

SERMON IV
THE DESIGN AND PURPOSE OF BAPTISM
TO WHICH ONLY IMMERSION CONFORMS
PLUS
A REFUTATION OF THE REASONS GIVEN FOR
SPRINKLING BY JOHN CLEVELAND

MATTHEW 28:19-20

"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the world. Amen."

A REQUEST TO MAKE AN HONEST DECISION AFTER CONSIDERING
THE EVIDENCE TO BE PRESENTED

Whilst discoursing to you upon these words, I have, as I suppose, proved to you what is the outward, and visible part of baptism. You have, to appearance, given a serious and solemn attention, and, I hope, a candid one, to what hath been said.

All which I ask of you in this matter is, that you in the spirit of meekness hear the whole, and then judge and practice in such a manner as you cannot refuse to do, without doing violence to your reason, and without disobedience to the command of Heaven.

Some of you may be afraid of discord; but whence, I pray you, will discord arise among brethren? Will a candid, prayerful and self-denying attention to truth cause this feared discord? Hath truth a tendency to produce discord among the faithful followers of the Lamb of God?

I know that once, when Christ preached the doctrines of the cross, multitudes of professing disciples went back, and followed no more with him. I hope it will not be thus with any of you. But, my brethren, however it may be with any of you, once things is clear—I ought, I must declare to you, so fast as I profitably can, all those truths of God which appear necessary to build you up in sound faith and holy practice.

DANIEL MERRILL BOUND BY TRUTH TO TEACH WHAT GOD DECLARES
IN HIS WORD

As I have said before, so say I unto you again, that all which I ask of you is, to give truth a candid hearing, and yield your assent, when facts are plainly proved.

Nothing should, by me, be thought too much to be done, to clear away from your minds the darkness of prejudice, together with any erroneous belief and practice which you may have imbibed, in part, by my means. I shall, therefore, in this discourse, after having attended to the purport, end or design of baptism, answer some objections, which may for the present obstruct the force of truth.

Before we proceed to the particular business of this discourse, you will, if you please, attend for a minute to a few questions, and their answers.

SOME PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Is it not a plain case, that it is my duty to deliver to you the whole counsel of God, according to the best light it may please him to afford me?

2. Is it not equally plain, that your duty is to yield, not to me, but to the truths which I deliver, an obedient ear?

3. Should you, from an un-candid and prejudiced mind, refuse to be converted by the truth, will the fault be mine?

4. Should I exhibit full evidence as to the subject on hand, and exhibit that evidence clearly too, or should it be that I have done this, and yet great difficulties should arise, will you be justified should you lay the blame to me?

5. Should I teach you the truth, and produce all the evidence which you can ask for, and you should, all, like faithful Christians, believe it, where or whence will arise any difficulty among us? Should any of you refuse to believe, will you charge your difficulties to my account?

6. Are not all of you determined that you will hear candidly, and believe upon evidence?

You will please to give a Christian and judicious answer to each of these questions, and let your practice be conformed with the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Having laid before you the principal part of the facts and evidence, which I intended, as to the visible and outward part of baptism, now—

7. Lastly, the purport, end and design of the Baptismal Institution may call for some attention.

A.

THE FIRST DESIGN AND PURPOSE OF BAPTISM TO SERVE AS THE DIVIDING LINE BETWEEN CHRIST'S KINGDOM AND THE KINGDOMS OF THIS WORLD

The purport, end or design of this Christian ordinance, or institution, appears to Be for a dividing line between the kingdom of our Lord, and the kingdoms of this world.

John was Christ's forerunner: he was sent before his face to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just: to make ready a people prepared for the Lord; (Luke 1:17); and that Christ should be made manifest to Israel, therefore says John, am I come baptizing with water. (John 1:31)

John's mission comprehended a double purpose, to make ready a people, prepared for the Lord, and to manifest Him unto Israel. The people which he instrumentally made ready, and prepared to receive the Lord, he baptized; and it appears from his rejecting many of the Pharisees and Sadducees, that he intentionally baptized none other. (Matt. 3:7)

The whole discourse which he had with them, *Matt. 3:7* to 12, is good evidence that he admitted none to baptism but such as brought forth visible fruits of repentance. Such persons he admitted among that people which he was making ready for the Lord.

