

BAPTISM AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

As explained by the chief learned men of the
different denominations who are in the habit of
sprinkling infants

BY
THOMAS PRICE,
ABERDARE.

And a History of the Practice of the Church

Regarding baptism during the first two centuries:

To which is added a history of the origin and increase of
infant baptism.

TRANSLATED BY LUCAS KING

CARDIFF:
PRINTED BY W. OWEN, DUKE STREET
1850

Thomas Price's
Baptism and the New Testament

Translated by Lucas King

Copyright © 2026 Lucas King

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

To request permission, contact the publisher at
info.kingstonepress@gmail.com

Printed in USA
First Edition, 2026

Published by Kingstone Press
info.kingstonepress@gmail.com
Kingstonepress.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM. — 6

Subjects of John's Baptism

Subjects of Christ's Baptism through the disciples

The characters whom Christ commanded to be baptized in the Commission

Baptism on the Day of Pentecost

Philip baptizing in Samaria

Baptism of the eunuch

Families receiving baptism

CHAPTER II.

THE MODE OF ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM. — 25

The meaning of the word Baptizo

The verses that explain the mode

CHAPTER III.

THE PURPOSE OF NEW TESTAMENT BAPTISM. — 42

Verses showing this

Witnesses

CHAPTER IV.

THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES. — 51

Subjects of Baptism up to the year 200

The mode of administration of Baptism up to the year 200

CHAPTER V.

INFANT BAPTISM. — 59

The practice is anomalous

The beginning of baptizing children in the year 204

The cause of the beginning of infant baptism

The cause of its continuation

The beginning of sprinkling on infants

Twenty facts proved by paedobaptists themselves

Postscript — Questions, &c. — 83

PREFACE.

KIND READER,

The purpose of this little book is not to create a controversy on the subject of Baptism. There have been enough controversies; for much time, strength, and the talents of the chief celebrities of the religious world, from the days of Tertullian until now, have been spent in debating this subject here. It is high time now, moreover, for the Jury, that is the body who love the purity of the religion of Jesus, and who love the commandments of the great Head of the church, to give their verdict on the matter.

The things the Jury has to decide are—

- 1, The Subjects of New Testament Baptism — who are they?
professing believers or infants?
- 2, The Mode of administration of the ordinance — whether by
plunging the whole body in water, or by pouring water on some
part of the body?
- 3, The Purpose of the administration of the ordinance — whether
to give the baptized an opportunity to respond with a good
conscience toward God, or to regenerate the soul?
- 4, What was the practice of the church for the first two centuries?
whether immersing the believer, or sprinkling on infants?
- 5, At what time, and for what reason was the baptizing of children
begun?

And to assist the members of our congregations, and attentive and thoughtful hearers of our assemblies to come to a right verdict on these, I have been careful to collect the testimonies they have been given in various ages, by the chief witnesses on the subject in debate; so that this book, though small, contains the essence of what was written by many of the chief authorities of the various religious parties which are accustomed to baptize infants.

The reader will find, under the first three questions, all the verses considered to belong directly to the subject, collected and arranged in order; and these verses will be explained by learned and respected writers among the paedobaptists.

In answer to the fourth question, the reader will find testimonies from nearly every writer who has dealt with the subject from the days of Barnabas, the companion of Paul, until Chrysostom, who wrote in the year 398 AD.

The fifth question will be answered by paedobaptists themselves. The quotations from the books of the various authors are only brief; but the reader may be assured that they have all been quoted honestly, and contain the thought of the writers; and this is of no small weight in this little book, since a reference accompanies each quotation to direct the reader to the place where the original may be found.

Let the reader also consider that all the Witnesses I have called to the Court, belong to those who baptize infants. Not so much as one witness has been taken from among those who profess themselves Baptists of believers.

But if the reader would like to know the reasons of the Baptists, let him be directed to read "The Theology of Baptism," a fine and unanswerable treatise on the subjects and mode of Baptism, by the Rev. John Evans, Pontfaen; and "Baptizo," a small but truly learned and admirable treatise on the mode and subjects of Baptism, by the Rev. D. Ll. Isaac, Pontypool. Both of these, as well as the valuable and important Lecture by R. Ellis, ought to be in the hand of every Baptist; indeed, the reader, as a person who "loves his neighbour as himself," I say they ought to be in the hand of every Paedobaptist also. I feel deeply grateful to the above brethren for their labour and service to religion.

With this commendation, I commend this little book to the reader's consideration, hoping that he will read it with consideration; and if it should be instrumental in bringing its readers to consider and think about Baptism in the New Testament in the light of truth, its purpose in being written will have been answered.

Aberdare.

THOMAS PRICE.

BAPTISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

The reader will receive a scriptural outline of the subjects of baptism as they are given by the Holy Spirit in truth; and then many famous scholars will be found expounding the words of the inspired writers. For fairness to the reader and myself, we will set out a proposition as a sort of target to aim at in this chapter. It is this:—

FIRST PROPOSITION.

The only true and proper subjects of New Testament baptism are persons professing repentance for sin and faith in Christ Jesus.

CLASS I.—The characters of those baptized by John.

MATTHEW, iii, 5, 6, 8:—

“Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan. And they were baptized by him in Jordan, confessing their sins. Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance.”

MARK i, 4, 5:—

“John did baptize in the desert, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized by him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.”

ACT. xix, 4:—

“And Paul said, John baptized with a baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.”

John then was expecting from those who received his baptism:

- 1, Confession of their sins.
- 2, Repentance for their sins.
- 3, Faith in Christ.

As proof of the truth of this, let the following witnesses be heard:—

DR. ERSKINE:—

“John’s baptism was called the baptism of repentance, and that because it required ALL who received his baptism to profess repentance.”

See Booth’s Paed. Bap. Exam., Vol. II, p. 241.

BURKIT:—

“John’s baptism was the baptism of repentance, from which infants were excluded.”

Note on Matt. xix, 13, 14.

SCOTT:—

“It does not appear that ANY had been baptized by John, but those of mature age. Jews of mature age professed repentance, and came unto them to become subjects of the Messiah, the only individuals John baptized.”

Note on Matt. iii, 5, 6.

MATTHEW HENRY:—

“Those who received his teaching, and submitted to his discipline were baptized by him in the Jordan, and thereby professed their repentance, and their belief that the kingdom of the Messiah was at hand. They testified their repentance by confessing their sins.”

Note on Matt. iii.

POOLE:—

“It is most certain that a profession of faith and repentance is required as a common prerequisite to baptism.”

Expon. Matt. iii, 6.

BENGEL:—

“The necessity of regeneration is first, and then baptism is confirmed.”

Note on John iii.

DR. LEWIS, (Llanuwchllyn):—

“Where men have come to age and reason before receiving their baptism, no conscientious minister will baptize them without satisfaction regarding the connection of their faith and their repentance.”

Dr. Lewis on Baptism

DR. WATTS:—

“Faith and repentance were the great things required of those who were permitted to be baptized; John was accustomed to require these; and this was the practice of the apostles in their ministry.”

Berry’s Ser., Vol. II, p. 177.

CLASS II.—The characters of those baptized by Christ when on earth.

JOHN iii, 22, and iv, 1, 2:—

“After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized.

When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.)”

There was one notable thing in mentioning these persons,—they were disciples being baptized—they were made disciples BEFORE their baptism.

What was required of a disciple to Christ at that time? The great Teacher himself will explain the character of a disciple to him.

CHRIST said, Luke xiv, 27:—

“And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.”

DR. OWEN:—

“With respect to discipleship to Christ, I look upon those who profess faith in his person and doctrine, and them alone. This is the plan of the gospel, that men are first brought through preaching to be disciples, or brought to the faith of Christ, and then to receive teaching to keep everything he commanded.”

In. Paed. Bap. Ex., Vol. II, pp. 275, 287.

T. SCOTT:—

“Christ’s baptism was undoubtedly of persons of mature age only.”
Expon. on John iii, 22, 24.

BAXTER:—

“I consider a disciple and a Christian to be one.”
Paed. Exam., Vol. II, p. 288.

CLASS III.—The characters whom Christ commanded to be baptized in the commission after his resurrection from the grave.

MATT. xxviii, 18, 19, 20:—

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.”

MARC xvi, 15, 16:—

“And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

Two things in the Commission point out the subjects of baptism:—

1, They are to be taught before their baptism.

2, Believing precedes baptism.

The following celebrities explain what believing, and the teaching in the Commission, is.

ARCHIBALD HALL. (From the writings of Dr. Waugh of London):—

“How noble and formidable is this solemn introduction to the establishment of Christian baptism! Who is the wretched and arrogant and vain person who dares to usurp authority, or to change the ordinances of the LORD which have been given as supreme over all to his church? The validity of the ordinance is lawful; and all the purposes of the ordinance are secured by the authority and blessing of Christ. It is dangerous and wretched to add any ceremony, or to omit any service under any circumstances from the ordinance of Heaven.”

R. BAXTER. (Author of the Saint's Rest):—

“Go and disciple all nations by baptizing them. For those who say they are made disciples through baptism, they are not speaking the meaning of the text, nor is it said that; or why is one person baptized and not another? It is not such a general direction for baptism; but it contains the COMMISSION of CHRIST to his apostles to preach and baptize, and intentionally it points out their various obligations, in their various times and order. Their first duty is, through teaching, to make disciples, those whom Mark calls believers. The second duty is to baptize them, and with this is connected the promise of their salvation. The third duty is to teach them in all the other things, which have been taught in the SCHOOL OF JESUS. Condemning this order would be to discredit every rule and order, and where can we see the order better set out than here? I profess that my knowledge is entirely certain from this text, that ONE kind of faith — that is, saving faith which must come before baptism, and the minister is bound to require a profession of this.”

Dispute of the Right to Sac. p. 149.

The word (Matheteuein) which has been translated “teach” in Matt. xxviii, 19, means

LIDDELL:—

“Making a disciple.”

Lexicon.

ROBINSON:—

“Guiding someone to become a disciple.”

Lexicon, under the word.

SCHLEUSNER:—

“Attracting one to the Christian faith.”

Lexicon.

GROTIUS:—

“They must be taught to remove all ungodliness, and to frame themselves to divine things, and thus make them fit for baptism.”

Noel on Bap. p. 28.

DIODATI:—

“Go and instruct all nations; gather together believers through the preaching of the gospel, and baptize them, as an ordinance of my grace I give them for the forgiveness of their sins, and as a pledge on their part of their consecration to me.”

Noel’s Essay, p. 27.

JOHN CALVIN:—

“Since Christ requires teaching before baptism, and only believers to be received to baptism, it seems to me that baptism is not being administered properly if faith does not precede it.”

Calvin on Matt. xxviii, 19.

ERASMUS:—

“Go and teach all nations; and those who shall have been taught, baptize them.”

In the Portsmouth Disputation.

HAMMOND:—

“Teach all the nations in the Christian doctrines; persuade them to embrace and live in accordance with their rules, then baptize them.”

Commentary on Matthew xxviii, 19.

POOLE:—

“Go and teach, &c.; in the old Greek language, make disciples of all the nations; but this must first be done through preaching to them and teaching them. Mark expresses it, ‘Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature;’ that is, to every reasonable creature capable of hearing and receiving it. It is not possible that any of the one thought of this class can be baptized before they are taught.”

Commentary on the Commission.

DR. BLOOMFIELD:—

“The first duty of the Commission is to make disciples of the nations, or to convert them to the faith. Secondly, to bring them

into the church through baptism. Thirdly, to teach the baptized the doctrines and duties of the Christian life.”

Greek Testament Vol. I, p, 181.

BOOTHROYD:—

“When they had been made disciples they were to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Commentary on Matthew xxviii, 19.

BENSON:—

“The words of Christ here clearly teach three things; that is, making a disciple to Christ — then baptizing them — and then teaching them to keep his commandments.”

Notes on the Commission.

SAWRIN:—

“In the apostolic church, teaching preceded baptism, according to the plan of Jesus Christ: ‘Go and teach all nations, baptizing them.’”

Booth’s Pead. Bap. Exam., Vol. II, 274.

CAMPBELL AND VALPY:—

“It is evident that here there are three things which our Lord commands his apostles with respect to the Nations; namely, to convert them to the Christian faith; to receive the converts into the church through baptism; and then, to instruct the baptized in all the duties of the Christian life.”

Noel’s Essay, p. 29.

I will add here a translation of the Commission, by one of the best linguists Wales ever produced:—

RICHARD ROBERT JONES, (Dic Aberdaron.)

“Go ye therefore and make scholars of all nations, by converting them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all the days, even to the end of the world.”

Oraclau Bywiol, addod. tud. 509.

CLASS IV.—The characters of those baptized by the apostles after receiving the commission from Christ.

I would think, if there are some men in this age, such as Dr. Halley, who fail to understand Christ's thought in the Commission, it is acknowledged by all that the apostles did understand it, and that their practice thereof is the best interpretation we can get on the words of Christ. For not all the apostles (as many in the present day) understood the thought of the King in one way, and practiced it in another way. Therefore, it is of the greatest importance to us to know what kind of characters were those baptized by the apostles, from Christ's ascension to the end of the first age. We shall not find it, dear reader, for the inspired writers have been remarkably careful on the point themselves.

First,—Baptism on the Day of Pentecost.

This took place ten days after Christ's ascension; and the apostles were full of the Holy Spirit. Here is the account:

ACT. ii, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42:—

“Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued”

steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.

Eight things are here to be noted as showing most clearly what kind of people these were. Before they were to be baptized, they were:

- 1, Having been taught by preaching, in accordance with Mat. xxviii, 19.
- 2, Having been stricken in their heart.
- 3, Having received a command to repent.

4, Having received the word with gladness, or having believed in accordance with Marc xvi, 16.

