



THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

DALE'S CLASSIC BAPTISM.

Classic Baptism; an Inquiry into the Meaning of Baptism, as Determined by the usage of Classical Greek Writers. By JAMES W. DALE.
Philadelphia Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1868.

IT IS curious and even cheering to observe what varying forms are assumed by the uneasy and perturbed spirit of pedobaptism. For it shows that a great and evangelical religious body, professing, and in the main evincing unconditional allegiance to the Head and Legislator of the church, cannot sit down in a complacent acquiescence in an alleged and half-conscious inconsistency between its convictions and its practice. If it cannot tear itself from a usage hallowed by a venerable tradition and a thousand endearing associations, it will bend its energies to prove that that usage is at least not expressly discountenanced by the Divine Word. Hence every now and then, some fresh endeavor to meet the exigency; some fresh rearguing of the subject from the old stand-point; or the broaching of a new theory to bolster up a failing cause.

More than thirty years ago, Prof. Stuart brought his wide learning and conscientious industry to the task, but failed of satisfying the pedobaptist, and (though his article, somewhat annotated, would have made on the whole a fair Baptist tract,) the Baptist public. He fought it out on the old line, surrendering mainly, though not entirely, the philological argument, and throwing himself back chiefly on the indifference of a spiritual faith to the demands of a rigid ritualism. Dr. Edward Beecher subsequently entered the field, taking up a

new line of defence, and claiming that βαπτισμα, under the specific New Testament meaning of *purify*, threw its broad shelter over every form of administration. Much more recently the Rev. Charles Wolfe put forth a book, arguing that classic Greek baptism consisted in *drowning*, and thus seeking to sever entirely its connection with the New Testament ordinance. This is largely, though with many modifications, the position of the book before us. Classic baptism proper, if it does not shut up its subjects to absolute and inevitable drowning, yet comes so near to it as to be, in its primary import, wholly unfitted for a safe Christian immersion. Thus we have reached a new order of things to which we must adapt ourselves. *Tempora mutantur*;—the old arguments are become curiously antiquated. Once we had to resist the plea for too little water, now the demand for too much. Once we had to prove that βαπτισμα could not legitimately *sprinkle* its subjects; now we are put to our wit's end to prove that it will not necessarily *drown* them. When our brethren shall have decided on their ultimate line of defence and attack, we may know where to dispose of our own. Till then our condition is sufficiently perilous. Our strongest entrenchments of to-day may be snugly occupied by the enemy to-morrow, and our most effective batteries be spiked or adroitly turned upon ourselves. Our only safe policy meantime would seem to be "a masterly inactivity."

The works of Dr. Beecher and Mr. Wolfe, especially the latter, were received with loud demonstrations of applause, and each, we believe, before the echoes of the plaudits had fairly died away, was quietly shelved and consigned to a kindly oblivion. Mr. Dale has met a warmer welcome and louder praise than either of his predecessors. Men eminent in the pulpit and the lecture-room have been unable adequately to express their admiration of the extraordinary skill and learning which he has brought to his task, and their delight at the accession to their ranks of this new and potent ally. Unless the enthusiastic utterances of the pedobaptist press are to be taken at a large discount, the "last word" would seem to have just been, or just about to be uttered, and the troublesome Baptist ghost of immersion laid in a grave from which it will have no resurrection.

Mr. Dale must not be deceived by this multitudinous din of applause. The question will not *stay* settled, or rather, it will not stay unsettled. Mr. Dale virtually misrepresents the facts when he speaks of "discussion" having "continued for centuries." There is scarcely a question in the whole range of theological literature on which the judgments of competent men have been so nearly unanimous as on the meaning of βαπτισμα. On matters of church polity and Chris-

tian doctrine, there have been among men of equal and the highest attainments, wide and obstinate differences of opinion. But on the word prescribing the New Testament rite of baptism there has been no difference of scholarly opinion that was worth the naming. The controversy has not been between Baptists and pedobaptists. It has been between pedobaptist principle and pedobaptist practice, between pedobaptism in the study and pedobaptism in the congregation. All that Baptists have needed to do, regarding the meaning of the word, has been to array the long line of pedobaptist testimony against itself. The works of Gale, Booth, Carson, Judson, Fuller, and the recent exhaustive and overwhelming treatise of Dr. Conant, were absolutely unneeded, except as *resumés* of the argument, and manuals of practical instruction. And the pedobaptist, on the other hand, who assumes the theoretical championship of sprinkling, has one of the most ungracious of tasks. His principal controversy is with his friends. His chief foes—and they are a long and formidable array—are they of his own household. In entering the lists he finds occasion for the utmost display of courage and knightly prowess. As he approaches the barrier where stands arrayed the long and frowning line of his opponents he may well pause before the stalwart and steel-clad forms whose lances he has undertaken to shiver, and whose harness he seeks to penetrate. It is not merely a few erratic and outlawed "Baptists" whom he defies and summons to the encounter. It is the leaders and rabbies of his own religious denomination—be that denomination what it may. Whether Catholic or Protestant, Lutheran or Calvinist, Episcopalian or Presbyterian, he will find on this subject, the magnates whose names he is wont to swear by, in the camp of his opponents. If this almost unbroken body of opinion—this collective and all but unanimous testimony of the learned world, embodied in lexicons, commentaries, and church histories, and flanked by the uniform usage of the Greek Church, and, until a very recent period, the prevalent usage of the English—if all this can now be done away, so be it. Baptists, we trust, will accept the situation, and bow gracefully to the discoveries that shall discredit the testimony of fathers and reformers, of theologians and commentators, of lexicographers and church historians, of the Luthers and the Calvins, the Scaligers and the Grotiuses, the Bentleys and the Bloomfields, the Meyers and the De Wettes, the Neanders and the Stanleys of the church.

We respectfully submit to Mr. Dale that it cannot be done. It is too late in the day to reverse the settled verdict of the world regarding the force of a Greek word of so frequent recurrence

and so obvious import as βαπτίζω. No amount of philological thimble-rigging—no tricks of critical legerdemain—no dexterous, or would-be dexterous manipulation of the words βάπτω and βαπτίζω, *tingo* and *mergo*, *dip* and *immerse* can alter the facts, or vary in the slightest degree the essential aspects of the question. Of these feats of petty sleight of hand Mr. Dale's book is full. It looks like an elaborate and persistent effort to trick βαπτίζω out of its honest meaning, and extract from sophistry and special pleading a signification which refuses to come from usage and the lexicons. The attempt will prove futile. Without learning, without philosophy, and without candor, the book will follow its predecessors to that hopeless submersion to which its logic dooms every consistent adherent of βαπτίζω.

We must add that of the real nature and magnitude of his undertaking, the author himself seems utterly unconscious. He has set himself to break a lance with every lexicographer and every scholar who ever undertook to define βάπτω and βαπτίζω. The grand aim of his book is to dissociate these two words from each other, as well as their respective English exponents *dip* and *immerse*; to unchain βάπτω from the car of βαπτίζω, to which Baptist prejudice has held it attached on account "of the vital connection of the act of *dipping* with the Baptist system," and by remanding the two words to entirely distinct categories of usage, to tear from "immersion" the aid and comfort derived from a surreptitious and illogical "*dipping*," and thus drive the Baptist either out of the water, or *into* it to its legitimate "suffocation." A less important, but by no means unimportant, point is the illegitimacy of the compound "immerse" as representative of the simple verb βαπτίζω. Mr. Dale insists on "merse."

Now we say nothing at present of the truth or value of these distinctions. We simply say that in insisting on them Mr. Dale is setting himself against a usage that is absolutely universal. Mr. Dale never opened a lexicon, nor read a commentator that did not systematically ignore these distinctions; that did not define βάπτω and βαπτίζω by the same words; that did not freely interchange, *dip*, *immerse*, *plunge*, etc., as substantial equivalents, and totally disregard his pet canon regarding the rendering of a simple verb by a compound. But of this fact Mr. Dale appears as ignorant as if he lived in another planet. From the beginning of his book to the end of it we have met with only one, and that the slightest shadow of recognition that the confusion and the blunders he complains of are chargeable upon any body but Baptists. Now we submit that considering the heinousness of the offense and the gravity of its consequences, it

would be but reasonable that he should saddle their fair share of the responsibility on the shoulders of his friends, and allow the Baptists the few crumbs of extenuation and comfort allowed them by the fact that they share their unscholarly proceeding with the universal scholarship of the world! That while they are committing the unpardonable blunder of treating βάπτω and βαπτίζω, "dip" and "immerse," as essential synonyms, and of loading down the simple βαπτίζω with the weight of a superfluous and illegitimate preposition, they are merely doing what every lexicographer and every critic that ever undertook to render the two words either into Latin or English has done before and beside them!