This people were, when prepared, to compose that kingdom, or the beginning of that kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, and which is an everlasting kingdom, which shall stand forever; *Daniel 2:44* and *7:27*. This kingdom Christ calls the kingdom of heaven, and says, it is not of this world.

It appears to be this kingdom, which was now at hand, almost ready to be set up, of which Christ speaks to Nicodemus, when he says, *John 3:5*, "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

All this does, for substance, meet the sentiment of Baptists and Pedobaptists on this subject. Both suppose, that none can belong to his kingdom without being born of the Spirit: but, perhaps,

neither the Baptists nor Pedobaptists, would say, that any due, strictly speaking, belong to this kingdom, except they have been born of water and of the Spirit.

Our Lord saith, Verily, verily, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. If a man cannot enter into this kingdom but in this way, he cannot belong to it in any other.

A FACT ON WHICH BOTH SIDES AGREE

BAPTISM IS A VISIBLE SIGN OF ENTRANCE INTO GOD'S KINGDOM

Both sides grant, that baptism, or to be born of water, is the only way of admittance into this kingdom.

THE ISSUE ON WHICH THEY DISAGREE

WAS IT BY IMMERSION OR BY SPRINKLING?

They are not so well agreed as to what it is to be born of water, whether it be to be sprinkled, washed, or immersed. Concerning this matter you must judge for yourselves.

This being a given point, that the design of baptism is, that it should be for a dividing line between that kingdom, which the God of heaven was to set up in the latter days, and this world, I would suggest for your consideration—Which draws the line of separation between this kingdom and all other kingdoms on earth; to enter it by being sprinkled; or by being visibly and actually buried in water, and rising as it were from the dead, to join this kingdom?

AN IMPORTANT ADDED ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION

WHICH MODE BEST REPRESENTS THE TRUTH OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM AS BEING DISTINGUISHED FROM THE UNBELIEVING WORLD?

I will also suggest one thing more for your consideration: Which hath the most direct and natural tendency to cause Christ's kingdom to appear to be, as it really is, not of this world? To have almost all admitted into it, in infancy, and so in unbelief, and all by sprinkling, or by a little water put upon the face, and the greater part of them living in open wickedness, or manifest unbelief, and unnoticed by the church to which they are supposed to belong;

Or, to have none admitted but professed believers, and these admitted in a way which significantly says, that they turn their backs upon the world; yea, that they are dead to the world, and are risen with Christ? I only suggest this for your consideration. I hope to attend to it in its place, but not to-day.

B.

THE SECOND DESIGN AND PURPOSE OF BAPTISM

TO SHOW THAT ITS SUBJECTS HAVE FORSAKEN ALL FOR THE GOSPEL

The purport, end or design of baptism appears to be for a manifestation, that the subjects of it have forsaken all, yes, their own lives, for Christ's sake and the gospel.

How can this be more visibly manifested, than by being buried with him in baptism? How can a man more visibly forsake all, than he does when buried? How can any one more manifestly forsake his own life for another, than by voluntarily submitting himself into the hands of another to be buried alive?

Is not this agreeable to what Christ says, "Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple"?

C.

THE THIRD DESIGN AND PURPOSE OF BAPTISM TO SYMBOLIZE BEING WASHED FROM OUR SINS IN THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB

It appears to be for a representation of our being washed from our sins in the blood of the Lamb. John, the revelator, says, speaking of Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

This is a figurative expression, showing at once the procuring cause, the blood of Christ, and the gracious effect, our souls purged from dead works to serve the living God. Can any natural sign represent this more fully, than does baptism, in which our bodies are washed with pure water?

D.

THE FOURTH DESIGN AND PURPOSE OF BAPTISM THE PROMOTION OF A SANCTIFIED AND SEPARATED LIFE IN BOTH THE SAINT AND THE CONGREGATION

The purport, end or design of this Christian ordinance appears to be for the promotion of piety in individuals, and purity in the church. What can have a stronger tendency to move the heart of a Christian to piety and weanedness [to free from dependence upon] from the world, than has the institution of baptism?

