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PREFACE.

The leading object contemplated in this treatise is the defence of infant baptism as a divine institution, and of scriptural latitude in the mode of its administration. Convinced by careful and protracted inquiry that immersion is neither identical with baptism, nor essential to it, and that "the little ones" cannot be rightfully debarred from the ordinance, I have endeavoured to present a critical analysis and digest of the evidence on which these convictions are founded. In prosecuting the inquiry, the principal testimonies from the ancient classics, the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and the writings of the fathers, have been examined at considerable length, and the results in some interesting cases tested and sustained by comparison with artistic monuments of antiquity. The chronological order has been to a certain extent followed in tracing the significations of the more important terms; the structure of
the passages in which these terms occur, has not been
overlooked as a modifying element; and the principle
has been broadly asserted that the ascertained usage of
any particular period is not the slave of antecedent
usage. Baptism, for instance, in the writings of the
apostles may not exactly correspond to baptism in the
works of Hippocrates or Plato; and in that case each
must stand upon its own evidence, the earlier usage
having no power to overlay or coerce the later. This
principle does not limit the province, though it aids in
wisely applying the products, of "historical philology,"
which renders valuable service in determining the mode
of the ordinance, and the discipleship predicated of its
subjects.

Without deviating essentially from the proposed plan
of discussion, I have considered it my duty, in the
present state of the baptismal controversy, to make
special reference to the opposing view as advocated with
characteristic power and acumen in Dr. Carson’s work
on Baptism. As a specimen of masterly criticism and
forcible argument, that work possesses merit of a very
high order; yet the scholarship of the writer, as it
appears to me, is not unfrequently at fault, and fallacy
lurks in several of those logical processes which seem
closest and most convincing. This charge is not pre-
ferred at random, nor would it ever have been penned in the absence of such proof as will satisfy every candid inquirer, and sustain the assault of adverse polemics. It is contrary alike to my intention and my feelings, if these pages contain a single expression inconsistent with sincere respect for Dr. Carson's talents and acquirements as an author, and his eminent worth as a Christian man;—still in instances not a few, his positions are challenged, his reasonings refuted, his assertions contradicted, and his abuse and dogmatism rebuked. For this course I have no apology to offer. It would indeed be a most unsuitable tribute to the memory of an author who zealously maintained the privilege of unshackled freedom of discussion, to shield his own views from the fire of criticism, and thus necessarily invest truth and error with a common sacredness.

On the mode of Baptism, I am disposed to rank the labours of Dr. Halley among the most important contributions to the cause which I have espoused. In none of the treatises which have recently issued from the press, have I detected the same comprehensiveness and mental grasp in dealing with the subject as a whole, combined with equal correctness in the examination and adjustment of matters of detail. Of the fruits of his well-directed talent, I have freely, and with marked
acknowledgments, availed myself in several parts of the discussion, without, however, in any instance sacrificing the responsibility, or shrinking from the toil, of independent investigation. More space than consisted with Dr. Halley's object, has been here devoted to several branches of the evidence on which Immersionists place considerable reliance; and their leading objections are combated,—with what success it remains for an enlightened Christian public to decide.

On the subjects of baptism, some of the views advocated by Dr. Halley find little favour in the present volume. Reasons have been assigned for setting aside his conclusions respecting the character and value of the argument derived from the Abrahamic covenant; and the restricted view of infant and adult baptism has been supported in opposition to the more liberal principle on which he dispenses the ordinance. Dr. Wardlaw, in his excellent Dissertation on Infant Baptism, approaches much nearer to the teaching which I hold to be at once patriarchal and apostolic. At the same time, candour must admit that the constitution and membership of the church, according to Dr. Halley's theory of which he has promised a farther expansion and defence, remain unaffected by the laxity with which he administers baptism to all infants indiscriminately, and to all adults
who apply for the privilege without manifest scoffing and profanity. I take leave simply to add that my honest disapproval of some of the author's most cherished opinions, has not, in the slightest degree, diminished the high estimation in which I hold him as a learned and able theologian, and an upright manly controver-
sialist.

Few in the present day, it may be presumed, depre-
cate all religious discussion, however they may regret the necessity for it. As a general rule it may be confi-
dently stated, that as is the spirit in which controversy is conducted, so are its tendencies for good or for evil. To the interests of the sceptic and the dogmatist, free, earnest discussion is equally hostile; while, under the divine blessing, it goes to dispel obscurity, elicit truth, and ascertain what are "those things which cannot be shaken." I patronize religious controversy, not because it may occasion a little present disturbance; but as an agency calculated to produce eventually the harmony which is based on sound comprehensive knowledge. Productive of temporary and adventitious evil, it yet secures permanent good: its course may be attended with transient strife and bitterness, but Christian unity will triumph in its consummation. While, therefore, I appear on the arena of religious controversy, my heart
owns no feeling of hostility to the friends of evangelical truth of whatever denomination, among all of whom I rejoice to witness a desire for more friendly co-operation, prompted doubtless by the Spirit of Him who offered the intercessory prayer "that they all may be one."

Belfast College, June, 1848.
CONTENTS.

PART FIRST.—MODE OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER FIRST.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT.

Claims of the Ordinance on the Student of Scripture.—It largely engaged the attention of the Reformers and their Successors.—Christian Baptism not to be identified with mode.—Points of agreement and difference among Baptists and Pseudobaptists, ........................................... 1

CHAPTER SECOND.

MODE ESTIMATED, AND EVIDENCE ARRANGED.

Estimate of the comparative value of Mode in observing the Symbolic Ordinances of the New Testament.—Arrangement of the Evidence supplied by the terms δαπέσαν and νεαράζω, ...... ........................................... 9

CHAPTER THIRD.

PRIMARY SENSE OF ΝΑΥΤΟ.

Detailed Evidence in support of "Dip" as the Primary Sense of δαπέσαν—The importance attaching to Diversity of Construction—Meaning of the expression "Wet with the Dew of Heaven," Dan. iv. 30, v. 21—Objections to the Baptist view, as expounded by Gale and Carson—Tendency of the Verb to shake off the trammels of Mode, ........................................... 18
CONTENTS.