After being baptized, we find them behaving as follows:—

- 1, Continuing in the apostles' doctrine.
 - 2, Continuing in the apostles' fellowship.
 - 3, Breaking bread, i.e. taking communion.
 - 4, In prayers; i.e. taking part in the worship of the church.
- This is further illustrated by the following celebrities:—

MATTHEW HENRY:—

“The Jews were called by Peter to repent first, and then to receive their baptism. His language was, Believe the doctrine of Christ, and submit to his grace and government; and make an open and unequivocal profession of this by the ordinance of baptism.”

Commentary on Acts. ii.

ALBERT BARNES; (The most popular commentator of this age):—

“Be baptized, &c.—The requirement that Christ gave to his apostles was, for them to baptize all who believed: Matt. xxviii, 19; Marc xvi, 16. The Jews had not been baptized; and baptism was now the first profession of the faith of Christ, or evidence to the world of their desire to embrace Jesus as their Messiah. The gospel demands this public profession, and there is no one who is free to refuse it. A public confession should be made by all who are asked the way of life. They are to repent, and then without undue delay to give proof of their repentance in the ordinances of the gospel.”

“And they were baptized, Adn. 41.—That is, those of them who had taken upon themselves the right of citizenship in the gospel community.”

Commentary on Act. ii, 38—41.

DR. ADAM CLARKE:—

“Repent; humble yourselves before God, and deeply inquire concerning the sins you have committed. And be baptized every one of you; take a public and open profession of the faith of Christ by receiving your baptism in his name; and thus acknowledge yourselves his disciples and his followers.”

Commentary on Act. ii, 38.

Well, reader, shall we leave the baptism of the Day of Pentecost at this? No, no, no; there is something new in the matter afterwards, not one observation has been made on Adn. 39, which says,—“For the promise is unto you, and to your CHILDREN”—that is, to your children, sir, have you heard? I think, but I will better finish the verse; “and”—“and”—“and”; that is, go forward—“and to all who are far off, as many as the Lord our God shall call.”

But is it now altogether fair to claim children as subjects of baptism? It is not. A little thought will show that there is nothing fair in this verse, nothing of the slightest kind; and there is not in the world anything of the slightest kind to support the practice of baptizing infants.

1, The content of the verse does not concern infants at all: see adn. 17.

2, The word Tekna, translated children here, means posterity, and not infants. Paido is the Greek word for infants, and not Tekna. But rather than arguing against this, dear reader, call six witnesses on the matter, who are certain to be as strongly opposed to our side as any, and indeed they would bring down the argument every time. Remember also that they are all entirely opposed to infants.

DR. WHITBY:—

“The words of the promise here make no case for infants receiving baptism, since the only promise here about the Holy Spirit, as it was spoken about in adn. 16, 17, and 18, is referring to the extraordinary outpouring of the Spirit; and the persons there who were through age able to receive his extraordinary gifts.”

Commentary on Act, ii, 39.

DR. DODDRIDGE:—

“Considering that the giving of the Spirit has been previously noted here, it is more natural to explain this promise as referring to the prophecy in Joel, which was quoted in adn. 17, where God promises the outpouring of the Spirit on their sons and on their daughters.”

Family Expos. on Act. ii, 39.

BARNES:—

“To you and your children; in Joel, to your sons and to your daughters, that those by then old enough to profess. There are

similar promises in Esay xlv, 3, and lix, 21. Here, and in similar verses, posterity or descendants are what is meant. It is not referring to children as children, and it should not be used as an argument to justify infant baptism.”

Notes on Act. ii, 39.

DR. HAMMOND:—

“If there are those who have used this powerful argument (Act. ii, 39), there is no word in it to support them. The word children here in truth means the posterity of the Jews, and not their infants.”

Hammond’s Works, Vol. I., p. 490.

LIMBORCH; (A truly learned man):—

“With Tekna (children) the apostle means posterity, and not infants; in which sense the word is found in many places in the New Testament: John viii, 39. Here it is evident that the argument built on this verse for infant baptism is worthless and entirely without value.”

Commentary on Act. ii, 39.

MATTHEW HENRY:—

“As many; as many persons of every nation as the Lord our God shall effectively call into fellowship with Jesus Christ.”

Commentary on Act. ii, 39.

Are you now satisfied, reader? If so, let us go forward a step or two to look at Philip the deacon and the Samaritans now. Second,—Philip baptizing in Samaria.

ACT. viii, 12:—

“But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.”

It is easy to recognize the kind of people these were by remembering,—

- 1, That they had been taught through the preaching of Philip.
- 2, Having believed— And on that having been taught and believed,
- 3, They were baptized, both men and women.

Philip was a deacon, but a good deacon, as many a worthy brother is in these days; he understood the thought of his Lord, and was

implementing it; for the spirit and letter of the Commission of Christ is being kept here. Since all this is self-evident in this place, I shall not call a single witness, but go forward to observe,—

Third,—Baptism of the eunuch.

This is a great man, reader, and there certainly ought to be a clean source in discussing his case. Hush! listen to the deacon speaking about baptism.

ACT. viii, 36, 37:—

“And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with thine whole heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.”

Here again is a clear example from the first preachers understanding the great Commission.

1, The eunuch being taught by Philip.

2, The eunuch making a profession of his faith in Christ.

3, The eunuch receiving his baptism.

BARNES:—

“What doth hinder.—This shows that he had been taught by Philip the nature and purpose of baptism. It also shows an immediate intention to give himself to Christ, to profess his name, and to consecrate himself to his service.”

“And Philip said.—This was said to show the proper conditions of making a profession of faith. The conditions are,—1, Faith, that is, the acceptance of Christ as Saviour; the commitment of the mind to the proper influences of the gospel. 2, Not only the assent of the mind, but the submission of the heart, the will, and the affections to the truth of the gospel. Since these are the proper conditions at that time, so they are now. There is nothing less that can be done.”

Commentary on Act. viii, 36, 37.

While Philip and the nobleman are preparing to go into the water, we are not given anything further, and we are not told about seeing the mode of administration of the ordinance.

Fourth,—Baptism of Cornelius and his friends.

Much weight has been placed, and is placed, by some, on the households that were baptized, as an argument for infant baptism. There is, dear reader, but I can truly assure you that I have been in these households more than once, and I have not seen one infant there at those times: but come, we will not go so far now, and if we find so much as ONE infant, we will not record it honestly and clearly, “in the light of the sun and in the light of intelligence.” Here is the account of the baptism of Cornelius and his friends.

ACT. x, 44, 46, 47, 48:—

“While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.”

Four things show us the kind of characters these were:—

- 1, Having been taught by Peter.
- 2, All of them had received the Holy Ghost.
- 3, Peter commanding their baptism.
- 4, The reason for their baptism was that they had received the Holy Ghost, i.e. they were believers.

It is impossible to get a better explanation of the commission than this one.

DR. HOLLAND:—

“In the early spread of Christianity among the Gentiles, those who were of age, and having been taught the doctrines of the Christian faith only, were permitted their baptism.”

Dr. Wall’s Hist., Vol. II., c. II., s. 14.

Fifth.—Baptism of Lydia and her household.

ACT. xvi, 14, 15:—

“And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, 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.”

Three things are necessary here before one argument can be obtained for infant baptism.

It must be proved:

- 1, That Lydia was a mother of children.
- 2, That the children were young infants at that time.
- 3, That the young children (if they were there) were with Lydia in Philippi at the time of her baptism.*

If the reader can be convinced by someone of the first, I shall be ready to give up the second and the third.

But two or three famous and learned men will be allowed to give their thoughts on the matter:—

DR. WHITBY:—

“And after she and her household had been taught the Christian faith, considering the nature of baptism which was required of them, they were baptized, she and her household.”

Whitby’s Paraph. in Loc.

LIMBORCH:—

“One cannot find a reason from this circumstance to prove that the apostles baptized infants. All the household could have grown to age, by some, practicing their reason, they believed, and then they could make a public profession of their faith when they were baptized.”

Exbon. on Act. xvi, 14, 15.

T. LAWSON:—

“Households can be without children — they may have grown up, &c. It is therefore only a false conclusion to build infant baptism on it.”

Baptismaloga, p. 92.

So leaving Lydia and the “brethren who were in her house,” we will not go so far as the old prison of Philippi. There is some notable event about baptism there also. Were there young children in the jailer’s house? I don’t know; but we will see shortly. The record says they were all baptized. Take a careful look, reader, we can get hold of the account now. Here it is:—

Sixth—Baptism of the jailer and his household.

ACT. xvi, 31, 32, 33, 34:—

“And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thine house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. And he brought them into his house, and rejoiced, believing in God, he and all his house.”

What is to be found here?

- 1, Preaching Christ to the jailer and his house.
 - 2, The jailer and his household believing.
 - 3, The jailer and the household receiving their baptism.
 - 4, The whole household rejoicing in the Lord.
- O! happy household!

DR. DODDRIDGE:—

“Thou shalt be saved, thou and thine house.—It is impossible to think that the whole household’s salvation was secured through his faith alone.”

Exbon. Teul. Act. xvi, 29.

SCHLEUSNER:—

“It is said that the jailer and all his household believed in God, i.e. he and the household all embraced the Christian doctrine.”

Noel’s Essay, p. 84, note.

STEPHAN:—

“He was rejoicing not only because of himself, but also because all the household had believed in God.”

Ibid, p. 85.

GROTIUS:—

“He was rejoicing because he and the whole household had received the fact of enlightenment.”

Christ. Bap. by Noel, p. 85.

MATTHEW HENRY:—

“Sounds of joy were heard in the jailer’s house. He was rejoicing believing in God, he and all his house. There was no one in the household who resisted receiving his baptism, but they were all willing in embracing the gospel, this was to add much to the joy.”
Esbon. Act. xvi, 34.

JOHN CALVIN:—

“Luke commends the godly zeal of the jailer, who consecrated the whole household to the Lord, in those also in which grace of God had appeared at once and brought the whole household to divine worship.”

Esbon. Act. xvi, 31—34.

Let us continue:

Seventh—Baptism of Crispus and his household, and the Corinthians.

The account of Crispus is fairly brief, but sufficiently comprehensive. Here it is.

ACT. xviii, 8:—

“And Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue believed on the Lord with all his household; and many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized.”

Three things here are again sufficiently clear, explaining the kind of characters these were:

- 1, They had been listening to Paul preaching.
- 2, Behold Crispus with his household, and many of the Corinthians believing.
- 3, There is Crispus with his household, and the believing Corinthians receiving their baptism.

Well, dear patient reader, if you are not altogether weary, I cannot pass by old Stephanas. I am told that he is a hard-working man indeed. And I have heard it said that he and his whole household have been baptized time after time. I feel anxious to see what kind of people his children are, and what kind of characters his servants and his domestics are. I suspect they were all believing before they were baptized?

Thus Paul says about them.

1 COR. i, 16:—

“I baptized also the household of Stephanas.”

Well, says the reader, here is a household baptized without mention of faith, or believing, or repentance, or anything else before baptism;—from what is said here one half of the household could be infants, and the other half could be unbelievers. Quite right; yes, right every word. But listen again, I have some knowledge that Paul said something more about this household, further on in the Epistle to the church of Corinth. Wait; take a careful look, that is it.

1 COR. xvi, 15:—

“I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.)”

This changes the matter entirely. Here is the remarkable household — a household of ministers to the saints.

DR. GUISE:—

“From this, it appears that the household of Stephanas were all believers and of mature age, and so baptized on a personal profession of their faith in Christ.”

Exbon. on the Verse.

DR. MACKNIGHT:—

“It appears that the household of Stephanas were all of age when they were baptized; for it is said of them that they applied themselves to the work of the ministry.”

Exbon. on 1 Cor. i, 16.

DR. DODDRIDGE:—

“It appears that the loving care of the whole household was to assist their fellow Christians, so that no member of it was secure.”

Commentary Teul. 1 Cor. i, 16.

We have now gone through those portions of the holy word which refer to the subjects of New Testament baptism; but before leaving this section of our little book, let us hear many more famous and learned men, to explain the subject in its ordinary character.

DR. GOODWIN:—

“Baptism presupposes regeneration first. Read ALL the book of Acts, and from beginning to end, it is said “They believed and were baptized.””

Works, Vol. I, p. 200.

T. BOSTON:—

“There is not ONE example of baptism in the scriptures, where any person was baptized without being shown to possess faith in Christ.”

Works, Vol. I, p. 384,

LIMBORCH:—

“There is not ONE example that can be found, from which it can be supposed that a child was baptized by the apostles.”

Compl. Sys. Div. B. v. c. xxii.

BAXTER:—

“I decide that all the examples of baptism in the scriptures show it being administered to believing ministers only. And there is no WORD given to any other guide. And I will challenge Mr. Blake to name ONE example or commandment to baptize nobody else but these characters, and do that well, if he can.”*

Dispute of Right to Sac. p. 156.

And how well Welsh paedobaptists receive this Mr. Baxter? If we were to give it to them, I would say the field is out of summer, — it is full, — it is impeccable, &c. But there it has been given by a paedobaptist as zealous as ever lived among you, — and one who was cruelly persecuting the Baptists. It is a pity that you cannot find ONE commandment or rule.

DAFYDD CADWALADR said to Thomas Morgan, Yswain:—

“Undoubtedly the Baptists administer the ordinance of baptism properly, and I am burdened on account of my disobedience in this matter.” “Why then did you not obey?” said the nobleman. “For fear of grieving my brothers,” was the answer of Dafydd Cadwaladr.

P. A. Môn on Baptism, tud. 4, 5.

DR. NEANDER, Church Historian and Chief Professor in Berlin College.

“Baptism was first administered to those of mature age, as people were accustomed to consider faith and baptism as wholly connected with each other.”

Church History, Clerks Edition, Vol I, p. 426.

DR. WATERLAND:—

“A profession of faith was from the beginning always required before baptism.”

Sermons, page 317.

I am now leaving the subjects of New Testament baptism to your careful consideration, dear reader; and whilst singing a healthy note to the subjects, not all of them, from the first who were baptized by John to the household of Stephanus, profess to be partakers of the following things in connection with the ordinance:—

- 1, They had been hearing the gospel.
- 2, Being showing repentance for sin.
- 3, Having believed in Christ before their baptism.
- 4, And receiving their baptism as a public profession of their acceptance of Christ as their Saviour.

