

It was not till 1811 that the legislature in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. "In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases before the Reformation. From Scotland it made its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established church. In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, it was keenly debated whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted; twenty-five voted for sprinkling, and twenty-four voted for immersion; and even that small majority was attained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in the Assembly. Speaking of ancient baptisteries, it says:

"Baptistry, in ecclesiastical writers, a place in which the ceremony of baptism is performed." "Baptisteries were anciently very capacious; because, as Dr. Cone observes, the stated times of baptism returning but seldom, there were usually great multitudes to be baptized at the same time, and then, the manner of baptizing by immersion, or dipping under water, made it necessary to have a large font like-wise."

2. Brand's Cyclopaedia says:

"Baptism (Greek, *bapto*, I dip), was originally administered by immersion, which act is thought by some necessary to the sacrament."

3. Chambers's Cyclopaedia says:

"Baptism, in theology formed from the Greek *bapto*, or *bapto*, I dip, or plunge." "Some are of opinion that sprinkling, in baptism, was begun in cold countries. It was introduced into England about the beginning of the ninth century."

4. National Cyclopaedia: "The manner in which the rite was performed appears to have been at first by complete immersion." In regard to the early custom of the English church, it says: "It was the practice of the English, from the beginning, to immerse the whole body."

5. The Encyclopaedia Britannica describes the process of changing from the primitive custom. It says: "Several of our Protestant divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland during the bloody reign of Queen Mary, and returning home when Queen Elizabeth came to the crown, brought back with them a great zeal for the Protestant churches beyond the sea, where they had been sheltered and received; and having observed that at Geneva, and other places, baptism was administered by sprinkling, they thought they could not do the church of England a greater service than by introducing a practice dictated by so great an authority as Calvin."

6. Rees's Cyclopaedia says of baptism: "In primitive times this ceremony was performed by immersion."

7. Penny Cyclopaedia—"The manner in which it was performed appears to have been at first by immersion."

8. Encyclopaedia Metropolitana—"We readily admit that the literal meaning of the word baptism is immersion, and that the desire of resorting again to the most ancient practice of the church, of immersing the body, which has been expressed by many divines, is well worthy of being considered."

9. Encyclopaedia Americana—"Baptism (that is, dipping, immersing, from the Greek *bapto*), was usual with the Jews even before Christ." "In the time of the apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally adopted a new name."

10. The Encyclopaedia Ecclesiastica says:

"Whatever weight, however, may be in these reasons, as a defense for the present practice of sprinkling, it is evident that during the first ages of the church, and for many centuries afterward, the practice of immersion prevailed."

Here is the testimony of ten literary and historic standards, the ablest and most trustworthy in our language. They were not written for sectarian purposes, to defend anybody's dogma, nor in the interest of any party or sect, but as scientific, literary and historic standards for all classes, parties and peoples, aiming only at facts, truth. They all agree as to the practice of the apostolic church, corroborating just what all the dictionaries assert, that baptism was immersion. They also tell us that sprinkling was gradually introduced, first in the case of the sick who could not leave their beds, and that in from one thousand to thirteen hundred years after Christ, it came into general use in Germany, France and Great Britain. Can we rely upon their testimony? If not, upon whose testimony can we rely? Ought not their testimony alone to be conclusive?

Argument from the Testimony of the Most Eminent Pedobaptists.

Beckman.—"Baptism, according to the force of its etymology, is immersion, and washing, or dipping."—Exercit. Theol., Exercit. xvii.

Bucanus.—"Baptism, that is, immersion, dipping, and, by consequence, washing. Baptistry,

a vat, or large vessel of wood, or stone, in which we are immersed, for the sake of washing. Baptist, one that immerses, or dips."—Instit. Theol., loc. xlviii, quæst. i.

Zanchy.—"Baptism is a Greek word, and signifies two things; first, and properly, it signifies immersion in water, for the proper signification of *baptizo* is to immerse, to plunge under, to overwhelm in water."—Opera, tom. vi.

Vitranga.—"The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word."—Aphor. Sanc. Theol., Apho. 884.

Hospinian.—"Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified."—Hist. Sacr., b. ii., c. i., p. 30.

Vossius.—"Baptizein, to baptize, signifies to plunge. It certainly signifies more than *epipolazein*, etc."—Disput. de Bap., Disp. i., thes. i.

"That the apostles immersed when they bapt a d there is no doubt."—Disput. de Bap., Dis. i., § 6.

Madgeburg Confutators.—"The word *baptizo*, to baptize, which signifies immersion into water, proves that the administrator of baptism immersed, or washed, the persons baptized in water."—Cent. i., b. ii., c. iv.

Ikenius.—"The Greek word *baptismos* denotes the immersion of a thing, or a person, into something, either with a view to expiation, or for washing and cleansing."—Disser. Philol. Theol., Dissor. xix.

Deylingius.—"The word *baptizesthai*, as used by Greek authors, signifies immersion and overwhelming. Thus we read in Plutarch (*baptismos scilicet est thalassan*), Dip yourself in the sea, like as Naaman (in 2 Kings v. 14) who baptized himself seven times in Jordan, which was an immersion of the whole body."—Obs. Sæc., pars iii., obs. xxvii., sec. 2.

Gurtlerus.—"To baptize, among the Greeks, is undoubtedly to immerse, to dip; and baptism is immersion, dipping. . . . The thing commanded by our Lord is baptism—immersion in water."—Inst. Theo., cap. xxxiii., sec. 108-115.

Reiskius.—"To be baptized signifies, in its primary sense, to be immersed."

Bishop Bossuet.—"To baptize signifies to plunge, as is granted by all the world." "It is certain that St. John the Baptist baptized no other way than by dipping—and his example shows that to baptize a great number of people those places were chosen where there was a great deal of water."—See Stennett's Answer to Russon, p. 174.

Walens.—"The external form of baptism is immersion into water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."—Enchiridium, p. 425.

Dionysius Petavius, speaking of the church's pretended power to alter or to impose, says:

"And indeed immersion is properly styled *baptismos*, though at present we content ourselves with pouring water on the head, which in Greek is called *perichusis*."—Dogm. Theol. i. iii., de ponti., cap. i., sec. 11.

Cattenburgh.—"In baptism the whole body is ordered to be immersed."—Spicil. Theol., i. iv., c. lxi., sec. ii., 22.

This is what I maintain. If *baptizo* signifies to sprinkle upon, then the whole body is to be sprinkled or poured upon, and not the head or face only.

Budeus.—"The words *baptizein* and *baptismos* are not to be interpreted of aspersion, but always of immersion."—Theol. Dogm. i. v., c. i., sec. 5.

Bishop Taylor teaches that Scriptural baptism is "not sprinkling, but immersion, in pursuance of the sense of the word in the commandment and the example of our blessed Savior."

Tyndale.—"The plunging into water signifieth that we die and are buried with Christ, as concerning the old life of sinne, which is Adam: and the pulling out againe signifieth that we rise againe with Christ in a newe life."—Obe. of a Chris. Man, p. 143, edi. 1571.

Selden.—"In England of late years I ever thought the person baptized his own fingers rather than the child."—Works, vol. vi. col. 2008.

Dr. Owen.—"The original and natural signification of the word *baptizo* imports to dip, to plunge, to dye."—In Dr. Ridgely's Bod. Div., ques. clxvi.

Dr. Whitby.—"Baptism, therefore, is to be

performed not by sprinkling, but by washing the body."—Com. on Matt. iii. 16.

Dr. Porson.—"The Baptists have the advantage of us. *Baptizo* signifies a total immersion." (The substance of a conversation with Dr. Newman.) See Dr. N. on Baptism, p. 20.

Estius (Roman Catholic and Chancellor of the University of Douay).—"The immersion and emersion performed in baptism are a kind of representation of death and resurrection."—Com. on the Epis., on 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Arnoldi (Roman Catholic).—"BAPTIZEIN, to immerse, to submerge. It was, as being an entire submersion under the water, since washing was were already a confession of impurity and a symbol of purification, the confession of entire impurity and a symbol of entire purification."—Com. on Matt., on iii. 6.

G. Bird.—"It can scarcely be disputed that immersion of adults is the only form of baptism of which we find any traces in the Scriptures."—On the Angl. Church, p. 69.

Sholz.—"Baptism consists in the immersion of the whole body in water."—On Matt. iii. 6.

Fritsche.—"That baptism was performed, not by sprinkling, but by immersion, is evident not only from the nature of the word, but from Rom. vi. 4."—Com. on Matt. iii. 6.

Augusti.—"The word baptism, according to etymology and usage, signifies to immerse, submerge, etc."

Rhembarth.—"In sprinkling, the symbolical meaning of the ordinance is wholly lost."—Ethics, vol. v., p. 79.

Dr. Chalmers.—"The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion."—Lect. on Rom. vi. 4.

Meyer.—"Immersion, which the word in classic Greek, and in the New Testament, everywhere means."—Com. on N. T., on Mark vi. 4.

Olshausen.—"The elements of repentance and regeneration, united in the sacrament of baptism, and prefigured by immersion and emersion (see Com. at Rom. vi. 3, etc.), were separate from one another in the later practice of the church, when infant baptism came into use."—Com. on Acts xvi. 14-15.

Dr. Stier.—"The perfect immersion is not accidental in form, but manifestly intended in the baptism."—Words, etc., vol. viii., p. 306.

Conybeare and Howson.—"It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the converts being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture."—Late and Epistles of St. Paul, vol. i., p. 518.

Archb. Sumner.—"John was baptizing i. e. immersing in water, those who came to him for this purpose, 'confessing their sins.'—Exp. Lec. on John i. 19-28.

Neander.—"John's followers were entirely immersed in the water."—Life of Christ, p. 55.