But not such are the tactics of our author. "Immerse and dip are confounded together by Baptist writers, and interchanged at will. There is no authority for so doing." (p. 16.) "When Baptist writers say that βάπτω and βαπτίζω mean to dip; do they mean understandingly to say," etc. (p. 25.) "If Baptist writers have failed to mark this discrimination—they must not be astonished if there is questioning," etc. (p. 26.) "Have Baptist writers maturely considered these distinctions," etc. (p. 26.) "This utter confusion of these words so long persisted in by Baptist writers," etc. (p. 38.) "The best foundation on which Baptist writers can stand in their plea for dip," etc. (p. 270.) And so on *ad nauseam* and *ad finem*—from the opening of the book to its close. All the obloquy of a "confusion" that has reigned through all the centuries, and is now first dispelled by the luminous logic of Mr. Dale, heaped upon the heads of the Baptists! If Mr. Dale knows no better, his ignorance is scarcely less than disgraceful. If he *does* know better, the terms appropriate to his proceeding would be still less complimentary. To which horn of the dilemma he may prefer to attach himself it is not ours to determine. We incline to the kindlier and less discreditable hypothesis. We doubt if his book indicates a knowledge of any usage other than that of "Baptist writers."

This fact furnishes the key-note to the book; as is its general spirit so are its details. What professes to be and ought to be, a dispassionate and scholarly examination of certain Greek and English words, never for one moment rises out of the atmosphere of sectarian partizanship into that of broad scholarship, and ingenuous criticism. It is one long endeavor by nice verbal distinctions to pit "Baptist writers" against each other, and against themselves, and the result is worthy of the purpose and the means. We proceed to inform our readers of its achievements.

After an outline of his proposed course of inquiry, the author

favors us with several so-called "Baptist postulates." The first in the series is that "*βαπτίζω* throughout the entire course of Greek literature, has but one meaning, which is definite, clear, precise, and easy of translation." This proposition, sagaciously remarks Mr. Dale, "is not self-luminous with truth." Doubtless; and neither is it "self-luminous with truth," that it is a "Baptist postulate" at all. And as Mr. Dale proceeds with great vigor and effect to demolish his own assertion, and to show abundantly that "Baptist writers" have united in asserting no such absolute singleness of meaning, and facility of translating, we may spare ourselves the trouble of refuting it. Baptist writers have held no peculiar views regarding the meaning of *βαπτίζω*. While concurring substantially with all scholarly authorities in affirming one fundamental idea controlling all the usages of the word, they have varied indefinitely in their modes of statement, and the special shades of meaning to be assigned to it in particular cases. No Baptist, we presume, has ever dreamed that one word could invariably translate it, or that it was, in every instance of its numberless rhetorical uses, easy of translation. The "one single word"; for its uses in all Greek literature, is an honor that has been reserved for Mr. Dale. With his invariable barbarism of "merse" he has done what no Baptist ever dreamed of attempting.

Our author's second "Baptist postulate" is this: "*βαπτίζω* and *βάπτω* have precisely the same meaning, *dyeing* excepted: in all other respects, whether as to form, or force, or effect, they differ neither more nor less." As to the absolute identity of the two words in "form," the possession of eyes and an acquaintance with the Greek alphabet, should have saved Baptist scholars from so gross a blunder. Regarding the rest of the proposition we have already declared our judgment. There is not a shadow of ground for imputing to Baptist writers any peculiar doctrine regarding the relations of *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω*. They have treated them as all lexicographers and scholars—from Stephens to Robinson, have concurred in treating them, as substantial equivalents, rendering them indifferently by *dip*, *immerse*, *plunge*, *submerge*, &c. That they have attached any controversial importance to the relation,—that they have held to the "dipping" of *βάπτω* to escape the threatened "drowning" of *βαπτίζω*, is a pure conceit of Mr. Dale's. We are not sure that Mr. Dale himself did not catch the suggestion from Dr. Dagg, who distinguishing the "slight and temporary immersion" of *βάπτω* from the "drowning and ship-sinking" affinities of *βαπτίζω*, "touches" to our author's excited imagination, "the nerve of truth," "so as to send a shock through all the Baptist system." The "Baptist system," it is comforting to know, was insensible to the "shock," and has survived it.

"Postulate" third runs as follows: "*Βαπτίζω* expresses an act, a definite act; mode and nothing but mode; *to dip*. *Βάπτω* (primary) expresses an act, a definite act; mode and nothing but mode, *to dip*." Of the relation of the two words and their meaning, as held by Baptists, we have already spoken. On his authority for this postulate, Mr. Dale himself shall enlighten us. On p. vi. he says: "Some hold it"—viz., the "definite act" theory—"absolutely (Carson). Some doubt (Gale). Some deny (Fuller). Some *non liquet* (Conant)." Again at p. 32: "If it shall be found that between postulates and writings there is no harmony; that between writer and writer there is as little; that the pages of the same writer, compared with each other, perpetuate this disharmony; that there has never been any attempt by any one writer, through these three hundred years, to carry these postulates through all Greek literature,"—then (we will take the liberty of following Mr. Dale's "if" to its logical conclusion) then the idea of propounding them as "Baptist postulates" is ludicrously absurd, and would imply in "Baptist writers" a stupidity only equalled by that of Mr. Dale in affirming them to be "Baptist postulates," and then proceeding to show, with Homeric fullness and vivacity, that they have been flatly disowned by every Baptist who within "these three hundred years" has written upon the question!

Nor do we believe that any Baptist scholar has ever maintained that these words mean *dip* in Mr. Dale's narrow sense of the term. As Prof. Stuart says "*βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω* mean to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerse* into any thing liquid; all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this;" so Baptists generally have freely interchanged the words *dip*, *plunge*, *immerse*, &c., as allied in their fundamental import. They have not trod anxiously as near an ambuscade of synonyms. They have not trembled for fear of being submerged in a tidal wave of nice verbal distinctions. They have affirmed that "dipping is baptising, and baptising is dipping," in the sense in which they would have said "immersion is baptising, and baptising is immersion;" they have employed the liberty hitherto accorded to every translator, of varying words according to diversities of idiom, without dreaming of an assault from Crabbe and Mr. Dale.

But precisely here is our author's strong point. "He is nothing if not" verbally and intensely "critical." He does not assail us with Stephens and Scapula. It is not clear that he has (more than) the slenderest acquaintance with critics and commentators. But he has studied English synonyms. He has determined the minute shadings that mark off "dip," "plunge," and "immerse," (as well as "bapt," "merse," "inn," and "intuspose,") and thus completely armed, dis-

charges his volley of synonyms with fatal execution into the Baptist camp. From the point of view of the synonyms he passes in review the Baptist authors, to see how they have made good their "postulates," and, as might be expected, finds them wofully deficient. Where all was to be definite, luminous, and exact, there reigns a perfect Babel of contradictory and unintelligible testimonies. One says "dip;" another "dip, and nothing but dip," yet presently adds "or immerse,"—a "note of discord," says the inspector. Another equally discordantly adds "plunge;" another takes "sinking" and "drowning" under the shelter of, βαπτίζω. Another hints at that distinction of βάπτω and βαπτίζω which sends "a shock through the whole Baptist system;" and to crown all, Dr. Conant brings up the rear with "dip, immerse, immerge, whelm, imbathe;" and we know not how many more enormities, to throw our author's critical soul into utter bewilderment and perplexity. Where and what, then, is the "one definite meaning" of βαπτίζω? Is dipping plunging? Is plunging immersing? Are "sinking," "submerging," and "laying under water" identical? Does not "plunge" express "a movement characterized by rapidity and force?" and "dip, a gentle, downward movement, entering slightly into some diverse element with immediate return"? Does not "immerse" like βαπτίζω express "no definite form of act" and "intuspose its object within a fluid element without providing for its removal?" And are "Baptist writers" to be allowed to toss about indiscriminately words so radically diverse, and, postulating one meaning through all Greek literature, and that *dip*, then thus wantonly to make shipwreck of their professions and the synonyms? And can we wonder that thus summoned before his critical tribunal he brands upon them utter "failure" to meet the demands of their postulates?