Seeing at every remembrance of it, he is put in mind, how Christ died *for sin*, and how every one who hath believed and been baptized, has by the ordinance signally died *to sin*, been buried from the world, and raised again to newness of life.

Hath not this ordinance also an equally strong tendency to preserve the purity of the church, should it be administered as we have proved it ought to be, by immersion only?

And should another thing be found to be true, that visible believers only should be admitted to it, what a world of unbelievers would this shut out of the church! How differently would the professed Christ of Jesus Christ appear from what it now does!

PEDOBAPTISM [SPRINKLING] WITH ITS ATTENDANT PRIVILEGES DESTROYS THE PURITY OF THE CHURCH

If my information be correct, every natural born subject of the crown of England is, according to the laws of their national church, to be baptized, and immediately considered as a member of the church. This is, indeed, consistent, if all the parents have, in any past period, been proselyted to the Christian religion, and if baptism have come into the place of circumcision, and to be administered to children and infants, as that was.

Not only so, but probably nine-tenths of the inhabitants of New England, if not of our nation, belong to the church, according the professed beliefs of the Pedobaptists. Upon the same principle, I presume that more than three-fourths of all the adults in this and the neighboring towns, belong to the church, and have, if the principle be according to the gospel, a right to require admittance to the Lord's Supper, and baptism for their children.

Then, upon the same principle, would their children be members of the church, and entitled to all the privileges of God's house, as they come to years, and nothing short of gross immorality could justify their exclusion. Does this look as though Christ's kingdom were not of this world?

E.

THE FIFTH DESIGN AND PURPOSE OF BAPTISM A SYMBOL OF THE BELIEVER'S COMMUNION WITH CHRIST IN HIS DEATH AND RESURRECTION

The purport, end or design of baptism appears to be will described by Dr. Goodwin, in the following words: "The eminent thing signified and represented in baptism is not singly the blood of Christ, as it *washes* us from our sins, but there is a further representation therein of Christ's death, burial and resurrection, in the baptized: and this is not a bare conformity to Christ, but is a representation of a communion with Christ in his death and resurrection; Therefore it is said, We are buried with him in baptism, and wherein we are risen with him, &c.

And moreover, here it is that the answer of a good conscience, which is made the inward effect of this ordinance, I *Peter* 3:21, is there also attributed to Christ's resurrection, as the thing signified and represented in baptism; and as the cause of that answer of a good conscience, even baptism doth now save us, as it is a figure of salvation by Christ."

F.

THE SIXTH DESIGN AND PUROSE OF BAPTISM TO PORTRAY THE BELIEVER'S FORGIVENESS AND CLEANSING FROM SIN

The purport, end or design of the ordinance appears to be to point out, or shadow forth, the forgiveness or remission of sins, and the being cleansed from them. Hence the propriety of scripture expressions, which are like the following: "The baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." *Mark* 1:4. "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." *Acts* 22:16.

Here it is worthy of the critical reader's notice, that the word translated *wash away*, is *apoulousai*, which signifies to wash clean, or to wash out a stain, as well as to wash away. It is also worthy to be observed, that the word *louo*, whence this is derived, is the only word or theme, save *baptizo*, which, in the New Testament, signifies to wash the body. This being well considered, it cannot be doubted but baptism is a most significant representation of the remission of sin, or cleansing from it.

G.

THE SEVENTH DESIGN AND PURPOSE OF BAPTISM A PUBLIC IDENTIFICATION WITH CHRIST AND AN OPEN DECLARATION TO LIVE FOR CHRIST AND ACTIVELY SERVE HIM

The purport, end or design of the ordinance of baptism appears to be, for an open and manifest declaration that those who receive it, do heartily, and of a ready mind, put on Christ, enter into his service, receive him to be their Prophet, Priest and King, and covenant to be for him, and for him only. Accordingly it is said, As many as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ: They have put on his name, his self denying profession, his suffering, despised, but glorious cause.