Dr. Lange.—"John administered the rite of submersion." "His idea of repentance exceeded the outward requirements of the Mosaic law as much as his rite of immersion that of sprinkling." "And were baptized, immersed, in the Jordan, confessing their sins. Immersion was the symbol of repentance. According to Meyer, repentance was symbolized by immersion, because," etc.—Com. on Matt., vol. i., pp. 113, 115, 118. Clark's ed.

Contrast this honest statement of Dr. Lange with an apparent appeal to ignorance of the import of a Greek word, by my opponent.

Dr. Alford.—"The baptism of proselytes was administered 'by immersion of the whole person.' "It is most probable that John's baptism in outward form resembled that of proselytes."—Gr. Tea. on Matt. iii. 6.

Bp. Browne.—"The language of the New Testament and of the primitive fathers sufficiently points to immersion as the common mode of baptism. John the Baptist baptized in the river Jordan (Matt. iii.). Jesus is represented as 'coming out of the water' after His baptism (Mark i. 10). Again, John is said to have baptized in Enon, because there was much water there (John iii. 23; see also Acts viii. 36).—In Dr. W. Smith's Dic. of the Bible, Art. Bap.

All these are Pedobaptists, and I could add as many more did time permit. Certainly the testimony of any one of them should many times outweigh the assertions of my opponent.

Argument from the Conjoint Testimony of the Fathers of the Reformation and of Methodism.

Calvin comments as follows on John iii. 22, 23:

"It is probable that after the feast, Christ came into that part of Judea which was in the neighborhood of Enon, a town situated in the tribe of Manasse. In that place the evangelist says there was much water (*quæ multa*) which did not so generally abound in Judea. Geographers state that these two towns, Enon and Sydon, were not far from the confluence of the Jordan and Jabbok, near which they place Scythopolis. Moreover, from these words [John iii. 22-23] we may learn that John and Christ administered baptism by the submersion of the whole body (*totius corporis submersione*).

Philip commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him."

Looking into Calvin's commentary on this verse we see that he explains thus:

"From this verse we clearly see what was the rite of baptism among the ancients; for they were accustomed to immerse the whole body in water (*totum corpus in aqua*). At the present time (sixteenth century) the practice has gained ground for the minister only to sprinkle water on the body or head." "The very word baptizo, however, signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church."

Zaingle.—"Into His death. When ye were immersed (*intinuerunt*) into the water of baptism, ye were ingrafted into the death of Christ—that is the immersion (*intinctio*) of your body into water was a sign that ye ought to be ingrafted into Christ and his death, that as Christ died and was buried, ye also may be dead to the flesh and the old man—that is, to yourselves."—Anno. on Rom. vi. 3.

Luther.—"Baptism is a Greek word, a id may be translated immersion, as when we immerse something in water that it may be wholly covered; and, although it is almost wholly abolished (for they do not dip the whole children, but only pour a little water on them), they ought nevertheless to be wholly immersed, and then immediately drawn out, for that the etymology of the word seems to demand." "The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from a *tauff*, which in their language they call *tauff*, because it is proper those who are baptized be deeply immersed."

In the Smalcald Articles, drawn up by Luther, he says:

"Baptism is nothing else than the Word of God with immersion in water."

And again he says:

"Washing from sins is attributed to baptism, it is truly indeed attributed, but the signification is too soft and slow to express baptism, which is rather a sign both of death and resurrection. Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized to be altogether dipped into the water, as the word doth sound, and the mystery doth signify."

John Wesley (1703-1791), the noted preacher, scholar, author, and founder of Methodism in 1729, says:

"Buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."—Note on Rom. vi. 4. "The ancient manner of baptizing by immersion is manifestly alluded to here."—On Col. ii. 12.

In his Journal for Georgia of February 21, 1736, he says:

"Mary Welch, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church and the rule of the church of England, by immersion."

Adam Clark, LL D., F. S. A. (1760-1832), the celebrated commentator, says: "It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water." In loco.

"When he (the person baptized) came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection to life. He was therefore supposed to throw off his old Gentile state, as he threw off his clothes, and to assume a new character, as the baptized generally put on new or fresh garments."—Comment on Rom. vi. 4.

"That the baptism of John was by plunging the body (after the same manner as from those things persons—was) seems to appear from those things which are related of him; namely, that he baptized in Jordan, that he baptized in Enon, because there was much water there."—Com. at the end of Mark.

"Buried," etc., alluding to the immersion practiced in the case of adults, when the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth; his rising again the third day, and there emerging from the water, was an emblem of the resurrection of the body, and a total change of life."—Com. on Col. ii. 12.

"But as they receive baptism as an emblem of death, in voluntarily going under the water, so they receive it as an emblem of the resurrection unto eternal life, in coming up out of the water; thus they

are baptized for the dead, in perfect faith of the resurrection."—Com. on 1 Cor. xv.

The Admissions of Twenty-two of the Most Eminent Presbyterian Scholars and Commentators.

Since our Presbyterian friends seem so ready to endorse the assertions of my opponent, that *baptizo* does not properly mean "to immerse," and that Rom. vi. 3 does not refer to water baptism, and that immersion was not the act John, the apostles, and all the apostolic and primitive churches observed, I wish to place before them, especially, the testimony of twenty-two—and I could easily double the number—of their most eminent scholars and theologians, from the days of Calvin down to this day. I wish to ask them if they will throw all these overboard into the deep and accept the assertions of one man, Eld. Ditzler, as of more weight? Between Eld. Ditzler and all these they must choose.

Calvin.—"The word baptizo signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church."—Inst., S. 4, sh. xv., sec. 19.

James Macknight (1721-1800), an eminent Scotch divine and critic, thirty years a minister in Edinburgh, and twenty years moderator of the General Assembly of Scotland, author of the Harmony of the Four Gospels, The Truth of the Gospel History, and Translation of all the Epistles, with Commentaries and Notes, says:

"Jesus submitted to be baptized—that is, buried under the water by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future death and resurrection." "In like manner the baptism of believers is emblematic of their own death, burial and resurrection."

"Plunged together in the likeness of his death. The burying of Christ and of believers, first in the water of baptism, and afterwards in the earth, is fully enough compared to the planting of seed in the earth, because the effect in both cases is a resurrection to a state of greater perfection."—Apost. Epist., Note on Rom. vi. 4-5.

Dr. Geo. Campbell (1719-1795), an eminently learned minister, theological professor, church historian, translator, and President of Marischal College, Scotland, says:

"The word baptizo, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse. It is fully employed in the sense of *plunge*, to sprinkle (which, as far as I know, it never is, in any use, sacred or classical) the expression would doubtless have been, 'I indeed baptize water upon you.'"

Dr. Thomas Chalmers.—"The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion." "We doubt not that baptism was administered in the apostles' days by a total submersion of the whole body under water." (On Rom. vi. 3-4.) "We are to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses. Jesus Christ, by death, underwent this sort of baptism by an immersion under the surface of the water. . . . He was buried again by his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation—in the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have resigned an old life and in the act of ascending, to emerge into a second or new life."

Isaac Carrahan (1559-1614), a Calvinistic theologian and critic, Greek professor at Geneva fourteen years, also held the chair of Greek and belles lettres in the University of Montpellier, and most critical Greek scholar of his age, says:

"This was the rite of baptizing, that persons were plunged into the water, which the very word *baptizein*, to baptize, sufficiently declares; which, as it does not signify *duneein*, to sink to the bottom and perish, so doubtless it is not the bottom and to swim on the surface. For these three words, *epipolazein*, *baptizein* and *duneein* are of different significations. Whence we understand it was not without reason, that some long ago insisted on the immersion of the whole body in the ceremony of baptism; for they urge the word *baptizein*, to baptize."—Annot. in Matt. iii. 6.

P. Van Maastricht, a scholar of reputation, and author of works on theology, who died in 1706, says:

"In baptism we emerge out of a sepulchre of water and pass, as it were, into a new life."—Theoret. Prac. Theol., b. vii., ch. iv., sec. 10.

"Immersion was used by the apostles and primitive churches." (Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5).—Ibid., sec. 9.

James Barrington, a man of great learning, a church historian who died in 1733, says:

"This (the reason . . .) Pope Stephen in the year 754 is accounted the first law against immersion. The pontiff, however, did not dispute with immersion, except in case of extreme urgency. The rite, therefore, did not change the mode of dipping in public baptism, as it was not till five hundred and fifty-seven years after that the legislature, in a council held at Ravenna, in the year 1311, declared immersion

and pouring indifferent."—Monumenta, vol. i., Fasciculus, ch. v., sec. 4. G. Diodati (1576-1649), a Swiss theologian and preacher of Geneva, professor of Hebrew and theology at Geneva, one of the best Biblical scholars of his day, both an author and translator, says:

"In baptism, being dipped in water according to the ancient ceremony, it is a sacred sign unto us that sin ought to be drowned in us by God's Spirit."

Richard Baxter (1615-1691), a distinguished preacher, author of Saints' Rest and about one hundred and forty-four other distinct treatises, says on Matt. iii. 6:

"We grant that baptism then (in primitive times) was by washing the whole body." "In our baptism we are dipped under the water, as signifying our covenant profession, that as He was buried for sin, so we are dead and buried to sin."

Dr. John W. Nevin, born 1803, an American theologian, and professor of Hebrew and Biblical literature ten years in the Theological Seminary at Allegheny City, also President of the College and Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Penn., editor of the *Mercersburg Review*, and author of a number of books, says in the *Mercersburg Review*:

"It needs but ordinary scholarship, and the freedom of a mind unpledged to mere party interests, to see and acknowledge here [that the Baptists have] a certain advantage on the subject of baptism. The original sense of the word *baptizo* is on the whole in their power. It corresponds with ideas of immersion more than with the idea of sprinkling."

S. Carcolleus, the learned and celebrated theologian, and professor at Geneva and Amsterdam, who died in 1659, says:

"Baptism was by plunging the whole body into water. . . . Nor did the disciples have to be sent out by Christ administer baptism afterward in any other way."—B. v., ch. ii.

