reference of the term *House* is to the INFANTS, *primarily* and *properly* ; and to the seniors, or even to the Parents, if at all, only *accidentally*, *improperly*, and *occasionally*. The ‘proof of this may safely rest on the following passages.

2 Sam. vii. 27. “Thou, O Lord God of Israel, hast revealed to thy servant, saying, I will BUILD thee a HOUSE,” will establish thy *family*. 1 Chron. xvii. 25. 2 Sam. vii. 11, 29 ; The Lord telleth thee that he will MAKE thee A HOUSE.

“Now let it please thee to bless the *house* of thy servant—and with thy blessing let the *house* of thy servant be blessed for ever,” his *family*. 1 Kings xi. 38. Exod. i. 21 ; “And it came to pass, because the midwives feared God, that he MADE THEM HOUSES,” he gave them numerous *families*.

Consult the history of Jacob and Rachel, Gen. xxx. 1–2 ; “Give me children, or else I die,” said the disappointed wife.—Her husband replied : “Am I in God’s stead, who hath with-

held from thee *the fruit of the womb?*" Psalm cxxvii. Except the Lord BUILD *the house*, they labour in vain that build it.

"Lo! CHILDREN are a heritage of the Lord, and the *fruit of the womb* is his reward." The Hebrew, very remarkable here, fixes the sense to *issue*: "those who labour to *build the house*, IN IT."

This etymological derivation of the term *house*—as importing a *metaphorical building*—CONTINUED, and WAS ADOPTED by the *Apostles*.

Eph. ii. 19–21. Now therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and members of the household-establishment of God; and are BUILT on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom *all the BUILDING*, fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are BUILDED together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. 1 Peter ii. 4, 5; Coming to the Lord, as to a living, life-giving stone —ye also, as *living stones* are BUILT UP a *spiritual house*, *family*, as that of Aaron, a holy priesthood, to offer up *spiritual sacrifices*.—Titus i. 11. They subvert—overturn WHOLE HOUSES—families: the very reverse of building up: UN-building.—These passages are decisive.

In proof that HOUSE imports CHILDREN, distinct from their parents.—Deut. xxxv. 9. "Then shall his brother's wife spit in his face, and say, so shall it be done unto that man who will *not BUILD UP his BROTHER'S HOUSE*,"—by obtaining children—*infants*—from his widow.—Gen. xvi. 2. "Sarai said unto Abram, the Lord hath restrained me from child-bearing: I pray thee go in unto my maid; it may be that *I may obtain children by her*," "be BUILDED by her." Gen. xxx. 3. "Rachel said to Jacob, behold my maid Bilhah—she shall bear upon my knees, that *I may also have children by her*"—"be BUILDED by her." Gen. vii. The Lord said to Noah, come thou AND all thy *house* into the ark.

The parent is distinguished from his family.—1 Kings xvii. 8, 16. The widow woman of Zarepta did according to the saying of Elijah;—and she, and he, and her HOUSE, did eat many days.—Her *son* must be her *house*, distinct from his mother; as there were but three persons concerned in the history. Gen. xl.—xlvi. 27. 31. "Jacob and all his seed came into Egypt, his sons, his sons' sons, his daughters and his sons' daughters, all his seed. *All the souls which came out of his loins*—all the souls of the HOUSE of Jacob were threescore

and ten."—The phrase those which *came out of the loins* of Jacob, must exclude Jacob himself. Numb. xviii. 11. "The heave-offerings have I given to thee and thy sons, and to thy daughters with thee, every one that is clean in thy HOUSE." The parent is evidently not comprised in the term *house*.—Deut. xxvi. 11. Thou shalt rejoice in every good thing which the Lord thy God hath given thee, and unto thine HOUSE. The distinction is here preserved also.—2 Sam. xiii. 11. "I will raise up evil against thee David, out of thine own *house*;"—from among thy children.

That this distinction between parents and children, CONTINUED, and was ADOPTED *by the Apostles*, is manifest from—Lydia, and her *house*;—the Bishop, and his *house*:—the Deacon, and his *house*:—the *family* of Stephanas, separate from himself;—the *family* of Crispus, separate from himself;—the *family* of Onesiphorus separate, &c.

In proof that HOUSE means INFANTS, *explicitly*.—Numb. xvi. 27, 32. Dathan and Abiram came out and stood in the door of their tents, and their wives, and their sons, and their LITTLE CHILDREN.—And the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up, and their HOUSES.—Their *little children*, then, were their *houses*.—JOB xx. 28. "The *increase of his house* shall roll away; shall flow away as a torrent flows, in the day of his wrath." The term "increase of a house," means a *family*, 1 Sam. ii. 3.—Psalm lxviii. 6. "God setteth the solitary *man* in *families*:" in a HOUSE—INFANTS. Psalm cxiii. 9. God maketh the barren *woman* to sit in her HOUSE—*family*; the joyful mother of *children*, INFANTS.—Isaiah xiii. 6. Their *children* shall be dashed to pieces before their eyes, their HOUSES shall be spoiled. The Medes shall not regard silver, nor delight in gold.—Their bows shall dash the young men to pieces: they shall have no pity on *the fruit of the womb*: their eye shall not spare *children*—It was not the *dwelling houses* which the Medes were to spoil, for they regarded not silver nor gold which are the natural spoil of dwelling houses; but *houses* in the sense of *families*—*the fruit of the womb*—INFANTS.

HOUSE means INFANTS, before they are conceived—consequently, when they are *not present*.—Gen. xviii. 19. "I know Abraham, that he will command his *children*, even his HOUSE, after him." Here Isaac is spoken of as *house* to Abraham, in the close of the day on which he was *promised* by the three Angels; consequently before his conception.—2 Sam. vii. 11–16. "The Lord telleth thee that

he will MAKE *thee*, a HOUSE and set up thy SEED after thee, *which SHALL PROCEED out of thy bowels.*—Consequently, this *infant*, David's successor, was not yet begotten.—Ruth iv. 12. “All the people that were in the gate, and the elders said—The Lord make the woman that is come into thy dwelling house, like Rachel and like Leah, which two did BUILD UP *the* HOUSE of Israel :—And let THY HOUSE, family, be like the *house* of Pharez, whom Tamar bare unto Judah, OF THE SEED WHICH THE LORD SHALL GIVE THEE OF THIS YOUNG WOMAN.”

It is not possible by any form of words whatever, to express INFANTS more decidedly, than by these applications of the term HOUSE: and if there were no other text in the Old Testament, this last alone is sufficient to establish the proposition that the term *house* in Old Testament language MUST mean an *infant*. The *building up* the *house* of Israel is *infant-child-bearing*. THY HOUSE—the “SEED which the Lord SHALL GIVE THEE of this young woman,” MUST mean an *infant*. This is the national and acknowledged language, used by “all the people that were in the gate;” not by the vulgar only, but by those well instructed, by the *elders*; and this took place before Boaz was married: for it follows—“So Boaz took Ruth to wife.”

Thus an *infant* is expressed in Old Testament language by the term *house*, both by the side of the father and mother, even before it is begotten. The same usage of the word continued and was adopted by the Apostles, as is clear from the case of the young women, 1 Timothy v. 14; concerning whom Paul says, as of a future event, that he would have them marry, bear children, despotize their *house* or family; in exact conformity with the wishes of the elders and the people, in behalf of Boaz and Ruth. Let us reduce the result to conclusive evidence.

By what was Sarah and Rachel builded up? By *Infants*.—What does the term *houses* imply? Little *Children*.—In what *house* does God set the solitary man? In an *Infant* family.—In what *house* does God set the barren woman? In an *Infant* family.—What is the increase of a house? *Infants*.—What is a house in the sense of fruit of the womb? *Infants*.—What was to be commanded by Abraham, as his *house*? His *expected Infant* Isaac.—What *house* was the seed which should proceed out of thine own bowels? An *Infant*.—What *house* was the seed which the Lord shall give of the young woman? An *Infant*.—In these ten instances, and

twenty might be added, the term *house* must signify *Infants*; and moreover, it is used for *Infants*, though not actually present.

But an objection to this inference has thus been propounded.—“If the argument be made to turn rather upon words than things, there is always this risk that the disputants become involved in all the difficulties arising from the attempt to fix the meaning of words which are necessarily fleeting, as well as from their incompetent acquaintance with a dead language. Every linguist knows that the words *pais*, *paidos*, *brephos*, *brephyllion*, *tecnon*, *puer*, *puerulus*, *parvulus*, *infans*, *infantulus*, *piccierillo*, *infante*, *infanta*, *infanzo*, *enfant*, *barne*, *infant*, *child*, are used indiscriminately for *MINORS*, whether they be twenty *days* or twenty *years* old; and sometimes for *terms of endearment* at any age. Hence it happens that we hear of “an *infant* who was hanged for killing his tutor,”—of “the last will and testament of the *little infant*, *infantulus*, Adald,” aged eighteen—of the “*Speculum parvulorum*,” or mirror of *little ones*, that is, of the *simple* or *little ones* in understanding—of the “*childe* of the age of *xiii* yere, vesture pryce *iii* shillings,” in a statute of Henry VII.—of “the *barne*, the young man, is not dead but sleepeth.” In a book of sacred dramas “compiled by Johan Bayle, we find John the Baptist, or “Johan the *dopper*,” called *puer*.

Pater celestis.

Preache to the people, rebukynge their negligence,
Doppe them in water, they *knowledgyng*e their offence,
 And say unto them the kingdom of God doth cum.

John Baptist.

Unmete Lord I am, *Quia* PUER *ego sum*.

Thus Luke the Evangelist, and Paul the Apostle, however intent on relating the practice of the Apostles in respect to *Infant* Baptism, are prohibited the use of the word *Infant*!! Let him not dare to say, we baptized *children*:—neither *pais*, *paidos*, *brephos*, *brephyllion*, *tecnon*, *puer*, *puerulus*, *parvulus*, *infans*, *infantulus*, *piccierillo*, *infante*, *infanzo*, *enfant*, *barne*, *infant* or *child*, if met with in *his* writings connected with *Baptism*, could signify what it universally signifies, or could mean, what elsewhere it really does mean. In Homer, a *child* imports a *child*:—but in New Testament Greek, it imports a *man*. Of what avail then is the argument, “if the Apostles meant to say they baptized children, why did they not use the term *child*? Children are mentioned on occasions of much less importance; why are they not mentioned in

connection with baptism?"—The answer is easy. The New Testament writers well understood that those names were liable to ambiguity; and they might foresee that in after ages men would pervert the meaning of the terms, had they used them! Happily, they have not once used such equivocal denominations, in reference to baptism. Instead of saying "we baptized men, women, and *children*," in *three* words; they tell us so in a *plainer and more direct* manner, in *one* word; and to that word, both Greek and Jew attached the same import and application.

Therefore with the preceding ten instances of the signification of the term *house* in the Old Testament language, and with every demonstration of the continued sense and adoption of the term by the Apostles, to the same purport and intention and without variation in the New Testament; I ask—*what did the Apostles baptize, when they say they baptized houses?*

What would a pious Hebrew Christian reading the New Testament have understood by the term *house* in the days of the Apostles, when he found it in various parts of their sacred writings? Could he *possibly* have separated from it the idea of Infants? And if he had been told that it was to be taken as excluding *Infants*, would he not have complained of the deception practised on him? Would he not have said—"If the New Testament writers use this word in a sense never before known in our nation, a sense entirely new and contradictory to common and popular acceptance, *why did they not tell us so?* How are we to understand them, if not by the language which they adopt, and how are we to understand their language, if not in its popular and fixed acceptance; the same as that in which it has uninterruptedly been employed from the days of our father Abraham to this very day; and in which it is now used?*

Do those Evangelist writers ever drop any hint of such novelty and deviation? So far from it, they give this term the most comprehensive sense possible. They speak of the

* The present customs of the East add their testimony to this principle. D'Arvieux, in his "Manners of the Arabs," says—"The Arabs never speak of their wives, nor does any person speak concerning their females to them; but indirectly they say, "MY HOUSE," and "those at home;" instead of "my wife and my daughters!" When one inquires after their health, it is by this form, "how does your house?" and "how do youse of your house do?" Besides its application to the general subject; this authoritative fact favours the conjecture, that daughters were the *HOUSE* of Lydia.

whole *house* of Crispus, Acts xviii. 8; and no exception is marked. Aristotle, Poet. 16, says; *ολον δε εσι το εχος, και μεσον, και τελευτη*—“The whole includes beginning, middle, and end.”—No; say some moderns, it only includes the beginning!—We baptized ALL the *house* of the Jailor, says the Evangelist, Acts xvi. 34. But it is retorted—when the Evangelists say ALL, they do not mean ALL; they only intend *some*!—When our Lord said to his Disciples; “Drink you ALL” of the sacramental cup; did he mean, only two or four of you drink of it? When he says; *go and disciple ALL nations*; does he mean *some* nations only?—To contract the free grace of God!—to narrow the extensiveness of the gospel of Christ!—is impiety, if not incipient blasphemy—and allied to it is the desire to exclude from *baptism* any member of a “*house*,” concerning which an Apostle or an Evangelist says, the *whole*, or ALL were baptized!

Οικος.—The Greek term for *house*, *oikos*, corresponds exactly with our usage of the English word; and the distinctions are uniformly preserved throughout Scripture, without any instance of confusion or interchange. As applied to persons, this Greek term signifies a continued descending line of many generations. So we have the *house* of Israel, and *house* of David, the nearest line by consanguinity that can be drawn to Israel, to David, through any indefinite number of generations. It signifies also a *family* living at the same time, and usually under one roof, contemporaries. With the addition of a syllable, *oiki-AS*, *οικι-ΑΣ*, it changes its application, and imports the attendants on a family, the servants of various kinds, or the *house-HOLD*; whoever *holds* to the *house*. Marriage or adoption might engraft a member of the *house-hold* into the *family*; yet *that* is not according to the appointment of nature, but is an arbitrary convention of civil society.

The term *house*, in the sense of a *building*, or as signifying a series of descending generations, can have no connection with the subject of baptism of persons. Neither has the term *house-HOLD* any immediate connection with this subject; Scripture affording no instance of a *house-HOLD* being baptized, *as such*; though individuals comprised in it might be. We are therefore restricted to the consideration of the term *house* in the sense of *FAMILY*: and it corresponds perfectly with our English term. Had it been rendered *family* at first, no error could have arisen on the subject of Baptism. There can be no *family* without *children*. A man and his wife are not a *family*. When a young woman is advanced in preg-

nancy, she is “in the *family* way;”—when her child is born, she has a *family*; yet this term is seldom used absolutely, unless three or four children or more compose the *family*. A widow with six or eight children is left, we say, with a *large* family: and speaking of them, we ask, “whether the *whole* family be well?—whether *all* be at home?”

The same precisely is the application of the Greek term *οικος*, in the New Testament. I know no instance in which it imports a married pair not having children; or the parents distinct from their children: but in several instances it imports children *distinct from their parents*. For the Apostle Paul baptized the *family* of Stephanas;—but he did not baptize Stephanas himself; and he salutes the *family* of Onesiphorus, but omits Onesiphorus himself, who was probably absent from them; or he might have been dead, leaving an unsettled family behind him.

Scripture always employs this term *οικος*, *family*, to import *the nearest degree of kindred*;—by consanguinity generally, yet not excluding marriage; and by descent generally; yet in one instance by ascent of parentage:—never varying however from the notion of *the nearest possible degree of kindred*.

It excludes servants or the *House-HOLD*. An unimpeachable instance of this presents itself in the allusion to Noah, Heb. xi. 7, who was saved by means of the ark, with his *FAMILY*. The Apostle Peter assures us, 1 Peter iii. 20, that only *eight* persons were saved in the ark; Noah with his wife, and his three sons with their wives; it follows, that no part of his *House-HOLD* is included in the term “family,” used by the writer to the Hebrews. The children of Noah saved with him in the ark, were certainly adults, for chronologers allow the youngest of them a hundred years of age: I proceed therefore to show, that this term *family*, denotes not only minors, but children in the youngest possible state of life.

The Apostle, describing the qualifications for a Christian bishop, 1 Tim. iii. 4, insists that he should be “one who ruleth well *HIS OWN family*, having *his children* in subjection with all gravity—for if a man know not how to rule his own *family*, how shall he take care of the church of God?” Here it is evident, the *children* are the *family*; in a state of non-age, pupilage, and youth, which requires *ruling* and guidance by their father.

In 1 Timothy iii. 12, we find a precept which directs that a Deacon be the husband of one wife, *ruling* well his *children*, even *HIS OWN FAMILY*—his nearest of kin—his issue. Lest

this should admit the possibility of equivocation, the apostle marks the family as *his own*. Nothing can be more a man's *own* than his children; and the force of the Greek term warrants any degree of strength that can be annexed to it.—Therefore, in both these places and connections, it fixes the parties designed by it, equally in reference to the Bishop as the Deacon, to natural issue or *family*. Nor can these children be *adults*, for then the term *ruled* could not be applied to them: they *must* be *young* children, under their father's direction, subject to his command and obedient to his control: he is to *rule* them.

But these children being under the *rule* of their father, though still young, are *somewhat* advanced in life. In proof that the term *family* imports *babes and sucklings*, consult the advice of the apostle to the young women, 1 Tim. v. 14. "I would have the young widows to marry, bear children, and guide their offspring; *οικοδεσποτειν*, literally, *despotise* their *family*." This order of the words is definitive: "marriage, —child-bearing,—child-*despotising*." This third term *must* mark that guidance, care, and assiduity concerning *infant children*, which mothers feel with the most lively anxiety. Who interferes with a mother's solicitude for her *infant*?—the father may sympathize with it when indisposed; he may express his fondness when it is in health; but it is the mother who *must despotise* it, govern it, direct all its motions and watch all its ways. This is the appointment of God in his Providence. These could not be foster children: for the apostle speaks of *child-bearing*, bearing children *of their own body*; nor could they be adults, for then, neither could their mother *despotise* them; nor could she be *young* if her children were of mature age. Observe also the change of term. The father, Bishop or Deacon, was to *rule* his family; the mother is to *despotise* her offspring, her *infant*, with maternal solicitude. The *infant* family is of necessity attached to the mother; and the mother is attached to the *infant* family, by Divine appointment.

I demand, therefore, VALID REASONS why the *family* attached to their mother, Lydia, Acts xvi. 15, was not a YOUNG family. Moreover, seeing that *Daughters* are always more attached to their mothers than sons are, and for a longer term of years: I demand also *valid reasons* for denying that Lydia's family were *Daughters*, in whole or in part: since there is the greater chance that they were *Daughters*, rather than Sons. Lydia was a native of Thyatira, but settled at Phil-

ippi. That she was on a visit or on a journey of traffic, does not appear. That conjecture is set aside by the mention of her *family* and her residence, which must have been a large house, to accommodate several lodgers, Paul, Silas, Luke, &c.; and a decent congregation in addition to her family.

It is said of Lydia, that "her heart was opened by the Lord: and that she attended to the things spoken by Paul:" but nothing of this is said of her family. The *baptism* of her family evidently accompanied her own; and is spoken of as a matter of course connected with her own *baptism*—"And when she was *baptized*, and her family"——There is no salutation to any of Lydia's family in the Epistle to the Philippians:—if her family were sons of mature age and members of the church, has not this omission its difficulty? The fixing of the term *brethren* to the family of Lydia, in a restricted sense, is unwarranted by the fair construction of the passage. In the instance of Lydia's *family*, the children *might be* young; and every thing leads to that conclusion; but in a numerous family, the certainty that some *must be* young is greatly heightened.

Scripture uses the words *all* and *whole*, to import *many*—*numerous*. The application of this word to *families* deserves notice. It imports *many* in lesser numbers, Math. xiii. 56: "his mother Mary, and his brethren James and Joses, and Simon and Judas, and his sisters, are they not *ALL* with us?" Admitting an equal number of sisters as of brethren, it makes eight or nine with the mother: a *large* or numerous family.

The nobleman who came to our Lord to beseech him to cure his son, had servants who met him; and as became a nobleman, literally a *little king*, he had a *numerous* household; for we read John, iv. 53; "the father believed with *ALL* his household." Now here notice the necessity of preserving the distinction between *house*, the word used by our translators in the sense of *family*, and *house-HOLD*; for the story seems to say that this nobleman had only one son: but he had *many* domestics: the *household* was numerous, but all this *household* was believers.

Paul uses the term, Acts xvi. 28, speaking to the terrified jailor—"Do thyself no harm; for we are *ALL* here;" *many* prisoners, beside Paul and Silas.

The consequence is inevitable, that families distinguished by the word *ALL* or *WHOLE*, had *many children*; since children are the family. Acts xviii. 8; Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed with *ALL* his *numerous* family. Cor-

nelius the Centurion feared God with ALL his *numerous* family, Acts x. 1. This particular was so striking, that it is repeated; for Peter reports the Angel to have said to Cornelius, Acts xi. 14; that not only himself, but "ALL his *family* should be saved," by the word to be spoken to them. This is not noticed in the first account of the appearance of the angel; but it was a striking fact; and the apostle knew it to be true from his own observation. This is included also when Cornelius says—"we are ALL here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God"—my family is NUMEROUS. This idea even runs through the story—"moreover the Holy Ghost fell on ALL them who heard the word"—on the *numerous* assembly. As Cornelius selected for his piety, the soldier whom he sent to Joppa, who was "a *devout* man," there can be no doubt, that HE also heard the discourse of Peter to the family; and most probably, those two domestics who accompanied him in bringing Peter, accompanied him also at this meeting. Now as the Holy Ghost fell on ALL who heard Peter speak, these members of the house-hold of Cornelius were among the first fruits of the Gentiles;—but they were not of his *family*, though consecrated and *baptized* at the same time with their master.

The assembly baptized at Cornelius's, was a kind of Epitome—representatives of the future Gentile church; and therefore contained individuals of every description; young and old—rich and poor—masters and servants—high and low—foreigners, natives of countries near, and of distant countries. Julian the Apostate, who acknowledged only *two* eminent converts to Christianity, named Cornelius the Centurion as one of them.

Now is it probable, that Crispus should have a *numerous* family, that Cornelius should have a VERY NUMEROUS family, and that the jailor should have a *numerous* family, but no *young children* in one of them? although the word expressly signifies young children! The families are spoken of as being *baptized*; no exceptions are marked: and the most numerous of all was *baptized by the Holy Ghost*, as well as afterwards with water.

This leads to the history of the Philippian jailor who rejoiced believing in God, with all his *numerous* family; Acts xvi. 34. He could not have been an *old* man. His first intention after the earthquake—"he drew his sword, and would have killed himself"—is not the character of age which is much more deliberate in its determinations. The action is

that of a fervid mind. In like manner, "he called for lights, and SPRANG IN." The original well expresses the strenuous action of a man in the vigour of life; yet this man had a NUMEROUS FAMILY, which according to nature *must* have contained young children. Cornelius was a soldier too, and taking human life as generally modified by professions, had *young* children in his very numerous family.

Luke was a good Greek writer, and relates the history of the jailor with his customary precision. He says, Paul advised him; "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be safe, with thy family. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his *house-HOLD*, to all in the jail." He brought all in his power under the word as Cornelius had done; but it is not said, that all who were in his *house-HOLD*, attendants, prisoners, &c., were *baptized*, which *is said* of the whole company at Cornelius's, but "he and his family were baptized." "he rejoiced with ALL his *numerous* family believing in God."—All heard the word: but *only* his family accompanied the jailor in baptism. This Jailor became one of the Philippian brethren; and would not lose the opportunity of attending the consolatory exhortation at Lydia's: and of bidding his spiritual fathers farewell. The *baptism* of this family is spoken of as that of Lydia: as the ordinary course of events; the children accompanying the father, as is perfectly natural; but his family was more *numerous* than that of Lydia; as appears from the use of the word *all* which is not applied to her family.

"I will take you," says the prophet, Jer. iii. 14; "one of a city, or two of a tribe, and bring you to Zion." Considering the isolated nature of the first conversions, it is wonderful that we have so many instances of the *baptism of families*; but if we could trace the establishment of a church within a limited neighbourhood, we might expect to find more connected instances of this practice.

The Church at Philippi, though apparently consisting of a few members only, especially when first planted by the Apostle Paul, affords two families, that of Lydia, and that of the Jailor which were certainly *baptized*.

The Church at Corinth also offers two families baptized, that of Crispus and that of Stephanas; besides an uncertain number of others.

Stephanas was "the first fruits of Achaia," 1 Cor. xvi. 15; and Paul confesses that he *baptized his family*. "Crispus, the chief of the synagogue, believed on the Lord, with ALL

his *numerous* family, Acts xviii. 8 ; and MANY of the Corinthians believed and were baptized."

The family of Crispus is said to *believe*, but it is not marked as BAPTIZED. Their *baptism* will readily be granted ; for to leave this believing family *unbaptized* would cut up "believer's baptism" by the very roots. The same reasons imply that among the "*many* Corinthians" baptized, others beside Crispus had *families*.

Stephanas, who was a deputy from the Church of Corinth to Paul, had been *baptized* and was a member of that Church. Neither of these particulars is recorded : but if Stephanas were not of their body, how came they to depute him, for the purpose of obtaining answers to questions in which their body was concerned ? and if his family were not attached to the Church at Corinth, what relation *could* it have to the state of parties in that Church ? or why recollect it in conjunction with Gaius and Crispus ? Stephanas their father is described as the *first-fruits* of Achaia ; are we obliged to take this term in the sense of "*first convert* ?" This worthy man might have resided at a short distance from Corinth ; and yet be a member of the Corinthian Church.

The Church of Corinth then presents two particulars which have not heretofore occurred in the history of baptism ;—that Crispus the head of his family was baptized by Paul, *separately from his family*, which was *not baptized* by Paul ; and that the family of Stephanas *was baptized* by Paul, *separately from its head or father* who was not baptized by Paul : directly contrary to what we have remarked of Crispus.

But if we admit that the family of Crispus was *baptized*, because we find it registered as *believing*, then we must admit the same of all other families which we find marked as Christians, though they be not expressly described as *baptized*. That of Onesiphorus, 1 Tim. i. 16, 18 ; and iv. 19 ; which the Apostle distinguishes by most hearty good-will *for their father's sake*, not for their own, and to which he sends a particular salutation. Also, that of Aristobulus, and that of Narcissus, Romans xvi. 10, 11 : which are described as being "in Christ." We have this evidence on this subject—*four* Christian families recorded as *baptized*—that of Cornelius, of Lydia, of the Jailor, and of Stephanas. *Two* Christian families not noticed as baptized—that of Crispus, and of Onesiphorus. *Two* Christian families mentioned neither as families nor baptized—that of Aristobulus, and of Narcissus. Eight Christian families, and therefore baptized ! although as

there was no such thing previously as a Christian family, there could be no children of converts to receive the ordinance!

Have we eight instances of the administration of the Lord's Supper? Not half the number. Have we eight cases of the change of the Christian Sabbath from the Jewish? Not perhaps one-fourth of the number. Yet those services are vindicated by the practice of the Apostles as recorded in the New Testament. How then can we deny their practice on the subject of Infant Baptism, when it is established by a series of more numerous instances than can possibly be found in support of any doctrine, principle, or practice derived from the example of the Apostles? Is there any other case beside that of Baptism, on which we would take families at hazard and deny the existence of young children in them? Take eight families at a venture in the street, or eight pews containing families in a place of worship. they will afford *more than one* young child. Take eight families on a fair average: suppose half to consist of *four* children, and half of *eight* children: the average is *six*: calculate the chances, that in forty-eight children, not one should be an infant: *it is hundreds of thousands to one*. But there is no occasion that absolute infancy should be the object: suppose children of two or three years old; the chances would be millions to one, that none such were found among forty-eight children, composing six families. Or supposing Baptism were completely ought of sight—"How many young children would be found, on the average, in *eight* families, each containing six children?"—What proportion do these *eight* families, identified and named in the New Testament, bear to that of Christians also identified and named? The number of names of persons converted after the resurrection of Christ, in the Acts of the Apostles, is *twenty-eight*. Four baptized families give the proportion of *one in seven*. The number of names of similar converts in the whole of the New Testament is *fifty-five*. How many converts may be fairly inferred from the History of the Acts of the Apostles; ten thousand? this gives ONE THOUSAND BAPTIZED FAMILIES. How many from the whole of the New Testament, one hundred thousand?—this gives TEN THOUSAND BAPTIZED FAMILIES. How many must be allowed during the first century and down to the days of Origen? one million?—it gives ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND BAPTIZED FAMILIES: ten millions? the proportion is ONE MILLION OF BAPTIZED FAMILIES. This calculation or one to the

same effect, can neither be evaded nor confuted ; for if this proportion be reduced one-half, still Origen, whose great-grandfather, grandfather and father were Christians ; and who himself travelled into the countries, and among the churches where Christianity was first established, who was the most inquisitive and learned man of his time, could not be ignorant whether the churches received infant baptism from the apostles or not ? Could he have any inducement to deceive or to be deceived on this MOST NOTORIOUS matter, this every-day public occurrence ? Mr. Booth was right in saying, "*the children of proselytes were baptized with their parents,*" among the Jews ; and he would have been amply justified by the New Testament in adding—"THIS PRACTICE THE APOSTLES CONTINUED AMONG CHRISTIANS."

It is said ; "If the New Testament presents so many instances of baptized families, it were not unreasonable to expect that some allusion to them should occur or at least to some part of them, as being in that imperfect state of Church relationship, which is so general in our own day ; that while they may be said to belong to a Church in some respects, they do not belong to it in others ;—that while registered among Christians, nevertheless, they should not be competent to appear in Church transactions." In answer to this, observe ; that where families were baptized previous to the formation of churches, that case was absolutely impossible ;—that a history so succinct, as that in the Acts of the first propagation of the Gospel, could not possibly contain express mention of every supposable fact ; and that the case imagined could only happen where a regular and numerous church was established. Nevertheless, the counterpart of it may be found. By the Apostle's reproof of a PARTY SPIRIT among the Corinthians, we learn incidentally and unexpectedly, the baptism of the family of Stephanas. The Apostle was not discussing the subject of baptism, but was intent on suppressing PARTY. Having censured this disposition, he takes occasion to thank God that *his party*, the Paulists, was so few ! for how many did it consist of in the Corinthian Church ? only two, Crispus and Gaius. 1 Cor. i. 14–16. "*I thank God that I baptized none of you, Corinthian church-members, except Crispus and Gaius ; lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name, and so had formed a party among your church. However, I did baptize also the family of Stephanas ;*" but, *they* are out of the question, as they cannot support any party. *Beside, or as to the rest of baptized families, I do not recollect*

that I baptized any other family :—but if I did, *they* also are out of the question ; since *they* also cannot support any party in the Church.

The family of Stephanas was *not* of the Corinthian Church, so effectually, as others who said, “ I am of Paul :” or to exert any activity or give any voice in party discussions ; for had it been completely of the Corinthian body, then the Apostle must have baptized *others of that body*, beside Crispus and Gaius, which he denies. Then that uncertain number of baptized families, which he denominates “ THE REST,” must have been full church members, equally with the family of Stephanas. In that case, it would have been to his purpose to recollect them, lest his enemies should have recollected them for him. Nor could he have described his party as restricted to *two* church-members only, when it might have comprised a higher number.

Paul’s reference to *many baptized families* completes the epitomized narrative of Luke ; who tells us, Acts xviii. 8 ; that *many* Corinthians believed, and were baptized ; but he says not a word on any family except that of Crispus ; and nothing about the *baptism* of the family of Crispus, but leaves us to infer *that*, as the natural consequence of *believing*. Had not Paul been intent on reprimanding the Corinthians, because of their party disputes, we should never have known that *Crispus himself was baptized* ; for Luke omits that fact ; much less, should we ever have known *who* baptized him. The undeniable inference is, that there were many baptisms conferred on persons and families in the primitive Church, which are not mentioned. We see one instance among the Corinthians, in the person of Crispus and his family ; and another, in the family of Stephanas. This strengthens the average already taken of such baptisms among Christians not mentioned by name in the New Testament ; that *baptized families were very numerous !*

The passage divides into two branches :—Whom Paul did *NOT* baptize : he baptized *NONE* of the Corinthian church members, except Crispus and Gaius. He rejoices that none can charge him with having baptized in his own name ; and so concludes this branch of his subject, referring to church members.—Whom Paul *DID* baptize : he baptized the family of Stephanas ; by which nevertheless, his party in the Church at Corinth was not augmented. Besides this there were many others. Now this “ *besides*,” or as it is better rendered “ *as to the rest*,” and also those “ *others* ;” the connec-

tion implies that they really were *baptized families*, of the same description as the immediate antecedent, the *baptized family* of Stephanas:—but equally with that family, they were incompetent to the augmentation of a PARTY in the Corinthian Church, in behalf of Paul; for which reason he *passes them*. Those baptized families in some sense belonged to the Church at Corinth; yet they were not members of it—what but the youthful state of these *baptized families* prevented them from being full church-members, capable of giving their voices in behalf of the Apostle from whom they had received *baptism*?

Notwithstanding, it is singular that a writer, treating on the subject of Baptism, could discover in Scripture no more than *three* instances of that rite, conferred on what he undistinctly calls *households*. Omitting that of Cornelius, which is a chief and prominent instance of the interference of the Holy Ghost, as well as of baptism by water; that of Crispus, of Onesiphorus, of Aristobulus, and of Narcissus,—he contents himself with mentioning that of Lydia, of the Jailer, and of Stephanas.

Concerning these, he argues that the Jailer's family MUST have been *adults*, because they “rejoiced in God.”—Yes, exactly such adults as those children who rejoiced in the temple, crying *Hosanna to the Son of David!* whom our Lord compares to BABES and SUCKLINGS.

On the subject of Lydia and family, I condemn without reserve that disingenuousness which affirms, that her family *exclusively* were the “*Brethren*” comforted by Paul and Silas—that this consolation was a private, and not a public act,—and that the *Brethren* were not the Christians of Philippi, but the *sons* of Lydia.

Acts xvi. 16, &c. Paul and Silas expelled a Pythonic spirit from a certain damsel; her masters caught them and drew them unto the forum, and brought them to the COMMANDING OFFICERS of the troops in garrison, the *Strategoi*, saying, these Jews do exceedingly trouble our city And the *commanding officers* rent off their clothes, and commanded to beat them; and when they had laid many stripes upon them, they cast them into prison, charging the jailor, the commander of the place for *military* punishments, to keep them safely. And when it was day, the *commanding officers* sent the serjeants, saying, let those men go: and the jailor, *military* ruler of the prison, told this to Paul, saying, The *commanding officers* have sent to let you go: now therefore depart in

peace. But Paul returned his answer to the commanding officers, by their own messengers, the serjeants; They have beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out PRIVILY? LET THEM COME THEMSELVES, AND FETCH US OUT. And the serjeants told these things to the *commanding officers*; and they feared when they heard that they were Romans. And they came in person, and CONSOLED them, and brought them out, and desired them to depart out of the city. And they went out of the prison publicly, and entered into Lydia's house where they lodged; and when they had seen the brethren who naturally resorted to the Apostle's lodgings, they CONSOLED them as publicly as they had been *consoled* by the commanding officers; the same word being used in the same sense, and they departed. Now if the *consolation* at Lydia's was *private*, then the *consolation* tendered to Paul and Silas by these officers was *private*; but if the consolation tendered to Paul and Silas by these officers was PUBLIC, which the whole story demonstrates, then the consolation tendered to the Christian brethren by Paul and Silas was PUBLIC; and if it were PUBLIC, it was not confined to the family of Lydia. Moreover, the whole of Paul's conduct proves that he studied *publicity* throughout every part of the transaction: in absolute humiliation of the tyrannic military officers who had wrongfully imprisoned him. He thus gave an example of firmness and courage, of resistance to oppression, and knowledge of his privileges and his duty that could not be too generally known at Philippi, nor too strongly evinced in the publicity of his consolation to all the Philippian converts.

The third rule of interpretation, *the acceptance of Scripture only, as conclusive authority*, may be exemplified by an examination of the history of Lydia, Acts xvi. 15. "On the Sabbath days we went out of the city to the river, where under protection of the law was a *Proseucha*, or place of Jewish worship; and sitting down, we spake to the women who resorted there; and a woman named Lydia, a seller of purple of the city of Thyatira, who worshipped God, heard; whose heart the Lord opened to attend to the things spoken by Paul; and she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there: and she constrained us."

So far as this passage refers to Lydia, it is throughout in the *singular* number: HER heart was opened to *attend* to the things spoken: SHE besought us—saying, if ye have judged

ME faithful :—come into MY house : and she constrained us." No mention is made of any one of her family in conjunction with herself. She does not say, come into OUR house : WE will endeavour to make it as agreeable to you, as WE can." Neither is any person of her family marked as *attending* to the discourses of Paul : nor as resorting with her to this Proseucha, where Paul discoursed.

We should never have known that she had a family, were they not incidentally mentioned as accompanying her in baptism :—“ *And when she was baptized, with her family.*” Insert *her* baptism, we find *her family* ; omit *her* baptism, she has no family recorded. The act of her baptism cannot be separated from that of her family. Now if her family were of mature age, capable of *attention* to the word spoken, how is it that *they* are not mentioned with her, as *attending* ; since they are mentioned with her as receiving baptism ? How is it, that *they* having received baptism with her do not concur in her invitation of their spiritual fathers ? Their non-age only can explain this. And that those who are not marked as having *attended* to the word, should nevertheless be marked as receiving baptism, has appeared to the Baptists themselves so unaccountable, that they have taken different ways to account for it ; which they have not accomplished ; for there cannot be a clearer instance to warrant the baptism of those children who have not *attended* to the word preached. They have also taken different ways to characterize the brethren mentioned in verse 40. “ They were *sons* of Lydia,” say some—but Scripture says nothing of her having any *sons*. Others say, those *brethren* were “ her *SERVANTS*, employed in preparing the purple dye which she sold : and her house contained only *brethren*, probably men-servants, whom Paul comforted.”

We read in Acts xvi. 3, 10 ; Paul would have Timothy “ to go forth with him ;” —and no doubt Timothy did go forth with him : —and *they*, Paul, Silas and Timothy went through the cities, by Mysia to Troas. A vision appeared to Paul ; and after he had seen the vision ; “ WE, I LUKE the writer being one, endeavoured to go into Macedonia ; WE came to Samothracia and to Philippi, “ and WE were in that city certain days.” —And on the Sabbaths, WE went out to the Proseucha —WE sat down, and spake to the women—Lydia constrained us to come to her house and abide there.” Now who were this WE, and this us, if not Paul, Silas, Timothy, and Luke ? The whole company lodged at Lydia's. “ And it came to

pass, as WE went to prayer, a damsel having a spirit of divination met us, and followed Paul and us many days." Her masters caught Paul and Silas. Timothy and Luke remained at Lydia's.

When Paul and Silas were delivered from prison, they went to their abode at Lydia's, and there met "*the brethren*" Timothy and Luke, from whom they had been separated one night. Timothy and Luke remained at Philippi after Paul and Silas left that city. Paul and Silas went to Thessalonica, and were sent away by night to Berea, where we again find Timothy; but Luke did not rejoin the company until they returned to Philippi, Acts xx. 6; for Luke says, "WE sailed away from Philippi." Luke remained at Philippi during that interval, naturally continuing at Lydia's. Luke also must have had intimate knowledge of the jailor and ALL his family; but he does not once intimate that any one of them was grown up to maturity. Inasmuch therefore as the rule directs me to accept as *conclusive evidence* whatever is expressed in Scripture, I believe that the *family* of Lydia was baptized, *because it is so expressed*; but that one of her servants was baptized, I do not believe, because it is *not* so expressed!—The same rule is applicable to the *family* of Stephanas. Scripture says his *family* was baptized; I therefore believe that fact—Scripture says nothing of the baptism of his household, I therefore do not believe it. *But I will believe it, whenever a passage of Scripture shall be produced, in which HOUSEHOLD, OIKIA, is connected with Baptism!*

The mischance that our translators should have used the terms "*house*" and "*household*" interchangeably, though Scripture preserves the distinction, is glaring respecting the family of Onesiphorus, 2 Timothy i. 16. and iv. 19. The Greek word in one text is rendered "*house*," and in the other "*household*," notwithstanding the same persons are intended. Our translators also have used one word, "*household*," to express both the *family* and *household* of Stephanas, though Scripture uses *two words* in order to mark the distinction, and certainly *does not mean* the same persons. This has produced confusion, and various weak and inconsistent arguments.

The Baptists thus allege—"As to the term '*household*,' there is no proof that infants were included in the household of Stephanas, of Lydia, and the Philippian jailor. Stephanas is not mentioned in the Acts, but by Paul, 1 Corinthians i. 16, and xvi. 15. "I baptized the household of Stephanas;"

and he besought the brethren to *submit* themselves to them ; because the members of his family were “ the first fruits of Achaia, who helped the Apostles and laboured with them, and were addicted to the ministry of the saints.” Now infants could neither preach the gospel, nor even assist and wait upon those who did ; and some time must elapse before they could be fit to take the lead in the church.”

This view of the Apostle's words, 1 Corinthians xvi. 15, 16 ; that the household of Stephanas was “ fit to take a lead in the church at Corinth,” and that the church as a body were directed to “ submit themselves to that household,” is impugned by the grammar of the passage—by the *reasons assigned* by the apostle, and by the *possibilities of the fact*, as they existed at that period.

