

and such as are generally the symbols of African superstition. A third chief soon made his appearance with another band, his name was JEANNOT, he was more ferocious and terrible than either of the preceding. His standard was the body of a white child, carried on the end of a long pole, and all around his tent were planted lances, each having on its end the bloody head of some white man or woman. The white females taken on the habitations were publicly abused in the presence of the whole camp, and then their throats were cut, and their heads used for the above purpose. Many of those who were the wives and daughters of their owners were reserved for the chiefs of these hordes of savages, and when they were tired of them they were made to act as servants to the negroes that were in the camp. Unheard of cruelties were daily practised among them—some were condemned to be *saten* between two planks—others had their hands and feet cut off—others had their thighs dislocated, and often the head of some white was cut off, and the skull cleaned out for a drinking cup for the chiefs—and to complete the awful tale, all around the camp were hung by the chin, to hooks that had been for that purpose driven into the branches of the trees, living men and women, rendering the air with their moans and lamentations. All this and much more took place within a few weeks of the first rising of the slaves. The poor Governor now saw his error, but it was too late. It was not, however, known that he had instigated the slaves to take arms, so he now called upon the inhabitants to aid him in putting down the revolt, a large force was collected for the purpose, and set off in search of them, with what success will be hereafter seen.

W. T. CARDY.
Carleton, St. John, N. B., Dec. 16, 1851.

THE WESLEYAN.

Halifax, Saturday Morning, January 3, 1852.

MODE OF BAPTISM.

Our Baptist friends generally have become exceedingly bold and self-confident in their assertions respecting the primary meaning of *baptizo*, *baptizo*; and he who, in these days of progress, should presume to doubt, or deny, that the verb primarily signifies to dip or plunge under water, and nothing else, and that such *modal* meaning is sanctioned by the uniform usage of Greek classical literature, will of course be charged with a want of fairness, or with betraying ignorance of the present state of the Baptist controversy. We are not inclined, however, to yield to this summary mode of disposing of the subject; and we hesitate not to say, that in his recent letters in the *Christian Messenger*, Dr. CRAWLEY has taken a position which is far from being tenable. His main proposition is thus assumed:—

"No philologist of any eminence, baptist or pedobaptist, contends, at the present day, that the original meaning of *baptizo* is other than to immerse, or that in classical usage, the word has any other meaning than that, or some shade of sense bearing a close affinity to it, and involving the same idea."

By the word "immerse," as used by Dr. CRAWLEY, we understand—*plunge or put into and under water, or other fluid*; and further that *baptizo* is affirmed to be strictly a *modal* verb, or one that so expresses the action of plunging or putting into and under water, &c., as to exclude any other mode of using the element. The qualifying clause—"or some shade of sense bearing a close affinity to it,—and involving the same idea," must provide for the necessary action of plunging, so strenuously contended for by the advocates of exclusive immersion, and so may be considered as synonymous with the terms preceding; or it is designed to cover supposed analogous cases, in which the word is used, where the action of plunging into and under water or other fluid is absolutely impracticable, as determined by the nature of things, or the facts recorded, which construction, if rightly made, is fatally ruinous to the position embraced in the former part of his proposition. A person or thing must be either plunged or not plunged—dipped or not dipped—immersed or not immersed. If those "shades of sense," to which Dr. CRAWLEY refers, should bar out the act of dipping, plunging or immersing, we think he will find it difficult to make this word when thus used, to signify dip and nothing but dip, plunge and nothing but plunge, immerse and nothing but immerse. To this point we deem it right, to direct the attention of our readers. Immersion, as understood by our Baptist friends, is "the act of putting into a fluid below the surface;" or "the act of plunging into a fluid till

covered." To justify his position, it is not sufficient for Dr. CRAWLEY to show that *baptizo* has, in Greek literature, this meaning in some or numerous instances, but in every instance. He must make out his case fully and completely, otherwise a verdict of "not proven" must be returned against him.

Let us, now, look a little at the principal or only admissible part of his proposition. "No philologist of any eminence, baptist or pedobaptist, contends, at the present day, that the original meaning of *baptizo* is other than to immerse, or that in classical usage the word ever has any other meaning than that." For the reasons above assigned, we stop here.