D. Chamierus, a great writer on systematic divinity, professor at Montauban, who died in 1631, says:

"Immersion of the whole body was used from the beginning, which expresses the force of the word baptism, whence John baptized in a river. It was afterward changed to sprinkling, though it is uncertain when or by whom it commenced."—Panstrat. Cathol., tom. iv., l. v., ch. ii., sec. 6.

Venema.—"The word *baptizein*, to baptize, is nowhere used in the Scriptures for sprinkling."—Inst. Hist. Eccl. Vet. and Nov. Test., tom. iii., sec. i., § 138.

H. Altling.—"The word baptism properly signifies immersion; improperly, by a metonymy of the end, washing."—Loc. Commun., pars i., loc. xii.

This confirms our statement that secondary and figurative meanings are not proper meanings.

Turretine.—"The word baptism is of Greek origin, and is derived from the verb *bapto*, which signifies to dip, and to dye; *baptizein*, to baptize, to dip into, to immerse."—Ina. loc. xix., quæst. xi., sec. 4.

Dr. Rees.—"Gr. *BAPTO* et *BAPTIZO*, *mergo* et *mergitur*. Voss. Etym. To dip or merge frequently, to sink, to plunge, to immerge." "The word baptism is derived from the Greek *baptizo*, and means literally dipping or immersion."—Encyc., Art. Bap.

Witsius.—"It cannot be denied, that the native signification of the words *baptizo* and *baptizein* is to plunge, to dip."—Econ. Fæd. l. iv., c. xvi., sec. 15.

"It is certain that both John the Baptist, and the disciples of Christ, ordinarily practiced immersion."—Econ. of the Cov., b. iv., c. xvi., § 18.

Eld. Ditzler can deny, though he can offer no proof of it.

J. G. Altman (1697-1758), a Swiss historian and divine, also professor of moral philosophy and Greek at Berne, says:

"In the primitive church persons to be baptized were not sprinkled, but entirely immersed in water, which was performed according to the example of John the Baptist."—On 1 Cor. xv. 23, sec. 8.

Dr. L. Coleman, S. F. D., born 1796, a noted scholar and church historian, says:

"The term baptism is derived from the Greek *baptizo*, with its derivatives *baptismos* and *baptisma*, baptism. The primary signification of the original is, to dip, to plunge, immerse. The obvious import of the noun is immersion."—Christian Antiquities, p. 255.

J. F. Stapfer.—"By baptism we understand that rite of the New Testament church commanded by Christ, in which believers, by being immersed in water, testify their communion with the

church."—Inst. Theol. Polem. tom i., cap. iii., sec. 1.

Jacques Saunier (1677-1730), a noted French preacher, and author of twelve volumes of sermons and various other treatises, says:

"Paul says, 'We are buried with him by baptism into death'; that is, the ceremony of wholly immersing us in water when we were baptized."—Sermous, vol. iii., p. 171.

Theodore Beza (1529-1605) an eminent reformer, Greek and theological professor, and on the death of Calvin, took his place and became the head of the Presbyterian church, says:

"But baptizo signifies to dip, since it came from *bapto*, and since things to be dyed are immersed."—On Matt. iii. 13.

He admits that some have disputed respecting immersing the whole body in the ceremony of baptism, but he maintains that "there is no other signification of the verb *amad*, which the Syrians use for baptizo." "It answers," says he, "to the Hebrew *tabal* rather than *rachatz*" (do). Elsewhere he says: "Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified. Neither does the word *baptizo* signify to wash except by consequence, for it properly signifies to plunge into for the sake of tinging or dyeing."—Loc. 2d to T. T.

Dr. McOrie—"We do not hold that the word baptizo signifies to pour or sprinkle. This was never our opinion."—On Bap., p. 32.

SUMMARY.

Mr. President. Having brought in all the direct proof in support of the *usus loquendi* of the verb *baptizo* that my time will admit, I will now sum up my argument as briefly as possible.

The proposition I set out to prove is, IMMERSION IS THE ACT WHICH CHRIST COMMANDED FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

My opponent denies it.

Now this was the one argument which I laid down by which to prove it:

I. The verb *baptizo* is the only verb which Christ used in the Commission to denote the act which he commanded for Christian baptism.

II. The primary and literal meaning of *baptizo*—which is the only real and true meaning—is "to immerse."

III. Ergo,

To immerse is the only act which Christ commanded for Christian baptism, since it must be granted that in enacting a law all terms must be used only in their literal, real and most obvious meanings.

The minor premise being admitted by both parties, the single issue to be settled is the major, i. e.,

Is to immerse, the primary, the literal and real signification of the Greek verb *baptizo*?

As it is conceded by all standard authorities that the use of any term by those with whom the language is vernacular, and by those who were conversant with the language, is the supreme and ultimate authority in determining its meaning. I first appealed to the New Testament for its invariable use by the inspired evangelists and apostles, who could not err.

1. I first showed that John the Baptist, the first gospel minister of the New Testament dispensation, used *baptizo* and the nouns derived from it in no other sense than "to immerse," and immersion.

2. I showed that the symbolism of the act, as taught by Christ was a prefiguration of his own death, burial and resurrection, a fulfillment of the all righteousness he came to fulfill, or accomplish, to secure the remission of the sins of his people; also,

3. That Christ metaphorically spoke of his own overwhelming sufferings as a baptism, alluding thus to his own at the hands of John.

4. That Paul, Rom. vi. 3, and Col. ii. 12, alluding to the act which Christ received in the river Jordan, calls it a "burying," a "planting," in the likeness of death.

I therefore concluded that Christ and his apostles, and all whom John baptized, were immersed in water. In support of this conclusion I brought forward the testimony of the most eminent Pedobaptist scholars, commentators and critics.

Immersion in water then was the only act which Christ first commanded his first minister to perform. Immersion in water was the act which he himself

received, as our lawgiver and exemplar.

Immersion, then, was the only act which the apostles and all the disciples of Christ, the members of the first Christian church on earth received prior to the ascension of Christ.

For it is on record that Christ's disciples made and baptized more disciples than John, and no one will deny that they administered the act which they and their Master had received.

IV. My fourth argument was from the commission itself—Christ used the same verb, *baptizo*, and therein no shadow of intimation that there was to be any change in the act itself, which, according to every principle of law and reason, there should have been had he designed to change the physical act of the rite or his apostles would inevitably have fallen into error. But he only extended a former commission given them, no longer limiting their ministry to Palestine, but extending it to the ends of the earth.

I reasonably concluded that Christ in the commission only authorized his apostles to administer the selfsame act which he appointed from the first, and which he and they had received at the hands of John, which was an immersion in water.

V. Then from the very internal construction of the language of the commission, I showed that the act commanded must have been immersion alone.

The subjects *autous* of the act being the direct accusative of the verb *baptizo* forbids the idea that some element, as water, was to be put upon them, since a preposition must be supplied, or the language be made figurative, neither of which is admissible; but that the subjects were to be put bodily into it.

I showed from the very signification of the verbs to sprinkle and to pour, which is to scatter into drops, disperse into fine particles, or to diffuse in a continuous stream, that literally they could not take indivisible or inseparable objects as direct accusatives, but must take liquids, as water, etc., or separable solids, as sand, ashes, etc. If Christ had intended the element water to be put upon the subjects of baptism, he would have made it the direct accusative of the verb indicating the act, and have used the preposition *en* or *epi*, before the subjects. Had he intended the subjects to be placed within the element, he would have placed them as the direct accusative of the verb. This he did do, and therefore we are compelled to conclude that this he intended.

Then again. Since it is impossible to sprinkle, scatter into drops or particles, or to pour, diffuse in a continuous stream, human beings without destroying life, therefore it is evident the verb *baptizo* Christ used can have no such signification.

VI. My sixth argument was from the invariable adaptation of the definitions to immersion and immersion in every passage in the New Testament where *baptizo* or its noun *baptisma* is used.

By substituting no other word can the sense of every passage be preserved, and this I regard as evidence demonstrative that *baptizo* literally signifies only to immerse.

VII. My seventh argument was, The apostles to whom the commission was given evidently understood Christ to mean immersion only as the sense of *baptizo*.

In all their ministry they evidently observed no other act. In all their allusions to the action of baptism, immersion is clearly intended, and no other act will fulfill the symbolism of baptism as set forth in their writings, so that we may say of them all as Chrysostom and Howson says of Rom. vi. 3, "It cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."

This fact alone I regard as demonstrative and conclusive that the real signification of *baptizo* is to immerse.

VIII. My eighth source of proof was,

The Invariable Use of the Term by Greek Authors Themselves.

It is an admitted fact, by all scholars, that no Greek author has yet been found who uses *baptizo* in a physical sense to signify either "to sprinkle" or "to pour," but always "to immerse," "to dip," etc., and that wherever they use it figuratively the sense of the figure involves the idea of an immersion. It is known to all that I repeatedly called upon my opponent to bring forward, or give an authoritative quotation from, one Greek author who used *baptizo* in a physical sense to mean "sprinkle," and he has been unable to do so.

IX. My ninth source of proof has been the lexicon.

I have brought forward the united testimony of forty lexicons, among these all that are regarded as standard authorities in Europe and America, and one and all, each and several, give "to dip," or "to immerse," as the primary—i. e., the literal and real significations of *baptizo*. To divert your attention from this stern, crushing and conclusive fact, my opponent has spent a full day in talking to you about a new discovery in philology, according to which the true primary is the *historical*, etc., which all scholars will laugh at as fanciful and absurd. To save needless controversy, at the very outset I presented Rules of Interpretation, selected from standard authorities, and these Rules were mutually accepted by us. By virtue of those Rules, what we are to understand in this case as the primary and literal sense of any term, is clearly determined.

Rules of Interpretation.

I. Every word must have some specific idea, or notion, which we call meaning.

Were not this so, words would be meaningless and useless.

II. The literal, which is also called the grammatical sense of a word, is the sense so connected with it that it is fixed in order, and is spontaneously presented to the mind as soon as the sound is heard.

