

this solitary word BAPTIZO. So thought *Dr. Gale*, a Baptist—"The meaning of the word BAPTIZO," he says, "must be considered as the main branch of our dispute."* *Mr. Robinson*, another Baptist writer, observes, "Whether John baptized by *pouring on* water, or by *bathing in* water, is to be determined chiefly, though not wholly, by ascertaining the precise meaning of the word baptize."† When they *speak out* upon the subject the perfect harmony of their views in relation to this matter is palpable.

Hence all their pains-taking research to collect together concessions from Pedobaptist writers, that BAPTIZO means to *immerse*.—But *such* concessions, were they accumulated to the skies, are perfectly irrelevant to the end which our Baptist brethren have in view, unless they can show that those authorities (to which they attach not the shadow of importance only when they can cull from them a detached expression *speciously* though not *really* favourable to their views) also decide that BAPTIZO means *nothing else* but to *dip*.

In the array of Pedobaptist concessions, falsely so called, which, following the example of Messrs. D'Anvers, Keach and Booth, *Mr. Crawley* has marshalled together, we see nothing whatever that omens ill to our cause, or produces the slightest intimidation. What *Dr. Williams* said of *Mr. Booth's* labours in this line, we may with the utmost propriety say of the Pedobaptist concessions exhibited by *Mr. Crawley*.‡ "What he has produced from Pedobaptist writers as concessions, no more regards the leading point in dispute than, I was going to say, the first verse of the first book of *Chronicles*, 'Adam, Seth, Enoch.' For the immediate question is not what is the radical, primary and proper meaning of the word *baptism*, in a philological or etymological sense; but whether the legal, the ceremonial or sacramental sense of the word, excludes, absolutely excludes, every other idea but immersion?—No concession short of this is of any real service to our opponents."|| Were a Pedobaptist to make such a concession, his opinion would not of course be entitled to exemption from scrutiny, any more than the assertions of an opponent. But the tendency of the manœuvre on which we are now animadverting, really and truly is to make an erroneous impression on the minds of the reader who is not versant in the controversy. After perusing such a list of concessions as *Mr. Crawley* has adduced, would not any

*Reflections on Wall's Hist p. 73, 74.

†Hist. of Baptism, p. 5.

‡Treatise on Baptism, p. 127, 3, 9, 140.

|| Autip. Exam. vol. 11. p. 5, 6.