The grammatical construction of the passage does not allow us to accept the words inclosed in a parenthesis by our translators, as a part of the original text written according to the train of thought current in the apostle's mind. The necessity felt for including them in a parenthesis is demonstrative proof that they have not been so considered ; but a parenthetical sentence should be so constructed as to *read in* with the text, and with the subject treated on in the text, which these words will not.

The apostle's “ I beseech you, brethren,” requires to be followed by some term congruous to his leading and introductory expression. There is no such *cause why he besought* them, marked ; but a harshness of transition irreconcilable with usual and regular construction ; “ I beseech you brethren, ye know”—. This want of connection and consequence cannot be reduced to grammar, in the sense of the objection.

The reason assigned for *submission* is absolutely inconsistent with the purpose. Nobody supposes that submission *in temporals* is intended by Paul. Can he say, “ the household of Stephanas had addicted itself—*eis diaconian*—to do certain services *in temporals* to the saints ; do you *therefore* submit to that household *in spirituals* ?” This is ridiculous. Popery itself never hazarded a more futile consequence ; never drew a more monstrous inference.

The possibilities of the facts are completely repugnant to that statement. Paul was at Ephesus, distant far from Corinth, where the household of Stephanas resided. The Corinthians therefore knew *much more* about the dispositions of the household of Stephanas than Paul did : they knew it *long before* he did. It must have been announced to

them many weeks—more likely *many months*, prior to his information about it:—why then should he so earnestly “*beseech* them” on a matter which was not a secret? Its usefulness and application depended on its being extensively reported.

The assertion that the *household* of Stephanas was “fit to take a lead in the church,” is utterly inconsistent with the little importance attached to the family of that Christian Brother in the first chapter of this epistle. Paul mentions Crispus and Gaius, all the members of this body which he had baptized: but he overlooks or forgets *this* family; and adds it subsequently as by an after-thought. Crispus and Gaius were more prominent in the Apostle’s contemplation than the family of Stephanas, which does not appear to have been esteemed by the apostle, for the purposes concerning which he was writing, on the same level with Crispus and Gaius. Is it possible that an act of recollection would be necessary to this inspired penman, in reference to a family “fit to take a lead in the church?” Is it possible, *that* family should be “fit to take a lead in the church” which was not so competent to support the party of Paul, as Gaius and Crispus were?

But if it be said the family of Stephanas might consist of *two* or *three* only; is it credible that the whole church at Corinth which “came behind in no gift,” including also Crispus and Gaius, were besought to *yield submission* to these *two* or *three*? Crispus the ruler of the synagogue, a man evidently of great respectability and influence; and Gaius “mine host,” says Paul, “and that of the whole church;” are *THEY* to *submit themselves* to two or three *young* persons? Is it *that* Gaius, to whom the apostle John addressed an epistle, commending his “faithful doings,” and announcing his high respect in terms the most remarkable of any *complimentary* passage that can be selected from the New Testament. “Beloved, *I wish above all things*, that thou mayest prosper and be in health, as *thy soul prospereth*.” Is this the man directed by Paul to *submit* himself with the whole church at Corinth, to the “*younglings*” of the household of Stephanas? Impossible.

The passage that alludes to the *family* of Stephanas, 1 Cor. i. 16; has no difficulty; but that respecting the *household* of Stephanas, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 16; is neither Greek, Grammar, nor common sense. Whitby thus paraphrases—“I beseech you, brethren, seeing you know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of the gospel in Achaia,

and that they have ever since addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints ; that you submit yourselves to such giving reverence and honour to them, and to every one that helpeth with us and laboureth." Doddridge renders ; " I beseech ye brethren as ye know the Household of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and as they have set themselves to ministering to the Saints, that you subject yourselves to such, and to every associate in that good work and labour." Pearce renders, " And I beseech you, brethren, HAVE REGARD to the family of Stephanas, because THEY ARE the first fruits of Achaia, and have set themselves about the *work* of ministering to the saints, that ye would submit yourselves unto such, and to every one who worketh with *them* and labour-eth." The Bishop saw clearly that " IT IS," in the *singular*, will not construe with " THEY ARE" in the *plural*—and that the phrase " I beseech you brethren"—must have an immediate subject ; and therefore he renders " I beseech you have regard." In his notes he gives as his reason for this version, that many MSS. read " *they are* the first fruits." Pagninus and all the Latins read " Stephanas and Fortunatus who are" —Others read " Stephanas and Fortunatus, and Achaicus, who are."

To prepare our minds for a correct view of the place, we ask, what is the Apostle's intention in writing it? To answer this question we must consider the whole of the Apostle's theme.

The Apostle's description of Timothy, 1 Corinthians xvi. 10, is remarkable, " He *worketh* the *work*, ERGAZETAI ERGON, of the Lord, as I also do!" Paul desires their submission to *co-workers*, SYNERGONTI. There seems to be a mutual reference between these words, which leads us to infer, that he who " *worketh* the *work* as I also do," must be a *co-worker with me*. This is implied in the *us* of our translators ; but it dismisses the " associate in *that* good work" of Doddridge ; and it dismisses the " *worketh with them*" of Pearce.

" If Timothy come to Corinth, take care that he be without fear or vexation from your party disputes among you ; for he *worketh* the *work* of the Lord, as I also do. Let no one therefore despise him, but accompany him on his journey, that he may come to me in safety ; for I and the brethren expect him. As to Apollos our brother, I and the brethren exhorted him much to come to you ; but he was by no means inclined to come now, during your party dissensions ; yet he will come when he hath a convenient season. And I beseech

you, brethren that ye submit yourselves unto such as Timothy and Apollos, but Timothy especially; and to every one co-working *with me*, and labouring." Here every thing is in its proper place, and reference: and to induce their greater care of Timothy, when he arrived, the Apostle reminds them that the *household* of Stephanas had set themselves to do acts of hospitality and kindness to Christian ministers and brethren, at once an example and a stimulus! Why did not Paul then recommend Timothy to lodge at that residence?—Probably because Stephanas resided NOT IN Corinth. The Corinthian Church then was not exhorted to submit itself to the *household of Stephanas*. The notion is unreasonable: the cause assigned is absurd. Crispus and Gaius, with the whole church, submit themselves to the *servants* of Stephanas, because these servants very readily and cheerfully offered their kind assistance to travelling brethren! Where is the congruity between cause and effect? But that Crispus and Gaius with the Corinthian Church might show all deference and honour to Timothy, might lodge, and entertain him respectfully, and bring him forward on his journey, with every mark of Christian attention; is exactly coincident with what the Apostle before had requested.

The concluding chapter of other epistles is composed of *memoranda* addressed by the Apostle to his Christian friends; and when introduced into the text, they are not placed precisely in due order. The same is the case here; and this reference to the *household* of Stephanas is neither more nor less than a marginal note. It could occasion no confusion in the original from the manner of writing it. The whole, I conceive, stood thus:—"Now, if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear; for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also work. Let no man therefore despise him; but conduct him forth in peace that he may come to me, for I look for him with the brethren. As touching our brother Apollos, I greatly desired him to come to you; but his will was not to come at this time; but he will come when he shall have convenient time. Watch ye, stand fast in the faith; quit you like men: be strong! Let all things be done with charity; and I beseech you, brethren, that ye submit yourselves to such and to every one that helpeth with *me* and laboureth."—*You know the household of Stephanas, inasmuch as he is the first fruits of Achaia, that they have set themselves to do services of accommodation, to DIACONIZE, to the saints.*—I am glad of the coming of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus: for that which

was lacking on your part they have supplied. For they have refreshed my spirit and yours. Therefore ACKNOWLEDGE them that are such."

Strange were it true, that the Apostle should command the Corinthian Church to SUBMIT to the servants, but only to *acknowledge* the master; only to *acknowledge* the brother who had refreshed his spirit, and the spirits of the Corinthians to whom he writes; but to SUBMIT to his servants, whose kindness though extremely laudable terminated on strangers, from whom neither the Corinthians nor Paul had received the same "refreshment" as they had from Stephanas. To complete this absurdity, Stephanas a member of the Corinthian Church is commanded by the Apostle, to SUBMIT, "*giving Reverence and Honour,*" as Whitby paraphrases, *to his own servants!* This becomes absolutely MONSTROUS, if these were the *sons* of Stephanas; for then, that eminent Christian, a brother, a deputy from the Church, the *first fruits of Achaia* is commanded to SUBMIT TO HIS OWN CHILDREN!!!

The result of the whole is this, that the *household* of Stephanas, as individuals, differ from the *family* baptized by Paul; and therefore, that the notion of baptized households has no sanction from this passage. It follows, that the actions ascribed to this *household* decide nothing whether the *family* of Stephanas were young or old; children or adults;—these actions are performed by others, not by them. Thus the three instances of *baptized families*, for which God has been thanked, that he had preserved sufficient proofs of their being adults, crumbles into dust. Neither of them singly, nor the whole of them together, affords the smallest subterfuge to those who impugn the testimony of Origen, that the Apostles enjoined on the churches, the PRACTICE OF GIVING BAPTISM TO INFANTS.—Wherefore I record my full conviction, that the Apostles practised infant baptism!

INFANT BAPTISM.

The differences between the Hebrew Christian Churches and the Gentile Christians almost from the first divided and distressed the community of believers. That the sentiments of Paul prevailed among the Gentiles is evident, not from the New Testament history only, but from Ecclesiastical History also, and from existing facts. That the Hebrews had sentiments which they strongly retained, appears from the same

evidence ; and on this subject, BAPTISM. It is commonly said, that "Baptism was given *in the room*, or *place* of circumcision:" and the imperfect manner in which this proposition has been expressed and defended, has occasioned much false argument and many mistaken assertions. It has been inaccurately described as a *succession*.

Mr. Booth says, "That baptism did not come in the place of circumcision, we have the strongest presumptive evidence. If Baptism succeeded in the place of circumcision, how came it that both of them were in full force at the same time ; from the commencement of John's ministry to the death of Christ ? If one institution succeed in the place of another we are unavoidably led to consider that other as having vacated its place. For one thing to come in the room of another, and the latter still hold its place, is an odd kind of succession. Admitting the succession pretended, how came it that Paul circumcised Timothy after he had been baptized ? For this, on the principle here opposed, there does not appear the least reason. But why do I mention the case of Timothy ? seeing it is plain on this hypothesis, that it was the indispensable duty of those parents who were baptized by John and by the Apostles, before the death of Christ, to have *all* their male infants both baptized and circumcised. For that the law of circumcision was then in its full vigour none can doubt ; and that Infant Baptism was then in its prime our opposers insist. Those favoured infants therefore, if ever they partook of the holy supper, in the language of Pædobaptism, must have had the covenant ratified to them by *three seals*."

"Had the supposed succession been a fact, not only the Apostles, but all the apostolic churches must have known it. What was the reason then that so many of the Jewish converts were highly disgusted at the thought of circumcision being laid aside ? Why such warm endeavours to support the credit of an ancient ceremony, which they themselves must have known to be obsolete, and for this very reason ; *Baptism came in its room !*"

But the rite of *circumcision* was NOT obsolete, this *succession* never was thought of, much less allowed by Hebrew Christians, and the fact intended is true, though the terms adopted in stating it are incorrect.

Paul severely censured the Hebrew Christians for their attachment to the Mosaic law ; and though circumcision be not derived from the Mosaic law, yet he describes his opponents, Titus i. 10, Phil. iii. 2, plainly enough, as "vain talk-

ers, and deceivers of the circumcision." "Beware of dogs: beware of the CONCISION." Though this Apostle manfully supported Christian liberty in behalf of the Gentiles, it appears demonstrably from his circumcising Timothy, that HE saw no opposition between the two rites. He practised them BOTH on the same person. This was the sentiment of his nation generally, so far as it was converted; and there is little hazard in saying, that ALL Hebrew Christians were BOTH *circumcised* AND *baptized*. In proof of this, the following testimonies which refer to the Hebrew Church in Judea are perfectly satisfactory.

Hegesippus, *apud Euseb. Ecc. Hist. lib. iii. cap. 32*, says, "*The Church of Jerusalem continued a virgin, or free from heresy, till the death of Simeon, who succeeded James the Just:*" till the time of Trajan, about A. D. 100, or 110. The least this can mean is this, that the Church at Jerusalem retained during the first century, the customs derived from its predecessors and original founders.

Irenæus says, *lib. i. cap. 26*, "The Ebionites used only the Gospel of Matthew: were over curious in the exposition of the Prophets; *disowned the Apostle Paul*, calling him an APOSTATE *from the law*. They *circumcised, and retained the Jewish law and Jewish customs*." These Ebionites were Hebrews. They used the *Syriac* Gospel of Matthew *only*; because the other Gospels being written *in Greek* were not *in the Holy Language*: They disowned the Apostle Paul, because he was the Apostle of the Gentiles; and though Christians, they *circumcised* their infants.

Origen says, "Those of the Jews who *believe in Christ* have NOT *abandoned the law* of their ancestors; for *they live according to it*; bearing a name, Ebionites. Origen also mentions as a proof of ignorance in Celsus;—that he had not noticed Israelites *believing in Jesus*, but NOT *relinquishing the law* of their Fathers."

How confusedly does Celsus's Jew speak on this subject? when he might have said more plausibly—SOME of you have relinquished the old customs—Some nevertheless observe the customs of their ancestors—Some are willing to receive Jesus as the person foretold by the Prophets, and to *observe the law of Moses according to the ancient customs*.

This disposition of the Hebrew Christians to adhere to the Law of Moses, continued unabated during the second century. It continued also in the third and fourth centuries; for Eusebius says: "The Ebionites used the Gospel according

to the Hebrews. *They kept BOTH the Jewish and the Christian Sabbath.*" Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 27.

The Gospel according to the Hebrews is usually supposed to have been the Syriac Gospel of Matthew. Those who kept *both* the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sabbath might well enough practice *both* the Jewish ordinance of *circumcision*, and the Christian ordinance of *baptism*.

Jerom, *Comment on Isaiah*, mentions Hebrews *believing in Christ*. He says they were ANATHEMATIZED for their rigid adherence to the *ceremonies* of the Jewish law which they mingled with the Gospel of Christ; *Propter hoc solum a patribus anathematizati sunt, quod legis cæremonias Christi evangelio miscuerunt*. He also has this expression—"The Nazarenes who *so* receive Christ, that they discard not the rites of the ancient law."

Jerom describes the Nazarenes as persons "who believed in Christ the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, in whom the orthodox believe:—but were nevertheless so bigoted to the Mosaic law, that they were rather to be considered as a Jewish sect, than a Christian. To this day a heresy prevails among the *Jews* in all the synagogues of the East, which is called that of the Nazarenes, who, from a desire of being Jews and Christians, BOTH AT ONCE, are neither Jews nor Christians." *Epist. ad Augustinum, de dissidio Petri et Pauli*. Who *anathmatized* these Hebrews, and by what authority, we need not be solicitous to learn. This disposition to be Jews and Christians *both at once*, this bigotry to the Mosaic law, in Jerom's days, prevailed chiefly *in the East*.

With this agrees Epiphanius who says: "Ebion adhered to the Judaic law, with respect to the observation of the Sabbath *and to circumcision*; and to all other things which are common to the rites of the Jews and the Samaritans."

It may be said, that "these, though Hebrew Christians, were *Heretics*;" the Gentiles called them so; but that they erred *in this particular* does not appear. I add another testimony which regards those who were *orthodox*, in a much later age.

Other writers, Eusebius, Sulpitius Severus, &c., inform us that the bishops of the Christian Church at Jerusalem, who had been correctly and fully *baptized*, were *circumcised* during many successions. It seems, however, that not ALL their people retained the Mosaic law entire; but that *some* of them exercised a liberty respecting those observances, which lib-

erty others scrupled.* The Church of Jerusalem comprehended the great body of Hebrew Christians. It was justly esteemed orthodox. It produced *men of great learning*, says Eusebius : who gives us *Eccl. Hist. A. D. 302, lib. vii. c. 32*, a list of fifteen bishops in succession who were *circumcised*. The first who was *uncircumcised*, was Marcus, A. D. 136. Those Hebrew Christians, as well as the Apostle Paul, saw nothing in *circumcision* inconsistent with *Baptism*; and most certainly, they did not consider Baptism as being the *successor* of their family rite which dated from before the law of Moses.

As to the Gentiles who never practised circumcision, it is impossible that Baptism should be the *successor* of that rite *to them*. Such an assertion would be a gross absurdity in language and fact. Nevertheless, this gross absurdity may be stated in terms by which it becomes a correct assertion.

Baptism was GIVEN to the Gentiles INSTEAD OF GIVING THEM CIRCUMCISION as the INITIATORY ORDINANCE of their religious profession.

We learn from Acts xv. that "certain men from Judea taught the Gentile brethren, except ye be *circumcised*, ye cannot be saved," Acts xv. 1, 5. At Jerusalem, the sect of the *Pharisees insisted* on this; and there was much *disputing* about it. The Council however at length determined to the contrary. But the Council's letter does not mention *baptism* or *any other Christian rite*: it enjoins nothing positive; but merely negative; abstinence from certain things offensive to the Jews. For the council knew that Baptism already was sufficiently administered. *They* therefore did not *add* circumcision to baptism, in reference to the Gentiles, although it appears demonstrated that the *Jewish Church* members retained the same principles and practices *as to themselves*, for which the Pharisees among them contended; and which certain teachers from Judea had propagated among the Gentiles.

It is singular enough that among the *false* accusations urged

* Sulpitius Severus says, Hist. Sac. lib. ii. cap. 31. Et quia Christiani in Palæstina viventes ex Judæis potissimum putabantur, namque tum Hierosolyma non nisi circumcissione habebat ecclesia sacerdotem, militum cohortem custodias in perpetuum agitare jussit, quæ Judæos omnes Hierosolymæ aditu arceret. Quod quidem Christianæ fidei proficiebat; quia tum pæne omnes, Christum Deum, sub legis observatione credebant. Nimirum id Domino ordinante dispositum, ut legis servitus a libertate fidei atque ecclesiæ tolleretur. Ita tum primum Marcus ex Gentibus apud Hierosolymam episcopus fecit.

against Paul, *by the believing Jewish zealots*, at Jerusalem, Acts xxi. 20, 21; one was, "that thou teachest ALL THE JEWS *which are among the Gentiles* that they ought not to circumcise their *children*." What then did they suppose Paul practised, in regard to children generally? They had heard that he did *something* or advised *something* to be done concerning them, what could it be? what did he substitute in the place of circumcision? We know of nothing but baptism that could give occasion to this information respecting Paul's proceedings. We know the credulity of the multitude, and the frequency of error in vague reports; and these reports were brought by unbelieving Jews from distant countries; but it by no means followed that because Paul conferred baptism on Jewish children, therefore he prohibited circumcision:—since BOTH were practised among those Hebrew Christians themselves. This however confirms the assertion of Irenæus, that the Hebrews, the mass of the people *disowned* the Apostle Paul; and considered him as an *apostate from the Law*. Those Jews were zealous for *the circumcision made by hands*. Those who reported this falsity concerning the apostle, Jews who themselves dwelt among the Gentiles were equally zealots in the same cause.

It is not then to *Jewish* converts, that the Apostle Paul addressed his expression, Col. ii. 11, "*In whom Christ ye are circumcised by the circumcision made without hands*"—for they had been circumcised *by hands*, by the Mosaic process: neither had *they* been circumcised by Christian profession, by baptism; for that would have been a second circumcision: whereas *the Gentiles*, had not been circumcised by hands, but *had put off the body of the sins of the flesh, by Christian circumcision*," Baptism.

To expect to obtain a clear view of this subject from Hebrew writers, were to expect them to be free from their prejudices. We must consult the writings of the Gentile Christians to discover *THEIR* view of this matter, and how *they* expressed their judgment. Do we find *them* saying that *THEY* received *Baptism instead of receiving Circumcision*?

That the Gentile Christians thus understood it, appears from their own testimony: so Justin, a few years after the Apostles, A. D. 140, writes; "We *Gentile Christians* also, who by him have access to God, have not received that circumcision according to the flesh; but that circumcision which is spiritual; and moreover, for indeed we were sinners, we have received this circumcision in Baptism; for the pur-

pose of God's mercy : and it is enjoined on all to receive it in like manner." Justin therefore thought that "*spiritual circumcision*," Baptism, was given *to us, the GENTILES*, instead of giving *us, the GENTILES*, carnal circumcision. In other words, the Gentiles accepted and practised Baptism, instead of accepting^f and practising circumcision. Baptism was *to them* instead of Circumcision.

Here comes in the evidence of the *Quest. ad Orthodox*, ascribed to Justin Martyr, "*Why, if circumcision be a good thing, do we not use it as well as the Jews did?*" The answer is, *Because WE Gentile Christians are circumcised BY BAPTISM with Christ's Circumcision.*" To support this sentiment, the writer refers to Col. ii. 11, 12. In other words, "*To us Gentiles*, baptism is given instead of giving us circumcision."

John Chrysostom, *Hon. 40, in Gen.* says "There was pain and trouble in the practice of *that Jewish circumcision*; but *OUR circumcision*, I mean the grace of BAPTISM, gives cure without pain; and this *for infants* as well as men."

Fidus, A. D. 250; hesitated to confer baptism on an infant *before the eighth day* after its birth. The reference of this to circumcision is too palpable to be questioned. Fidus asked whether baptism might be performed before a child was eight days old. Cyprian the Bishop to whom he wrote for advice, and the *sixty-six Bishops of the neighbourhood* convened in council, without a dissenting voice, decided explicitly, that Baptism might be performed before the eighth day. But how did Fidus think of such a thing unless it bore some resemblance to Jewish circumcision? Why did not Fidus mention on the eighteenth or the twenty-eighth day? Why had not one among that assembly of Bishops, the honesty to tell him—"We never heard of Baptism conferred at all in early life; never but on men and women and youth grown to years of discretion!" Why did not they censure him for uttering a heresy so erroneous and judaizing, in reference to such infants? He seems to have adopted the Jewish notion that *a child is not perfect till a Sabbath has passed over it*; but Cyprian informed him, that a child being a work of God, the spiritual circumcision ought not to be restrained by circumcision according to the flesh; but that the most extensive notion should be connected with that of the grace of Christ, especially to infants. To this all the bishops in council agreed. Thus the testimony of Origen is fully confirmed; that "the Apostles commanded to confer baptism on Greek infants;" and that being a Greek infant, thou wast baptized." Wherefore, the

Church saw nothing improper in retaining the Abrahamic circumcision, and receiving the practice of baptism, performing both—while the Gentiles acknowledge, that they received in baptism that spiritual circumcision which originated in God's mercy and that led to further communications of it; Acts xxiii. 10. *Baptism was their circumcision*; which was not restrained to a particular set time, but which might be administered as propriety might determine. It also deserves notice, that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrew Christians attempted not to draw them off from circumcision, although he earnestly labours to moderate their attachment to Moses.*

Dr. Gill expressly denies that any covenant could exist between man and God previous to that of circumcision made with Abraham; but he overlooked or forgot the expression of the Deity, Psalm l. 5; "Gather my saints together unto me; those who have *made a Covenant with me by sacrifice.*" Sacrifice was long prior to circumcision; and covenants were ratified by sacrifice. This expression is not referable only to saints subsequent to the Abrahamic covenant; but is addressed to the earth at large, and also to the heavens. It is general and not restricted. Nevertheless, we know so little of the modes of performing sacrifice in the earlier ages of the world, that unless we accept the Mosaic writings and ordinances as representing the more ancient services, we must remain unenlightened on the subject. It cannot be supposed, that the special forms observed in that extraordinary and perhaps singular covenant made between Abraham and God, Gen. xv. 17; were customary on all occasions of sacrifice; but rather, that Moses in reducing his Levitical precepts to writing, for the guidance of his people, now becoming a nation, did but embody and perpetuate the practices of his forefathers, the Patriarchs.

When the Covenant of *Circumcision* was made with Abraham, Gen. xvii. 10, 25; he was already the father of Ishmael; who, at the time when he received this rite in his own person, in consequence of the faith of his father Abraham, was "thirteen years of age."

* The circle or glory, which painters from the earliest ages have placed around the heads of saints, is called *Nimbus*, and marks the descent of the Holy Ghost, or his inspiration of the person so ornamented; and their custom of *anointing* after bathing might possibly give occasion to the ecclesiastical custom of *Uction* after Baptism; yet I suspect that it was a sign of the Holy Spirit retained long after the thing signified had ceased.

At the same time with Ishmael, were circumcised probably about fifteen hundred men of different ages, who had no relation whatever by consanguinity to Abraham; but merely received this sign, "the seal of Abraham's faith," in conformity with the faith and obedience of their Master. The posterity of Ishmael in imitation of his compliance, now practice circumcision at the same time of life as their first father underwent that rite.

The Baptists assert, that circumcision was only a token of right to *temporal* blessings in the land of Canaan; and therefore was conferred on infants in proof of their descent from him to whom the land originally was promised; but what right to such succession did it confer on Ishmael, and on those persons who were circumcised at the same time with him; among whom were *many* children. They were neither Abraham's posterity, nor partakers of Abraham's faith; therefore circumcision could not be to them the seal of righteousness by faith. What faith had the Edomites and the Midianites?—*Circumcision was not a mark of personal faith among the Hebrews, but of obedience.* What right to inheritance in the land of Judea did circumcision confer on the Gileadites, Joshua ix. 23; on Achior, Judith xiv. 10; and on the Persians who became Jews, Esther viii. 17; under the patronage of Mordecai?

The precept given to Abraham commanded Adult Circumcision; but Infant Circumcision was *included*. The command given to the Apostles was "baptize all nations;" infants were equally *included*. If in the term "all males," every boy-child was a party; so in the term "all nations" every state of life in the community was a party. When we acknowledge the circumcision of Abraham and Ishmael, we do not deny the circumcision of a hundred children at the same time; so when we acknowledge the baptism of "men and women," we do not deny the baptism of their *families*. "Now we, as Isaac was, are children of the promise," says the Apostle; Gal. iv. 28, 30; and he adds, "cast out the bondwoman and her son!"—"so, then, Christian Brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman but of the free; stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." This was not addressed to Jews by descent: but to converts resident in Galatia; formerly heathen, but then Christians.

The primitive Church understood this Gospel liberty; but those who in later times take upon them to be wiser than the primitive Church, charge the early professors with perverting

liberty into licentiousness, and with introducing and cherishing corruptions in faith and practice.

“The opinions held by the majority of real and pious Christians, in the early ages, as Jerom observes, when the blood of Christ was yet warm in the breasts of Christians, and the faith and spirit of religion were brisk and vigorous,” were those that were taught by the apostles, and constituted the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. ‘The observable harmony and *unanimity of the several churches in their most public acts* is a circumstance which irresistibly confirms this position. It is scarcely probable that any large church of those early ages should vary, in things of moment, from the Apostolical doctrines: and it is quite absurd to imagine that ALL the churches should combine in the same error, and conspire together to corrupt the doctrine of Christ. This argument is justly insisted upon both by Irenæus and Tertullian against the heretics of their respective times. They both affirm that the true disciple, one who believes that He who wrought their salvation upon earth was God, “is a follower of the *public doctrine of the church.*”

Is this argument totally inapplicable to this subject? May we not depend on what we find generally practised, while “the blood of Christ was yet warm in the hearts of Christians, and the faith and spirit of religion were brisk and vigorous”—in reference to Baptism? May we not accept the current opinion of those times, as really the doctrine of the Apostles, and the genuine intention and command of Christ?

It was the established practice of the Jews to confer the initiatory rite of their religion on children in early infancy. *Jesus Christ commanded no alteration!* The natural consequence is this, *the continuation of the principle of it.* But it is objected, “the rite is not the same;” yet if the *principle* be the same, not abrogated, the inquiry follows—*Is the principle transferred to a succeeding rite?* Let us examine some particulars connected with circumcision as understood by the descendants of Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and David.

“Circumcised the eighth day” is placed by the Apostle of the Gentiles, Philippians iii. 6; as the first of his privileges enjoyed as a Hebrew; but supposing that he, as thousands of other new born infants, had been sickly or weakly, did the law allow no dispensation from circumcision on the eighth day? In every Jewish book describing this service, there is an observation to this effect—“If the child be sickly, he is not circumcised till he is well.” David Levi Cerem. Jews.

But this liberty had its bounds ; which terminated at the proper time for registering the infant among the descents of his house or family. What that time was, will admit of no hesitation, after having considered a few passages of the Old Testament.

“ Hezekiah appointed Kore son of Imnah the Levite, over the free-will offerings of God, to distribute the oblations of the Lord and the most holy things. 2 Chron. xxxi. 14. Next to him were Eden, and Miamin, and Jeshua, and She-maiah, Amariah, and Shechaniah in the cities of the priests, in their set-Office, to give to their brethren by courses, as well to the great as *to the small*. Beside their GENEALOGY of males from THREE YEARS old and upwards, even unto EVERY ONE THAT ENTERETH INTO THE HOUSE OF THE LORD, his daily portion for their service in their charges according to their courses. Both to the genealogy of the priests by the house of their fathers, and to the Levites from twenty years old and upwards, in their charges, by their courses ; and to the genealogy of ALL their LITTLE ONES, their wives, and their sons, and their daughters, through all the congregation : for in their set-Office they sanctified themselves to holiness. Also, the sons of Aaron the priest, who were in the fields of the suburbs of their cities, in every several city, the men that were expressed by name, to give portions to ALL the males among the priests, and to ALL *that were reckoned by genealogies* among the Levites.”

According to this passage, the GENEALOGY of the males was authenticated at three years of age ; and they then *entered into the house of the Lord* ; not in an uncircumcised state ; but prepared by the initiatory rite of their law. It follows, that the threat of a child's being *cut off* for want of circumcision was executed, by omitting to inscribe him in the genealogy of his family. He was not slain, that had been murder :—but not being recorded among his tribe, he could claim no civil existence in their line—but if he were found circumcised when he was to be enrolled, the want of circumcision on the eighth day did not affect his registry.

Children at *three years old entered into the house of the Lord* :—but children of the priests, whose were the most holy things and the oblations to the Lord, had a right to *eat of those most holy things*, at that early time of life ! How could they eat them with proper reverence ? How could they acknowledge God in partaking of them ? How could they perform any one act, or cherish any one sentiment connected with them ?

Moreover, the text is studiously precise. These Officers were to distribute *to the small* as well as to the great: according to the genealogy of ALL their LITTLE ONES who are distinguished from *sons* and from *daughters*. This principle extended through *all the congregation*. Neither is this a forced sense on the passage "*given to such of their male children from THREE YEARS upward as came into the house of the Lord.*" Therefore at that early time of life, children entered the Holy Temple, were participators in the rites there performed, and were inscribed on the sacred registers.

Moses says; Deut. xxix. 11; "Ye stand all of you this day before the Lord your God....your LITTLE ONES"—children of three years old, according to the passage in the Chronicles—"to ENTER INTO COVENANT with the Lord thy God." Children of three years old, *enter into God's covenant!* They could not tell what a covenant was; much less could they assent to its conditions; and much less still, if they promised to observe those conditions, could any dependence be placed on their conduct in future life.

Joshua confirming, or rather renewing this covenant of the Lord on Mount Gerizim, "read all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law to the LITTLE ONES;" Joshua viii. 3, 4; to children of three years old! Why read to them who could not understand a word?—or if read to them, why record the reading and so particularly identify *them*? Hence, children of three years old were members of the Hebrew community, civil and religious, in the most sacred rites, and in the most solemn transactions, equally as their fathers were. They were subject to the same preparatory purifications, and were treated on the same ritual principles as their fathers. What reason may be alleged for this?

I answer, *three years old* was the *weaning time*. The Israelitish women suckled their children three years; as the mother in the Maccabees adjured her son, 2 Macc. vii. 27; "have pity on me, who gave thee suck *three years*, and nourished thee." While children were at the breast, they were not considered as subjects of regular religious admission to the temple service. Hannah attended to this in the case of Samuel, till she weaned him; and while he was yet young a mere childling, she brought him, and thenceforth he attended at the Divine Altar.

While children sucked, they were *infants* or *babes*; but after they were weaned, they were described by another

name, *little ones* or *little children*. The first stage of life was passed. Have we any thing resembling this in the Gospel?

Eustathius and Phavorinus state that an *infant*, or *babe* is *Βρεφος*, “*a new-born child, nourished by the teat from his birth, until he be FOUR YEARS OLD.*” The Greeks then extended infancy to *four* years of age: the Jews only to *three* years of age. On what pretence have some affirmed that *infancy* in the Gospel times extended to the age of *twenty*, or *twenty-one*?—and that “*brephos, brephyllion,*” are used indiscriminately for *MINORS*, whether they be *twenty days* or *twenty years* old?” The testimony of Eustathius and Phavorinus proves, that an *infant* is such only to the age of *FOUR YEARS* at the utmost.

This is further evident, if we consider the terms used to denote the “*little ones,*” whom our condescending Saviour blessed, Matt. xix. 13. The Evangelist Matthew calls them *παιδια*, “*little children;*” Luke calls them “*infants,*” Luke xviii. 15, *τὰ βρεφη.* They were about that time of life, when *infancy* ends and *childhood* is beginning;—about three years of age. They were so young that the benignant Redeemer for their security, took them up into “*his bended arms,*” Mark x. 16. An action in the Saviour of the World at once graceful and gracious!

What has this to do with *Baptism*? Much: for if the Greek language extends *infancy* to *four* years old, and the Greek church extended baptismal infancy to *four years*, while the Jewish custom extended it only to *three years*—we see the reason at once why Gregory Nazianzen adopted *three years* as the term beyond which he would not have baptism delayed. Robinson called this opinion of Gregory “*a new affair;*” new as the days of Hezekiah, King of Judah; new as the days of Moses and Aaron; and probably as new as the sacrificial rites of the Patriarchs Jacob and Abraham, if not of Noah himself!

The next period of life ends about the conclusion of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh year. In what we have yet seen, the *little ones* were rather passive than active, in making a covenant: but in the case of King Joash wonderfully preserved and at length produced to the people; we read, 2 Kings xi. 17; 2 Chron. xxiii. 16, “*Joash was seven years old;* and Jehoida made a covenant between the Lord and the King, and the people—between the King also, and the people.” A child at that time of life therefore was competent to acts of the most important nature; and though in fact under guar-

dianship, yet his assent was authoritative and binding : and no doubt Jehoiada delayed the installation of Joash to that time of life purposely for this reason.

At what time did childhood end ? About *twelve* years of age. At that time of life, Luke ii. 42, our Lord paid his first visit to the Temple. About thirteen, those Jews who can read are called to attend to the reading in the synagogue. The child raised to life by our Lord, Mark v. 42, Luke viii. 42, who was of the age of twelve years is called a "little daughter," the "little child," for to that age the state of childhood continued ; and about twelve or thirteen it ceased to give place to another appellation ; for at *twelve* or *thirteen*, began the character of "*young men*" or "*young women*," which ended about *twenty* years of age ; to give place to that of "*men*" or "*women* ;" of "*fathers*" or "*mothers*."

The same progress obtains among the Jews at this day ; for Mr. Frey tells us in his Narrative : " Before I was *three years old* I began the Hebrew alphabet, and when but *six years of age* I could perfectly read any chapter of the five books of Moses. When a Jewish boy has arrived at the age of *thirteen years and a day*, he is considered a MAN, fit to be one of the ten necessary to constitute a full number for public worship. At the age of *twenty-one* I received a second honorary degree to be a leader of the synagogue, to read the public prayers and the law of Moses." Have we any such division of life in the Gospel ? One Apostle speaks of "travailing again in birth" of Children ; Gal. iv. 9 ; which must be taken metaphorically. The Apostle John also uses the term "little children" both metaphorically and in its proper and literal import, 1 John ii. 12 ; " I write unto you LITTLE CHILDREN, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake. I write unto you, YOUNG MEN ; I write unto you, FATHERS."

Nobody has ever supposed, that the terms *fathers* and *young men* are to be taken metaphorically ; but the term *little children* is exactly of the same nature as they are : John xxi. 15 ; Feed my *little lambs* ; τα αγρια ; it follows that this term also expresses *children young in years*. Are not the souls of children at *twelve years* old as precious as those at *thirteen* ? those of *ten* as those of *twelve* ? and those of *eight* or *six*, as those of *ten* ? Since the Jewish period of life at which infants became "*little children*," commenced at *three years* of age, what reason can be given why John, himself a Jew, should not comply with the custom of his country,

and direct his address to children of the same age, as Moses, and Joshua, and Hezekiah had included in the most solemn religious rites in the personal act of *covenanting with God*? No reason can be assigned why the Gospel should exclude little children whom the law had *included*, favoured, and patronized.

Here we perceive the genuine application of the invaluable rule—“*Every word should be taken in the primary, obvious and ordinary meaning, unless there be something in the connection or in the nature of things which requires it to be taken otherwise.*” But there is nothing in the connection nor in the nature of things that requires this word *little children* to be taken in any other than its *obvious* and *literal* meaning; unless we would annul the proceedings of Hezekiah, Joshua and Moses.

What is the doctrine addressed to these children? Is it a deep question of divinity? Are the powers of a Newton necessary to comprehend it? It is the simplest proposition possible; “your sins are forgiven you, *for his name’s sake.*” Any child can comprehend this. Thousands of children of three years old are daily taught this very doctrine; and they understand it as much as is necessary for their tender years: though they cannot explain or learnedly expatiate on it.

This Epistle is GENERAL. It does not describe the state of “*little children*” connected with a single church *only*; though it may remind us of those *many* who in a sense were members of the church at Corinth; whereas the Apostle John speaks of these without reserve, wherever his Epistle might be presented. We cannot possibly confine this within the limits of the seven Asiatic churches. The influence of his writings must have penetrated far and wide in Asia. Now as he employs neither hesitation nor exception, it follows that the custom of admitting infants into the church by baptism was *general*: and this accounts for our finding it in all parts of the Christian world of which we have any hints or histories. A practice so general did not rest on vague report; but on well authenticated Apostolic warrant. For those children addressed by the Apostle were either *within* the Christian church, or they were *without* it. If they were *without* it, why did the Apostle address them? A brother Apostle says, “What have I to do with those who are *without*?”—and John was actuated by the same spirit. But if these “*little children*” were *within* the church, *how* and *when* became they so? They must have undergone the initiatory

rite. Like the *families* of Lydia, Stephanas, &c., they had been admitted by baptism, for no other means of admission existed.

Seeing "their sins were forgiven," *when* were they forgiven? "I acknowledge ONE *Baptism* for the remission of sins," say the ancient Church; and the ancient Church was right. These children were admitted into the church by baptism administered for the remission of sins, Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3; Acts ii. 38. They were past three years of age, and they had been already consecrated to God.

Irenæus may be considered as a kind of grandson of the Apostle John: for Polycarp was intimate with John; and Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp. He was also a man of an inquisitive mind; and diligently treasured up the discourses of his master, which he repeated from the Apostles. These are not only in perfect concord with the language of John, but are a convincing commentary on it. A. D. 167. Adv. Hær. lib. ii. Christ "sanctifying every several age by the likeness it has to him, for he came to save ALL by himself.* ALL, who by him are re-born to God; INFANTS, and LITTLE ONES, and CHILDREN, and YOUTHS, and Persons of Mature Age. Therefore he passed through these several ages;—for INFANTS, he was made an INFANT, sanctifying INFANTS. FOR LITTLE ONES, he was a LITTLE ONE, sanctifying thereby those of that age; and also being to them an example of goodness, holiness, and dutifulness. TO YOUTHS, he became a YOUTH." "Re-born to God," regenerated; how this could be in the case of infants, except *ritually* by *baptism*, "re-born of water," John iii. 5, may puzzle the most knowing.

Observe the variation in his language. He does not say, Jesus was an *example* to infants; because infants are incapable of following an example, and the Apostle John does not address *infants*; but he was an example to *little ones*, because children from *three years old* to six are capable of being influenced by example. This demonstrates, that infants in the

* Magister ergo existens Magistri quoque habebat ætatem. Non reprobans nec supergrediens hominem, neque solvens suam legem in se humani generis: sed omnem ætatem sanctificans per illam quæ ad ipsum erat similitudinem. Omnes enim venit per semet ipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per cum renascuntur in Deum; infantes, & parvulos, & pueros, & juvenes, & seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem: & infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes: in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem; simul & exemplum illis pietatis effectus, & justitiæ & subjectionis: in juvenibus juvenis.

sense of “*men newly converted,*” cannot be intended here; for Christ is an example to them, which they are bound to follow. It is said that Irenæus contemplated MEN in all conditions of life; are then youths, children, little ones, or *infants, MEN?*

<i>Years of life.</i>	<i>IRENÆUS.</i>	<i>JOHN, Apostle.</i>
Birth to 3 or 4 years	INFANTS	
3 or 4 years to 6, or 7	LITTLE ONES . . .	LITTLE } CHILDREN } YOUTH YOUNG MEN
6 or 7, to 12 or 13	CHILDREN . . .	
12 or 13, to 18 or 20	YOUTH	
18 or 20, to elder life	SENIORS	FATHERS.