This meaning is always, save one instance, placed first in the lexicons, and is known as the primary meaning.

III. "The primary or literal meaning is the only true one"—Ernesti, p. 14.

Ernesti quotes Morus in support of this. "There can be no certainty at all in respect to the interpretation of any passage, unless a kind of necessity compels us to affix a particular sense to a word, when sense, as I have before said, must be one, and, unless there are special reasons for a tropical (or secondary) meaning, it must be the literal sense."

Stuart says: "If anyone should deny that the above principles lead to certainty when strictly observed, would deny the possibility of finding the meaning of language with certainty."

Now by these rules I have strictly been governed, and these every University and Theological Seminary in Europe and America will endorse.

I have sought throughout this discussion for the true, and the real, the literal signification of *baptizo* and have, therefore, in reading from the lexicons, as a general rule, read only the strictly primary meanings, the first one, two or three given, in all cases only ONE, and that the FIRST would have been sufficient! In every case I have faithfully and fully given the primary sense of the lexicon. I have shown that no figurative, which is always the secondary, sense of a term, is its real and physical sense and is, therefore, not a real or literal signification, and with such we have nothing to do in this debate. I have explained how that, in strictest truth, Baptists may say with Carson and Anthon, that

"No STANDARD LEXICON IN THE WORLD GIVES 'TO SPRINKLE' OR 'TO POUR' AS A LITERAL AND REAL SIGNIFICATION OF BAPTIZO."

I have in almost every speech not only most alludingly invited, but urgently called upon demanded or challenged my opponent to produce one Greek lexicon of acknowledged authority, or an authoritative quotation from one, that gives to sprinkle or to pour as a primary meaning of *baptizo*. HE HAS NOT DONE IT! His failure to do so should be considered as conclusive evidence to all that to immerse, etc., is the only signification of *baptizo*.

Every semblance of an argument made by him has been founded upon the figurative significations of *baptizo*, or, that by some author or in some version, a word used for *baptizo* that elsewhere is used in the sense of to wet, or to sprinkle!!

X. My tenth argument, and one upon which I am willing to rest this whole controversy, is embraced in the last, but to make salient, I place by itself:

In 1846 Liddell and Scott, of England, upon the basis of Passow, brought out their great English lexicon, which has been endorsed by the scholars of both continents as the best Greek and English lexicon extant. In their first edition, as a seventh meaning of *baptizo*, figurative of course, they give "to pour upon." Prof. Drisler, of Columbia College, undertakes an American edition. Before he gets the last pages of his work through the press, Liddell and Scott issue in England a second edition, and because satisfied that to pour upon is not sustained by classical or New Testament usage, they omit it, as well as "to drench."

Prof. Drisler, in his second American edition, does likewise. In the last edition of this last and greatest of all the Greek lexicons published in the English language, only "to dip in, or under water, of ships, to sink them, is given as the primary meaning of *baptizo*."

Now thirty full years have passed since Liddell and Scott, with the eyes of the scholars of Germany, England and America upon them, with their knowledge and approval, made this change in their lexicon, and for no other reason except that they could not find a standard Greek author who used *baptizo* in the sense of to pour upon, or to drench, even figuratively, and no scholar of earth could then help them to the author.

Thirty years of investigation and research have by. Thirty years of the Pedobaptist scholars of Germany, passed, and all the Pedobaptist scholars of Germany, England and America have not been able to furnish any authority to justify to pour upon, or to sprinkle, as even a proper figurative signification of *baptizo*. Should not this fact settle this question in the mind of every candid man and Christian in the world? How supremely ridiculous for a man who never read as many consecutive lines in one book of classic Greek as these scholars have read Greek classic Greek to stand up in the hearing of the world and assert that *baptizo* primarily, never means to dip, to immerse, but means to sprinkle "to pour." Such a man is not talking to be regarded by scholars, he knows that he must forget all standing among them, but to the ignorant, with whom bold assertion accomplishes far more than argument.

XI. My eleventh source of proof was the testimony of the Greek Fathers and Bishops, to whom Greek was vernacular, and every one bore witness that *baptizo* naturally signified only to immerse, and that immersion was the sole and universal practice of the apostolic churches, and to this I added the invariable practice of the Greek church from the fourth century until now.

XII. My twelfth argument was from the testimony of all the Latin Fathers, from Tertullian downward, and they one and all understood *baptizo* to signify *mergo*, *immergo*, *ingo*, and *subingo*, to sink in, to immerse to dip, to dip in, and that immersion was the universal practice of the primitive churches, and to this I added the uniform practice of the Latin or Roman Catholic church for 1300 years, except in cases of necessity when sprinkling was allowed, which was finally established by law by Pope Sixtus at Arles in A. D. 754.

XIII. My thirteenth source of proof was the Versions of the Old and New Testaments.

(1) The first Greek version of the Old Testament was made in the third century before Christ by seventy learned Jews. They rendered the verb *tabal*, the word which as invariably in Hebrew means to immerse as to dip does in English—by *baptizo*—save in one instance, where they translate it figuratively "to dye."

(2) In the Syriac Peshito, which, until the appearance of the Curettonian text, was regarded the oldest version of the New Testament, translates *baptizo* and its derivatives invariably by the verb *amal* and its derivatives, and *amal* in Syriac, as all standard lexicons testify, primarily signifies to immerse. I have put it in proof that the Syrian Christians from the first century have immersed. I have put it in proof that at Eleassa, where was their most ancient, their mother church, a large baptistry called *mauthwa* was erected for the purpose of immersion. I have said nothing in this discussion contradictory of what I wrote in my Edition of Stuart on Baptism, which any one by comparing me can see, but I have, for the honor of the Holy Spirit, opposed the claims of equality with the inspired text, which my opponent has put up for it, which I regard as little less than profane! God's word with me is above all that has been written. It is in lead an ancient version, but made by uninspired and therefore fallible men, and scarce by compared with the inspired text; but all its testimony is in support of immersion as the only act of Christian baptism, as is the practice of the Syrian churches from the beginning until now.

And this I have shown with respect to every version of the New Testament made, whether in the Orient or the Occident; ancient or modern, wherever the word has been translated, a native word being invariably used that signifies to immerse.

XIV. My fourteenth argument in proof is, The testimony of all the historians of the Eastern or Greek Church.

They all say that immersion was the primitive practice.

XV. My fifteenth is the united voice of all the historians of the Latin or Roman Catholic church.

XVI. My sixteenth is the unbroken testimony of the historians of the Church of England without exception.

XVII. My seventeenth is the united testimony of all the historians of the Lutheran church.

XVIII. My eighteenth is the accordant testimony of all the historians of the Presbyterian church.

XIX. My nineteenth is the testimony of all the historians of the Methodist church, as well as of all historians endorsed by that communion.

XX. The testimony of all the historians of the Congregational church.

There is the utmost accord among all these that immersion was the only act of apostolic and primitive baptism.

Can it be that these, one and all, are unreliable? Can it be that the unsupported assertions of one man will outweigh twenty three of most eminent scholars and all the historians of seven different denominations?

XXI. My twenty-first argument in proof is the conjoint testimony of the Fathers of the Reformation, and of Methodism itself, Zwingli, Calvin, Luther, and Wesley.

These four unitedly bear the same testimony that the radical and natural signification of *baptizo* is to immerse, and that immersion was the practice of the first churches. Will Methodists suffer the authority of their father and founder to be ranked as inferior to the bare word of a modern traveling preacher? Will Presbyterians admit that the authority of my opponent is superior to that of their great Calvin, who was indeed the first scholar of his age?

XXII. My twenty-second argument in proof is the admissions of twenty-three of the most eminent Pedobaptist scholars, commentators and critics.

These extend over a period three hundred consecutive years, embracing the ripest scholarship of every century, including the first. Must the united testimony of all these weigh light as air, when counterpoised by the bare words of one man?

XX. Finally, I have presented the conjoint testimony of ten standard Cyclopedias.

These are neither denominational nor partisan, but national in their character, establishing the fact that immersion was the only apostolic and primitive act.

In view of all these irrefragable proofs, I conclude in the language of Moses Stuart, one of the very first Pedobaptist scholars of his age:

"*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into any liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed on this." "It is," says Augusti (Denku. vii., p. 216), "a thing made out, *v. g.*, the ancient practice of immersion. So indeed all the writers who have thoroughly investigated the subject conclude I know of no usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this."—pp. 61, 149, 150.

I therefore, Mr. President, feel justified in saying that I have established my major premise above all question or controversy—i. e., the primary, literal and real signification of *baptizo* is "to immerse," and only "to immerse."

Ergo,

I feel that I am justified in saying that my conclusion is logical and invincible—

Immersion was the act which Christ commanded for Christian baptism. Q. E. D. (Time Out)

Kid. Ditzler's Nineteenth Reply on Mode.

We now have no time to notice little points, the debate is to be settled by the real facts in the case, the science of language, the laws of philology. To this all scholars are agreed. I can only give a few of my many points and facts in the short space of half an hour. Then

I. We quoted where twenty five of the highest authorities known in lexicography, though four of them wrote not lexicons, yet define or translate the word, they of second and fourth centuries, define *baptizo*: either by sprinkle, *adsperso*, *conspergo*, *perfundo*, *begiessen*, in German, *ubergiesen*, or pour, pour forth (ol upon, *profundo*, *affundo*, *uberschutten*, pour upon, (ol water), or by a word equivalent to both *brecho*, *be-aprinkle*, rain, shed down, etc. There were six more by Buddens, 1519, (some 1529), Stephanus, 1572, Scapula, etc., the last and Passow's. Hedericus Schrevelius, etc., being only manual abridgments of Stephanus, or of those abridged from him, being made, the original Buddens and S. when dipping was the law, and they baptized by dipping, their queen dipped, all these lexicons are taken from Buddens and Stephanus. These lexicons by the dippers, made under law, requiring dipping in all cases, save where it was a risk of life, (1). Never definite dip. (2) It is immerse only in later classic Greek. (3) It is never immerse in New Testament. (4) In New Testament it is *abluo*,

lavo, cleanse, wash, every time. Wherever *lavo* is modal, it is sprinkle, so given by all lexicons.