And so, is it true then that the proposition I put forward at the beginning of this chapter, namely — “That the only true and proper subjects of New Testament baptism are persons professing repentance for sin and faith in Christ Jesus?” I leave the question with you. Answer it in your heart as a person who fears God, with the torch of the word in your hand, and the solemnity of the judgment awaiting you and me.

CHAPTER II.

THE MODE OF ADMINISTRATION OF NEW TESTAMENT BAPTISM.

I shall take it for granted that the reader and I are of one mind about water, as the proper element of the administration of the ordinance. But the subject that needs to be determined is, In what manner should the ordinance be administered? Whether by dipping the water TO the person being baptized, or by placing the person being baptized IN the water.

One class of religionists holds that placing the baptized person in the water is the only proper way to baptize.

Another class holds that pouring water on the baptized is the correct way to baptize.

A third class holds that sprinkling water on the baptized is the proper way to baptize; while another party holds that each of the above three methods is correct (or as a Negro once said — one is as good as the other, and the other is better too); i.e. the baptizer can choose his method, and do as he thinks best.

But the question arises inevitably, Where did these various opinions come from, about what should have been clear, since it is of such great importance? Well, listen, dear reader, not from the Bible. The truth is clear. And I know that I shall unite you and I in this great matter. It is not He who has led you astray nor I; no, no, fair play to the wise and just God; his manner is to speak as clearly as it can be understood. He has spoken most clearly about baptism as well as about the Lord's supper, and we cannot misunderstand his words either way. When commanding bread and wine, we understand immediately that is his meaning. When he once commands to the chief priests to sacrifice an only lamb, that was the meaning, and not the sacrifice of two lambs. When calling for red yarn, nobody thought it was meant to be blue thread. When he once ordained one lamb for the Passover, everyone understood it would not serve the purpose to use a hundred lambs. When commanding two male doves, none of the women came with two

female sparrows, arguing that there was no difference but the intent is good. No, that was not how it was then. God's meaning was understood, and it was carried out accordingly. And since God is so clear under the law of the shadow, it is to be doubted that he is not clear under the law of light of the gospel.

In truth, what then is baptism? Take a careful look, reader; don't be so hasty; you will find it with me in union. And in order for us not to understand each other quite as well, I will make an arrangement here. It is this:—

THE SECOND PROPOSITION.

Immersing or plunging the whole body of the baptized in water is the only method of baptism in the New Testament.

Who is to be the judge? O! paedobaptists will certainly be, as in the preceding section. Not as much as one testimony from any of the professing Baptists.

CLASS I.—The meaning of the word used in the New Testament to set out the ordinance of baptism.

The word baptism is not a Welsh word, nor is it native to that language in its own right. It is a Greek word that has been translated, or rather *Gymreigyddio* (made Welsh). This was done when translating the New Testament; not with the fault of the Welsh language for translating to the common people, but in order to convey the ordinance surrounded by awe and mystery; for the reader will understand, the translators were obliged by King James not to translate every word in the Bible. He said to them thus:—“You must abandon the church terms without translating them;” i.e. among others such words as *Διακονος* (*diaconos*), *Επισκοπος* (*episcopos*), *Εκκλησια* (*ecclesia*), *Βαπτίζω* (*Baptizo*), &c. The lack of words was not the reason they were not translated, but there was another purpose in view: and so instead of being translated to deacon, bishop, church, baptism, &c., they have been translated to *diacon*, *esgob* (bishop), *eglwys* (church), *bedyddio* (baptism), &c., in place of overseer, assembly, *tan-suddo* (total-immersion), &c. If the word *Baptizo* had been translated, there would have been no room for an argument about the mode of baptism. Now then, fair play to the word, fair play to the ordinance, fair play to the truth,

and fair play to the reader is to translate the word, in order to see its meaning.

The New Testament has been translated into various languages, besides Welsh and English, and some of the translators were far removed from the constraints and conventions of our translators. Well, how have they translated the word? We shall see, dear reader. Here it is:—

SYRIAC TESTAMENT. The one translated in the first century:—

Baptizo is translated to “Amad.” The meaning of Amad, —
MICHAELIS AND CASTELLI is “immersing, plunging, total-submersion.”

Freytag Lexicon Arab.

COPTIC TESTAMENT. Cf. in the third century:—

Baptizo is translated to “Ghasaber.” The meaning of Ghasaber, —
LE CROSE, is “plunge, total-plunge.”

Le Crose, Copt. Lex.

ETHIOPIC TESTAMENT. Cf. in the fourth century:—

Baptizo is translated to “Tamaka.” The meaning of Tamaka, —
LUDOLF, is “total-plunge.”

Ludolf Ethiop. Lex.

GOTHIC TESTAMENT. Cf. in the fourth century:—

Baptizo is translated to “daupjan.” The meaning of daupjan, —
MEIDINWYR, is “total-plunge.”

Lex. Etym. Lang. Teutonic.

ARMENIAN TESTAMENT. Cf. in the fifth century:—

Baptizo is translated to “Morgedil.” The meaning of Morgedil, —
ANCHER, is “plunge into water.”

Ancher’s Lex.

ARABIC TESTAMENT. Cf. in the sixth century:—

Baptizo is translated to “Amada.” The meaning of Amada, —
FREYTAG AND DR. HENDERSON is “plunge, total-plunge, immerse in water.”

Freytag Lex. Arab.

GERMAN TESTAMENT:—

Baptizo is translated to “taufen.” It is said about taufen thus, —

MARTIN LUTHER:—

“Although we are not accustomed to immerse in baptism, yet we should do so, as the meaning of the word taufen, plunge, or immerse the baptized wholly under the water shows.”

Luther’s Works, p. 2593.

DUTCH TESTAMENT:—

Baptizo is translated to “doopen.” The meaning of doopen, —
MEIDINWYR, is “plunge.”

Lex. Etym. Lang.

SWEDISH TESTAMENT:—

Baptizo is translated to “dopa.” The meaning of dopa is the same thing as taufen, namely immerse.

Adeleiny’s Lex.

DANISH TESTAMENT:—

Baptizo is translated to “dope.” The meaning of this is again the same as dopa.

See the Lexicons.

Let us go forward now to see how more recent scholars translate the word. Here we can choose seven or eight of the best Dictionaries, whose authors are those who are acknowledged by the world as truly learned:—

DR. JOHN JONES:—

“Baptizo,—Immerse, immerse in water, plunge, bury, cover up, cover completely.”

Lexicon Bap.

DR. ROBINSON:—

“Baptizo,—Immerse and Plunge, these are the usual and proper meanings of the verb baptizo.”

Lexicon p. 126.

STEPHENS:—

“Baptizo,—Plunge, total-plunge, immerse.”

Thes. Ling. Graeci. Bap.

SCHREVILIUS:—

“Baptizo,—Plunge, immerse, total-plunge, and wash in water.”

Lex. Bap.

DONEGAN:—

“Baptizo,—Plunge to the water, immerse thoroughly.”

Lex. Bap.

EWING:—

“Baptizo,—Cover entirely in water, total-plunge, immerse, surround the object in the water.”

Lex. Bap.

WRIGHT:—

“Baptizo,—Immerse, plunge, total-plunge, completely cover in water.”

Lex. Bap.

PROFESSOR STUART:—

“Bapto and Baptizo; the meaning of both these words is immerse and plunge, and on this every scholar, and every critic of repute agrees.”

Stuart on Baptism.

The above is sufficient on the meaning of the word, for it will be seen by the reader that the celebrities agree; and if all the Dictionaries (Lexicons) were to be heard they would say the same thing, since there is not one Greek scholar in existence who can propose to deny that the meaning of Baptizo is plunge, or immerse. After listening to the above Scholars translating the bare word, let us go forward to see how the word baptizo is explained by Theologians with regard to its connection with the ordinance.

PROFESSOR PORSON. (Professor of Greek in Cambridge University):—

“It is absurd to imagine that baptizo has any proper meaning other than fully immerse, or plunge.”

Dore Ser. on Bap., p. 12.

HOLWYDDOREG DENMARK:—

“Question.—In what manner is the Christian baptism to be administered?

Answer.—The person must be immersed deeply in the water — in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Danish Catech. on Bap.

C. BULKLEY:—

“As for its external form itself, it evidently involves the immersion, or the plunging of the whole body under the water. This based on all the observations available from imagination, and is shown to be the proper, special, consistent and invariable meaning of the word in its Greek original.”

Economy of the Gos., p. 481.

DR. ASH:—

“Baptism in theology is immersing, plunging, fully plunging.”

Dict. Article. Bap.

DR. BASSUET:—

“To baptize signifies plunge, and this is acknowledged by the whole world.”

Westlake on Bap., C. II, p. 10.

SALMASIUS:—

“Baptism is immersion; and it was administered in the old days in accordance with the force of the word.”

Ibid p. 11.

LEIGH:—

“The proper and natural meaning of the word baptizo, is to immerse in water, plunge under the water; and metaphorically, to plunge into great difficulties.”

Crit. Sacra. p. 77.

HOMER (the Greek Bard) said,—

“When the blacksmith cools his axe or his sword, he immerses it in water.”*

Dr. Gale’s Refl. page 96.

*How do Aberdare’s smiths do this? Do they sprinkle water on the axe, or plunge the axe into the water?

H. CLIGNETUS:—

“Baptism is thus called from plunging, or plunge; for in the old times those who were baptized plunged wholly into the water.”

Westlake on Bap. ch. II, page 11.

ZEPPERUS:—

“If we take the proper meaning of the word, baptism signifies plunge into water, or the action here in the sense of immersing.”

Ibid.

POOLE:—

“To be baptized, is to be plunged in water; in the metaphorical sense, submerged in trouble.”

Commentary on the New Testament.

WITSIUS:—

“It cannot be denied, that the common meaning of the word baptism, is immerse or plunge.”

Econ. of the Cov. Vol. IV, p. 13.

BEZA:—

“Christ ordered us to be baptized, and by this, immersion is signified certainly. Receiving baptism in water, signifies nothing else than being plunged in the water.”

Booth’s Pued. Bap. Exam.

BAILEY:—

“Baptism is the act of washing or cleansing by immersion; and when it was applied to the Christian institution called thus, it was not defined by the early Christians in any other sense than immerse, as the scholar Grotius and Chasaubon observe very well.”

General View of Baptism, Chapter II.

VENEMA:—

“The word baptism is not in one place in the scriptures associated with sprinkling.”

Westlake on Bap. Chap. II, p. 12.

DR. JOHNSON:—

“I understand that the papists have the same right to change the manner of the Lord’s supper, as we have to put sprinkling in place of the old mode of baptism.”

Bos. Life of Johnson, Vol IV, page 311.

PETAVIUS. (One of the most learned men in the Church of Rome.)

“It is most true that immersion is baptism; but we are no longer accustomed to pour water on the head.”

Dr. Carson on Bap. p. 245.

T. SCOTT:—

“Immersion, undoubtedly, is baptism.”

Life by J. Scott.

DR. WARDLAW:—

“Immersion is Christian baptism essentially.”

P. A. Môn on Baptism, tud 81.

LYMAN COLEMAN:—

“The ordinary meaning of the word baptism is plunge, total-plunge, immerse; the obvious and strong meaning of the noun is immersion.”

Church Antiq. p. 115.

A. CAMPBELL:—

“The word Baptisein among classical writers is commonly represented as immerse, plunge, and it was translated by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin Fathers, as tingere, the word used for dyeing cloth, which was done by immersion.”

Notes on Math. iii, 11.

DR. HAMMOND:—

“Baptismos signifies immersion, or washing the whole body.”

Expos. on John, xiii, 10.

BISHOP TAYLOR:—

“If one relies on the natural signification of the word baptism, it signifies plunging into water, or washing with immersion.”

Rule of Con. R. 3, Ch. 4.

MARTIN LUTHER:—

“Baptismos (baptism) is a Greek word, and can be translated immersion, when something is plunged into water, so that it is covered with water. And though it has been completely discarded by most, because they do not immerse all the children, but only sprinkle them with a little water; but they should, for that reason, immerse them fully, and draw them out immediately, as that is the meaning of the word in its intention. I want all who are to be baptized, to be immersed in the water.”

Tom. I., 71, & Tom. II., 19.

JOHN CALVIN:—

“The word baptism, itself, signifies immerse; and it is certainly true that the rite of immersion was practiced by the church at first.”

Calvin’s Inst. Lib., ch. 15, s. 19.

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:*—

“We are surprised,” says the Editor, “that so ignorant a man should venture to deny that Bapto means immerse. We believe there was never anyone who denied that baptizo, as well as bapto, means immerse, or plunge.”

Presbyt. Review, Vol. I., 521, 523.

*This is a denominational publication accepted by the Presbyterian church in Scotland, and therefore contains the thought of that large body.

VITRINGA:—

“The act of baptism is immersing believers in water. This expresses the force of the word.”

Pæd. Bap. Ex., Vol. I., ch. 2.

SCAPULA:—

“Baptism—immerse or plunge, as one would plunge anything to dye it, or clean it in water.”

Booth’s Pæd. Bap. Vol. II, c. 2.

DR. CAMPBELL, of Aberdeen:—

“The ordinary meaning of baptisma (baptism) is immersion, the meaning of baptisein (to baptize) is immerse, plunge, cover completely.”

IV Gospels Note on Math. xix, 22.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND:—

“And then naming each of them, he immerses them in the water modestly and reverently, saying, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Book of Common Prayer on Baptism.

CHURCH HISTORIANS:—

“The baptism by immersion was placed on sufficiently firm ground to move it, as can be shown from the testimony and evidence of the most approved ancient writers, as well as some more recent ones.”

History of Relig. Vol. IV, p. 194.

