

A

VINDICATION OF THE BAPTISTS

FROM THE

CHARGE OF BIGOTRY,

AND OF

EMBARRASSING MISSIONARY OPERATIONS,

BY

TRANSLATING, AND REFUSING TO TRANSFER

IN ALL THEIR VERSIONS OF THE SCRIPTURES AMONG THE HEATHEN,

THE WORDS

RELATING TO BAPTISM.

BY JOHN DOWLING, A. M.

PASTOR OF THE WEST BAPTIST CHURCH, NEW-YORK.

New-York:

J. P. CALLENDER, 141 FULTON-STREET,

John Gray, Printer, 222 Water-street.

1838.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the need for consistent and reliable data collection processes to support informed decision-making.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the role of technology in modern data management. It discusses how advanced software solutions can streamline data collection, storage, and analysis, thereby improving efficiency and accuracy.

4. The fourth part of the document addresses the challenges associated with data security and privacy. It provides guidance on implementing robust security measures to protect sensitive information from unauthorized access and breaches.

5. The fifth part of the document explores the importance of data quality and integrity. It discusses strategies for identifying and correcting errors or inconsistencies in the data to ensure that the information is reliable and trustworthy.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the ethical considerations surrounding data collection and use. It emphasizes the need for transparency, informed consent, and responsible data handling practices to build trust and maintain the organization's reputation.

7. The seventh part of the document provides a summary of the key findings and recommendations. It reiterates the importance of a comprehensive data management strategy that encompasses all aspects of the data lifecycle, from collection to analysis and reporting.

8. The final part of the document offers concluding thoughts on the future of data management. It suggests that continued investment in technology and training will be crucial for staying ahead in a data-driven world.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following paragraph is extracted from a recent work published in this city, entitled "HUMBUGS OF NEW-YORK," by David M. Reese, M. D. Under the head of ULTRA SECTARIANISM, the author remarks :

" There are two among the prominent sects of Christendom, who are most deeply involved in the sin of embarrassing, delaying and hindering the conversion of the world, especially so far as the heathen nations are concerned ; and to these especially does the work of reformation belong, unless they are prepared to put their Ultra sectarianism into the scale, as of more intrinsic value than the souls of men. The first of these is the Baptist denomination, a large portion of whose ministry and membership cannot even unite with other Christians in furnishing the bible to heathen nations in their own language unless the word IMMERSE is substituted for BAPTIZE where it occurs in the English translation. If this be not the very climax of Ultra-sectarianism, we despair of indicating its existence anywhere."

Had the above accusation appeared only in the pages of the book from which it is extracted, the limited circulation to which the merits of that work entitle it, might have precluded the necessity of a reply. As, however, the conductors of some highly respectable religious papers have seen fit to transfer the above extract into their columns, as especially deserving attention, and thus have given it a publicity which otherwise it would not have attained, the writer of this pamphlet considers it due to the denomination of which he is a member, briefly and candidly to examine the justice of the charge. Were this the only instance in which the conduct and motives of the friends of the American and Foreign Bible Society have been impeached by their Pædobaptist brethren, it might have been suffered to pass in silence. So far however is this from being the case, it is well known that the charges of *party feeling, sectarianism and bigotry* have been so often hurled at that Society, and at the denomination which sustains it, within the brief period that it has been in existence, that they have already become almost as familiar as household words. While we shall endeavour to vindicate ourselves from the charge with which we are thus assailed, the course of argument we shall be compelled to pursue, it is hoped, may be permanently useful to our own churches, as an exposition of the principles by which as Baptists we should be governed in furnishing the heathen with the pure and uncorrupted word of God.

Our object is not simply to reply to the paragraph quoted from the work of Dr. Reese, of which the ludicrousness and vulgarity

175164

220.52

D 7561

of the title is such as almost to forbid its introduction in a serious discussion. A reply to such a production, even if crowned with undoubted victory, would be an effort, the results of which would be far too unimportant to compensate for the time it might consume. My design is rather to spread before the public such a statement of the principles upon which Baptist missionaries have always acted and are still resolved to act in all their versions of the scriptures among the heathen, as it is hoped, may convince every candid reader, not only that they are not chargeable with bigotry, but that they have acted in accordance with the principles of eternal truth and justice, and by no means inconsistent with that CHARITY which, while it *suffereth long and is kind*, at the same time REJOICETH IN THE TRUTH.