We then have thirty odd authorities speaking from the stand point of lexicography, all with us, unanimously with us is lexicography.

2. We next took up the standard immersionist authors of Europe and America, past ages and present, Baptist and Disciple, and examined their appeal from lexicography to the original Greek, classic Greek, their favorite field for support, where they have always imagined they stood in impenetrable armor, inviolable. We saw, (1) That immerse, from their own renderings, Gale, Carson, Mell, Pendleton, A. Campbell, Conant, Ingham, etc., their princes in learning and dogmas, immerse is a very rare and late rendering of *baptizo*. (2) That on an average of 475 occurrences, *baptizo* was rendered dip only 18 times—457 against 18 for dip, and they false renderings. Hence (3) That showed that dip was not a meaning at all. (4) That of 63 consecutive cases by Dr. Conant, their greatest light, it was immerse 10, whelm 45 times, overwhelm 8 times—i. e. 53 whelm and overwhelm, all implying affusion, and philologically pointing out pour; and through it sprinkle as the primary force of *baptizo*, with no dip at all. Hence, with these facts from such a source, dip no meaning, immerse such a rare and late one, Passow, the master and prince of Greek lexicographers, is to the point when he says of *baptizo*, "generally to sprinkle upon, pour upon, overwhelm."

Immersion authorities universally sustain his rendering here. And though I introduced this fearful array of facts in my opening reply five days ago, Dr. Graves, up to this good hour, never has replied any part of it. Every one could see, must see, that nothing on earth could relieve him till these stunning facts were met, their force overcome. He evidently realized that it was a hopeless task to attempt to assail them.

3. They appealed to the Greek from the lexicons, and attempted philology with this result: (1) *Bapto* means wash as the effect of dip. (2) If a word means dip, immerse, it never can be applied to affusion. All admit *baptizo* at times means immerse, hence it never can apply to affusion, mean sprinkle, pour.

We exposed these, their main and only philological crochets, elaborately, in detail, with no attempt on his part to try to meet the facts or refute my laws. We showed that wash was not derived from dip or immerse, 1. Because dip is not a meaning of *baptizo* at all. 2. Because immerse, words that properly or primarily mean to immerse, immerse or dip, never mean to wash. We gave words in Latin, Greek, German, Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, etc., all verifying this, *mergo*, *immergo*, *demergo*, *submergo* are pure Latin, the very words themselves in a copious literature, yet never do they mean wash, are samples, 3. Because there is no necessary connection between dip and wash, immerse and wash. Objects may be immersed or dipped in filth, ink, paint, dye, mud, ponds of stench, and are as often so as in cleansing elements. Nay, mere immersion in them will not wash, cleanse at all. A dirty hand or garment merely dipped; in no case is it cleansed thus. 4. We then showed that wash is from one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five or one hundred and fifty years older, as a meaning of *baptizo*, than immerse, hence could not be derived from it. 5. That words primarily meaning to sprinkle, to pour, applied to water, constantly come to mean to wash, to cleanse, in all Semitic and Aryan languages. Hence the argument was perfect, and apertly demonstrated to be the primary force of our word. Against their canon that if it is dip or immerse it never can be sprinkle or pour, we had an array of over fifty words, adding some twenty-five of their own, demonstrating that not only was it utterly and ridiculously untrue, but that the only and universal law of language was from sprinkle to dip, immerse, wherever words of such meanings as *bapto* and *baptizo*, wash, cleanse, intoxicate, overwhelm, overflow, whelm, asperse, pour, etc., have occurred. 4. This brought us fully on to philology, the science of word-building, the laws of language, word derivation, and developed or secondary meanings. Here

1. We gave full twenty five words, have over fifty, that primarily mean to sprinkle, or, as a small proportion, that mean to moisten, bedew, wet, where it is by affusion, oft of tears, juice of vines, sap; dew, rain, etc., that come to mean all that *bapto* and *baptizo* are admitted to mean by all parties. Hence the unexceptional and universal law of language is, from sprinkle to moisten, wet, stain, color, thence dye, as in *bapto*; where coloring fluid is not an accident, it is sprinkle, (moisten, wet), pour, (of water), wash, drench, soak; from soak, drench, comes make drunk, intoxicate; from pour, of water, rain, comes overwhelm, overflow, inundate. From overwhelm, oppressed with [over]

whelming elements, coases sink, (*immergo, submergo*) and from sink, sinking in water, etc., comes drown, perish. Pouring water by the power of its friction necessarily comes wash. Pouring water washes per force. It is God's general cleanser of all the earth. Dew washes dust and dirt off vegetables, flowers, etc., even as perspiration washes paint off the face. This we saw was the universal law of language.

2. We saw that no word in Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, Greek, Latin, German, Spanish, English, that properly or primarily meant dip or immerse, ever meant what all admit *bapto* and *baptizo* so often mean. It is absurd to presume that these two important words violate all known laws of language, all principles of philology, and all admitted facts of history with not one word of reason or fact either to demand the acceptance of universal absurdity.

(1) Wash, we saw, is a derived meaning of *baptizo*, and of hosts of words primarily implying sprinkle. It is never a derived meaning of immerse in any language of earth. Hence as it is derived from *baptizo*, yet never from immerse, immerse never was a primary meaning of the word.

(2) Intoxicate often is a derived meaning of words primarily meaning to sprinkle, to moisten, where it is with dew, rain, tears, but never from immerse or dip as a primary. But intoxicate is a derived meaning of *baptizo*. Hence immerse never was a primary meaning of *baptizo*.

(3) Overflow is a derived meaning of *baptizo*. It never is of immerse or dip. Hence immerse, dip, never were primary meanings of *baptizo*. Words primarily meaning sprinkle, pour, often mean to overflow.

(4) Overwhelm is a constantly recurring meaning of *baptizo* as a derivative. It never is derived from dip or immerse. Hence dip, immerse, never were primary meanings of *baptizo*. But overwhelm, whelm and overflow are constantly derived from words meaning to sprinkle, to pour—pouring rain causes all these. Hence all facts, all philology, demonstrate sprinkle as the primary meaning of the word.

(5) We then took up the classics in Greek and showed

1. No lexicon gave immerse as a meaning earlier than Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Josephus and Ptolemy—all late in the iron age of Greek.

2. No Greek used it for immerse earlier than these.

3. All the earliest occurrences for centuries were ones (1) of metaphorical use only, (2) all in the sense of sprinkle and pour—not one dip, not one immerse. Pindar, Aristophanes, Alcibiades, Demosthenes, all use it for asperse, pour torrents of abuse upon people. Plato three times to intoxicate, once to confuse with questions. Aristotle, the first known to use it in a literal sense, makes it equivalent to *katakludo*, overflow, whose primary meaning is asperser, insersion. Now, then, philology, on which immersion late heretofore have all relied so securely, as clearly demonstrates our position as Euclid ever demonstrated a mathematical problem. All the occurrences of the word in earlier Greek do the same. All facts confirm it. From these there is no appeal. Hence by the laws Dr. Graves laid down, no Baptist is baptised save the few who have gone from Pedobaptist churches. You are not baptised if we are to adhere to primary use or apostolic precedent.

(6) Dr. Graves then, seeing his cause swept away as with a flood, backed down squarely on primary. He gave up the ship on that great issue, their last hope in appealing from the general definitions given by lexicons. Nay, after spending his first full hour in giving us an outline and his philological laws, the moment he saw we cut him entirely off, he abandoned his line, fled from his entrenchments, and took the nearest out he could for Jordan and Enon, and never passed at the drying up Jordan till he was heard in the tomb, buried by baptism into death. Never was there such a precipitate flight from such costly and labored entrenchments.

(7) He appealed to the Hebrew *tahal*, rendered baptise in the Seventy, used by the apostles and by the lexicons. We showed

1. That sprinkle was its primary meaning.

2. That twenty four of the greatest Hebrew lexicographers of the world declared where "the object merely touched the water, (or liquid), in part or in whole," it baptised.

3. That the 25th, Rabbi Furst, the greatest Hebrew critic of the last ten centuries, showed its primary

meaning was to besprinkle, in which the facts of the other 24 show him to be correct, and all our laws of philology demonstrate it. It is vain, therefore, for Dr. Graves to seek to disparage this prince of science in Oriental philology, when all science, and all facts, and all scholarship unite in his support by their facts; for if Dr. Graves' position be true, all these, Buxtorff, Schindler, Castell, Pocock, Kimchi, Stokius, Leigh, etc., are all wrong, wholly wrong. If it implies immersion, then it is false to say it only implies a mere touch to the liquid, or to be touched by the water, (*ab aqua*) It could not be true that one could baptise with "the little particles of hail" gathered by one on a cold day. Nor could a man well immerse himself in one fifth of a pint of water, as we saw they baptised with it.

(8) We showed that Origen, the most scholarly of all the church Fathers, born eighty-four years after John's death, says of the altar of stones and wood built on the mountain in the dry time of three year's drouth, an ox laid upon that, on which "four pitchers of water" were poured, not barrels, were no barrels then, but pitchers of water. Origen says, "they baptised the altar." Basil says it was baptism. We quoted their words where we introduced it. Dr. Graves attempted no reply worth the name. He mainly ignored it.

We quoted the learned Greek father of A. D. 190 Clemens Alexandrinus, who tells us of parties washing, one besprinkling herself with water before devotion, we quoted the Greek, and Clemens held this an image of Moses' baptism handed down by the poets, Homer, etc., for "the Jews daily baptise upon a couch," that is, sitting at meal on couches, as they did in Christ's day. He has never even noticed this testimony so sweeping.