ZANCHY:—

“Baptism is in Greek, and signifying naturally immersing in water — through baptism our Saviour was united with Christ.”

Knatchbull’s Annot. p. 301.

M. MORUS:—

“Baptism was administered first by plunging the whole body in water, and not by throwing a few drops on the forehead.”

Paed. Exam.

DR. GREGORY:—

“The original ceremony of baptism was fulfilled by the plunging of the whole body.”

Hist. of the Church, Vol. I, p. 53.

DR. HALLEY*:—

“We believe that the meaning of baptize is to put something in a different place through immersing, plunging, burying, covering completely, or any other means, but to take care that the two come into direct union with each other.”

Halley on Sac. p. 345.

*For fear of tiring the patience of the reader, let us go forward from the meaning of the word Baptizo to the verses which refer to the MODE of administering the ordinance, in the New Testament.

CLASS II.—The verses that explain the mode of administration of the ordinance.

First,—John baptizing in the river Jordan.

MATT. iii, 6:—

“And they were baptized by him in the Jordan.”

MARC i, 5:—

“And all of them were baptized by him in the river of Jordan.”

T. LAWSON:—

“John’s practice, according to the divine arrangement, was to immerse, or plunge their whole bodies under the water, as Scapula and Stephan, two of the most scholarly men in the Greek language, testify.”

Taen. Bap. in Paed. Ex.

MOSHEIM, (The famous Church Historian):—

“The form John adopted for all was their plunging in the water.”

Comt. on First Three Cent.

Again he says:—

“John’s disciples were brought into the kingdom of the Prince through the ceremony of plunging or baptism.”

Eccles. Hist., Ch. I., Part I.

LIGHTFOOT:—

“These words set out correctly the ordinance of baptism, which was originally administered through plunging.”

Notes on Math. iii.

BISHOP NEWTON:—

“John was immersing his disciples.”

Note on Parad. Regd. by Milton.

TERTULLIAN said of John’s disciples thus:—

“Those who were immersed by John in the Jordan.”

Stenett’s Ans. to Russen.

DR. ADAM CLARKE, and DR. LIGHTFOOT:—

“That John’s baptism was the plunging of the body is evident from the things said about it; namely that it was baptizing in the Jordan and in Ainon, because there was much water there; and to Christ, having been baptized, coming up out of the water.”

Clarke’s Comt., Vol. V. p 263.

DR. HALLEY:—

“John was baptizing (I must decline the translation A’R Iorddonen or â’r dwfr) IN THE JORDAN, whether along its course, standing on the bank, as Dr. Carson supposes, or in its flow, as I (who am better informed about this place) believe.”

Halley on Sac., p. 416.

Second.—CHRIST being baptized.

MATH. iii, 13, 16.

“Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water.”

MARC i, 9, 10:—

“And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit descending upon him like a dove.”

DR. DODDRIDGE:—

“After Jesus had been baptized, so soon as he ascended from the water, behold the heavens opened to him.”

Family Expos. on Math. iii.

DR. MACKNIGHT:—

“Jesus submitted to receiving his baptism, this is his burial under the water by John, and arising from it again, as a symbol of his death and resurrection.”

Exbon. on Rhuf. vi, 4.

BISHOP TAYLOR:—

“The early churches were not accustomed to sprinkle, but immerse; in accordance with the meaning of the word and our BLESSED SAVIOUR’S EXAMPLE.”

Paed. Bap. Ex. Vol. I., p. 199.

LAURENTIUS, (A famous theologian in the fifth century):—

“Christ was immersed once in the Jordan.”

Dr. Allix’s Hist. of Piedmont, p 30.

HELVETIC CONFESSION OF FAITH:—

“Baptism was ordained and consecrated by God. John was the first who baptized, and he immersed Christ in the water of the Jordan.”

Westlake on Bap. p. 29.

MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS:—

“The Son of God was immersed in the water of the Jordan by the hand of John.”

Paed. Bap. Exam.

DR. HALLEY:—

“I am not about to deny that John baptized in the Jordan, since our Lord was baptized there. In some instances, and so here, immersion may be the most convenient method.”*

Halley on Sac., p. 416.

*Thoughtful reader, since CHRIST was in the river, Is it too much sacrifice for you to follow in his footsteps?

CHARLES, of Bala:—

“Before Christ began the work of his ministry publicly, he received his baptism by John in the river of the Jordan.”

Dictionary, Cyf. I, tud. 310.

Third.—John baptizing in Ainon.

JOHN iii, 23:—

“And John also was baptizing in Ainon, near to Salim; because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized.”

JOHN CALVIN:—

“From these words, we can see that baptism was administered by John and Christ through plunging the whole body under the water.”

Nodiad yn Paed. Ex. Vol. I, p. 194.

DR. WHITBY:—

“‘Because there was much water there,’—in which they could be immersed totally; for in this way only did baptism first be administered; through going into the water, (Act. viii, 38,) and coming up out of the water, (Act. 39,) and burying therein, (Rom. vi, 4, and Col. ii, 12.)”

Expos. John iii, 23.

DR. DODDRIDGE:

“He chose this place for the notable reason that here there was plentiful water, which was needed to carry out his purpose conveniently.”

Fam. Expos. on the place.

DR. TOWERSON:—

“What need was there for the Baptist to go near much water, if his baptism was not being administered through immersion? A little water, like the moisture that is used the present time with us, is enough for sprinkling or pouring.”

Booth’s Paed., Vol. I. p. 209.

Fourth,—Christ calling his sufferings baptism.

MATH. xx, 22, 23, and Luc xii, 50:—

“But I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!”

Thoughtful reader, and is sprinkling a few drops of water on the face of an infant enough to show the greatness of the Saviour’s sufferings? Or is full immersion more likely to show it, since baptism was the sufferings of the Messiah as much as is the place where you and I are now?

DR. DODDRIDGE:—

“And could you take your baptism with the baptism that is in me, and be plunged into the sea of sufferings, in which I shall one day find my immersion, and be completely covered for a time.”

Esboniad Teul. ar Math. xx, 22.

DR. CAMPBELL; (his translation of the Verse):—

“I have immersion to go through; and O! how I am straitened until it is completed.”

Four Gospels—Math. xx, 22.

WITSIUS:—

“The immersion in the water is to be considered by us as a symbol of the true righteousness given by God, in which the soul of Christ was overwhelmed for a little, when he was atoning for our sins. It is reminiscent of David, who was foreshadowing him, ‘I came into the depths of the waters, and the flood overflowed me,’ Psalm lxix, 2.”

Econ. Cov. L. iv, Ch. 16.

JAMES HARVEY:—

“He was longing (the generous and blessed Being), yes, he was longing for the weighty hour. He was enclosed in a kind of sacred discomfort until the completion of the great work — until he was baptized with a baptism of sufferings, immersed in blood, and plunged in death.”

Theron & Vespasio, Vol. II, Let. 7.

SIR HENRY TRELAWNEY:—

“Here I must confess that our Baptist brethren had the fantasy; for we owe to compare the sufferings of the Saviour to a few drops of water being sprinkled on the face, for he was plunged in suffering, and his soul surrounded with anguish.”

Dore’s Sermon on Bap. p. 39.

Fifth,—Baptism of the eunuch.

ACT. viii, 38, 39:—

“And they went down both into the water, Philip and the eunuch: and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip.”

DR. TOWERSON:—

“What need was there for Philip and the eunuch to go into the water, if not to administer baptism through immersion?”

Paed. Bap. Ex. p. 194.

JOHN CALVIN:—

“Here we can see how baptism was administered by the ancients — they immersed the whole body in the water.”

Exboniad ar Act. viii, 38, 39.

DR. DODDRIDGE:—

“It would be entirely unnatural to think of them going into the water for a few drops to be poured on the eunuch.”

Exboniad Teul. on Act. viii, 38, 39.

QUENSTEDIUS:—

“It is written in Act. viii, 38, 39, that Philip went down with the eunuch into the water and baptized him there; and after being administered, it is said they came up out of the water. The primitive and universal churches were admirably faithful in keeping the ceremony of plunging for many years.”

Westlake on Bap., p. 30.

It could also be possible to refer the thoughts of the reader to many verses in the epistles to prove that plunging is the mode of baptism; but since we shall have occasion to notice these verses in

the next section, we will not now bring them before us. Besides, we are well aware that enough has been said to argue against every fair-minded man with any connection to the administration of the ordinance.

In finishing this chapter, allow me to draw out the following conclusion, which the reader may verify himself:—

CONCLUSION.

The meaning of the word Baptizo — the authority of the ancient Translators of the New Testament — the commentary of the chief scholars of the world on the practices of John, Christ, and his apostles, agree to show clearly and indisputably that the only and proper mode of administration of the ordinance is through immersing or plunging the baptized person in water.

CHAPTER III.

THE PURPOSE OF NEW TESTAMENT BAPTISM.

For better clarity between the reader and myself, I will set out another proposition here, and it will be judged whether the proposition is confirmed by the verses and the learned authors or not.

THE THIRD PROPOSITION.

- 1, New Testament baptism gives the baptized the opportunity to show publicly his love to God, by paying personal and actual obedience to the ordinance of the Lord Jesus.
- 2, It is a clear display of the sufferings, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and the baptized in his baptism professes his faith in these doctrines, as well as in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead on the last day.
- 3, The baptized professes that he is dead to sin and his old ways, and risen to newness of life, and from that to put on Christ about him.
- 4, And finally, in connection with personal, actual, righteous, and charitable obedience to baptism, forgiveness of sins is promised to the baptized.

If the above things are true, it is evident that only the believing person is likely to be a subject of New Testament baptism: But let us go forward to see “what the scripture says?”

ROM. vi, 3—6:—

“Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his

resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.”

GAL. iii, 26, 27:—

“For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.”

COL. ii, 12:—

“Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.”

R. BAXTER:—

“Therefore, in our baptism we are to receive our plunging under the water to show our profession; and as Christ was buried for sin, we also die to sin; and as he was raised from the dead by the glorious power of God, so we should rise to live a new and holy life.”

Paraph. on Rom. vi, 3, 6.

DR. S. CLARKE:—

“Buried with Christ; in the early times the proper mode of baptism was through immersion, or plunging the whole body in the water.”

Expos. of Church Catechism, p. 294.

JOHN WESLEY:—

“Buried with him, &c. This refers to the ancient mode of baptism through immersion.”

Commentary on Rom. vi, 4.

DR. WELLS:—

“The apostle here refers to the immersion, or the plunging of the whole body under the water in baptism.”

Bib. Illust. Rom. vi, 4.

SCOTT:—

“Jewish, or Gentile baptism showed it to be professing death to sin, and beginning to live in newness of life.”

Note on Test. New.

VERTINGA:—

“Baptism into Christ is an indisputable personal profession of union with Christ, and a personal testimony of faith in Christ.”

Obs. Sac., Vol. III, p. 22.

GEORGE WHITFIELD:—

“It is certain that in our text, Rom. vi, 3, 6, there is a reference to the mode of baptism through immersion, which is what our church acknowledges.”

Whitfield’s Sermons, p. 297.

BARNES:—

“The act of baptism signifies dedication to the service of Him in whose name we are baptized. One of its purposes is our separation and consecration to the service of Christ.”

Note on Test. New.

PROFESSOR STUART:—

“The thought is, as many of them as have committed themselves to Christ through baptism.”

Stuart’s Notes on Rom.

TILLOTSON, the Archbishop:—

“In old times those who were baptized were to have their plunging and their burial in the water, to show their death to sin; and then they were to rise from the water, to show their beginning to live a new life. To this practice the apostle refers, Rom. vi, 3—6.”

Works, Vol. I, Ser. vii.

ARCHBISHOP SECKER:—

“Burying the baptized in the water, and raising him from the water was the argument that was the practice of the church first; therefore Paul speaks of baptism as a display of death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; as well as our death to sin, and our rising to walk in newness of life.”

Lect. on the Catechism, Lect. xxxv.

DR. NICHOLSON, Bishop of Carlisle:—

“We did not go into the grave with Christ; our body was not, nor could it be there with him; but in baptism through a kind of

likelihood, while our body is under the water, we are found buried with him.”

Expos. of Chur. Cat. p. 174.

DR. ADAM CLARKE:—

“When (the baptized) comes up from the water, it appears that he is receiving a resurrection to life. Therefore look upon him as throwing off his old Gentile customs, as if he were throwing aside his old garments, and putting on a new character.”

Comm. on Rom. vi, 4.

DR. MACKNIGHT:—

“Christ’s baptism was an emblem of his death and his resurrection. And in the same way baptism of the believer is a representation of his dying, his burial, and his resurrection.”

Comm. on Rom. vi, 4.

DR. JOHN EDWARDS:—

“Their plunging into the water displayed the death of Christ, and their coming up from the water showed his resurrection; and no less showed their own resurrection.”

Thenet’s Ans. to Addington, p. 105.

CRANMER THE ARCHBISHOP:—

“The immersion in the water signifies that the old Adam should be killed by the conviction of spirit and repentance.”

Histor. of Bap. p. 443.

PETER MARTYR:—

“As Christ drew us with him through baptism to his death, so also he drew us out to life. This is shown through our immersion in the water, and our rising from it in our baptism.”

Westlake on Bap. p. 24.

BURKITT:—

“The apostle here is undoubtedly referring to the ancient mode of baptizing people in those eastern countries, which was done through immersion, or their being placed under the water.”

Comm. on Rom. vi, 4.

DR. CHALMERS, (One of the chief Theologians who lived in this age):—

“The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion. And although we neither look upon it as a trifling matter which mode administers the ordinance in this manner or through sprinkling; yet we do not doubt that the common mode in the apostle’s days was, by actual plunging of the whole body under the water. We refer to this here, in order to cast light on the symbolism that is suggested in these verses. Jesus through his death came under the nature of this baptism, namely plunging under the face of the earth, from whence he came back through his resurrection; we through having our baptism into his death, are seen as having made a significant movement in the act of going down under the water of baptism, having put aside the old life, and in the act of coming up to be re-submerged, or a new life.”