We assure our readers that we have indulged in neither caricature nor hyperbole. We have given, above, the substantial import of some fifty pages of as barren verbal criticism as it was ever our misfortune to read, and, we believe, the misfortune of any sensible man to write. We venture the following specimen:—

We are told that this word "expresses putting into or putting under, immersing or submerging." Does Dr. Conant mean by this language that the word means either to put *into* or to put *under*,—but he cannot tell which? Or that sometimes it means the one, and sometimes the other; not being fixed in its meaning? Or, that it means both; there being no difference between "into" and "under?" Or, that it means, exactly, neither, but some third thing? Surely we are left quite in the dark as to any definite idea of the action expressed by this word.

"To put" gives no definite information, for it has sixty-seven variations of usage according to Webster, and sixty-seven more perhaps might be added. No valuable aid is found in "put *into*," or "put *under*," for these terms are very far from agreeing in one.

Such pitiful drivel—and the book is plethoric with it—Mr. Dale, we suppose, calls criticism. As to his general review of the usage of Baptist authors, we need only remark that they have used words in their current acceptation, with no reference to nice shades of difference, and varying their renderings according to the demands of idiom, and those slight diversities of view under which the same fundamental thought presents itself to honest and independent minds—and his phantasmagoria of contradictions vanishes like the fabric of a dream.

The "failure" he pronounces to be threefold: it embraces the "act," the "object," the "end" of the rite. How the Baptist case fails to be made out regarding the "act," we have already seen. After chasing it through its Protean trasmutations of *dip*, *plunge*, *submerge*, *immerse*, *put under water*, and failing to hold it in any "questionable shape," he turns away in despair. The Sphinx never propounded a darker enigma, and Mr. Dale is no Œdipus for its solution.

It fares no better with the "object." At first, indeed, all here seems plain sailing. "The man," "the subject," "the body," "the candidate," "the whole body,"—here is "diversity of phraseology, but unity of material object," blandly declares our master of synonyms, and delighted that our unintelligible "act," has at least an intelligible "object," we are about to bow ourselves out of the judicial presence. But stay: the law has yet another hold on us. The theory is all right, but how about the "practice?" Baptist principle requires the submerging of "the whole body" in water in the rite of baptism; but the practice nullifies the principle. According to the unfortunate concession of Dr. Ripley "the going down into the water" is no part of the baptism. It requires but half an eye to see the consequence—a consequence which scatters to the winds our pretended fidelity to the divine ordinance, and completely vitiates every alleged Baptist baptism from the days of Philip and the Eunuch until now. Does not a theoretical Baptist baptism demand, as part of the rite, the submerging of the whole body in water? And does not Baptist practice render this impossible by submerging a part of the body previously to the ceremony? Can he be totally immersed in baptism half of whose body is immersed already? Is the dipping of the "head and shoulders" the dipping of the whole body? And what refuge from

this logic, but to cease to profess immersion, or else adopt the benevolent suggestion of Mr. Dale, provide ourselves with "ropes and pulleys" and have the "body slid off the bank by a little clever management?" "Never fear," exclaims our *captator verborum*: "the thing has been done. None need hesitate through fear that 'ropes and pulleys' could not secure an orthodox Greekly baptism."

Our pen fairly tingles with shame as it records this strange compound of folly and irreverence. We will not insult the understanding of our readers by a moment's reply to such incredible puerility. Is there another living man, out of an idiots' asylum, who would maintain that the Baptists "have never in one instance, for three hundred years," consistently "obeyed the command" of immersion, because the candidate descended into the water in order to its performance? Did any body but Mr. Dale ever fancy that the fact of Philip and the Eunuch's going down into the water, not only does not prove that there was a consistent Baptist baptism, but proves irrefragably that there was not? Would any body else construe the natural act precedent and preparatory to the ceremony, into an effectual bar to its performance? And will not Mr. Dale's facetious suggestion of "ropes and pulleys," and "clever management," and "sliding the body off from the bank," be relished as a good joke by the large denomination into whose face he flings his impertinent and insulting proposal? If he can make any thing by showing up the inconsistencies of "Baptist writers," he is welcome to the gain and glory of the achievement. But let him spare his scoffings at the ordinance which nineteen twentieths of the Christian world believe to have been hallowed alike by the command and the example of the Redeemer.

But the "failure" is equally signal in regard to the "end." The professed end is *immersion*; the consistent end would be *drowning*; the actual end is *dipping*. "The idea of emersion," justly says Dr. Conant, "is not contained in the Greek word: but a living being put under the water without intending to drown him, is of course to be immediately withdrawn from it." Mr. Dale resists the humane suggestion. "True, there is nothing in the word to prevent its object from being 'immediately taken out of the water;' but it is also true that the word *never contemplates* the removal of its object from the condition in which it has placed it." "I remember but one solitary case in the classics to which the supposed case is applicable." "Baptize will put a man into the water, but it never did, and never will take him out." To enter the water, then, under its auspices is imminently perilous. It has no thought of extricating its subject, and if he emerges it is with no thanks to the hard-hearted agent that has

"mersed" him. Commend us, then, to the tender mercies of βάπτω. She stipulates in advance to bring her votary to the surface, and hence the death-grasp with which Baptists cling to βάπτω as sister and confederate of βαπτίζω. They stand in imperative need of both. If they go in simply for a "bapting" (in our author's classic phraseology), they fail of the divinely commanded *baptizing*. If they go in for a "baptizing," they run the hazard of that unpleasant "suffocation," which Mr. Dale tells us is so common an attendant on "drowning." Thus, if they only "baptize" they *drown*; if they only "bapt," they emerge indeed, but the "dipping," brief as it was, has been long enough to submerge their principles.

The curtain falls, then, on a scene dark enough to satisfy our bitterest enemies. The "act" inextricably confused by all that muddle of ideas implied in dipping, immersing, plunging, laying under water, putting into or under the water! The "object," theoretically, "the whole body," but practically only "the head and shoulders!" And the "end" inevitable drowning, unless averted by an act of lexicographical dishonesty, which the Furies of the murdered βαπτίζω stand ready to avenge with a whip of scorpions by the hands of Mr. Dale! We wait to see the curtain rise on his "renewed" and independent investigations.

These consist primarily in establishing the complete distinction of βάπτω and βαπτίζω. They belong, he maintains, to entirely separate classes of words, and never can be, and in all Greek literature never are, interchanged or confounded. Βάπτω expresses primarily and ordinarily a definite act, *to dip*, implying a gentle motion, a superficial entrance, and a speedy withdrawal. Βαπτίζω implies no "definite form of act," but a *state* of complete "intusposition," for an unlimited time, and without contemplating its termination. The distinction thus established Mr. Dale applies rigorously to the Baptists. He can no longer allow them to play fast and loose with totally diverse words; to go into the water under the conduct of βαπτίζω, in pretended obedience to the divine command, and just when that would send them to the bottom, raise the cowardly cry of "Help me," βάπτω "or I sink," and on its illegitimate shoulders scramble back to the shore with life and dishonor. He will force them to an alternative. They must choose whom they will serve. If βαπτίζω is their idol, let them follow it—to the drowning; if βάπτω, let them abandon their claim to preëminent fealty to the divine ordinance. If they choose to remain *dippers*, let them say so, and give up their unfounded, not to say hypocritical pretence of immersion. If they choose to become *baptizers* let them become so, and manfully face the consequences.