CHAPTER FOURTH.
SECONDARY SENSE OF ΒΑΤΗΣ.
Secondary sense of ἑλευκοκολον, to dye.—Dr. Carson opposed to his Brethren on this point.—Direct proof that the Verb denotes to Dye, irrespective of Mode.—Examples from Greek Authors.—Curious Misreading of Kale, copied by Carson.—Comments and Strictures.—Evidence from the Septuagint and New Testament.—Argument from the Structure of certain Passages, well stated by Halley.—Derivatives of ἑλευκοκολον sustaining the preceding views, ................................................................. 58

CHAPTER FIFTH.
FIGURATIVE USE OF ΒΑΤΗΣ, AND RELATION BETWEEN THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SENSE.
Figurative use interesting chiefly as it involves an important principle.—Examples.—Full Statement of the principle—and Defence against the incorrect Translations of Gale.—Connection of the Secondary Sense with the Primary—its nature illustrated.—Strictures on the Renderings of Gale and Carson.—General Concluding Observations on this branch of the discussion, ................................................................. 54

CHAPTER SIXTH.
EXAMINATION OF ΒΑΤΗΣ.
Basφλος related to ἑλευκοκολον in Etymology.—The Nature of the Relation.—Difference in meaning between the two Verbs.—Various opinions stated and examined.—Basφλος not a diminuative, nor frequentative, nor causative, nor continuative.—The usual form, not the form of the Verb, determines its sense.—Comparative value of early Greek Literature in ascertaining the Mode of Baptism.—Shade of Meaning in the New Testament may differ from that of the Classics.—Dr. Carson’s Rule infringed by himself.—Testimony of the Greek Fathers.—Its uses and limits, ........................................... 71

CHAPTER SEVENTH.
EVIDENCE FROM THE GREEK CLASSICS.
Meaning of Basφλος.—General Statement sustained by the view of Dr. Gale.—Instances from Plato explained in Ast’s Lexicon Platonicum.—Interesting example from Aristotle fully canvassed.—Testimony of Hippocrates—of Diodorus Siculus—Basφλος in construction with δις cont-
CONTENTS.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

EVIDENCE FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOSEPHUS.

Reason for introducing Josephus earlier than Chronological Order would warrant.—His Testimony possesses no very determinate character, and relates to matters unconnected with the Ceremonial Ablutions of the Jewish Law, or the Baptism of Proselytes.—Instances;—Baptism of Aristobulus, which issued in Drowning;—Baptism of Ships at Sea under various circumstances.—Reference to an interesting Figurative Application.—General Remark, .......................................................... 133

CHAPTER NINTH.

EVIDENCE FROM THE SEPTUAGINT AND APOCRYPHA.

General Value of the Septuagint in the Interpretation of the New Testament.—Infrequent occurrence of βάπτιζε.—Utility of Collating Greek with Hebrew.—Important Testimony from 2 Kings v. 14.—Relations of βάπτιζε with καινή considered.—Reply to Dr. Carson's Dissertation on καινή, including an Account of the Bath among the Ancient Greeks.—Use of ομφαλός and ψυγηνός in the early Christian Church, compared with that of λύμα and Cognate Terms in the Septuagint.—Naaman's Baptism fully discussed, in connection with the Washing enjoined by the Prophet. —Egyptian mode of Bathing opposed to the assertion that καινή implies Immersion.—Figurative instance of βάπτιζε, from Isa. xxxi. 6.—Examples from the Apocrypha.—Judith xii. 7, Wisdom of Solomon xxxi. 25, (30).—Not easily reducible within the limits of Baptist Mode, .................. 144

CHAPTER TENTH.

JEWSH PROSELYTE BAPTISM.

Alleged relation of Proselyte Baptism by the Jews to Christian Baptism. —Priority of the Jewish Rite advocated by different Authors, particularly by some of the leading Orientalists.—Testimony of the Talmud, and
CONTENTS.

other Rabbinical writings.—Later Origin of the Baptism of Proselytes the Doctrine of Carpov, Lardner, and others.—Amount of support it derives from the state of the Evidence.—Estimate of the comparative soundness of these opposing views, in a series of connected observations.

1. The Prior Existence of the Rite has not a clear Historical basis.—
2. Yet its observance preceded the date of the Evidence on its behalf, by some considerable period.—3. Jewish writers assert that it arose before the days of Our Saviour.—4. The silence of some ancient Authors has exercised too much influence against the idea of its early origin.—5. Which appears to be implied in various passages of the New Testament.—
6. Remarks on the Mode of Jewish Proselyte Baptism, ............... 187

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE.

Result of preceding inquiries how related to the Evidence found in the Greek Scriptures.—This Evidence less copious than might be anticipated.

The Reason assigned.—Testimonies arranged, and canvassed, in the following order.—I. Occurrences of σύναψις, and its derivatives, which do not apply to the Ordinance of Christian Baptism.—II. Occurrences in which these terms denote "the Baptism of John," or of Jesus, and the intimately related Baptism with the Holy Spirit.—III. Figurative applications, including Strictures on the Principles and Reasonings of leading Baptist writers, in the interpretation of such passages as 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, and 1 Peter iii. 21, 22.—IV. Refutation of some of the principal objections of the Immersionists.—V. Subordination of more Mode to the substance of the Ordinance, as indicated by the expression, "Baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—Mat. xxviii. 19, .............................................................. 210

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

EVIDENCE FROM THE FATHERS.

Character and value of the Patristic Argument, as distinguished both from the mere opinion and practice of the Fathers.—Mode of Baptism countenanced by early Christian writers not necessarily that of the Apostolic Commission.—Tendency of Religious Observances to assume stereotyped forms.—Patristic Evidence most forcible, when it relates to Baptisms unconnected with the Christian Ordinance.—Classified summary of the principal points to which the Fathers bear witness.—I. The Baptism of Christ administered by pouring or perfusion.—Strength of this branch of the General Argument.—II. Comments by the Fathers on different portions of Scripture, prove that they did not identify Baptism with Immersion.—III. The Fathers applied the term Baptism to ablations in which there was no Immersion.—Conclusion of the First Part, ......... 316
PART SECOND.—SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER FIRST.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION.

Character of this part of the Discussion.—Baptist and Pædobaptist to some extent occupy common ground.—Both administer Baptism to a believing Adult.—Point of divergence.—The Infants of Church Members also admitted to the Ordinance by the Pædobaptist.—His opponent professes to baptize none but believers.—Scripture the supreme and solo arbiter.

CHAPTER SECOND.

PROFESSION A PREREQUISITE TO ADULT BAPTISM.