Is it possible to produce a closer commentary more accurately in unison with the sentiments, the language and the feelings of the inspired Apostle, who was the affectionate disciple of the most benevolent of masters? “Suffer *little children* to come unto me,” says our Lord; “*little children* your sins are forgiven you for his name’s sake,” says the beloved disciple; “*Infants, little ones, children* are re-born unto God by him, sanctified by him,” says the “Faithful Man,” recording his testimony for the benefit of “others also.” The Law shall never triumph over the Gospel in its tenderness for infants. Does it describe *little ones* entering into covenant with God? Does it allow *little children* to enter the sacred precincts and partake of the most holy rites? Does it register them at their early age as members of the holy community “among the living in Jerusalem?” Does it sanctify them to the Lord as Samuel was sanctified? So does the Gospel. “HE came to save ALL by himself;—Infants, Little ones, Children, Youths, and Seniors;” so says the reverend Disciple; so says the Apostolic Master; and so says the DIVINE LORD—WHO DARE GAINSAY IT?

“Youths, Children, Little ones, Infants!” this is a whole *oikos*; a *family*! *Oikos* includes both sexes, and all ages. This is the reason why Luke employs that term. Had he said “*infant,*” some would have discovered that he did not mean “*little children.*” Had he said “*youths,*” they would be doubly sure, that he could not possibly mean “*children or little ones.*” Had he used a masculine term, *Sons*; females had been excluded on the principle of circumcision. Whereas, by using the term *oikos* or family, he includes ALL; so

the inspired Evangelist says, "We baptized the **WHOLE FAMILY** of the jailor!"*

It has also been objected, that had the old Saxon compound word, "*cradle-child*," been used in reference to Baptism, it would have fixed the application of the rite. Listen to Gregory Nazianzen—"Hast thou an infant child? *let him be dedicated from his CRADLE*. Give him the great and excellent phylactery." Here is the very "*cradle-child*" which the Baptists affect to want! When the same writer gives his opinion for baptizing children at three years of age; it is retorted, "this was a new affair!" But the difficulty is this, on the Baptist hypothesis, how could it be any affair at all? How could any man think that the baptism of a "*cradle-child*" under three years of age was lawful? How could Gregory Nazianzen recommend it, if Infant Baptism had never before been heard of in the Church?

Every Baptist admits the similarity between the Jewish Passover and the Lord's Supper. Why then will they not follow out the conformity? "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us;" says the Apostle, 1 Corinthians v. 8; what did the law require of worthy partakers of the Passover?—Exodus xii. 48. "When a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, **LET ALL HIS MALES BE CIRCUMCISED**, and *then* let HIM come near and keep it." Was not his own personal circumcision sufficient passport to the Passover Table? No. Moses says inflexibly, **LET ALL HIS MALES BE CIRCUMCISED**. No perhaps, says Moses; *after* "EVERY MALE" is circumcised, **THEN** let HIM come near and keep the sacred institution." Not only must the father of

* **DISTRIBUTION OF THE AGES OF LIFE.**—The Baptists insinuate that this distribution of the ages of life is a peculiarity of Irenæus.—Xenophon, *Cyropædia*, Book I, describes four stages of life, popularly distinguished among the Persians—"Childhood, Youth, Mature age, and Eldership, or the time which was past military service." Epiphanius, *Heres.* xxxiii. says—"Ἄλλα τὸ μὲν ὑποτιθῆναι διὰ δακτύλου παιδεία γίνεται: παιδίω δὲ μείζονχαιρος ραπίστματος μείρακιω δὲ διὰ ἱμαντὸς νεανιστικῶ διὰ ραβδόν, ἀνδρὶ δὲ ἐπιδίκτησις τῶν μείζονων παραπτωμάτων μάχαιρα διὰ νομοῦ.—But to *infants* correction is given with the finger; to *children* with the hand; to *youngsters* with the whipping-rod; to *youths* with the cane; but for grosser crimes *men* are punished with the sword." This progress from infancy to childhood, to youngsters, to youth, and to manhood, is precisely analogous to that of Irenæus from infancy to little ones, to children, to youth, and to seniors; which proves that the distribution of life employed by the Apostle John, 1 John ii. 12; "*little children, young men, and fathers,*" was well known among those to whom he wrote; and being familiar to them, they must *literally* have understood his words.

the family be circumcised, but his whole *oikos*. The whole *oikos* was *baptized*, because "in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female," no distinction in behalf of either sex. None can deny that if ALL the *sons* of a family *must* be circumcised under the law, *something* of a similar duty obtained under the Gospel. Think of Lydia, of the Jailor, of Stephanas, &c. ; were not their *families* baptized on good and valid reasons, or causes completely satisfactory? Was not the baptism of the *numerous* family of Cornelius by the Holy Ghost, both a warrant and an example?

Were it admitted that as the Lord's Supper was given to Gentile converts, instead of the Passover, so Baptism was given to them instead of Circumcision, *controversy would cease*. The baptism of families would be assigned to its proper place; and the law of the ancient ritual would be fulfilled in the new dispensation. Nor can we deny that reasons might be adduced for the injunction given by Moses. It might be the will of God for the trial of obedience. It might be appointed as the test of established faith. It might be enacted to prevent discord in families. And if obedience must be *so, and no more, and no less, and no otherwise*, then that precept might rest on a conviction of its being a touchstone of character, of the hearty good-will with which a convert showed himself animated by fulfilling the law to its uttermost *punctilio*.

I have sought only FACTS and EVIDENCES: but the present topic furnishes an exhortation. Let me affectionately ask: Do you believe that Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us? Are you willing to manifest your regard to this great Passover to the same extent as was expected and commanded of old?—if not, have you any reason to think that you can be an acceptable guest at the Christian Passover Table, while you have at home any belonging to you, any over whom your care extends, any whose welfare you are bound to seek, upon whom the initiatory rite of your religious profession has not passed? This obligation was of Divine appointment. The Gospel exceeds the law in its attention to children. Christ has sanctified the state of Infancy—why do you withhold the *sign* of sanctification from those in that state? How dare you partake of the Christian Passover, while your children are in the unconsecrated condition!—Think what a contrast there is to your disadvantage, between your conduct and that of a convert to Judaism! Think what your avowed allegiance

demands of you : and to what your duty as a Christian by profession *ought* to bind you !

Historical Scripture expressly states the Baptism of families which are composed of children in all states of life ; infants, little ones, children. The Apostle Paul acknowledges that he baptized or was the cause of baptizing *many families*. The Apostle John addressed *children*, as members of the Church, and fit subjects of his Apostolic care, in an epistle *general* to the churches. His disciple at one remove affirms the sanctification of the *state* of infancy by Christ, and the *ritual* sanctification of the persons of infants by Baptism. The Christian writer who of all others took the greatest pains by inquiry, by travelling, by close examination, purposely instituted and long continued, says ; the Church received from the Apostles, the injunction to confer Baptism on infants. This was in the very earliest ages of the Church ; within two centuries. Can falsehood boast of all these incidental unanimities, these coincidences, which in fact and argument *dove-tail* into one another ? Can this be error supported by such extensive, universal, and satisfactory evidence ?

It is said “ *we* in these days ought not to be too sure, too overweening in our interpretation of Scripture and the Fathers ? ” I wish the sentiment on which this proposition is founded were more prevalent among Christian sectaries. But let us direct our attention to those who best understood their own language, and the practice of their own days. What say the various communities, whose evidence interests us on this subject ?—Did *they* conform to the Arab or the Israelite principle and practice ? Did *they* postpone their rite of distinction from other religions, or did they not rather anticipate than delay it ? Did *they* ritually sanctify infants, little ones, children, and youths ; or did they defer ritual sanctification to the seniors and the aged ?

In following this inquiry, we may properly commence with the harbinger of the Gospel.

JOHN THE BAPTIST BAPTIZED INFANTS.—For proof of this, we refer to the testimony of a body of men still existing in Syria, the acknowledged disciples of that eminent prophet. They are known under the appellation of “ *Disciples of John*,” or simply “ *disciples*,” or “ *Sabians*,” *Baptists* : and sometimes, *Hemero-Baptists*, or *Daily-Baptists*. Disciples of John are spoken of repeatedly in the Gospel history.

These Sabians denominate the Baptism of their Master John, “ the Baptism of Light ; ” Heb. x. 32. where Christians

are spoken of as *illuminated*, baptized. They speak of a Being called *Light*, distinct from the Supreme Being, which united itself with John the Baptist—the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, John i. 33—at the time when he baptized a celestial Being the Lord from Heaven, who appeared to him in *the form of a LITTLE CHILD*. Marsh's *Michaelis on New Testament*, vol. iii. part 1. Their books say, When John baptized in the Jordan of living water, with the baptism of life, and pronounced the name of life, the disciple of life said, "Stretch out thy arms, take me, and baptize me with the baptism of life, and pronounce over me THE NAME which thou art accustomed to pronounce! John answered the disciple of life, '*that cannot be!*' But the scholars of John earnestly requested him; he baptized, therefore, the disciple of life. As soon as the Jordan perceived the disciple of life, the river overflowed, and covered John himself, so that he could not stand. The lustre of the disciple of life shone over the Jordan; the Jordan returned within its banks, and John stood on dry ground." "The river overflowing covered John himself."—This was a phenomenon, a *singular* incident: for the river did not overflow on account of ordinary baptisms; but on such occasions, John standing on dry ground was beyond its reach.

This statement supports two decided inferences. That John baptized in the GREAT NAME: meaning the name of the God of the Jews, JEHOVAH. That he who baptized disciples *as* little children, could have no aversion to the baptism of little children themselves. And this is rendered evident by the practice of his followers who baptize children at *forty days old*; and who use a formula, importing, "*I baptize thee with the baptism with which John the Baptist baptized.*" They say that they know not correctly the words which John used, and therefore they adopt this form; in which the reader will perceive an indisputable allusion to the sacred name which no Jew ventured to pronounce; the true pronounciation of which the Jews affirmed to be lost. These people also baptize by *trine immersion*; which is an unquestionable reference to the *Trinity*: three *plungings*, but *one* baptism.

It may be worth while to compare with this the history as recorded in the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. Hier. lib. iv. Comm. in *Esaiam*. "It came to pass, as the Lord ascended out of the water, that the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit descended, and rested upon him, and said unto him, "*My son, I have expected thy coming in all the Prophets; and now I remain upon thee; thou art he in whom I rest, who shall reign*

for ever.”* The Gospel of the Ebionites, a branch of the Nazarenes, had these words—Epiph. Hær.; “John came baptizing the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan. After the people had been baptized, Jesus came also, and was baptized by John, and as he ascended out of the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of a dove, which descended and came towards him; and a voice was heard from heaven, saying, ‘*Thou art my beloved Son, in thee have I been well pleased.*’ Immediately a great light shone about the place. John seeing it, said unto him, *Who art thou, Lord?* Again a voice from heaven said unto him, ‘*This is my beloved Son, in whom I have been well pleased.*’ Then John falling down before him said, ‘*I pray thee, Lord, baptize thou me;*’ but he forbade him, saying, ‘*Suffer it to be so; for thus it becometh that all things be fulfilled.*’”

Whether the “*Great Name*” was *light*, or *life*, certainly it intended *Jehovah*. An ancient creed adopts the simile, “Light of light; very God of very God:” and this Baptism inculcates the doctrine of a Trinity, *before* there could possibly be in this expressive rite any commemoration whatever of the washing of the dead body of the great Redeemer.

In the form of words commanded by our Lord, to be used in administering Baptism, Matth. xxviii. 19, there is a clear and immutable inculcation of the doctrine of the Trinity, but not a shadow of injunction to perpetuate any ritual remembrance of his dead body: not the slightest allusion to any rite of purification passed upon it, or to any imitation of such rite to be practised by his disciples.

If we examine the practice of the churches severally, the same ideas are predominant; that consecration to the Trinity is the main import and purport of Baptism; and that they were and are desirous of conferring this consecration on children in early life—in baptismal infancy.

* Baptism among the Jews, although administered in the name of the Lord Jesus only, might include a recognition of the Trinity. Irenæus has preserved two formularies of baptism used by the Valentinians, of which, though apparently mere gibberish, it has lately been attempted to make sense and meaning. This is the version—“*In nomen tuum, Exaltissime; in id quod est lumen, est principium vitæ, Spiritus, quoniam tu in corpore tuo regnasti.—In thy name, O most exalted, in that which is light and the principle of life, Spirit, inasmuch as thou in thy body art reigning.*” The mention of light, spirit, and exaltation clearly alludes to a Trinity.

The Apostles rebaptized the disciples of John. That was not because they had received his baptism in their infancy, but because they had *explicitly* professed neither the name of Jesus, nor that of the Holy Ghost.

Oikos and *Oikia*.—It is proper to advert again specifically to these terms in connection with Infant Baptism.

Aristotle says that *Oikia* means both “bond and free.” One passage of Scripture afforded the most proper opportunity to include a servant in the term *family*, John viii. 35 ; “The SERVANT abideth not in the house—not *oikos*, but *oikia*—for ever ; but the *son* abideth ever.” Thus the son is a member of the *oikia*, but the *servant* is not a member of the *oikos*.

When *oikos* is used to denote a *family*, the connection of numbers with the term forms the *experimentum crucis* of the distinction between the family, *oikos*, and *oikia* the entire establishment, including servants. We read of the *oikos*, family of Noah, consisting of *eight* persons, being saved in the ark : here servants are evidently excluded. Gen. vii. 1 ; 2 Peter iii. 21. So we read of the whole *oikos*—family of Jacob that went down into Egypt with him, being *sixty-six* persons. Genesis xvi. 26. The servants are excluded, for they amounted to some hundreds. “Ahab had seventy sons in Samaria—look out the best, and fight for your master’s family”—*oikos*. The servants are excluded ; 2 Kings x. 1, 5, &c.

That the LXX express *infants* by the term *oikos*, appears from the following instances. Gen. xviii. 19 : “For I know Abraham that he will command his *children*, even his family—*oikos*—after him.” Isaac was only promised, not born at the time. Gen. xxxiv. 30 : “I being few in number, shall be destroyed, I and my family, *oikos*.” There were infants in Jacob’s family, at the time.—Numbers xviii. 31 : “Ye shall eat it in every place, ye and your families, *oikos* ; for it is your reward for service.” The *infants* of the priests and Levites did eat at three years old their “rewards for service.”—Deut. xii. 7 ; xv. 20 : “And ye shall eat before the Lord and rejoice, ye and your families, *oikos*.” The same infants who did eat before the Lord are here said to “rejoice” before the Lord.—Deut. xiv. 26 : “Thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy family, *oikos*.” Here again the parent is said to “rejoice” with his family before the Lord ; which is exactly what is said of the Jailor’s

family when baptized ; and as it here *expresses* the presence of *infants*, children of three or four years old, so undoubtedly it does in the New Testament.—Deut. xxv. 9 : “ Then shall his brother’s wife say, “ ‘ Thus shall it be done unto that man who will not build up his brother’s family, *oikos* ”—by procreation of *infants*.—1 Sam. ii. 33 : “ ‘ The increase of thy family—*oikos*—shall die in the flower of their age. ” This must mean *infants*.—2 Sam. vii. 16, 18, 25, 27, 29 : “ And thy family, *oikos*, and thy kingdom shall be established for ever. Thou hast spoken of thy servant’s family, *oikos*, for a great while to come. ” 1 Chron. xvii. 23, 23, 25.—“ This must mean *infants*.—1 Kings xiii. 2 : “ Behold, a child shall be born to the family, *oikos*, of David. ”—“ This child must be an *infant*.—Psalm cxiii. 9 : “ He caused the barren woman to have a family, *oikos* ; and to be a joyful mother of children. ” *Infants* are here intended.

When Jacob was going down into Egypt, the sacred writer informs us that the number of his sons and his sons’ sons, of his daughters and his sons’ daughters, with him, was sixty-six. He then mentions particularly the “ two souls ” born to Joseph in Egypt, who were infants, and closes by saying ; “ All the souls of the house, *oikos*, of Jacob were three score and ten. ” The phrase “ all the house ” is evidently inapplicable till these two infants of Joseph are INCLUDED. Omit these, the term does not apply : insert them, the term is instantly and correctly applied. The term, therefore, EXPRESS-ES the presence of those INFANTS. Without those infants the number cannot be made up. The sacred writer waits to *express* them ; and then *all the house* is the suitable phrase. This passage is demonstrative of the presence of infants in the term *oikos* ; not merely morally or grammatically ; but by means of the numbers, mathematically and strictly demonstrative. The infants are here expressed in the term *all the house*. Neither fraud nor force can eject them. The Greek adds *five infants*, the sons of Manasseh, and a grandson of Benjamin, making *all the house* of Jacob seventy-five persons.

The *presence of infants* is EXPRESSED beyond all possibility of doubt, in the use of a term by the LXX. Exod. i. 1 : “ Now these are the names of the children of Israel who came into Egypt, every man, *πανοικι*, with all his house, ” his own personal family. The sons of Jacob *did* bring their LITTLE ONES in the wagons sent by Pharaoh. Gen xlvi. 5. The intention of the LXX is to inform us, that the whole did not come down confusedly, but each man distinctly, *εκατος*,

heading all his family. Here then the term *with all his house*, ΠΑΝΟΙΚΙ, intentionally expresses the presence of infants.

What is desired? Merely to allow the same force to the same word in the New Testament which it bears in the LXX. The Apostles wrote in a language, the words of which had been long settled. The Jailor was baptized, he and ALL his family; and he rejoiced WITH ALL HIS HOUSE, πανοικι, at the head of his family, believing in God. But *panoiki* EXPRESSES the presence of INFANTS in the instance of the sons of Jacob descending into Egypt; why then does it not equally EXPRESS the presence of INFANTS in the instance of the Jailor's family? If the terms ALL the house express infants in the instance of ALL Jacob's family, why do they not equally express infants in the case of ALL the Jailor's family? If there be any scruples about the Jailor's family, there can be none about the family of Cornelius, of which it is said, "he with ALL his house—συν πανι τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτου—feared God:" and ALL were baptized. "Can infants fear God?" Did not Samuel fear God, when he "ministered" to the Lord in his sanctuary?—and Timothy, when he studied Holy Scripture? They were *infants*.

Being myself convinced that the Apostles practised Infant Baptism, and that the Evangelist meant to tell us so; I affirm that the *natural* import of the term *oikos*, family, includes *children of all ages*. In proof, I offer *fifty* examples; if *fifty* are not sufficient, I offer *a hundred*; if *a hundred* are not sufficient, *two hundred*; if *two hundred* are not sufficient, *four hundred*. I affirm that *oikos* VERY OFTEN expresses the presence of infants; of this I offer *fifty* examples; and if we admit classical instances, *fifty* more. Euripides alone affords half the number; though he frequently uses *domos* instead of *oikos*. More than *three hundred* instances have been examined, which have proved perfectly satisfactory.

What terms could the Evangelist have used to satisfy us of the Apostolic practice of Infant Baptism? Had he said, "We baptized *infants*;" Origen says this—and Baptists immediately exclaim, "*Metaphorical* infants! *metaphorical* infants!" Had he said, "We baptized *children*," as the apostles Paul and John, and Clement of Alexandria say, they answer, "*Metaphorical* children!" But Clement's allusion, "the fisherman and CHILDREN drawn out of the water," is extant among other Christian emblems of ancient sculpture—Arringhius, Roma Potteranea, Tom. II. tab. xiii; in which are seen an angler, at whose line three fishes are nibbling; and already

drawn out is, not a bearded sage, not a MAN, but a BOY *about four or five years old!* So much for *metaphorical children!*

I submit this rule—"Whenever a verb implying *locomotion*, entering in, going out, &c., is connected with the term *oikos*, look for a *dwelling-house*;" for a man *enters* a family by affinity, matrimony, adoption, &c.; but he *enters* a dwelling by locomotion. Let us try some passages by this rule. "Into whatever house ye *enter*." Men on a journey enter a house by locomotion; it therefore means a *dwelling*. Acts vii. 10; We are informed, that Pharaoh made Joseph governor over Egypt, and over all his *house*;" but what have *children* to do here? In 1 Kings xiii. 8, we have the expression—"The man of God said *to the KING*, If thou wilt give me half thine *house*," *oikos*, LXX—his *Royal Property*: surely he did not mean half his *children*. Joseph was *over* Poti-phar's *house* so supremely, that his master knew not ought he had, save the bread he did eat; and had kept back nothing from Joseph, save his wife. Into exactly the same supremacy of administration over his property, *house*, *oikos*, Gen. xli. 40, did *king* Pharaoh place Joseph—"only in the throne will I be greater than thou." This is the light in which the Psalmist viewed the transaction; for he tells us, "He made him lord of his house, and ruler over *all his SUBSTANCE*," his *Royal Property*. Psalm cv. 21. *Substance* is properly connected with the king's *house*. 2 Chron. xxi. 17; Proverbs vi. 31: "A thief shall restore seven-fold, all the *substance* of his *house*," all his property. Canticles viii. 7: "If a man would give all the *substance* of his *house*," all his property for love, it would be utterly contemned. 2 Sam. xii. 8: Gen. xxxix. 5.

When the Philippian Jailor inquired, "What must I do to be saved?" the Apostle answered, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy *house*," including his servants. The *oikia*, servants of the Jailor, heard the Word: but we do not read that one of the *oikia* was *baptized*, saved. But this we *do* read of the Jailor, and of *all his house*; which is exactly what the Apostle foretold.

Well therefore may the words of an objector, only changed in the application of them, be adopted—*The sacred writers baptized infants! The primitive Christians baptized infants! "We know they did, because they have told us so themselves."*

CHRISTIAN SYMBOLS USED IN THE FIRST CENTURIES.—The witness of Scripture is preponderant and decisive; yet inquirers should examine and obey whatever evidence bears

upon the question from other sources. Hence the value of the Christian writers, and of the Christian pictures of the first ages.*

The open profession of Christianity was at first exposed to incessant and imminent peril. Against this, believers provided in part by a certain degree of secrecy. To preserve which they adopted a series of private symbols; and by these, while they concealed themselves from the heathen, they discovered each other. The Revelation opens with one; "I am *THE Alpha*, and *THE Omega*," *Εγώ ειμι ΤΟ Α και ΤΟ Ω*. Admitting the usual date of this symbolical book, A. D. 96, it follows that before the end of the first century, and during the life of the Apostle John, this symbol *A* and *Ω* was current among the faithful.

* *TRADITION*.—Notwithstanding Tradition is a Scripture term used by the Apostle to describe his own writings, because it has latterly been employed to express unwritten reports, handed down from age to age, and therefore uncertain and often mutilated or perverted, the Baptists charge the Pædobaptists with depending on incompetent and unworthy authority. That sense of the term is perfectly inapplicable to the age of the Apostles and of the Apostolic men, among whom it had no such meaning. The term *Παραδοσις*, *Paradosis*, *Tradition*, as used by the ancient Fathers, signifies good and credible evidence delivered by one person to another, either written or by speaking; and is applied even to the Gospels, which were called, Suicer. *Thesaur.* Tom. ii., *Ευαγγελικαι παραδοσις*, *Traditionary Gospels*. Thus Irenæus says of the Gospel of Mark—"Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri, et ipsa quæ annuntiata erant per scripta nobis *TRADIDIT*. Mark was the disciple and interpreter of Peter, and the things that were spoken by Peter he has preserved by writing tradition for us." The people urged Mark to write; as the Elders of the church afterwards urged the Apostle John to write. This desire for *written* tradition was the very contrary to a disposition to depend on *uncertain* tradition. Clement of Rome says, *Epis. Corinth.* xlii. xlv., "The Apostles appointed their first-fruits to be Bishops and Ministers over such as should believe, having first proved them by the Spirit. They gave direction, when they should die, how other chosen and approved men should succeed in their ministry." This is perfectly coincident with Paul's charge to Timothy, to commit to faithful men what he had heard that Apostle deliver to many Christian brethren for this purpose, 2 *Tim.* ii. 2. Justin Martyr says of himself: "Having been a disciple of the Apostles, I became a teacher of the nations. Those things which were *delivered to me* I minister to them who are become worthy disciples of the Truth." The Epistle to Diognetus ascribed to Justin says expressly, "*the Tradition of the Apostles is observed.*" The churches enjoyed the instruction of the Apostolic men long after that date. This, on the subject of Baptism, is of so much the greater consequence, as about A. D. 200, there arose a violent dispute concerning this rite; and about the same time Tertullian remonstrated against Infant Baptism; which proves the prevalence of the practice.

A passage hitherto covered with impenetrable darkness, as commentators confess, is illustrated by this custom, Rev. ii. 17; "To him that overcometh will I give a *white stone*, and in the stone a *new name* written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it." On this, says Doddridge: "Among the Greeks, a *white stone* was a token of *absolution*, as a *black stone* was of *condemnation*; but the writing a *new name* upon this stone is not illustrated by any ancient practice. I have sometimes thought the phrase may signify *one that hath received it*, as it seems a name given to any person must be known to others, or it would be given in vain."

The term for *stone* here used does not import a *large stone* proper for building, but a small *pebble*. It is used to describe the vote, voice, given by Paul—*ψηφοι*, Acts xxvi. 10; about the size of a bean; as customary among the Greeks in voting. The Egyptian pebbles, on which the scarabeus is sculptured, are usually *red Carnelian*, about the size of our watch-seals; but there is also a *white Carnelian* equally used, and this is apparently the stone intended in the text.

The term *name* does not of necessity imply an appellation, but a badge or cognizance; that by which a person or thing is known or *distinguished*; and it is so used in this book: Revelation xiii. 1; xiv. 1; xvii. 3. "A Lamb stood on Mount Sion, and with him a hundred and forty-four thousand having his Father's *name* written on their foreheads;" an abbreviated token, or significant cypher, or symbol, the mark of God set on the forehead of his people, as in the vision seen by Ezekiel, iv. 6. "I saw a woman sitting on a scarlet coloured beast, full of *names of blasphemy*," blasphemous symbols: "*full of names*" is clearly inapplicable; the beast could not be written all over. "I saw a beast rise out of the sea, and upon his heads the *name* of blasphemy," a blasphemous *device*, badge or cognizance, like those placed on the head of idols; the sun with its rays, the moon with her crescent, &c.

We have now the key to our text—"To him that overcometh will I give a *white Carnelian pebble stone*, and in the stone a *new cognizance* or *device* engraved, which no man knoweth save one who hath received it," and is in the secret. With this exactly coincides the language of Clemens Alexandrinus, A. D. 190, writing to primitive Christians, who says, "You have also your little private tokens or symbols, that of a dove or of a fish, or a swift ship driven by the wind, or a musical lyre, a device used by Polycrates, or a ship's anchor,

which Seleucus engraved on his coins ; or if your device be any one engaged in fishing, angling, it puts you in mind of the Apostle, and of the CHILDREN *which are drawn out of the water.*"*

This testimony is valuable ; as it proves the use of private symbols among the Christians in the second century, and by illustrating the passage in the Revelation, shows the practice to date from the first century ; and as it proves that CHILDREN were at that time, as formerly by the Apostle, drawn out of the water of baptism.

Although Clemens describes all Christian who are not arrived at heaven as children, compared with what they will be in that state ; yet the term cannot be taken metaphorically in this passage, unless the dove, the fish, the ship, the lyre and the anchor could be taken metaphorically ; which would be false ; for the anchor may be seen on the coins of Seleucus. Among the symbols on Christian sepulchral inscriptions of the earliest ages we find the *fish*, the *anchor*, and the *dove* ; which justify his words in their full extent and *literal* acceptance.† "A FAITHFUL, descended from ancestors who were also FAITHFULS, Here lies Zosimus : he lived two years, one month, and twenty-five days." The *anchor* and the *fish* mark a period of primitive and *suffering* Christianity. A FAITHFUL!—a church member ! at two years of age, descended from FAITHFULS ; who in causing their infant to be baptized, continued the practice of their primitive Christian ancestors. In what sense did they or their forefathers understand the Apostolic injunction ?—The following with the symbol of a *dove* bears the same import. "Achillia, NEWLY BAPTIZED, is buried here ; she died at the age of one year and five months.‡ Probably the accompanying figure of a dove marks the female sex particularly. It is a Christian symbol of the second century, derived doubtless from an earlier period. "Newly baptized !"—In what sense did they who baptized that child,

* Sint autem nobis vel vobis signacula, columba, vel piscis, vel navis, quæ celeri cursu à vento fertur, vel lyra musica, qua usus est Polycrates, vel ancora nautica, quam insculpebat Seleucus : et si sit aliquis qui piscetur, meminerit Apostoli, et PUERORUM qui ex aqua extrahuntur. Clemens Alexandrinus. *Pædagogus*. lib. iii. cap. 11.

† Fidelis ex Fidelibus Zosimus Heic Jaceo. Vixi Annos II. Mensium 1. Dies xxv.—Muratori, Fabretti.

‡ Defuncta est Achillia ΝΕΟΦΥΤΑ unius anni Mensium v. vii. Martias Die Lunæ. Muratori, vol. iv.

ence

sealed

Lib. iii.

not a year and a half old, understand the language and practice of the Apostles?

The *Inscriptions* which the Sepulchres contain, furnish abundant materials for "FACTS and EVIDENCES." Among the thousands which remain are many of the primitive Christians: and some of these refer to children who died young. An example may explain my meaning, while it furnishes a specimen. Buonarotti, 43.

ΣΙΜΠΛΙΚΙΑ-Η-ΚΑΙ-
ΚΑΛΩΝΥΜΟΣ-ΕΖΗ
ΣΕΝ-ΕΤΗ-ΙΑ-ΗΜΕΡΑΣ-ΚΓ
ΕΤΕΛΕΥΤΗΣΕΝ ΙΙΙ-ΙΓ-ΚΑΛ-ΝΟΒΕΜΡ ΦΑΣΤΩ ΚΑΙ
ΤΑΛΛΩ ΥΠΑΤΟΙΣ.

SIMPLICIA—called also CALONYMUS, who lived Years XI. Days XXIII. His course was ended by violence, the 13th of the Calends of November, Faustus and Tallus being Consuls.

This reference to the Consuls gives a date, by which we find the child was a martyr under Dioclesian. He had certainly been baptized, as appears from his receiving a second name *Calonymus*; and he was a martyr at eleven years of age.

Another inscription commemorates a still younger Christian. It has explicit marks of primitive Christianity in persecuting times. Buonarotti 17; Fabretti, cap. 4.

I X Θ Υ C .

I Posthumius. Euthenion. Fidelis. qui. Gratia sancta. consecutus.

X Pridie. natali suos erotina. hora. reddit. debitum. vitae. suae. qui vixit.

Θ Annis Sex. et depositus. v. idus Julias. die Jovis. quo et natus. est. cujus.

Υ Anima. cum Sanctos in pace. Filio Benemerenti. Postumii. felicissimus.

C. N. Ey Euthenia Fytista. avia. ipse jus.

k

W Posthumius Euthenion, a faithful Christian brother, accompanied with the Holy Grace. On the day before his birth-day, "Y^o he gave back again that which he had received, his life. dove ved six years; and was buried the fifth of the ides of musical a Thursday, on which day he was born: whose soul

is with the Holy One in peace. Erected to a well-deserving son, the most happy Posthumius, by order of his grandmother, Euthenia Fytista.

Was the title of *Fidelis* ever given by the primitive Christians to any one before baptism?—On the contrary, they were baptized to be made *fideles*. This then decides the character of this child. He was a follower of, or was followed by, the “Holy Grace.” This child then had been baptized: yet he died before he was *six years* old. As his grandmother appears to have been a zealous, warm-hearted Christian, we cannot suppose this son would pass the *third year* of his life without undergoing this rite: perhaps much earlier. “His soul is with the Just One in Peace,” says the inscription: while the symbolical Acrostic *IXΘYC* sufficiently marks his Christianity; with the necessity of the time, for concealing the profession of the cross. A more satisfactory instance of Infant Baptism, excepting the absence of a date, can hardly be expected; for this “*faithful*,” baptized Christian brother, was not *SIX YEARS* of age.

But the Christian symbol *IXΘYC* is placed on the top, as well as down the side of this inscription; probably expressing a Christian ancestry. The letter *N*, importing *Nika*, “Christ has overcome,” being a Greek symbolical term, seems to suggest, with the Greek termination *Euthenion*, that it was a Greek family. Euthenia, the grandmother, only did for the child what had formerly been done for herself and her family; and this fact refers the Infant Baptism back to that earlier date.*

These instances show that the words of Clemens in reference to those Christian symbols, the *fish*, the *anchor*, the *dove*, and the *ship*, must be taken literally; where then is the pretence for taking his term children other than literally? Were not Zosimus, Achillia, and the other little ones, literally children

* The term *IXΘYC* is derived from the first letters of the name of Christ placed thus—

I	Ιησους	Jesus
X	Χριστος	Christ
Θ	Θεου	of God
Υ	Υιου	the Son—
ϸ	σωτηρ	Saviour.

Those united letters form the Greek word signifying a *fish*; whence a *fish* became the private mark of Christian sepulchres, and concealed them from violation by the Heathen. Clem. Alex. Pædagog. Lib. iii. Cap. 10.

drawn out of the water of baptism ; and in no other sense could that Christian teacher, when writing to Christians and using that expression, understand the Apostle's language and practice.

The primitive Christians also caused the symbol to be engraved on their seals and rings ; and by that token they discovered those who had been baptized into their common faith. In reference to this, Tertullian, *De Bapt.*, chapter i, speaking of Fideles, the Faithful, who had passed through the water of Baptism, calls them *pisciculi*, *little fishes*. Combine this with the repetition of the symbol, *ΙΧΘΥC*, on the tomb of Posthumius. Whoever perseveringly pursues this argument will produce many instances which may be referred to the first and second century. Who then will venture to affirm that "*Infant Baptism is a new affair ?*"

CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP OF CHILDREN.

UNDER the Mosaic law, the children of the Hebrews, when arrived at three years of age, or from that to four years, were thought capable, by the leaders of their nation, of covenanting with God, in common with other members of the Old Testament church ; and became in a sense public persons. The Children of the priests were at that age admitted into the Temple and "did eat the most holy things." At three years old Samuel "worshipped the Lord," 1 Samuel i. 28, ii. 11, in his sanctuary : and in New Testament times, at three years old, *from his infancy*, 2 Tim. iii. 15, *απο βρεφους*, Timothy knew the Holy Scriptures which were able to make him wise to salvation. Would the Apostles have refused Baptism to such Children ?

When our Lord's doctrine during his personal ministry was favourably received, the persons so disposed were called *disciples* ; and this is their usual appellation in the Gospels. So we read, "Jesus *made* and *baptized* more disciples than John." He *made* them disciples *ritually* by baptism, by the agency of his Apostles. After our Lord's death, his followers were called by their enemies, Men "of that way"—"Nazarenes"—"Heretics ;" but they called themselves CHRISTIANS. They added moreover, when addressing each other, the appellations of *Brother* or *Sister* in the Lord, with the titles, *the called, the elect, the illuminated, holy persons* or *saints, faithful, &c.* These were regularly given to church-members ONLY. None

without the church ever received one of these appellations. They were given at or immediately on Baptism, and Baptism was initiatory to those appellations. The newly-baptized were called *new plants*.

Whoever was *baptized* was a member of the church of Christ: and as baptism was the *only* way of admission into the church, it follows that whoever was a member of the church of Christ had been baptized. The terms are interchangeable. If then it be shown that any one of these Christian appellations is bestowed on children, that children are designated by any one of these titles, the church-membership of children is the undeniable consequence; and with their church-membership their Baptism.

THE APPELLATION HOLY ASCRIBED TO CHILDREN.—*HOLY persons* is an appellation given to church-members. So Paul confessed, that “many of the *holy persons* he had shut up in prison,” Acts xxvi. 10, τῶν ἁγίων: though afterwards we find him speaking repeatedly in the most respectful manner of them; “I go to Jerusalem to minister to the *holy persons*,” Rom. xv. 25, τοῖς ἁγίοις. He also writes on various occasions to them “who are sanctified in Christ Jesus, to the called, to the *holy persons*”—“To the *holy persons* at Ephesus”—“To the *holy persons* at Colosse”—“To all the *holy persons* in Christ Jesus at Phillippi.” This is a title given in a multitude of places to members of the Christian Church ONLY. But this appellation is also given to children of a church-member—“Now are your children *HOLY*,” 1 Cor. vii. 14; ἁγιά. The lowest sense that can possibly be put on this term in this passage, even by a writer against Infant Baptism, is that of Tertullian, who says they are *holy*, because *designed for holiness* in baptism. Even in that ancient adversary’s opinion, their *ritual holiness* was complete at baptism; for which he assigns two reasons: *Seminis prerogativâ*, the privilege of descent from a church-member; and *Institutionis disciplinâ*, the course of education which such a child would naturally receive from its parent. He implies, that the heathen dedicated their children to their idols *before they were born*. But the fact is indisputable, that the appellative *HOLY* is not bestowed in the New Testament on any person not a member of the church of Christ!

The following examples prove that the term “*Holy*,” was appropriated to children.

“Maurentius son of Maurentia, a most pleasing child, who

lived five years, eleven months and two days ; worthy to repose in peace among the HOLY persons.”*

“ Sacred to the great God. Leopardus rests here in peace with *Holy* spirits. Having received Baptism he went to the blessed innocents. This was placed by his parents, with whom he lived seven years and seven months.”† Fabretti refers this expressly to Baptism.

“ To the honourable memory of Innocentius Amantius, who lived eight years and six days ; he reposes in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the peace of the Lord Jesus Christ.”‡ From the phraseology it is probable that the child was of Hebrew parentage.

“ The most innocent Cervonia Silvana, gone to enjoyment with Holy Spirits,” A. D. 291.§

“ Julia reposes in peace among the *Holy* persons.”|| The terms “ *in peace* and *holy*” prove that she was a member of the Christian church. Consequently it was the appellation given to the disciples among both the Grecks and the Latins.

THE APPELLATION FAITHFUL APPLIED TO CHILDREN.— In connection with the appellation *holy* given to church-members, we find the appellation FAITHFUL ; and this was more

* Maurentius Maurentiæ
F. D. qui vixit Annis V. Menses
XI. Dies Duo. Digna inter
Sanctos Deus jussit in Pace.

† D Ma Sacrum. XL.
Leopardum in Pacem
cum Spiritu Sancta. Accep-
tum eunte abeatis innocinem
Posuer. Par. q. Ann. VII. Men. VII.

‡ Bone Memorie
Innocenti Amantio
qui vixit Annos
VIII. Dies Sex
Quiescenti in
Sinu Abrahæ
Isaac et Jacob
in pace XTI DMNI
PS. VIII. KAL. IAN.
Muratori, 7. Calari in Cæmetrio. Bonfanto.

§ Innocentissima Cervonia Silvana
Refrigera cum Spiritu Sancto.

|| ΕΙΘΥΛΙΑ ΕΝ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ
ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ.

extensively and more permanently used in the church, as the distinguishing title of church-members in Scripture.

It is applied to individuals, in the singular:—To Timothy, to Tychicus, to Onesimus, to Silvanus, and probably to others. 1 Cor. iv. 17; Eph. iv. 21; Col. iv. 9; 1 Pet. v. 12.

The mother of Timothy, is called a FAITHFUL. Acts xvi. 1; πιστῆς.

What concord hath Christ with Belial? what part hath a FAITHFUL with a *non-faithful*? 2 Cor. vi. 15. If any FAITHFUL man or FAITHFUL woman, πικρὸς ἢ πικρῆ, have widows; let such relieve them, that *the Church be not charged*; 1 Timothy v. 16.

It is also applied in the plural:—They of the circumcision, “FAITHFULS, πιστοί,” who came with Peter, were astonished. Acts x. 45. These are called *brethren*. Acts. ix. 23; Acts xi. 12.

Those servants who have masters that are FAITHFULS, πιστους; despise them not; 1 Timothy vi. 2; because they are *brethren*.

Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example to the FAITHFULS; 1 Tim. iv. 12.

The things thou hast heard from me; 2 Tim. ii. 2; commit thou to FAITHFULS, men.

He is Lord of lords, and King of kings, and they who are with him are called, and chosen, and FAITHFULS; Revelation xvii. 14.

It is also addressed to Churches, as communities:—Paul to the *holy persons* who are at Ephesus, and to the FAITHFULS, πιστοῖς; in Christ Jesus; Eph. i. 1.

Paul to the *holy persons* in Colosse, and to the FAITHFULS, πιστοῖς; to the *brethren* in Christ; Col. i. 2.

A remarkable instance is that of Lydia, in her address to the Apostle—“When she was baptized, with her family, she besought us, saying, Since you have adjudged me to be a FAITHFUL, πιστην; to the Lord Jesus, come into my house, and abide.” Acts xvi. 15. Here the appellation *faithful* is so strongly connected with the term *baptism*, as to be even interchangeable with it; for the sense would be the same, if the term *baptized* were submitted for *faithful*, and *faithful* for *baptized*. It amounts to an identity.

The title *faithful* was a current designation of members of the Christian church. To call a man a *faithful* was equivalent to calling him a *Christian brother*, or a *disciple* of Jesus Christ, or by any other appellation denoting his relation to

Christ and the church. Is this appellation FAITHFUL applied to children? Certainly it is: and in the sense of a whole family. For so writes the Apostle, Titus i. 6; describing the character of a bishop—"he must be the husband of one wife, HAVING CHILDREN WHO ARE FAITHFULS."