Now on this, his grand position, we beg to offer a few general remarks. And first, this utter and absolute distinction between βάπτω and βαπτίζω, he has not proved, and it is scarcely too much to say that he has not *attempted* to prove it. He has *affirmed* it over and over with an emphasis and confidence that he has doubtless mistaken for a demonstration. But there is not a paragraph in his book in which he has endeavored to maintain it by scholarly argumentation. He seems to have *constructed* it by reasoning back from the supposed distinction between "dip" and "immerse;" and, assuming the corresponding distinction in Greek, he settles every individual case by a fierce assertion of the general law. His whole argument is little else than a begging of the question, and reasoning in a circle. If he alleges the examples which he adduces in proof of the meaning of "dip," we reply that that is not in question. Nobody doubts that βάπτω may mean "to dip." The only question, and one which Mr. Dale has not taken a single honest step toward settling, is whether βάπτω and βαπτίζω are in usage separated by that broad and impassable line which he affirms, and which he thinks (no matter whether justly) he has established between "dip" and "immerse."

But, secondly, Mr. Dale's position is intrinsically improbable, and in fact erroneous. That the two words are entirely independent, and never interchanged in all Greek literature, no scholar would affirm for a moment. Closely allied in *origin*, they cannot but have had the same fundamental signification. That they should *continue* wholly identical in meaning, was, of course, improbable. Βάπτω, the more primitive word, early specialized itself, from dipping into a coloring fluid, into *dyeing*—a meaning which need not, and did not pass over to βαπτίζω. Βαπτίζω, on the other hand, partly, perhaps, from a real or supposed *causative* force in its ending, and still more, we think, from the lengthened and heavier character of its form (analogously to the heavier Imperfect forms as compared with the lighter Second Aorists), became naturally applied ordinarily to immersions of a more formal character and longer duration, while the shorter and lighter βάπτω (like the English *dip*) ordinarily denoted the lighter and more transient immersions. Thus arose the distinction suggested by Dr. Dagg, giving a partial foundation for the dogma of Mr. Dale. But in the unqualified form in which Mr. Dale states it, the doctrine is totally untrue, and his canon constructed on *a priori* grounds, with no regard to etymology, and little regard to usage, is largely false, and, so far as true, scientifically worthless. The radical identity of the two words in meaning is determined by their etymological relationship. Their substantial identity of usage is shown by the fact that lexicogra-

phers and critics uniformly render them by the common words *mergo*, *immergo*, *dip*, *immerse*, *submerge*, *plunge*, etc., indiscriminately; while their easy interchangeableness can be shown abundantly from usage. In three of Mr. Dale's examples of βάπτω the scholiast replaces it by βαπτίζω. Aratus sends the sun to his ocean bed with βάπτω, and the Orphic Argonautæ with βαπτίζω. The defiled Egyptian (Herod. ii. 44,) removes his pollution by βάπτω. Naaman the Syrian, Judith in the Bethulian encampment, the Pharisee coming home from the market, the votary of the Expiatrix (Plut. de Superst., 3), all perform their ritual cleansing by βαπτίζω, (neither of them intending to be *drowned*.) Hierocles (in Suidas) *dips* (ἔβαψε) the hollow of his hand in blood and sprinkles the judge; the voyager on the Nile drinks, (Achil. Tat. ii. 14) by *immersing* (βαπτισας) his hollowed hand into the river and filling it; and the dying Roman general (Plut. Parall., Gr. et. Rom. iii.) dips, immerses (βαπτίζεν) his hand with blood in order to inscribe a trophy. Nebuchadnezzar took a long and thorough bathing in the dews of heaven with βάπτω, while Philip (Polyæn. iv. 2, 6) played the game of mutual dipping or immersing (with no drowning purposes,) with δια-βαπτίζομαι. We might multiply our examples indefinitely, but we will simply add that every ritual immersion of the New Testament (expressed by βαπτίζω, and with no purpose to *drown*) refutes our author's position. Two or three of the above examples are, indeed, from Scripture, which we must be permitted to adduce until the light of Mr. Dale's final volume shall dispel our darkness on Judaic and Scripture baptism. In some of the above passages, also, we have crossed the track of Mr. Dale's criticisms. Several of these we shall have occasion to notice. Such as we do not, the learned reader who will consult them (*e. g.*, pp. 271, 275, 343,) will excuse us from replying to. Like most of the book they exhibit powers of philological criticism which, diligently cultivated, will make Mr. Dale illustrious when Bentley and Hermann are forgotten. We repeat: none will deny the partial truth of Mr. Dale's distinction; but asserted without limit or qualification, it becomes a falsehood and absurdity.

But we remark, thirdly, that however clearly and absolutely the distinction were made out, it is utterly without significance in the baptismal controversy. Though βάπτω were proved a thousand times over to mean *dip*, in the rigidist sense, and never interchangeable with βαπτίζω and *immerse*, it would beto Baptists a matter of absolute indifference. It could not put the weight of the shadow of a feather into the scales of the argument. If "Baptist writers" have maintained that "dipping was baptism," it was in the times of that ignorance in which the torch of Mr. Dale's synonyms had not shed its

light upon the world, and they lay enveloped in the common darkness which practically confounded it with "immerse." We do not believe the Baptist writer ever lived who was afraid to trust himself and his cause to the "uncovenanted mercies" of βαπτίζω in its most absolute idea of submersion. Granting that βάπτω *always* engages to take its subject from the water (which we do not believe), and that βαπτίζω *never* does (which we readily admit), we have Mr. Dale's reluctant confession that it interposes no obstacles to his coming out. True, he claims for βαπτίζω "mersion" for "an indefinitely protracted" period. But "indéfininitely" is a skillfully chosen word, and may cover any space from a second to a century. Βαπτίζω abundantly meets the Baptist exigencies. It lays its subject under the water; it does not hold him there a single moment. Its whole function is fulfilled with the act of submersion; it offers no shadow of an obstacle to his instant emergence from his watery entombment. We have the utmost confidence in the kindly purpose of βαπτίζω and of Him who has made its liquid grave the external portal to his kingdom. Neither it nor He intends to drown us. We let βαπτίζω take us into the water, and can trust to men's instinctive love of life, their common sense, their power of volition and normal muscular action, to bring them safely out. We assure Mr. Dale that the experience of centuries proves this reliance to be entirely safe. Men will not commit either homicide or suicide for a synonym. They will not either drown others, or submit to drowning themselves, simply *because they have not been commanded not to*. In a matter so precious as life they instinctively take the benefit of the *permission to live*; and Mr. Dale's elaborate argument, if his success in it had been as complete as his failure, is a pure superfluity, and a grand impertinence. He may dissociate βάπτω and dip, from βαπτίζω and immerse, as completely as he pleases; he may sink them in the Styx, or roll over them the waters of the Atlantic. The distinction is absolutely destitute of the slightest harm to the Baptist argument. The law of God in Revelation sends the Baptist down into the waters of immersion; when it is accomplished, the equally imperative law of God in nature brings him safely out.

But finally, granting the distinction perfectly established, and in fact so far as it is established, the proper word for the ordinance is not "dip" but "immerse," not βάπτω but βαπτίζω. The *exclusive* use of βαπτίζω is explicable, indeed, on the ground that the word employed in the original command would naturally become, with all the disciples, the technical designation of the rite. But as between the two, βαπτίζω is the appropriate word, partly from its greater

length, weight and dignity of form, and still more from its distinctive import. It is not a dipping that our Lord instituted, but an immersion. He did not command to *put people into the water and take them out again*, but to *put them under the water, to submerge them, to bury them symbolically in the grave of their buried Redeemer, like him, indeed, not to remain there, but with him to arise to a newness of life*. This arising, though essential to the completeness of the transaction, could not be included in the designation of the rite any more than the rising of the Redeemer could be included in the words denoting his crucifixion and his burial. In its primary idea the Christian baptism is a *burial*, a burial with Christ, and to change it into a "dipping" for the sake of a totally superfluous provision against drowning, is to divest it of its symbolical significance and moral dignity. We repeat, with emphasis, for the consideration of our Baptist brethren: Christian baptism is no mere literal and senseless "dipping," assuring the frightened candidate of a safe exit from the water: it is a symbolical immersion, in which the believer goes with sublime and solemn trust into a figurative burial, dying to sin for a life with Christ; and just as far as Mr. Dale's distinction holds good (which even thus far *he* has not established), βαπτίζω, and not βάπτω, is the only suitable designation of the baptismal ordinance. The early Israelites were baptized to Moses in the cloud and in the sea. They emerged indeed and were intended to emerge, at last. But it was in their wondrous march through that long and fearful night, with the double wall of water rolled up on either side, and the column of fiery cloud stretching its enshrouding folds above them, it was in this, and not in the closing emersion, that they were baptized into their allegiance to their great Lawgiver and Leader. Mr. Dale will ridicule this "burial-baptism," for he has done it already (p. 95); but to the apostle of the Gentiles it was solemnly significant.