Importance of ascertaining the Scriptural qualifications for Adult Baptism.
—Connection of this topic with Infant Baptism.—Presumptive argument drawn from Jewish Proselyte Baptism, and from John's "Baptism of Repentance."—The doctrine of the Apostolic Commission favourable to the necessity of a profession of Faith and Obedience by the Adult candidate for the Ordinance.—Our view of Mat. xxviii. 19, borne out and strengthened by the instruction recorded in Mark xvi. 16.—Value of such forms of expression as place Baptism posterior to Faith and Repentance.

CHAPTER THIRD.

A PROFESSION PREREQUISITE—APOSTOLIC PRACTICE.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

EVIDENCE FOR INFANT BAPTISM ARRANGED.

The Evidence and its arrangement variously viewed by different classes of writers.—Some not only commence with the Apostolic Commission, but suspend almost the entire Argument on its Testimony.—That course rejected in this Treatise, without prejudice to the importance of the Commission.—Constitution and state of the Old Testament Church not to be neglected by the student of the New Economy.—Covenant with Abraham the true starting point, and the Evidence to be traced chiefly in the order of History.—Reasons for this arrangement, ................. 382

CHAPTER FIFTH.

INFANTS INCLUDED IN THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT.

Spiritual blessings, in connection with temporal good, secured by the federal arrangement with Abraham.—Prominence of the Religious Element in the Historical Disclosure of the provisions of the Covenant.—Circumcision, as its sign and seal, intimately related to the higher interests and objects of the ancient economy.—Infant children of none but Church Members recognised as proper subjects of this rite.—Connection of parents with their infant children.—Initiation into the Ancient Church performed by affixing the seal of the Covenant, ......................... 388

CHAPTER SIXTH.

INFANTS IN THE CHURCH TILL CHRIST'S COMING.

Scripture recognition of Infants as a component part of the Church under the ancient economy.—Their title equally valid with that of Abraham and Moses.—Character and value of the relation in which they stood to the saving promises of the Covenant.—Continuance of Infants in the Church from its foundation till the fulness of time.—The Covenant standing of Females considered.—Indirect influence of Circumcision in securing their federal privileges.—Objection from Ezra ix. x. and Neh. xiii. 13, answered.—General bearing of the law of admission into “the Church of the Fathers” on the right understanding and interpretation of the analogous law under the New Covenant, ........................................ 422

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

INFANTS NOT EXCLUDED BY THE NEW COVENANT.

Importance of ascertaining the range and limits of the New Covenant.—Infants, according to Dr. Carson, not interested in its provisions.—Statement of his Argument, with a detailed Refutation, embracing a comparison of the Old Covenant with the New,—an examination of the terms
of the latter,—and an account of the relation it sustains to Christ as its Mediator.—The federal standing of Infants under the Christian dispensation in obvious accordance with other portions of Scripture.—Saving provisions of the Covenant of Grace under each successive economy not commensurately with its administrative extension.—Dr. Cameron’s attempt to hold militant Infants up to ridicule, neither logical nor scriptural..... 438

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

ROOM FOR INFANTS IN THE COMMISSION.

The Apostolic Commission, Mat. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15, 16, cited and considered.—Its structure viewed in the light of certain Baptist admissions.—Nature of the connection in which the Commission introduces Baptism.—Relation of Baptism to Discipleship not unfriendly to the admission of Infants—nor its relation to Faith—nor its relation to the subsequent teaching of the baptized, as enjoined in Matthew.—The limited view of Infant Baptism sustained by the Commission.—Possibility and hope of uniform action among the advocates of Pedobaptism........ 464

CHAPTER NINTH.

ROOM FOR INFANTS IN THE APOSTOLIC BAPTISMS.

Character of the Adult Baptisms recorded in Scripture.—The evidence they furnish wholly inadequate to sustain the cause of our opponents.—No instance in all the New Testament, of Adult Baptism, in the sense in which it is impugned by the Pedobaptist, and forms the peculiarity of the Antipedobaptist system.—Examination of Apostolic testimonies.—Acts ii. 38, 39, “The promise is unto you and to your children.”—1 Cor. vii. 14, Holiness of Children; its import investigated—and Infants shown to be federally holy, and therefore entitled to Baptism.—Household Baptism proved to involve Infant Baptism.—Concluding Remark, 499

CHAPTER TENTH.

PATRIARCH INFANT BAPTISMS.

After the third century, no evidence for Antipedobaptism during a period of 700 years.—Testimony of Pelagius and of Augustine in the fourth century.—Even in the first three centuries—no instance of the Adult Baptism which alone can sustain our opponents—no opposition to Infant Baptism on Antipedobaptist principles—and no aid in tracing that observance to a human original.—Summary of Patriarchal Evidence for Infant Baptism—Persian Church—Cyprian and the Church in North Africa—Origen and the Church of Alexandria—Tertullian—Irenæus—Justin Martyr.—Observations on the Evidence.—Conclusion, ............ 594
PART FIRST.

MODE OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER FIRST.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT.

Claims of the ordinance on the student of Scripture.—It largely engaged the attention of the Reformers and their successors.—Christian Baptism not to be identified with mode.—Points of agreement and difference among Baptists and Pennobaptists.

The ordinance of Baptism, as the initiatory rite of the New Covenant, demands from the student of Scripture a full and searching investigation. Instituted by our blessed Lord, and designed to continue in the church till his second coming, this solemn and interesting observance puts forward high claims on the understanding and conscience of every Christian, and more especially of him who "ministers in sacred things." Through ignorance of its character, or misapprehension of the engagements which it imposes, the ordinary member of the church will fail in the department of personal duty—the gospel minister in the discharge of public obligation.
MODE OF BAPTISM.