This passage is decisive. Of the two terms, we have examined FAITHFULS. The other, *children*, in Greek *tekna*, on the authority of Baptist writers themselves, expresses "MINORS from twenty days old to twenty years." The passage then stands thus in sense; "having children, MINORS from twenty days old to twenty years, who are church-members." But the Apostle speaks of children. He does not say, "those of full age;"—Nor does he say, "excepting the younger;"—but the Bishop's "children" of any age must be FAITHFULS, church-members.

This was a proper place to have stated exceptions, if such existed in the Apostle's mind or practice: for he was not giving instructions to Titus only, but to all the Christian world. Error there was error in perpetuity. Nor does the Apostle formally introduce or treat the subject: he mentions it as an expected thing, without emphasis or explanation. It was therefore no novelty. The baptism of their children—their CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP—is here charged on the Ministers as a *duty*; and the omission is a marked disqualification for ecclesiastical office.

Some inconsiderate mind may insist—"those children *must be adults*; for they are supposed to be accusable of riot and unruliness." But in that case, the official character of the parent is made to depend on the established character of his children; and this publicly known and notorious, before their father can enter on his office. Supposing then his children to be born, when he is about thirty years of age, and their characters to be civilly and ecclesiastically fixed at the same time of life—their father must be sixty years old before he can possess this qualification for a bishop. What service could churches expect from their Bishops, every one aged sixty *at his entrance* on office? Is this consistent with the other facts?

The parallel passage in Timothy plainly expresses the bishop's having a family of *young* children. The injunction applies to ALL bishops.

But suppose the bishops had *daughters only*, they may be relieved from this imputation of being riotous and unruly:

yet these must be made FAITHFULS; for the term *children* includes both sexes.

Moreover, a bishop might have no children. Were not Timothy's qualifications for the episcopal office sufficient, without waiting till he became a husband and a father, and till the character of his children should be pronounced by the church and the world?

The Baptists would be bound by their own argument to admit only old men, married men and fathers, into the ministry. The argument goes to prove that *all ministers, all Baptist ministers, having children who are not baptized, in Paul's opinion, are unfit for their office.* They are not "ensamples to the flock."

These consequences follow this interpretation of the passage. Here then I make my stand—not on unrecorded tradition, not on the universal practice of the churches, not on the positive affirmation of Origen and others, who plead Apostolic injunction for the baptism of children—but on SCRIPTURE. The language of the Apostle is explicit and could not possibly mislead those who consulted his writings.

The Apostle Paul speaks of *children* as being church-members under the terms HOLY and FAITHFULS. The Apostle John writes distinctly to LITTLE CHILDREN. The inference is all that can be desired. Here then I stand on the rock of Scripture; and Scripture is consistent with itself; for the Evangelists applied to children the terms *believer* and *disciple*.

Though the Apostolic testimony is explicit and satisfactory, yet it may be gratifying to know whether Scripture has recorded any instances of conformity with this injunction. That inquiry must be answered in the affirmative; as is evinced by THREE INSTANCES OF CONFORMITY BY CHRISTIAN TEACHERS TO THE APOSTLE'S INJUNCTION.

"Greet Priscilla and Aquila, and the church in their *family*;" Rom. xvi. 3. 5. This is the sense given to the word *house*, in this place, by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, who say literally, "their *family* WAS ALL MADE FAITHFULS; and such whole families the Apostle calls a church."* The same persons are mentioned, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; "Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the

* *ὡσεὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτῶν πάντας πιστοὺς ποιῆσαι, τοὺτους καὶ ἐκκλησίαν ὠνομάσεν—τὸν οἶκον πάντα πιστοὺς εἶχεν, ὡσεὶ καὶ ἐκκλησίαν καλεῖσθαι*—They converted their whole families to the Christian profession; for such families he calls a church.

church in their *house, family*." All the Greek scholiasts and Grotius say, that "this signifies a *family* consisting wholly of Christian converts, as was the Jailor's, Acts xvi. 31, 32; and that of Crispus, Acts xviii. 8. "Salute Nymphas and the church in his *house*;" Colossians iv. 15. "House" means "Family," as is affirmed by Theodoret, Oecumenius, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. "He had made his whole family Christians, so as to be called a Church"—Literally—"He had made his whole family *Faithfuls*, so as to be called a Church."* "Paul to Philemon, and to the church in thy *house*;" Philemon 2. "To the church in thy *family*;" says Theodoret, for his "family" was "illustrious for the piety of all its members."

The following inscriptions will illustrate the opinions and practice of the ancient Christians.

Cyriacus a *Faithful* died aged eight days, less than three years.†

Eustafia the mother places this in commemoration of her son Polichronio a *Faithful* who lived three years.‡

Urcia Florentina a *Faithful* rests here in peace. She lived five years, eight months, and eight days.§

The sepulchre of the twin brothers Alcinous and of Alexander their cousin, three *Faithfuls*, of twelve years old, erected by their mother Præmissa. With three Fishes.||

The *three fishes* form another justification of the literal language of Clemens. On this term, Muratori *De Resur.* thus annotates—"Fish: by this name the most ancient Christians were accustomed to express Christ the Lord, according to the testimony of Augustin, Prosper, Optatus, Milevitanus, and others. This was also the symbol during the reigns of the Heathen Emperors, under which the Christians concealed

* "Nam ubi Apōstolus ad Collossenses scribens, cap. iv. 15; ait—"Salutate Fratres qui sunt Laodiceæ et Nympham, et quam in domo ejus est Ecclesiam," subdit de hac sanctissimi exempli muliere; tam enim devota videtur fuisse, ut omnis domus ejus signo titulata esset Crucis, hoc est in Ecclesiam conversa."—*Ambrose*.

† Cyriacus *Fidelis* decessit octo dies minus tres annus. iij. Kal. Mar.—Boldetti; Muratori.

‡ B. M. In commemoratione Eustafia Mater Filio Polichronio. *Fid.* qui vixit annis iij. Gruter No 8.

§ Urcia Florentina *Fidelis* in pace Vix. An. v. Mens. viii. Dies. viii.—Muratori.

|| Geinorum Alcinoorum Sepulchrum, Alexandrique Consanguineorum, Tres Duodennes. Mater Præmissi, Piscis iij.

ICΘYC, id est *Piscis*, uti perquam notum, literis suis indicat nomen *Jesu Christi Dei Filii Salvatoris*.—Muratori, No. 6.

their profession; but their brethren very well knew what it signified." Tertullian says, "We little fishes according to the example of our fish, ICTHON, Jesus Christ, are born in water; neither are we safe any longer than while we remain in water.—One kind of flesh of birds, martyrs who soared to heaven in sufferings; another kind of FISHES, those who received only Baptism."

One Inscription will prove that the term *Faithful* was continued and applied to children during several centuries.—“Here lies Maria daughter of John, who was of the town of Nicerata, she lived three years, three months and a half, a *Faithful*. She died the fourth day of the month Xanticus; under the consulate of the Princes Honorius, xi. and Constantius, ii.”*

The term *Faithful* continued to denote church members, from the days of the Apostles.—“It is not enough for the true character of Christians, that they be pure, but also that their works are conspicuous; that they are clear from every censure by others; that they are of consummate chastity excluding all cause of suspicion; that they are not only *Faithfuls*, but also evidently, *worthy Faithfuls*;" not only church members, but honourable in that station.†

Eusebius more formally says—“There are three descriptions of members in the church—one who guide, and two who are guided. The people of the Christian church are divided into *Faithfuls*; and those who have not been admitted by the “laver of regeneration.”

The interpretation of the term House “in the sense of *Family* was universal both in the Eastern and Western churches; and thus these three families of Christian teachers must be added to those previously adduced. How then can any say—“We have neither example nor precept for baptising children in all ages?”—The Apostle’s *injunction* has the force of a *precept*: and so great a number of Christian families exemplifies the *practice* to demonstration: for there is no excep-

* Heic jacet Maria filia Johannis cui Niceratum vixit Annos tres, Menses tres et semis, *Fidelis*, Defuncta est Mensis Xantici Die iv. Sub consulatu Honorii Augusti xi. et Constantii ii.

Niceratum, Vicus ingens, apud Apameam Syriæ situs; called by Theodoret, Nicerte.—Muratori.

† Non solum enim temperantibus satis est, ut sint puri, sed etiam adhibenda est opera, ut sint ab omni reprehensione alieni, ut sit consummata castitas, omni exclusa suspicionis causa; ut non simus solum *Fideles*, sed etiam videamur fide digni—ὡς μὴ μόνον εἶναι ἡμᾶς πιστοὺς ἀλλὰ ἀξιόπιστοὺς φανῆναι.—Clem. Alex. Pædag. Lib. iii. Cap. ii.

tion, no reserve, and no restriction marked in any passage of Scripture connected with baptism. Nothing therefore is desired from any society of Christians, but that *they follow the Apostolic example and baptize whole families!*

APPLICATION OF THE TERM NEOPHYTOS ; *Newly planted* ; TO CHILDREN.—A third appellation is strongly identified with Baptism by the Baptists themselves. “They are *planted*,” say they, in the likeness of his death, being buried with him by baptism.” The Apostles charged Timothy that a person newly *planted*, newly baptized, shall not bear office in the church. Our translation of 1 Timothy iii. 6 ; says, “not a *novice*,”—the original is this—“not a *Neophytos* ;” a *new plant*.

I select a few examples from the ancient existing memorials.

Rufillo, *newly baptized*, who lived two years and forty days. Quintillian the father places this to the memory of his son who sleeps in the peace of Christ.”*

To Domitius, an innocent, *newly baptized*, who lived three years and thirty days.†

Valerius Decentius the father places this to his son, *newly baptized*, who lived three years, ten months and fifteen days.‡

To Pisentus, an innocent soul who lived one year, eight months and thirteen days. NEWLY-BAPTIZED : buried on the ides of September in peace.§

To Jovius son of Callistus, who lived six years, ten months, and nineteen days. NEWLY-BAPTIZED, he died in peace.||

To Leoni, NEWLY-BAPTIZED, who lived six years, eight

* Rufillo Neafito qui vixit An. ii. D. xl. Quintillianus Pater filio dulcissimo in pace XPI.—Arringhius, Lib. iv.

† Domitio Innocenti *Neofito* qui vixit An. iii. Dies xxx. Dep. viii. Kal. Junias.—Fabretti No. 36.

‡ Valeri Decentius Pater filio suo *Neofito* bene Merenti Valerio Vialiano qui vivit xc. cum parentibus suis Annos N. iii. et Menses x. et dies N. xv. Italianete in pace.—Muratori.

§ Pisenti Anima in
nox q. vixit. Ann. I.
M. VIII. D. XIII. NEOFIT.
Dep. Idibus Sept. in Pace.

Muratori.

|| Jovio Filio Callisius qui vixit Annis
xesei Menses Decem. et dies Dece. et
Novem. NOF. in pace morenti.

Fortasse Callistus. Nihil est xesei nisi Sex. NOF. creditur pro
NEOPHYTO.—Muratori.

months, and eleven days. He reposed the sixth of the nones of July, Phillippus and Sallia being Consuls.*

To Aristus, who lived eight months: NEWLY-BAPTIZED, he went off the first of the nones of June: Timasius and Promotorus being Consuls.†

To the memory of Libera, who rests in peace. She lived eight years: NEWLY BAPTIZED. She was buried the third of the nones of May: Gratianus and Equitius being Consuls.‡

Flavia Jovina who lived three years and thirty-two days: NEWLY-BAPTIZED; deposited in peace, the eleventh of the calends of October, A. D. 367.§

B. M. to Silvinus, NEWLY-BAPTIZED; who lived on earth eleven years, five months, and ten days. Virilianus and Lampadius have placed this to the memory of their scholar.||

The following refers to a *catechumen* who was not a *faithful*—“Here rests in peace Onesima, a Catechumen, aged four years, five months and three days.”¶

Here repose two brothers, Innocents: Constantine, NEWLY-BAPTIZED; who lived eight years, two months and six days: was buried the third of the ides of November, our lords the princes Arcadius and Honorius being Consuls. Also, Justus,

* Leoni NEOFITO qui vixit Ann. VI.
Mens VIII. Dies XI. Requies—
VI. Non Jul. Pillippo et Sallia Conss.
A. D. 348.—Bosio.

† Aristo Puer Innox. qui
vixit Menses Octo NEO-
FITUS Recessit Pridie Nonas
Junias Timasio et Promotor.
CC. Conss. A. D. 389.
Gruter, CDLXII. I. Ex Passionei
Append. Muratori Supp.

‡ Benemerenti
in pace Libera
que bixit Ann. 5II.
NEOFITA. Dep. Die
III Nonas. Mais. Con.
Gratiano III et Equitio.

§ Fl. Jovina quæ vixit Annis tribus D. xxxii. Depos. *Neofita* in Pace, xi. Kal. Octob. A. D. 367.—Boldetti. Gruter.

|| B. M. Silvino. NEOFITO. Qui vixit in Seculo. Ann. xi. Mens. v. Dies. x. Virilianus et Lampadius Alumno suo Innocenti Memoriam posuerunt.—Gruter, No. 3. Ex Apiano et Alciati.

¶ B. A. Ω. M. Quievit Onesime Catechumena, in Pace, vii. Kal. Julias, Annorum iv. Mensium v. Dierum iii.

a FAITHFUL, who lived seven years.* This Justus is called a *faithful*, because in his earliest infancy he had been baptized; but Constantine is called a *neophytos*, because he had been recently baptized.

This inscription seems to prove that the same family was not always strictly uniform in observing the rite.

To Romanus, NEWLY-BAPTIZED, who lived eight years and fifteen days. He reposes in peace. Flavius Gratianus being a second time Consul, and Petronius Probus, Consul also.†

Pascasius lived six years, and received baptism on the eleventh of the calends of May. He took his white robe with him to the sepulchre.‡ The dates give for the birth of Pascasius, A. D. 457, and for his death, A. D. 463.

Hundreds of thousands of Christian children died in infancy, whose graves were not marked by a single inscription, and of those which were so marked not one in a thousand is come down to us. The evidences of this kind which exist in Eastern countries under Mohammedan government are inaccessible to us. These few inscriptions however contain most of the terms by which *Baptism* is signified in the New Testament; all which terms are applied to children.

The Apostle wrote to the Hebrews, x. 32, that “after they were *illuminated* they endured great afflictions.” Commentators, by *illuminated*, understand *baptized*. Accordingly the

* B. A. ω. M.

Hic . requiescunt . duo . fratres.
Innocentes . Constantius . NEOFITUS.
qui . vixit . Annis . Octo . M II.
D . VI . Depositus III . Idus . Novemb.
Cons . D . D . N . N . Arcadi . et . Honor.
Augg . Justus . FIDELIS . qui . vixit .
Annis VII . A . D . 394 .

Boldetti refers to Hieronym. Aleand. in Symb. Navis Eccl.—Justum hunc ideo, FIDELIEM appellat, quia in prima infanti Sacro fonte ablutus fuerat: Constantinum verò NEOPHITUM nominat, quod recens baptizatus esset. Gruter Ex Apiano et Velsarianis.

† Romano Neofito
Bene merenti qui vixit
Annos VIII. D. XV.
Requiesit in Pace. D N.
Fl. Gratiano. Aug. II. et
Petronio Probo C. S. A. D. 371.

‡ Natu Severi nomine Pascasius, dies Pascales Prid. non. April N die Jobis FL Constantino et Rufo VV CC CONSS. qui vixit Annorum VI. Percepit XI. kal. Maias et albas suas Octabas Pascæ ad Sepulcrum deposuit D. IIII. Kal. Mai. FL. Basilio. V. C. CO.—Fabretti.

inscriptions describe Achillia as *neo-photistos*, “newly illuminated,” meaning newly baptized. This illumination could be *ritual* only to a child of seventeen months. They describe Refrigerius,* a neophyte, as *Ana-bio*, “receiving a new life,” in baptism. The baptized were called *ἀναβιωαίς*, says Arringhius, *vera è mortuis operibus carnis et infidelitate reviviscencia*; because they were called to quit the dead works of the flesh and of unbelief, to live a new life to the glory of God. This is applied to a child!

Whence could *originate* the custom of applying these terms “HOLY” and “FAITHFUL.” to children? What could induce parents so to describe them? That parental affection should mark infants as *innocents*, not guilty of actual transgression is easily conceivable; but who could first think of calling infants HOLY, an appellation proper to church members only? Do we call our children *saints*? Who could think of denominating infants *faithful*? in what had their faith been tried? in what had it triumphed? These are not difficulties to a Pædobaptist. Those terms are used in Scripture and therein are applied to children. He traces them from Scripture, with the history of the Church, through Apostolic men, to the fourth century—or if the order be more desirable, they can be traced from the fourth century up through Apostolic men to Scripture. Hence, they originate and terminate in Scripture. They rest on the authority of the Apostle Paul; or rather on the revelation of the Holy Spirit speaking by him. If that sacred writer had “the mind of Christ;” and if he spake, and wrote, and practised, according to the intention of the only authoritative and infallible Legislator to the Church of God; then we may safely rest in his application of the terms “HOLY” and “FAITHFUL;” which he applies to *Children, Newly Baptized, NEWLY PLANTED*, and in which, he was followed by the whole Christian Church.

I close these researches upon the SUBJECTS OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM with two inferences.

1. The Christian Churches in the North, in the South, in the East, and in the West NEVER DID REFUSE BAPTISM TO INFANTS. Are the Baptists then wiser than all the world? than all the “*Faithful Men*” of Apostolic ages, and than all

* In Mire Exempli Innocentiæ Ac NEOFITO Anabio Satrio Refrigerio qui vixit Annis X. Dies XLVI. Publius Cornelius Zetos et Satria Dignitas Parentes in pace B. M. Fecerunt.—Reinesius Inscriptionum Antiquorum, No. 172.

their contemporaries? Is it likely that they alone, of all the millions of Christians of every period and nation, in spite of these "FACTS and EVIDENCES," should be the *only* persons who have elicited Scriptural truth?

2. In all Christian Churches, Baptism is a *consecration to the Trinity!* Not one uses any form of words—the Baptists themselves do not use any form of words, in the administration of Baptism, allusive to the *burial* of the person baptized, as they say Christ was *buried*. Had our Lord intended any such allusion, he would have said so. They have taken a *secondary* sense referring by allusion only, not by *direct* purpose, as the *primary* and *peculiar intention* of the rite. This is neither *wisdom*, nor *grace*, nor *orthodoxy*, which would put the principal things of religion in the principal place. I adhere to the initiatory words of Christ as the best and greatest authority on the subject; for it is very extraordinary that in a religion having but *two* rites, they should *both* point at the same thing. The death of the Saviour is clearly the primary and direct purport of the Lord's Supper. Is it likely or credible, that the *primary* and *direct* purport of Baptism should *also* be the death of the Saviour? But if in the initiatory rite there be a commemoration of the *interposing Deity*, and in the Lord's Supper a commemoration of the *interposing Humanity*—if for this reason, consecration to the Deity is sufficient by one act and ought not to be repeated—while devotedness to Jesus, as Lord of all, is frequently renewed and to be repeated continually—then there is between the two rites that distinction which was evidently intended; and which it well becomes all professors of our common faith to retain to the latest generation.

MODE OF BAPTISM.

Importance of Truth.—Perversion of Terms.—Βαπτω.—Εμβαπτω.—Βαπτισμος.—Synonymous Words.—Baptism by the Holy Ghost.—Meaning of Baptism.—Corresponding terms in different languages.—Inferences.—Overwhelming.—Submersion.—Immersion.—Baptism in the sense of Overwhelm.—Staining.—Pouring or Affusion.—Sprinkling.—Washing.—“Doctrine of Baptisms.”—Anabaptism.—“Divers Baptisms.”—John’s Baptism.—Baptism separate from Immersion.—Philip and the Eunuch.—Baptism in Abyssinia.—Metaphorical Scripture.—Cornelius.—Christian Baptism was Pouring.—Baptizing of persons naked.—Deaconesses.—Enon.—Υδατα πολλα.—Hebrew Christians.—Syrian Church.—Greek Church.—“Buried in Baptism.”—Baptism as signifying Death and Life.—Primitive Baptistries.—Catacomb at Rome.—Ancient pictorial representations of Baptism.—“Chapel of the Baptistory,” at Rome.

TRUTH should be the object of our most anxious research ; and when recognized, should be most affectionately and fervently embraced. Religious Truth rises in consequence, according to the importance of that branch of the general system with which it is most intimately connected : and what can be more important than Institutions of Eternal Truth, established, enjoined, perpetuated for the edification of the Christian Church at large ? Such are the Gospel Sacraments : two in number, simple in administration. It might have been expected, that professors of the name of Christ, however varying in opinion on certain doctrines, confessedly too profound for human comprehension, would nevertheless have preserved *these*, in their clear, well defined, and unadulterated observance. The history of the Church and the state of religion at this day demonstrate the fallacy of such expectations. Yet the multifarious practices of the various sects, known by history or observation, have rested or have affected to rest on the ground of Scripture authority ; and all appeal to the “Law and the Testimony” in justification of their sentiments and proceed-

ings. Amid all this diversity, Truth is essentially the same ; but is not seldom lost to the ingenuous inquirer, amid the contentions and prejudices of parties. Some dare not seek Truth ; and many dare not acknowledge her when found. Some will not follow where she leads ; and others so far overshoot her unsophisticated determinations, that they do her little or no more honour than the veriest dastards : and if “ *an argument that proves too much proves nothing*,” then it must be confessed that those who transgress by excess, though Truth may support them in part—those who deduce extreme consequences from arguments valid to a certain point only—enfeeble the very doctrines they mean to support, and contribute to render them objects of suspicion, of dislike and denial.

Before we can discuss a theological subject, we must clear away those perversions in which *industrious ignorance* and criminal presumption involve it. The principal of these on the present topic is the following proposition—“ *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 of the Holy Ghost.*”

I answer—the bad *Latin* term, *Immersion*, is a very convenient cover for a very delusive proposition ; especially when used in an unlimited, unfixed, or unqualified sense. By way of shewing what enormities lurk under expressions so vague and indefinite, converted into technical terms, I adduce an instance exactly the same in kind, and nothing worse in degree.

The Jewish rite of circumcision, to which Christian baptism is supposed to bear some analogy, was in fact neither more nor less than a *manufacture* ; for the Apostle, Eph. ii. 11, distinguishes circumcision into *manufactured* and *unmanufactured*. No linguist in the world can translate the Greek original more accurately into a *bad Latin* term ; but this is little less than high treason against the English language, which recognizes the terms, “ *made by hands*,” and “ *not made by hands*,” Col. ii. 11.

Equally fallacious and little less preposterous is the term *Immersion*, used indefinitely. A man is *immersed* who stands on his toes or up to his knees in water ; he also is *immersed*, Baptists say, over whose head the water flows. If the term then be so indeterminate, it were chasing an *ignis fatuus* to follow it, when facts are in question ; it eludes the test of Scripture, reason, and common sense.

Instead therefore, of bewildering ourselves in attempting to

trace the strict use of a *word* notoriously uncertain in its application and import, let us examine the *thing* it should represent. Instead of poring over *bad* Latin, let us endeavour to apply *good* English. Translate the term into our mother tongue. To put under water the whole body, is to *plunge* it.—Now mark the proposition:—“Christian Baptism is neither more nor less than *plunging* the whole body, in the name, &c.” This affords a precise idea, that may easily be examined. Does the original Greek word *baptize*, wherever it occurs in Scripture, denote *plunging*?—Let us try this by applying the term to the leading passages.

Βαπτιω.—In the New Testament the verb *bapto* occurs thrice:—

Luke xvi. 24.—Send Lazarus that he may *dip* the tip of his finger;—that he may **PLUNGE** the TIP of his finger.

John xiii. 20.—He to whom I shall give a sop when I have *dipped* it;—a sop when I have **PLUNGED** it.

Rev. xix. 13.—His name is called the Word of God:—he was clothed in a vesture *dipped* in blood;—clothed in a vesture **PLUNGED** in blood.

Εμβαπτιω.—The compound verb *embapto* is used three times:—

Matthew xxvi. 23.—He that *dippeth* his hand with me in the dish;—he that **PLUNGETH** his hand with me in the dish.

Mark xiv. 20.—One of the twelve that *dippeth* with me in the dish;—one of the twelve that **PLUNGETH** with me in the dish.

John xiii. 26.—He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have *dipped* it; and when he had *dipped* the sop;—he it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have **PLUNGED** it; and when he had **PLUNGED** the sop.

Now, does language tolerate the expression “to *plunge* the tip of a finger?” does Christianity tolerate the notion of our Lord Jesus “wearing a garment *plunged* in blood?” does common decency tolerate the *plunging* of two hands in the same dish, at the same time?

Βαπτισμος.—The noun *baptismos* occurs four times:—

Mark vii. 4, 8.—The *washing* of cups and pots, and of brazen vessels, and tables;—the **PLUNGING** of cups and pots, and of brazen vessels, and tables.

Heb. vi. 2.—The foundation of the doctrine of *baptisms*;—doctrine of **PLUNGINGS**.

Heb. ix. 10.—Services, in meats and drinks, and divers *washings*;—divers **PLUNGINGS**.

These passages imply very different modes of performing that action which the sacred writer calls *baptism*; and their order is favourable to the eliciting of conclusive evidence from their connection and tenor.

Whoever has seen cups and pots washed at a pump, may judge whether *they* were necessarily *plunged*. Whoever considers what cumbersome pieces of furniture these *tables* were—*fifteen* or *twenty* feet long, by *four* feet broad, and about *four* feet high—may judge whether they were *plunged*, after every meal taken upon them. Why does the sacred writer describe the doctrine of *baptisms*, in the plural, as one of the foundations of Christianity, if there were only *one* mode of *baptism*, that by *plunging*? The same writer says expressly, that under the law there were *divers kinds of baptisms*:—and from the law itself, we know that by far the greater part of them were not *plungings*: the word therefore cannot possibly be restricted to that import.

If then the word *baptism* be not restricted in Scripture to that import, but is used in senses distinct from that of *plunging*, in reference to *things*, let us examine its import in reference to *persons*. What think you of the *baptism* by the Holy Ghost? This was not a metaphorical or figurative baptism. It was a real and indisputable subject of the senses seen by John the Baptist, by the Apostles, in company of the hundred and twenty, as is generally thought, and by Peter with his brethren, in the instance of Cornelius; and not less conspicuous than at the Jordan. It was the subject of John Baptist's repeated prediction; Mat. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16: "He shall *baptize* you with the Holy Ghost." It was also the subject of our Lord's repeated prediction; Luke xxiv. 49: "I send the promise of my Father upon you—ye shall be endued with power *from on high*." Acts i. 5: "Ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence."—Acts ii. 2: "And suddenly there *came from heaven*, and APPEARED *unto them* cloven tongues, like as of fire; and it sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." The same occurred in the case of Cornelius: Acts x. 44; for Peter says, "the Holy Ghost *FELL* on them, *as on us at the beginning*." Acts xi. xv: 8: "God....gave them the Holy Ghost, *even as he did unto us*, and put no difference between them and us, purifying their hearts by faith."

Two words are employed to express this similitude; one of which, *ωσπερ*, denotes a strict and exact similitude, likeness, or conformity.

The manner in which this *baptism* was conferred or administered was not only distinct from *plunging*, but it was absolutely INCONSISTENT with that action—*Plunging* was an IMPOSSIBILITY in the administration of this *baptism*.

It is proper to adduce those *synonymous words* which the sacred Spirit has graciously thought fit to employ, for the purpose of fixing the sense of that word which is the immediate subject of investigation. We waive all reference to critics and commentators, however numerous, and however positive. We depend on the New Testament alone—on those writers, under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, who were his instruments in explaining spiritual things by spiritual words.

This test is a sort of *experimentum crucis* to false propositions. It has detected many. Let us try it in the case before us.

Luke xxiv. 49.—Shall *send* the Holy Ghost—FROM ON HIGH.

I saw the Spirit DESCENDING FROM HEAVEN like a dove, and it *abode* upon him ; John i. 32.

'This is what was spoken—I will POUR OUT of my Spirit ; Acts ii. 2.

Jesus having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, has SHED FORTH this which ye now see and hear ; Acts ii. 35.

Suddenly there *came from heaven*, and APPEARED UNTO THEM cloven tongues ; Acts ii. 2, 17.

That they might receive the Holy Ghost ; for as yet he was FALLEN upon none of them ; Acts viii. 16.

Ananias put his hands on Paul, that he might be *filled* with the Holy Ghost ; Acts ix. 17.

God ANOINTED Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost ; Acts x. 38.

Acts x. 44.—The Holy Ghost FELL on all.

Acts xi. 15.—The Holy Ghost FELL on them, even as on us at the beginning.

Acts x. 45.—They of the circumcision were astonished, because on the Gentiles was POURED OUT the Holy Ghost.

Acts xv. 8.—*Giving* them the Holy Ghost, even as unto us.

'Titus iii. 6.—The Holy Ghost ; which he SHED on us abundantly.

1 Peter i. 12.—The Holy Ghost *sent down* from heaven.

Eph. i. 13.—*Sealed* with the Holy Spirit of promise.

These passages give us as synonymous with *baptize* :—

Sending down ; Coming ; Giving ; Falling ; Shedding ;

Pouring; Sitting or Abiding; Anointing; Filling; and Sealing.

In all these synonymous words, there is not *one* that raises the idea of *plunging*, or even approaches to it. Yet they all refer to *baptism*. "The Apostles shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost," is the prediction; the Holy Ghost was *POURED OUT* upon them, is the accomplishment. Even Paul who was then absent speaks of the Holy Ghost as being *SHED* on him; doubtless at his baptism; Acts ix. 17. Perhaps, however, the instance of our Lord is the most complete, of *baptism* by the Holy Ghost; and in that we have the very height of certainty, there was no *plunging*, nor any thing like it: although almost all the synonyms meet in his person;—as *DESCENDING, COMING, FILLING, ANOINTING, SITTING OR ABIDING AND SEALING.*

We are now advanced to the question, "Did *baptism* by water resemble *baptism* by the Holy Ghost?—and in what?" That there must have been *some* resemblance is certain; and the resemblance must have been *striking*; for the Apostle Peter, seeing the Holy Ghost *poured out* on the company at Cornelius's, immediately recollected an allusion to John's *baptism* by water. The Lord said, "John baptized with water; but ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost." If there were no resemblance between the two *baptisms*, how came the Apostle's memory to be refreshed with what he saw? How came he to lay a stress on his recollection, thus raised to exercise? This made so strong an impression on his mind, that he adverts to it a long while afterwards. Acts xv. 8. If it be asked what he *did* see? I answer, he saw the *pouring down* of the Holy Ghost; for this is the *term expressly used in the history.*

Try both these irreconcilable propositions by the substitution of their synonyms. "John *plunges* you in water; but ye shall be *PLUNGED* in the Holy Ghost." Shocking abuse of language, and principle! Try the other: "The Holy Ghost shall be *POURED* upon you, *shed* upon you, *fall* upon you, &c.; as John *pours* water, *sheds* water, *lets fall* water, &c., upon you." What is there offensive in this? What is there contrary to fact? What to decency? What to the analogy of faith? What to the analogy of grammar and language? Even that seemingly inappropriate term, *anointing*, preserves the action though it changes the fluid.

The *baptism* by the Holy Ghost was conferred by the *descending* of the baptismal element. Are there any instances

of the use of the word *baptism* in reference to *water*, which instances also mark the *descending* of the baptismal element? If there are, then *water baptism* must be taken in a sense strictly coincident with *baptism* by the Holy Ghost; or else we render one part of the Word of God repugnant to another.

The first instance is afforded by the Greek translators of Daniel, who inform us that Nebuchadnezzar, in his deranged state, should be *baptized* with the dew of heaven, Daniel iv. 23, 25, 33; and this is repeated, to inform us that he really was *baptized* with the dew of heaven, v. 21, affording so many unquestionable applications of the word *baptize*, to the *descent* of the dew of heaven upon Nebuchadnezzar. The vapours raised into the atmosphere during the heat of the day, descended, shed themselves, *fell down*, during the cooler hours of the evening and night, on the person of the unhappy Babylonian monarch: by these, say the Seventy, he was *baptized*! A clearer instance of *descent* there cannot be.

A New Testament instance is furnished by a passage from an eminent Greek scholar, who, intending to elucidate the subject, remarks that the word *baptism* is used in reference to the Israelites passing *through* the sea, and *under* the cloud. 1 Cor. x. 2. But the Israelites did not pass *through* the sea, if by *sea* he means the *water*; for Moses affirms twice, that they *passed over on dry land*. Exod. xiv. 21, 29. Nehem. iv. 11. If he means to say, they passed *along*, or *across* the bed of the sea, where the waters usually were, though at that time absent, he is right; but what language is this?—to pass *through* dry land! On the other clause of the sentence there can be but one opinion; for if Israel were *under* the cloud, then was the cloud *over* Israel; and if Israel were *baptized* in the cloud, then did *water*, the *baptismal* element, *descend* on the Israelites from above, as the dew had *descended* on Nebuchadnezzar. The word *baptize* maintains the same reference to *descending*, when water is the baptismal element, as it bears when employed to describe the *pouring out*, or *pouring down*, SHEDDING of the Holy Ghost.

In these preparatory remarks, I have adhered to the rule, that EVERY WORD SHOULD BE TAKEN IN ITS PRIMARY, OBVIOUS, AND ORDINARY MEANING, UNLESS THERE BE SOMETHING IN THE CONNECTION OR IN THE NATURE OF THINGS WHICH REQUIRES IT TO BE TAKEN OTHERWISE.

When the Pharisee saw that our Lord went to dinner *without* BAPTISM, Luke xi. 38, is it possible that he could expect our

Lord should PLUNGE *himself* before dinner? But to see the real force of this word in this instance, we must recollect that the feet were washed, as a customary compliment, by pouring water upon them, Luke vii. 44; and the hands also. So we read of Elisha's "pouring water upon the hands of Elijah." 2 Kings iii. 11.

If it is asked whether the word *baptize*, as used by the Greek translators of the Old Testament, necessarily implies PLUNGING, let the use of it in the instance of the passage of the Jordan by the Israelites, Josh. iii. 15, 17, be considered; a history that affords great illustration of the passage of the Red Sea by Israel under Moses. "As they who bare the Ark of the Lord were come unto Jordan, and the feet of the priests that bare the Ark were *baptized*, say the LXX, MOISTENED, *damped*, *wetted*, *dipped* in the smallest possible quantity of water, the very *reverse of plunging*, the water recoiled, and stood on a heap." The feet of the priests were rather *at* than *in* the water: rather at the *brim* of the bank that confined the water, than *immersed* in the water itself. This our translators have properly expressed. All Israel passed over on dry ground, as at the Red Sea.

The bird that was to be let fly away at the cleansing of the leper, Lev. xvi. 6, was to be BAPTIZED, *dipped*, in the blood of the bird that was killed: but no bird could yield blood enough to admit the PLUNGING of the living bird; of cedar wood, scarlet, wool and hyssop, which also were to be *dipped*. The word *baptize* is never used in the LXX in the sense of PLUNGING; nor is it so understood by our translators, except in one instance, Job ix. 31, for the sake of a strength of expression.

בִּטְבַּל—The Hebrew term, rendered *baptize*, expresses not only in the Old Testament, but in *Talmudical* Hebrew, ablution, immersion, washing, &c. But to Gospel *baptism* this can have had no reference; though it PRECEDED that ordinance; as in the instance of Naaman, 2 Kings, v. 14, the allusions to the custom in the Psalms of David and other passages in the Old Testament. That it was continued afterwards, appears not only from the united, unequivocal, and uniform testimonies of the best informed and most inquisitive Jewish Rabbis; but also John iii. 25, from the questions agitated between certain Jews and the disciples of John, about ritual purification.

CORRESPONDING TERMS.—Whoever translates from a foreign language, most solicitously should select corresponding

terms in the language into which he translates. He should not adopt several terms having distinct ideas in his own language, to express one idea of his original; and he should be most anxiously cautious not to combine them, or so to employ them as if they were synonymous, that his ordinary readers must misapprehend them. If the foreign term be of extensive import, a caution should mark in what sense it is used, lest the writer should subject himself to unpleasant imputations. For instance, says some perverse sophist:—

“The term *Baptism* imports *drowning*.” He quotes from Josephus—“The ship of Jonah was about to be *baptized*”—sunk, or *overwhelmed*. The death of Aristobulus—“Enticed in the water to swim, and then, under pretence of play, *baptized* him”—he was *drowned*. “The young man being *immersed* in a fish-pond, he came to his end.” Josephus’s “own ship being *baptized*”—wrecked. “The Dolphin, vexed at the Ape’s falsehood, *immersing* him, killed him,” by plunging him into the water. 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 again when *sinking*, *baptizonta*, that he should never rise again.”

Baptists, when writing on the subject, thus begin their statements—“BAPTISM, from the Greek word *Baptizo*, of *Bapto*, I dip or plunge;” “to dip, plunge, or immerse:” to these three words are added, *imbued*, *drenched* or *soaked*, and *overwhelmed*. Are all these English terms synonymous? Have the words *dip*, *plunge*, *immerse*, *imbue*, *drench*, *soak*, *overwhelm*, the same meaning, in our language, to say nothing of *sinking* and *drowning*? If it be true, that either or all of these words fairly express the sense of the Greek word *baptize*, then the Baptists’ cause is resigned to its adversaries.

Let us interchange some of these synonyms. I content myself with *plunge* and *dip*. The instances shall be taken from the New Testament.—Luke xvi. 24: “Send Lazarus, that he may *plunge* the tip of his finger in water.” *Plunge* the extreme TIP of his finger! The ideas are irreconcilable: the phrase is ludicrous: the thing is impossible! Matthew xxii. 3; Mark xiv. 20: “Judas who *plunges* his hand *with me* in the dish.” What! two hands *plunged* into the same dish at the same instant! Rev. xix. 13: “The person called the Word of God was clothed in a vesture *plunged* in blood.” The context shows that the writer had in his mind the effect of grapes trodden in a wine-press; does the man who treads

grapes in a wine-press *plunge* his clothes in their juice? Surely not; for the treaders held supports in their hands, to avoid that *plunging*.

To these passages may be added another, 1 Corinthians x. 2; "our fathers were baptized, *plunged* in the sea." But Moses says, Exod. xiv., "The children of Israel shall go on dry ground through the sea; the children of Israel walked on dry land in the midst of the sea." Isaiah also, xi. 15, sanctions this by allusion, when he speaks of men passing the sea *dry-shod*. How then were the Israelites *baptized*, in the sense of being *plunged*? By what means, while this is maintained, shall we reconcile these inspired writers? Moreover, if full-grown men were really *plunged* in the sea, what became of children not half their height? *They* must have been "*baptized* unto Moses" in the sense of *drowning*.

Hence, I infer that we should be cautious not to err by stating even truth in extreme terms—because it is not safe to say, either that Baptism always includes *drowning*, or *plunging*; or that "*Bapto* means *I dip or plunge*," without explaining the distinction between those terms in the English language, and marking in what places they occur in the sense proper to each term. Were this correctly practised, it would contribute essentially to the promotion of Christian charity.

Therefore, as it is impossible to reduce the Greek word *Baptism* to *one* signification, so it is impossible to reduce it in translation to *one* English term, and to intend by that term, *one* action only in one form. But if we use several terms, it is our bounden duty to ascertain the meaning of those terms, to understand them fully, and to state clearly their distinctions and differences. Inasmuch as our language affords more than one term to express various circumstances or modes of the same action, we should endeavour correctly to understand those terms.

Dipping imports precisely a *partial* plunging:—when a person *dips* into a book, we infer his *slight* acquaintance with its contents. Swallows *dip* into a pond, but we never see them *plunge*. To add no more, it would be nonsense to call the "*dipping* needle," by the term "*plunging* needle."

The inference is undeniable, that to *plunge* and to *dip* are not equivalent terms;—and our purpose now is to point out distinctions equally strong between the terms *plunging* and *overwhelming*; by both of which the original word *Baptism* has been rendered.

Overwhelm is a compound term. When resolved into its

component parts, it divides into *whelm* and *over* : and each of them demands attention.

To *whelm* is to throw upon a subject, whether person or thing, or over that person or thing : or to throw upon or at a person or thing, what may fall upon him or it ; whether he or it be covered therewith or not. It is not to throw a person down into the mire ; but to throw mire at or against the person. We find it used in this sense by Spenser :

They by commandment of Diana there,
Her WHELM'D *with* STONES ;

They did not throw her *at* the stones, nor throw her *upon* or *against* the stones ; but they threw the stones *at* her, *against* her, *upon* her ; and these stones WHELMED her.—Stones thrown at a person may strike the legs, or the back, or elsewhere.