We distinctly state, that we do not pretend to know the opinions of every philologist, baptist or pedobaptist, in the wide world at the present day, and therefore we dare not presume to decide authoritatively what many of them may or may not contend for with respect to the original meaning of *baptizo*. But this we know, that some, who have proved themselves to be philologists of some eminence, even at the present day, absolutely and unqualifiedly deny the assumption contained in the proposition of Dr. CRAWLEY. This statement may surprise a person who knows the precise state of the controversy at the present time; nevertheless it is true. We cite the declaration of the Rev. ROBERT WILSON, Professor of Sacred Literature for the General Assembly, Royal College, Belfast, from whose work on Baptism we made a quotation in our last number; and we certify our readers, that, as far as we are capable of forming an impartial judgment, Professor Wilson has made no vain boast, but, after having examined numerous instances, in which the word in question is used, according to the admitted canons of enlightened criticism, he gives substantial, and, in our view, unanswerable reasons for the conclusions to which he has been led to arrive:—

"Our general statement is, that the verb *βαπτίζω*, (*baptizo*) unlike *βαπτίζω* (*bapto*) in its primary sense, is not tied to any exclusive mode, but embraces a wider range, and admits of greater latitude of signification. Let the baptizing element encompass its object, and in the case of liquids, whether this relative state has been produced by immersion, affusion, overwhelming, or in any other mode, Greek usage recognizes it as a valid baptism. Thus the sea-coast is baptized when the tide flows over it, cattle are baptized upon them and drown them, and the altar built by Elijah was baptized, when his attendants poured upon it the required quantity of water. Sometimes the action of the verb applies to the whole, sometimes to a part of the baptized object; this information, however, is not conveyed by the term itself, but must be learned from the context, and generally from the surrounding circumstances. In attaching to the verb this generic sense, we take our stand upon the solid foundation of the usage of the Greek language through all periods concerned, including the Classical, the Biblical, and the Patristic." (pp. 96, 97.)

Nor does Dr. Gale, himself a Baptist, and accounted by the baptist denomination a "philologist" of "eminence," differ very materially from the views expressed by the above pedobaptist author. In his "Reflections," page 122, he says:—

"The word *βαπτίζω* (*baptizo*) perhaps does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as in general a thing's being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it; though, indeed, to put into the water is the most natural way, and the most common, and is, therefore usually and pretty constantly, but it may be not necessarily implied."

This admission of Dr. Gale is far from tying down the verb to express only one mode, and that mode, the action of plunging into and under water; as, according to his definition, a thing may be "in that condition," when baptized, where putting into and under water may not even be "necessarily implied."—Or, in other words, *baptizo* primarily differs from *bapto*, and is not necessarily a *modal* verb, and therefore in its original sense is not bound down to the action of dipping, plunging, or immersing.

As Professor Wilson proceeds with his examination of passages, we find such statements as these, showing the deep conviction of their truthfulness existing in his own mind:—

"The assertion that *baptizo* denotes to dip,

and only to dip, we hold to be utterly incapable of proof, by a full induction of the instances presented in the classical literature of Greece."

"We feel satisfied, indeed, that the more comprehensive and thorough the sifting of the usage of *baptizo*, conducted in the spirit of a discriminating Hermeneutics, it will become the more apparent, that the exclusive sense of dipping is unauthorized by the practice of the Greek language."

The word in question, in some of its forms, is used by Plato. Can an instance be produced where it is used by this author in the sense of dipping? "In the *Lexicon Platonicum* of Ast," says Professor Wilson, "on which he expended the literary labour of a lifetime, the primary sense of *bapto*, in the writings of the Grecian philosopher, is expressed by *immergo* to dip, to immerse,—that of *baptizo*, by *obruo*, *opprimo*, to overwhelm, to oppress, having no reference whatever to the action of dipping."

We conclude this article by a reference to the writings of Hippocrates. As a physician he had frequent occasions to use in his prescriptions the word *dip*, or *dipping*. If *baptizo* primarily be equivalent to *bapto*, how can this fact be accounted for on such a supposition—that Hippocrates has employed *bapto* about one hundred and fifty times, to denote the *modal* dip, and its derivative *baptizo*, for the same specific purpose, only once, if indeed that one occurrence belongs to the genuine text?—We state this on the authority of Dr. Halley, as quoted by Professor Wilson.

Professor Stuart.

A person who had never read Professor Stuart's Dissertation on the Mode of Baptism in the 10th number of the Biblical Repository, would not, we are confident, form a correct opinion of the Professor's views, from the representations of Dr. CRAWLEY. He admits what no one is disposed to deny, that "the relation between the verb and its object may be secured by the act of immersion," and thus he renders the verb "to dip, plunge or immerse;" but he states with equal plainness, that it signifies to "overwhelm," "literally and figuratively in a variety of ways," and gives many instances, from the Greek classics and Christian fathers, in proof. "It were easy," he says, "to increase the number of examples; but these are enough to exhibit both the literal and metaphorical sense of the word. The reader will observe, that in all these examples, the word *baptizo*, (and not *bapto*.) is employed; which, with the usage in Nos. 2, 3, 4, is a conclusive argument against supposing that these two words are in all respects synonymous."

He also shows that *baptizo* signifies in the Septuagint "to overwhelm;" in the Apocrypha "to wash, cleanse by water;" in the New Testament "to wash," "copious affusion or effusion."