The paragraph referred to is merely placed at the commencement of these pages, to show that we do not complain without cause, of the attacks which have been made on our conduct and motives in this matter, and is itself, merely a specimen of the charges which have been repeated against us in different quarters. We do not feel called upon, therefore, to examine the claims which this writer or his book has to the attention of the public, or to animadvert upon the exceedingly bad taste (to use the mildest term) displayed in the introduction of any thing connected with the eternal welfare of 600 millions of heathen, in a book with such a title. We could retaliate, if we chose; but we think to apply the term *humbug* to any thing connected with religion, or to the conscientious opinions of acknowledged Christians, would be inconsistent with that charity which doth not behave itself unseemly. In the following pages I shall endeavour to avoid unkind words, while at the same time I shall strive to give to the arguments employed their full force. My motto shall be

“Soft words and hard arguments.”

The charge of being “deeply involved in the sin of embarrassing, delaying and hindering the conversion of the world,” is certainly a serious one; and if it were true, I would be among the first to sound the alarm, and exhort my brethren who have been *guilty of translating the word denoting the ordinance of baptism by its proper meaning*, to repent of this their wickedness.

If, however, it should eventually prove, that the charge of embarrassing missionary operations belongs, not to the venerated Judson, and Marshman, and Yates, and the sainted Carey; not to those who have adhered literally to the commands of the great Head of the church in reference to an ordinance of his own appointment, but to those who have substituted in its stead something which Christ did not command, then it will be acknowledged that “the work of reformation belongs” not to the former, but to the latter class of individuals.

VINDICATION OF THE BAPTISTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE BAPTISTS NOT ACCOUNTABLE FOR THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH RESULTED IN THEIR SEPARATION FROM THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY, AND THEREFORE NOT CHARGEABLE WITH BIGOTRY BECAUSE THEY DO NOT STILL CO-OPERATE WITH THAT SOCIETY IN FURNISHING THE BIBLE TO THE HEATHEN.

BEFORE we proceed to state the grounds upon which we believe not only that we have a lawful right, but that we are imperatively bound to *translate* and not to *transfer* the word *baptizo*, in giving the bible to the heathen, it may be desirable to correct a misapprehension which may arise in the minds of many from the following expression in the above extract.

“The first of these is the Baptist denomination, *a large portion of whose ministry and membership cannot even unite with other christians in furnishing the bible to heathen nations in their own language, unless the word immerse is substituted for baptize, where it occurs in our English translation.*”

Now I ask, would not the first idea formed by a person ignorant of facts, upon reading the above sentence, be, that the Baptists had voluntarily separated from their brethren of other denominations in the American Bible Society, because *they*, (i. e. other denominations) would not translate the word denoting the ordinance of baptism, *immerse*?

So far then is this from being true, that the Baptists did unite for many years, with other christians in giving the bible to the heathen, though the word was not translated immerse by any except the missionaries of the Baptist denomination. The doctrine of the Baptists always has been and still is, that every translator of the bible is accountable only to God for the faithful discharge

of his duty. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." Rom. xiv. 4.

Instead, therefore, of refusing to unite with other Christians in furnishing the heathen with the bible unless the word was uniformly translated *immerse*, the Baptists only wished to have the liberty of discharging their duty to God and their own consciences, and in the discharge of that duty *to be let alone*. The liberty which they demanded for themselves, they were willing that others should enjoy, and had they not been denied it, they would still have co-operated willingly and cheerfully with other Christians in the American Bible Society, in furnishing the heathen world with the bible, leaving every denomination, for the faithfulness of the translations executed by their missionaries, accountable only to God.

Instead, therefore, of asserting, in broad and general terms, that the Baptists were unwilling to unite with Pædobaptists in furnishing the bible to the heathen unless the word "immerse was *substituted* for baptize," it ought to have been stated that the Pædobaptists were unwilling to unite with Baptists in furnishing the heathen with the bible, unless in the translations made by Carey, Judson, and others, in every case where the word denoting the ordinance of baptism occurs, it were left *untranslated*, and the meaning of the word concealed by *substituting* a Greek word utterly unintelligible to the heathen, in place of the appropriate Burman or Bengalee word expressive of the meaning of βαπτίζω (*Baptizo*.)