We cannot, indeed, entertain the apprehension that the church will become insensible to the vital importance of baptism, or forget the high authority by which its observance is expressly enjoined. The inspired record of its institution, by the evangelists—Matthew and Mark—has long afforded considerable employment to different classes of critics and Theologians. In many respects, this is as it should be. A dark day will dawn on the followers of the Lord Jesus, when the apostolic commission fails to awaken the deepest interest, and to summon forth the most powerful energies of those who are “set for the defence of the gospel.” It behoves the heralds of the cross to comprehend, in its full import, the momentous, the divine utterance, which bids them “go and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Upon these instructive words the resources of theology have been largely, and sometimes not unsuccessfully, concentrated. To investigate, scripturally, the signification of the ordinance—to mark the great facts and doctrines which it obviously symbolizes or implies—to press home, by enlightened enforcement, the motives it furnishes to practical godliness—these are objects to which minds of the first order, both in ancient and modern times, have piously consecrated their energies, with the rich stores of knowledge which they had laboriously accumulated. These views occupy a place of merited prominence in the writings of the leading reformers. We do not refer to the works composed by Luther, and some of his distinguished compeers, in refutation of the errors of the Anabaptists, or, as Zwingle styled them, the
Katabaptists. Our remark points emphatically to those calm, didactic exhibitions of divine truth by which these men of God enlightened the darkness, and animated the deadness, of European mind. The Institutes of Calvin may be mentioned as a felicitous example of that theological disquisition, which, penetrating the shell of rite and ceremony, brought to view the substantive blessings of the baptismal institution, as symbolical of “the cleansing efficacy of the blood of Christ.” By a succession of able men, this spiritual element has been from time to time fully developed, and faithfully pressed on the attention of evangelical Christendom; while none, perhaps, have better succeeded in presenting it, on the sure foundation of Scripture verity, than our excellent Westminster divines. Whatever importance, then, may legitimately attach to the outward ceremonial, we hold it to be comparatively as the shell to the kernel, or the casket to the gem, which they respectively contain.

We do not, by these remarks, court the imputation of complimenting theology, properly so called, at the expense of sacred Hermeneutics. The function of the interpreter of Scripture is not distinguished from that of the theologian, by an exclusive devotedness to modes, and forms, and rites, and the entire tribe of externalities. It may indeed appear frequently in the costume, and occupy the position of an outer-court worshipper; yet, there exists no barrier in the way of its free entrance into the Holy of Holies. When engaged in canvassing the institution of baptism, its province is by no means confined to the common questions respecting the authorized use of water, and the scriptural subjects to whom
that element is to be applied. The very terms of the apostolic commission demand, for the exercise of its powers, a loftier range of investigation, and raise topics of infinitely more profound interest, in the discussion of which it is entitled to a patient hearing. A simple reference to the phrase—"Baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"—must instantly satisfy every candid mind that the ordinance implies, on the part of its subjects, an intimate relation to the author of the new economy, and, consequently, that the sound exposition of it cannot fail of conducting us into the region of spirituality.

The principle thus briefly indicated appears to be loudly called for, in the present crisis of the controversy respecting baptism. So far has inconsiderate attachment to a particular view carried some of the disputants on one side of the question, that the mode of administration has been avowedly identified with the ordinance itself; and the alteration of the form is affirmed to involve the destruction of the substance. Thus the *PrIMITIVE CHURCH MAGAZINE*, the representative of the Strict Communion Baptists in England, in a review* of Dr. Halley on *The Sacraments*, risks the adventurous proposition, "That in baptism the mode is the ordinance, and if the mode is altered, the ordinance is abolished." This carnal and degrading view of the initiatory rite of Christianity, we hold to be utterly incompatible with the plain language of the apostolic commission. Had that commission merely enjoined baptism with water, and were such baptism ascertained

---

* Number for October, 1844, p. 515.
to be stringently synonymous with dipping, then indeed it might be triumphantly contended that "the mode is the ordinance." But so long as the record commands to "baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," the conscientious and enlightened interpreter of the Bible will be compelled to admit that baptism is something more than mode. Even conceding, for the sake of argument, that the mode is fixed and unalterable, we should still maintain that the use of the divine name, in a form so beautifully solemn and impressive, does not constitute an ornamental appendage to the ordinance, but enters into its nature and essence. The mode may be of very material interest—it might be even essential to the scriptural administration of baptism; still, it can never be rightfully identified with the baptismal sacrament, until the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be blotted out of the commission. We do not wonder that a correspondent of the respectable periodical to which we have referred, "would feel obliged by an answer to the question, 'Is it consistent, with our Lord's institution of the Supper, to observe it at any other time than in the evening?'" This is to introduce into the generous religion of Christ that narrow and atomic spirit, of which Seneca complained in the department of philosophy—"Sed non debuit hoc nobis esse propositum, • • • philosophiam in has angustias ex sua majestate detrahere." Might it not be respectfully suggested, to the conductors and their correspondent, that a disproportionate zeal for external circumstances has an unhappy tendency to impair the exercise of spiritual discernment, and, in the case under
consideration, to reduce both ordinances to the level of those "beggarly elements," which we have the highest authority for pronouncing alien to the genius of Christianity?

In entering upon our present inquiry, it affords us pleasure to notice that the controversy between the Pædobaptist and Anti-Pædobaptist does not cover the entire ground of the ordinance. The advocate of affusion, or sprinkling, for example, does not generally impugn, as wrong or unscriptural, the mode of administration adopted by the Immersionist. His position is, that the terms of the institution are of such latitude as to permit diversity of mode, without trenching upon the character and substance of the ordinance, or rendering its import of none effect. We consider baptism to be equally valid, so far as mere mode is concerned, whether the subject is plunged into its waters, or these are applied to him by sprinkling or affusion. The language of the Confession of Faith on this point is well weighed, and distinguished alike for caution and discrimination. "Dipping of the person into water," say the Westminster divines, "is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person." On this branch of the argument, therefore, we stand entirely on the defensive, not assailing the mode defended by the Anti-Pædobaptist, but simply vindicating the scriptural validity of our own. He is bound by his principles to cut up our mode by the roots—and religiously does he labour to discharge the obligation; while we have no quarrel with his mode, except in relation to what we conceive to be its unwar-
rantable intolerance and exclusiveness. The right or the wrong of these several points of agreement and antagonism must, of course, be decided mainly by appeal to the ascertained usage of the Greek language.

Again, in regard to the subjects of baptism, it is admitted, by the vast majority on both sides of the controversy, that the ordinance may be administered to an adult, and that the administration must be preceded by at least his credible profession of faith in Christ, and obedience to him. The principle of adult baptism, as we may have occasion to notice more in detail, has been uniformly held by the Christian church from the earliest times; most generally, however, has it appeared not as the rival, but the companion of infant baptism. The statement holds good at the present hour. Our Pædobaptist missionaries in heathen lands, and among the Jews, invariably commence with the baptism of adults; and, in this respect, the ordinary narratives of the dawn of missionary enterprise, in all parts of the globe, present a pleasing and instructive similarity to the records of the apostolic age. In common, then, with our Anti-Pædobaptist brethren, we believe that adults should be baptized with the “one baptism;” and we farther concur with them generally, in maintaining that the adult applicant must possess certain religious qualifications. But with reference to another class of the proposed subjects of this ordinance, the Anti-Pædobaptist denies, and we affirm, that “The infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized.” We charge his system with unauthorized restriction in the administration of baptism, contrary to the liberal and comprehen-
sive spirit of the new covenant, and unsupported by the provisions of the apostolic commission. He condemns ours as wantonly opening the door of the commission, to admit subjects whose exclusion was obviously intended by our blessed Saviour.