We return to our author. After entertaining those who will read it with a dissertation of some twenty pages on "bury, drown, and whelm" (as words of the class of βαπτίζω), he proceeds to define βαπτίζω more fully, and then look after a "representative word," by which uniformly to designate it, and thus achieve the result of which "Baptist writers" have so signally failed. He admits it impossible to find any one word entirely adequate, but thinks it better "in controversy" to make the endeavor. Most men would think that "in" or out of "controversy" the best rendering of a word is that which in each case most nearly reproduces in idiomatic English, the precise force of the original. But Mr. Dale's tactics are peculiar. He finds an extraordinary virtue in words. He entraps the Baptists in a pit-fall of

words. He now waves his wand, and summons trooping from the vasty deep, an array of words to submit to him their respective claims to "represent" βαπτίζω through all Greek literature. The process is edifying to follow.

The first claimant (*horrescimus referentes*!) is *drown*. "To drown is in some respects quite a favorable representative word." Never mind the reasons: they are pretty nearly decisive, and we are on the point of being startled by a decision which will send every victim of βαπτίζω, past, present, and to come, to a watery grave, when our judge relaxes, and his humanity gets the better of his logic. With inimitable *nâiveté* and a touching tenderness he remarks: "but in translating to *drown* we should assuredly be embarrassed by the greatly predominant meaning—to destroy life by suffocation under water." The kind-hearted man! From much of his book we should have supposed that so trifling a consideration would be anything but embarrassing. But he was merely playing with our fears, and reminding us, if he were only so disposed, to what a terrible fate our senseless Baptist obstinacy might consign us. He dismisses *drown*, but lets it, as it retires, fling a Parthian arrow behind it—dodge it if we can: "Nevertheless it is of importance to state that this Greek word is fairly, though inadequately represented by *drown*." In what the inadequacy consists we will not stop to speculate. We simply take issue with the author, and deny that βαπτίζω ever properly means to *drown*. "Drowning" is, in usage, only figuratively applied to inanimate things, and though βαπτίζω cannot take sentient beings out of the water, neither can it of itself push their submersion to the extent of drowning. Drowning may accompany, and, under the circumstances, be *implied* in βαπτίζω, but is not *expressed* by it. Mr. Dale's humanity has stood him in stead of knowledge. It has saved him from the blunder of adopting as its "representative" a word which not only does not ordinarily, but strictly speaking *never*, represents βαπτίζω.

"Whelm" and "steep" are examined, but do not meet the case. "Inn" is a favorite with the author, but after the dalliance of three paragraphs, is denied the post of honor. "Immerse is peremptorily excluded," because "compounded with a preposition," and for other reasons perhaps equally cogent. "Baptize" is smilingly regarded as a candidate for the secondary meaning of βαπτίζω, "as expressing controlling influence," and though dismissed at present, we can divine that it is intended to do good service in the coming times of "Judaic" and "Johannic" baptism.

Our judge finally lights down on "merse," and this word with

steady hand, and with none of the "gerrymandering" whose "full power" he urbanely remarks would "be taxed to express the ins and outs of Baptist writers in jotting down the 'one only meaning of βαπτίζω through all Greek literature,'" he carries this word, sense or nonsense, through all the usages of βαπτίζω which he cites. Certainly we are far from complaining of his choice, and on the whole concur with him in its adoption. We congratulate him on his success—on an achievement whose significance he has himself, perhaps, failed fully to appreciate. We congratulate him on having solved the problem, and adjusted the "conflict of the ages." "Mersion" is a good word; we welcome it as a universal exponent of βαπτίζω. Pedobaptists, from their enthusiasm over his book, we are sure will follow their leader in this felicitous adjustment. We can almost pledge Baptists to its reception. We might, indeed, put in a modest plea for our pet *im*, just to smooth off the English, and make the "mersion" a shade more classical. But all parties must sacrifice something, and where so much is at stake, we choke down our æsthetic objections, and dropping "some natural tears," go in for the compromise. Baptists, then, will lop off the obnoxious *im*; pedobaptists shall make whatever little concessions are required, and we all meet together on the common ground, or rather in the common waters of "mersion." No more sprinkling, no more pouring, no more dipping, no more immersing, no more plunging, no more drowning—nothing but mersing! Pedobaptists shall revise King James' Bible, and we will revise the Baptist revision. "Then went out to him Judæa and Jerusalem—and were mersed by him in the Jordan." "And John was mersing in Enon near Salim, because there was much water there." "And they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he mersed him." A Daniel come to judgment! we thank him for teaching us this word.

We might here bid good-bye to Mr. Dale. In demonstrating the drowning propensities of βαπτίζω he has made it necessary to find for himself and friends some escape from the consequences of his own work. For this terrible word βαπτίζω lays its injunction on them as well as on us. The ark of deliverance from its submerging flood is found in a secondary meaning, viz.: that of *exerting a controlling influence*, to the expounding of which the last half of his book is devoted, and which independently, of any outward form, admits the largest variety of *modes* of exerting it, dipping always excepted. But as Baptists have no fear of βαπτίζω primary, they have no need to resort to βαπτίζω secondary. As we can come legitimately out of the literal immersion, we have not the slightest interest in resolving it into the

gaseous vagueness of a "controlling influence." It is with simple curiosity, therefore, that we follow Mr. Dale into this department of his verbal manipulations. We notice first, however, some of his preliminary illustrations of the classic usage of βάπτω. From his success in these we may forecast his achievements with βαπτίζω.

His first examples illustrate his meaning of *dip*—a meaning which none will dispute. It will be remembered that he links βάπτω, *dip*, and *tingo*, in close union, and separates them "wide as the poles asunder" from βαπτίζω, *mergo*, *immergo* (and all manner of compound verbs) and *immerse*. The first example we notice is p. 30, καὶ ναὺς γὰρ ἔβαζεν (Eurip. Orest. 705)—"for a vessel, with her sail violently strained, dips; but stands, on the other hand (or again) if they loosen the sails. Mr. Dale mistranslates it: "if a vessel has dipped." But passing this, we listen to his comment:

Euripides speaks of the dipping of a sailing vessel; but it is not the entire vessel that is dipped, but merely the rising and falling produced by the wind. . . . The following quotation illustrates the passage: "As the squadron rounded the buoy, the wind was free and the sheets were eased off: the vessels righted at once." The dipping is not directly stated, but it is involved in the "righting." Some have translated this passage "if a vessel has sunk." There is no sanction here or elsewhere for translating βάπτω to *sink*. It is never applied to vessels or any thing else, sunk: βαπτίζω exclusively is used in connection with such facts.

Now this certainly is a very innocent dipping, "merely the rising and falling produced by the wind,"—the ship gracefully bending under strained canvas before the wind. But no such harmless dipping is suggested by the context. The passage illustrates the folly and madness of resisting, nearly single-handed, by force, instead of soothing by gentle words, the rage of an excited populace, hard "to quench as a fierce fire;" and the figure is without pertinence unless it speaks of threatened disaster and ruin. The same figure employed by Sophocles (Antig. 715) for a very similar purpose, expounds that of Euripides: "For the shipmaster who, straining the sail-rope of his vessel, gives no way, oversets her, and navigates henceforth with benches turned up-side down;"—a Greek tragedian's rather Milesian way of saying that she goes to the bottom. So much for the connection. As to the authorities, the Latin translations give "*mergitur*" and "*mergi solet*" (Anglicé "*immerse*."). One Greek scholiast explains: "she becomes *submerged* (ὑφαλός *under water*), for a violent wind striking, oversets ἀνατρέπει her." Another says "she dips, that is to say, baptizes (ἐβάπτισεν) herself"—for which an alternative

reading is ἐπόντισεν *plunges into the sea*, which would be equally fatal alike to the ship, and to Mr. Dale's pet theory of βάντω. Matthiæ for the meaning of the passage, refers to the Antigone; Passow renders: *the ship draws water, goes under*; and Pape, Rost and Palm, and Liddell and Scott, all make it expressly "the ship sank."