IMMERSION IS THE ONLY MODE THAT MEETS THE SEVEN DESIGNS AND PURPOSES OF BAPTISM

Is the purport, end and design of baptism as hath been now stated? then the mode is immersion; and those who change the *ordinance* from *dipping* to *sprinkling*, and apply it to

unbelievers, *pervert* the *ordinance*, lose its import, and make it quite another thing. This we have, for years, ignorantly, done.

THE ARGUMENTS OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND FOR SPRINKLING, WITH THEIR SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION

We will now attend to the arguments, which the late Rev. John Cleaveland hath left us in support of *sprinkling*, as being authentic baptism. This Mr. Cleaveland was, and I believe justly too, esteemed as one of the most pious and faithful servants of Christ.

Whilst I was favored with a personal acquaintance with him, he stood very highly in my estimation, for his unaffected piety, and fervent simplicity, as a preacher of the ever-lasting gospel. I still retain the same opinion of the good man. But great and good men are not always wise. In any instance where their wisdom hath failed them, we should be careful how we follow.

THE NECESSITY FOR TESTING ALL ARGUMENTS BY SCRIPTURE

The Bereans would not take Paul for a guide, without first bringing him to the standard of divine truth. The Bereans were justified. Should we treat Mr. Cleaveland in the same way, he could not, and I am inclined to think, he would not, though he were living, condemn us.

I might let his works and arguments in support of sprinkling, sleep, were it not, that some of you, my people, and perhaps others, may by them in one particular, be kept from beholding Christ, as in an open glass.

1.

ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE

THE WORDS "BAPTIZO" AND "BAPTISMOUS" SIGNIFY THE SAME AS THE WORD "NIPTO"

The good man's object was, to prove that baptism by sprinkling is authentic, or is scriptural; or that sprinkling is baptism. I will now lay before you his supposed strong arguments by which he supports the validity of sprinkling for baptizing.

After stating the principles of the Baptists, as to the ordinance now considering, his first argument is, "Their learned men know that the word *baptizo* in *Luke* 11:38, and *baptismous* in *Mark* 7:2-5, are used to signify the same as *nipito* is, i.e. proper washing, or making clean by the application of water, in cases that do not necessarily require dipping as the mode of washing."

SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION

CEREMONIAL WASHING MEANS TO BATHE IN WATER, NOT SPRINKLE

The answer this is: That neither the learned men among the Baptists, nor the learned among any other class of men, know any such thing. Besides, *baptisthe*, in *Luke*, and *baptismous*, in *Mark*, have reference to, and mean, a ceremonial, a religious, or rather, as may be more properly called in these instances, a superstitious washing. What is meant by a ceremonial washing, you may see by looking into the ceremonial law: *Lev.* 11:32, and in *Num.* 19:19, where you will find that this ceremonial washing was, to put into water, or to bathe one's flesh in water.

You hence see that these two passages, with which Mr. Cleaveland lays the foundation of his support of sprinkling for baptism, utterly fail him, and come in as auxiliaries to confirm immersion as the only scripture baptism.

I will not say that *nipito* is never used to signify ceremonial washing, and so intend the washing or putting the hands into water, (*pugme*) with abundance of exactness, as Dr. Doddridge expounds it, or up to the elbows, as L'Enfant renders it.

But one thing is evident to all who will examine the texts, and compare them with the ceremonial washings of the ceremonial law, in conformity with which the Jewish doctors meant

to have their traditional ceremonies, that *baptizo* and *baptismos* are not used in the sense in which *nipto* generally is.

In every point of view, Mr. Cleaveland's texts utterly fail him, and go to destroy the custom or tradition he brought them to support. Besides, I do not find that *baptizo* is used, in any place, for washing the hands, or for washing or dipping a part of the body; or any other thing.

2.

ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO

"DIVERS WASHINGS" IN HEB. 9:10 MEANS "DIVERS SPRINKLINGS"

Mr. Cleaveland's argument is built upon *Hebrews 9:10*. where the Apostle speaks of (*diaphorais baptismois*) divers washings. Here, where the Apostle is speaking of divers ceremonial washings, or bathings, Mr. Cleaveland, without the least possible evidence, concludes the Apostle means divers sprinklings.

SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION

SPRINKLINGS WITH BLOOD NOT EQUIVALENT TO WASHING WITH WATER

The same answer which was given to the first argument belongs to this, as Mr. Cleaveland has produced no evidence, that (*baptismois*) washings, or bathings, means sprinklings, save that in the 13th and 21st verses. The Apostle makes use of the word sprinkle, when speaking of the application of blood, and speaking of the unclean; he says, they are *rantized*, and adds, almost all things are by law purged, *catherized*, not *baptized*, with blood.

It is not a little surprising that a man of Mr. Cleaveland's good sense should say, and that Dr. Lathrop, and other men of erudition, should follow him, in saying, these different sprinklings, in the 13th and 21st verses, refer to *baptismois*, when, had they looked three words farther, they would have found them to be, *kai dikaiomasi sarkos*, the liberal English of which is, "The ordinances of God concerning the ceremonial rites of bloody sacrifices!"

Had they looked into their Greek testaments, they might, with ease, have seen that their argument would not beat examination. Surely, had these gentlemen had the right question, they never would have compelled the Apostle to explain by the sprinkling of blood, what he meant by bathings or washings with water.

Perhaps a more forced exposition of scripture is seldom heard. Besides, the Apostle told them, by placing what is translated, carnal ordinances, between divers washings in the 10th, and sprinklings in the 13th and 21st verses, that he intended no such thing as they supposed.

3.

ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE

"BAPTO" AND "BAPTIZO" MEAN THE SAME THING AND SIGNIFY MORE THAN DIPPING INTO WATER

If I mistake not, Mr. Cleaveland's third argument is an attempt to prove that *bapto* and *baptizo* are used to signify some-thing more than to dip, put into water, &c. When the good man brought forward his argument, he forgot -- &c. -- which belongs to his quotation from Dr. Gale, and which includes immersion and overwhelming, and which comprises the whole which Mr. Cleaveland has proved that *baptizo* signifies.

But, waving his forgetfulness, we will attend to what he says. All which he appears to do here is, to show that *bapto* and *baptizo* are used to wash, dip and wet with sprinkling the dew of heaven, and to overwhelm. That is, *bapto* signifies to dip, put into water, wet with the dew of heaven, &c. and *baptizo* signifies to dip, put into water and overwhelm.

What is the consequence? According to Mr. Cleaveland, it is this: Because *bapto* is sometimes used to signify one's being wet with the distilling dew of heaven, &c. therefore *baptizo* signifies the same thing:

Because *bapto* signifies one place to wash without dipping, therefore *baptizo* signifies to wash without dipping; and because *bapto* is sometimes used to signify to color, or stain, by aspersion, or the like therefore *baptizo* is used in the same sense; therefore sprinkling is authentic baptism.

SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION

SIMILARITY OF WORDS IS NOT IDENTICAL WITH MEANING OF WORDS OR USE OF WORDS: "BAPTIZO" NEVER SIGNIFIES SPRINKLING!

What evidence, I pray you, my hearers, is there in all this? Would ten thousand such arguments afford you the least conviction, or gain your assent, where you had a cent to lose?

Every person of sense, who is acquainted with the Greek, would, generally speaking, allow Mr. Cleaveland's premises, that *bapto*, in different places, signifies the application of water in different ways; and that *baptizo* sometimes signifies overwhelming. But no person, who understands the matter, will allow his conclusion, for it hath no connection with the premises.

His argument, in plain English, is this: The verb to wet, sometimes signifies to sprinkle, as in a heavy dew we say it sprinkles, or wets; the verb to overwhelm, sometimes signifies to cover all over with water, as is the beach, by the flowing of the tide. Of consequence, to overwhelm is to sprinkle; therefore to sprinkle is authentic overwhelming, or baptism.