If there be any truth in language, any accuracy in the principles on which our language is constructed, the term *over* implies *upper*, *above*, a *higher* station or place ; so we say, *overhead*, *overtop*, *overshade*, *overflow*, *overlay*, *overarch*, &c. Matters falling from above, on a person or thing, *OVERwhelm* him or it. Here then, we perceive an essential difference from the notion of *plunging*. If a person be plunged into water, the water is *below* him ; he *descends* into the water, he is *lowered* into it ; he is *UNDERwhelmed*?—If a person be *OVER-whelmed* with water, the water is *above* him : it descends on him from a height. A person plunged into water *approaches*, or is brought to that water : when a person is overwhelmed with water, the water *approaches*, or is brought to him. The actions are the reverse of each other, and are also incompatible. Snow may *overwhelm* a person ; but he cannot be *plunged* into snow. He may be *overwhelmed* with sand falling on him ; but he cannot be *plunged* into sand. He may be *overwhelmed* with gravel or stones ; but he cannot be *plunged* into gravel or into stones. He may be *overwhelmed* with earth falling down and covering him ; but he cannot be *plunged* into earth. As one of these actions is possible, and the other impossible, they cannot be the same. How then, can the terms of language by which they are described be synonymous ? To use them synonymously deludes the unwary. It leads the confiding reader to admit as true, what is false in fact. It conjures up a kind of shadow in place of

real argument, which is the thing wanted. Wherefore it is the duty of those who know better, to detect such fallacies; and to separate and arrange the passages which have been passed by indiscriminately, without having accurate ideas affixed to them.

Thus the distinctions which exist in the use of the terms in the English language enable us properly to arrange the instances of the term *Baptism* in "the Scripture of Truth." Whence we infer, that if the Baptists employ the words "*dip, overwhelm, plunge, soak,*" &c., as synonymous, they mislead themselves and their readers: but as they use those words correctly in *different* senses, and according to their true, distinct, and individual import in other cases; where do they find their warrant for annexing to the term a single sense exclusively, that of *plunging*, when it is applied to the mode of administering the ordinance of Christian Baptism?

The following examples are cited by the Baptists as their strongest demonstrations from the Pagan authors, in favour of their exclusive interpretation, that the Greek *βαπτιω*, and *βαπτισμος* mean only putting under water; and that they express in English terms, as synonymous, to *dip*, to *overwhelm*, to *plunge*, and to *soak*, with similar words. A few remarks are interspersed, to show that the evidence is either totally irrelevant, or altogether defective, or that the instances adduced directly confute their own fundamental proposition.

I. BAPTISM IN THE SENSE OF PLUNGING ;

MEANING THE WHOLE AND ENTIRE

SUBMERSION

OF THE

PERSON OR THING BAPTIZED, UNDER WATER.

1. Josephus says, concerning the ship in which Jonah attempted to flee from the presence of the Lord, "The ship was about to be baptized, *βαπτισθησθαι*, sunk or overwhelmed." Antiq. Lib. ix. C. x.

2. Josephus 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, βαπτίζοντες ουκ ανηκαν εως και καρτα-
 πασιν αποπνιξαι, baptizing, immersing, or putting him under water, they did not leave off until they had quite suffocated him. Jewish Antiq. Book xv.

3. 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."

4. Josephus, in his Life, speaking of his own voyage to Rome, and providential deliverance when shipwrecked, says ; —"βαπτισθεντος γαρ ημων τον πλοιον, for our own ship being baptized, or overwhelmed in the midst of the Adriatic Gulf, we being about the number of 600 persons, swam all night, and at daybreak about 80 were taken up by another ship."

5. Speaking of the sons of Herod, he says, "This, as the last storm, επιβαπτισεν, *epibaptized*, or *utterly overwhelmed*, the young men, already weather-beaten."

6. When the inhabitants of Jotapata urged him to stay there, they pressed him not "to leave his friends, nor 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*, επιβαπτισειν, no one daring to oppose its enemies, if he, who kept their courage up, should depart."

7. Esop's Fables; The Ape and the Dolphin.—"the dolphin vexed at such a falsehood, βαπτιζων αυτον απεκτεινεν, *immersing* him, killed him," by plunging him into the water. Let any child judge what the word means here.

8. "Platting a garland once, I found Cupid among the roses. Taking hold of him by the wings, Εβαπτισεις τον οινον, I *immersed* him, or *plunged* him into wine, and drank him up with it." Melancthon's Anacreon.

9. Polybius, speaking of a sea-fight between the Carthaginians and the Romans, says ; "They *immersed* or *sunk*, εβαπτιζον, many of the vessels of the Romans."

10. Gregory Nazianzen.—"That we may not be *immersed* or *sunk* with the ship and the crew ;" βαπτισθομεν.

11. Dion Cassius.—"How would not his ship be *immersed* or *sunk*, βαπτισθειη, by the multitude of our rowers ?" Book 1. § 18.

12. "They were *immersed*, εβαπτιζοντο, their ships being bored through."

13. Diodorus Siculus.—“της δεινως βυθισθεισης,” in the Text, “whose ship being sunk.” In the Note, “βαπτισθεισης, being *immersed* is the Coislinian reading, which is sufficiently elegant.” Polybius, Lib. xi. § 15.

14. 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*, βαπτιζοντα, that he should never rise again.”

It must be observed that not one of those instances is from Scripture: therefore, Scripture never uses the term *Baptism*, in the sense of *plunging*; for then it would have been discovered and quoted.

As it is not denied that *PLUNGING* is one sense of the term *Baptism*, there is no need to add a word on this division of the subject.

II. BAPTISM IN THE SENSE OF DIPPING;

MEANING THE PARTIAL COVERING, OR

IMMERSION

OF THE

PERSON OR THING, IN WATER.

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

2. Lev. iv. 6.—The priest shall *dip* his finger in the blood, and sprinkle it; βαψει—και προσθαρει.

3. Lev. iv. 17.—The priest shall *dip* his finger.

4. Lev. ix. 9.—He *dip*t his finger in the blood.

5. Lev. xi. 32.—Every vessel, &c., it must be *put into* water; εις υδωρ βαθησεται.

6. Lev. xiv. 6.—He shall *dip* them, and the living bird, in the blood of the bird.

7. Lev. xiv. 16.—He shall *dip* his right finger in the oil.

8. Lev. xiv. 51.—He shall *dip* the cedar, hyssop, scarlet, and the living bird.

9. Num. xix. 18.—A clean person shall take hyssop, and *dip*, βαψει, in the water, and sprinkle, a very different word, περιούρην, upon the tent.

10. Deut. xxxiii. 24.—Let Asher *dip* his foot in oil.

11. Josh. iii. 15.—The feet of the priests were *dipped* in the brim of the water.

12. Ruth ii. 14.—*Dip* thy morsel in the vinegar.

13. 1 Sam. xiv. 27.—Jonathan *dipped* the end of his rod in a honeycomb.

14. 2 Kings viii. 15.—Hazaël *dip*t a cloth in water.

15. Job ix. 31.—Yet thou shalt *plunge* me in the ditch.

16. Psa. lxxviii. 23.—Thy foot may be *dipped* in blood and the tongue of thy dogs in the same.

All these places clearly refer to *partial* immersion or *dipping*; the passage in Job not excepted: for the import of that passage is not, “that a righteous person should be entirely plunged over head and ears into mire and dirt”—but “that his imperfections and failures would prove so many stains on his character: like the defiled condition of a person who has fallen into a *ditch* of shallow muddy water.”

17. Luke xvi. 24.—That Lazarus may *bapt*, or *dip*, his finger.

18. John xiii. 26.—He to whom I *bapt*ing the sop—no doubt, *dipping*.

19. Rev. xix. 13.—Clothed with a vesture *bapted* in blood, *dipped* in it.

20. Matthew xxvi. 23; Mark xiv. 28.—He that *inbapt*s, *dips*, his hand with me in the dish.

21. John xiii. 26.—*Inbapt*ing or *dipping* the sop.

22. Homer.—As when a smith, to harden an iron hatchet or pole-axe, βαπτει, *dips* it in cold water.—*Odyssey* ix. line 392.

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

No child can plunge, from end to end, a sword into a viper's bowels: the handle at least must be excepted. A viper is but a slender creature, neither thick nor broad; and cannot contain a sword.

24. Euripides.—Go take the water-pot, and βαψασο, *dip* in the sea. *Hecuba*, Act iii. ver. 609.

25. Theocritus.—Every morning my servant βαψαε, *shall dip* me a cup of honey. *Idyllium* v. ver. 126.

26. The boy let down a capacious pitcher, making haste βαψαι, *to dip* it. *Idyllium* xiii. ver 47. No servant would think of *plunging*, *submerging*, a cup in a honey-pot. Good honey does not allow of it. Who has not drawn water in a pitcher, without *submerging*, or *plunging* the whole of the vessel?

27. Dionysius Halicarnensis. — 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. It is completely impossible that a spear of the shortest kind, fourteen feet long, or of any length entitling it to the name of a spear, should be *plunged*, thrust from end to end, in a man's belly. Some spears were twenty-five feet in length.

28. 2 Kings v. 14.—Naaman *dipped*, or baptized, himself in Jordan seven times.

29. An old verse has often been quoted from Plutarch—*Ασκος βαπτιζη, δυναι δε τοι ουθεμις εσι*—The bladder may be *dipped*, but never drowned; or it may be immersed, but it cannot be kept under water.

30. Basil, the Christian Father, speaks of “suffering with those that were *immersed* or plunged in the sea,” βαπτιζομενοις.

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

32. Polybius, III. c. 72, quoted by Livy, Book xxi.—“The infantry crossed it with difficulty, baptized, or *immersed* up to their breasts.”

33. 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,” βαπτιζεται μεχρι κεφαλης.

34. Strabo uses, “μεχρι ουφαλου βαπτιζομενων—*Immersed* up to the middle.”

35. Diodorus Siculus. — “Many land animals, carried away by the river Nile, being *immersed*, are destroyed: others escape, fleeing to higher places.” Ships may be run ashore in a river, without being entirely sunk under water. But how can it be said, that the cases 32, 33, and 34, support the notion, that *plunging* is the *inherent* and *only* sense of the word *Baptism*? Is a man in water up to his waist, *plunged*? So directly is it the contrary, that any eye-witness of only common sense, would think him only *partially* immersed, and no more; for all the upper parts of his person are above the water, consequently he cannot be *plunged*. *Immersed up to the breast, up to the head*, afford the same remark. Had Porphyry said, “*over the head*,” the passage had been to the purpose.

36. Strabo.—“The lakes near Agrigentum have 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, ix.

37. Strabo 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. xiii.

38. Strabo 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. In these passages the sense is clear; *partial* plunging is the writer's idea.

39. 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 βαπτισθηναι. Book xxxvii. § 57.

40. Diodorus Siculus.—"Most of the land animals, if they are intercepted by the river, are destroyed, being *immersed*," βαπτιζομενα. Lib. 1. § 36.

41. Diodorus Siculus.—"The river being borne on with a more violent stream, πολλους εβαπτισε, *immersed*, or *overwhelmed* many." Lib. xvi. § 30.

42. 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.

Boats which are *plunged* into a lake are sunk. Not so those which are *immersed* or partially plunged, as we see every day. Now if these were not sunk, neither were their owners *plunged*; for the same word applies to both boats and men.

43. *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.

44. 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. The *handle* must be excepted in both these cases.

III. BAPTISM IN THE SENSE OF OVERWHELMING ;

MEANING THE WATER, OR OVERWHELMING MATTER,

BROUGHT ON THE PERSON.

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

2. Luke xii. 50. “ I have a baptism wherewith to be baptized ;” which Campbell renders, “ I have an immersion to undergo.” “ Are ye able to suffer such sufferings as will be *brought on me?*”

3. In the Wars of the Jews, Josephus says ; “ Many of the noble Jews, as though the city was on the point of being *overwhelmed*, βαπτιζομενης, swam away, as it were, from the city”—*overwhelmed* by the miseries about to befall the city.

4. Josephus, also speaking of the Heads of the Robbers getting into Jerusalem, says ; “ These very men, besides the seditions they made, *baptized* the city, εβαπτισαν την πολιν, *overwhelmed* it, *plunged* it into ruin, or were the cause of its utter destruction.”—They brought *upon* the city utter destruction.

5. Josephus, speaking of the sons of Herod, says, “ This, as the last storm, ελιβαπτισεν, *epibaptized*, or *overwhelmed* the young men, already weather-beaten.”

6. Plutarch uses this word figuratively ; speaking of Otho’s “ being *immersed*, or *overwhelmed*, or *sunk*, βεβαπτισμενος, in debts of fifty millions of drachmæ.”—Having *brought on himself* great debts.

7. Plato speaks of his “ knowing the youth to be “ *overwhelmed* or *immersed* in sophistry.”—Having habituated himself, *brought on himself* the habit of sophistry.

8. Plato.—“ These from above *immersing*, βαπτιζοντες, or sinking the ships with stones and engines ;” Book i, § 32—“ *overwhelming* them with stones.” These stones are expressly said to come *from above*.

9. Plato.—τους δε ιδιωτας ου βαπτιζουσι ταις εισφοραις.—But the common people they do not *overwhelm* with taxes. Lib. 1, § 67. They do not *bring* or lay upon the common people enormous taxes.

10. Plato.—“Perceiving that he was altogether abandoned to grief, and *overwhelmed* or *immersed* in calamity,” *τη συμφορα βεβαπτισμενον*. Lib. ii. Cap. 3. Calamity was *brought over* or *upon* him.”

11. Plato.—“Since the things you met with have *overwhelmed* you,” *εβαπτιζεν*. *Casus tui obruebant ac demergebant*.” Lib v. Cap. xvi.

12. 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. Nothing can be clearer than that these lands are not *plunged*. Neither can there be a clearer instance of *overwhelming*—for the water advances to the lands when the tide flows; and when the tide is at the full they are *overwhelmed*; or as the Baptists assert, they are *covered over* with water; undoubtedly not by their sinking *under* the water, as is the case in *plunging*, but because it *poured itself* over them.

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

This may mean a person “disguised in liquor;” as the ancient comedians *baptized* their faces to disguise them. I rather think it may be referred to another head: “I was stained, discoloured, being a very different man from what I am when sober.”

IV. BAPTISM IN THE SENSE OF STAINING;

MEANING A

DIFFERENT COLOUR PUT UPON A THING,

FROM WHAT IT HAD BEFORE.

1. Ezek. xxiii. 15.—“*Dyed* attire upon their heads.”

2. Plato uses the word several times in one paragraph.—*Οι βαφεις επιδαν βουληθωσι βαψαι ερια;* The *Dyers*, when they are minded to *dip* wool: *ουτω δε βαπτιουσι*, and so they dip it.” *De Republica*, Book iv.

3. Marcus Antoninus.—“A conqueror in that noble strife of mastering the passions, *βεβαμμενον*, *immersed* entirely in justice—*penitus justitia inbutum*.” Lib. iii.

4. Marcus Antoninus.—“The mind *βαπτεται*, *is imbued* by the thoughts; *βαπτε*, *dip* or *imbue* it therefore in the constant meditation of such thoughts.” Lib. v.

5. Isa. xxi. 4. The clause rendered in the English translation, *fearfulness affrighted me*, is in the LXX, *Iniquity baptizes me, overwhelms me*.

6. Aristophanes in Plato says: “I am one of those *baptized* yesterday;” meaning, who drank much, or as an Englishman would say, who had well soaked ourselves, or were *immersed* in wine.

7. An instance has been quoted from Homer’s *Βατραχομομαχια*, or Battle of the Frogs and Mice, where it is said of the death of the frog Crambophagus,

εβαπτετο δαιματι 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.

These passages contain a proper and a metaphorical use of the word *Baptize*: but in all it imports *to put another colour on a thing*, by whatever action.—In Ezekiel, xxiii. 15: the probability is, that it means *striped* turbans of more than one colour; as *blue* and white. In Plato it means also *to stain*, but a dyer would think wool very indifferently dyed that was only *plunged*.

On the use of the word *Baptize* by Marcus Antoninus, I transcribe a note.* Xylander renders, “thou shalt not *tinge*,

* VI. 30. Μη βαφῆς, *ne mergaris et obruaris*, Xyl. imo, *ne tingaris, ne inficiaris*: ne mores aulici genuinum animi candorem obfuscent, quod *inquinamentum combibere* Septimius dixit *de Spectac.* C. 14.

ὡς δτε τις τ' ἐλεφαντα γυνῆ φοίνικι μένη,
ut Homerus loquitur *Il.* δ. 141. i. ut Maro *Æn.* xii.

Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro

Si quis ebur—

quod nos diceremus, “that you be not stained:” nam quod Græci *μυίνειν* et *βάπτειν*, nos dicimus, “to stain.”—*Classical Journal*, No. 23.

dye, or change the colour of—and what the Greeks expressed by *Baptein*, observes the author, we express by “*to stain*.”—In the continuation, *Baphe* is used in connection with the words importing *discoloration*, a communicated *tincture*; as when ivory is *dyed*, green or red: also with other words, importing what the Greeks called *corruption* of colours, meaning that when a painter having several colours on his palette, mixes two or more of them together, they *adulterate, corrupt, baptize* each other, by changing each other’s tint, thereby making a compound tint, different from either of the original tints. This is called in modern language, “*breaking of colours*, and is one of the grand arts of painters.

Marcus Antoninus uses the word *Baptize*, both in a good and in a bad sense. A mind imbued with justice is *improved*, as dyed ivory acquires a more splendid colour: but a mind that *stains, pollutes* itself in its own *phantasies* or wandering imaginations, is *discoloured*, deteriorated by mixture, and is the worse for such *baptism*; it is no longer itself. This perhaps elicits the origin of that seemingly strange and erroneous version of the LXX hitherto found unaccountable. “*Iniquity baptizes me; it terrifies me so, that I am beside myself*.” My mind is alienated, changed from what it was; corrupted by the force of terror: which is coincident with the sense of our English version, Isaiah xxi. 4; “*Fearfulness, rather the cause of fearfulness, affrighteth me*.”

Aristophanes in Plato, in the sixth quotation, may refer to a person no longer himself, through alienation of mind, by the force of liquor. It is certain that *Bapsei* is used in association with *pthoras*, and to the same effect: now *diaphthora, diaphthareises, kataphthora*, all from the same root, express the condition of a man—“*deprived of his reason in consequence of intoxication;*” *in confusion and perturbation of mind*. If then these words are employed in conjunction and conformity with *Bapsai*, used metaphorically to express corruption, discoloration of mind; why may not *Bapsai*, equally with them, also import perturbation of mind, whether from intoxication or from terror?—What now becomes of *plunging*? Is that the *only* way in which a person may prove “*beside himself*?”

V. BAPTISM IN THE SENSE OF POURING ;

MEANING THE

DESCENT OR AFFUSION

OF A

CONSIDERABLE QUANTITY OF WATER.

As I have elsewhere explained the nature of Baptism by *pouring*, especially by the affusion of the Holy Ghost, I shall merely allot a few words to the texts alluded to by the Baptists.

1. Judith xii. 7. "She *washed*, bathed or immersed herself in a fountain, *εβαπτίζετο*." The indecency of this rendering is enormous, if taken in the sense of *plunging*!! When it is said, "She went out, and was *baptized* at the spring of water that was *in the camp*;" can we possibly suppose, that she was *plunged* into the supply of water for an army of two hundred thousand men? Would *they* have suffered it, who were to drink the water after her ablution? Would *she* endure it, whose scheme demanded the closest privacy, for three or four days only, and would have been totally ruined by such immodesty?

The notion can have originated only in total ignorance of the country; for D'Ohsson says expressly, speaking of the women's baths in the East—"They *scarcely ever immerse their bodies in water*: the large marble urns which are in the form of bathing-tubs are for invalids. The strictest decency is observed." Now if where every thing is prepared and all conveniences are at hand for the purpose, the women *scarcely ever immerse their bodies in water*, how can we suppose that Judith would be *plunged* in an open fountain, in the midst of a camp of soldiers?

Denon, describing a bath of the men in Egypt, says, "The bather . . is *INUNDATED* with water"—*PLUNGING*! or at least *immersion*! but the next words dissipate the delusion—"which the attendants take out with a *small basin*, and *POUR* over his body." But we cannot suppose that Judith was *baptized* in this exposed manner, or that water was poured over her whole body at the spring of water *in the camp*.

That Judith performed her ablutions by having water *poured* on her hands is sufficiently credible. The manner of which service is thus:—"A copper vessel is placed before the person, sitting on a piece of red cloth, to prevent the carpet or mat from being wet: a servant kneeling on the ground, pours out water for his master; another holds a cloth destined for those purifications. The person begins by baring his arm as far as the elbow, then washes his hands, mouth, nostrils, face, arms," &c.—*D'Ohsson*.

This is exactly what the Pharisees expected from our Lord. They wondered that he had not been *baptized* before dinner; that he had not had water *poured* on his hands, for the purpose of purification. Thus Elisha poured water on the hands of Elijah; in other words, he *baptized* him.

The remark applies also to other passages and facts of Scripture.

2. With respect to the Pharisees wondering that our Lord had not bathed before dinner; see Campbell on John xiii. 10.

3. 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 unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea. It would have been madness to follow him into such a situation, had they not been assured of his divine mission. Exod. xiv. 19; xv. 8. The water *pouring* from the cloud *baptized* the Israelites.

4. Mark vii. 4. The Immersion of cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables. Refer to Gill on that place.

5. Mark vii. 8. The tradition of men, as the immersion of pots and cups. Cups, pots, and tables were *baptized* then as they are now, by having water *poured* upon them. The term "*tradition of men*" refers to some established order and ceremony in the ablutions. It still exists in the East.

6. Describing the purification of the people at Sin, Josephus says; "when persons were defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes into spring water with hyssop, and βαπτισαντες, baptizing, *dipping* or *immersing* part of these ashes into it, ερραινον, they sprinkled them with it." Lib. iv. C. iv. § 6. This quotation, say the Baptists, clearly shows the difference between baptizing or dipping, and rhanizing or sprinkling.

I maintain the contrary. Does Josephus really say, "they immerse those ashes into the water?"—Then his order of the rite contradicts the express directions of his master Moses, who enjoins that they pour the water to *the ashes*: "They

shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer, and running water shall be put *THERETO*, in a vessel." Numb. xix. 17. The ashes were *baptized* by the water put *to* them.

7. One passage is produced from Origen, on which more stress is laid than on all others, in which he speaks of the wood of Elijah's sacrifice as being *baptized*, though the wood was certainly not *dipped* in water, but four barrels of water were *poured* upon it three times over. 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 English, might he not have used the word *immerse* with propriety, and without rendering its usual meaning ambiguous? Would not our opponents think such a three-fold soaking as bad as even a "trine immersion?"

Any child may detect this silly evasion. The question is this: "By what *ACTION* were those faggots soaked?" They answer: "The *quantity of water* was great."

Origen was speaking of John's *baptism*, and considering him as the Elias who was to come, he says: "How came you to think that Elias, when he should come, would *baptize*? who did not in Ahab's time, *baptize* the wood upon the altar, but ordered the priests to do that. Not only once, says he, but *do it a second time*, and they did it the second time. He therefore, who did not himself *baptize*, but assigned the work to others," &c. The comparison shows, that as water was *poured* on the wood by order of Elijah; so John the Baptist *poured* water on the people who received his Baptism. Elijah ordered it to be done by others: whereas John poured the water himself.

VI. BAPTISM IN THE SENSE OF SPRINKLING;

MEANING THE

DESCENT OR AFFUSION

OF A

SMALL QUANTITY OF WATER,

OFTEN BY WAY OF

RITUAL OBSERVANCE ONLY.

1. Nebuchadnezzar *wet* with the dew of heaven. Daniel iv. 33; and v. 21.

That the dew of heaven *descended* on Nebuchadnezzar is as clear, as that it ever descended on any grass of any meadow under heaven. Who has not read of “dew-besprinkled grass?” Such is the progress or action of dew. As to the *quantity* of dew that then descended at Babylon, it is not *now* remarkable; for if it were so, no doubt but Mr. Rich would have noticed it. He mentions gardens and cultivation at Babylon; but says nothing of dews. Memoir on the Ruins of Babylon.

2. Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25. “He that *washeth* himself from a dead body. He was to bathe himself in water. Num. xix. 19; *βαπτίζομενος απο νεκρου.*”

Moses gives these directions: Numbers xix. 11, 20.—“He that toucheth the dead body of any man, he shall be unclean seven days. He shall purify himself with it, the ashes of the heifer, on the *third day*, and on the *seventh day*: so shall he be clean; but if he purify not himself *on the third day*, then on the seventh day he shall not be clean. Whosoever toucheth the body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, on the third day, and on the seventh day, he defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be *cut off from Israel*, because *the water of separation* was NOT SPRINKLED *upon him*: he shall be *unclean*: HIS UNCLEANNESS IS YET UPON HIM.....And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel: and a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon *the tent*, and upon *ALL the vessels*, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave. And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean *on the third day*, and *on the seventh day*; and on the seventh day he, the unclean person, shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even. But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation: because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord;—the WATER OF SEPARATION *hath not been sprinkled* upon him: HE IS UNCLEAN.”

Nothing can be clearer than that this service divides into two parts. The *first* performed by the unclean person himself. He was to wash himself, and to bathe himself thoroughly in water: and *secondly*, a clean person, it is not said *priest* or *Levite*, but a clean person, shall sprinkle on the unclean the water of separation. Until the very moment that the water of separation is sprinkled upon him, he is UNCLEAN. He

may wash himself times without number, in any imaginable profusion of water, all goes for nothing. He is UNCLEAN till the ashes of the heifer sprinkle his *flesh*. The virtue of effectual purification resides in them ONLY. Let us examine the comparison intended by the writer of the Ecclesiasticus.

“A man who fasteth for his sins, and goeth again and doeth the same:—who will hear his prayer? or what doth his humbling profit him? So he who has been *baptized* from a dead body, and again toucheth it, of what use is HIS *washing*?”

The word “washing” must mean his washing of himself: for nobody else *washed* him. The word *baptism* cannot mean this washing; for baptism was performed by another person, a clean person; not by himself. It therefore is not the same action.

The words *baptism* and *washing* are obviously set in contradistinction, expressing the different parts of the rite. A man was not clean by washing himself. Moses takes special care to repeat three or four times, that he is UNCLEAN upon whom the *sprinkling* had not passed on the third day, as well as on the seventh. This is confirmed by the Apostle; Heb. ix. 13; who calls the person UNCLEAN, that was not yet *sprinkled* by the ashes of the heifer. Now the comparison employed by the writer of the Ecclesiasticus demands, that the person be in some sense CLEAN, how else could his renewing the cause of his uncleanness renew his unclean state?—How could he be compared to a relapsed penitent?

It is obvious, that if the person who had been *baptized* on the third day should on the fourth day again touch a dead body, he would not be clean on the seventh day, how scrupulously soever he might wash and bathe himself.

This is confirmed beyond denial by the language in the Epistle to the Hebrews, who certainly understood the rituals of their country. There were divers kinds of baptisms, says the Apostle; Heb. ix. 10; and he specifies two of these kinds—baptism by blood; and baptism by water. Of these he selects *three* rites: and what is beyond measure extraordinary on the hypothesis of the Baptists; ALL THOSE THREE RITES ARE SPRINKLINGS.

I know no other occasion on which the bloods of bulls and of goats were used together, as they were combined on the great day of Expiations. What were the directions for that day’s service? Leviticus xvi. 14, 15;—“Aaron shall take of the blood of the bullock, and SPRINKLE *it with his finger*

upon the mercy seat eastward: and before the mercy seat shall he SPRINKLE of the blood *with his finger* seven times."

"Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and SPRINKLE it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat."

The Apostle's allusion is to this service; Hebrews ix. 6, 14; for his theme is the Mosaic Tabernacle. He says, "the priests went into the *first* or outer tabernacle daily: but into the second apartment, went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people—a figure for the time then present, in which were offered gifts and sacrifices, meats and drinks, and divers kinds of *baptisms*:—the blood of bulls, and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer SPRINKLING the unclean."

There is nothing in the Apostle's discourse to which it is possible to refer this blood of bulls and of goats, except to the great day of Expiation.

There is no action to which those *sprinklings* of blood, called *baptisms*, can be referred, but to the *sprinklings* by Aaron.

Thus the writer of the Ecclesiasticus is not singular in describing the action of *sprinkling* under the term *baptism*.

Now we are prepared to understand the true reference of the Apostle's words: Hebrews vi. 1, 2; "Leaving first principles, let us go on unto perfection: not laying again the foundation of *the doctrine of BAPTISMS*, and of laying on of hands."

"The doctrine of *Jewish baptisms*," say some;—but the Baptists would not choose that *Jewish baptisms* should become the *foundation* of *Christian doctrine*. "The baptism by water, and that by the Holy Ghost," say most;—but this cannot be. What *doctrine* was connected with the *gift* of the Holy Ghost? Was this GIFT imparted to all? to women?—We do not even know in what it consisted: and if it be alluded to in this passage, it is included in the subsequent term "laying on of hands," which ceremony always *preceded* it.*

* The present Abyssinian method of baptism elucidates the subject contained in the phrase "the *doctrine of BAPTISMS*"—for in what does the baptism of the Mussulman Boy, narrated by Mr. Salt, p. 144, essentially differ, from the ancient mode of Jewish baptism. First, the person rendered unclean by touching the dead body was to wash and bathe himself, thoroughly in water. Thus the convert from Mohammedism, spoken of by Mr. Salt, was "*washed all over very carefully in*

But the *baptisms* concerning which *doctrine* was delivered to converts were these; the *washing* of the person, signifying death unto sin; and the *pouring* of water, signifying consecration unto a renewed life. These lay at the *foundation* of Christianity. They were *first principles* of the doctrine of Christ. These it was necessary to learn and to practice; but it was injurious to rest satisfied only with acquaintance with them. Neither is it possible, unless the plural baptisms here mentioned coalesced into *ONE rite*, to vindicate the accuracy of the apostle, who says Eph. iv. 5; "one Lord, one Faith, *ONE BAPTISM.*"

Thus John the Baptist might easily baptize a thousand persons in succession; but he required several streams, in which many might be bathing themselves or others, at the same time; to whom as they approached him he administered Baptism by pouring.

There is no difficulty in admitting, that three thousand persons might thus be added to the Church by Baptism in one day: since those who administered the *ritual pouring* had no occasion to engage in the previous *washing*.

Respecting the interval marked by Luke between the immersion of the Eunuch and his baptism by Philip, Acts viii. 36—38; it has been stated that the Syriac and Arabic versions are silent on this particular. I answer, Luke certainly "knew the customary *separation* between immersion and baptism;" he *must* have known it, or he must have been totally ignorant of the rite of *baptism* on account of pollution by the dead; which from the frequency of its occurrence was impossible. His language, marking a *separation* of the two actions, is strictly coincident with that established custom. What is there extraordinary or unnatural in it?

Justin Martyr, describing Baptism, A. D. 140, says: "I will now declare to you after what manner we being made anew by Christ, have dedicated ourselves to God. We bring converts to some place where there is water, and they are regenerated by the same way of regeneration by which we were regenerated; for they are *washed* with water in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour

a large bason of water." Next, the ritual *baptism* or *sprinkling* elsewhere was performed by a clean person, as a distinct action, yet it was part of the same rite—so the Abyssinian youthful candidate was *baptized* from another font, in another place. The *actions* were distinct, although the *RITE* was *ONE*.

Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit." The same Justin also says, that *sprinkling* with Holy Water "was invented by Dæmons, *in imitation of the true Baptism*, signified by the prophets, that their votaries, those of the Dæmons, might also have their pretended purifications by water." If the Heathen *SPRINKLINGS imitated* the true Baptism, then the true Baptism included *SPRINKLING*; for if there was not sprinkling, there could not be any *imitation*.

There is a passage in the Epistles of Cyprian to Magnus, Ep. 76, A. D. 250, which seems to turn on this distinction of the rite into two parts. A difficulty was started, whether a person, who being sick in his bed, received baptism by *sprinkling* or by *pouring*, *ONLY*, ought to be considered as completely baptized. Cyprian pleads, that where the faith was complete, this *baptism* also was complete; and might be admitted as entire and valid. He supports his opinion by reference to the purifications or baptismal sprinklings, under the Mosaic law. But knowing that in the customary mode of *baptism*, the ritual sprinkling was *preceded* by a thorough washing of the person, he adds; "If any one shall think that they are not at all benefited, who have been only *besprinkled* with the water of salvation, without previous washing, let them not be imposed on; and if they, the sick, recover; let them be *baptized*, undergo the customary washing. But if they cannot with propriety be baptized by the customary washing, because that always *preceded* ritual sprinkling, and never followed it, as having been already *SANCTIFIED* with the *ECCLESIASTICAL BAPTISM*, the ritual sprinkling, why are they distressed with scruples?"

Unless the rite were divided into two parts, where is the possibility of any persons supposing, that *sanctification with ecclesiastical baptism* was in any respect imperfect? How could such expect to render perfect what they had received, by any addition whatever, unless they understood that addition to be a part of the same identical rite in its complete state? And how could Cyprian allow a second baptism, who well knew that *ONE BAPTISM* only was enjoined upon believers?*

* *Anabaptism*.—The following is the only instance I have found. From Cyprian's observation it seems not to be altogether singular; and probably it may be referred to his time: but *Correctors* are mentioned in the ensuing example as early as A. D. 117. If Zoilus were a public officer, sent purposely into Sicily to obstruct the progress of Christianity, it may account for his wife, a zealous Christian, being sent to a private

That these two ideas were included in the rite of Baptism as late as Augustin's days, A. D. 388, is evident from the

country village; and for the baptism of her child, performed imperfectly, certainly not *registered* among the faithfuls, in such concealment. During the eighteen months of the child's life, the persecution might somewhat remit, at least so far as Zoilus was concerned, who appears at last to have consented to the regular baptism of the infant, at the earnest desire of his wife; and who also solicited that dangerous favour from the Christian presbyter. The language of the original is very awkward; but the general sense is obvious.

“Nilæ Florentinae infanti dulcissimæ atq. Innocentissimæ FIDELI Factæ Parens conlocavit quæ Pridie nonas martias ante lucem pagana nata Zoilo corre. mense Octavo Decimo et vicesima secunda die completis FIDELIS facta Hora noctis octava ultimum Spiritum agens supervixit Horis quatuor ita ut consueta repeteret ac de functa Hyble hora diei prima Septimum Kal Octobris cuius occasum cum uterq. Parens omni memento fleret per noctem majestatis vox extitit quæ defunctam lamentari prohiberet cuius corpus pro foribus Mart. Xrorum cum loculo suo per presbiterum Humatu e IIII. non octobr.—*Muratori; Sicilia Inscriptio.*”

“To Nila Florentina, a most sweet and innocent infant, MADE A FAITHFUL by her parent, placed with her in a country seclusion. She was born the first of the nones of March, before day-light, daughter of Zoilus the Corrector: having completed eighteen months and twenty-two days, she was *again* MADE A FAITHFUL, at the eighth hour of the night, at the last extremity of life: she lived afterwards but four hours: the rite having been performed according to custom, she died at Hybla, the first hour of the day, the seventh of the calends of October; on which decease her parents wept with each other every moment of the night: open lamentation for the *Christian* dead being prohibited as treason. Her corpse, with its coffin, by the presbyters, was interred in the burying-place of the Christian martyrs; the fourth of the nones of October.”

This case is precisely that supposed by the Apostle, 1 Cor. vii. 14, a heathen husband, and a Christian wife. Whose creed shall the child follow, Zoilus, a public officer *must* comply with the religion of his country; his child therefore following its father, *must* be dedicated to idols and become an idolater. Or following the mother, may it be dedicated to the Trinity? to Jehovah rather than to Jupiter? It *must* be to either one or the other;—It is either UNCLEAN or HOLY. The Apostle says; “If *either* parent be a faithful, the child is HOLY.” Such is the Christian practice. I shall therefore cause it to be BAPTIZED, said the mother.

This is Tertullian's view of the Apostle's direction—He says; *De Anima*; “The superstition of the Romans place the fœtus in the womb under the protection of the goddess Alcmena; under Partula, who presides over delivery; under Lucina, who brings forth children to the light. At the birth, Lucina and Diana are invoked, and its bodily frame is consecrated to the goddess Statina. What vows to avert evil from its head! Its hair is cut off or it is shaved off solemnly; or it is bound up as an offering; or it is sealed up as devoted; to comply with a national custom; with that of the parentage; with public or private devotion. Not a birth can be otherwise than UNCLEAN among the heathen.

different opinions which then were held. "Some said, they are baptized, not for forgiveness of sin—but that they may be made heirs of the kingdom of Heaven."—"A little while ago, says Augustin, when I was at Carthage, I cursorily heard some transient discourse of some people who were talking, that infants are not baptized for remission of sins; but they were baptized, that they may be sanctified to Christ." This he thought a novelty; and his opinion, that *original sin* was "remitted" at baptism, doubtless prevailed with those who gradually contracted the entire rite into *immersion* only; while those who deemed that consecration to Christ, he should have said to the Trinity, was the object of baptism, contracted the whole rite into *pouring* only. He is not far from right, when on a different branch of the subject, he says—"If each party would grant to the other what they urge of truth, they would both hold the WHOLE truth."

Hence it is clear, that the Baptist quotations do not support their own hypothesis—that *Βαπτω, Εμβαπτω, and Βαπτισμος*, mean exclusively, plunging the person or thing into and under water—for the preceding list of passages adduced by themselves furnish three to one against it; but had the collection been extended, the proportion would have been about one in ten for the sense of *plunging*, and nine out of ten against it, in the other senses which appertain to the generic term.

The fact appears to be this. The population of the countries had embraced the faith of Christ so very generally, that converts from heathenism becoming unusual, the rite proper to them gradually lost its application; and thus, "the death unto sin," Idolatry, &c., no longer possessing any reference to infants born of Christian parents, its ritual representative, immersion, declined into oblivion; while *pouring*, as the sign of "newness of life" or consecration to the Trinity, was continued; such consecration being the intention of parents on behalf of their infants.

Thus we have traced the two branches of Baptism, from the Mosaic institution of ceremonial cleansing from pollution by a dead body, which consisted of washing and sprinkling. It is so divided by the writer of the Ecclesiasticus. It was practised as a double rite by John in his Baptism. Christian Baptism is described as a double rite by the Apostle Peter—

Hinc enim et Apostolus ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait. Hence, says the Apostle, either parent's issue, that parent being HOLY, is also HOLY, by privilege of descent.

by the Apostle Paul, frequently; who also expressly calls the *sprinkling* part of the Mosaic rite, *baptism*. It was understood to be double by Luke. It is described as double by Justin Martyr. It is so represented in all the ancient pictures known, from the second to the fifth century. We find it alluded to by Cyprian and by Augustin, in terms implying the same division: and it is still practised in the same division by the Abyssinians who received it from the church at Alexandria, A. D. 313.*

I have often pitied that ill-judged zeal by which Christianity has been set in opposition to the religion of the Jews. Our Lord declares that "he came to fulfil the law and the prophets;" and that heaven and earth were not more fixed and permanent than the Divine Institutions of ancient times. He was rather a reformer than an institutor; for he perfected what he found existing.

A Parable was a Jewish mode of teaching:—Who taught by parables, equal to Jesus Christ? What is the most distinguished and appropriate rite of his religion, but a service grafted on the passover customs among the Jews of his day? It was not ordained by Moses, that a part of the bread they had used in the passover should be the last thing they ate, after that supper; yet this our Lord took and converted into a memorial of his body. The "cup of blessing" has no authority whatever from the original institution, yet our Lord found it in use and adopted it as a memorial of his blood:—and taken together, these elements form one commemoration of his death. We therefore infer that whatever rite Jesus appointed as the ordinance of admission into the community of his followers, he would also adopt from some service already

* The Church at Alexandria, originally planted by Mark the Evangelist, consisted of *Hebrew* Christians; whose national manners might easily be preserved in a country, of which Mr. Salt says: "The reader conversant in Scripture, cannot fail to remark the general resemblance existing throughout between the manners of this people, the Abyssinians, and those of the Jews previously to the reign of Solomon; at which period, the connections entered into by the latter with foreign princes, and the luxuries consequently introduced, seem in a great measure to have altered the Jewish character. I was so much struck with the similarity between the two nations, during my stay in Abyssinia, that I could not help fancying at times that I was dwelling among the Israelites; and that I had fallen back some thousand years, upon a period when the king himself was a shepherd, and the princes of the land went out, riding on mules, with spears and slings to combat against the Philistines."

existing, and some token familiar among the people of his nation. A ceremony for the first time heard of, would have surprised and shocked them. It would have acted as a prohibition on the minds of a people so remarkably and obstinately tenacious of established customs and notions.

“Divers *baptisms*” existed under the law; and we have every reason to believe, that the admission of proselytes into the profession of Judaism was really and truly marked by a *washing* with water, in a ritual and ceremonial manner. Maimonides is perfectly correct, when he says: “*in all ages when a Heathen, or stranger by nation, was willing to enter into the covenant of Israel, and gather himself under the wings of the Majesty of God, and take upon himself the yoke of the law—he must be circumcised, and BAPTIZED, and bring a sacrifice; or if the party were a woman, then she must be BAPTIZED, and bring a sacrifice.*” He adds, “*at the present time, when the temple being destroyed, there is no sacrificing, a stranger must be circumcised and BAPTIZED.*”

The more strict among the Jews described this ceremony as a *death* in a religious sense; and deemed the past life of the party to be as distinct from his ensuing life, as the lives of two separate persons could be. They even showed their conviction of his not being the same person, by allowing him to marry among his former relatives, within the degrees of kin prohibited by the law. They gave rules for the performance of this initiatory rite; and caused it to be strictly and thoroughly performed, by *WASHING* the person all over, in a bath or other sufficient quantity of water; not less than a certain number of gallons. This was not *baptism*, correctly speaking; for *baptism*, being a Greek term, could not be adopted by the Jews to express a religious ceremony practised long before the Greek became the prevailing language of the East. It was טבילה what the LXX. adopted the Greek word *baptize* to express; but that was prior to the days of John and Jesus. This *washing* I call *IMMERSION*:—and its signification was *DEATH*.