So much for Mr. Dale's "gentle motion," "superficial entrance," and innocent little "dip;" and so much for the "some" whose authority he thus summarily disposes of. We beg particularly to remind Mr. Dale that whatever βάντω does with the vessel, whether putting her under the water, or sending her to the bottom, it puts her into a state from which *itself has no power to rescue her*. We beg to remind him that one scholiast makes it *overset* (ἀνατρέπει) and put her under the water (ὑφαλος); that another makes it *immerse* (ἐβάπτισεν) or *plunge her into the sea* (ἐπόντισεν), that the Latin translators make it "merse" (*mergitur*) her, and that the chief German and English lexicographers make it *sink* her—and that the authors of these manifold enormities, including Euripides himself, are none of them "Baptist writers."

From the Schol. to Eur. Hec. 608, he gives the definition of βάπτειν, viz.: "to let something down into water;" we remind him that the language neither expresses nor implies any withdrawal.

Suidas de Hierocle is cited to prove that βάπτω means to *wet*: βάψας κοιλὴν τῆν χεῖρα, etc.: "wetting the hollow of his hand, he sprinkles the judge (τὸν κρίτην, not, as Mr. Dale, τὴν δικαστηρίαν). But why "wetting?" How does he wet the hollow of his hand, and why the hollow of it rather than his fingers, in order to sprinkle; and what necessary relation between "wetting" and sprinkling? The appropriateness of the imagery is totally lost in Mr. Dale's rendering. "He dips the hollow of his hand" (literally, "his hand hollowed");—it is clearly a case of dipping, not of "wetting."

Two examples make βάντω *moisten*. "Being pressed it moistens and colors (βάπτει καὶ ἀνθίζει) the hand." (Arist. Hist. Anim. 5, 15). But why "moisten" rather than "dye?" To avoid tautology, says Mr. Dale: "two words are not needed for dyeing, while the moistening by the juice is essential to dye, stain, or color the hand."

True, but that does not prove that βάντω means *moisten*; and in fact βάπτει *dyes* and ἀνθίζει *colors*, are rhetorically quite different. "Dye" is the generic term, and "color" the specific. βάντω, *dye*, states the *fact* to the mind, ἀνθίζω *color* (from ἄθος *bloom, a flower*) paints the *result* to the imagination. But "we the more readily adopt this meaning because Plutarch expressly says that the word is used in this sense." And then follows the example referred to, from Plu-

tarch (Sympos. Probl. 8, 6): "*Βάψαι* the poet has called *διῆναι moisten*." But Plutarch says no such thing. If he had, it would rather disprove Mr. Dale's assertion, than prove it, as it would show the need of explaining the use of *βάψαι* as "moisten," by a poetical figure. But "the poet" here is, by familiar Greek usage, Homer. Homer has nowhere employed *διῆναι moisten* as an equivalent to *βάπτω*, but he has so employed *μιάλω stain* (Il. iv. 141), and beyond all doubt the true reading here is *μιῆναι, stain*. These cases of *βάπτω*, then, belong to *dye*, and "moisten" disappears.

He next makes *βάπτω wash*. First we have Aratus 950; *ποταμοῖο ἐβάψατο—κεφαλῆς*, of which he gives us this elegant and lucid translation, "washed head and shoulders of the river." We will not inquire after the river whose 'head and shoulders' received the washing. The author's commentary relieves the difficulty, but creates others. "Aratus speaks of a crow washing itself 'of the river.' The phraseology indicates that *dipping* is not intended." We beg to dissent. The phraseology does *not* indicate that dipping is not intended. The broad use of the Greek genitive (to which, we suppose, Mr. Dale refers) often in prose, and still oftener in the poets, will cover almost any form of special relation. True, "wash in respect of the river" would be equivalent to "wash in the river," and the barbarism "wash of the river" is no better than "dip of the river." But here nothing indicates that the crow comes to the river for a washing. From his delight in the water in certain states of the atmosphere preceding a storm, he comes to swim upon the river, and to *dip* himself into it. "The Scholiast," says the author, "omits the limitation 'head and shoulders,' and says 'washes itself—*βάπτει δὲ ἑαυτὴν*'—including the whole, while a part only is washed." But the Scholiast does *not* omit the limitation, but gives it expressly "from the head to the extremities of the shoulders," and for *βάπτω* substitutes *βαπτίζω*, in defiance both of the quotation and the canon of our author. "The importance of the form of expression," adds Mr. Dale, "is obvious in the translation of Carson—'if the crow dips his head *into* the river.' 'Into' has no existence in the text, and whatever Carson may think, others will be likely to judge that 'into the river' and 'of the river' are phrases of very different value." Mr. Dale is not mistaken. The phrases *are* "of very different value;" and the difference consists in this, that Dr. Carson's "into the river," is an entirely just rendering of the Greek into idiomatic English, while Mr. Dale's "of the river" is neither sense nor English.

The next example is from the same author (Arat. 588.) *ἀνέφαλος βάπτοι βόου ἐσπερίοιο*; rendered with the same ingenious awkwardness

as the above, "Cloudless, washes of the western flood," for the poet's graceful "But if the sun should plunge (or dip himself) without clouds into the western flood." "The form of the phraseology," says our author, "is similar to the preceding, and is indicative of a similar use." True; and nothing in the "form of the phraseology" of either requires us to change the customary "dip," of βάπτω into *wash*. The sun does not go down into the ocean flood to wash himself; but he goes under, dips or plunges himself. The Scholiast replaces it by δύνηται (*sink or go under*) which Mr. Dale tells us p. 246 "is used as an equivalent of βαπτίζω." The Latin translation of Buhle's edition, renders it by *mergitur*, and the Orphic Argonautæ for the same idea, says, "Βαπτίζετο τὴν ἥλιον the sun was immersing himself (not "had mersed himself," as Mr. Dale), into the ocean stream." The authors of these outrages on Mr. Dale's canon are neither of them "Baptist writers." We add, that although βάπτω might take the crow out of the river, it does not undertake to bring back the sun from his western 'dip'. It leaves him to find his way as well as he can around to his oriental emersion. Before leaving Aratus we cite another passage in which the constellation Cepheus (l. 651) "brushes the earth with his girdle, dipping his head, etc., 'of' the ocean," which the Scholiast explains by δέδυξε, Stephen's lexicon renders by *mergitur*, *immergitur*, and Cicero who, like Stephens and the Scholiast, was not a "Baptist writer," and, unlike Shakespeare, knew a good deal of Latin and not much less Greek, renders *demergo* in double violation of our author's principle.

The next example is from Herodotus (II. 47) who says that an Egyptian accidentally defiling himself by contact with a pig "goes to the river and dips himself together with his garments"—ἐβαψεν ἑωυτόν, βὰς ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν; which Mr. Dale, with his usual skilful avoidance of correctness, elegance, and sense, converts into "washes, going upon the river." "Coming upon" for "happening upon" a river is idiomatic English. "Going upon the river" can properly mean nothing but "going upon the surface of the river," except possibly "going *along* it." Mr. Dale explains correctly enough, and the barbarous rendering is, like multitudes of others in his book, purely gratuitous, designed, we suppose, to fascinate us with the beauties of "classic baptism." For substituting "wash," here for "dip, bathe, immerse" there is neither authority nor reason. Carey and Rawlinson both render spiritedly and freely "plunge." If absolute exactness were demanded, it is not certain that βάπτω, while it certainly puts him into the river, brings him in with a plunge. He may *walk* in and the submersion follow.

