

2nd century, translated it to immerse: but about that time the word *baptizo* had been adopted into Latin as an ecclesiastical word, meaning to immerse, and they practised nothing but immersion. So when the version of the 3rd century was made, the word *baptizo* was employed instead of the word of the previous version *tingo*, to dip or to immerse, and this rendering was followed by the translator of the vulgate in the 4th century. For nearly a thousand years until the council of Ravenna in 1311, wherever this version was used the practice of immersion prevailed. He concluded that from these translations the word was substantially rendered to immerse.

In the French, Spanish, and Italian versions of the 16th century, *baptizo* was transferred, not translated. They were not hostile to immersion or bore no testimony against it. In the Welch version of the 16th, in the Irish of the 17th, and in the Gallic of the 18th centuries, it is translated to *bathe*, of course favorable to immersion. The principal versions of the 19th century are those made by Drs. Carey, Marshman, and Judson, and their associates, in the languages of Southern Asia and China, in all of which *baptizo* and its cognates are translated in words which signify to immerse.

Mr. Waller said that it would thus be seen that the most celebrated translations, ancient and modern—the only versions in the languages of an overwhelming majority of mankind, *baptizo* is translated immerse: in no version of any repute in any language has it a hostile rendering—in none is it translated to sprinkle or to pour, or by words necessarily involving those actions. He concluded by insisting that a version in English as assumed in the proposition under discussion would be faithful to the original, to the extent alleged unless all the translators of all the versions that had ever been made, had made unfaithful versions. Because a majority of them had rendered it in terms as contended for and none in hostile terms.

Dr. Newton rejoined in substance as follows:—

He admitted the facts as stated of the versions, but denied that they were adequate to sustain the positions of the affirmant. For, he said, this is a question not to be settled by authority, and assumed that there was a material difference between evidence and authority. He then urged that some of these versions did not translate with uniformity—some of them translated it in the sense to drown, others to dip, and one to dip deeply; while others translated it to wash, and assumed that if wash is used when immerse is not then it is hostile to immerse. But he insisted he did not regard these versions or any other as authority to sustain the affirmation. That the true way to settle the question was by an appeal to the Scriptures—they were God's lexicon

and we must be governed by his definition. He said the true way to ascertain the meaning of *baptizo* was to learn the design of baptism. It was designed to represent the work of the Holy Spirit. He referred to Matthew, 3rd chapter and 11th verse, and urged that water baptism is the antithesis of baptism of the Spirit—i. e. the former is the symbol of the latter. If water baptism represents the influence of the spirit, then it cannot mean to immerse. No model word can represent the influences of the spirit. "Into" must follow immerse, and no man could say immerse "with" water—and it would be false in fact to say that any one was ever immersed *into* the Holy Spirit, for such a thing never occurred. He then referred to the gift of the Holy Ghost as recorded in the 2nd chapter of Acts, and urged from the circumstances that they were not immersed *into* the Holy Ghost.

Second day in the Morning.

Rev. Mr. WALLER set out by stating that it was not usual in settling the meaning of any mooted word in the Scriptures or elsewhere, to reject all authority. That the versions he had cited were consulted by all critics and commentators as *very high authority*, not ultimate of course, but as furnishing the best circumstantial evidence in support of any rendering. He stated that he was willing to submit to the audience to determine the force of the proof adduced and which was conceded; that all the most respectable versions, ancient and modern, had translated *baptizo* immerse, and that no version had been made directly hostile to such a rendering. He then replied to the positions of Dr. Newton in regard to the baptism of the spirit. He insisted that *baptizo* when used with reference to the operations of the spirit *must* be understood figuratively and not literally. *Literally* the spirit could not be poured out or immersed, into or sprinkled. The spirit is God. So the true question is, would it be an appropriate figure to speak of the influences of the spirit on the day of Pentecost as an immersion? The baptism of the spirit on that day was of the soul and not of the body—was internal and not external—they were filled with the spirit—they were put entirely under its influences. If the operations had been slight and trivial, affecting only a small part of the soul, then the appropriate figure might be to pour or to sprinkle; but if they were powerful, overwhelming, affecting the whole soul, the appropriate figure is immersion. So the Saviour, speaking of his sufferings, says: "I have a baptism to be baptized with"—alluding to the overwhelming nature of his sufferings—he was immersed in suffering.

He denied that any baptism represented the gift of the holy ghost as externally presented upon the day of Pentecost. For there is no form of baptism that is as a

rushing mighty wind filling the whole house—there are no cloven tongues like as of fire to sit upon each of the candidates, nor did he know that they were *filled* by any thing as those were filled with the holy ghost upon the day of Pentecost. So he distrusted the position of Dr. Newton, that water baptism represented the baptism of the holy ghost, but even granting it, neither Dr. Newton nor any other man ever represented it by the baptism he was accustomed to administer. No man knows *how* the spirit operates—its influences are as the wind—we cannot tell where it cometh or whither it goeth. How then can there be a symbol or representation of a thing of whose form and figure we can have no conception? Besides there is no baptism now as that upon the day of Pentecost. It was given for a specific purpose; and was not possessed by any of the patriarchs or prophets, or holy men of old. Its distinguishing peculiarity was the gift of tongues. It was usually conferred afterwards by the imposition of the apostle's hands. The object for which it was bestowed, was accomplished, and it has ceased to be given in that way, if given at all, for near eighteen centuries. So the representation of the baptism of the spirit, as that baptism is contended for by Dr. Newton, would be the representation of a thing long since passed away. In support of the position that to baptize *with* the Spirit, was figurative and should be understood to mean to immerse in the spirit, he quoted quite a number of Pedobaptist scholars and critics. He then announced his second proposition in support of his affirmation, to wit: that *baptizo* means truly and properly to immerse, as asserted by all of the lexicons of the Greek language, and that the rendering of any word by its true and proper meaning is "*faithful*."

He then read the following lexicons: Scapula, Stephanus, Suidas, Thesaurus of Robertson, Schleusner, Stokes, Donnegan, Jones, Greenfield, Robinson, Hedericus, Groves, Bretschneider, Pasor, and Bass; and went on to remark that Prof. Stuart said that "all critics and lexicographers of any note, were agreed in saying that *baptizo* meant, 'to dip, to plunge, immerse into any thing liquid.'" Surely that would be a faithful translation of a word which was given as its leading, primary meaning in all lexicons. All the meanings of *baptizo* that they do give, whether secondary or otherwise, may be included in the leading meaning, *immerse*. None of these lexicons define the meaning—to sprinkle or to pour; none of the meanings given necessarily involve either of those actions.

He concluded by insisting that the authority of lexicons was the most usual way of ascertaining the meaning of a word—their authors were men who made it their business to ascertain the sense of words;