

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

### CONCERNING BAPTISM.—XII.

BY REV. W. M. KAY, B.A., WOODSTOCK, AUTHOR OF "IMMERSION A ROMISH INVENTION."

From the Christian Standard.

MR. EDITOR,—In your issue of April 8th, you a second time object to my quoting Dr. J. Ditzler. Well, I suppose the next time I attempt to write a book, I will have to go down to Ohio and obtain from the editor of the "Standard" the names of some few men of "established reputation," of "acknowledged scholarship," and quote only from them. I am glad the editor has already furnished me with at least one such name. He has approved Moses Stuart as of "established reputation" and "acknowledged scholarship," and time and again he has referred to Prof. Stuart as a man of great learning and scholarship. I purpose, therefore, to give a few quotations from this man of "acknowledged scholarship;" and from these quotations the reader can judge the fairness (?) and honesty (?) of immersionist writers in quoting Moses Stuart in favour of the exclusive dipping theory. After Stuart had, as the editor of the "Standard" tells us, "collated his more than a hundred examples from the Classics and the Fathers," he says, on p. 382 of the Biblical Repository of April, 1833: "*Classical usage can never be very certain in respect to the meaning of a word in the New Testament.*" Who does not know that a multitude of Greek words here receive their colouring and particular meanings from the Hebrew and not from the Greek classics? Do *theos*, *ouranos*, *surx*, *pistis*, *dikaioisune*, and other words almost without number, exhibit meanings which conform to the Greek classics, or which, in several respects, can even be illustrated by them? *Not at all.* Then how can you (immersionists) be over-confident in the application of the classical meaning of *baptizo* when the word is employed in relation to a rite that is purely Christian? Such confidence is indeed common; but it is *not the more rational nor the more becoming* on that account." Thus writes Prof. Moses Stuart, and he could not be more specific or conclusive in his argument even if he had directed reference to the position taken by the editor of the "Standard."

Then this man, declared by the editor of the "Standard" to be of "established reputation" and "acknowledged scholarship," proceeds to show that even the meanings "*dip, plunge, immerse, sink,*" etc., attributed to *baptizo* in classical usage, are dependent on the interpretation and practice of the ancient Greek and Roman Catholic Churches. He says: "After all, then you (immersionists) depend for the exegesis of *baptizo*, as meaning to immerse, *mainly on the practice and views of the early churches.*" And on p. 381 this man of "acknowledged scholarship" says: "If you take your stand on the ancient practices of the churches in the early days of the Christian (?) fathers, and charge me with departure from this; in my turn, I have the like charge to make against you (immersionists). It is notorious, and admits of no contradiction, that baptism, in those days of immersion, was administered to men, women and children, *in puris naturalibus*—naked as Adam and Eve before their fall. The most tender, delicate and modest females, young or old, could obtain no exception, where immersion must be practised." Truly there was a necessity to invent "baptisteries" at this time to remedy, as far as possible, the indecency of the scene. "The practice," continues Stuart, "was pleaded for and insisted upon because it was *thought to be apostolic.*" Again, on page 382, Stuart says: "But you (immersionists) say that there is no evidence that the primitive mode of baptism required persons to be divested of all their garments." Grant it; but still there is the same kind of evidence as proves to you that immersion was the only apostolic mode of baptism, viz.: the universal usage of the ancient churches. *Your main reason for believing that baptizo means immersion must depend, after all, on the exegesis of the fathers and the ancient (Catholic) churches.*

This is Moses Stuart, the man of "acknowledged scholarship" and "established reputation;" and these are his views at length on the meaning of *baptizo*. And yet, repeatedly, the editor of the "Standard," and other immersionist writers, quote this scholar as if he believed in the dipping theory. (See "Standard" April 8th and October 7th.) I leave the intelligent Christian reader to pronounce upon the morality of

such conduct. Well may Dr. Gallaher say: "The dipping theory originated in ignorance and error, and it has been fed on fallacy and falsehood." And the same dishonesty that is practiced by immersionist writers when they quote Moses Stuart in behalf of their theory and practice, is also perpetrated whenever the names of Calvin, Wesley, Baxter, Chalmers, etc., are quoted in defense of dipping. Such perversions of truth in the avowed defense of religion, is enough to make us blush for our common Christianity. These were men of God, who practiced what they believed. They repudiated dipping into water for baptism, and they taught and practiced sprinkling and pouring; and for their warrant, they went to the Word of God. The quotations given for their writings are usually garbled; always separated from the context, and always represent the authors as holding views heaven-wide from the faith in which they lived and in which they died. "We have read much of religious controversy," says an American clergyman—"controversy between Calvinists and Arminians; between the advocates of Prelacy and the defenders of Presbytery; between Papists and Protestants; between Trinitarians and Unitarians, but nowhere have we found so much perversion of fact, and such shameful garbling of the language and sentiments of opponents as we find among the advocates and defenders of the immersion theory." Well may we add, with the same writer, "Could men, who were conscious that their doctrines are sustained by the Word of God, seek to confirm and substantiate their 'theory' by systematically and persistently perverting the sentiments and teaching of those who differ from them?"

