

and probably have prevented the debate between the Baptists and Pedobaptists; whereas the use of different words in translating the same rite has occasioned a confusion of ideas and a strife about words not likely soon to end.

If I mistake not the debate is immediately owing to the mere fact that the word baptism does not occur in our version of the Old Testament. Hence it has been supposed that the thing itself did not then exist; and that John was the first who baptized; whereas the truth is that baptism was administered more frequently before his time than since. There is another fact which helps on this debate. In the English version the baptism of the New Testament is invariably called baptism, but not so the baptisms of the Old. They are translated "washing" oftener than baptism, which throws them into the shade, so that the English reader cannot see them to be baptisms at all, and they are so translated, where "baptism" would have been specially serviceable for conveying a just view of the text. A judicious comparison of the two Testaments together is needed to throw light on the subject of baptism.

I believe that by the positive command of God, and the plain direction of his word, infants have been baptized by sprinkling ever since the days of Moses, and will be to the end of time. I believe also that, by the same authority, adults have been, and will continue to be, baptized in the same manner, till all the heathen nations are converted to the profession of christianity.

In executing my office of a Guide to Baptism, I shall endeavour to show,

- I. That baptism belonged to the Old Testament as well as to the New.
- II. That God directed it to be administered by sprinkling both adults and infants with water.
- III. That this baptism is continued under the New Testament, with some circumstantial alterations.
- IV. I shall review the principal passages of Scripture supposed to favor the opposite side.

I. My proof of the first of these positions is simply this: That the inspired writers of the New Testament have employed the word "baptism" in translating the purifications required by the law of Moses, and that they have employed it as readily and freely as when they treat of christian baptism. This proof I reckon complete, because I know no reason why they should give the same name to both purifications, but because they knew them to be substantially the same thing. I shall lay the passages before the reader that he may judge for himself.

Heb. vi. 2: "The doctrine of baptisms and of laying on of hands." The New Testament owns one baptism only; here are baptisms. These baptisms, then, and this laying on of hands, viz: on the heads of the sacrifices, (see Lev. iii. 2, &c.) belong to the law of Moses, and the doctrine which they teach is repentance from dead works and faith toward God, and this doctrine they teach as truly as the plainer language of Paul. All the baptisms of Moses teach repentance, so does the baptism of John (Matt. iii. 11.) and so does Peter's (Acts ii. 38).

Heb. ix. 10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings" ("baptisms" in the original Greek), "and carnal ordinances." This is a passage of great importance for guiding into just views of baptism. It is evident that by "divers baptisms" Paul means the various purifications of the law of Moses without exception. In this verse he gives us the sum of the whole book of Leviticus, and exactly in the same order with Moses. Ten chapters treat of "meats and drinks," that is, meat offerings and drink offerings which accompanied the sacrifices; five treat of "divers baptisms," and the defile-