Lect. on the Rom., Vol. II, c. vi.

REVIEW OF THE PRESBYTERIANS:—

“We cannot but confide that Mr. Ewing had been guilty of a number of mistakes as clear and as contradictory to attempting to prove sprinkling. We have seldom come across so wretched and imaginary an argument as that of Mr. Ewing, for instance, attempting to persuade us there is no reference to the mode of baptism through immersion in the words, ‘We are buried with him through baptism.’ This point ought to be acknowledged as honest, and truly it cannot be denied with any kind of reason.”*

Review, Vol. I, p. 531.

*Mr. Ewing had written a volume against baptism of believers through immersion, but as above he is being given his punishment by his own brothers,—Serve him right.

JOHN CALVIN:—

“When Paul addresses believers, those who are rightly using the symbols, he connects them with the truth which is displayed in them. There it is reasonable for him to have told them they put on Christ in baptism.”

Calvin’s Notes on the Epistles.

DR. DODDRIDGE:—

“As many of you as were baptized into Christ, and thereby made a profession of your faith, you have put on Christ — you have taken on his character, and covered yourselves with his righteousness.”

Note on Gal. iii, 27.

BENSON:—

“As many of you as were baptized into Christ, having believed in him — you have received him as your Righteousness and your Sanctification.”

Notes on Gal. iii, 27.

TERTULLIAN:—

“In baptism we die in a symbolic sense and we rise.”

Curson on Bap., p. 491.

CHRYSTOSTOM:—

“Our being plunged down, and then our being raised up again is a symbol of our going into the grave, and our rising from it.”

Ibid.

DR. SHARP, Archbishop of York:—

“Whenever a man was baptized formerly, not only was he to profess his faith in the death and resurrection of Christ, but he was also to look upon himself as under an obligation to die to his fleshly desires, and begin the new life; and the mode of baptism was illustrating this. For what does it signify that he is plunged under the water, but that he is taking it upon him, in a similarity to the death and resurrection of Christ, to leave the old ways, and thus his coming out of the water shows his commitment to lead a holy and spiritual life.”

Sermon before Queen Mary, March 27, 1692.

BISHOP PEARSE:—

“The person who is baptized goes down into the water, and as if he were buried from it.”

Note on 1 Cor. xv, 29.

DR. KNAPP:—

“As many as were baptized into Christ put on Christ, i.e. they are Christians — they belong to Christ’s school, and thus under an obligation to acknowledge Christ as their Lord and Master — to obey him, and to follow his example.”

Christian Theology, p. 430.

THOMAS CHARLES, of Bala:—

“There is a display of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ in baptism. The plunging of the body of the baptized in the water, or his sprinkling with water signifies his sufferings; and his being under the water, his burial; his rising from thence, his resurrection.* It symbolizes to the baptized union with Christ in these things, namely death to sin through the body of Christ, the mortification of sin, burying the old man with him, and co-rising with Christ to a new life of righteousness and newness of life.”†

Dictionary, Bap., tud. 311.

*Can some of Mr. Charles’s followers reconcile the practice of his followers with what is said here about the mode of baptism? Does the baptized find them being “plunged in the water”—“remaining under the water,” and “rising from the water?”

† Does sprinkling on any infant signify to them the things Mr. Charles says baptism signifies to the baptized?

And he says again:—

“The baptized signifies, from an external profession, union with Christ and his church, and is a professing subject of that kingdom which is raised up in the world against the kingdom of Satan, and a soldier for it.” Rom. vi, 4; Gal. iii, 27; 1 Cor. xii, 13.*

Dictionary, Cyf. I, tud. 313.

We shall not pause to note one more verse, which illustrates
THE PURPOSE AND OBJECT OF BAPTISM.

1 PETER iii, 21:—

“The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.”

DR. KNAPP:—

“The meaning here is, that through baptism we take upon us ourselves a solemn commitment before God, to keep a good conscience — to be obedient to the gospel against sin, and to extend at sanctification.”

System of Theol. p. 431.

ROSSENMULLER:—

“Baptism is connected with a promise of pure conscience to keep us from sin.”

In Bloomfield’s Digest.

A. BARNES:—

“No man can be saved without a reborn and purified heart, of which baptism is the proper symbol.”

Barnes’s Notes on New Testament.

DR. OWEN:—

“I am not about to deny that there is a great likelihood between the salvation through the Ark, and that through baptism, since the former is a display, and the latter a display of Christ himself.”

Owen on Heb. Vol. IV, p. 138.

DR. A. CLARKE:—

“Baptism signifies dedication and consecration of the body and the soul to God. He who is faithful in keeping baptism iadol, taking God in Christ, having a share in saving himself from his sins.”

Commentary Cyf. VI. tud. 1897.

Now, dear reader, is it not evident from the foregoing verses, as well as the commentaries of the celebrities, that everything said about New Testament baptism, in its purpose and its object, by its nature can only refer to believers? And what is a personal act of baptism? And is it only belonging to professing believers in Christ? And was it the practice of the apostles to baptize people BEFORE making them members of the Church of Christ on earth? Take a careful look, and read the verses and commentaries again, and see every sentence confirming not only the proposition at the

beginning of this chapter, but also the propositions in the two preceding chapters.

And whilst you, dear reader, are having the consideration of the contents of this chapter, I am preparing another chapter for your benefit on the Practice of the Church after the death of the apostles.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SUBJECTS AND MODE OF ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM FOR THE FIRST TWO HUNDRED YEARS OF THE CHRISTIAN AGE.

This is worth knowing, since the practice of the church in the years closest to the apostles should be the best interpretation of the apostles' own practice.

Here again we will set out a proposition:—

THE FOURTH PROPOSITION.

That the only subjects of baptism for the first two hundred years of the Christian age, were professing believers in the Son of God — and that the only mode of administering baptism for this period was through immersion.

We have not a single verse to challenge on this point, since we have already stepped outside of the inspired volume. There are tens of witnesses; but I shall be particularly careful to choose those witnesses acknowledged by the world as honest, learned, and good men, that the reader may venture to rely on what they say.

CLASS I. —Subjects of baptism from the death of the apostles to the year of the age of Christ 200.

The first writer who has ever said a word about infant baptism, is TERTULLIAN, who wrote at the beginning of the third century; and it is evident from his words that the practice was begun at that time. But let the reader judge for himself. Here are the words

TERTULLIAN:—

“The Lord truly said, ‘Suffer little children to come unto me.’ Suffer them to come, therefore, when they are older, when they have grown to full understanding; when they have been taught where to come. Let them become Christians when they are able to know Christ.”

De Baptismo, Cap. xviii.

CURCELAESIS:—

“The baptism of children was wholly unknown in the first two centuries of Christianity; and in the third and fourth century, it was sometimes permitted by some. In the fifth, and the ages following, it became something common. But in the early ages, there was not one instance of sprinkling on infants; and it was introduced without any command from Christ.”

Paed. Bap. Exam. Vol. II, p. 76.

SALMASIUS AND SWICERUS; (two of the most learned men):—

“In the first two centuries, no one was baptized without first being taught in the faith, and brought to know and believe the doctrines of Christ; and making a personal profession of being a believer.”

Yn Pengelly’s on Bap. p. 65.

RIGALTIIUS; (Commentator on the Official Works of Cyprian):—

“We fill in the book of Acts of men and women being baptized after they believed the gospel preaching by Philip, and there is no word about infants. From the days of the apostles until the days of Tertullian the matter was ambiguous; and some of Christ’s words were cited — ‘Suffer little children to come unto me’ — about baptizing newborn infants, but Christ gave no command for baptizing anyone of the kind.”

Annot. in Cyprian Epis. ad Fidem.

VENEMA:—

“TERTULLIAN opposes infant baptism, which would not have been done had it been a tradition and practice in the Church, since he was remarkably careful about traditions. And if infant baptism were a tradition, he would certainly have taken note of it. I conclude from this, therefore, that infant baptism did not exist

before the days of TERTULLIAN; but that some in his days had been seeking to have their children baptized for fear of them dying unsaved; but they were opposed by TERTULLIAN."

In Paed. Bap. Ex. Vol. II, 78, 80.

CHAMBERS:—

"It appears that no one was baptized in the early times, but those of mature age."

Booth on Bap. Ex.

BISHOP BARLOW:—

"I believe, and know, that there is no commandment nor example in the scripture for infant baptism, nor one righteous proof for it from the first two centuries of Christianity."

Letter to Mr. Tombs.

In addition to these, rather than swelling my little book by calling more witnesses on this point, since it is so evident, I refer the reader to the learned work of Lyman Coleman, "The Antiquities of the Church," pg. 116 and 117, where he can get the testimonies of the learned:—BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS; HAHN; DE WETTE; DR. NEANDER; RHEINWALD; GIESLER; SIEGEL, and many others acknowledged by the world as learned men from the first class; and they have thoroughly examined the subject, and acknowledge and prove that there is no word about infant baptism for the first two hundred years of the Christian age. And if this is not enough to satisfy your mind, it will be quite easy for you to refer to A HOST of learned celebrities to prove the proposition at the beginning of this chapter; that is, that professing believers were the only ones baptized for the first two hundred years of the Christian age.

CLASS II.—The mode of administering the ordinance for the first two centuries.

PROPOSITION.

That immersion was the ONLY mode of baptizing from the days of the apostles to the middle of the third century; and from the

middle of the third century to the thirteenth century, immersion was the common mode and rule of the churches to administer baptism, but some did permit sprinkling in cases of sickness. Note that the reader will see me making a distinction with regard to the time of beginning infant baptism and sprinkling on infants. In the following section, we cannot show the practice of baptizing infants earlier than the third century, but neither sprinkling on an infant nor a person of mature age is found before the middle of the third century, and sprinkling was only found being permitted as an exception to the rule until the beginning of the thirteenth century. Thus, we shall find the holy ordinance kept in its purity, from the standpoint of its mode, for many more years than its subjects, since the subjects received their change of about A THOUSAND years before entirely changing the mode.

But for fear of your tiring, better call the witnesses:—

BARNABAS (companion of the Apostle Paul,) said, in his letter on baptism, as follows:—

“Those who have founded their hope on the cross, and have gone down into the water. We go down into the water, and rise from it, and bring forth fruit — having the fear of reverence in our heart, and hope through Christ.”

Epistol Barnabas, Pen. xi.

HERMAS, (he who is greeted by Paul in Rom. xvi, 14):—

“The apostles and the teachers who had been preaching to those who had previously died, then the apostles went down into the water, and they rose from it again.”

The Pastor, Lib. I, Vis. 8, s. 7, &c., &c.

JUSTIN MARTYR. (Wrote around the year of Christ 140):—

“Those who believe that our teaching is true, and promise to live accordingly, are directed by us to pray and to fast for the forgiveness of their sins; and we will pray and fast with them. Then they are brought to some place where there is water, and they are baptised with the same baptism which we ourselves received, because we are washed in the water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Apology for Christ. II. s. 79.

On these words of Justin, note —

DR. WALL*:—

“This is the oldest account of baptism we have next to the Bible, and shows clearly and simply the mode of its administration.”

In Pengelly, page 74, note.

*Dr. Wall was Vicar of Shoreham in Kent. There is no man who has been more diligent in researching the arguments for infant baptism than this learned man. He diligently researched for many years, and published the fruit of his labour under the name, “The History of Infant Baptism,” (Hanes Bedydd Babanod,) for which learned book Dr. Wall was thanked by the WHOLE Officials having met in synod. Therefore the opinion of Dr. Wall is of great importance to us in the present investigation. He will be giving his testimony more than once before the end of the book.

MR. REEVES, (he who translated the official works of Justin Martyr,) said as follows:—

“It is evident, from the above statement of Justin Martyr as well as from Tertullian (De Cor. Mill. c. 3), that rivers and streams were the only baptizing places of the church for the first two hundred years.”

Apologies, Vol. I. 19 note.

TERTULLIAN; (writing O. C. 204):—

“Those who were believing were having their plunging or their immersion. The baptized, with the greatest simplicity, is placed in the water, and has his immersion. There is no difference whichever one is baptized in the sea or in a lake, in the river or in a spring; there is no difference between those who were immersed by John in the Jordan and those who were immersed by Peter in the Tiber.”

De Baptisma, Cap. 2, 4, 7, 13.

GREGORY, NAZIENZEN; (writing O. C. 360):—

“We are to be buried with Christ in baptism, and to rise with him also; we go down with him, so that we may rise with him; we ascend with him, so that we may be glorified with him.”

Orat. 40 in Stennett’s Ans. to Russen, page 144.

AMBROSE; (writing O. C. 374):—

“You were asked, Do you believe? You said that you believed, and you were immersed, that is, you were buried with Christ.”

De Sacram, Lib. 11, Cap. vii.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, (writing O. C. 374), addressing those who had been baptized, said to them:—

“After all this you were led to the baptismal pool; and having made your confession you went down into the water, and came up again, and the water of baptism was like a grave to you.”

Catech. xx, s. iv—xvii, s. iv.

CHRYSTOSTOM, (Writing O. C. 398):—

“Our baptism, and our total-immersion, and our return from thence is a picture of our going into the grave, and our return from it; therefore Paul calls baptism a burial.”

Homil. XL., in 1 Cor.

To the testimonies found from the fathers above, we can confirm them with the testimonies of more recent scholars.

WITSIUS:—

“It is most certain that John the Baptist and the disciples of Christ administered baptism, in the practice of immersion, and their examples were followed by the early church, as VOSSIUS has shown through many arguments from among Greek and Latin writers.”

Econ. of the Cov. Lib. IV.

BOWER:—

“Baptism through immersion, undoubtedly, was the apostolic practice, and was never at any time left aside by the church, except in cases of sickness.”

Hist. of the Popes, Vol. II, 110.

G. J. VOSSIUS:—

“The apostles immersed those they baptized, everywhere, which is beyond all debate; and it is most clearly evident from the DIRECT testimonies of the fathers, that the early church followed their examples.”

