

## CHAPTER II.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM NEITHER ENJOINED NOR DESCRIBED IN  
THE NEW TESTAMENT. BAPTISTS INCONSISTENT  
WITH THEIR OWN PRINCIPLES.

WERE there a particle of precise injunction in the New Testament in reference to the mode of performing the baptismal rite, an expeditious method might be adopted to put an *end* to all controversy upon the point. The fact, that our Baptist brethren have produced no inspired prescription favourable to their views, will be deemed on all hands proof abundant that none such exists; since if it did, who can suspect that, by any possibility, it could have escaped the perspicacity of those who consider the *manner* of the thing of such essential consequence.

Not only have our Lord and his Apostles omitted giving any express direction in relation to this particular, but, we diffidently conceive, it will appear extremely probable, to say the least, from the *usus loquendi* forms of expression used by the sacred writers when speaking of Christian baptism, as compared with classic usage, and interpreted as the established laws of syntax and idiom in the Greek obviously require, that they have *studiously* avoided a description of the mode in which it ought to be administered. That they have done so, whether with or without design, will incontestibly appear in the sequel.

Our opponents, who impugn the validity of baptism performed by affusion or sprinkling, are bound, in order to sustain their exclusive immersion scheme, to prove, 1. That the word *baptise* means to *dip*, *submerge*, and nothing else, and 2. That a strict assimilation to the original *manner* of practicing an outward ceremony is obligatory upon all christians, in all climates, and in all the ages of the church.