The entire ground of debate, so far as it commonly engages public discussion, may be placed before the reader in the simple, suggestive questions, Is baptism divinely tied to one mode? and are believers alone, or such as make a credible profession of faith, its scriptural subjects? In the extensive course of investigation, requisite to furnish a satisfactory answer to these questions, we shall have occasion to consider, in its bearing on both branches of the controversy, the important expression, "Into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."
CHAPTER SECOND.

MODE ESTIMATED, AND EVIDENCE ARRANGED.

ESTIMATE OF THE COMPARATIVE VALUE OF MODE IN OBSERVING THE SYMBOLIC ORDINANCES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.—ARRANGEMENT OF THE EVIDENCE SUPPLIED BY THE TERMS ΒΑΘΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΘΤΙΖΩ.

In common with the great mass of evangelical Christians, we hold, as has been already intimated, that while baptism may be rightly administered by immersion, there exists no adequate ground for the lofty and exclusive pretensions with which that mode has been confidently invested. We are free to admit, that were immersion ascertained to be absolutely essential to the ordinance, or, had the Saviour's injunction specified that particular mode as obligatory upon his followers, then unhesitating submission would have been the duty and the privilege of the Christian. But the language of Scripture, as we are convinced, correctly expounded, allows us greater latitude in the administration of baptism; and hence we will not permit the sphere of our Christian liberty to be circumscribed, or bring ourselves into bondage, by subjection to a modal observance which divine authority has not imposed.
The comparative value of mode in baptism has been sometimes illustrated by referring to a parallel principle, practically elicited in partaking of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. That solemn ordinance was instituted by our blessed Lord on the night in which he was betrayed. The very season, therefore, which he selected for this purpose, formed a strong link of association between the sacramental partaking of bread and wine, and that repast which immediately precedes the rest of the night. But the case supplies us with evidence more cogent than that which arises out of the mere exercise of a principle of association, however natural and irresistible. As if to confirm and perpetuate the bond between the ordinance, and a certain period of the day set apart for its observance, the Spirit of God has expressly designated it "the Lord's Supper." The term in the original is ἑσπέριον, the history of which discovers some striking varieties of application, particularly among the earlier classical writers. According to Dr. Halley, in his able work on The Sacraments, forming the Congregational Lecture for 1844, "The heroes of Homer partook of their ἑσπέριον in the morning, and their successors seem to have made it their dinner; but long before the apostolic age, it had become regularly and constantly the evening meal." The former part of this statement appears to be chargeable with some degree of inaccuracy. In the age of Homer, as is noticed by Damm, Buttmann, and other lexicographers, there are two daily repasts—one in the morning, and the other in the evening; and the term ἑσπέριον is found to be generally, though not exclusively, appropriated to the former. The
philosophy of its subsequent transitions may probably be explained in a satisfactory manner, if, as Nitzsch maintains in his learned commentary on the Odyssey, it primarily denoted the principal meal, without reference to time. But on whatever principle we may dispose of the philological explanation, it is an undoubted fact, that in the later period of Greek literature, ἕκκαφος precisely corresponded with the Latin coena, and our English Supper; and its application, in this sense, to the communion of Christ's body and blood, cannot be successfully challenged.

The student of Scripture, who drinks at the fountain of the originals, will thus perceive that a triumphant case could be easily made out for restriction to a specified time in the observance of this solemn institution. By a process analogous to that which is commonly adopted in investigating the sense of σαρκίσμα, it were not difficult to prove, by a mass of evidence, superior to all exception, drawn from Hellenistic Greek, that in the apostolic age ἕκκαφος was the appropriated designation of the evening meal. The New Testament alone, according to Bruder's accurate Concordance, supplies eighteen examples, all obviously limited to the one application. Now, proceeding upon this, as an established fact in the history and usage of the Greek language, might we not, after the manner of our opponents, earnestly warn the professed disciples of Jesus against disobedience to the command of their divine Master, when we find them in the morning, or at mid-day, sacramentally partaking of bread and wine, and calling this observance the Lord's Supper? Are they at liberty, we might ask with
unfeigned astonishment, to trample upon the time selected by their Saviour, in the institution of the ordinance, and ingrained in the name given to it by the spirit of inspiration? To reasoning and appeals of this stamp, it would be deemed sufficient by the great body of Christians, including a majority of the Baptist denomination, to reply that time forms no essential part of the ordinance; and that, therefore, at whatever period of the day the humble and exercised Christian sits down at the table of the Lord, he realises a substantial and scriptural participation of the Lord's Supper. This view of duty we are not disposed to controvert; and we are gratified to understand that it commands the suffrages of the most enlightened of our Immersionist brethren. Now, even on the assumption that mode is invariably and essentially implied in ἐκλαυσία, the sin of the advocate for sprinkling or affusion, consists simply in regarding mode, as one of the circumstantials of the ordinance. And while he cherishes a godly jealousy against all unholy, or prohibited liberty with the word of God, he feels it both hard and inconsistent to be rebuked by a Baptist brother, who, with all his boasted attachment to literal exposition, has had the temerity to expunge the element of time from the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. We reiterate our conviction that the evangelical Baptist commits no breach of the divine law, in partaking of the Sacramental Supper in the morning; but if he denounces, at the same time, our baptism as no ordinance of Christ, because it wears not the outward garb which his sect may consider essential, we shall take the liberty of holding the mirror up to nature, for the exposure of this
specimen of flagrant inconsistency. Does he attempt to
defend the peculiarity of his procedure, by asserting that
mode is inseparable from the term βαπτισμα, and there-
fore belongs essentially to the ordinance? We reply
time is just as necessarily included in δείπνον: and when
he produces his warrant for the ejectment of time from
the observance of the Supper, we shall be prepared to
establish our right to dispense with his favourite mode,
in the administration of baptism.