ENCYCLOPEDIA ECCLESIASTICA, (One of the most learned books):—

“It is evident that baptism through immersion was the practice of the church in the early ages, and for many years after this; and it is not shown that it was ever left aside, except when baptism was administered on the dying on the edge of death — and at that time baptism was not considered complete.”

Article Baptism.

I consider this sufficient to prove the first part of the proposition from the practice of the church to the middle of the third century. And I shall call the learned witnesses following to prove the last part of the proposition:—

BISHOP BOSSUET:—

“We are able to prove, through the acts of synods, and old canons of church councils, that baptism through immersion was administered, as far as possible, by the whole church for THREE HUNDRED AND TEN YEARS.”

Stennett’s Ans. to Russen, p. 176.

STACKHOUSE, (Author of the History of the Bible):—

“Many Authors have proved that immersion was practiced (as far as possible) by the church for THREE HUNDRED AND TEN YEARS AFTER CHRIST.”

Hist. of the Bible, P. 8, p. 1234.

DR. WHITBY:—

“Since it is so clearly stated here (Rom . vi, 4) and in Col. xi, 12, our burial with Christ in baptism, through having our burial under the water, and since this immersion has been observed in a religious manner by the Christians for THREE HUNDRED AND TEN YEARS, and since it has been accepted by our own church, and since it was changed to sprinkling, without any permission from the AUTHOR of the institution, or consent of any church council, in something which the Papist yet uses as a pretext to justify his withholding of the cup from the laity; it would be becoming if the ceremony were to come back into common use.”

I consider this sufficient to prove the second part of the proposition, namely that immersion was the common practice of all Christians until the thirteenth century.

I also think, by now we have enough evidence from the proofs to believe that JOHN WAS AN IMMERSER — that CHRIST WAS AN IMMERSER — that THE APOSTLES WERE IMMERSERS — and also that THE IMMERSERS WERE ALL CHRISTIANS FOR THREE HUNDRED AND TEN YEARS, except for permitting some to be sprinkled on their sick-beds. Thus, baptism through immersion is not a new thing at all.

Now, reader, I have gone through as much as I considered necessary of the history of BAPTISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. But before ending, allow me to add one more chapter, to clarify the type of practice which many in these days have taken in place of the ordinance of the Son of God.

CHAPTER V.

INFANT BAPTISM, AND SPRINKLING ON INFANTS.

The reader will remember that there is a great difference between baptizing infants, and sprinkling water on infants. There is a great difference in the time, the cause, and the reasons for their establishment. The first goes against the New Testament baptism, from the standpoint of its subjects; and the latter changes the mode of administration of the baptism established by Christ in his church.

CLASS I.—We will take a look at the practice of baptizing infants. First, The practice of baptizing infants is wholly without scriptural authority for its institution.

We shall prove this from the testimony of sincere friends of the practice itself. We shall not begin with the great Reformer:—

MARTIN LUTHER:—

“It cannot be proved from the scriptures that infant baptism was established by Christ, or that he began with the first Christians after the apostles.”

Orchard’s History, p. 333.

DR. WOODS:—

“We have no commandment or example for infant-baptism in all the holy writings.”

Baptizo, gan D. Ll. Isaac, tud. 23.

BISHOP BURNETT:—

“There is no command or rule given in the New Testament for infant baptism.”

Expos. of the Articles—Art. xxvii.

DR. NEANDER, (the famous Church Historian):—

“It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism. We cannot prove that the apostles ordained infant baptism from the places commonly cited for infant baptism, such as Act. xvi, 33; 1 Cor. i, 16.”

Neander’s Church History, Ed. 1843.

He says again,—

“Baptism was first administered only to those of mature age. There is every reason not to base infant baptism on apostolic institution.”

Church History, Vol. I, p. 426.

S. PALMER:—

“There is nothing in the history of the institution nor in the history of the administration of the ordinance, nothing as much as ONE command, nor a sample of the practice through all the New Testament.”

Answer to Dr. Priestley, page 7.

LIMBORCH:—

“There is not one example that can be found, from which it can be concluded that as much as one child was baptized by the apostles.”

Complete Sys. of Div. B. V, ch. xxii.

HAHN, (of Breslen):—

“There is neither in the scripture nor in the first hundred and fifty years, one sure example of baptizing children to be found; and we must confess that we cannot contradict his many opponents on the direction of the gospel.”

Coleman’s Chur. Antiq. p. 116.

LANGE:—

“Every attempt to make infant baptism out of the New Testament has failed. The practice is entirely contrary to the spirit of the apostolic age and to the foundational principles of the New Testament.”

Yn Hanes y Bed. gan R. Ellis, t. 20.

DR. HAGENBACH:—

“The verses of the scripture, those which are supposed to refer to infant baptism coming into practice in the early church, are doubtful and prove nothing; namely Marc x, 14; Math. xviii, 4—6; Act. ii, 38, 39, 41; a x, 48; 1 Cor. ii, 11, 12.”

History of Opinions, Vol. I. p. 193.

POOLE:—

“‘Suffer little children to come unto me,’ Math. xix, 14. We should be careful not to base infant baptism on Christ’s example in this text; for it is evident that he did not baptize the children here.”

Note on Math. xix. 14.

BISHOP TAYLOR:—

“It would be a conclusion from the fact that Christ blessed infants, that baptizing infants was a duty, showing further than anything else that a good proof is needed. For the most natural conclusion would be thus. Christ honoured infants and showed them as such, but he did not baptize them, therefore it should not be the custom to baptize infants.”

Liberty of Prophecy, p. 230.

DR. COWRA:—

“Our Lord did not ordain infant baptism.”

Bib. Cab. Vol. xxxiii. 2.

DR. KNAPP:—

“There is therefore no command to be found in the New Testament for baptizing infants.”

Christian Theol. p. 435.

WM. PENN:—

“There is not so much as one text of scripture to prove that sprinkling on the face was the water baptism, or that infants were subjects of baptism in the early times.”

Defense of Gospel Truths, p. 82.

ROBERT BARCLAY:—

“Infant baptism is mere human tradition; for this there is no command or example from it in the whole scriptures.”

Barclay's Apology, Prop. xii.

BISHOP PRIDEAUX:—

“Infant baptism is not resting on a better foundation than episcopacy.”

Facical Controv. p. 210.

DR. FIELD:—

“Infant baptism is called a tradition, because there is no history in the scripture of the apostles baptizing infants, nor a command to them to do so.”

Field on the Church, p. 375.

DR. KITTO, AND J. JACOBI:—

“Infant baptism was not established by Christ nor his apostles.”

Kitto's. Bib. Cyclop. Vol. I, p. 287.

PROFESSOR STUART:—

“I can find no command, nor sure example of infant baptism in the New Testament.”

Yn Baptizo, Tud. 23.

DR. M'NIEL, (One of the chief men of the Church of England at present):—

“With respect to the effects of baptism on infants, indeed, with respect to infant baptism in general, I do not know of one word about it in the word of God. There is no word about it as much as one work in the holy scriptures.”

Letter on the Gorham case, Nonconformist, Sep. 11, 1850.

DR. LEWIS, (of Llanuwchllyn):—

“ALL acknowledge that we have in the Bible not ONE clear example of infant baptism, no definite command for its administration. They cannot believe nor repent.”

Body of Divinity Lewis, Tud. 505.

I think, reader, that these twenty-two are sufficient to prove the first proposition, namely the UNSCRIPTURALNESS of the ceremony of infant baptism. There are armies yet in the rear supporting the same testimony, if there will be a call for them.

Second.—Baptizing, (not sprinkling) children began around the year of Christ 204, and not before.

Under this section, to save my time, and that of the reader, and for fear of swelling the little book, I refer you throughout to pages 47 and 48, where you can get the testimonies of Official Works, — Tertullian, Curcellaesis, Salmasius, Swicerus, Rigaltius, Venema, Chambers, Barlow, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hahn, De Wette, Dr. Neander, Rheinwald, Giesler, and Siegel in proving clearly the proposition here with respect to the time of beginning the practice of baptizing children.

Third, The cause and the reasons for baptizing children.

The practice of baptizing infants was begun from a misunderstanding of the nature, purpose, and object of the ordinance, as well as a misunderstanding of God's plan to keep souls to eternal life. The founders of the practice believed it was regenerating an infant, and that there was no way to keep the soul of a small infant without its baptism. This appears plainly from the writings of the fathers.

CYPRIAN; (writing O. C. 253.)

“As far as it rests with us, no soul ought to be lost. We are not to prevent any person from getting baptism and the grace of God. The rule pertains to all, and it should particularly be kept in relation to infants, those who are to be helped, and the mercy of God to be given them.”

Pengelly on Baptism, p. 67.

AMBROSE; (writing O. C. 390.)

“No person enters the kingdom of heaven except through the sacrament of baptism — infants are baptized and transferred according to their nature from evil.”

Pengelly, page 67.

CHRYSOSTOM; (writing O. C. 398.)

“The grace of baptism gives improvement without pain, and we are filled with the grace of the Spirit. Some think that heavenly grace only includes forgiveness of sins; but I have counted TEN benefits pertaining to it. If we were to die an untimely death before our

baptism, even though we were blameless in terms of good deeds, we would have nothing but hell for our teacher.”

Dr. Wall’s Hist. of Infant Baptism, Vol. I, pp. 13, 14.

AUGUSTINE (Writing O. C. 370):—

“Not only people of age, but also young children and newborn infants, if they die without baptism, they go to eternal fire.”

Davye on Bap. p. 67.

ISIDORUS (Writing O. C. 430):—

“Whilst children are unbaptized and thus unregenerated thereby, and their original sin to be washed away, they are in a state of damnation.”

Magd. Cent. 7. p. 98.

BERNARD:—

“Children cannot be saved without baptism.”

Danvers on Bap., p. 120.

SALMASIUS; (A truly famous historian and critic.)

“The belief existed that no one could be saved without his baptism; and for that reason the practice of baptizing infants was begun.”

Booth on Bap. Vol. II, 129.

The attentive reader can see from the above that the founders of infant baptism believed that every one who would die unsaved would be damned; and that baptism on the other hand washes away sins, and saves the souls of infants; and for that reason the ceremony was brought into practice.

Well, having found the original cause of infant baptism, we shall now look further at what was carried on before it, and what it brought with it in the following centuries.

We shall find this in the writings of the churches of Rome, Luther, Greece, Peterborough, and England.

CHURCH OF ROME; (as it was around O. C. 800):—

“Sin, whichever it is through the birth of our first parents, or committed by ourselves, through the wonderful virtue of the Sacrament of baptism, is forgiven and pardoned. Through baptism

we are united and bound to Christ, as members to the head.
Through baptism it is pointed out to us in the name which can
never be erased from our forebears. Baptism opens to every one of
us the gates of heaven.”

Westlake on Bap. p. 53.

COUNCIL OF TRENT; (a synod held O. C. 1545):—

“If anyone says that baptism is not necessary for salvation, let him
be condemned.”

Catech. Council of Trent, p. 164.

LUTHERAN CHURCH; (in the confession of faith in 1530, it is
said):—

“That baptism is necessary for salvation; and that the grace of God
is given through baptism. And the condemnation of the Baptists
for not baptizing their children, and for saying that God saves
infants without baptism.”

Augustine Confession.

DODWELL:—

“Through baptism the soul is made immortal.”

In Paed. Bap. Exam.

GREEK CHURCH; (around O. C. 1100):—

“We believe that baptism is an ordinance, ordained by God; and if
a person does not receive it, there is no fellowship for him with
Christ.”

Confess. Crist. Fidei cap. xvi.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF PETERBOROUGH; (O. C. 1666):—

“Here lies a babe that only cry’d
In Baptism to be wash’d from sin and, died.”

In Welsh —

“Here lies a baby, raised only one feeble cry,
His sin was washed away through baptism, and died here.”

Hacket’s Epit. p. 124.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND; (or the Reformed Church established around 1533):—

This Church has declared its view from the start; and from the days of Henry VIII. until now, has been teaching its view and its practices in every parish throughout England and Wales; and it is evidently believed and taught that its baptism regenerates the young infant.

In the Catechism on baptism we find the following:—

Question (from the priest). “What is your name?”

Answer (from the child). “John or Mary,” (or as the case might be).

Q. “Who gave you this name?”

Answer. “My godfathers and godmothers, at my baptism, when I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven.”

Q. “What is the inward spiritual grace” (in baptism)?

Answer. “Death to sin, and new birth unto righteousness; for, since we are born in sin, through baptism we are made children of grace.”

Catechism of the Church of England.

We can also see the same view being taught in the service performed when baptizing infants.

Without wearying the spirit and patience, and the common sense of the reader, by going through what is said by the priest to the child, and to the parents at the mother’s baptism, we cannot listen to the great God in all-powerful and completely wholesome service.

In the prayer before baptizing the infant, the priest speaks as follows:—

“Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we are lowly thankful to thee for that it pleases thee to call us to the knowledge of thy grace and faith in thee; increase this knowledge, and confirm this faith in us always. Drive away thy Holy Spirit from this little child, so that he may be born again, and made an heir of eternal salvation.”

After going through the ceremony of baptizing the infant, the priest prays again, and uses the following words:—

“Great thanks to thee most merciful Father, that it has pleased thee to regenerate this little child with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him as a child to thee, through adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church.”

Service of Infant Baptism in the Parish Church.

The above views are confirmed by bishops and priests, as well as common members of the Church of England, for the past centuries.

Fourth. — The cause of the practice of the ceremony of infant baptism in the last years, as well as the ground on which one justifies the practice at present.