Was such *washing*, or *IMMERSION*, continued in the administration of John's *baptism*?—I apprehend it was.

Was such *IMMERSION* the whole of John's baptism? No.

Was *IMMERSION* of the like kind continued among the primitive Christians? Many expressions in the New Testament have a clear and unimpeachable reference to that preparatory rite.

The Apostle describes the Corinthians, 1 Cor. vi. 11, as being WASHED and *sanctified*.

Having our bodies WASHED with pure water, Heb. x. 22 : let us hold fast the profession of our faith.

Christ *sanctified* and *cleansed* the church, Eph. v. 25, by the WASHING of water.

He saved us by the WASHING of regeneration, Titus iii. 5, and the *renewing* of the Holy Ghost.

Does the term *baptism* ever occur to express these *washings*? Not that I can discover. The nearest approach I know of is that by the Apostle Peter. Baptism doth now save us, NOT *the putting away the filth of the flesh*; 1 Pet. iii. 21, but the stipulation of a good conscience toward God.

The Apostle evidently divides the rite into two distinct and contrasted parts; the first of which, WASHING, he says, has no consequence salutary to the party on whom it is performed; but the second, an engagement to maintain a conscience void of offence toward God, is salutary to a person of whose solemn profession it forms a part. This "stipulation of a good conscience toward God" is of the essence of *baptism*; previous *washing* or *immersion*, or "putting away the filth of the flesh" is not; for if it were it would have had some salutary consequence. At what period of the administration of the rite was this stipulation made? Always AFTER *washing*; according to the order in which the Apostle Peter places it.

John Baptist, being the son of a priest, perfectly knew what were the established rites and ceremonies of religious *washings*; but not content with these, he ADDED, both by word and deed, to what was customary among his people and nation.

Matthew iii. 8; He *baptized* unto repentance. He stipulated with the Pharisees that they should bring forth fruits meet for repentance.

Luke iii. 11. He stipulated with the people, for benevolence and charity; with the publicans, for equity and moderation; and with the soldiers, for mildness and content.

These ADDITIONS were the tenor of his admonitions at the time of his baptismal administrations. But he did something more *in action*, something bearing a precise resemblance to the *pouring out* of the Holy Ghost, although performed with water; and on this account he assimilates his own baptism to that by the Holy Ghost, even while he acknowledged its inferiority; saying, "I am come baptizing with water in order

to manifest HIM to Israel. I saw the Spirit *descending* and remaining on him; this is he who *baptizeth*—not with water, but with divine and ineffable baptism—with the Holy Ghost. 'This is the Son of God!'

When the Pharisees asked John, "Why *baptizest* thou?" they did not mean to ask him "why *washest* thou?" That is not the term they use. As a priest he had authority to *wash*, like other priests of his nation. When our Lord asked the Jews; "Was the *baptism* of John from Heaven or of men?" they could have found no embarrassment in answering "from men;" had the customary *washing* only been in question. The difficulty lay in admitting that John practised this additional rite, *baptism*, by revelation from Heaven, for the express purpose of manifesting the Messiah; yet when he was manifested by John, the Rulers of the Jews persisted in denying his mission. This only was the point at issue, concerning which Jesus could have replied, as they foresaw; "Why did ye not believe him?" This BAPTISM then was strictly and properly *from Heaven*. The previous *washing*, though a ceremonial purification, was traditional; hence, the Jews answered in a dubious phraseology, but without violating truth, that they could not determine whence John's *baptism* originated. By this they avoided inflaming the people, and eluded the *point* of the question.

Does the New Testament afford any instance of *Baptism separate* from immersion? Examine, as a *subsequent* act, the instance of Philip and the Eunuch? Philip, in company with the Eunuch, "came to water, and he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, here is immersion, and he *baptized* him," here is baptism.

It might be said, taking the text for correct, that *baptism* was distinct from immersion, because it followed it; for the writer does not say, "they went down into the water, that he might baptize him," but—"and he *baptized* him." But what are the real facts of the case? In order to preserve what he knew to be the customary separation between *immersion* and *baptism*, the Sacred Writer inserts a whole sentence, in itself perfectly unnecessary, and clogging the progress of the story, in the very middle and height of the sacrament. It conveys no additional information, but it marks a pause. It distinguishes the two parts of the service—"the putting away the filth of the flesh," from "the stipulation of a good conscience towards God." Luke even takes pains to produce this effect: "And they went down both into the water, BOTH PHILIP AND

THE EUNUCH ; and he, Philip, baptized him, the Eunuch ; and when they were come up," &c. We knew both Philip and the Eunuch, from the former part of the history ; but the insertion of this description of the parties, has the effect of separating the foregoing from the following sentence ; and consequently of separating the foregoing from the following action, which is the only assignable purpose of the writer for there inserting it. Nor is this the only peculiarity in the story. No other passage can be adduced in which the person administering *baptism* went himself down into the water. John Baptist did not. Who did ? This then is an exception to the general practice ; and this took place in a country almost or wholly desert ; where no convenience of any kind could be commanded ; and those exceptions recommended the instance for insertion.

The Eunuch, says Church History, carried the Gospel into Ethiopia. Are there any remains of this separation between *immersion* and *baptism*, extant in Ethiopia at this day ? There certainly are. The Abyssinian records affirm, that Queen Candace had a palace at Axum ; where those rites are now practised. Let us contemplate the rite as described by an observant British traveller, lately returned thence.

Mr. Salt, thus describes the *full* ceremony of Baptism, as practised in Abyssinia.

"BAPTISM of a Mussulman boy. — This ceremony took place at day-break ; an early hour being considered requisite, on account of the subsequent celebration of the communion which can only be administered fasting.

"On reaching the church we found the head priest, Abou Barea, with about twenty priests of inferior order, waiting in a small area about thirty yards from the spot ; some of them were engaged in chaunting psalms, while the rest were busy in preparing the water, and making other necessary arrangements for the occasion. At sun-rise, every thing being ready, an attendant was sent round from the high priest, to point out to each person concerned, the part which he was to take in the ceremony. The officiating priest was habited in white flowing robes, with a tiara or silver-mounted cap on his head, and he carried a censer with burning incense in his right hand. A second of equal rank was dressed in similar robes, supporting a large golden cross, while a third held in his hand a small phial containing a quantity of *meiron*, or consecrated oil, which is furnished to the church of Abyssinia by the patriarch of Alexandria. The attendant priests stood round in the

form of a semicircle, the boy being placed in the centre, and our party ranged in front. After a few minutes interval employed in singing psalms, some of the priests took the boy, and *washed him all over* VERY CAREFULLY in a large bason of water. While this was passing a smaller font called *me-te-mak*, which is always kept outside of the churches, owing to an unbaptized person not being permitted to enter the church, was placed in the middle of the area filled with water, which the priest consecrated by prayer, waving the incense repeatedly over it, and dropping into it a portion of the *meiron* in the shape of a cross. The boy was then brought back, dripping from head to foot, and again placed naked and upright in the centre: and was required to renounce "the devil and all his works," which was performed by his repeating a given *formula* four separate times, turning each time towards a different point of the compass. I named the child *George*, when I was requested to say the Belief and the Lord's Prayer, and to make much the same promises as those required by the Established Church of England. The head priest afterwards laid hold of the boy, dipping his own hand into the water, and crossed him over the forehead, pronouncing at the same moment—"George, I BAPTIZE THEE; in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." The whole company then knelt down, and joined in reciting the Lord's Prayer.

"Here the ordinary ceremony of baptism concludes; but as the boy had been a Mussulman, he was crossed with the consecrated oil over every joint of his body. After this, he was wrapped in a clean white linen cloth, and placed for a moment in my arms, the priests telling me that "I must henceforth consider him verily as my Son." The high priest did not take any active part in this ceremony, but the whole was conducted with great decorum and a due degree of solemnity. The boy afterwards, according to the custom of most of the Eastern churches, was admitted to partake of the holy communion."*

* On the subject of the white linen cloth, Mr. Salt adds; "This is a very ancient part of the ceremony, as appears from the testimony of many of the Fathers collected by Casalius.—"Puellus infans mutatione vestis sensu externo festum colit, quandoquidem interiori animi sensu nondum potest," &c. De veteribus sacris Christianorum ritibus, auctore Johannis Bapt. Casalius Romanus. The same author says, on the reception of the eucharist, by the newly baptized—"Ritum Eucharistiæ suscipiendæ post Baptismum non solum adultis, verum etiam infantibus fuisse communem."

Here we have a clear and incontestable distinction and separation preserved between *immersion* and *baptism*: for had it so happened, that this boy had changed his mind in the interval between coming from one place, "dripping wet from head to foot," and reaching the other place, about "thirty yards" distant, where *baptism* was performed, it is evident beyond all denial, that he would have suffered *immersion*; but he would not have been *baptized*.

The Abyssinian church derived its rites with its conversion, from Egypt, A. D. 313; and those conversant with the subject, will readily recognize in Mr. Salt's description, the baptism of a heathen, as performed in Egypt, in the second century, by Origen, or the other preachers.

Here is no necessity for *tanks* and cisterns, and reservoirs of water. Those priests could have immersed in rivers or *lakes*, had they so pleased: but they had been accustomed to use "great basons of water," from their forefathers, and those they still retain.

This Abyssinian *baptism* not only strongly recalls the second century of the Christian Church; but it affords a memorable instance of the extreme impropriety of annexing to the rite of Gospel Baptism, observances founded on the *literal* acceptance of METAPHORICAL PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

The introduction of *oil* and *anointing* into the office of Baptism is of extreme antiquity in the church, and passages of Scripture may be adduced in its favour; for was not Jesus Christ *anointed* at his Baptism? And why should not believers be *anointed* also? "whose duty it is to be conformed in all things to their Head." It is also of almost universal usage, where oil is the product of the country; and some churches anoint *before* immersion as well as after it.

Scripture authority may also be pleaded for the "clean white linen cloth," used as a garment; for are we not commanded to "*put off* the Old Man with his deeds," Eph. iv. 24; which was done in the previous *washing*, and to *put on* the New Man? to *put on* Jesus Christ? Rom. xiii. 14; as signified by this white robe. Anciently also, the first food taken by the person baptized was *milk and honey*; for, does not Scripture say, Isaiah vii. 15; the Messiah shall eat "*thick milk, the Eastern butter, and honey*, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good." Can we then too closely imitate actions attributed to Jesus Christ? You see the consequences of adopting into the administration of a Christian ordinance, customs grounded on metaphorical ex-

pressions of Scripture ; do they furnish valid arguments for the practice ? The sacrament of Baptism does not rest on such supports ; neither is it improved by the adoption of such similitudes.

There is another view of this administration under which it answers punctually to the expressions used in Scripture in reference to BAPTISM.

Did they exhort you to “ Arise, and WASH AWAY THY SINS, calling on the name of the Lord ? ” Acts xxii. 16.—*Yes*.

Did they lead you to the WASHING OF REGENERATION, Titus iii. 5 ; and PUTTING AWAY THE FILTH OF THE FLESH, Heb. x. 22 : 1 Peter iii. 21 ; by having *your body WASHED with pure water* ?—*Yes ; they washed me ALL OVER VERY CAREFULLY*.

Were you BURIED *with Christ in baptism* ; PLANTED *with him* ; CRUCIFIED *with him* ; BAPTIZED *into his death*, Rom. vi. 3—6 ; immersion in “ the great bason of water,” importing all these ?—*Yes*.

Is *immersion* ALWAYS PRACTISED at baptism ?—Is it esteemed ESSENTIAL to the ordinance ?—*Yes*.

You were “ dripping wet from head to foot,” after your immersion ; and do you affirm that this is the regular and established administration of the ordinance in the Abyssinian church ?—*Yes ; IMMERSION has been the continued practice, for more than FIFTEEN HUNDRED YEARS*.

Thus the practice of Baptism in Abyssinia affords nothing short of an ABSOLUTE DEMONSTRATION !

Immersion was an introductory observance.—BAPTISM was administered in a different place, by a different person, from a different font, with a different water, requiring a different action, under a different form of words. The actions WERE ENTIRELY DIFFERENT ; though they formed nominally one ceremony, called CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

These questions have been formed in reference to the rite importing DEATH only : but the inference is certain that the Abyssinian boy commenced a renovated LIFE ; and was known by his new name GEORGE ; as a substitute for his Mohammedan appellation, or name previous to his symbolical death.

What a light this throws on the story of *baptism* conferred on Cornelius ! Acts x. xi. xv. That every Roman family had such a “ great bason of water,” or what was much the same, is notorious. Cornelius, as a Roman, could not be without one ; and what answers the purpose of the church at Chelicut, where *baptism* is expected to be performed as a Christian

rite, might well answer the purpose in the house of a Roman officer, who had not the most distant idea of *baptism*. Is it asked, did other churches practice *baptism* in similar "basons?"—The proofs of it are extant to this day. Several of these "great basons" are still preserved in Italy; and some in France. Unless they have been destroyed during the French revolution, they may be seen at St. Denis, five miles from Paris.

The history of the baptism of Cornelius leads to further important consequences: for if I were asked to produce an instance of *baptism* conferred without previous immersion, this is that instance.

Acts x. 14, 44. It is remarkable in this history, that Peter uses two words to describe the natural condition of food: *unwashed* and *uncleansed*. The first certainly signifies UNWASHED in the instance of hands not *immersed* before dinner: the second signifies a *ritual*, ceremonial, or religious *cleansing*: and is by far the stronger term. The answer to Peter therefore is—"What God hath ritually, ceremonially, or religiously CLEANSED, in the strongest and highest degree, *that* call not thou *unwashed*, in the lower and weaker degree." This was done thrice. Now taking this in reference to Cornelius, did not the *descent* and *pouring out* of the Holy Ghost on that good man announce his ritual or religious CLEANSING though a heathen, in the strongest possible degree? What necessity after this unequivocal, sublime and Divine token of a purified and accepted person, could there be for the entire *washing* of his body in water, his *immersion*? That might have been indispensable for his regular admission into the Jewish community: not so into the Christian church. Having received the greater purification, the higher degree of celestial cleansing, why impose the lesser, the carnal and beggarly elements of this world? It would be degrading the *baptism* by the Holy Ghost below the preparation for the humble *baptism* administered by John. This is IMPOSSIBLE!

The answer of Peter when challenged on the subject, coincides perfectly with this representation:—Acts xi. 15; "As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed *baptized* with water; but ye shall be BAPTIZED with the Holy Ghost. Forasmuch, then, as God gave to them the like gift, *baptism* by the Holy Ghost, as he did to us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ,—WHAT WAS I, THAT I COULD WITHSTAND GOD?"

Nevertheless it being proper that each convert should personally make a clear and distinct profession of his faith in Christ and of his future adherence to him, should be openly *consecrated* to his service, and this being the regular intention of Christian baptism; the Apostle directed that those highly favoured persons should have that opportunity, before proper witnesses; for *his* justification, and for *their* own satisfaction. "He commanded them to be *baptized* in the name of the Lord."

Such was the authority of Peter for departing from the strict rules of the Judaico-Christian church; and such the circumstances under which the first fruits of the Gentiles were dedicated to Christ; and by which those who called Peter to account were put to silence.

There is another history of which the same view may be taken: that of the brethren who had been *baptized* with John's *baptism* only; Acts xix. 3. Having been *immersed* previous to their reception of that rite, under Paul's direction, they were *baptized* in the name of the Lord Jesus, as a proper opportunity of explicitly acknowledging him as their head and sovereign; an opportunity that they had not at the time when they received baptism from John.

The advice of the Apostle to the people of Judea at the feast of Pentecost, Acts ii. 38, agrees with this; they had been *baptized* with John's *baptism*, Peter therefore counsels them, to make an explicit avowal of the name of Jesus Christ in *baptism*.

Thus we have made some progress towards explaining that very difficult expression, "*baptism* in the name of Jesus." Those people had already religiously recognized the God of the Jews, in the rite of *baptism*; to which they now *added* a recognition of the Lord Jesus. These are all the places where this phrase occurs.

BAPTISM OF PERSONS NAKED.

The immediate subject however is the mode; and without fear of contradiction I affirm, that *Christian Baptism was POURING*; and moreover, *the convert was NAKED!* If any person object—"Why, would you have us ———?" The question is not *what any man would have?* but this is the simple inquiry—"In what state did the primitive Christians receive baptism?" The answer must be, "NAKED."

The Baptist principles demand the most scrupulous adherence to the original form of this "*positive institution*," for "positive precepts admit of no degrees, no supplements, and no commutation. It is the will of God, for the trial of our obedience; nor will he allow us to enquire *why?* or *how?* Compliance **MUST** be **SO**, **AND NO MORE**, **AND NO LESS**, **AND NO OTHERWISE**. What we call little things, trifling deviations, are the pins and screws which hold the sacred tabernacle together: take these away, the whole edifice falls. The same rash hand that makes *one* alteration may make twenty; if in small things, why not in greater? till at length the foundation is destroyed; Christianity is superseded; Superstition takes its place; and all is death, desolation, and darkness."—Booth. Pæd. Exam. Vol. I.

This conclusion the Baptist objector foresaw. "The primitive Christians baptized **NAKED**; we baptize **CLOTHED**." But whence was derived the authority for this change? Do *you* know what is *proper*, better than the institutor of the rite? Do *you* undertake to *correct* the institutions of the Divine Saviour? To *improve* them? To *qualify* them? You talk of *decency*, did not **HE** know what was decent? If they plead decency, modesty, decorum, as valid arguments for the change which they have adopted, with what grace do they deny to others the right to plead decency, modesty, and decorum? How happens it, that these terms are commanding in their mouths, but horrible in the mouths of others? I mean not to deny the propriety of their *practice* in consulting modesty and decorum; but I expressly deny their right to *practice* one thing while they *profess* another; I deny their right to censure their brethren for deviating from the primitive practice less than they do, and on less controvertible principles.

Nor does the evidence of baptizing *naked* rest on those pictures; for Wall, who had examined the subject extensively, says, Hist. Bapt. Vol. II, "It was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism." This he supports by instances in various places, and he censures those who alleged against the Anabaptists as a fault, the practice of baptizing *naked*.

The earliest rite called *baptism* that we know of is clear on this article. Numb. xix. 11-22. The person who was defiled by the dead was to wash himself thoroughly; to bathe himself in water; and the *sprinkling* of the ashes, called *baptism*, was effectual to the purification of the tent, if the water touched the tent; of the furniture in the tent, the

drapery ; if it touched that furniture, that drapery ; and it also sanctified to the purifying of *the FLESH*. It therefore was received by *the FLESH* ; and the party receiving it was *NAKED* ; whether absolutely or relatively is no matter. For if the water purified only where it fell, will the Baptists allow, that a few drops falling on the face, all the rest of the person being clothed, the whole man was sanctified ?—That were to support the decried practice of *INFANT SPRINKLING* !

The New Testament clearly mentions as a part of Baptism, the putting away of the *filth* of the *FLESH* ; 1 Peter iii. 21. Church members are said to have had “ their *BODIES* washed with pure water,” Heb. x. 22. Is there a single Baptist living whose “ *BODY* was washed with pure water,” at his baptism ?—His clothes might be :—but his body ? No. When did any one “ put away the *filth* of the *FLESH*” at this ordinance, as administered by English Baptists ? None living at this day : whatever some might have done more than a century ago. The error lies in the *profession*, not in the *practice* ;—You *say*, and do not.*

The evidence is clear, that the ancient Christian painters

* Inasmuch as this washing denoted, metaphorically, a funeral preparation, it preserved a commemoration of the state of death in which for a time the body of Jesus lay ; but how can a dead body be washed, while clothed ? The thing is impossible ; the imitation of it therefore while clothed is impossible. The Oriental customs assist us here : the law is : “ The Funeral Lotion consists in washing the body entirely ; whether it be that of a man, woman, or child. The law of modesty, which is the same for the dead as for the living, requires that the men should be washed by men, and the women by women.”—D’Ohsson, p. 445, 446.

“ The head and beard of the corpse must be washed with the flowers of *Ehiltmy*, or with soap. The right side must be washed first, while the body rests on the left ; the left side, while it rests on the right : after that it must be turned on the back, and must be rubbed with a soft and gentle hand.

“ *From the Booke of Common Prayer*, Lon. 1549. The prieste shall take the childe in his handes and aske his name : And nameing the childe, shall dyppe it in the water thryse. First dyping the right side : seconde the left side : the third time dyping the face towarde the fonte : so it be discretely and warely done, saying, &c.”

Considered as rites, this order is similar. One body is “ *dyped*” to be returned to its cradle ; the other is washed to be prepared for the grave : for it is not yet interred. After the washing come the *invelopement*, the funeral prayer, &c. The conformity ceases long before the final *interment*. Nor is this coincidence accidental ; for at first, our reformers did little other than translate foreign usages into English, and this may be traced for several centuries upwards ; as early as *trine immersion*.

were fully justified, in representing the subjects receiving baptism, *NAKED*. If they had represented them otherwise, they would have sinned against fact and evidence. Primitive Christianity acknowledged no such rite as Baptism administered by immersion to persons clothed from head to foot.

It was certainly the custom to baptize the Catechumens *NAKED*—and the person who had been baptized, immediately on coming out of the water, was wrapped in an envelope called *Sabano*—whence Simon of Thessalonica says, “the *NAKED* Catechumen is covered with a large covering περιβολαιον wrapped around him closely in *THREE* windings! Buonarotti Oss. sopra vasi di Vetro. Thus the *Trinity* meets us at every turn, among the ancient Christians, in connection with Baptism!—and it is not a little remarkable, that the very sentiments and language of the modern Baptists, respecting the unclothed state of the Catechumens during the administration of the rite of Baptism, are precisely the scoffing objections of Julian the Apostate!

As the “envelope wrapped around” the *washed* Catechumens had the form of a pallium or cloak, it seems to be alluded to by Tertullian—“Suadeo, reverere habitum unius interim erroris tui renunciatores—enimvero cum hanc primum sapientia vestit, quae vanissimis superstitionibus reunit; tunc certissime pallium super omnes exuvias, et peplos augusta vestis.”—De Pallis; Cap. 3, and 4.—Hence is supposed to have arisen the error of writers who reported that Christians after baptism left off the toga, and assumed the pallium.

The ancient Christians had among them also pictures of Adam and Eve. “Paolino clearly makes mention of representations of Adam and Eve, on occasion of his describing various pictures in the Basilica. Augustin alludes to that subject in his book against Julian the Apostate.*

Buonarotti thus writes on the subject of Baptism.

“Whoever desires to know to what degree the ancient Christians were solicitous to preserve a certain tradition of their sacred symbols used in painting, and what care they employed, that they might always be represented in the same manner, and not be changed in any thing, which from the beginning had been customary in the church, let him reflect

* “A pictoribus me didicisse derides, quod Adam et Mulier ejus pudenda contexerint, Horatianum illud decantatum audire me præcipis. Quidlibet audiendi semper fuit æqua potestas.”—Lib. v. cap. 2.

on the uniformity found among the paintings on those most ancient pieces of glass, also on the basso relievos of the Sarcophagi, Sepulchres, on the paintings of the Cæmeteries, Catacombs, and the Mosaics of the churches in Rome ; which are not equally ancient : but especially, let him well observe the Vatican Sarcophagus, published by Arringhi, in the middle of which, as there represented, we see almost the very same things, that are seen on the glass. There is the Saviour on the mount, from which issues four streams.*

I had always understood that it was a fact acknowledged by all parties, that the primitive Christians received Baptism in a state of nakedness : the denial of this lately by the Baptists has taken me by surprise. The evidence now offered must be considered as a kind of *gleaning* ; comprising merely such passages as presented themselves in the continuation of researches on the general subject.

The first witness is the Baptist Historian Robinson, who says, Cap. xv. ; “ The primitive Christians *baptized NAKED*. Nothing is easier than to give proof of this by quotations from the authentic writings of the men who administered Baptism, and who certainly knew in what way they themselves performed it. *There is no ancient historical fact better authenticated than this*. The evidence doth not go on the meaning of the single word *naked*, for then a reader might suspect allegory : but on many facts reported, and many reasons assigned for the practice. Chrysostom criminates Theophilus because

* Chi vuol conoscere quanto i Cristiani antichi fossero attenti a conservare con una certa tradizione i sacri simboli delle pitture, e quanta cura avessero, che sempre si facessero i medesimi, e non si variasse da quello, che sul principio avesse cominciato a costumare la Chiesa, basta riflettere all'uniformità, che passa fra le pitture di questi vetri antichissimi, ed i bassirilievi de' Sarcofagi, e le pitture de' Cimiteri, ed i Mosaici delle Chiese di Roma, che non sono tanto antichi; ma particolarmente bisogna osservare il Sarcofago Vaticano riportato dall' Arringhio alla pag. 295, nel mezzo del quale, come si è accennato, vi sono quasi affatto le medesime cose, che si vedono in questo vetro; vi è il Salvatore sul Monte, da cui scaturiscono i quattro fiumi; il Salvatore dà alla figura, che è dalla sinistra il volume, questa figura è vestita, e sta in attitudine di scendere nel Giordano, come sta la nostra, ed ha una Croce in ispalla; dalla parte destra vi è quella medesima immagine di uomo colla barba, e col pallio, e colla destra distesa, che noi abbiamo creduto, che rappresenti S. Giovan Batista; a' piedi del Redentore vi è l'Agnus Dei, ma con una croce sul capo, e più basso le pecorine; di qua, e di là dal Salvatore vi sono due palme, e sopra a quella mano dritta vi è un uccello, che sarà fatto per la nostra fenice; e vi sono parimente due torri, e due porte di Città.—*Buonarrotti Osservazioni sopra alcuni vasi Antichi di Vetros.*

he had raised a disturbance without, which so frightened the women in the baptistery, who had just stripped themselves naked in order to be baptized, that they fled naked out of the room, without having time to consult the modesty of their sex. —Basil rose up with fear and trembling, undressed himself, putting off the old man, and went down praying into the water ; and the priest going down along with him baptized him.” The reasons assigned for this practice are, that Christians ought to put off the old man before they put on a profession of Christianity ; that as men came *naked* into the world, so they ought to come *naked* into the church, for rich men could not enter the kingdom of heaven : that it was an imitation of Christ, who laid aside his glory, and made himself of no reputation for them ; and that Adam had forfeited all, and that Christians ought to profess to be restored to the enjoyment of all, only by Jesus Christ. Basnage, than whom no man understood Church History better, says, “ *When artists threw garments over pictures of the baptized, they consulted the taste of spectators more than the truth of the fact.*” Basnage might have added, that ALL the truly ancient representations of baptism represented the person receiving baptism as absolutely naked : not even “ a wrapper round the middle” was thought of, till after the simplicity of the Gospel was considerably vitiated. Because the case is so clear Robinson gave no additional quotations ; and Wall was influenced by the same consideration. His words are these : “ The ancient Christians, when they were baptized by immersion, were ALL BAPTIZED NAKED, whether they were men, women, or children. Vossius, De Baptism. Disp. i. cap. 6, 7, 8, has collected several proofs of this, which I omit, because it is a clear case.” Hist. Bapt. vol. II.

What could Origen mean, if Baptism were not received in a state of nakedness, when he says, “ With thy garments newly washed thou camest to the grace of Baptism ; thou wast by it purified in thy body ; thou wast purified in thy spirit ; thou wast cleansed from all defilement of flesh and spirit.”* Hence the Christian Fathers took literally, in reference to the baptism of individual converts, the words, Ephes. v. 26 ; Christ “ sanctified and cleansed the church by the washing of water :” using also a certain form of words, the Baptismal

* Lota sunt vestimenta tua cum venisti ad Baptismi gratiam ; purificatus es CORPORE ; purificatus es spiritu ; mundatus es ab omni inquinamento CARNIS, et spiritus. Exod. in lib. ii.

form, each believer having neither spot nor wrinkle; but being no less scrupulously washed in his person than was the practice among the Jews, in their administration of baptismal washings. Hence, says a Poet, "The parents receive from the sacred font their infants white as snow, in body, in heart, in habit. The souls of the baptized are cleansed, and the members of their body are washed."*

The history quoted by Robinson and Wall deserves further examination: for that writer seems to have entertained no doubt that even women were baptized naked; and Wall expressly asserts the same, not only in the words we have quoted, but in his remarks on the violence offered to Chrysostom's female converts. "They took great care to preserve the modesty of any woman that was to be baptized. There were none but women came near or in sight, till she was undressed, and her body in the water: then the Priest came, and putting her head under water, used the form of Baptism. Then he departed, and the women took her out of the water, and clothed her again with white garments." But the preservation of modesty by this mode was impossible, especially when a number of women were to be baptized together. Not so much as the face of any modest woman was seen, at any time, except by her own husband: so that it is not necessary to prove with what inflexible adherence to custom the women in the East conceal their faces. Surely then, decent women, Christian converts, would not suffer themselves to be seen and handled, as they must be if plunged by a stranger; and this impossibility increases as it affects the young women, the maidens. Moreover, the very mention of priests and deacons in this history confutes this notion. Wall says; There is an account given by Sozomen, H. E. lib. viii. cap. 21, A. D. 403, of an insult made by the soldiers in the great church at Constantinople, against Chrysostom and his adherents: for on Easter-eve they rushed in armed; and, he adds, "There was a great tumult at the font, the *women* shrieking in a fright, and the *children* crying. The Priests and Deacons were beaten, and forced to run away with their vestments on." Were those priests and deacons waiting in the same apartment with the women who were undressing themselves

* Abluitis quicumque animas, et membra lavacris,
Cernite propositas ad bonafacta vias.

Inde Parens sacro ducit de fonte sacerdos
Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu.

for the purpose of receiving baptism? Where then was female modesty? How is this consistent with the former assertion that "none but women came near?" The more this is examined, the more evident will it appear that, although those ablutions, or immersions, for they are the same thing, were the initiatory part of Baptism, yet Baptism was not performed by the priest's access to the person of any woman, while she was naked, and "her body in the water." Could the prayers and the responses, or confessions of faith, &c., be rehearsed, while a woman, or a number of women, remained standing in the water?

The embarrassment of our Baptist brethren on this matter is very great. They find themselves guilty of departing from the primitive usage in this particular, even while most vehemently urging uniform adherence to that usage as a part of positive duty, in which negligence is sinful. If precise conformity in all points to the original ritual be indispensable, as obedience to God and to Christ, and if in this point they violate the original ritual, then they stand self-condemned. That they *do* depart from the institution as at first performed, these extracts evince.

There are two ways by which Baptism might be performed with due regard to female modesty. After the Deaconess had caused the woman or women under her care to be properly washed, and clothed in the baptismal habit, the Priests and Deacons might come into the same apartment and confer Baptism—or the woman or women properly habited, after immersion, might go out of their apartment into the *Accubitum*, or Vestry, and there receive the remainder of the rite from the lesser font. But either of these implies a division of the service; the first part being *immersion* or *washing*, and the second, *baptism* or *consecration*.

Nor let it be thought strange that this official superintendence of immersion should belong to the Deaconess; for as the women in the East are in the habit of going often to the public baths, it doubtless often happened that the Deaconess had frequently met with her charge at the baths, under the same circumstances of washing and dressing. Possibly she might have done the same services from civility, which were also done as a ritual of religion. At first Deaconesses were widows, who had lived with one husband only; not less than sixty years of age. In later times they wore a distinguishing dress. They visited women in the name of the Church, when sick or in poverty; and it is supposed also, that they

visited female prisoners suffering as Christians. The Apostle Paul says that Phebe had been the *patroness* of himself and many others. This implies both dignity and respectability of station in life as appertaining to the office of Deaconess.

Muratori gives us the following sepulchral inscription of one of those ancient female office-bearers in the Church :

DACIANA DIACONISSA
 QUE V. AN. XXXXV. M. III.
 ET FUIT F. PALMATI COS.
 ET SOROR VICTORINI PRESBRI
 ET MULTA PROPHETAVIT.
 CUM FLACCA ALUMNA
 V. A. XV. DEPOSITA IN PACE III. ID. A. D. 412.

“Daciana, a Deaconess, who lived forty-five years and three months ; when F. Palmatus was Consul. She was sister to Victorinus the Presbyter ; and had instructed in religion many of her sex.”

Considering that men had scarcely any access to the younger women at home, there can be little doubt that they received the major part of their religious instruction from the Deaconesses ; and so much of it as was requisite previous to Baptism was a convenient preparation for that ordinance.*

DEACONESSES.

Deaconesses were of Apostolic institution ; but the office of Deaconess, though unquestionably Scriptural, is discarded from Baptist Churches, which therefore are confessedly imperfect. They have abandoned the Scriptural example ; for what cause, it becomes them to explain who profess inviolate and punctual conformity. Paul writing to the Romans, xvi. 1, expressly calls Phebe, *διακονον*, diaconon, “Deaconess of the church at Cenchrea ;” and she is described as the succour and protectress of many. To women of this character whom he describes among the Deacons, 1 Timothy, iii. 11,

* The practice of *anointing* after Baptism is extremely ancient, and was almost universal. In that, the Deaconess performed the principal part among the women ; for the Presbyter anointed the woman’s head only. The Deaconess anointed the female body, which was in conformity with the prior ceremonies respecting the washing with water in Baptism.

as "grave, not slanderers, sober and faithful in all things;" Paul also refers. Pliny, anxious to discover the secrets of the Christians, caused two female servants of the church, called "*ministers*," to be tortured; but he could not obtain from them any confession of guilt. "I could find nothing," he said, in his formal letter to Trajan, "but a vile superstition." *

That female Church officer, the *Deaconess*, long continued to be both popular and useful among the faithful. They gradually became more rarely adverted to by ecclesiastical writers, and are not mentioned in connection with the ministrations of the Church after about A. D. 1000. Deaconesses are most particularly specified by Epiphanius. Hæres. lxxix. "Quæ est Collyridianorum;" who says, "There are also Deaconesses in the Church; but this office was not instituted as a priestly function, nor has it any interference with priestly administrations; but it was instituted for the purpose of preserving a due regard to the modesty of the female sex, especially at the time of baptismal washing, and while the person of the woman is naked; that she may not be seen by the men performing the sacred service, but by her only who is appointed to take charge of the woman, during the time that she was naked." † Now if the men performing the sacred service did not see the woman receiving baptism while unclothed, how could any one go down into the font and plunge her? If the woman, while the process of immersion or washing was performing, was seen by the *Deaconess* alone, Baptism could

* Quo magis necessarium credidi, ex duabus ancillis quæ ministræ dicebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta quærere. Nihil aliud inveni, quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam. Lib. x. Epist. 97.

† Gabriel Albaspineus. "*Diaconissa*.—Ministerio Diaconissarum plerisque in locis pudori feminarum consulebatur: illæ enim ad Baptismum venientes honestè nudabant et exuebant, nequid oculis baptizantis invecundè ingereretur, ut Epiphanius indicat. Διακονισσών μὴν ταγμα ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ εἰς τὸ ἱερατεῖον ὑδεὶ ἐπιχειρεῖν ἐπιτρέπειν. Ἐνεκεν δὲ σεμνοτήτος τῆς γυναικείου γένους ἢ δι' ὄραν λόγων καὶ ὃ τε γυμνωθεὶν σῶμα γυναικῆ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ ὁ ἀνδρῶν ἱεροργεῖται θεαθεῖν, ἢ ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς ἱερωῆς ἐπιμελεῖσθαι γυναικῶν ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς τοῦ σώματος αὐτῆς γυμνώσεως. Est quidem Diaconissarum in Ecclesia; sed non est institutus ad functionem Sacerdotii, vel ad aliquam ejus modi administrationem, sed ut muliebris sexus honestati consulatur, sive ut tempore adsit Baptismi sive quando nudandum est mulieris corpus, ne ab iis conspiciatur, qui sacris operantur, sed à sola videatur Diaconissa; quæ jussu sacerdotis curam mulieris gerit, dum vestibus exuitur; atque id secundum constitutionem boni ordinis et Ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ ex prescripto canonis admodum stabilitæ."—Causaubon Antiquitates Ecclesiasticæ Exere. lvi. ad Annales Baronii.

not possibly have been administered according to the notion and practice of the Baptists.

If the "FACTS and EVIDENCES" adduced have Truth on their side, whatever appears to oppose them is proportionally weakened and rendered inefficient as argument. Nevertheless, objections are drawn from incidental circumstances which, however feeble or erroneous, have been announced by the Baptists as highly important. One of them is the passage, John iii. 23; in which "much water," as our translators have rendered the words, is assigned as a reason why John was baptizing in that place. It is admitted, however, "that *υδατα πολλα* is plural, and denotes *many waters*."—To which I add, that the words *υδατα πολλα* most properly signify *flowing waters*, or currents; and had the words been rendered "*many streams*," I should have applauded their correctness.

EXON.—The objection is thus propounded by Dr. Ryland. John iii. 23.—This 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 *hydata polla*, *υδατα πολλα*, would be more literally rendered many waters, or 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 *hydata polla* is plural, and denotes literally *many waters*, but that it does not mean *small streams* is evident, from all other places where it is used in the New Testament. It occurs only in the Revelation written by this Evangelist; 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; 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 "as the voice of many 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, 15; who sat upon *many waters*; which are explained, 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 situa-

tion of old Babylon. Jer. li. 13. "O thou that dwellest upon *many waters*, &c."

מים
מים רבים
מים חיים
מים אדירים
מים כבירים
מים טהורים

Hydata polla is evidently a Hebraism, the word for waters in that language being in the Dual form, *mim*, and having no singular, always is connected with a plural adjective; as *mim rabim*, many waters, *mim chaim*, living waters, *mim adirim*, mighty waters, *mim cabirim*, mighty waters, *mim tehurim*, clean waters. The cor-

responding phrase *mim rabim* occurs often in the old Testament; Ezek. xvii. 5, 8; and xliii. 2. Ps. xviii. 16. "He drew me out of many waters," or *small streams*.—Cant. viii. 7. "*Many waters* cannot quench love," *small streams* cannot!—Psa. lxxvii. 19. "Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in *many waters*," the great waters. Ps. xciii. 4. "The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, than the mighty waves of the sea."—Isa. xxiii. 3. It is said of Tyre; "By *many waters*, great waters, the seed of Sihor, the harvest of the river is her revenue. Let our Brethren search if they can find an instance of *mim rabim* being used as synonymous with *small streams*."

A goodly parade of words!—"voices—roarings—thunderings—Cataracts—Seas—Sihor—Tigris—Euphrates,—" why did not they add—"Burhamooter—Oronoko—Niagara?" the addition would have been quite as much to the purpose, as the other ingredients of the note. Happy fountain! Happy *Enon*! ennobled by such mighty associations, by such magnificent alliances! But the nature of the fountain called *Enon*, is a question not to be solved by verbiage. It is a simple question of pure geography. Was there ever issuing from one spring, a body of water forming many parts, in any district of the land of Judea, in any locality accessible to John Baptist in his travels, by which these allusions to the Tigris, Euphrates, &c. may be justified? or are they merely phantoms of Baptist ingenuity and fancy?

Dr. Ryland has a thousand times enforced the established maxim in logic—"Concerning that which does not exist, and that which cannot be shown to exist by credible testimony, the inference is exactly the same." Under the shelter of this maxim, I affirm, in unequivocal terms, that there is no such spring in existence; there never was such a spring in existence, in any part of Judea, as the *Enon* thus described, and thus illustrated. If a spring so copious were in existence, it

would be invaluable to the native inhabitants : the memory of it could not have perished : it would be still in use : some rumour of it would have reached us. Who mentions such a spring ? European travellers have explored the Jordan, from the lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea, with great assiduity : which of them has ever seen this wonderful discharge of waters ? Which of them ever gathered the most distant hint of a phenomenon so mighty, so acceptable ? They have visited Scythopolis, or Beth Shen : or if Salim, as is probable, be some miles further south—the wonder is so much the greater, that a body of water so considerable should continue unknown ; since hundreds of travellers have been within a short distance of it. The French, at the time of Napoleon's expedition into Syria, had a *corps of horse* at Beth Shen ; and roamed the country down the Jordan : particularly exploring it on the west. Have they dropped the smallest hint of a discovery so acceptable, especially for cavalry ? Not a single word of any fountain answering to the Baptist *Enon*. Our whole information concerning this spring rests on the authority of Eusebius, repeated by Jerom, who says in a few words—it was eight miles from Scythopolis, south, between Salim and the Jordan. This is the whole that appears in CALMET ; of this thundering fountain, *he knows absolutely nothing*. Since then it is unknown to our ablest Geographers, to our most adventurous and observant travellers, to our most inquisitive men—I deny its existence :—according to the character attributed to it by the Baptists.