The editor of the "Standard" quotes Moses Stuart as saying, "*baptizo* means to dip, plunge, or immerse into anything liquid. All lexicographers and writers of any note are agreed in this." And the uninformed reader is thus left with the impression that this great scholar and theologian, although himself a Pædobaptist, yet endorsed the exclusive dipping theory. Let the reader again examine the quotations from Stuart I have given above, and then say if he has not been grossly deceived by the editor and others as to the views of this man. Moses Stuart says that we have the same kind of evidence for immersing *naked* as we have for immersing at all, viz., "*the use of the ancient (Catholic) churches.*" And this I heartily endorse; for it was the teaching and practice of those fathers and churches—Roman and Greek—full of superstition and fanciful interpretation of Scripture, that originated the practice of putting people into the water to 'soak out sin and soak in grace.' The practice and teaching of these same superstitious Catholics is the only foundation upon which any lexicographer rests for authority that *baptizo* anywhere means to "dip, plunge or immerse." This is proven by the fact that the leading lexicographers, misled by the authority of the ancient Catholic teaching and practice, and by the example of early Catholic lexicographers, almost all give "to dip repeatedly," "to immerse repeatedly," as the very first and most proper meaning of *baptizo*. This definition grew out of the "dip three times," and was the practice of the ancient churches. One dip never constituted a baptism with the Romish and Greek churches. *Baptizo* never was a frequentative verb, and the only ground for such an opinion in the minds of many of the ablest grammarians and lexicographers, was the practice of "three fold immersion" by these same superstitious Catholics."

Even Grimm's Lexicon, which the editor of the "Standard" pronounces "one of the highest authorities" gives "to immerse repeatedly" as his first definition. This clearly shows where Grimm, as well as Liddell and Scott, Donegan, Rost and Palm, and a number of others, got their authority for saying that *baptizo*, ever or anywhere, had the meaning of dip or immerse. Lexicographers who betray their servitude to the Catholics for their definitions, I cannot endorse as of "any weight as authority" in the interpretation of the Word of God. Will the editor please furnish us with an example of *baptizo* in the classics or Scriptures where it has the sense of "to immerse repeatedly?" If he does not do this, he stands convicted of quoting a lexicon, and calling it "one of the highest authorities now in use," that gives us the first proper meaning of *baptizo*, "to immerse repeatedly," when he will admit himself that no such meaning was ever attributed to *baptizo* till after the second century of the Christian era, in other words, till a superstitious church invented that meaning.

And even after superstitious Catholics had invented

their "trine-immersion," and were putting their people, men, women, and children, three times into the water naked as they were born, there is no evidence that the head was put under the water, or that they practiced the submersion of the whole body, a point upon which so much stress is laid by modern immersionists. The "blessing the water," the "nakedness of the subject," the "taper lighted into the hands," the "white garment on the person" after baptism—all these and other similar superstitions were considered by the early churches (Catholics) just as essential parts of baptism as the putting into the water. And all the above superstitions have just the "same kind of authority" as immersion—just as ancient and just as weighty. The first record of dipping to be found in the history of the Church is that of trine-immersion—when it took *three* dips as we have just seen, and a great deal more to make one baptism; and where there was not a single action or step in the entire performance of the rite that any intelligent immersionist will to-day approve as scriptural. Can the editor of the "Standard" point out a single step in the practice of baptism by the churches (Catholic) after the second century, that he can approve as Scriptural? Take any one of the three dips and he cannot say it is Scriptural. For one dip was in the name of the Father, one in the name of the Son, and the third in the name of the Holy Ghost. And in not one was it required that the head be put under. If he denies, let him produce the record.

Yet it is upon this rotten mass of Catholic rubbish that the Dippers have built their immersion edifice. The classics furnish no foundation for immersion, the editor himself acknowledges that the Old Testament furnishes no instance of one person dipping another, and the New Testament knows nothing of immersion as it is interpreted in the light of a superstitious Catholic teaching and practice. The pretended instances of dipping from the classics given by the editor will be examined in my next. I ask the reader to look out for them.

I close this communication in the language of Moses Stuart, that man of "established reputation" and "acknowledged scholarship," whom the editor of the "Standard" and other immersionists hold in such high esteem. On p. 388 he solemnly deposes, after all his investigation of the subject, and all his collation of "over one hundred examples from the classics and the Fathers," "My belief is that we do obey the commandment to baptize when we do it by affusion or sprinkling."

[To be continued if the Lord will]

### MANITOBA LETTER.

REV. DR. BLACK.

The new population rushing into Manitoba, and coming into contact with only the later civilization, are in danger of never knowing that it had a fore-runner. Presbyterianism is one of the faiths of Red River of old. It did not occupy the place then that it does now, but its history is most interesting. Dr. Black was its apostle. A company of ardent Highlanders had kept for forty years their altar fires burning without a minister. Though attending an Episcopal service, they had taught their children the Shorter Catechism, and had kept up family worship in their homes. Their own psalms, their own idioms in prayer, their own ideas of public worship, and their own theology were kept living by discussions around the fireside. It was hard to get any one adventurous enough to go to Red River to look after them. The Free Church of Canada, filled with the same unction as its Scottish mother Church, at last found one of its first students from Knox College willing to go. At that time, 1851, it was comparatively easy to go from the east as far west as the Mississippi, but after that it was a leap in the dark, and some 700 miles of land carriage had to be undertaken. Arrived at the Mississippi, his escort, Sheriff Ross of Red River, who had waited over time for him had gone, and but for the opportunity of joining the party of the Governor of Minnesota the progress of the young missionary would have been stopped. Late in the year 1851 Mr. Black arrived at Red River. What rejoicings there were among the Selkirk Highlanders! Without a chieftain for forty years, now the chief had come! Some three hundred, who on the Sabbath before, worshipped in the Episcopal Church of St. John, the next Sabbath met, not a family missing, in the building afterwards used as a manse, built on the "Frog Plain," given the settlers by the Hudson Bay Company. Mr. Black,