It is acknowledged by the most honest critics, the best historians, and the chief scholars and thinkers a nation has had, that there is not one degree of foundation for the practice of baptizing children in the scriptures; and since the ceremony began through misunderstanding the ordinance of baptism in the third and fourth century; and since it has been kept until now in the Church of Rome, Greece, Luther, and England, through identifying the baptism with the power to regenerate the baptized; and since various religious denominations among the Nonconformists, such as the Independents, the Methodists, the Wesleyans, and others profess to be denying the doctrine of “regeneration through baptism,” — the question arises naturally, On what grounds are THEY continuing the practice of sprinkling on infants? And it is very difficult indeed to give knowledge on what grounds the paedobaptist churches of the present time practice the ceremony, since it is difficult to get any two writers to agree on the subject. Every author has his own reason, but seldom can one writer be found to agree with the preceding, as it changes with the ceremony of this practice.

I shall give here some views from among the scores that have been trying to defend the practice.

DR. WILLIAMS; (A zealous defender of infant baptism among the Independents):—

“The champions are not able to agree on the authoritative grounds for infant baptism.”

Notes on Morrice’s Social Religion, page 68.

DR. WALL AND DR. HAMMOND; (and many others who base infant baptism on):—

“Baptism of Jewish proselytes.”

Dr. Judson on Bap. pp. 22, 23.

DR. OWEN AND DR. JENNING:—

“Having proved that baptism of proselytes did not exist in any age of Christ, and therefore it cannot be the basis for infant baptism.”

Judson’s Sermon, p. 63.

DR. WARDLAW; SIR N. KNATCHBULL; RICHARD WATSON; R. PRICHARD; THOS. AWBREY; (and many others, in founding the practice on):—

“Circumcision of the children of Israel.”

See their books on Baptism.

DR. HALLEY (proving):—

“There is not so much as a kind of basis in infant baptism in the circumcision; but it should be based on the commission in Math. xxviii. 19.”

BAXTER; LIDDEL; ROBINSON; CALVIN; HAMMOND; POOLE; BOOTHROYD; BENSON; SAWRIN; CAMPBELL; VALPY; DR. BLOOMFIELD; (and many others showing):—

“There is not the slightest shadow of a basis for infant baptism in the commission in Math. xxviii. 19.”

See pg. 16, 17, 18, 19,

BEZA; DR. DODDRIDGE; (and many with them, and agreed):—

“The holiness of children of religious parents is the basis for their baptism.”*

Notes on 1 Cor. vii. 11.

*But Independent ministers, and the greater part of the Wesleyans have entirely rejected this basis, since they are ready to baptize children of all, without enquiring about faith in the parents, not in the child. While the Church of England requires faith from three persons, from the testimonies of godly witnesses, those who stand in the place of godparents for a believing child; and who answer for its faith on behalf of time and vow.

DR. ADAM CLARKE, (from the other side, showing):—

“There is not the least kind of holiness belonging to one child more than another; and no one on earth other than Christ possesses the kind of character.”

Notes on Rom. v. 12, 13.

MATHEW HENRY; DR. DWIGHT; DR. BURDER; CHARLES OF BALA; (and many others saying):—

“It is the faith of the parents that gives their children the right to be baptized.”

See Henry’s Treat. on Bap. p. 76.

Dwight’s Theol. Bap.

Burder’s Sermon on Bap. p. 7.

Dictionary Charles on Bap.

D. EDWARDS, Commentator of the Book of Songs, sets out perhaps the most surprising basis, if no more certain than any of the foregoing, in his commentary on the Book of Songs.

SONGS vii, 2:—

“Thy navel is like a round goblet, which wanteth not liquor.”

“This is where a great argument receives its interpretation between us and the Baptists, those who are against baptizing infants, because they have not come to the age of understanding.

Let it be remembered from what is said here that infants receive nourishment through the navel, before they take any food through the mouth.

Thus, therefore it is not a good argument against infant baptism, that they are unknowing, and without understanding what they are doing; and that they are not capable of receiving spiritual nourishment in the common way, it can be done through the navel; through that covenantal bond that secures them safely to their

Christian and believing parents; by this, in the opinion of the best theologians, is the incontrovertible argument for proving the validity of infant baptism.”*

D. Edwards, on Cant. vii. 2.

MR. WHITE, minister of the Independents in Henffordd, “Having decided that there is infant baptism WITHOUT ANY BASIS WHATSOEVER, and for that reason he and the church under his care had agreed to cast it overboard, and live consistently without one baptism.”

See the Principality am Ion. 18, 1850.

Thoughtful reader! but you see something uncertain and perplexing — something that is wild and confused, in the practice of baptizing infants, when so many different arguments, and so many contradictions and counter-contradictions are given by the MOST ZEALOUS DEFENDERS of the practice in support of its observance. Are things such as these sufficient to encourage uncertainty in the minds of Christians themselves, and to drive the unruly world to Infidelity?

It is also a shame, indeed, it is a libel on the character of CHRIST, to think that he has established an ordinance in the church, and calling on every one of his subjects to pay obedience to it, and yet so wild and incomprehensible that to this day the chief authorities of the world cannot agree on the reason for its observance.

I think indeed, that it was high time for attentive, thoughtful, discerning, and judicious members of various congregations to take the matter into their own hands.

And would it not be reasonable for you to get scriptural and reasonable answers to the following questions:—

Did Christ ordain infant baptism? And is there as much as one scriptural example of infant baptism? And were the apostles accustomed to baptize infants? And was as much as one infant baptized before the third century?

The New Testament is now freely available to every man; read it yourselves, and consider the matter carefully. It is not enough for you to rest on the claims and counter-claims of your forebears.

You see that they are like the east wind as they look at the basis for infant baptism; and if they are so far from each other in placing the basis, farewell once and for all to teaching unity in the supreme-ordinance.

I must confess that I am not able to explain the development of your forebears.

But with regard to the conduct of the Church of Rome and the Church of England, it is understandable — it is diverse and clear — it is consistent and in its light. The language of these two churches is this in effect:—

“We acknowledge that we have no scriptural authority for infant baptism; but the church has the right to change the subjects and mode of baptism. We believe baptism saves those who are baptized by us, and that all who will die without their baptism will be condemned; and FOR THIS REASON we baptize the infants.”

Well, on this ground, one can understand their zeal for the practice. And are there views like this, or similar to this, being embraced by Welsh and English Nonconformists? It would be good to answer no; but I was yet in the way of doing this, and I found the doctrine of “baptismal regeneration” being taught nearer to us than Rome? I know that my co-religionists are surprised at my mode of thinking about this; but I am most serious, and not without foundation either.

I ask humbly, but seriously, the body of Methodists, what is the ultimate effect of baptism on your children?

They answer quite readily, “It is their being made members of the church.” Members of what church? Members of the Church of Christ, certainly. Well then, what kind of characters are members of the Church of Christ in all the Bible? Those who have been reborn — who have been born of the Spirit and of the water — those who have been changed through grace, &c. &c. Now, is your baptism then bringing the children into the church, do all the following things:

Fulfil all the purposes of the Bible, the ministry, repentance, faith, personal obedience, and the working of the Spirit of God on the person of mature age; since the child, through baptism, is guaranteed insured with the obedient and devout Christian, — they

are the two in the church, the two sharing the blessings of the covenant of grace.

Here is one or two examples of the teaching of your forbears on the point:—

JOHN WESLEY:—

“If the infant is guilty of original sin in the normal manner, they cannot be saved otherwise than by this being washed away through baptism.”*

Westlake’s View of Bap., p. 55.

*I refer the Wesleyan reader further to the treatises of Thomas Aubrey and those of R. Prichard, where quite a good argument will be found for church membership in infants.

DR. ADAM CLARKE:—

“Baptism carries its privileges along with it whilst opening the way to enjoy holy things in the church, and placing the baptised within the church. Tell us, therefore, why the child is not as capable of being brought into the visible church, and receiving the noted symbol which distinguishes the Christian from the pagan, the same as a man of mature age?”

Clarke’s exposition at the end of Mark.

We have now made the fairest examination with the forerebears of the denominations which are disputing for infant baptism. Can it be now honestly asked and settled from the doctrine of “baptismal regeneration?” that is, they through baptism as much at the benefit to the infant, as if they were protecting its body against death, — in making it a child of God — and in bringing it as a member of the Church of Christ on earth, and in adapting it to enjoy all the privileges of the gospel? Their being taught this is clear to every man who took the trouble to read the books of the best and most acceptable authors among them.

But what have they to say in the face of this before Dr. Pusey and Bishop Exeter? And are they raising clean hands to throw a stone at one of them? But since these are their views, we are not surprised at their being so zealous for the practice, but we cannot do less than wonder at them as their seal has been founded on a dangerous and terrible basis.

It is now natural to draw the CONCLUSION:

That infant baptism was established in the third century — that it began through a misunderstanding of baptism — and that it has been defended until today through attributing to the ceremony of infant baptism wholly unscriptural effects.

CLASS II.—The beginning and growth of the practice of Sprinkling on Infants.

We can call this practice Sprinkling on Infants, rather than sprinkling on infants, since it is more proper to set out the practice under consideration. John and the apostles baptized persons, but in practicing sprinkling in place of baptism, it is not the child that is sprinkled, but water is sprinkled ON the child. A few scriptural examples make our meaning clearer. Let the reader take his Bible, and turn to the following places:—Exod xxiv, 8, “He sprinkled ON the people,” and not “he sprinkled the people.” Exod xxix, 16, “And sprinkle ON the altar,” and not “sprinkle the altar.” Lev. vi, 27, “Sprinkle ON the garment,” and not “sprinkle the garment”; vii, 3, “Sprinkled ON Aaron,” and not “sprinkled Aaron”; xvi, 14, “Sprinkle with his finger ON the mercy seat,” and not “sprinkled the mercy seat.” Heb. ix, 13, “After being sprinkled ON those who were made unclean,” and not “sprinkle those who were made unclean.” Heb. ix, 19, “And sprinkled ON the book,” and not “sprinkled the book.” Thus, with regard to the practice under consideration, it is nothing more nor less than sprinkling water ON infants. How different the mode that the Holy Spirit speaks of baptism in the New Testament; here it is the baptized who is the action, EFE who receives his baptism, and not the water which receives his baptism ON HIM.

Let us look further now at the practice of sprinkling IN PLACE OF baptism.

The first example we find in historical record of sprinkling in place of baptism took place in the year of Christ, 250. The person sprinkled was a man of mature age, by the name of NOVETIAN. The account is related as follows by

EUSEBIUS, (The Church Historian):—

“Novatian fell into reckless unbelief, and thinking he would die immediately, he received baptism, he was sprinkled from the surrounding water, as it were while he was lying, if such a thing can be called a baptismal act.”

Eccles. Hist., L. VI., ch. 43.

We have the account of what took place in the year following in connection with Novatian, who explains the view that was then held by the church on sprinkling at that time. It is said as follows by...

DR. WALL:—

“He was opposed by all the ministers from getting a church post, because he had not been properly baptized.”

Wall's Hist., P. II, ch. ix, s. 2.

This was the beginning of the practice of sprinkling water ON a person, in place of baptizing the person IN the water.
From that time, that is the year 250, sprinkling was permitted as an exception in cases of sickness only.

In the year 800, pouring (that is pouring water on the head of the baptized) was permitted in place of immersion by the Church of Rome, since immersion was the rule for years after this.

In the year one thousand five hundred (1500), pouring came into common practice, in place of immersion, in the Church of Rome.

See Rituals of the Church of Rome,

“Bossuet, in Stennett's Ans.”

Immersion was the only mode of baptism in England at the time of Henry VIII, because it is said...

ERASMUS, in 1530:—

“With us (the Dutch) they pour water on the baptized, but in England they immerse them.”

Dr. Wall's Hist.

After the Church of England was established by Henry VIII, it was ordained that baptism should be administered “through immersion

modestly and reverently in the water.” And thus it continued until the time of King Charles II, in 1662. when, in a case of weakness, it was permitted “to pour water on the child.”

Wall’s Hist. of Infant Bap.

In the Catechism pertaining to the Church of England, the child is taught to look at baptism as immersion only, because it is said, — “Water in which the baptized person is,” &c., &c.

Catech. Church of England.

From the year one thousand six hundred and sixty two (1662), sprinkling came into common practice in this country, as more were being sprinkled in the parish churches than were being immersed.

But though the practice is by now common, yet good and learned men in the Church of England disapprove of it as something new and unscriptural.

DR. WALL:—

“The manner that is now being practiced, we cannot deny that it is something new that was brought into the Church of England by those who had been taught in Germany or Germany (and they were not willing to follow the example of pouring a measure of water, which was brought in there in place of immersion); and they were satisfied, if that was so, to translate the word immersion, from pouring to sprinkling, as the old mode of baptism may have been considered as little a likelihood as possible.”

Def. of the His. of In. Bap. p. 403.

SYR J. FLOYER:—

“Pouring or sprinkling was brought into the church by the scholarship of the Papists; and our Nonconformists have received it from them. The scholars put their thoughts to work in trying to find reasons for the change, and brought pouring into the SIXTEENTH CENTURY.”

Essay on Cold Bathing, p. 58.

We have now seen the origin and growth of sprinkling in the State Churches, and we shall look at it once more with the Nonconformists.

The Independents. — The practice of sprinkling on infants was begun by the Independents some time after the year 1616, and not before, as they did not exist as such before then.

The Wesleyans. — The practice of sprinkling on infants with the Wesleyans was begun some time after the year 1740, and not before, as they did not exist as a religious society before then.

The Calvinistic Methodists. — The practice of sprinkling on infants with the Welsh Methodists was begun some time after the year 1790, and not before, as they did not exist as a religious society before then.

It is evident, then, since sprinkling is something common in this country now, that it is a new practice, and that the OLD WAY of baptizing through immersion was FIFTEEN TO TWENTY THOUSAND years ahead of it.

But it is an important fact for us to remember, that a nation and a large number of religious societies, besides the believing Baptists, have never at any time practiced the ceremony of sprinkling.