(9) We showed that *bapto*, the root word of *baptizo*, that gave it its primary meaning, primarily meant to sprinkle, never to immerse, but it did mean in later Greek to dip, where it was partial, as a derived meaning from stain, color, as stain was derivative of sprinkle. We showed that *bapto*, in earliest Greek, was used in the sense of sprinkle, pour. That all its other meanings could be accounted for on no other ground, applying the facts and laws of languages as on *baptizo*. Not only Homer, Euripides, Sophocles, Aristophanes, etc., the earliest Greeks, use it for sprinkle, stain, where it is by pouring, touching, etc., but later, Origen, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, the Syriac, Itala, Ethiopic, and all the earliest versions, have translated it sprinkle. Dr. Graves never even referred to or noticed any of these facts.

(10) We exposed his views of Jordan, of Philip and the eunuch, baptism at Enon, etc., showing it did not involve immersion at all. We showed that *ek*, out of Jordan, "out of the water," (Ex. ii. 10; Josh. iv. 16-21, etc.), *eis* to Jordan, *eis* towards the sea, *eis* at the Jordan, occurred often in the Greek, where all admit it involved no entrance into, or *ek* emergence from, the water.

He appealed to Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5, and fought desperately to hold the fort, as here was the Gibraltar of their views. But we showed that it was spiritual engrafting, as into Jesus Christ, that it was no allusion to water, or water baptism at all. So Beza, Hodge, Stuart held also. We then proved that baptised into Christ spiritually resulted in our spiritual incorporation with him, we die daily, are crucified with him; conformed to his death, which was by crucifixion; were "buried by the baptism" of the Spirit into his death, were planted, Greek, born together, "engrafted together in the likeness of his death," which is spiritual crucifixion. That is not a dip under water. Hence, 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, "we who live are always delivered *eis* into death" by being thus crucified or engrafted together in the likeness of his death. The word in the Greek is never modal, and never implies burial or immersion, the word rendered plant, while a man "was buried with the burial of an ass, drawn forth and cast beyond the gates of Jerusalem," Jer. xxii. 19, left to be eaten of dogs, no envelopment. Yet these two words were their only hope. We have followed the doctor as closely as death its victim in every attempted argument, while he has really made no effort even to meet or offset the terrible array of facts, laws of language and authorities we have adduced against him.

(11) The Laver. This plain but telling argument he has not dared to attempt to grapple with either. We quoted Lev. xl. 30-37, xv. entire you can read, Num. xix. 3-22, especially verses 13 and 22; xxxi. 23; viii. 7, making the greater part of the "diverse bap-

tisms" of Heb. ix. 10, the mode given in verses 13, 19, 21 of the same chapter. These showed that for hundreds of things men became ceremonially unclean, and had to baptise every day from one to three or four times. We showed that for any uncleanness they had to baptise. Mark vii. 4, 8; Luke xli. 38; Eccl. xiv. 24, etc. We showed that the great Laver, Ex. xxx. 18-20; xl. 30-32, 2 Chron. iv. 2-10, was for the priests to wash (*ex anton*) *ek* out of it, not in it. That it was twenty-one feet high to keep its waters from being defiled by any unclean person or thing touching them. That it had apertures, coaks, at the base, that even with a man's face in height, whence the water ran for washing "out of it." That daily, hourly baptisms were here performed, I read the law: "Whatever the unclean person toucheth shall be unclean." Num. xix. 22, and much else to the same effect. See Lev. xv. xi. and xvi. entire. I read where Dr. Graves, A. Campbell, Gale, Carson, Ingham, etc., all hold this washing to be immersion, baptism. That the New Testament and Apocrypha apply *baptizo* repeatedly to it. Immersion was impossible, because forbidden. They dared not even touch the water in it, but wash of it. Had one immersed in it, all its nearly one thousand barrels would have to be emptied out, it cleaned by fire, Num. xxxi. 23, etc., and filled before it could be used. It required a leap twenty-one feet high to get into it. All the details we gave. The result was at smallest count, in the 1,500 years from Moses till the commission, 1,615,500,000,000 of baptisms among the Jews took place, baptism with water, all by affusion, not one by dipping. It was insisted that Jews had private cisterns, some two even twenty-five to twenty-seven feet deep, twelve to sixteen feet in diameter, to hold plenty of water against dry seasons, etc. But by the laws read personal cleansing in them would not be allowed. Immersing one person in one would defile all its waters, Lev. xi. 30-35, Num. xix. 22, etc., the vessel of wood must be emptied, rinsed, if earthen ware, broken, if metallic, burned out and then sprinkled with water. All those facts show that they did not immerse. Hence all the oldest Greek Bibles, (MSS), fourth century, in Mark vi. 4, read "sprinkle themselves" for those washings, because it was always simply a sprinkling, not even a pouring or heavier washing. Besides, who can believe that a decent family, besides being forbidden so often by their Bible, would drink, cook with, and baptise with water from three to five months or a year, in which, in a cistern, from four or five to ten men and women and children daily immersed themselves? How preposterous! Yet this was all so if immersionists are to be believed here.

It was at the end of such a universal practice of affusion that the harbinger said, "I baptize with water, he shall baptise with the Holy Spirit." It was in the familiar use of the terms, I will pour water on him that is thirsty, all modal allusions being to affusion, sprinkle, pour water, Is. xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, etc., that the baptism of the Spirit was always a pouring of it on the people.

(12) Finally, we come to the ancient versions. We have seen that the Syriac, Ethiopic, Itala, Vulgate, Sahidic, Basmaric, the more modern Lusitania and Lutheran of the sixteenth century, all translate *bapto* sprinkle. We have seen the most learned of all the Greek Fathers, Origen, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, do so.

We have seen that the Itala and Jerome translate baptise in Chaldee *tsava*, by sprinkle, *conspargatur* and *infundetur*. Yet they never render baptise by dip or immerse. If immerse was the word for baptise, if *baptizo* were *immergo* or *intingo* in Latin, why there, in those two Latin versions, was the very place to exhibit it. Immerse is pure Latin anglicized. That was the chance to render it immerse or dip. But no, not once do they do so. All the versions for the first fifteen hundred years after Christ made from the original, are with us, every one supports affusion, not one supports dipping. We have not time to review them. We bring up the grand old Syriac, the version so eulogized by Dr. J. R. Graves' quotation from Judd, so praised by Gale, the best version, most literal, accurate and pure ever made. We appealed to this as the version made in the apostolic age, when and where the translators knew both tongues, and knew the apostolic practice. Between James' version and the apostles a thousand years of dark ages roll between, a thousand years of superstition and darkness throw their black shadow over the West. Fifteen hundred years roll between them and the apostles. But here is a version made in the apostolic age, in the very country where they preached, in the very language Jesus and the

apostles preached in, and what is its testimony? *Baptizo* is rendered *tsava*, same in Arabic and Syriac. We saw that *tsava*, wash, pour, sprinkle, in Greek is rendered *amad* in Syriac before Christ's day. We saw *immerse* in Greek never was. No case is found where immerse, none where dip, is ever rendered *amad*. But *amad*, to wash, made wet with rain, sprinkle, bedew, to moisten with dew, to perfume, this word translates *baptizo* into the apostolic version. It translates it in the Arabic version in the golden age of Arabic learning, when Plato, Aristotle, etc., were translated into Arabic, when algebra was discovered by the Arabs as a science, and the courts of Al Raschid and Habrour were more academies than courts. In that age also were more academies than courts. In that age also the word used for washing the face, washing a babe only a day old, for a lady sprinkling aromatic waters on rose water on her head or hair. And is this immersion?

We showed that *amad* translated *baptizo* in the apostolic age. That it applied, in Arabic and Syriac, to sprinkling, pouring—such as falling rain, dew, water of any kind. It was to wash, cleanse. It never meant immerse in the New Testament. Its noun applies in John to the washing at Siloam. We saw that *tsava*, wash, pour, sprinkle, translated *amad* in Susanna before the birth of Christ. No where is immerse—*bathizo*, *pondizo*, *katakludo*, *catulo*, *duplo* (dip) translated *amad*, nor is *tsava* immerse in Hebrew ever rendered *amad*. Not only does Catafago who, sixteen years, lived in the country where this version was made, in the lexicon I hold in my hand, defines the word—"the being wet with rain"—that is the only definition he gives it—but Castell's immortal work in which nineteen men, the most learned, the scholarship of that renowned century of learning, seven-

teenth—who had the resources of Kimchi, Maimonides, Schindler, the Buxtorffs and Pocock before him—Selden and Golius—this based in Syriac on the two great Manuscript Lexicons of two native Syrians in the ninth and tenth centuries, while their language was a living one—being equivalent, then, to twenty-one, Catafago making twenty-two, Syriac lexicons and Arabic (Catafago's Arabic), all giving sprinkle, moisten, wet with rain, dew, water as its prevailing meaning—immerse no New Testament meaning at all—only once in Old Testament there baptise does not occur in the original—such is the word that translates *baptizo* in the Syriac and Arabic New Testament.

We saw that this old Syriac translates baptizo (*tahal*) the first time it ever occurs. Gen. xxxvii. 31, by sprinkle.

Then we saw that there were other versions of great value, in centuries, all agreeing substantially with this. Every one of them on till the close of the fifteenth century, so far as they were from the Hebrew and Greek equally sustained affusion—not one favoring immersion.

We turned to that old Peschito, apostolic version, and found that affusion was sustained by its text throughout. The Syriac and Arabic have another word for baptizo. It is *tsava*, pronounced *tsavaga* (heavier sound) in Arabic. It is used for baptizo in the second and subsequent centuries, and in Syriac and Chaldee for *bapto* and *baptizo*, immersionists assure us in days before Christ. Indeed it occurs in fifth century before Christ in Daniel several times, rendered *bapto* in Greek. Either *tsava* or *amad* was used in the commission. Hence we read Ps. vi. 6 (7): "My couch have I baptised with my tears." In Ezek. xli. 24: "Thou art the land that is not baptised; no, upon thee the rain has not fallen." So reads the old apostolic Syriac. In Luke vii. 38, 44, it occurs twice—take the last—"Simon, into thy house I came; water upon my feet you gave me not. But she with her tears my feet hath baptised." So verse 38: "She began to baptise his feet with her tears."