With his accustomed insolence Mr. Dale here summons Dr. Carson to his critical tribunal. "We have here another of those broad discrepancies so often found in the translations of this writer as compared with the original. The text is 'going upon (the bank of) the river.' If, however, it be assumed as an unstated fact, that after having come upon the river he 'also went into the river,'" etc. To which we reply that it is not "an unstated fact" that he went *into* the river. The statement of Herodotus is as unequivocal as the Greek language can make it. *βάπτω* as clearly takes him *into* the river as *βάς ἐπι* brings him *to* it. Dr. Carson's rendering "going into the river" is undoubtedly inexact; but the error does not vitiate in the slightest degree his interpretation of the passage as a whole. His rendering is entirely true to the facts, while Mr. Dale's is partly false and partly nonsense. With *βάπτω* right before his eyes, and with the *ἀποτοῖς τοῖς ἱματίοις* with *his very garments* (without significance on his hypothesis), he coolly tells us that it is "an unstated fact" that he went into the water at all! With his "very garments" the defiled Egyptian stood on the bank and "washed"!

It is amidst such displays of taste and scholarship that Mr. Dale talks complacently about "the broad discrepancies" of Dr. Carson, and here through two or three frivolous pages, as often elsewhere, makes himself merry at his expense. Now Dr. Carson is not faultless. He is not, we readily admit, our *beau ideal* either of a scholar or a controversialist; but in neither capacity is he a man to be sneered at by such a one as Mr. Dale. "The Philosopher of Tubbermore," as Mr. Dale facetiously designates him, will have to descend a great many degrees before getting near the level of the expounder of "classic baptism."

We must discontinue our detailed criticisms though the material is still abundant. In our author's example of *βάπτω* as *stain* (Soph. Aj. 95 *ἔβαψας ἔγγος εὖ—στρατῶ* *did you nobly plunge*, etc.?) he has certainly misunderstood the structure, and probably mistranslated the verb—"Is it well that you stained," etc.? His meaning of "gild" is obtained by stripping the single passage which furnishes it of all its force and beauty. A dyer, after dyeing everything else, has "dyed poverty" and exhibits himself rich. "Gild" ruins the rhetoric. But leaving *βάπτω*, and proceeding to *βαπτίζω*, we might first comment on the task of carrying "meræ" a word not English to begin with, through all usages of the Greek *βαπτίζω*, and castigating the "gerrymanderings" of "Baptist writers" for having the good sense to vary their renderings according to the various shades of usage, and the demands of English idiom. But "classic baptism" has beauties higher even than this. For

καταβαπτίζω thoroughly immerse, completely whelm, and διαβαπτίζομαι mutually immerse, immerse one another, we have repeatedly the extraordinary combinations "de-merse (de-baptize)," and "thoroughmerse" (we believe not, thorough-baptize.) Of the phrases "washes head and shoulders of the river," and "washes, going upon the river," a sagacious reader, we believe, might study out the meaning. But we defy his utmost divining power, when brought to bear on "de-merse" and "thoroughmersē." "De-merse," according to all English analogy, like de-naturalize, de-centralize, de-intoxicate, should reverse the action of "merse;" in no case can it, like the Greek κατά, intensify it. "Thorough-merse" is still more monstrous, either totally misleading, or totally unintelligible. If Mr. Dale had manufactured "inter-merse," it would have been far from a good translation, but would have avoided a hybrid, and approached the force of the preposition. Dr. Conant's rendering "they know how to play the dipping match with him," and Mr. Dale's "they know how to thorough-merse with him," illustrate the difference between a man who has taste and scholarship, and a man who has neither. If Mr. Dale pleads the exigencies of controversy, we reply that it is a principle yet to be established, that renderings either false or unintelligible can subserve any legitimate ends of controversy.

Mr. Dale's general style of criticism, we are bound to say is in harmony with the renderings and the comments which we have cited. There is not an *indigenous* criticism in his book—(two on "Baptæ" are communicated)—that sheds any scholarly light on the passage it discusses. Eight pages are devoted to Aristotle's "Wonderful Report" concerning the tidal ebbing and flowing on the coast beyond the Pillars of Hercules. In eight pages a scholar, and even a candid man of sense, could scarcely avoid offering upon the topic some valuable suggestions. Mr. Dale has no better use for the entire space than arraying "Baptist writers," who have commented on the passage with freedom and independence, against each other, and converting their slight and natural differences into vital and ruinous contradictions. Dr. Gale regards the submerging of the land by the rising tide as indicating the *result*, rather than the *act*, of immersion. Dr. Carson finds in it no infringement of his doctrine that βαπτίζω carries invariably the idea of mode, and thus sees in the overwhelming of the land by the rising waters a figurative dipping or plunging of the land into them. Dr. Fuller coincides substantially with Gale; and over this slight and perfectly legitimate diversity of view, Mr. Dale makes himself merry through eight pages of as dreary and barren criticism as the tide-washed coast that has created the discussion. He does not seem to have the

faintest idea of the flexibility and subtlety of thought, and of language as its exponent, nor of the varying aspects under which the same thought may present itself to the imagination. To the sailor, now the boat recedes from the shore, and now the shore recedes from the boat. To the railway traveller, now the train flies by the landscape, and now the landscape flies by the train. As the rising floods beleaguer a mountain, now the floods seem to be whelming the mountain, now the mountain seems to be sinking into the floods. In all these cases now one object is conceived as stationary, and now the other. Either form of conception is equally true to the imagination, and therefore equally legitimate in expression, though not equally true to the fact. To the intense conception of the poet, the "coward lips do from their color fly," instead of waiting for the color to fly more prosaically from them. In the case before us it is nearly equally natural to conceive of the water rising and whelming the shore, or the shore dipping and sinking into the water. The former is more literally exact; the latter more figurative, and yet by no means violently so; and a difference like this of Drs. Gale and Carson reflects not the slightest discredit on the scholarship or good judgment of either. The whole force of his feeble ridicule recoils on the captious critic. If Mr. Dale could have risen to a philosophical conception of this free play of thought and expression—this rapid and half imperceptible gliding over of one conception into another—why then his vocation would have been gone, and "Classic Baptism" would never have shed its light upon the world.

Our nearly exhausted space compels us to deal summarily with the rest of Mr. Dale's book. It is devoted to the exposition of the various uses of "*βαπτισμ* primary" which consist in general in '*intusposing*' (qu. a compound?), and specifically, in "mersing, drowning, whelming, steeping, and innig"; and of "*βαπτισμ* secondary" which performs its work in general by "*influencing controllingly*," and specifically by mersing, whelming, steeping, innig, baptising, and intoxicating. Here baptising may be specialized into *stupefying*, *bewildering*, *polluting*, *purifying*—any thing apparently but "dipping." Any thing that can exert a "controlling influence" is competent to effect a baptism; and *βαπτισμ* thus used, may with the utmost fidelity be rendered *stupefy*, *intoxicate*, *bewilder*, etc. "One drop of Prussic acid is as thoroughly competent to effect a baptism secondary (perhaps the more common form of baptism expressed by the Greeks) as is an ocean to effect a baptism primary." But neither an "ocean" nor a puddle is required by Mr. Dale's definition for a baptism primary. If "intuspose" and "inn" are, as definitions, any thing more than

mockery, then putting a man into the sand, or into a barrel, or into a stage-coach is as legitimate a baptism primary as putting him into an ocean. Does Mr. Dale really discard the idea of a fluid from his conception of a literal baptism?

Our author makes three divisions of βαπτίζω primary; viz., "intusposition,"—1, "without influence;" 2, "with influence;" 3, "for influence." An example of the first is "Immersed (Cupid) into the wine." Why not *for* influence, as he was intending to swallow him? Of the second: "that we might lighten the 'mersed' part (τὸ βαπτίζόμενον) of the ship"—how immersed *with* influence, rather than *without* or *for*? Of the third: "immersing (βαπτίζων) he killed him." But how is '*for* influence,' expressed by the participle? The truth is the distinction is wholly factitious; many of the examples might perfectly well change places, and in them all, whatever of "influence" is intended or implied, (except in figurative uses) the influence is suggested by the context, not contained in the verb itself. Persons may be immersed that they may be drowned, or that they may be purified; vessels, that they may be destroyed, or may shut up a harbor; nothing in the word itself is changed by or expresses the purpose. The ass that in passing through the river, immersed the panniers, did it for a purpose, but no shadow of the purpose cleaves to βαπτίζω.