In this line of argument, we have proceeded upon the
assumption that dipping is the synonyme of baptism; we
see no reason, however, for conceding that great point in
the discussion. It may perhaps be considered prepos-
terous, or unprofitable to go over ground which has
been so often traversed by the most competent Biblical
scholars and philologists of various religious denomina-
tions. In particular, it may be supposed to betray the
confidence of an enterprising spirit to challenge some of
the leading positions of the late lamented Dr. Carson,
whose ability and critical acumen eminently qualified
him for profound philological investigation, while a higher
tribute of respect is due to his character, as a Christian
man of exemplary candour, and unfaltering honesty of
purpose. It were, however, a mistaken compliment to
the memory of one who loved and courted great freedom
of discussion to spare his views, when we may consider
them erroneous, or shrink from the manly task of
exposing his statements and reasonings, where they are
ascertained to be illogical or inconclusive. The memory
of the good we delight to hold in high and venerable
estimation; but apart from all names, however honoured,
we are bound to reserve for the heavenly form of truth, the deep and unlimited homage of our hearts.

Among the earlier writers on both sides of the question, it was customary to mix up the verbs βάπτω and βαπτίζω, in critical disquisitions on the mode of baptism. This procedure evinced not only want of discrimination, but utter ignorance of the true functions which these terms respectively are employed to discharge. The confusion which thus lay at the foundation of many a learned treatise, forced the author into a variety of philological and controversial details, which could serve no other purpose than to display the unphilosophical cast of the mind from which they emanated. Thus, the advocates of baptism, by sprinkling, or affusion, derived a popular argument in support of their practice from the secondary sense of βάπτω, which is to dye or tinge; and their opponents, in order to neutralise the force of the argument, had the hardihood to deny the existence of this secondary sense altogether, in defiance of the plainest facts of usage, and the soundest canons of criticism. In reference to the reasoning of the Pædobaptists, though the term has unquestionably the secondary acceptation for which they contended, yet their cause could reap no direct benefit from that circumstance; for in the whole circle of Hellenistic Greek, the ordinance is never once designated by ψβάπτω, or any of its immediate derivatives. Whatever,

* In the edition of Stephanus, by Hase and Dindorf, βαπτισμός is said to be used for βαπτισμός, in the following example from Arrian. Epictet. ii. 9, 21:—"Οταν οἱ αναλάβῃ τὸ πάθος τοῦ βαπτισμοῦ

* * τότε καὶ οὕτω τῷ ὄντι καὶ καλάται ἱνωδοὶ. Some sort of baptism is here indicated.
then, may be the strength or clearness of the evidence establishing the claim of this verb to a variety of senses, we are not entitled to infer a corresponding variety in the use of \( \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omicron \), which must prove its own meaning, not by hereditary descent, so to speak, but by personal testimony. We admit, indeed, that the philologist having encountered actual diversity in the one verb, may anticipate probable diversity in the other: but the anticipation possesses no practical value, unless upon examination it is borne out by facts. The Paedobaptist, therefore, had no legitimate warrant to argue from an ascertained secondary sense of \( \beta\alpha\pi\tau\omicron \) to a supposed or assumed similar sense of \( \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omicron \); though, in so doing, he merely exemplified the unhappy confusion which long remained common property on both sides of the controversy.

It is, indeed, painfully instructive to observe the efforts of the Immersionists of a former age, to prove that every occurrence of \( \beta\alpha\pi\tau\omicron \), in the sense of dyeing, necessarily involves the modal signification of dipping. You direct the attention of Dr. Gale to the case of the aged dandy, who had recourse to colouring matter in order to disguise the hoariness of his locks; you place under his eye the statement of Arrian, on the authority of Nearchus, "that the Indians dye their beards;"—you even present him with the decisive passage from Hippocrates, in which the author states, that when a certain liquid "drops upon the garments they are dyed;" and you inform him that these constitute a sample of the testimonies found in the language to the secondary sense of \( \beta\alpha\pi\tau\omicron \), and its immediate derivatives. Having briefly
submitted the matter to the consideration of the "very learned doctor,"—the former leader of the English Baptist world, you respectfully ask for his decision. This he pronounces as follows:—" Those persons who would depend upon these passages to prove that βάπτω signifies something else besides dipping, must consider there is a manifest allusion in these and all such to the art of dyeing. And if the word is borrowed from thence, as none can be hardy enough to deny, they must allow it is used there improperly and metaphorically, and that its true primitive meaning only is still referred to and implied."

Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap. Vol. III. p. 109. The philosophy of Dr. Gale on this subject is unceremoniously and very properly impugned by Dr. Carson; and it is gratifying to learn from Dr. Halley's treatise, that the Baptists of Britain, despite of the faith and philology of their ancestors, now generally adopt, at the instance of Dr. Carson, the secondary sense for which their Paedobaptist brethren have all along contended. "As generally I am told," observes Halley, "as they did follow Dr. Gale in denying a secondary meaning, do they now follow Dr. Carson in asserting it. To what extent this may be true, I cannot say; but as no opponent appears, and as we have no reason to suspect the sincerity of our brethren's convictions, the result furnishes a remarkable instance of the difference in the force or the impression of arguments, as they are suggested by a friend, and as they are propounded by a foe: That βάπτω often means to dye, without dipping, was said by one Paedobaptist after another, no Baptist regarding; but when Dr. Carson said the same thing,
multitudes were converted."—Halley on the Sacraments, Vol. I., p. 440.

In the present day, writers at all acquainted with the literature of the subject, and professing to enter critically into the analysis of the evidence, take the verbs βάπτισμον and βαπτίζω into separate consideration, and thus avoid much of the confusion and irrelevancies chargeable on the reasonings of their predecessors. Following this course, we shall proceed to adduce proofs of the primary and secondary sense of βάπτισμον, defending the views which we consider well founded, and offering such strictures as the positions of some authors of merit may appear to us to demand.
CHAPTER THIRD.

PRIMARY SENSE OF BÁIHTΩ.

DETAILED EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF “DIP” AS THE PRIMARY SENSE OF BÁIHTΩ

That dip represents the primitive and leading sense of βάιττω is freely, and, we presume, universally conceded. This position is not more zealously maintained by Gale, Booth, Maclean, Carson, and others, than it is cordially admitted by such writers as Vossius, Matthies, Professor Stuart, and President Beecher. A few examples, embracing the principal constructions in which the term occurs, will at once place this meaning on a solid foundation, and probably bring to light some tendency to departure from the modal signification. The instances we may thus classify:

1. The action of βάιττω is conceived to be expressed most unequivocally and emphatically in construction with the preposition σε: as in the Timaeus of Plato 73. E. ed. Steph. Ἐις ὅλος βάιττω, “He dips (an object)
The verb is not confined to fluids, but applies equally to solid substances which are penetrable. Thus Lycophron, surnamed Tenebrosus, in his Cassandra, v. 1121, predicting the punishment of Clytemnestra, by Orestes, for murder, says: Εἰς σφαλλόγγι ἠχόμευ ἁυτόχρον βάψει εἰς ρο, The child • • • "with his own hand shall dip (plunge) his sword into the viper's bowels." The same construction occurs in the Septuagint, Numb. xix. 18, "And the man that is cleansed shall take hyssop, and βάψει εἰς τὸ ὕπερ, dip it into water." From the New Testament we can furnish no example of this verb with εἰς and the accusative. The word occurs only in three passages of the Greek Scriptures, and two of these are characterized by peculiarities which may hereafter claim a word of explanation.