The fallacy of this argument is easily detected, and with the same ease may any one, who knows the different significations of *bapto* and *baptizo*, uncover the fallacy and complete inconclusiveness of Mr. Cleaveland's argument.

The plain truth is, he hath done his side a disservice; for by searching he hath found, and implicitly acknowledges, though not intentionally, and (I suppose) without knowing it, that no instance can be found where *baptizo* signifieth the application of water by sprinkling, or any other way, which does not imply overwhelming, or washing, that is, a ceremonial washing, which is bathing, or putting into water. But—

4.

ARGUMENT NUMER FOUR

BAPTISM [BY SPRINKLING] SIGNIFIES CHRIST'S BAPTIZING BELIEVERS WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT

There is another argument upon which Mr. Cleaveland chiefly dwells, and upon which he appears greatly to rest the defense of his whole cause. It is his strong hold against immersion, and for sprinkling; and it is this: Baptism with water, or baptism as a Christian ordinance, is to signify Christ's baptizing with the Holy Ghost.

I have no where found that he hath proved that this is the great and principal thing which baptism signifies; nor do I by any means obtain conviction that the mode of baptizing is to be determined, with certainty, from this particular thing, even should it be granted that one important design of baptism is to signify Christ's baptizing with the Holy Ghost.

But, as Mr. Cleaveland seems to depend upon the strength of this argument more than he does upon the strength of any other, we will grant for the present, that baptism with water was appointed particularly, if not mainly, to set forth the mode in which Christ baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

Now the great question is, In what manner or mode, by sprinkling or overwhelming, did Christ Jesus baptize with the Holy Ghost? Mr. Cleaveland in his treatise, replies abundantly, By sprinkling, certainly. We will put this subject to the test, by instancing the most remarkable

season which ever was, in which Christ, in a most remarkable, public and astonishing degree was baptizing with the Holy Ghost.

I presume were Mr. Cleaveland now alive, he could not, with any face of propriety, object against taking a sample for the whole, the most remarkable instance which ever hath been, and perhaps which ever will be exhibited of Christ's baptizing with the Holy Ghost.

I am willing to submit the strong argument of Mr. Cleaveland to this great sample of Christ's baptizing with the Holy Ghost. Are not all you, my hearers, willing to leave the weight of his argument to such a decision? I am persuaded you all say, yes.

SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ABOUT WHICH CHRIST SPOKE FAVORS IMMERSION NOT SPRINKLING!

AT PENEOST, THE DISCIPLES WERE "OVERWHELMED" WITH THE SPIRIT OF GOD, NOT "SPRINKLED" WITH THE SPIRIT.

We will then bring his argument to the proposed test. The instance which we will take, (for surely it is the most astonishing one,) is that which Christ foretold, as related, Acts 1:5. "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence."

The accomplishment of this prediction and promise we have related in the four first verses of the next chapter. It is thus: "When the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there was a sound from heaven, as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."

Here was truly a wonderful instance of Christ's baptizing with the Holy Ghost. Here, (a) All the house was filled with the sound, wind or Spirit from heaven. (b) Cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. (c) They were all filled with the Holy Ghost. We here see that they were all overwhelmed; for all the house, where they were sitting, was filled; and not only were they all overwhelmed, but they were also filled.

It is left for you to determine, what becomes of Mr. Cleaveland's argument, upon which he lays so much stress, and of which he speaks with so much confidence and not un-frequently with an air of triumph.

Is there a word about sprinkling in any part of it? or is there any thing which looks like it? Does it not look considerably like immersion, or overwhelming? At least, does it not favor immersion, or overwhelming, as much as it does sprinkling? If so, then it proves nothing for sprinkling. It is left with you to determine which side it favors.

It is possible, however, that some of you may suppose, that Mr. Cleaveland might intend *that* baptism, if it may be so called, which the Holy Ghost ministers, when it creates the soul anew. To this supposition, I will just observe, "The wind bloweth (saith Christ) where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell *whence* it *cometh* or *whither* it *goeth*; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Would it not be extreme folly to suppose that water baptism represents the *operations* of the Spirit, when none can know *whence* it *cometh*, or *whither* it *goeth*? It may represent the effect of the Spirit's operations; and it is called, a being born, not sprinkled, of the Spirit.