O, sir, the best you can do is to infer that they went from four acres of forty-five feet deep water at Jerusalem to Jordan and Enon to get water enough in which to dip a man, but it is all absurd. A Campbell says, after pressing the case of the Eunuch—the "inference is" he immersed him. Elder Wilkes urges that all he could adduce supported "the hypothesis" that Philip immersed him. They have only an inference—a process so doubtful in their estimation, that they utterly discredit all arguments of references when they come to infant baptism. But here we ask—we want no inference. We present no hypothesis. We know the mode where David's falling tears baptised the couch—the pouring rain baptised the land. The women kneeled over the unsandaled feet of Jesus

—the tears dropped down one by one, and fell upon his feet—a clear affusion—not one-tenth our bandrest the amount I always pour on babes I baptise, and he says: "My feet hath she baptised with her tears." No dark ages roll between this old Syriac and apostles—no superstitious and multiplied accumulations of them.

We showed that not till the beginning of the third century could immersion be found; it was not named as baptism; and then it was by three dips, oil administered, honey and milk given; and they admitted they had no gospel authority for it. The first man who names mersion as baptism, also uses *tingo* constantly, *adpergo* and *perfunto*—sprinkle for it, *tingo* being used as our baptize, not restricted to any mode. The moment we find *mergo*, *mergio* applied, we find it three dips, and superstition reigning. They believed there was "medial virtue" in the water and "sanctifying grace." Hence they mersed themselves into it to absorb and "imbibe" the regenerating efficacy. It was not for mode. No merit or importance attached to that. It was purely a superstition as to the cleansing power of water, "under invocation of the priest." With Tertullian, mersion was the simplest way of absorbing the grace out of the water.

Again, I challenge Dr. Graves, as over and again I have done, to find in all the world, where baptism was administered as Baptists do—by one "immersion"—dip—into the water earlier than the fourth century after Christ. He cannot do it. The first time baptism in the world's history was administered by one "immersion," by a single dip—performed as you perform it, it was in the fourth century. It was then denounced by the whole church as a "heresy," "an innovation," and causing a "heresy!" (See Eunomius, Hist. Eccles., ch. xxvi. 232-234.)

And now, dear friends, look at the facts. All Greek lexicons sustain us; seven-tenths of them utterly crush our opponent. All Hebrew lexicons support us—all refute ever his as a possible mode, as to the Bible. All Syriac lexicons support us, and crush his hopes of even supporting his mode. All ancient versions support us, not one tolerates his mode, let alone his wild theory. The only point is, are his people baptised at all, or not? All the classics support ours as the only mode. All the English arguments—the great Laver baptism—one trillion, six hundred and forty-five billions, five hundred millions, at lowest count, all by affusion—not one immersion—these are the explanations of the expression: "I baptize with water!" Such are the facts. Brethren, we are baptised! The only question in doubt is, have these "Baptists" been baptised? If Dr. Graves' rules are to be adhered to, if they are rightly applied by him, not a Baptist here is baptised, save the few who may have gone out from us. Sirs, we have the facts. We intend to conquer a peace. Yes sir, we mean it; "mean business!" You have to give it up. We have the facts, the authorities, the documents. We began not this war, you began it. We begged for peace; you clamoured for war. Now you have it, and the result is upon you, before you. We repeat it, all the doubt is on your side; not a shadow on ours. You may be, you may not be baptised. We are baptised. If you wish, then, to be sure, certain, have no doubt, let it be as was in apostolic days; as the Spirit defines it, by pouring. The Lord pour upon you all his baptising Spirit.—[Time out.

WARNING TO BOYS.—A certain doctor, struck with the large number of boys under fifteen years of age whom he observed smoking, was led to inquire into the effect the habit had upon the general health. He took for his purpose thirty-eight boys, aged from nine to fifteen, and carefully examined them. In twenty-seven of them he discovered injurious traces of the habit. In twenty-two there were disorders of the circulation and digestion, palpitation of the heart, and a more or less marked taste for drink. In twelve there was frequent bleeding of the nose; they had disturbed sleep; and twelve had slight ulceration of the mucous membrane of the month, which disappeared on ceasing from the use of tobacco for some days. The doctor treated them all for weakness, but with little effect until the smoking was discontinued, when health and strength was restored. Now, this is no "old woman's tale," as these facts are given on the authority of the "British Medical Journal."

The Baptist.

"THOU HAST GIVEN A BARRE TO THEM THAT SEED THEM, THAT IT MAY BE SOWED IN THE EARTH OF THE TASTE."—Ps.

J. R. GRAVES, Editor and Proprietor.
M. P. LOWREY (Riley, Miss.), Business Manager.
W. E. PAXTON (Savannah, Ga.), Correspondent.
J. E. SARGENT, Contributor.
J. R. GRAVES, Jr., Order Clerk.
Business Office: 301 Main Street, Memphis, Tenn.

Subscribers: \$2.70 per annum, in advance.
Send Money by Postoffice Order, Registered Letter, Express, or Draft, at our risk; otherwise, at the sender's. If answer is desired by mail, send stamp or postal card.

Send all Brace orders to the Editor and not to other parties in this city, or elsewhere, for we cannot be responsible for money or Braces sent through others.

Don't send book orders to us. We have no connection whatever with the book store of the Society, and it compromises our business. Send all money and orders for books to W. D. Mayfield, Business Manager Southern Baptist Publication Society—never to us.

Circulation of THE BAPTIST this week, 7,840.

JACKSON.

MANY have thought that the Baptists of Jackson were unwise in building a house so large and elegant, and so far in advance of the other church buildings of the place, but daily experience shows the wisdom of their course. On the day of opening, though the other churches, except the Cumberland, had their regular services, the new house was filled to its utmost capacity. And since then the Sabbath services have been well attended, demanding all the accommodations provided.

At the present, meetings are held every night. The religious interest is evidently on the increase. Several have expressed hope in the Savior, while new inquirers are showing their anxiety. The pastor has the assistance of Eld. Cason, the State missionary.

Mr. Cason lives in Jackson, and holds his membership in the church there, and is held in high regard by the brethren.

A few days since the wife of the pastor of the Cumberland Presbyterian church in Jackson was received by letter into the Baptist church. Although the wife of a Pedobaptist minister, her principles would not allow her to join her husband's church, so she has always remained with the Baptists. On her husband's accepting the pastorate of the Cumberland church, she sought her own people, and worships with them! In this day when husbands and wives so often compromise their religious principles, and govern their church relations by family considerations alone, it is refreshing to meet such a case as this. Not only do we honor this sister for her Christian steadfastness and consistency, but we likewise honor the husband for the homage he renders to his wife's principles, in not requiring her to accompany him to the church of his faith.

The Queryist.

What action should the church take in case of a brother who signed a petition for a dram shop?

Westville, Mo., December, 15th 1875.
Answer.—We think that the church after explaining to him the hurt he had inflicted upon her, and Christianity in general, and that community by his unchristian act, and he does not make an *amende* to the church, it should by resolution reprove his conduct.

Do you think that reading sermons is the preaching of the gospel Christ commanded.

W. O. L.
Answer.—We think that the ministrations of the gospel minister touching the word, are divided into 1. Preaching, indicated by the Greek, *kerysso*, to proclaim with the voice like a herald, 2. Teaching, *didasko* and this may be done in any way the best calculated to accomplish the end, even by maps and black boards, if needed.

Letter-Box

9-20.

This is the Vol. and No. of this paper, and is changed weekly. Look on the margin of your paper and see the figures after your name, and when they correspond with the above, your time is out. By this means you can tell when your time expires, and renew before your name is dropped.

M J JAMES, South Carolina.—Your name was dropped by express to Orangeburg Court-house, March 22d.

A A KEITH, Texas.—All right now. We had credited the full amount to Lacy.

QUERIST, from Fulton, Ky., touching the Catholics, their numbers and design, will find all he wants under Papacy, weekly.

M D BLANCHARD.—You send us \$1 and tell us to credit you on paper, but do not give postoffice or State. Where are you?

J D JAMES, South Carolina.—We have made another effort to get Eld S Knight his paper. Let us know if it does not come, and we will try again.

A T THOMPSON, Texas.—Write to W D Mayfield, Business Manager Southern Baptist Publication Society, 361 Main street, for agency of The Debate. Send him \$1 for canvasser's out fit.

G W KEMPER, Tennessee.—Mr Saml McIntosh's paper will go all right now. Our note in Letter-box of April 1st was written on the authority of the postal clerk at this postoffice. Your sending the county has made all right.

W A TREADWELL, Mississippi.—You will doubtless see an exposition of all the passages you mention which you think favor the final apostasy of some believers when that subject is discussed in the Debate. Read that, and then write us.

WM RANDOLPH, Louisiana.—The last Debate sent you was an exchange and we entered the directions on the order-book as we received them. The missing number, of December 18th, 1875, we cannot furnish. The price of The Debate in book form will be \$3.50 and \$4.00.

J BIXLER, Illinois.—Where are you? We have been sending the paper to you at Chambersville, Ill. The postmaster informs us that there is no such office in that State. Anyone knowing the brother's office will confer a favor on both the subscriber and ourselves by showing this to him, or writing to us.

WE HAVE been engaged this week in sending postal cards to all whose names were dropped last month. Since mailing them some have renewed. We mention this to allay any fears that may arise in their minds in regard to their money sent. Should the paper fail to come after a reasonable time, write. We take pleasure in correcting any mistakes that may occur.

Business Department.

Money Letters Received from March 28th to April 4th.