2. We find βάπτω often construed with εἰς, occasionally with ποτός, and the dative, a formula which is commonly rendered dip in; though critics of distinction, holding this to be the dative of instrument, consider the construction unfavourable to the modal sense of the verb. It would, perhaps, be imprudent to stand a siege in such a fortress. The shade of meaning may indeed be singularly varied by alterations in syntax; but, in the present instance, the ground to be gained by either party would not, we are satisfied, justify a hard-fought battle.

3. Kindred to the preceding construction is βάπτω followed by a dative without the preposition. Strabo, quoted by Dr. Gale, speaking of the "wild sport" of elephant-hunting, states that the Arabs used "arrows χόλη βαμμάνακα, dipped in the gall" of serpents. This construction is not of frequent occurrence, at least when
the verb is taken in its primary signification; and it does not seem to demand any particular remark.

4. The syntax of βάπτω with the genitive, of which there are some examples, presents a less manageable construction, and little light has been cast upon it by our more eminent controversialists. An instance meets us in Luke xvi. 24: “Send Lazarus, that he may βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὀλιγοὶ ὄλλοις dip the tip of his finger of water.” On this passage Stuart has the following note:—“ὀλιγοί, the genitive of instrument, i.e., that he may wet his finger with water, which is a rendering that seems to accord more exactly with the syntactical construction of the sentence.”—Mode of Bapt., p. 25. Kunitz, in his able Commentary on the Historical Books of the New Testament, adopts a summary method of eliminating the difficulty. “Ὦλιγος, he informs us, is for ὦλιγος, used instead of ἐἰς ὄλλοις,—which is, of course, unspeakably sage and satisfactory! Were such wholesale and unscrupulous use of what are imagined to be syntactical equivalents, admissible in exegesis, all difficulty and all precision would vanish simultaneously from the structural interpretation of language. That βάπτων ὄλιγος, and βάπτων ἐἰς ὄλλοις convey different meanings, is obvious to the veriest smatterer in Greek, while the resources of the most profound and accomplished scholarship may be requisite for elucidating the precise difference. The point is not devoid of interest; but to do it justice would carry us too far from our object. Besides, it will be found partially illustrated under the subsequent observation.

5. We discover a somewhat similar construction of
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βάπτω with the preposition ἄνο and the genitive. We do not remember to have met this peculiarity in the ancient classics, and, so far as it affects Hellenistic Greek, it would seem to form the mere echo of a corresponding expression in the Hebrew of the Old Testament. The subjoined example, as adduced and canvassed by Stuart, will serve for illustration. Lev. iv. 17: “And the priest shall smear over or moisten (βάπτω) his finger, ἄνο τοῦ ἀμαρτος, by or with the blood of the bullock; מַעָּרַק וּמִמֶּנָּה. When the sense of plunging into is directly and fully expressed in Hebrew, it is by using the preposition יַעֲשֶׂה after the verb ἐπιτροπή. • • • But יַעֲשֶׂה is sometimes used (as in the example above) before the noun designating the liquid element made use of; and then the Seventy have imitated this in such a way that we are constrained to render their version as I have done above.”—p. 23. The constraint to which Professor Stuart has yielded, Dr. Carson is not prepared to recognise, and his views of language conduct him to a very different interpretation of the formula. “When ἄνο follows βάπτω,” he says, “it respects the point from which the finished dipping has proceeded. βάπτω ἄνο τοῦ ἀμαρτος, I dip it from the blood. The blood is the point from which the thing dipped proceeded, after the operation.”—Baptism, p. 51. Both these attempts at explanation are, for different reasons, manifestly exceptional and unsatisfactory. Professor Stuart’s consists merely of an empirical adjustment of English to Greek, without even pretending to found on any established principle. Dr. Carson’s assumes, as a basis, the purely local sense of the preposition, without a particle of proof,
and erects on the assumption an exact and well-proportioned theory. In this interesting construction, as it appears to us, the leading thought is that of obtaining, by the action of βάπτω, some portion of the fluid for an ulterior purpose. Under this view, what our ablest and most recent lexicographers have styled "the partitive use of ἀπό," seems legitimately applicable, and furnishes for the majority of occurrences a law of plain meaning and easy development. Thus ἀπὸ ἀπὸ λήσος, denotes a share of the spoil; and βάπτωσι σωτίνας ἀπὸς, from the Hecuba of Euripides, refers to salt water obtained by dipping a vessel into the sea. In the latter example, though the preposition is not used, the construction exhibits no substantive feature of diversity. To the partitive application of ἀπό, therefore, and the corresponding usage of the genitive, we are disposed to look generally for a satisfactory account of this perplexing specimen of Greek Syntax, while we advance it rather as a suggestion, to be valued at what it is worth, than as an ultimate or dogmatical solution.