To the question, "Do *baptizo* and its derivatives, when applied to designate the Rite of Baptism, necessarily imply that this rite was performed by immersion of the whole person?" He replies—

"There is then no absolute certainty from usage, that the word *baptizo*, when applied to designate the rite of baptism, means of course to immerse or plunge."

"In all other cases," excepting Mark I. 9, "in the New Testament, the mode of baptism is left undetermined by the original Greek, so far as the language itself is concerned, unless it is necessarily implied by the word *baptizo*; for in all other cases, only the element by which, not the mode in which baptism is performed, is designated by the sacred writers."

As to the word itself, "independently of any historical facts," he states "that the probability that *baptizo* implies immersion is very considerable, and on the whole a predominant one; but it does not still amount to certainty. Both the classic use and that of the Septuagint show that washing and copious affusion are sometimes signified by the word. Consequently the rite of baptism may have been performed in one of these ways, although it is designated by the word *baptizo*."

After an examination of "all those passages in the New Testament, in which the circumstances related or implied would seem to have a bearing on the question before us, viz. Whether the Mode of baptism is determined by the sacred writers?" He says—"I am unable to find in them anything which appears to settle this question. I do consider it as quite plain, that none

of the circumstantial evidence, thus far, proves immersion to have been exclusively the mode of Christian baptism, or even that of John. Indeed, I consider this point so far made out, that I can hardly suppress the conviction, that if any one maintains the contrary, it must be either because he is unable rightly to estimate the nature or power of the Greek language; or because he is influenced in some measure by party-feeling; or else because he has looked at the subject in only a partial manner, without examining it fully and thoroughly."

With this statement before him, Professor Stuart could not have affirmed immersion to be the uniform practice of the apostolic church. He expressly refers to churches "after the times of the Apostles"; and asserts, that "in the writings of the apostolic fathers, so called, i. e. the writers of the first century, or at least those who lived in part during this century, scarcely anything of a definite nature occurs respecting baptism, either in a doctrinal or ritual respect. It is indeed, frequently alluded to; but this is usually in a general way only. We can easily gather from these allusions, that the rite was practised in the church; but we are not able to determine with precision, either the manner of the rite or the stress that was laid upon it."

Quoting Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who says—"Nor should any be troubled, because such persons are sprinkled or affused, since they obtain the favour of God, for the Holy Spirit says by Ezekiel the prophet: 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you,' &c., (Ezek. xvi. 25.)"—Professors Stuart says—"Here then, sprinkling, so early as the former half of the third century is pronounced to be legitimate and valid, by one of the noblest men among all the Christian fathers. I need only add, that this noble and liberal decision of Cyprian was confirmed and proclaimed by several ecclesiastical councils, not long afterwards."

"My Missionary Brethren," who sought his advice, he says, "will now perceive, that my opinion must of course be, in accordance with the principles above developed, that they should render the Greek *baptizo* in the same way as our English version and the Vulgate have done, viz. by retaining the word *baptizo*, and merely giving it a form that will render it analogous to other verbs in the language to which it is transferred. In doing this, they are still at full liberty to explain to their hearers the meaning of the word, according to the views of it which they entertain; while, at the same time, they free themselves from the charge of having made a sectarian translation."

Without pledging ourselves to all Professor Stuart's admissions, we have deemed it nothing more than just to him, to place these extracts before our readers, that they may judge for themselves to what extent he has conceded the whole case to the exclusive immersionists.

But we are told that Professor RIPLEY's reply contains "a complete and triumphant answer." Two passages, by way of example, are noticed, to show that nothing in these passages justifies a departure from what Mr. RipleY assumes to be the Greek usage.

"It is said of Judith" says Mr. Stuart, "in C. 12: 7, that she went out by night into the valley of Bethulia, and washed herself (*ebapto*) in the camp at the fountain of water."

The only "complete and triumphant answer" that we can see in the reply is, that a question is asked—"Why may not Judith have plunged herself into the fountain?" Without dwelling at large on the improbability of a woman going out alone by night into a military camp, and plunging into a fountain, we content ourselves by stating, that, in our humble judgment, the language of the record conveys another idea. The terms are *ἐβίπτει* *πρὸς* *τὸν* *ὕδατος*—*AT*, the fountain of water, which we hold to be conclusive that she did not plunge herself into and under the water of the fountain.

On Mark 7: 3, 4, Dr. Bloomfield is opposed to Mr. RipleY. He says—"Here, however, we are not to suppose immersion implied, but merely ordinary washing; or, perhaps, on occasions of urgent haste, sprinkling. Hence the gloss (for it is no more) of some MSS., *rantisontai*." "This view," says Professor Wilson, "stated by Bloomfield, is sustained by the authority of most of our leading Greek lexicons, which generally concur in regarding this baptism as a lathing or washing."