

contradicts Carson—one says that all the dictionaries are for the Baptists and the other all against them. Benedict further said.—Ib.

"There are some men, it is true, of small calibre, who have a large development of combativeness, who enter the field of controversy, and in opposition to all canons of philology—all the facts of history—the plain language of the Bible, and the general consent of learned men of all parties, and maintain not only that pouring or sprinkling *may do* but that the earliest Christians were thus baptized." These were Baptist spectacles he was looking through now.

He then denied that *baptizo* was always used in an exclusive sense of immerse in the classics.

Third Day at Night.

Rev. Mr. Waller commence by alluding to the complain. made by his opponent as to his course of argument and of his writhing under the authorities adduced. While his opponent seemed to complain under the pressure of the authority brought by him, he was quite willing to introduce Baptist concession whenever he could find them. He proceeded to remark, that notwithstanding all his complaint he must bring his enemies into court, compel them to bear unwilling testimony to his cause, and that he intended now to bring his opponent upon the stand as a witness. Did he esteem this controversy ought to close with his present opponent—if he thought it proper to consider him as the accredited representative of the Pede-Baptist party—he would seize upon his concessions and close this controversy. His opponent has surrendered all for which he contended. Certain it is, that if he were in a court of equity or a court of law, and these distinguished moderators (alluding to Gen. Foote and Judge Fisher) were Judges or Chancellors, with authority to decide, he would proceed no further; but would claim—aye, DEMAND the judgment of the court in his favor.

He should in that case, contend, with perfect confidence—with a confidence that that every lawyer and judge of law here will duly appreciate—that his opponent has surrendered the whole controversy.

By way of illustration:

If one party files a bill against another, making certain allegations, the effect of which is to fix a certain liability upon his opponent, that opponent has but one of two courses to pursue. He must either deny the allegations thus made, and thereby put the complainant to the proof; or he must admit the allegations, or set up new matter to repel or avoid the liability. If he pursues the latter course, the burden of proof is his—it devolves upon him, when the trial comes on, to prove this new matter; and if he fails to do so, the decree of the Chan-

cellor goes against him, of course. This is a rule of equity. It commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. The allegations of the complainant fixed a liability upon the defendant. The defendant admitted the allegations. He had stopped at that point, the decree as a matter of course, would have gone against him. But the defendant went further, and set up a new matter to discharge that liability; but he failed to prove it, and so the controversy stood precisely where it would have stood, if it had not gone beyond his admission. For when the defendant in the case supposed, avers anything, and fails to prove it, his averment is nothing. Averments and assertions, however roundly made, and however vociferously asserted, amount to just nothing at all, with men sitting as the guardians of the truth and the dispensers of justice.

Again: If one sues another at law, and in his declaration makes out a case of liability against him, that other must, either by his plea deny the averments of the declaration, or he must admit them, and set up new matter and show the liability does not exist, in other words, he must "confess and avoid," in the language of law writers—and if he fails at the trial to prove what he has set up "in avoidance" of his liability, the judgment of the court goes against him as a matter of course. By way of illustration, suppose the speaker were to sue the opponent, in one of our courts, on a promissory note—setting out in his declaration its date, amount, when payable, etc., his learned opponent comes into court and by plea admits that he gave the note as specified. If he were to stop here, the plaintiff would be entitled to judgment. But suppose he should go further, and aver at a certain time and place, he paid the note; but when he came to trial, failed to sustain his averment by proof, aye, was content to rest the whole matter upon his simple unsupported averment—no matter how often, how earnestly and vociferously made—yet he fails to *prove* the payment—what would be the result?—The failure of his proof in the face of his admission, that he gave the note, would entitle the plaintiff to judgment.

Now to apply this to the case in hand:

It is a canon of criticism—a law of interpretation which accords with all common sense—that the meaning of a word in the New Testament Scriptures is to be ascertained precisely as we ascertain the meaning of a word in other books; and when the writer gives no intimation to the contrary, the word must be taken in its usual and ordinary acceptance to mean what was commonly understood among the people among whom and by whom it was spoken.

Blackstone, in laying down "the fairest and most rational method of interpreting the will of the lawgiver," says, "words are generally to be understood in their usual

and most known signification; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar, as their general and popular use."—Now, we have undertaken to ascertain the meaning of the last statute of the great Lawgiver in Zion—into whose hands is given all power in heaven and upon earth. There is one word in controversy. It is *baptizo*. He had endeavored to ascertain its most usual and known signification by those whom it was used. He had shown that among the Greeks, long before the Saviour and long after, it was used in the sense of immerse. His distinguished opponent admits this to be "its common and usual meaning—and perhaps," he said, "its *primary* meaning." He had proved, that the Greek Christians ALWAYS understood it to mean immerse. His opponent admits this to be true. His opponent admitted that *immersion* was its ordinary, usual, and common meaning in the Greek language; and complained that he wasted so much time in proving it, in face of his admission. Very well: that much of his allegation is admitted. In classic Greek, as written by Homer and spoken by all his contemporaries, as written by Josephus and spoken by all his contemporaries, &c., &c., the common meaning of *baptizo* is to immerse. But his opponent now sets up an "avoidance," and alleges that there is a difference between classic and Hebraistic Greek—and he quoted, in support, two brethren of his own family, Drs. Campbell and Robinson.

But unfortunately for him, they gave no testimony in favor of his views of *baptizo*. They did not testify that this word in the N. T. Greek differed one particle from classic Greek. On the contrary, the most celebrated of his witnesses, Geo. Campbell, says emphatically that *baptizo*, "both in sacred usage and in classical, means to dip, immerse, plunge." He (his opponent) has utterly failed to prove *baptizo*, in Hebrew Greek, differs from its meaning in all other Greek. He has attempted no proof. His plea of "avoidance" rests only upon his unsupported assertion. He admitted his opponent's word to be very ponderous—quite sufficient, perhaps, to sink an ordinary steamboat; but in the interpretation of the law of Christ, we cannot admit the mere *ipse dixit* of any man to contravene the long established laws of interpretation. Jesus Christ spoke in the language of men, and wished to be understood by them.—He knew what they could understand.—The Apostles did not learn Greek, it is true, in any college of the Greeks; but they were taught it by the spirit of God. If Jesus or his apostles had wished to teach any mode, they could have done so. The Greek is a copious language; they could have found no difficulty; therefore, in finding a suitable word, if they had preferred *marino* for the ordinance, they could have used *cheo* or *ekcheo*. If a partial washing, *nipito* could have been used; if an entire