Intimately related in structure to this class of examples, which we derive chiefly from the ceremonious purifications of the ancient economy, are the two well-known passages in Daniel, respecting the awful judgment which God pronounced and executed upon Nebuchadnezzar. Dan. iv. 30, (33, Auth. version,) "He was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς θείας τοῦ ὄρου τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἱδαφω, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven." In Dan. v. 21, the same expression is repeated without the slightest alteration. These texts form the battle-ground of many a fierce though bloodless
contest among the controversialists. In entering upon the consideration of them we notice, as somewhat remarkable, that the Baptists, the fast friends of literal interpretation, cannot approach these verses without displaying an ardent, if not suspicious, affection for the beauties of trope and figure. But is there not a cause? The literal exposition, it is evident, possesses no affinity for the modal sense of βάρνυ; nor is it practicable either to force or flatter these discordant elements into a state of reconciliation. The dew manifestly fell upon Nebuchadnezzar—its diamond drops were not collected into a pond, or other receptacle, that the monarch might be plunged into the crystal depths. Influenced by the indubitable facts of the case, some front-rank men among our opponents have been betrayed into a surrender fatal to the cause which they defend. "It seems very clear," observes Dr. Gale, "that both Daniel and his translators designed to express the great dew Nebuchadnezzar should be exposed to, more emphatically, by saying he should lie in dew, and be covered with it all over, as if he had been dipped: for that is so much like being dipped, as at most to differ no more than being in, and being put in; so that the metaphor is very easy, and not in the least strained."—Reflections, p. 150. But who does not perceive that the difference which this writer treats as insignificant, is just the difference between the modal and non-modal acceptation of the verb, and that his uncritical and imprudent admission has laid bare to the sword of the enemy the bosom of his beloved system? Dr. Carson adopts more skilful tactics, and exhibits superior circumspection. Abandoning several unfortunate
positions in the line of defence attempted by Gale and Cox, he rests the tropical exposition of the passage mainly on the great principle that "one mode of wetting is figured as another mode of wetting, by the liveliness of the imagination." With the principle itself we have no quarrel, believing it entitled to "a local habitation and a name" in the region of figurative language; but we may perhaps presently adduce sufficient grounds for questioning the justness of its application to the case under review.

Dr. Carson's usual accuracy appears to have forsaken him, in introducing to his readers these passages from Daniel, and his discussion of them we hold to be incapable of affording rational satisfaction.

1. He introduces them inaccurately. In Dan. iv. 30, and v. 21, "this word," he informs us, "is rendered by wet in our version." What word? The only answer supplied by the context is the word βάπτω. Now, it is almost superfluous to state that βάπτω is not rendered in our version at all; inasmuch as our version does not profess to be taken from the Septuagint, but aspires to the honour of representing the Chaldee original. In Dan. iv. 15, (Sep. 12,) the authorized version has "let it be wet," where the Greek rendering is Κοιμάσθηναι, "he shall be put to bed," or "shall make his bed." Surely, in this example, wet is not the translation of Κοιμάσθηναι.

2. His reasoning on the passages adopts almost exclusively for its basis the Greek rendering, and not the Chaldee original, while he avails himself of their assumed correspondence. Not only are the references to the original trifling and incidental, but they appear purely in
the form of unsupported assertions, borrowed from Cox and Gale. No effort is made to prove, by examples, or otherwise, the modal sense of ἐν, though Dr. Carson asks triumphantly, "How can mode be excluded, if it is in both the original and the translation?" Had he confined his remarks to βἀντα, as the term whose meaning it was his avowed object to ascertain and vindicate, the procedure, so far, would have brought upon him no breath of animadversion. He had an unquestionable right to canvass the Septuagint rendering, and extract from it whatever amount of testimony it could bear in favour of his cause, without the slightest regard to the ability or faithfulness of the Greek translators. But as he advanced a claim to the joint support of Chaldee and Septuagint, he was bound in honour, and in common justice to the interests which he espoused, to show that his claim had a solid foundation. We are fully aware that in many instances there exists no accurate correspondence between a translation and the original; but as Dr. Carson asserted its existence in the case before us, the assertion should have been sustained by evidence.

As these occurrences of βἀντα involve some peculiar principles and difficulties, they are of sufficient importance to warrant a more particular and detailed examination. We observe then—

I. That Baptist writers have signally failed in their attempts to confine the original of these passages to a modal application. This remark is not to be understood as including Dr. Carson, who stands exempted from all imputation of failure, by discreetly abstaining from any
assault upon the Chaldee. Into his first edition he had indeed copied a statement of Gale, characterised by an imposing parade of Oriental learning; but in the second edition, we observe, he consulted his reputation as a scholar and critic by quietly omitting it altogether. The authorities, which form no inconsiderable part of Dr. Gale's proof, that the term in the Chaldee necessarily implies immersion, are Buxtorf, Castell, &c. ! and he appeals above all to "the constant use of the word." Now, on looking into the instances cited by Buxtorf, in his great Chaldee and Rabbinical Lexicon, we do not find them lending unqualified support to the cause of the learned doctor. The great Hebraist, indeed, plainly regards the passage in Daniel as an instance of dipping, but he shows as plainly that the verb denotes also to wash, and has even rendered it painted, in a curious example which he quotes from an old Rabbinical author. On the testimony of Castell it is not requisite to bestow a separate notice, as it substantially harmonizes with that of Buxtorf; and in regard to Gale's "&c.," we confess our inability to rebut the evidence which may be wrapped up in so mysterious a symbol. In the present day, however, we have access to the testimony of biblical scholars not less learned, and probably far more critical, than those referred to by Dr. Gale. Of these Gesenius, who stands "facile princeps" in the ranks of European Hebrew lexicography, assigns as the primary sense of the Chaldee verb, to dip in, to immerse; and in Pahel and and Ithpahel, rigavit, to wet, moisten, and to be wet, moistened, respectively, under which latter he classes the different occurrences of the term in Daniel. Dr. Lee,
again, probably the first Orientalist in Great Britain, adopts, without hesitation, in Dan. iv. 22, the rendering *made wet*, without noticing any other sense as possessing a better claim to acceptance or originality. On the mere ground of lexical authority, therefore, the confident assertions of the Baptist Doctor do not appear in a very enviable light. It may be desirable to add the testimony of the younger Rosenmüller, whose distinguished critical ability, and extensive acquaintance with Eastern languages, entitle his judgment, on a topic of this nature, to the most respectful consideration. In his *Scholia* on Dan. iv. 15, having adopted as the translation of the disputed clause,—*Et rore coelorum tingetur*, he immediately explains the verb by the terms, *imbuetur, et madidus fiet*, thus precisely coinciding with the view of Gesenius.

We do not forget, however, that Dr. Gale appeals also to the tribunal of "constant use," from which in common with him we are content to receive the ultimate decision. Let us see, then, how he prosecutes his appeal in the highest court of Critical Justiciary. "It is," says he, "by this word the Jerusalem Targum renders the Hebrew בָּשַׁל, Lev. iv. 6,"—a word which, he had before asserted, "every one must own signifies dip." *There*, in sober seriousness, the reader has before him the entire evidence by which Dr. Gale seeks to substantiate his affirmation of constant use! He lays down an universal proposition respecting the application of a term, and he furnishes, as its basis, one solitary example!! To upset this fragment of constant use, we have simply to cite Lev. xiii. 6, on which the same Jerusalem Targum employs צָרֵף as the rendering of the Hebrew צָרֵף to *tread*, or *trample*,

---
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