Enon, by its name, imports a single spring ; “ the fountain of *On* :” but it flowed in several or many streams. There is no difficulty on the word *polla* ; it clearly signifies *many*. Nor ought there to be, on the adoption of the English word *streams* : notwithstanding the determined opposition to this very convenient and very innocent monosyllable. The English word, “ *stream*,” is of very extensive import : it describes the whole course of the Ganges, at its most extensive overflow ; the much narrower course of the Thames, as distinct from the tide-way ; the progress of the sea, running thousands of miles in the open ocean—as the *gulf-stream* ; the current of a rivulet, or the discharge from the spout of a teapot. But on the subject under investigation, we want an article that we can reduce to the test of ocular evidence : we want one on which the *same Greek word* has been employed, as we find employed by the Evangelist John, in describing

the spring of *On*. I know of but one such ; and that is the fountain of Elisha, at Jericho.

In 2 Kings ii. 20 ; the elders of Jericho complained to Elisha, “ the *water* is naught,” says our translation ; but the words are *plural* in the Hebrew ; and the Greek rendering is *plural* ; τὰ ὕδατα πονηρὰ, *ta hydata ponera* ; the *streams* are evil. Now what says matter of fact to this ? Maundrell shall inform us. “ Its waters are at present received in a basin, about nine or ten paces long, and five or six broad : and thence issuing out in GOOD PLENTY, divide themselves into several small streams, dispersing their refreshment to all the field, between this and Jericho, and rendering it exceeding fruitful. Close by the fountain grows a large tree spreading into boughs over the water, and there in a shade we took a collation, with the Father Guardian, and thirty or forty Friars more, who went this journey with us.”

Here we have “ *waters*,” “ *in good plenty* ;” and it might appear an unexceptionable rendering of the passage, to say, in Bible language, “ John was baptizing in the fountain of Elisha, near Jericho, because there was *good plenty* of water.” But against this rendering, fair as it seems, we are barred, by the *plural* form of the original : this *good plenty* describes the water, while flowing in one body ; the Hebrew and the Greek speak of it *after* its division. To represent the original accurately, we *must* render : “ John was baptizing at the fountain of Elisha, near Jericho, because there were *several streams* there.” It is demonstrated, by this evidence, that the Greek term *hydata*, imports *streams* : and as to the “ *many*” —respecting water issuing from one source, the greater be the number of streams into which it is divided, the more is each diminished. *Two* are of less magnitude than one : *four*, than two ; *eight*, than four, &c. Let the Baptists fix on what number they please for this *many*, and let the argument abide the consequence.

The present question is this—What was the magnitude, and what were the powers and properties of the spring of *On* ? Let an accurate geographical description of this spot be adduced. Till then, I infer from what I do know satisfactorily, that it is not safe to describe Enon, *the spring of On*, by comparison with the *Euphrates*, the *Tigris* or MIGHTY THUNDERINGS. It is SINNING BY EXCESS !

But after affirming that the words, ὕδατα πολλὰ, are evidently a Hebraism, it is added.—“ Let our brethren search if they can find an instance of ΜΙΜ ΡΑΒΙΜ being used as

synonymous with small streams." I retort—"our Brethren" have no farther to seek than the very first reference specified in the concordance to the Bible, to annul this futile argument. It is recorded in Numbers xxiv. 5, 7.

How goodly are thy Tents, O Jacob!
 And thy Tabernacles, O Israel!
 As the Valleys are they spread out,
 As Gardens along the river side :
 As AHALIM trees planted by JEHOVAH :
 As CEDARS by the water courses.
 A stream shall flow around his suckers ;
 And his seeds *shall flourish* in many streams.
 —*mim rabim.*

The Cedar is a mountain tree, the Cedars of Lebanon are far off from broad rivers, the Nile, the Euphrates, or the Tiber. Moreover, the higher parts of mountains are precisely the places where we look for "*tinkling rills* ;"—and if this majestic tree, when at its full strength, might maintain itself against the impetuosity of "great waters," how the suckers growing around its roots, how the offsets taken from it, or how its seeds, *cones*, in the instance of the Cedar, could resist the velocity of roaring floods, must continue a secret to all but the objector. However, supposing that the Cedar, a tree famous for its strength, should be so fortunate; none can believe this of that weakest of all trees, the Vine. Yet, of this clasper by nature and necessity, the prophet says; Ezek. xix. 10.

Thy mother was like a Vine,
 Planted in thy levels, beside thy water courses :
 She was fruitful and full of branches,
 By reason of many waters ; *mim rabim.*

Is a place, the confluence of waters, of great waters, a place assimilated to Sihor, to the Tigris, to the Euphrates, proper for the culture of the Vine? Can the feeble scion of this feeble parent, almost a trailing plant, unless assisted by some sturdy associate, possibly come to maturity, if exposed to the dangerous action of violent streams? Would they not sweep it away in some overflow? *Small* streams are most suitable to the services required by the Vine, which naturally loves a dry soil, and there it yields the finest grapes.

I close this part of the subject, by denying in express terms, that there is now, or ever was such a place as the Baptists describe. Who has seen those mighty waters?

ANCIENT TESTIMONY.

In further pursuing the inquiry, our way divides into a consideration of the primitive HEBREW Church, the branches of which extended throughout Judea, Egypt, and Abyssinia; probably also eastward and southward; especially south of Judea:—and of the ancient Church of ANTIOCH, or the SYRIAN CHURCH whence the first Christian Gentile Church extended its branches throughout Syria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Parthia, and into India.

HEBREW CHRISTIANS.

The EGYPTIAN Church, being of Hebrew origin, *retains* circumcision; which it places before baptism; but it baptizes the children presently after circumcision. Simon Hist. East. Churches. This seems to have been the order observed by the Hebrew Christians generally; circumcision being bound to time; but not so Baptism. From the question proposed by Fidus to Cyprian, it may be conjectured, that many Christians in Africa adhered to this order of the rites. The Deacons carry the children to the altar; where they are anointed *before* baptism; and this unction, they say, makes them “new spiritual men.”

The manner of Baptism among the ABYSSINIANS, who also practice circumcision, has been fully related in the instance of Mr. Salt's Mohammedan Boy. The Abyssinians are a branch of the Egyptian Church; which is a branch of the Hebrew Church.

THE SYRIAN CHURCH.

It is not easy to ascertain, the genuine practices of the Ancient Christian Churches at Antioch. Wars and revolutions have destroyed their authentic documents: but the habits of that Church must be gathered from the practices of those branches of it which remain so far as we know them. Simon Hist. East. Churches. The Georgians and the Iberians practice infant baptism in the name of the Trinity. The Godfather baptizes the child; the Priest reading the baptismal words. Baptism is conferred *by immersion*, and about *two years of age*; and the child is anointed *after* the plunging: They hold that this anointing is the principal part of the ordi-

nance ; the Orientals in general call this unction “the *perfection* of Baptism.”

“*Baptism* is administered among the Armenians ; Tournefort’s *Voy. au Levant*, vol. iii ; by immersion ; and the officiating Priest pronounces the words, *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;* and plunges the child three times in the water, in memory of the Holy Trinity. Though our Missionaries showed them their mistake, in repeating all the words at each immersion, there are still many Priests who do it through mere ignorance.

They baptize only on Sundays, if the child be not in danger of death ; and the Priest gives it always the name of the Saint of the Day, or of him whose feast is to be the Day following, if there be no Saint for the Day, on which the Baptism is celebrated. The midwife carries the child to Church, but the godfather carries it home to the mother, with the sound of drums and trumpets, and other instruments of the country. The Baptisms which are administered on Christmas-day are the most magnificent, and they put off to that day the Baptism of such children whose state of health will permit it. The most famous are principally celebrated in places where there is a large pond or river. For this purpose they prepare an altar in a boat covered with fine carpets : thither the clergy repair as soon as the sun rises, accompanied by their parents, friends, and neighbours ; for whom they provide boats fitted and adorned in the same manner. Be the season ever so severe, after the ordinary prayers the Priest plunges the child three times into the water, and performs the Unctions.”

The Nestorians or Chaldeans, whose Patriarch takes the name of Patriarch of Babylon, are a numerous body of Christians ; estimated at three hundred thousand families.—They are spread throughout the east. They baptize children. They use no Holy Oil in Baptism ; but they use it afterwards as a kind of Confirmation. The Jacobites who inhabit the same country, and say they take their name from the Apostle James, practice both circumcision and baptism.

Dandini, *Voyage au Mont. Liban*, says—“The Maronites of Mount Lebanon as to what regards the Sacrament of Baptism, do not preserve in the baptismal fonts the water, which has been sanctified on Holy Saturday, for this service, but they sanctify it every time it is wanted, by reciting a series of long prayers. They plunge the person receiving baptism, three times into this water : or they throw a portion of it over

him three times. They pronounce but once the necessary form of words, and they give a name to the person at the same time. They use no salt; and they anoint not only the head but also the breast, with the palms of the hands which they hold open. They anoint also the shoulders, with the front and the back of the body, from head to foot; although in some of their books two Unctions are described, one before Baptism, the other after it; and this last with certain words, which have the air of conferring the sacrament of Confirmation. They assured me that they do not use this second Unction, and that such books do not describe their true practice.—“The godfather does not hold the child over the font; but the priest having received him from the godfather, receives the child into a large linen cloth.” It should be observed that Dandini was a Roman Priest sent by the Pope on a special commission to this sect of Christians. He adds: “They are accustomed to delay Baptism, whether from negligence, or from any other cause, till the child be fifty or sixty days old.”

The true reason however why the Maronites defer Baptism for fifty days is, because they consider the mother unclean during the time she keeps her bed; and the child would contract ceremonial uncleanness, by remaining with the mother, in that state, after having been ritually cleansed by Baptism.

Mr. Newell, the American Missionary, who visited the Syrian Christians in India, in 1814, says: “I made particular inquiry respecting the *MODE of Baptism* in the Syrian Church. I found it was *AFFUSION*. In the administration of this ordinance they mix cold and warm water together. When I asked them the reason of this they seemed at a loss for an answer, and finally said, it was because Christ was baptized in a part of the Jordan where another stream met with it.

“Respecting the *SUBJECTS* of Baptism, I made no inquiry, as I supposed it was a matter of notoriety, that the Syrians are *PÆDOBAPTISTS*. Brother Hall, who conversed with those same Priests when he was at Cochin, understood that children were usually baptized at *eight years old*.”

Is it too much to conjecture, that those distant countries to which Christianity penetrated, have retained the practices derived from their forefathers, more punctiliously than the perturbed nations of Christendom? They have been less tormented with opposing opinions, and ambition has had less scope for its operations among them, than among more ex-

tensive communities and interests. A slight sketch of their history may assist us in forming a judgment on the antiquity of their rites.

“A certain Theophilus arrived from India very young, among an embassy sent to Europe in the thirty-first year of the reign of Constantine, A. D. 337. He returned to India in the character of a missionary, A. D. 356, having staid nineteen years; during which his conversion, instruction, &c. took place. His voyage was by the Red Sea, where he made some converts. Proceeding to the peninsula of India, *he there found churches already established.* This seems to be the first mention of Christians on the coast of Malabar. Cosmas *Indicopleustes* found them there, A. D. 540, and there the Portuguese found them, in the latter end of the fifteenth century, on their discovery of India.

This church was of considerable standing before the visit of Theophilus. Its liturgy was then as it is now, Syriac. The Bishop, till within these few years, was consecrated by the primate of Ctesiphon, the representative of the ancient Babylon. The merchant fleets sailed in the times before Constantine *annually* to that coast from Egypt. By some of these, missionaries might easily proceed to India. This does not carry up the date of Christianity in that country to the time of the Apostles: though more than one of them or their immediate disciples are said by good authority to have preached the Gospel in India. I have met with mention of a Bishop in India, about A. D. 180. They are called Christians of St. Thomas.—Kerr’s Report. La Croze. Eusebius.

GREEK CHURCH.

We come now to the Greek Church, whose authority in favour of immersion is strongly pleaded by the Baptists although they deny their testimony in respect of Pædobaptism. Surely, if it be authority for one practice, it is authority also for the other. It is impossible to account for the “*corruption*” of the church in baptizing children, unless it were an original injunction: since no mistake could occur in the language used to describe it in Scripture; for this church spoke the same language which *was* and still *is* the dialect of their country. It is not possible to perceive by what process they could “*corrupt*” the gospel rite.

Nothing is easier than to perceive by what process they varied immersion into baptism. They have done no more

than take a part for the whole. This form of error is the mildest possible ; whereas if they have substituted the baptism of infants for that of men and women, *that is* the grossest possible form of error. It is the renunciation of a fixed Apostolic principle, for the reception of a contrary principle ; in direct violation of Scripture and Tradition, of their original Churches, and of their best-instructed Fathers. Common Charity is at no loss which side to take on this question ; and Scripture and Charity coincide.

“Baptism is performed by Immersion. It is reiterated three times, at each time plunging in the whole body of the child, which the curate holds under the arms. At the first Immersion he pronounces in his Language a Form of Words, that signify ; *Such a one — the Servant of God, is baptized in the Name of the Father, now, for ever, and in Secula Seculorum.*” At the second Immersion he says, *Such a one — the Servant of God, is baptized, in the Name of the Son, &c.* At the third, *In the Name of the Holy Ghost.* The godfather answers every time, *So be it.* The parents do not usually present the child till eight days after its birth. On the day of its Baptism, they take care to warm a quantity of water, and to throw into it flowers of a grateful scent. After the papa has blown upon it and blessed it, pouring into it some sacred oil, then with it they anoint the body of the child so thoroughly, that hardly any of the water can dwell upon it. They throw into a hole that is under the altar, all that has been used in the ceremony. The *Greeks* so firmly believe that sprinkling of water on the head of the child is insufficient for Baptism, that frequently they re-baptize the *Latins* who embrace their Communion.—Tounefort’s Voyage, Vol. 1.

“The Muscovites have a custom if there are many children to be baptized, that the Font is *emptied for each child*, and other water is consecrated ; it being their persuasion, that the former being *soiled with the impurity of that Child’s original Sin*, who had been baptized before, it is not fit to cleanse a second, much less a third. They dip the child *three times*, pronouncing the ordinary words.” “Apostate Christians, Turks, or Tartars, receive Baptism in a brook or river, whereinto they are plunged over head and ears.”—Ambass. Trav.

The reason for this is evident. *Running* water has always been chosen for immersion. Even the Heathen preferred *streams*, as the Hindoos at this day prefer the Ganges.

Hence the disciples of John say, he baptized in "*living water*;"—the Jordan. Hence he baptized at Enon, because there were many *streams* there; and hence the Jewish priests were so scrupulous, that according to Lightfoot, if the water in their reservoir vessels had stood more than a few hours without running over, they held it unfit for purification, and drew fresh water. Nothing can more clearly express the *ritual* cleansing of the *person* from guilt: and it is in the instance of these Christians, a remain of that "putting away of the FILTH of the *flesh*," of that "*washing* of the *bodies* of believers in pure water," which was certainly practised in the Apostles' time, previous to Baptism. We have something of it among ourselves, in the *cleanliness* of the children presented for baptism; and in the cleanliness of the mother, on such occasions; as the clean white dress anciently worn after baptism, was a mark of a new life begun, and of putting on the Lord Jesus in a way of professional holiness.

Hence, Baptism was administered under a variety of forms. In some churches, Baptism did not supersede circumcision. Elsewhere, the priest did not baptize the child. Some also practised *Trine immersion*. In some churches, Baptism was administered by immersion or by pouring—and the sacramental words are pronounced once, or three times—but in all those varying ceremonies the essential intent of the rite is preserved; because the subject of the ordinance is consecrated to the Trinity!

Notwithstanding the evils and the superstitions which are the natural consequences of accepting metaphorical expressions, as valid arguments, and reducing them to practice, as if they were literal propositions—yet the overpowering authority of that which describes believers as "*buried* with Christ in Baptism," is urged; and disregarding the order of the Apostle's words, and consequently the true bearing of his argument, *planting* is placed before *baptism*: a demonstrative proof that the meaning of the passage is not accurately understood. It is said of persons approaching the baptismal water—"They are about to be *planted* together in the likeness of his death, being *buried* with him by Baptism into death; and they hope to be planted together in the likeness of his resurrection." What a jumble of incoherencies! I will not affirm that neither *burial* nor *planting* has any business here; but these terms, thus applied without caution or explanation, delude both speaker and hearer.

In reading the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans,

from which these words are taken, we find that in order to impress on Christian converts, the duty and importance of a holy life, after their solemn profession made, or in the expressive language of the Apostle Peter to convince them that NOT *the putting away of the filth of the flesh*, but the stipulation of a good conscience towards God is salutary; Paul uses three similitudes to denote more effectually the same thing: what is rendered *burial*: what is rendered *planting*: and *crucifixion*; which all acknowledge to be unequivocal death. Now these comparisons evidently increase in force according to the order in which they stand; we are therefore obliged to accept the first in a degree of strength less than the second, as the second is in strength less than the third. To place *planting before burial* is to violate the order of ideas in the Apostle's mind; and assuredly, to place *burial BEFORE death*, *crucifixion*, is an inversion of all propriety, alone sufficient to convince us that such disorder cannot be right. *Burial after death* all the world allows; but *death AFTER burial* is unnatural, and equally unscriptural.

Let us examine the import of these words, and endeavour to understand them by obtaining some fixed idea on which to reason. In our English language, *burial* implies DEFINITIVE INTERMENT. So we have "burial grounds;" grounds for *definitive interment*; we have a public "burial service," for *definitive interment*. In this sense, I deny that Jesus Christ was BURIED. He was NOT *definitively interred*.

For what does the original word import? David saw corruption, and was *buried*; but the son of David saw no corruption, and was not *buried*, Acts ii. *εταφη*, in the same sense as his father David was. We find this word rendered *burial*, applied to our Lord, when a living man, in perfect health, and going about according to his custom; for we read concerning Mary; Mark xiv. 8. *εταφιασμον εις τον εταφιασμον*; "she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the *burial*;" which, if they would adhere to their own principles, they ought to render "to anoint my body IN the sepulchre." This the Apostle John expresses, by saying, John xii. 7, *εταφιασμος*, "unto the day of my *burial* she hath kept this;" it was on the day of his burial she expended this; but can our word *burial* be correctly applied to a living man in perfect health? There is not the smallest pretence for annexing the idea of *definitive interment* to that day: our Lord's sufferings were at that time future. Nevertheless he calls it the day of his sepulchral rites.

But even in the case of dead bodies, we find the word *burial* used, where common sense forbids its application. This inadvertency misleads English readers. So we read, Acts v. 6; that “the young men arose, and wound up Anamas, and carried him out, *εθαψαν*, and *buried* him.” They did the same, Verse 10; *εθαψαν*, to his wife Sapphira: “They *buried* her by her husband.” The term *burial* used in these cases, in the sense of *definitive interment* cannot be accepted.

What! *bury* a man, *definitively inter* him, his nearest and dearest relations not knowing of his death! even his wife remaining in perfect ignorance of his decease!—Bury a woman, too, *by MEN*! Contrary to decency! Contrary to the custom of the country! Contrary to the laws! Contrary to every thing human and divine! Can there be stronger proof that the word rendered to *bury*, must be taken here in a sense very distinct from that of *definitive interment*, although applied to persons no longer living.

Even in the parable of the rich man, who is said to be *buried*, Luke xvi. 22; our Lord does not mean to admit of the smallest interval between his death and punishment. He died; and while his body was *preparing for interment*, his soul was in torment.

Every thing concurs to support the explanation given by PARKHURST, in his Dictionary. He says, the word “includes the whole *funereal apparatus* of a dead body. TO PREPARE a *corpse for BURIAL*, as by WASHING, anointing, swathing, &c. Matth. xxvi. 12; the instance of Mary *anointing* our Lord, while living; “She did it FOR MY BURIAL.” John xix. 40;” the instance of our Lord’s body prepared by Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus.

The Jewish ceremonies *previous* to definitive interment were always reckoned strict and essential parts of their religion. The Jews have institutions to enforce them. They cannot be omitted. Those who attempt it incur the greater excommunication. In our present inquiry, we need only consider two: WASHING and ANOINTING. If we examine how far these preparatory services were applied to the dead body of Christ, we shall find that in the nature of things, and according to Scripture, he could not have been BURIED, *definitively interred*. He himself had hinted, while living, that although *anointing* was a customary funereal preparation, yet that *his* body had received all the anointing it ever should have; and accordingly, the good women, his disciples, who “saw how they laid him,” went away into the city, and prepared spices,

and ointments, and came in the morning early, that they might *anoint* him; but his resurrection disappointed their purpose, Luke xxiii. 56; Mark xv. 47.

If this *second* step in the preparation for *definitive interment*, ANOINTING, had not passed on our Lord, how could he be *definitively interred*? If he were *definitively interred*, how could the women expect to obtain his body, that they might *anoint* it? Who would disinter a body—to continue the preparatory services proper BEFORE it was committed to the grave! What a contradiction in terms! That our Lord's body was WASHED, is evident; for the Apostle John says, John xix. 40; it was "clothed in linen cloths"—which was never done till after washing: and indeed, no body could ever require this more than our Lord's body, for he had been repeatedly *baptized* in his own blood; his blood had been *poured out* over him.

That WASHING was the first preparation for interment, is evident from the instance of Dorcas; Acts ix. 37; "who fell sick, and died; whom when they had WASHED, they laid in an upper chamber." It was to such *washing* at death that the Jews compared the ritual *washing* bestowed on their converts; that *washing* indicating ceremonial *death* in the party; because such *washing* indicated a state of natural death in the body which received it, according to the custom of their whole nation. In like manner our Lord's body was WASHED. Moreover, as Dorcas was removed for convenience to an upper chamber, so was our Lord removed to an unfinished tomb in the garden. There was no time for more; and although spices were thrown over him, yet even this was incomplete; for the women who designed to anoint him, also "brought *spices*." If then this preparation for intended embalmment was so strongly pressed for time, and therefore so slightly executed; if the second preparation for interment, ANOINTING, had not been commenced, but was postponed, and attempted on the third day after his being deposited in Joseph's tomb, what argument can be founded on the delusive use of the term "*buried*" in our version, as importing the grave in which his body lay! Was he not truly and without equivocation DEFINITELY INTERRED?

Let us apply this view of the state of our Lord's body, on which the sepulchral rites were begun, to the subject under consideration. How was the baptism of believers assimilated to this?

1. I answer:—Whoever was *ritually united to Christ*,

was *baptized* into the profession of his *death*, by that *washing* at baptism which “put away the filth of the flesh;”—by that *washing*, which all considered as importing *death*; which all esteemed a proof of *death*; and which all took for *death*, and called *death*. Such a person was conformed to what had passed on Christ’s body. He was *NOT* *definitively interred*, for Christ was *NOT* *definitively interred*; but he underwent the ritual preparation for definitive interment, as Christ underwent the mortuary preparation for definitive interment. The resemblance is exact and striking. It gives also the true import of this comparison—baptized into a conformity to that preparation for definitive interment which had passed on Christ; *washed* from former sins and pollutions; as Christ was *washed* from natural defilements, and from the effects of his sufferings. For what purpose is this *death*?—that we might afterwards “walk in newness of life.” The Apostle reserves his particle of likeness for the proper action of *baptism*, that which represented *rising again*, as Christ rose again, to the glory of God the Father.

2. Although the Apostle does not describe the *baptism* of converts as possessing any resemblance to the death of Christ; yet he *does* describe what is rendered *PLANTING*, as possessing such resemblance, to express which he employs a significant and specific term, *σπρῖναι*.

Macknight endeavouring to explain this allusion, says: “The burying of Christ and of believers in baptism, is fitly enough compared to the *PLANTING* of *seeds* in the earth,” &c. How strangely ignorant are some learned men! *Seeds* are *NOT* *planted*: they are *sown*; and the Apostle speaks expressly and repeatedly of the body as *sown* in the earth by *definitive interment*, when his subject related to a body so deposited; then he employs a distinct and proper word, 1 Cor. xv. 43, *σπρῖνεται*, to signify *definitive interment*, or sowing.

The proper sense of the term here used, we learn from the Apostle James, in whose Epistle, Jam. i. 21, it denotes *ENGRAFTING*. What is the process of *engrafting*?—The scion is wholly and entirely removed from the parent stock;—no longer draws nourishment, or influence from it;—no longer depends on *that* for vitality and progress, Rom. xi. 17; but draws nourishment and influence from another root, depends on another stem for vitality and progress; and is wholly supported by its new connection. Is not this the exact “*similitude*” of Christ’s personal state in heaven? No longer connected with this world by bodily ties;—no longer partak-

ing of earthly food, or drinking of the fruit of the vine ;—no longer subject to bodily inconveniences—to suffering, to insult and to death :—He being raised, dieth no more. His resurrection is to glory—and he draws all his honours from the blissful state and world : he is *TRANSPLANTED* from earth to heaven. In like manner, converts, heathen converts especially, at their profession of Christ, are *TRANSPLANTED* into a new state. Old things are done away, all things are become new. Old connections are shaken off ; old practices are abandoned ; old principles are disavowed ; old *names* even are relinquished. The old man is no more. Instead of these old things, the newly *transplanted* person draws nourishment and influence from his new connection ; depends on his new source for vitality and progress ; is wholly supported by a new sap, and possesses a new life, to be dated and reckoned from the day of his *transplantation*. “ If, then, we have been *transplanted* conformably to the similitude of Christ’s death, we shall be further, into that of his resurrection as the direct consequence ;” spending the remainder of our time in godly fear, and bringing forth the fruits of genuine piety, Col. iii. 1. This *resurrection* is from the death of sin, to a new life of holiness ; and is manifested *ON EARTH*—*NOT in heaven*.

3. This sense is confirmed by the import of the third simile, *CRUCIFIXION*, on the consequences of which the Apostle reasons at length. Our old man is *CRUCIFIED* with Christ :—in order that as in *baptism* we professed death unto sin, by undergoing a metaphorical death, *WASHING*, preparatory to interment :—in order that as in *transplantation* we broke off all connection with our former state—so in this *crucifixion*, “ *the body of sin might be destroyed.*” The Apostle’s purpose is *ONE*, though his similies be *THREE*. He exhorts, that after *baptism* we should walk in newness of life ; that after *transplantation* we should conform to the holiness and resurrection of Christ ; that after *crucifixion*, we should “ yield ourselves unto God, as those who are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God.” These similies are *THREE* ; but the purpose of them all is *ONE*. The last also is the strongest. The middle one is marked by the point of *similitude* ; the first is the weakest, and preparatory to the others. They *MUST* stand prepared for interment, transplanted, crucified. To violate their order is to wrong the Apostle.

We are now prepared to understand a *literal* version of the argument.—“ How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any

longer therein? Know ye not that whosoever of us are baptized, *εις*, to a *profession of* Jesus Christ, are baptized, *εις*, to a *profession of* his death? We are therefore prepared for interment, *δια*, for the purpose of Baptism, *εις*, to a *profession of* his death, *ωα*, in order that in like manner as Christ was raised from the dead, *δια*, for the purpose of the glory of the Father, so also to the glory of the Father we should walk in newness of life. So surely as we have been transplanted together by similitude of his death, moreover, much more, by that of his resurrection, we shall be. Knowing this, therefore our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that we should not henceforth serve sin:—for the dead is discharged from sin.”

There can be no doubt that the resurrection after *crucifixion* is intended for this life; and that the resurrection after *baptism* is intended for this life; the inference is undeniable, that the resurrection after *planting* must also be intended for this life. See how easily by foolishly realizing a metaphorical expression into a literal proposition, Hymeneus and Philetus might err concerning the faith, 2 Tim. ii. 18, saying that “the resurrection is past already,” in *baptism*!

The Latin term *immersion*, to an English reader, is not a translation of the Greek term *baptize*;—which Greek term suffers extreme violence when forced into English by the term *plunging*. I have shown, that the *baptism* by the Holy Ghost *descended*—that the *baptism* of Nebuchadnezzar *descended*—that the *baptism* received by the ancient Israelites also *descended*—that the use of the word *baptize* by the LXX, stands opposed to the sense of *plunging*—that the Hebrew rite of *washing* was long prior to Christ, and was continued in Christian baptism, with additions;—as the Lord’s Supper was a continuation of a part of the Passover with additions;—that the *additions* to ritual washing were the true and proper *Baptism*—that Scripture enables us to distinguish between the two actions of *immersion* and *baptism*—that the churches which best understood the language of the New Testament, it being their mother tongue, observed and perpetuated the distinction between *immersion* and *baptism*—that the distinction between *immersion* and *baptism* obtains at this day, and is still practised; that this ritual *washing*, or *cleansing*, resembling that always applied to the dead, recalled the idea of mortal departure—while the *addition* made to it under the Gospel dispensation, expressed and signified professional holiness, a *resurrection*, a newness of life; therefore, the

general inference is, this ; WHOEVER ADOPTS IMMERSION WITHOUT ADDING POURING, MAY CERTAINLY CLAIM ALL THE CREDIT DUE TO THE REVIVAL OF AN ANCIENT JEWISH CEREMONY, SIGNIFYING DEATH ; — BUT CHRISTIAN BAPTISM SIGNIFYING LIFE, THEY DO NOT PRACTICE.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM:

AS ADMINISTERED

BY THE

APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS,

AND THE

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS.

THIRTEEN ILLUSTRATIONS.

EXPLANATION OF THE ENGRAVINGS.

“DISTINGUISH THINGS WHICH DIFFER.”

OF the hundred testimonies quoted from critics by Mr. Booth, on the subject of Baptism, in his “Pædobaptism Examined,” ninety-nine are repetitions or copies reducible to the effect and power of one or two original witnesses. He thus quotes Deylingius, who says: “So long as the Apostles lived, as many believe, *immersion* only was used; to which afterwards, perhaps, they ADDED a kind of AFFUSION; *such as the Greeks practice at this day*, AFTER HAVING PERFORMED THE TRINE IMMERSION.” Do the Greeks, at this day, ADD a kind of POURING, AFTER immersion?—then they do not consider immersion as the whole of Baptism but only as preparatory to it; exactly as their disciples in Abyssinia perform the ordinance, and “*perhaps*” this they received from the Apostles’ days. But since Baptism has certainly undergone many variations, what confidence is due to the Greeks of this day? How far may this “*perhaps*” be converted into certainty?—always supposing that the higher we can trace the evidence, the nearer to the first century, the more effectually it justifies our reliance. To which we add, that *independent* witnesses, if possible to be obtained, are worthy of more than double honour: their united testimony is credible in a much greater ratio, than the testimony of each taken singly; or if supposed to stand alone.

Montfaucon observed in the Preface to his *Antiquité Expliquée*, that we learn a thousand particulars from ancient representations, sculptures, &c., concerning points of classic inquiry, which are not mentioned by any of the old writers. Robinson, in his History of Baptism, introduced those *ancient* representations of that Christian ordinance, which he conceived might illustrate the subject. For these speak the


same language to all nations. They present no difficulty of construction, nor variation of sense in particles or prepositions; the learned and the unlearned may *translate* them with equal correctness, and with equal facility. They are vouchers for the time in which they were executed; and though we cannot hear the men of that generation *viva voce*, and we dare not put words into their lips, yet we may *see* their testimony, and judge of its relevancy to the inquiry that engages our attention. For these reasons, and in full reliance on their authenticity and authority, the following subjects have been compiled.

I. BAPTISM OF JESUS CHRIST.



This subject is an ornament on the door of the great Church at Pisa. From the shape of the characters it must be of very ancient workmanship. The motto upon it is BAPTIZAT. It was obviously made for some Christian establishment. According to the tradition current among the Pisans, it was brought from Jerusalem by their Crusaders, about the commencement of the twelfth century.

II. BAPTISM OF CHRIST IN JORDAN.



This picture is taken from the Church on the Via Ostiensis, at Rome. The outside is a plate of brass, covering a substance of wood. The figures are partly in relief, partly engraved. Some of the hollows are inlaid with silver. The inscriptions are in Greek, with the motto—*ΒΑΠΤΙΧΘ*.

The door which it covers is dated 1070; but the plate is much older than the door; and from the letters, it is manifestly of Greek origin and very ancient workmanship.

III. JESUS BAPTIZED IN THE RIVER JORDAN.



This picture is copied from the door of the Church at Beneventum, which was one of the first cities in Italy where the Gospel was introduced. The ordinance of Baptism is represented as conjoining both Immersion and Aspersion. It is rudely executed, and extremely ancient.

IV. BAPTISM OF CHRIST IN JORDAN.



This representation is the centre-piece of the dome of the Baptistery at Ravenna; which building was erected and decorated in 454.

John the Baptist is drawn as standing on the bank of the river, holding in his left hand an oblong cross, and in his right hand a shell from which he pours water on the head of Christ who is standing in the water up to his waist. Over the Lord is a crown of glory, and the figure of a dove, symbolizing the Holy Spirit. The rite of Baptism appears to be performed both by Immersion and Affusion at the same time. The name JORDANN is written over the head of the mythological figure, which according to the custom of the ancients represented that river.


V. CHRIST BAPTIZED IN JORDAN.



This is a representation in Mosaic of the Baptism of Christ in Jordan, preserved in the Church, in Cosmedin, at Ravenna, which was erected, A. D. 401.

In the centre is Christ our Saviour in the river Jordan. On a rock stands John the Baptist, in his left hand is a bent rod, and his right hand holds a *patena*, shell; from which he POURS WATER on the head of the Redeemer; over whom descends the dove, the symbol of the Holy Ghost, with expanded wings, and emitting rays of glory and grace.

VI. ANCIENT BATH.



In order to remove all doubts whether Baptism might not be administered in the house of the person receiving it, by means of those baths with which every Roman family was furnished, this plate contains one example of those articles. Some of the baths were small and might be removed from one room into another, for many purposes as well as Baptism. In such a bath the Believers in the house of Cornelius might have been baptized. The Philippian jailor having used such a portable bath to wash the lacerated bodies of Paul and Silas probably, "straightway" used the very same bath for the purpose of "*washing away his sins*;" and of afterwards receiving Baptism in the name of the Lord.*

* The bath represented above is still extant in the celebrated Baptistery of Constantine at Rome near the Lateran. It was used for Baptism from the earliest times.

VII. BAPTISM OF A HEATHEN KING AND QUEEN.




This picture represents the King and his Queen in a family bath ; and in addition to the immersion, a man in a military habit POURING water on them from a vase. In the original, a number of attendants are around them, witnessing the administration of the ordinance. This monument of sculpture combines both this delineation and also that of engraving VIII. ; and is found at Chigia, near Naples. From the dresses, they are Longobardi, who received Christianity through the influence of Theolinda, A. D. 591. The picture represents the Baptism of Argilulfus the king, and Theolinda, the queen of the Longobardi, who occupied Beneventum in the sixth century.

VIII. ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM.



This depicts two points of time. First; the candidate is seen kneeling down and praying near the bath of water; and a hand issues from a cloud above him, to denote the acquiescence of heaven in his petitions. Second; Baptism is administered by **POURING** WATER out of a vase on persons who are kneeling on the ground, and *not immersed* at all. Either then, Baptism was administered *without immersion*, by *pouring only*; notwithstanding the convenience of the bath; or those persons had previously been immersed, and afterwards received Baptism, as a distinct, subsequent, and separate act. Either of these facts, and one of them must be the truth, cuts up the Baptist system by the roots.

IX. BAPTISM OUTSIDE OF THE CHURCH.



The boy is unclothed, and the ordinance is administered by *pouring*. This representation shows that the present Abyssinian mode of Baptism, as narrated by Mr. Salt, anciently was extant among the Greeks as well as among the Romans. For although this plate is at Rome, yet it was the work of Greek artists, in the ninth or tenth century.

X. LAURENTIUS BAPTIZING ROMANUS.



This representation is in the Church of Lawrence, extra muros, at Rome. The jugs or vases are remarkable; being the same as in other pictures of far remoter antiquity. The action of pouring is the same, and by an Ecclesiastic.

In the other Baptisms portrayed in Plates VII. and VIII.; as they were performed in an inconvenient manner and place, it might be alleged, that the peculiar vase was adopted, because there was not a better vehicle at hand; but this objection does not apply to this case, because Lawrence, the Martyr-preacher is depicted as formally administering Baptism in a regular Baptistry by **POURING!**

XI. BAPTISM OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE.



This is a representation of the Baptism of Constantine the Great. The Emperor receiving Baptism is *immersed* in the bath, metaphorically called the “laver of regeneration;” and Eusebius adds the proper rite of Baptism, by **POURING WATER** on the Monarch’s head.

BAPTISMAL CEREMONIES.

WE thus adduce *twelve* ancient examples of Baptism, all administered by POURING. The number might easily be made up to *fifty*; while on the contrary not one instance of *plunging* can or ever will be adduced. The numerous instances of *Baptism by pouring* plainly show, that the action and attitude of the administrator of the ordinance and of the person submitting to the rite were constantly the same. Whence as the uniformity amounts to identity, we learn that they are implicit and unvarying repetitions of one original appointment. On these representations of ancient Baptism in the engravings, the antiquary Ciampini reasons to the following effect. In these pictures we see Christ *immersed* in water, and John also POURING WATER on his head. This raises a doubt whether Baptism should be performed by *immersion*, or by *aspersion*, or by both. That the rite of Baptism was anciently performed by *immersion*, we have the testimony of numerous representations, and of various writers.

He proceeds to investigate the difficulties presented by these testimonies; which he reduces chiefly to, I. *The person who administers Baptism*;—who is a *layman*, not an ecclesiastic. II. Baptism is administered by *immersion*, and by *aspersion*. He concludes, after considerable argument, as to the first difficulty, that all the canonists agree that in cases of necessity, *laymen may administer Baptism*.

He proceeds to draw the following inferences on the second point.

“It is beyond all doubt, that the first faithful were *baptized* wherever convenience offered:—some in rivers, others in fountains, others in lakes, others by the way-side, others in the sea, others in private houses. The mode of Baptism also differed, *as is believed*; insomuch that if they were in a place convenient for *immersion*, baptism was conferred by *immer-*

sion : if they were in a place where streams, fountains, or other lesser waters were found, water was **POURED** on the head."

Some writers think that **SUBMERSION** was sometimes practised in baptism. The word *first* occurs in a letter of Alkwin to Ædwin, both being Saxons. They lived in the eighth century. *Trine* **SUBMERSION** is alluded to by the same writer.

Ciampini sums up the whole in these words : "*Baptismus itaque primitiva in ecclesia, ut nuper exposuimus, ubicunque se offerebat occasio, celebratur ; nam in fluminibus ; in fontibus ; in Mari Domi, aliisque in locis hoc primum ad salutis januam ministrabatur sacramentum.*" From the expressions used by this antiquary, it appears that he had not arrived at any determinate opinions on the subject of Baptism, as represented by these compositions. He perceived their testimony and acknowledged their competence ; but he draws his inferences with hesitation and indecision.

It does not appear to have occurred to Ciampini, that these pictures represent, as passing at the same instant, actions really distinct ; because such was the necessity under which the art of the painter or sculptor was confined. A moment's consideration will demonstrate this ;—for *the descent of the Holy Ghost was not till after our Lord had come up out of Jordan* : yet in all these subjects it is represented as descending upon him while **IN** Jordan : contrary to the moment of time, and to the text. In like manner, the action of the Baptist, **POURING**, is distinct from the prior *immersion*, though consecutive on it. Neither painter nor sculptor could represent this action as distinct from the other, without employing *two* pictures or two sculptures.

Here are five ancient and ecclesiastical representations, in which our Lord Christ appears **IN** the water of Jordan. It is to no purpose to dispute about the power of the Greek preposition or particle : we have only to open our eyes, and declare whether or not his figure be partly *immersed in the water*. It is a question not of grammar, but of appeal to the senses. This is **IMMERSION**.

Although Jesus is **IN** the water, yet John is **NOT**. Every one of these representations, as also others instanced by Robinson, places John *on the bank of the river*, but not **IN** the water. This is clearly consistent with Holy Scripture, which never gives the least hint of John's being **IN** the Jordan.

It follows demonstratively, that John, standing on the bank and higher than Jesus, could not possibly **PLUNGE** him.

Unless he were IN the water—which he is NOT—he could not have sufficient power over the person of any one who is in the water to PLUNGE him.

Supposing it *possible* that John could have had power, not being himself in the water, to *plunge* a person who was in the water, yet it is clear, from these ancient ecclesiastical representations, that he did not exert that power. He employed an action entirely different, and even INCONSISTENT with it: for *after* the *immersion* of the party, he administered *baptism*, by POURING WATER on the head of the subject baptized. This is the action of all the instances: not of those representations only which may be attributed to the Latins; but of those wrought by Greeks, and for Greeks. There is no room for equivocation here. The Greek letters prove that they are Greek representations; and their conservation and dedication as spoils of war, mark their origin in a country far distant from Italy; where their evidence on the subject of Baptism was not anticipated. Arians and Othodox, who agreed in nothing else, all attest to this representation.

These Greek and Latin workmen, with the Greek and Latin ecclesiastics under whose direction they wrought, together with their churches, either believed that John's *baptism* was administered by POURING, or they were guilty of a conspiracy and intention to deceive their people; by representing this action as performed in a certain manner, when they knew in their hearts and consciences that it was performed in a manner totally different, ABSOLUTELY INCONSISTENT with what they represented; and nothing less than IMPOSSIBLE to be thus performed at the time, and for the purpose.—Those may believe this who can. There was no purpose to be answered by this flagrant iniquity. The workmen lived in distant countries: they lived in distant ages: how then could *they* combine? Who does not see in these distinct evidences the UNIVERSAL conviction of the truth of the action, as here represented?—A more forcible appeal cannot be made to the heart and judgment, by means of the senses. Every man not stone blind—or not so *blind as those who WILL NOT SEE*, must feel the force of this appeal.*

* I have followed Robinson through the very work that he selected when composing his "History of Baptism," and have restricted my examples to that collection. He notices the preceding representations; but he did not dare to bring their figurative evidence together; because their united testimony would completely have overturned the Baptist hypothesis.