5.

ARGUMENT NUMBER FIVE

FIVE GREEK WORDS SIGNIFY "TO WASH"; THEREFORE BAPTISM HAS TO BE BY SPRINKLING

In reading Mr. Cleaveland's defense of sprinkling, as being authentic baptism, I noticed but one more distinct argument, and it is this: "*Nipto, baptizo, louo, brecho, pluno, or apopluno*, all signify to wash." The conclusion which he draws from this is, in short, the following: To baptize is not to immerse, but to sprinkle.

SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION

THERE IS NO CONNECTION BETWEEN MR. CLEAVELAND'S PREMISE AND HIS CONCLUSIONS: "COMMON WASHINGS" NOT EQUIVALENT TO SPRINKLING AND THEY FAVOR IMMERSION

I see no connection between his premise and conclusion. Besides, Mr. Cleaveland tells us, page 80, that the Jews, by adhering to the tradition of the elders, observed the washing of hands, and divers other things, as a religious ceremony.

Now, if all the words which Mr. C. mentions, signify to wash, and yet some of them signify common washing, and another, and that *baptizo*, signifies ceremonial washing, and that be to put into water, as is the case, what does his argument prove? It proves just nothing to his point.

Had he proved, what he hath not even attempted, that they all signify the same kind of washing, and that the washing signified was not immersion, but sprinkling only, then his conclusion would have followed, that sprinkling is baptism.

If the above arguments will not support Mr. Cleaveland's theory, it must all come down; for they are they substance, if not all the arguments, which he hath adduced, and I presume better cannot be found.

I thought to have taken Dr. Lathrop's arguments upon the same subject, into consideration; but upon re-examining them I find there is no material dissimilarity between his and Mr. Cleaveland's; they therefore both stand or fall together. A word or two may be here added.

A FINAL ARGUMENT DEFLATED

DR. LATHROP'S USE OF THE POST APOSTOLIC CHURCH FATHER CYPRIAN ACTUALLY VALIDATES IMMERSION AS THE ANCIENT MODE OF BAPTISM, WHILE ADMITTING THAT SPRINKLING WAS USED ONLY BY SO-CALLED "NECESSITY" NOT BY SCRIPTURAL PRECEPT

Dr. Lathrop assures us that Cyprian, who wrote within about one hundred and fifty years of the apostles, speaking of sprinkling, says, "In the sacrament of salvation (that is, baptism) when *necessity compels*, the shortest ways of transacting divine matters do, by God's grace, confer the whole benefit." The Doctor adds, "**The ancients practiced immersion.**" (pp. 24-25)

By this quotation of the Doctor's from Cyprian, and confession of his own, being put together, it appears at once that all his preceding arguments are erroneous; for Cyprian does not intimate the sprinkling was from heaven, but says it was from necessity.

Besides, his calling baptism the sacrament of salvation, shows us the error, whence the necessity of sprinkling came, namely, a belief that the ordinance of baptism was necessary to salvation.

This being the case, and it also being true, as the Doctor acknowledges, that the ancients practiced immersion, save when necessity compelled, as they erroneously supposed, the consequence is fairly this, that immersion is from heaven, the ancients being judges; and that sprinkling is from men, from necessity, or rather from error.

ONE MORE BRIEF REFUTATON

I thought to have added no more upon the Doctor's mode of Christian baptism. However, one argument ought to be taken out of his hands, lest it misguide some of his readers. He tells us, that *baptizo*, in Mark 7 and Luke 11 is used to signify the application of water to the hands. The only answer needed is, It is not thus said, in Mark, or Luke, or in any other part of the Bible. When the Doctor shall re-examine the passages, he will probably see the mistake.

CONCLUSION

IMMERSION

THE INSTITUTION OF HEAVEN

Will gentlemen, and Christians too, forever contend against *immersion*, the institution of heaven, and for *sprinkling*, which hath nothing but *error* and *convenience* for its support!