All the congregations of the Greek Church practice immersion to this day.* Let us take a testimony or two on this point:—

THE PANTALOGIA; (a truly learned work):—

“This part of the Christian church was first established in Greece, but has now spread over a larger domain than any other Established Church, since it includes in its membership Greek, the Greek Islands, Wallachia, Moldavia, Egypt, Abyssinia, Nubia, Libya, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, and the Land of Canaan. It should be noted that they ALL (though they are mistaken in many minor things), continue to baptize through immersion, which was undoubtedly the original mode.”

Pantalogia, Art. Greek Church.

DR. WALL:—

“What has been said about pouring or sprinkling in the common practice of baptism, this is to be understood with respect to Western European parts ONLY, since it is not in common practice among any other man. The Greek Church continues to practice immersion, and thus all the other Christendom except the Latinists. Those who acknowledge the authority of the Pope, baptize their infants through pouring or sprinkling; while those who do not

acknowledge his authority have, been, and continue to immerse their infants.

“ALL the Christians in Asia, all the Christians in Africa, and about a third of all Europe, practice immersion.

“The Greek Church in all its congregations continues to practice immersion.”

Hist. of Infant Bap. P. 1—11, Ch. ix.

This is important for us, since there is no man who has understood the meaning of the word better than the Greeks themselves, yet here the Greeks ONE and ALL baptized through immersion. Where can we get a better explanation of the Greek word than the GREEKS themselves using it?

Well, reader, shall we go forward to call witness upon witness from among the celebrities of the religious world? I can assure you there are A HOST of them yet in reserve, if their testimonies are needed. But we consider sufficiently enough witnesses have come to the court ready to argue against any person without integrity and indifference to catching hold of the truth. We have not spent time gathering around high words, but here we have brought before a treasury of FACTS, that is, FACTS acknowledged by the chief scholars of the world, who have researched the subject to the greatest depth.

It is indeed true that the scholars I have called as witnesses in this matter, in the practice of sprinkling on infants; but it is enough for me that they are ONE and ALL acknowledging that professing believers were baptized in the time of Christ and his apostles, and that immersion baptism was the baptism of John; and, of course, immersion baptism was the baptism of my BLESSED LORD; and in the one mode which HE was baptized, the command was given to me to take my baptism. “FOR THIS,” said I, “we are ordained to fulfil all righteousness.” Yes, reader, “I TO YOU:” thank you for the privilege of having our “co-burial with Christ in baptism.” I am not ignorant of the statements of our neighbours, and some writings in the Theology in the months and years that have passed. It is known to the reader that some are to be found, principally among the Independents, to claim with sufficient arrogance that sprinkling is the proper meaning of the word baptizo. That

sprinkling was done by John. That infants were sprinkled by John, by Christ, and the apostles; and that sprinkling infants was the practice of the early Church; and that the immersers had no case to search (?) about them before the synod of Munster. That the believing Baptists are a very small sect. That the Baptists are cruel towards their children for refusing to sprinkle them. That the Baptists place more weight on the water than on the Holy Spirit. And when they fail in every other place, they venture to try to persuade their listeners that baptism is a “worthless thing” — that is, yes, yes, little brother, a worthless thing, look at it; — nothing but plisgyn (a husk) in sight. O, yes, a kind of fine nonsense among our Baptist brothers; — nothing of importance except the colour of the coat — nothing of importance which it is a large button or a small button on the coat — getting the coat is the point, my lad,” &c.

But is such conduct as this sufficient to win the world, and is it inclined to believe there is no weight in anything commanded by Christ, the Head of the Church? And if a minister gives reason for immersion baptism, quoting portions of authoritative writings of some of the paedobaptist scholars, he is accused of plainly copying; it is said that he has compiled the whole thing. Hush! if he is copying, he would have been heard of in my face more than once, by some who did not know better.

Silent contempt (silent contempt) would perhaps be the most appropriate courtesy (compliment) to a family which is able to display as much ignorance and arrogance. But to be serious about this, I shall give an answer to all of the above and their like, testimony from a man or two; and there is ONE of them who would be bold to all the ministers and scholars of the Independents throughout Wales, to stand against him on the subject under consideration, since he has spent many years researching all the writings of the ancients and moderns on the proofs of infant baptism. But he may speak for himself.

DR. WALL:—

“This (that is immersion) is so clear and bright from the direct testimonies, that we cannot do less than wonder at the feeble attempts of those who are seeking to prove the contrary, and we should be completely dismissed, and show our disapproval of the

HOLY BAPTISM displayed by some men to the Baptists, only because their body is immersed; since it is in all probability the mode which our BLESSED SAVIOUR was baptized; and it can be certain that immersion was the common mode the old Christians had their baptism. It is a great failure of honour, and a great failure of integrity indeed to oppose what is in ABSOLUTE TRUTH, and what can be proved thus. Such conduct is creating disgrace in all that is said to us.

“The practices of the Christians who lived in the times nearest the apostles, are delivered to us in books, and it is KNOWN that they were accustomed to FULL IMMERSION.”

Hist. of Infant Bap. Pt. II, Ch. ix.
Def. of Hist. of Infant Bap. p. 131.

The above extract is sufficient to outweigh the ignorant, arrogant, and disorderly stupidity of the Reformer and the Mob for the next TEN YEARS.

PROFESSOR CAMPBELL:—

“I have recently heard a debater in the face of scholarship and practice claiming that the word baptizo more properly means sprinkling than immersing; and in the face of all history, claiming that sprinkling was the most common and usual mode of baptism. The man who argues in this mode is always safe with men of knowledge, to betray the cause which is he defending; for with the ignorant arrogant claims are often as successful as arguments, and sometimes better; yet it would be frivolous for every honest mind to take advantage to defend truth.”

Lect. on Pulpit Eloquence, p. 304.

It would be very easy for me to find enough fruit which would be agreeable indeed to those whose eyes are open in the light of day “to despise the counsel of God, without being baptized,” Luc vii. 30. But not arguing was our intention in this little book, rather to set out the true stand of the argument between paedobaptist baptism and believing baptism; and we look at our having succeeded in doing this whatever lines were ever written more on the argument between the immersers and the sprinklers. Every proposition in the little book has been proved by the paedobaptists themselves; every verse cited for the argument has

been explained by Infant-baptists; every historical fact has been confirmed by the opponents of the Baptists. And yet every verse, every commentary, every historical fact, every acknowledgment from the celebrities are clearly showing that the present practice of the Baptists is in perfect agreement with the practice of JOHN, CHRIST, and the APOSTLES, as well as with the practice of the Church for the FIRST TWO HUNDRED years, with respect to the subjects and the mode of baptism.

In conclusion, we do not lament the small compass of our little effort, so that the reader may remember it well.

Remember that the following FACTS have been admitted and proved by the celebrities who gave their testimony; and since FACTS they are, they are truths BY THEMSELVES and DIRECTLY in it.

1, FACT IT IS that persons professing repentance for sin, and faith in Christ, were baptized by John.

See the Witnesses (Tystion), Page (tud.) 10. **[In Original Manuscript]**

2, FACT IT IS that the persons baptized by Christ had been made disciples before their baptism.

Witnesses tud. 11.

3, FACT IT IS for Christ to command us to teach people before their baptism.

Tystion, tud. 12—14.

4, FACT IT IS that the persons baptized on the day of Pentecost, had heard the word with gladness, — had repented, — and had believed in Christ before their baptism.

Tystion, tud. 16—18.

5, FACT IT IS that the Samaritans had believed the word of the kingdom before their baptism by Philip.

Tudal. 18.

6, FACT IT IS that the Eunuch believed with his whole heart before his baptism.

Tystion. tud. 19.

7, FACT IT IS that the five households baptized in the time of the apostles possessed characteristics that could never at all be attributed to infants; such as their being “having heard the word” — “having believed the gospel” — “the firstfruits of the church” — “in ministry to the saints” — and the brothers of Paul and Silas before their baptism.

Tystion, tud. 20—24.

8, FACT IT IS that the untranslated word is the word baptism in the New Testament, and therefore, it is by this itself that it is untranslatable to the reader into his own language.

Tystion, tud. 29.

9, FACT IT IS that the ordinary and proper meaning of the word Baptizo is immerse or plunge, and that “every critic of repute acknowledges this.”

Tystion tud. 28, 29.

10, FACT IT IS that the translators of the Scriptures for the first centuries translated the word Baptizo into words which correspond to immerse or plunge.

Tystion, tud. 28, 29.

11, FACT IT IS that John baptized in the Jordan and in Ainon, because there was “much water there.”

Tystion, tud. 34.

12, FACT IT IS that the chief scholars of the world acknowledge that the baptism immersion was the baptism of John.

Tystion, tud. 35.

13, FACT IT IS that our PRINCE and BLESSED SAVIOUR received his baptism in the river of Jordan.

Tystion, tud. 35, 36.

14, FACT IT IS that the sufferings of our GREAT SAVIOUR are called baptism; and that not a mere outward and trifling thing were his sufferings.

Tystion, tud. 37, 38.

15, FACT IT IS that the baptism immersion was the baptism of the Eunuch.

Tystion, tud. 38, 39.

16, FACT IT IS that it is impossible to fulfil the purpose of New Testament baptism, without the baptized paying personal, actual, and charitable obedience, through his taking his burial with Christ in baptism.

Tystion, tud. 39—45.

17, FACT IT IS that persons professing repentance and faith, were the only subjects of baptism from the days of the apostles to the year of the age of Christ, 200.

Tystion, tud. 46, 48.

18, FACT IT IS that the only mode of administering baptism from the days of the apostles to the year of the age of Christ, 250, was through immersion.

Tystion, tud. 48, 51.

19, FACT IT IS that immersion was the common practice of all the churches until the year of the age of Christ, 1400.

Tystion, tud. 51, 52.

20, FACT IT IS that the practice of baptizing infants, and its sister, the practice of sprinkling on infants, are wholly unscriptural, since there is no command for, or example of, or kind of basis in the whole Bible of God — and the friends of the practice are the judges.

Tystion, tud. 52, 70.

Now, the argument between the Baptists and the Sprinklers has been brought to quite a small circle, it can be summed up in a nutshell; — it rests in this:—

HAVE MEN THE RIGHT TO DESPISE OR CHANGE A DEFINITE ORDINANCE OF THE SON OF GOD?

On this point the argument turns. And here I shall leave it to the serious consideration of the youth of Wales.

Fare thee well, dear gentle reader. Thank you for coming with me as far as this place. I trust we are no less friends now than when we started. May the Lord BAPTISE you in his mercies. AMEN.

POSTSCRIPT.

For the benefit of the children of the School, I shall answer a few questions, heard from time to time, still in connection with the contents of this book.

QUESTION 1.—Does baptism save?

ANSWER.—It does not; JESUS CHRIST is the ONLY SAVIOUR.

Q. 2.—Is baptism necessary FOR salvation?

AN.—It is. Baptism is part of the ordained means by God by which Christ saves listeners to the gospel. Baptism of the one importance is in itself faith, repentance, communion, prayer, living in godliness, &c. The ONE Man who has commanded all or both of these things as religious duties:

Q. 3.—Are infants who die unsaved damned?

AN.—They are not; they are all saved.

Q. 4.—Since baptism is said to be necessary for salvation, how are infants saved without baptism?

AN.—In the same way they are saved without faith, without repentance, without communion, without living in godliness, &c.

Infants do not come within the circle of the gospel ministry, and therefore they are not under obligations to pay obedience to its requirements.

Q. 5.—Is there harm in the practice of baptizing infants?

AN.—Yes, very great harm indeed, since it aims to confuse the world between baptism of believers, which is a definite ordinance of the Son of God. Besides this, the practice teaches people to think they do something, and that was performed upon us when infants, in the place of paying obedience to the definite commands of the King of the church. Personal obedience is what Christ requires in his baptism, the same as in the supper.

Q. 6.—Did some other ceremonies besides this come into the church around the time of infant baptism?

AN.—Yes, very many indeed. I shall name some:— 1. Infant baptism. 2. Communion of infants; this continued for about a thousand years. 3. Consecrating the water before baptism. 4. Getting sponsors to repent and believe in place of infants. 5. Placing two hands on the baptized. 6. Anointing the baptized. 7. Offering for the dead, &c., &c.

Q. 7.—Are these things now being practiced by some who are professing Christianity?

AN.—They are ALL (but the second,) being practiced by the Church of Rome; many of them are being practiced by the Church of England; and some of them by Welsh Nonconformists.

“Infant baptism came into the world,

Two daughters of the famous Pope, at the same time;

And many a century went by them in one stream —

A small part died, a large part is living.”

Q. 8.—Should we be content, and let every man think he is certainly right in his own mind? Or, should we try to enlighten our fellow-citizens about the connection to these practices?

AN.—It would be a sin in us as a religionist to be content and silent whilst any religious practices are in our fellowship. It would be a sin for a man “to think he is certainly right in his own mind,” if the thought given to that was dependent on truth. We should try as much as there is in it to bring men to the light, by arguing with them on the ground of the gospel. Advise everyone to weigh their denominational obligations in the scales of the word — measure them with the measure of truth; and everything that does not stand on the safe ground of the Great King, cast it away from it.

Q. 9.—Does drawing the admiration of other denominations for doing this?

AN.—Likely enough we shall. But we must remember that TRUTH is more worthy than offering it in the name of “brotherly love.” I know we shall be more respectful by some of our neighbours if we leave baptizing and a word about baptism; but I know as well as that we shall lose the respect of the GREAT KING, who has commanded us to do the two. Our duty is to speak and preach the truth, the truth in all, a nothing but the truth, and to leave the consequences in the hand of Christ. If truth will offend people, it is not on us that the fault will lie. Thus it was in the time of Christ. “I have come,” said the Saviour, “to cast fire on the earth, and what do I desire if it were already kindled?” Luc xii. 49. And “the servant is not more than his lord,” John xiii. 16.

Christ before me an example and model,
And his love beneath my breast,
And presses the way of works more
Than the emptiness of the world from the breast.

ERRATUM.— The reader of the Note at the foot of page 61, at the foot of page 60.

Printed by W. Owen, Heol Duc, Caerdydd.