Next comes "influence with rhetorical figure" of which the "number is not large." The reason why it is "not large," is because Mr. Dale allows no rhetorical figure except where some added clause makes denial of the figure impossible. We suspect the cases of a figurative use of βαπτίζω are far more numerous than he supposes.

Then comes the "great gun" of the author next to the detaching of βάπτω from βαπτίζω. It is the "secondary use" of βαπτίζω, that, viz., of "controlling influence." This is first, "general, without mersion in fact or in figure," and second, "specific, with or without intusposition." Under each of these heads a large number of cases is cited, translated, and commented upon, after the fashion which we have indicated. The general doctrine is that βαπτίζω loses its primary meaning of literal "intusposition" or "mersion", and (just as βάπτω passes over from the primary meaning of *dip* into the secondary but equally literal one of *dye*) passes over into the simple generic idea of "controlling influence," without either any literal, or any figurative "mersion." Whether he means to be understood that it can ever be *translated* "to influence controllingly" does not appear. He never so renders it himself, although it would seem that that which is the proper meaning of the word ought to be competent for its translation. Neither

has he given the actual renderings *stupefy, pollute, purify*, which he tells us are occasionally entirely adequate for its translation.

The bare statement of Mr. Dale's monstrous doctrine is enough to condemn it. We do not suppose that he would find a scholar or man of taste in Christendom, who would regard the position as worth the trouble of refuting. Suppose we should be told that words of so decided and striking physical import as the English "plunge," or "immerse," had in English only a very few examples of figurative use; and that in nearly all the cases in which there was no literal plunging, or literal immersion, all reference to the primary idea was lost, and 'plunged in sleep,' 'drowned in care,' 'immersed in study,' were simply prosaic statements of a 'controlling influence.' Who would not instantly reject the statement as absurd? And not a whit less absurd is the affirmation when applied to the Greek *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω*. *Βαπτίζω*, like our words 'immerse,' 'whelm,' 'plunge,' is a strong word; the physical act which it denotes is one that admits of being, and with the mind's love of analogies, inevitably would be, employed in a great variety of figurative uses. In some the figure would be retained in full force; in others it would be more slight. But to have all these figurative uses at once swept away, and all the tinge of rhetorical and poetic imagery which not only "Baptist writers," but every man of taste who ever read Greek, has recognized, exchanged for a "controlling influence"—involves an absurdity too great to need a moment's argumentation. Mr. Dale himself by rendering in every instance "merse," has contradicted his own theory, unless his uniform rendering is either intentionally false, or intentionally unmeaning. If "merse" is the best rendering which he could give in all these cases, or if it is a justifiable rendering, then his own examples falsify his theory—for "merse" can be used in no such latitude of signification as he claims for *βαπτίζω*. If we can "baptize" a man with "one drop of prussic acid," we cannot "merse" him in that remarkable way. It cannot be proved that "immerse"—we discard the barbarism "merse"—ever entirely loses sight of its primary import. Put Mr. Dale's principle to this simple test. He has been accustomed, perhaps, to exercises in rendering English into Greek. He takes this English sentence: "The sun exercises a controlling influence over the motions of the planets"—would he deem himself authorized to render the verb with its object by *βαπτίζω*? And if he did, would any body understand him? So of ten thousand similar cases.

And as his general principle is false, so his special handling of it is in the highest degree arbitrary. Three of the examples of "specific influence," are cases of the simplest possible use of *βαπτίζω* in its

primary sense of 'immerse.' One that of "immersing hot iron in water;" another that of "immersing Bacchus in (*τρος in respect to*) the sea; the third that of going to "immerse oneself into the sea," as matter of purification. On the last case four or five pages are expended in the idle endeavor to make it out something else than a simple immersion into the sea and that entirely equivalent to the dipping of *βάπτω*. On the second, Dr. Conant justly remarks that "to immerse Bacchus is nothing else than to temper wine"; but rightly classes it among the literal uses of *βαπτίζω*, the *imagery* being that of a literal submersion of the wine-God in the sea. Our author, confounding the *letter* of the command with its *inferred import*, says, "Well, then, the command is to baptize wine. How is this done?" Need Mr. Dale be told that the command is *not* to "baptize wine," but to "baptize Bacchus?" that "immersing Bacchus" is the literal act, but which is interpreted to mean "temper wine"? They are no more commanded to "baptize wine," than they are to "temper Bacchus." The fisherman had wit enough to know that the natural analogy to a literal submersion of Bacchus in the sea, which they could not do, was the submersion of wine (no matter how, by *pouring*, if Mr. Dale pleases) in sea-water, which they could. It is not, then, a case of "controlling influence," but of "mersion."

Mr. Dale's conclusion, given with the emphasis of capitals, is that whatever can "thoroughly change the character, state, or condition of any object, is capable of baptizing it;" "and by such change does in fact baptize it." The doctrine is unphilosophical and false. "A drop of prussic acid" that poisons a man, does not baptize (*βαπτίζει*) him. The financial kings whose purse controls the affairs of Europe, do not baptize them. The chemical agents that decompose and alter a substance, do not baptize it. The medicines that change a diseased body into a healthy one, do not baptize it. The locomotive that crushes a human being into a lifeless mass, does not baptize him. The wine that makes a man drunk, the questions that bewilder and confound him, the opiate that puts him to sleep, the rites that pollute or purify him, neither of them baptizes him. Death does not baptize a living man; and a resurrection to life does not baptize a dead one. To none of these things, *as literal facts*, is the word *βαπτίζω* applicable. To none of them is it applicable until they have received the magic touch of the imagination, and assumed the vivacity and picturesqueness of figure. Over against Mr. Dale's position we place this, that whatever the *imagination conceives* under the figure of an immersion, a plunging, a whelming, a submersion—and many of the above facts and innumerable others, are capable of being so conceived—may be desig-

nated figuratively by βαπτίζω. Beyond that the term cannot be extended. So long as the mind conceives them in their naked literalness—so long as they have not been tinged or transmuted by the subtle alchemy of the imagination, so long they lie totally outside of the sphere of βαπτίζω. Not one of Mr. Dale's examples disproves our position, his own translations being judges.

We cannot take leave of Mr. Dale's book without expressing our honest and profound regret that so much very earnest labor should have been so completely wasted. We do not remember a single point in which his book is not a failure. It is a failure in charging perpetually upon "Baptist writers" a usage of βάπτω and βαπτίζω, of "dip" and "immerse," which is common to them with the universal scholarship of Christendom. It is a failure in affirming a total separation in Greek classical usage between βάπτω and βαπτίζω, which it has not proved; which, in its extreme form of statement, is incapable of proof; and which, if ever so fully proved, would be as indifferent to the Baptist cause as the appearance of the last comet. It is a failure in its elaborately argued doctrine of a "controlling influence," which, if as true as it is the reverse, would be to the Baptist simply a matter of curious speculation. We stand on "βαπτίζω primary" and "the bond." In its literal import, even with all the alleged vagueness of act, and dark propensities to drowning, with which Mr. Dale has invested it, it is abundantly sufficient for Baptist exigencies. The book fails, if possible, still more signally, in that it discusses a purely scholarly question in a spirit of narrow and bitter partizanship. If Mr. Dale wished to break a lance with the critics and lexicographers on the meaning of a Greek word, it was competent for him to do so. A scholarly discussion is always welcomed by scholars. But a scholarly attitude is apparently beyond the conception of Mr. Dale. His volume would be retrenched of more than half its bulk by excising from it its assaults, at once needless and frivolous, upon "Baptist writers." In fact the entire substance of his book could be comprised, we believe, within fifty pages, of which one half would be false, and the other half irrelevant. Its large collection of passages from the English classics, illustrating certain words, may, for ought we know, be useful to Professors of English Literature, to whose attention we commend them. But for any display of sound scholarship or just criticism on its pages,—for any gleam of light which they shed on either "classic" or Christian baptism, they might as well have been left in their virgin whiteness. They could not well have been blanker than Mr. Dale has made them.

A. C. KENDRICK.