Tennessee.—N M Lovelace 18.00—Brace, D D Cepshaw 8.25—paper, etc., R D Goodwyn 2.50, Mrs A Boone 10.00—Brace, G W Dowdy 2.70, Dave Galloway 2.00—Missouri fund, J R Price 1.50.

Mississippi.—R S Smith 2.70, E J Rucell 2.70, Mrs Ellen Clayton 2.70, Mrs D P Owen 2.70, R Jackson 1.00, W L Gideon 1.85, G A Grammer 60 cents, Alford A

Boyd 2.70, Jno T Buck 10.00—Brace Mrs J T Wilson 10.00—Brace, J L Walton 10.00—Brace, etc., Mrs D A Dornor 10.00—Brace, Clara H Hood 2.00.

Alabama.—Grant Taylor 2.70, H Russell 2.00, J F Johnson 2.70, Wm W Evans 12.50—Brace, S Jackson 7.70—paper, etc., Georgia.—W D Jones 2.00.

Miscellaneous.—L E Martin, Iowa, 10.00—Brace, J H Durham, California, 10.00—Brace, N C Alsbaugh, Indiana, 2.10—book, etc., J C Bleakney, Nova Scotia, 2.85.

Missouri.—E M E T label 1.00, E A Finney 10.00—Brace.

Louisiana.—F M Fortson 7.70—paper, etc., Wm Randolph 6.45, J H Tucker 3.00, N P Smart 2.75, W E Tynes \$5.40.

Texas.—Jas Corrigill 2.70, J H Emery 2.70, J I Jordan 3.00, A Butler 2.70, W R Dischehear 13.60, A T Thompson 2.70, A Richardson 3.00, M Upchurch 1.00, J C Sizole 10.00—Brace, Mrs J S Calloway 12.70—Brace, etc., J J Slodge 20.00—Brace.

Arkansas.—W A Crouch 4.00 T A Heard 4.05, T J Allen 1.10, Ann H Nunn 2.70, J F D Shoffy 2.70, R F & G Kellam 21.00.

50 Braces for Females at \$10.

So signal is the relief afforded by the Body Brace and Abdominal Supporter to females suffering from prolapsus, and so few, through mistaken modesty, have given their names, that this offer is made with the decided understanding that with in 60 days the one accepting it shall state its effects, whether good or otherwise. Let the initials be given, if not the full name, and postoffice. There are thousands of noble women in the South dying daily of female weakness, that bane of health and enjoyment, and of life, who, with the Brace, would be restored to health and happiness. No husband, worthy of the name, will withhold one from his suffering wife. This offer will be good until the fifty Braces have been taken. Address, J. R. GRAVES.

SE MANY failed to get through with their clubs and to just got the money on time, and have begged for an extension therefore, be it known, that the offer of \$10 to all ministers and \$12.00 to all others, or ten new subscribers, will pay for the Brace, and that this offer is good until the first of April. Each one accepting this offer must return a certificate within sixty days or pay an additional \$5.

Single Subscribers. RAY'S CORN.—I will send each single subscriber two papers of Ray's celebrated Seed Corn for each new subscriber, one for himself and one for his subscriber. Read the advertisement, and go to work at once.

Are You a Six Month Subscriber? One thousand have subscribed for the paper since the debate commenced for six months, \$1.35, whose time will be out the last of this month. To every one of these who will this month send us \$2.70 for whole year, we will send a nice package of Java Prolific Cotton-Seed or Ray's Early Yellow Corn. Either premium will be worth \$10 to you. Send on at once, if you borrow the money. Claim the premium if you expect it. J. R. GRAVES.

Special Notices.

Any Church wishing to build a house of worship can secure an approved Design of a neat and commodious house, of moderate cost, by sending \$1.00 to the clerk of the Baptist Church, Tallahoma, Tenn. This design includes a perspective full set of detail drawings, plan, bills and specifications. The proceeds of this sale is a present to our church, to be applied to completing our house. Brethren, all, anonymous, send up the dollar and get the picture.

Coughs.—A medicinal preparation in the form of a lozenge is the most convenient. "Brown's Bronchial Troches" allay irritation which induces coughing, giving relief in Bronchitis, Hoarseness, Indigestion, Consumption and Asthmatic complaints.

Agent.—We are willing to act as agent for anything we know to be excellent. We therefore accept the agency of the following articles, which we know will be a benefit to our farming friends:

1. The Java Prolific Cotton Seed, raised from one imported seed, by McCarty, of Mississippi. All who tried it last year say that it will yield fully one-half more than common seed, and is three weeks earlier, which of itself is a great feature. Buy one bushel. We will see it promptly sent, and genuine.

2. Ray's Early Prolific Yellow Corn. We not only have the reliable testimony of Dr. M. W. Phillips to its superior value, but that of Bro. Lowrey, who would deceive no one. We want to advance the interests of our farming patrons, and secure them against being humbugged. There are parties now selling quantities of corn, which they call the Ray Corn, and they take along our paper and the Farmer to deceive the people. Beware of them. We will fill all orders from \$1 upward—and send a nice package to every new subscriber until the first of June, and every single subscriber who will get a new one, and to his subscriber also.

3. We know from five years trial that the Pyraonith Hedge Plant is the greatest blessing yet offered to Southern farmers. We can make a good fence that will turn any common stock in three years, and in four and five, nothing will attempt to pass it, and it costs less than to split rails in the woods. It can be planted in Mississippi successfully until the first of May, and until the first of June in Tennessee, Kentucky and Illinois. Let each farmer make a trial this spring, and if you have a place in Iowa, fence it with the Pyraonith if you want a thing of beauty and utility. J. R. GRAVES.

REMEMBER THIS. Now is the time of year for Pneumonia, Lung Fever, Coughs, Colds, and fatal results of prostration to Consumption and other Throat and Lung Diseases. ROCHER'S GUMMAY EXTRACT has been used in this neighborhood for the past two or three years without a single failure to cure. If you have not used this medicine, yourself, go to your Druggist and ask him of its wonderful success among his customers. Two doses will relieve the cough. If you have no faith in any medicine, just buy a Sample Bottle of ROCHER'S GUMMAY EXTRACT for 10 cents and try it. Regular size bottle 75 cts. Don't neglect a cough. Sold at all druggists. Wholesale by W. N. WILKINSON, 340 Main Street, Memphis, Tenn. 9-12-40000

SOMETHING NEW.

An Imported Remedy—Cannabis Indica. This wonderful preparation, known by the above title, which has attained such celebrity during the last few years in all parts of the United States as a positive cure for Consumption, Bronchitis and Asthma, can now be obtained at all first-class druggists. We have made permanent arrangements in CALCUTTA, INDIA, for obtaining "PURE HEMP," and having it extracted upon its own oil (the climate of India being too changeable to extract large quantities free from milder). These remedies are now prepared from the best hemp gathered at the right season, and extracted during the summer in Calcutta. There is not a single symptom of Consumption that it does not dissipate, and it will break a fresh cold in twenty-four hours. One bottle will satisfy the most skeptical. \$2.50 per bottle, or 3 bottles for \$6.00.

As this is an imported article, we do not claim our own remedies, but will be pleased to make Cash agents everywhere.

Address, C. GADDOCK & CO., 1022 Race St., Philadelphia. A-8-43-9-17000.

COCKET INHALER. CARBOLATE OF IODINE INHALANT.

A certain remedy for all NASAL, THROAT AND LUNG diseases, affording relief in some cases in a few minutes. For CATARRH it has proven the only known remedy. Bronchitis yields to it, and CONSUMPTION if taken in season. ASTHMA, HOARSENESS, and RAY FEVER cured. NON-THROAT, HOARSENESS, and common colds relieved at once. A few Inhalations will correct the most OFFENSIVE BRONCHITIS. Made of hard rubber, it may be carried as readily as a lead pencil or needle-case, and is always ready for use. It supercedes all other Inhalant tubes and contrivances—is approved by the entire Medical Faculty, and endorsed by the standard Medical Journals of the world. Dr. George Hadley, Professor of Chemistry and Pharmacy in the University of Buffalo, in a carefully considered report upon its merits, concludes in these words: "On the whole, this Inhaler seems to me to be a most successful and useful remedy, and by its use the most simple and effective means, to the philosophical conception, and well by itself, to the execution. No person afflicted or threatened with any of the difficulties stated, should be without this Inhaler. It is sold in the United States, England and Canada. Over 200,000 in use. Send your address and receive our descriptive literature and testimonials of hundreds of patients who have used it in their practice. We send Inhaler with Inhalant for two months' use, free by mail, for \$2. Extra bottles of Inhalant, 50 cents. Sold by Druggists.

W. E. SMITH & CO., Proprietors, Buffalo, N. Y. 4-9-17-37000

A WATCHMAKER AND JEWELER, a Baptist completing our house. Brethren, all, anonymous, send up the dollar and get the picture.

J. A. ERENK, Clerk.

Wanted Agents.—\$100 per month and expenses with \$11.00 capital. Business pleasant and respectable. B. Bicknell & Co., 174 Elm St., Cincinnati, O. A-9-14-36

To have good health—the Liver must be kept in order.

SANFORD'S LIVER INVIGORATOR

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

INVIGORATE THE LIVER.

April 8, 1876.

OUR SCHOOLS.

JARY SHARP COLLEGE.

April 8, 1876.

Faculty:

C. G. GRAVES, LL. D., President, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy and Logic.

A. F. HIX, A. M., Professor Greek and Latin.

A. F. HARRIS, A. M., Professor French and German.

C. L. SMITH, Professor, Principal Free Department.

Wm. A. G. CHAPMAN, A. M., Primary Department.

Faculty of Music:

C. L. SMITH, President, with a full corps.

Tuition:

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music, etc. \$10.00

Ornamental Work (teach branch) \$10.00

Boarding (including fuel, washing, etc.) \$10.00

Room (for board of students) \$10.00

French, Latin, etc. \$10.00

German, Italian, etc. \$10.00

Music