Let us review this part of the evidence, and show the proper application of such testimony. If we inquire what is the authority of the Church of Abyssinia, for administering Baptism *after* immersion, and distinct from that action, we must turn our eyes to the Greek Church who, says Deylingius, practise affusion after immersion; and if we examine further, the engravings show, that both the Greek and Latin Churches made a distinction between the actions of immersion and baptism, in the eighth, the sixth, the fourth, and the third centuries; doubtless grounding their practice on the custom of their forefathers as received from the Apostles, and strongly indicated in the Scripture instance of Philip and the Eunuch.

Thus we trace the custom, by means of these evidences, to the fountain-head of authority. Let it be supposed that I have misconceived the instance of Philip and the Eunuch, yet the Greeks understood their own language. *They* were capable judges; and how came *they* to establish this distinction?—whence was *their* authority for this practice?—Who could enforce this innovation, if it had not the countenance of Scripture; and where is that to be found, beside the history recorded in the Acts? I rest my interpretation on the obvious construction of Luke's words; but I support it, by the consent of all the churches, in the early centuries of Christianity, from whom it descended to their successors and their disciples, and by whom it is maintained at the present day.

Of what avail, then, is Mr. Booth's *would-be* dilemma—"Is there any text that requires *pouring* in opposition to immersion. Has any passage of Sacred Writ been found that enjoins pouring water on the face, head, in contradistinction to *plunging* the whole body?....But if immersion be not required, in contradistinction to pouring, and if pouring be not required in opposition to immersion: we should consider it as a favour if an opponent would inform us what *is* required?" In answer I observe, that if immersion preceded baptism, according to the evidences now produced, this mighty argument is reduced to silence.

Mr. Booth's goodness was not in exercise when he wrote such a passage as this:—"Whether Guise, and those who follow him, imagine the son of Zacharias to have used his naked hand, a scoop, a squirt, a brush, or a bunch of hyssop, I cannot say. The poet Gay has mentioned another instrument that is well fitted to sprinkle a multitude expeditiously;

"When dexterous damsels twirl the *sprinkling MOP*."

Whether this was the instrument used by John, we leave our opposers to judge." *This is not wisdom, if it be wit* : and it is not candour, if it be cunning. But what say the foregoing Plates to this particular ?

From the small size of most of the subjects, I find it impossible to distinguish correctly that vehicle out of which John *POURS water*. Ciampini calls it a *patera* ; I have thought it a *shell* ; but it may be a bowl. Certainly it must come under the general meaning of the Greek word, *μετρον* ; rendered *measure* ; and the Scripture affords an allusion to it. John Baptist was informed by his disciples that Jesus *baptized*, and all men came to him ; John iii. 34. Part of his answer is this ; " He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God ; for God *GIVETH* not the Spirit *εκ μετρος* ; *OUT OF a measure* unto him ;" as water is *given* at baptism, by his forerunner, to those upon whom it is *POURED*. This is fixed to the subject of *baptism*, by the occasion of the story ; which was a question or debate between the disciples of John and certain Jews about ritual *purification*.—*THAT* contention could relate only to the *addition* made by John to the *καθαρισμοις* ; *washings* common among the Jews. The querists, no doubt, attacked his new mode ; and his authority for this innovation. To no other period of our Lord's life than his baptism could those words spoken by John refer, in those early days of his ministry, when he had as yet done comparatively nothing ; and what but the action of *giving* could recall the Baptist's mind to the recollection of *giving* out of a measure ? Every one of the figures in the engravings, administering baptism, holds in his hand what answers the purpose of, and in effect is that *measure* : so that we see clearly in what sense the water of baptism was really given *out of a measure*, to the person baptized ; for a *vase*, or measure of capacity is a leading sense of the word *metron* ; and such a vase is used in those representations.

Unable to deny the authority, or the authenticity of these representations, it is objected that *they are not of the first*, but of the *third*, or *fourth*, or *fifth* century. But this gives additional strength to their evidence ? For in the *third*, or *fourth*, and still more in the *fifth* century, the administration of Baptism had departed greatly from its original simplicity. Metaphorical allusions had been multiplied—some Scriptural, and others totally unwarranted. For instance—the baptistery had *three* steps leading down to it. The person descending was supposed on the *first* of these to renounce the world—

on the *second*, to renounce the flesh, and on the *third*, to renounce the devil.—Then in returning ; he was supposed to ascend the *first* step in the name of the Father—the *second* step in the name of the Son—and the *third* step in the name of the Holy Ghost. Many other “*unscripturals*” also were practised. In the subjects of the preceding representation we see nothing of all this ; nor of any thing, the cross excepted in one of them, but the simple rite : for as to the angels “attending on the Son of Man,” they are supposed to be invisible ; and as to the different forms of the glory and the dove, they are subsequent to the act of Baptism. What could induce those Greek and Latin artists from the remotest antiquity to adhere to the one simple action ; to the unvaried truth unadulterated by metaphorical allusions—in contradiction to the taste of their times ; unless they had felt themselves constrained by the unbroken consent of all Christ’s disciples to represent Baptism by this mode, as being “*verily and indeed*” THAT to which their Lord and Master had submitted ? The Baptists can neither evade the force of this truth, nor can they answer this argument !

CONSTRUCTION OF ANCIENT BAPTISTERIES.

As the practice of *immersion* ceased, converts from heathenism gradually increasing, the conveniencies of Baptisteries were changed; so that now few traces of their original accommodations can be discovered. Nevertheless, we occasionally find hints which refer to them. John the Deacon, in his lives of the Neapolitan Prelates, says of Vincenzo—"Fecit Baptisterium fontis majoris, et accubitum juxta positum. That *accubitum* I translate by the modern term *vestry*: and then the passage reads thus—"He made the BAPTISTERY of the greater font, and the VESTRY close by it." The mention of the *greater* font implies the existence of a *lesser* font; and the *vestry* informs us where the priests and deacons might wait, while the women were unclothed, receiving *ablution* from the *greater* font, without any disparagement to modesty. The soldiers who beset a Baptistry doubtless would assault the vestry close to it.

Gruter has preserved this inscription—

HIC EST LONGINIANUS QUI FON—
TES BAPTISMATIS CONSTRUXIT
SANCTI PAPÆ DAMASI VERSIBUS
NOBELITATOS.

A. D. 394. Flavius Macrobius Longinianus fuit præfectus Urbi.

"This is Longinianus who constructed the Baptismal Fonts." Why are *fonts* mentioned in the plural, unless as in the foregoing instance of Vincenzo, there were both a greater and a lesser font? The inscription bears date in the year 394, when Longinianus was the præfect, the chief magistrate of the city of Rome.

But some person may retort as an objection; "Since those smaller fonts were so useful, it may be regretted that none of

them have been preserved as evidences of the ancient practice." One however still exists in the Cathedral at Syracuse, where it is regarded as of most venerable antiquity; and in my judgement, the fonts usual in the parish churches of Britain are those portable fonts now fixed in one position. Of the Syracusan font tradition affirms, that it is the very implement used by their primitive Bishop Marcian. It is of marble; small and has two handles; therefore was portable; but it has a broad foot, on which to stand steady; and is about *twelve* inches deep. This inscription is on the font—"The dedicated present of Zosimus, who devotes to God this Holy Cistern for the purpose of Sacred Baptism."—The term *KPATHPA*, *kratera*, cistern imports a receptacle, from which water or wine is distributed at festivals to many applicants. This holy cistern doubtless was imitated in the *me-te-mak* of Abyssinia; which with other evidence proves the existence of smaller fonts, at the same time with the larger at the beginning of the fourth century.*

The only reason assigned by Antiquaries why this font cannot be more ancient than the fourth century is this; because no instances of Christian inscriptions importing gifts to the church are known before that period; but the correctness of this inference may be doubted, for the Heathen much earlier inscribed their gifts to their temples.


*

ΑΝΑΘΗΜΑ ΙΕΡΟΥ ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ^{τος}
 ΖΟΣΙΜΟΥ ΘΕΩΔΩΡΟΥ^{ουτος}
 ΤΟΝ ΚΡΑΤΗΡΑ ^{αγι}ΟΝ
 DONARIUM SACRI BAPTISMATIS
 ZOSIMI DEO DONUM
 HOC VAS, sive, HUNC CRATEREM.

Siciliæ Inscript. Class 17. No. 1.—Gualtheri Monum. Sicul.—Jac. Phil. Tomasinus de Donariis, Cap. 43.—Paciaudi de Sac. Christian Balneis, Cap. xvi.

XII. JESUS CHRIST BAPTIZED IN THE JORDAN

BY JOHN BAPTIST.



This picture is in the small chapel of the Catacomb of Pontianus, called the "Chapel of the Baptistry." Beneath the portraits is painted one of those crosses, ornamented with precious stones, called *Gemmatæ*; to the arms of which are hung the symbolical characters of Christ, *A* and *Ω*.—Arringhi, Roma Solterranea, Tome 1.

The Lamb is introduced in allusion to "the Lamb of God;" and as the sculptured delineations of many other Baptisms have *three* angels, the *single* angel in this representation proves that it is a work of the most remote antiquity.

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON



The history of the city of Boston is a subject of great interest and importance. It is a city that has played a significant role in the development of the United States. The city's history is filled with events that have shaped the nation's destiny. From its early days as a small settlement to its current status as a major metropolitan area, Boston has a rich and varied past. The city's location on the eastern coast of North America has made it a strategic point of interest for many centuries. Its harbor has been a vital link between the continent and the world. The city's history is a testament to the resilience and spirit of its people. It is a city that has stood the test of time and continues to thrive in the modern world. The history of Boston is a story of growth, change, and progress. It is a story that is worth knowing and remembering.

XIII. CHAPEL OF THE BAPTISTRY.



Internal view of the Chapel of the Baptistry in the Catacomb of Pontianus, out of the gate Portese at Rome.

CHAPEL OF THE BAPTISTERY.

IN the first ages of Christianity, that subterranean recess was appropriated to the administration of Baptism. This is witnessed both by the source of living water which is still to be seen in it, and by the subject of the picture.

This is a subject of "great interest"—and occupies the first place among the Baptisteries, as being the most simple, and perhaps, the most ancient of these monuments. The style of the paintings shows that they were added after the place had been destined to this usage.

"It is situated at Rome, out of the *Porta Portese*: in a place called *Monte Verde*; there is still seen the bason of running water which served to administer Baptism in the earliest times of the church; from the first to the fourth century."

This may be considered one of the first Baptisteries of the Christians; as is evidently proved by the painting in fresco, executed on the wall at the farther end; the subject of which is the Baptism of Jesus Christ.—This place was undoubtedly a Catacomb of the Christians in the first century; and also a *Baptistry* from the very earliest period. The spring still flows whence issued the water in which the converts from heathenism renounced their idols. The basin cut in the rock in which the converts stood yet exists, while the sacred name and rite consecrated their transition to a renewed life. How awful is this subterranean retreat! This was the depository of all that could die of holy martyrs, who held fast their profession even in death. The Christian symbol still marks where the sufferers rest in peace. An inscription thus imports—**** "*Who received the crown of martyrdom.*" the dust barely retains the form of a skeleton; time having almost obliterated its last remains.—**** "*Who was decapitated,*" the skull separated from the bones of the trunk, with the guilty instrument by the side of it, tells the whole history.—

The phial tinged with blood, half way up to another sepulchral monument, speaks louder than a thousand voices, that the Christian whom it was designed to commemorate sealed the truth of the Gospel by his death.

By examining the engraved illustrations at the commencement of this description, we may trace some incidents of its history. It was a Baptistery before it was a Sepulchre ; for originally the walls of the small chapel which does not exceed six feet square were carried up to the ceiling ; which formed a narrow, cell-like, but complete room.

But when it was formed into a burial-place, the rock was cut away from the upper part and a portion of the sides, leaving the remaining part of the faces of the Baptistery projecting about eighteen inches. Those sepulchres were formed at the time of persecution ; yet their inscriptions do not exhibit any mark by which the date can be obtained. The first persecution took place under Nero, A. D. 64 ; but it is scarcely admissible, that Baptism was administered at that period in any other place than private houses. There could be no cause for subterranean privacy. The next violent persecution at Rome was during the reign of Trajan, A. D. 107 ; and the Christians then must have found the continual necessity of the most absolute secrecy on numerous occasions ; for their "*superstition*," as it was denominated, had been embraced by many dignified persons as well as by a multitude of other classes of the people.

The Baptistery therefore may justly be dated before the latter end of the first century. If the reader will examine the plan, he will observe a small recess of about two feet in depth and width, just sufficient to hold *one person only* :—and there undoubtedly stood the person who administered the ordinance. It could serve for no other use : and evidently was cut for that purpose. It follows, that Baptism was not *there* administered by *plunging* ; but as the accompanying picture bears testimony, by *pouring* on the head of the convert. Yet this will not decide whether the convert did or did not *there* receive a previous ablution. This Baptistery then agrees with *every instance known*, in witnessing that the administrator did not enter the water : and so far the conclusion is established on the rock itself.

We cannot say as much for the sepulchres *that* may date from A. D. 107, or A. D. 169, or A. D. 202. In 235 to 238, a persecution raged ; and again in the year 257, in which many churches built by Christians were destroyed. The

last was under Dioclesian in 305. Those Sepulchres then ascend to the third century. The medium would place them from about, A. D. 202 to 235. The rock is cut away over where the picture is now placed ; and it was a custom of the earlier Christians, to replace such ornaments, where they had before existed.* The Painter of this baptism certainly was a Christian ; for to have employed any "Heathen sculptor accustomed to represent Jupiter and Priapus," would have placed a most dangerous secret in his power ; a secret which reward, interest, loyalty, duty and religion would incessantly urge him to reveal : which would have insured the destruction of the whole family, or society, on whose premises the private chapel was detected, with *all the list* of the Baptized. The Artist might be a mere dauber, as a Painter, yet an excellent Christian ; and *that* answers every cavil. The inferiority of his talents prevented M. d'Agincourt, from strictly estimating the date of his performance. It is bad, but not too bad for a Christian slave of the second century : and of equal date with the conversion of this Baptistery into a Catacomb. I have chosen this picture of Ancient Baptism, because as an example it speaks for itself, beyond controversy ; because it agrees with all other ancient representations known ; because the action of the Baptist is clearly that of *pouring* : and *because it is much older than any copy of the Gospels now in existence*. It is two centuries older than those venerable Manuscripts, the Alexandrian and Vatican copies ; and is one of the earliest possible monuments of Christianity that can be now remaining. But it is not the first of the kind. It is a repetition of an idea borrowed from elsewhere, and may even be a repetition of a picture painted in the same place, previous to its enlargement for a Catacomb.

The man who can contemplate this most venerable scene, these holy remains, without feeling an awe stealing over his spirit—who can realize to himself the horrors of persecution raging in the world above—the ardour of a convert descending with solemn alacrity to acknowledge a profession of the name of Jesus, unmoved by the surrounding graves of parents—acquaintance—countrymen—perhaps deriving fresh vigour from recollection of their fortitude and felicity, under excruciating torments—determined through the grace of God to

* Buonarotti says, "There is a picture and a like history included in the Baptism of Jesus Christ, in an ancient Baptistery in the cemetery of Pontianus out of the Porta Portese at Rome." It was discovered in 1687.

live a new life, or to leave a dying testimony in his turn ; and thus to verify the principle, that “ the blood of the Martyrs is the seed of the church : ”—the man who can realize this scene and remain unmoved, has little of the feelings of Christianity. He may be more orthodox than the illinformed who uncovers his head, and in a paroxysm of admiration exclaims, *Sancte, Sancte, ora pro nobis !*—but he knows nothing of Christian sympathy ; and nothing of the communion of saints !

Yet in this very seclusion, where the light of day never entered, where fallacious ornaments were useless and criminal, where the congregation was composed of a far greater number of dead than of living, where departed spirits, if departed spirits re-visit this lower world, were the only witnesses, and where God the Supreme, and the exalted Saviour were all the objects that *could be* adored, there we find one of these pictures. For what purpose was it placed in that subterraneous vault, if not to instruct the administrator and the convert, that *thus* their Lord himself was baptized in Jordan ?—that duty led them to be *thus* conformed to this part of the image of Christ ; that it became them “ *thus* to fulfil all righteousness ? ”—This picture announces Baptism as the beginning of the profession of Christ and the end is denoted by the CRUX GEMMATA, the cross in glory ; which with the \mathcal{A} and Ω , the Alpha and the Omega, points to that better world, to which all who there were baptized, and all who were buried there, directed their *ardent wishes*, their *sincere and steadfast profession*, and their *deathless HOPE* !

TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE

ILLUSTRATED BY THE PRECEDING

"FACTS AND EVIDENCES."

	Page		Page
GENESIS.		Leviticus xiv : 6, 16, 51, .	122
Genesis vii,	42	Leviticus xvi : 6,	116
Genesis vii : 1,	33, 87	Leviticus xvi : 14, 15,	134
Genesis ix : 21,	33	NUMBERS.	
Genesis xv : 17,	72	Numbers ix : 15,	33
Genesis xvi : 2,	42	Numbers xvi : 27, 32,	43
Genesis xviii : 10, 25,	72	Numbers xviii : 11,	43
Genesis xviii : 19,	43, 87	Numbers xviii : 31,	87
Genesis xxiv : 67,	33	Numbers xix : 11, 22,	133
Genesis xxviii : 18,	18	Numbers xix : 16,	133
Genesis xxx : 1, 2,	41	Numbers xix : 17,	132
Genesis xxx : 3,	42	Numbers xix : 18,	122
Genesis xxxiv : 30,	87	Numbers xix : 19,	133
Genesis xxxix : 5,	90	Numbers xxiv : 5, 7,	163
Genesis xl,	42	DEUTERONOMY.	
Genesis xli : 40,	90	Deuteronomy v : 30,	33
Genesis xlvi : 5,	88	Deuteronomy xii : 7,	87
Genesis xlvi : 6, 26, 27,	87	Deuteronomy xiv : 26,	87
Genesis xlvi : 26,	87	Deuteronomy xv : 20,	87
Genesis xlvi : 27, 31,	42	Deuteronomy xxv : 9,	42, 88
EXODUS.		Deuteronomy xxvi : 11,	43
Exodus i : 1,	88	Deuteronomy xxix : 10, 11,	76
Exodus i : 21,	38, 41	Deuteronomy xxxiii : 24,	123
Exodus xii : 22,	122	JOSHUA.	
Exodus xii : 48,	82	Joshua iii : 15,	123
Exodus xiv,	118	Joshua iii : 15, 17,	116
Exodus xiv : 19,	131	Joshua v : 2, 7,	22
Exodus xiv : 21, 29,	115	Joshua viii : 3, 4,	76
Exodus xv : 8,	131	Joshua ix : 23,	73
Exodus xxix,	18	RUTH.	
Exodus xxxiv : 16,	15	Ruth ii : 14,	123
LEVITICUS.		Ruth iv : 12,	44
Leviticus iv : 6,	122	I SAMUEL.	
Leviticus iv : 17,	122	1 Samuel i : 28,	96
Leviticus ix : 9,	122	1 Samuel ii : 3,	43
Leviticus xi : 32,	122	1 Samuel ii : 11,	96
Leviticus xiv : 6,	116	1 Samuel ii : 33,	88

	Page		Page
1 Samuel x : 1, . . .	18	Psalm cx : 3, . . .	20
1 Samuel xiv : 1, . . .	19	Psalm cxiii : 9, . . .	43, 88
1 Samuel xiv : 27, . . .	123	Psalm cxxvii : . . .	42
II SAMUEL.		Psalm cxxviii : 3, . . .	41
2 Samuel v : 11, 29, . . .	41	PROVERBS.	
2 Samuel vii : 11, 16, . . .	43	Proverbs vi : 31, . . .	90
2 Samuel vii : 16, 18, 25, 29, . . .	88	CANTICLES.	
2 Samuel vii : 27, . . .	41	Canticles viii : 7, . . .	90
2 Samuel xii : 8, . . .	90	ISAIAH.	
2 Samuel xii : 11, . . .	43	Isaiah vii : 15, . . .	146
I KINGS.		Isaiah xi : 15, . . .	118
1 Kings vii : 1, 6, 8, 9, . . .	33	Isaiah xiii : 16, . . .	43
1 Kings xi : 38, . . .	41	Isaiah xxi : 4, . . .	128
1 Kings xiii : 2, . . .	88	Isaiah xxiii : 3, . . .	160
1 Kings xiii : 8, . . .	90	JEREMIAH.	
1 Kings xvii : 8, 16, . . .	42	Jeremiah iii : 14, . . .	52
1 Kings xviii : 32, 35, . . .	132	Jeremiah xvi : 14, . . .	33
II KINGS.		Jeremiah xxxv : 4, . . .	33
2 Kings ii : 19, . . .	162	Jeremiah xxxvi : 10, 12, 20, 21, . . .	33
2 Kings iii : 11, . . .	116	Jeremiah li : 13, . . .	33
2 Kings v : 14, . . .	116	EZEKIEL.	
2 Kings viii : 15, . . .	123	Ezekiel iv : 6, . . .	92
2 Kings x : 1, 5, . . .	87	Ezekiel xvii : 5, 8, . . .	160
2 Kings xi : 17, . . .	77	Ezekiel xix : 10, . . .	163
2 Kings xxiii : 8, 13, . . .	33	Ezekiel xxiii : 15, . . .	127
I CHRONICLES.		Ezekiel xxxii : 14, . . .	33
1 Chronicles ii : 10, . . .	33	Ezekiel xlili : 2, . . .	159
1 Chronicles xvii : 23—25, . . .	41, 86	DANIEL.	
1 Chronicles xxix : 19, . . .	33	Daniel iv : 23, 25, 33, . . .	115
II CHRONICLES.		Daniel iv : 33, . . .	132
2 Chronicles xxi : 17, . . .	90	Daniel v : 21, . . .	115
2 Chronicles xxiii : 16, . . .	77	AMOS.	
2 Chronicles xxxi : 14, . . .	75	Amos iii : 1, . . .	33
EZRA.		ZEPHANIAH.	
Ezra x : 3—14, . . .	16	Zephaniah i : 9, . . .	33
NEHEMIAH.		MATTHEW.	
Nehemiah ix : 11, . . .	115	Matthew ii : 11, . . .	31
ESTHER.		Matthew iii : 8, . . .	142
Esther viii : 17, . . .	73	Matthew iii : 11, . . .	112
JOB.		Matthew ix : 6, . . .	32
Job ix : 21, . . .	116	Matthew x : 42, . . .	18
Job xx : 28, . . .	43	Matthew xi : 12, . . .	20
PSALMS.		Matthew xiii : 56, . . .	50
Psalm xviii : 16, . . .	160	Matthew xviii : 3, . . .	17
Psalm l : 5, . . .	72	Matthew xix : 13, . . .	17, 77
Psalm lxviii : 6, . . .	43	Matthew xxi : 15, . . .	18
Psalm lxviii : 23, . . .	123	Matthew xxiii : 14, . . .	32
Psalm lxxvii : 18, . . .	160	Matthew xxiv : 17, . . .	33
Psalm lxxxiv : 3, . . .	30	Matthew xxvi : 12, . . .	171
Psalm xciii : 4, . . .	160	Matthew xxvi : 23, . . .	111
Psalm civ : 17, . . .	30	Matthew xxviii : 19, . . .	20, 86
Psalm cv : 21, . . .	90		

	Page		Page
MARK.		ACTS.	
Mark i : 4,	80	Acts i : 5,	112
Mark i : 8,	112	Acts i : 13,	33
Mark ii : 11,	32	Acts ii : 2,	112
Mark ii : 42,	78	Acts ii : 2, 17,	113
Mark vi : 3,	19	Acts ii : 35,	113
Mark vii : 4,	131	Acts ii : 38,	80
Mark vii : 4, 8,	111	Acts iv : 27,	19
Mark vii : 8,	131	Acts v : 6, 10,	171
Mark x : 13,	17	Acts vii : 10,	90
Mark x : 16,	77	Acts viii : 16,	113
Mark x : 38, 39,	126	Acts viii : 36—38,	136
Mark xii : 40,	32	Acts ix : 17,	113
Mark xiii : 15,	33	Acts ix : 23,	99
Mark xiv : 8,	170	Acts ix : 27,	19
Mark xiv : 20,	111	Acts ix : 37,	172
Mark xv : 47,	172	Acts x : 1, 5, 6,	51
LUKE.		Acts x : 10,	31
Luke i : 27,	33	Acts x : 14, 44,	148
Luke ii : 42,	78	Acts x : 38,	19, 113
Luke iii : 3,	80	Acts x : 44,	112, 113
Luke iii : 11,	142	Acts x : 45,	99, 113
Luke iii : 16,	112	Acts x : xi,	32
Luke v : 24,	32	Acts x : xi : xv,	147
Luke vii : 44,	116	Acts xi,	112
Luke viii : 42,	78	Acts xi : 11, 12, 13,	32
Luke xi : 38,	115	Acts xi : 11, 17,	31
Luke xii : 50,	126	Acts xi : 12,	99
Luke xvi : 16,	20	Acts xi : 12, 13,	32
Luke xvi : 22,	171	Acts xi : 14,	51
Luke xvi : 24,	111	Acts xi : 15,	143
Luke xvii : 31,	33	Acts xi : 17,	112
Luke xviii : 15,	77	Acts xii : 12,	31
Luke xx : 47,	32	Acts xv,	69
Luke xxiii : 56,	172	Acts xv : 1—5, 6,	69
Luke xxiv : 49,	112	Acts xv : 8,	112, 113
JOHN.		Acts xv : 10,	72
John i : 29—34,	142	Acts xvi : 1,	16, 99
John i : 32,	113	Acts xvi : 3, 10,	59
John i : 33,	85	Acts xvi : 15,	49, 99
John iii : 5,	80	Acts xvi : 16,	57
John iii : 23,	159	Acts xvi : 28,	50
John iii : 25,	116	Acts xvi : 31, 32,	102
John iii : 34,	207	Acts xvi : 33,	52
John iv : 53,	50	Acts xvi : 34,	47, 51
John viii : 35,	87	Acts xvi : 40,	59
John xii : 7,	170	Acts xviii : 8,	44, 53
John xii : 23,	173	Acts xix : 3,	149
John xiii : 10, 11,	131	Acts xx : 6,	60
John xiii : 26,	111	Acts xxi : 20, 21,	70
John xiv : 2,	32	Acts xxii : 16,	147
John xix : 40,	172	Acts xxvi : 10,	92, 97
John xxi : 15,	78		

	Page		Page
ROMANS.			
Romans vi,	169	Colossians ii : 11, 12,	71
Romans vi : 3—5,	147	Colossians iii : 1,	174
Romans xi : 17,	173	Colossians iv : 9,	99
Romans xiii : 14,	146	Colossians iv : 15,	102
Romans xiv : 15,	15	II THESSALONIANS.	
Romans xv : 25,	97	2 Thessalonians ii : 15,	24
Romans xvi : 1,	157	2 Thessalonians iii : 6,	24
Romans xvi : 3, 5,	101	I TIMOTHY.	
Romans xvi : 10, 11,	53	1 Timoihy iii : 4,	48
I CORINTHIANS.			
1 Corinthians i : 14—16,	55	1 Timothy iii : 6,	104
1 Corinthians i : 16,	60	1 Timothy iii : 11,	157
1 Corinthians iv : 17,	99	1 Timothy iii : 12,	48
1 Corinthians v : 7, 8,	15	1 Timothy iv : 12,	99
1 Corinthians v : 8,	82	1 Timothy v : 4,	35
1 Corinthians vi : 11,	142	1 Timothy v : 14,	44, 49
1 Corinthians vii : 12, 13,	16	1 Timothy v : 16,	99
1 Corinthians vii : 14, 17,	138	1 Timothy vi : 2,	60
1 Corinthians vii : 16,	16	II TIMOTHY.	
1 Corinthians vii : 29,	21	2 Timothy i : 16,	60
1 Corinthians x : 2,	115	2 Timothy i : 16, 18,	53
1 Corinthians xi : 2,	24	2 Timothy ii : 2,	25, 99
1 Corinthians xv : 43,	173	2 Timothy ii : 18,	175
1 Corinthians xvi : 10,	63	2 Timothy ii : 20,	31
1 Corinthians xvi : 15,	52, 60	2 Timothy iii : 15,	96
1 Corinthians xvi : 15, 16,	61	2 Timothy iv : 19,	60
1 Corinthians xvi : 19,	101	TITUS.	
II CORINTHIANS.			
2 Corinthians I : 21,	19	Titus i : 6,	100
2 Corinthians vi : 15,	99	Titus i : 10,	66
GALATIANS.			
Galatians iv : 9,	78	Titus i : 11,	42
Galatians iv : 28, 30,	73	Titus iii : 5,	142
EPHESIANS.			
Ephesians i : 1,	99	Titus iii : 6,	113
Ephesians i : 13,	113	PHILEMON.	
Ephesians ii : 11,	110	Philemon 2,	102
Ephesians ii : 19,	30	HEBREWS.	
Ephesians ii : 19, 21,	42	Hebrews vi : 1, 2,	135
Ephesians iv : 5,	136	Hebrews vi : 2,	111
Ephesians iv : 21,	99	Hebrews ix : 6,	135
Ephesians iv : 24,	146	Hebrews ix : 10,	111
Ephesians v : 26,	142	Hebrews ix : 13,	134
Ephesians vi : 4,	21	Hebrews ix : 14,	135
PHILIPPIANS.			
Philippians, iii : 2,	66	Hebrews x : 22,	84
Philippians, iii : 6,	74	Hebrews x : 32,	106
Philippians, iv : 22,	37	Hebrews xi : 7,	48
COLOSSIANS.			
Colossians i : 2,	99	JAMES.	
Colossians ii : 11,	70, 110	James i : 21,	173
I PETER.			
		1 Peter i : 12,	113
		1 Peter ii : 4, 5,	42
		1 Peter iii : 1,	16
		1 Peter iii : 20,	48
		1 Peter iii : 21,	87
		1 Peter v : 12,	99

	Page	Page
II PETER.		
2 Peter i : 15, . . .	25	Revelation ii : 17, . . . 92
I JOHN.		
1 John ii : 12, . . .	78	Revelation xiii : 1, . . . 92
1 John ii : 27, . . .	19	Revelation xiv : 1, . . . 92
REVELATION.		
Revelation i : 8, . . .	91	Revelation xiv : 2, . . . 159
Revelation i : 15, . . .	159	Revelation xvii : 1, 15, . . . 159
		Revelation xvii : 3, . . . 92
		Revelation xvii : 14, . . . 99
		Revelation xix : 6, . . . 159
		Revelation xix : 13, . . . 111

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

	Page		Page
A.		Baptism explained, . . .	114
Abiding, . . .	114	“ for Circumcision, . . .	66
Abrahamic Covenant, . . .	72	“ illustrated, . . .	177
Abraham's "House," . . .	43	“ instituted, . . .	19
Abyssinia, . . .	144	“ of a boy, . . .	144
Abyssinian Boy, . . .	145	“ of Children in the	
Adult Circumcision, . . .	73	first centuries, . . .	70
Affusion, . . .	130	Baptism of Children not a	
Ages of Life, . . .	82	“ new affair,” . . .	77
Anabaptism, . . .	137	Baptism of Families, . . .	84
Ananias and Sapphira . . .	171	“ “ Gentiles, . . .	70
Ancient Baptism, . . .	166	“ “ Holy Ghost, . . .	114
“ Baptisteries, . . .	209	“ “ “ Households,” . . .	60
“ Testimony, . . .	164	“ “ Infants, . . .	107
Anointing, . . .	114, 171	“ “ John, . . .	84
Anointing at Baptism . . .	146	“ “ Light, . . .	84
Apostolic Baptism, . . .	107	“ “ persons naked, . . .	149
Appellatives, . . .	97	Βαπτισμος, . . .	111
“ “ Faithful,” . . .	98	Baptisms under the Law, . . .	134
“ “ Holy,” . . .	97	Baptism teaches the Trinity, . . .	86
“ “ Neophytos,” . . .	104	“ the mode, . . .	109
Aquila, . . .	161	“ “ subjects, . . .	13
Arabs, . . .	46	Baptisteries, . . .	209
Argument entire, . . .	14	Βαπτω, . . .	111
Aristobulus, . . .	53	Biel on Οικος, . . .	33
Aristotle's "House," . . .	39	Bird Baptized, . . .	116
“ Testimony, . . .	87	Bishops, . . .	48
Arringhius, . . .	89	Booth's Sophism, . . .	14
		Βρεφος, . . .	77
B.		Brethren at Philippi . . .	59
Baptismal Ceremonies, . . .	203	Brother's widow, . . .	42
“ Fonts, . . .	208	Building a "House," . . .	42
“ Resemblances, . . .	114, 172	Buonaretti on Baptism, . . .	152
Baptism and Circumcision, . . .	83	Burial, . . .	170
“ “ Immersion, . . .	143	“ of Christ, . . .	172
“ by the Syrians, . . .	164	“ Buried in Baptism,” . . .	170
“ consecration to the		C.	
Trinity, . . .	108	Carthage Council, . . .	71
Baptism divided, . . .	142	Casaubon, . . .	158
“ eighth day . . .	71	Celsus' Ignorance, . . .	65

	Page		Page
"Chapel of the Baptistry,"	215	"Domus,"	35
Childhood.	77	Dorcas,	172
Children and Christ	17		
" of Proselytes,	55	E.	
" weaned,	76	Early opinions,	74
Christian Baptism,	177	Ebionites,	86
Christianity,	67	Egyptian Church,	164
Christian Symbols,	90	Εμβαπτω,	111
Christ's Burial,	172	Engrafting,	173
Chrysostom,	71	ENGRAVINGS,	179
Church at Corinth,	61	I. Baptism of Jesus Christ,	181
" Jerusalem,	69	II. Baptism of Jesus Christ	
" Philippi,	52	in Jordan,	183
" Membership of Chil-		III. Jesus baptized in Jordan,	185
dren,	96	IV. Baptism of Christ " "	187
Ciampini on Baptism,	203	V. Christ baptized " "	189
Cicero's Evidence,	36	VI. Ancient Bath,	191
Circumcision,	66	VII. Baptism of King and	
" and Baptism,	83	Queen,	193
" mark of obedi-		VIII. Administration of	
ence,	73	Baptism,	195
Clemens Alexandrinus,	92	IX. Baptism outside of the	
"Coming,"	113	Church,	197
Consecration to Christ,	18	X. Laurentius baptizing Ro-	
" the Trinity,	86, 108	manus,	199
Construction of Baptistries,	209	XI. Baptism of CONSTANTINE,	201
Contemporaries of Origen's		XII. " Christ in	
Family,	27	Jordan,	211
Cornelius,	51	XIII. Chapel of the Baptis-	
Corresponding Terms,	116	tery,	213
Council of Carthage,	71	Enon,	159
Covenant of Circumcision,	72	Epiphanius,	86
"Cradle-Child,"	82	Ethiopia,	144
Crispus,	53	Eucharist,	145
Crucifixion,	174	Eunuch and Philip,	143
Cyprian,	43, 137	Eusebius,	34, 103
		Expressions of Scripture,	113
D.		F.	
Daciana, Deaconess,	157	"Faithful," title of children,	98
Dathan and Abiram,	43	"Falling,"	113
Deaconesses,	157	Family,	47
Deacons,	48	Feelings for Children,	16
Dead washed,	133	Fidus on Baptism,	71
Definition by Baptists,	117	"Filling,"	114
Definitive Interment,	170	First Christians,	22
Deylingius,	179	Fishes as Symbols,	102
Dipping,	118, 122	Fonts for Baptism,	208
Disciples of John,	84	Forms of Baptism,	169
Distinction of Meats,	148	Frey's Testimony,	78
Distribution of Ages,	82		
"Divers Baptisms,"	112	G.	
Division of Baptism,	143	Gaius,	55
Doctrine of Baptisms,	135	Genealogy of Israelites,	75
Doddridge on Stephanas,	63		

	Page		Page
Gentile Christians,	65	Jailor at Philippi,	51
Gill on Circumcision,	72	Jericho,	162
"Giving,"	113	Jerom on the Nazarenes,	68
Greek Church,	167	Jewish ceremonies,	171
Gregory Nazianzen	82	" children,	78
		" proselytes,	141
H.		" sympathies,	15
Hebrew Christians,	67, 166	John Baptized Infants,	84
Hebrews and Gentiles,	65	John's Baptism	142
Hebrew term "Baptize,"	116	" Disciples,	87
Hegesippus,	67	Judaism,	67
Hesychius on <i>Οικος</i> and <i>Οικια</i> ,	32	Justin Martyr,	70, 91, 136
Hezekiah on the Genealogy,	75		
"Holy," title of Children,	97	L.	
"House,"	28	Linen Cloth,	145
" and Household,"	28, 37	"Little ones,"	17, 76
" builded,	42	Logical maxim,	160
" for Family	103	Lord's supper,	83
"Household,"	28	Lydia,	57
" of Stephanas	62		
House plan,	39	M.	
Husband and Wife,	21	Maimonides,	141
<i>Hydata Polla</i> ,	160	"Many Waters,"	159
		Mark the Evangelist,	26
I.		Maronites,	165
ΙΧΘΥC,	94	Maundrell's Travels,	162
Ignorance of Celsus,	67	Maxim in Logic,	161
Illustrations of Baptism,	177	Meats,	148
Immersion,	109, 122	Metaphorical Children,	89
" and Baptism,	143	" Texts,	146, 169
Importance of Truth	109	Mode of Baptism,	109
Infancy,	77	Montfaucon,	179
Infant Baptism	65	Muscovites,	168
Infant Baptism Apostolic and	107	Mussulman Boy,	144
Universal,	107		
Infant Circumcision,	73	N.	
Infants,	36, 44	Naaman,	116
" baptized by John,	84	Narcissus,	53
Inferences,	118	Nazarenes,	68
Inscriptions,	98, 102	Nebuchadnezzar,	115
Institution of Baptism,	19	"Neophytos,"	104
Intermarriages,	15	Nestorians,	165
Interment,	170	Newell on Baptism,	166
Interpretation,	29	Noah in the Ark,	37, 48
Introductory Notice,	5		
Irenæus on Infants,	80	O.	
" Tradition	25	<i>Οικια</i> ,	30, 37, 87
Ishmael's circumcision	72	<i>Οικος</i> ,	28, 29, 47, 87
Israelite genealogy,	75	Opinions, early,	74
Israelites in Jordan,	116	Origen on Baptism,	23, 26
" " the Red Sea,	115	Origen's Family,	27
		Origin of the Work,	13
J.			
Jacob and Rachel,	41		
" leaving Canaan,	42		

	Page		Page
Ωσπερ,	112	Sprinkling,	132, 134
Overwhelming,	118, 126	Staining,	127
		Stephanas,	52
P.		Subjects of Baptism,	13
Πανοικι,	88	Submersion,	120
Parables,	140	Sulpitius Severus,	69
Παραδοσις,	91	Symbols of Baptism,	90
Partial Immersion,	124	Synonyms of Baptism,	113, 117
Passover,	83	Syrian Baptism,	165
Pearce on Stephanas,	63	“ Churches,	164
Pentecost,	112	T.	
Perversion of Terms,	109	Temporal blessings with Cir-	
Peter at Cesarea,	148	cumcision,	73
Philip and the Eunuch,	143	Terms interchanged,	117
Plan of a “ House,”	39	Tertullian,	22, 97
Planting,	173	Texts of Scripture,	219
Pliny,	158	Timothy,	21
Plunging,	120	Tradition,	24, 91
Polycarp,	25	Transplantation,	174
Positive precepts,	150	Trinity taught by Baptism,	86
Pouring,	114, 130	Truth,	109
Principle of Circumcision in		U.	
Baptism,	74	Υδατα πολλα,	160
Priscilla,	101	Union with Christ,	172
Proselytes,	55	W.	
R.		Wall’s Testimony,	154, 155
Rebaptism,	87	Washing,	171
Reception of Eucharist,	145	“ of a corpse,	133
Resemblance of Baptisms,	114, 172	Water Baptism,	115
Ritual Observances,	134	“ of Separation,	133
“ Purification,	116	Waters of Jericho,	162
Robinson on Baptism,	153, 155	Weaning of children,	76
Rules for interpretation,	29, 115	Whitby on Stephanas,	62
Ruth’s “ House,”	44	White Linen cloth,	146
Ryland’s Statement,	159	White Stone,	92
S.		Words interchanged,	117
Sabians,	84	“ synonymous,	113
Salt on Baptism,	144	Y.	
Scripture Terms,	113	Years of Life,	81
Sealing,	114	Z.	
Sending down,	113	Zoilus and Infant,	137
Septuagint on Infants,	87		
Sepulchral Inscriptions,	93		
Shedding,	113		
Sitting,	114		
Sophism by Booth,	14		