The Baptists naturally enough inquired—Why after co-operating with us for so many years in the circulation of these very same translations, should you at length resolve to discard them? Why should we be required to conceal the import of the word denoting baptism, by refusing to translate the term into the language of the heathen, and to give them instead, a Greek word, or even an English word, as unintelligible to eastern nations as the language of the Mohawk Indian? And what was the reply of the American Bible Society? Stripped of ambiguity, their reply was in substance thus: "Instruct your missionaries to *transfer* the word βαπτίζω into the languages of the heathen, and not to *translate* it; alter the translations you have already made,

and where you have given a translation of the word, strike it out, and substitute instead thereof the Greek word; and then you may continue to act with us, then we will appropriate money to aid in circulating your translations; but if you refuse these conditions, you must look elsewhere for aid; we cannot give you a single dollar.”

That this was the purport of the resolutions, in their application to this particular case, adopted by the Board of the American Bible Society, February 17th, 1836, by a majority of 30 to 14, no one will pretend to deny. Let it be remembered too, that the resolutions, thus virtually excluding the Baptists from the American Bible Society, and refusing further aid to Baptist translations, were adopted at a time when there was a large balance in the treasury of that Society, much of which had been contributed by Baptists in the undoubted persuasion, that the Society would never refuse to aid the Baptist missionaries, in furnishing their translations to the heathen. The Baptists had contributed *in legacies only*, the sum of \$45,000, and probably a much larger amount in other ways; while the whole amount appropriated to aid the Baptist denomination, in money and bibles together, is \$28,450 75. (See the report of the American and Foreign Bible Society, during the year of their provisional organization,) p. 29, a most valuable and interesting document.

Compelled by the passage of the said resolutions, as the Baptists were, either to purchase the aid of the American Bible Society by a sacrifice of principle, or else to act alone; they preferred the latter alternative.

It is reported to the disgrace of the aspiring Paley, that he said on one occasion “*I cannot afford to have a conscience.*” Had the Baptist Board of Missions accepted the appropriation of \$5000 which was made on the day the resolutions referred to were adopted, upon the condition that they would make the alterations required, they would have thereby proclaimed to the world the same humiliating confession,—*We cannot afford to have a conscience.*

Driven thus from co-operation with their brethren of other denominations, are the Baptists to be charged with Ultra-sectarianism and Bigotry, because they act by themselves? With as much propriety might a father correct his son for not remaining

within doors, when he himself had turned him into the street and locked the door upon him.

After the passing of that act of the American Bible Society which excluded the Baptists from a participation in its benefits, the only condition upon which they could have retained their connexion with the society, was the alteration of the translations of the Scriptures already made, and the acting upon a different principle in future translations. The head and front of their offending was, a steady refusal to submit, in this respect, to the dictation of the American Bible Society. For this it is that the charges of bigotry and Ultra-sectarianism have been so unsparringly hurled at their heads. What is bigotry? It is defined by the lexicographers *blind zeal, prejudice*. Now, in refusing to alter translations which we consider faithful, if we are impelled by a blinded zeal, and if we are actuated by no higher motive than attachment to a party, then we submit to the charge; but if we can show reasons of the most sacred and binding character, reasons which our allegiance to our Master, and our duty to the heathen forbid us to compromise, then we repel the charge, and it recoils upon the heads of those who make it.

CHAPTER II.

A STATEMENT OF THE REASONS WHICH, IN THE OPINION OF BAPTISTS, RENDER IT UNLAWFUL AND UNJUST TO TRANSFER WORDS, WHICH ARE CAPABLE OF BEING LITERALLY TRANSLATED.

To render intelligible to all, the reasons we shall assign for our refusal to *transfer* the Greek word denoting the ordinance of baptism; it may be necessary distinctly to state that to *transfer* a word from one language to another, is simply to express the word by the same letters as are used in the original language, with such a change of termination as may be required by the analogy of words.

On the other hand to *translate* a word, is to express its meaning by a word belonging to the language into which the transla-

tion is made, of the same signification as the word in the original language.

The following examples will render this matter plain to the English reader.

<i>Greek words.</i>	<i>Transferred as in the Popish Rhemish Testament.</i>	<i>Translated, according to the Lexicon of Parkhurst, a learned Episcopalian.</i>
Α ζυμος (Azumos)	Azymes	Unleavened bread.
πασχα (Pascha)	Pasch	The passover.
βαπτίζω (Baptizo)	Baptize (<i>transferred also in the common version.</i>)	To dip, immerse, or plunge in water.

It would have been easy to multiply similar instances of the *transfer* of Greek words, into the Popish Rhemish Testament, concerning which miscalled translation the learned historian Fuller has remarked: that it was a translation “which needed to be translated,” and that its editors by all means laboured to suppress the light of truth under one pretext or other. (See Horne’s Critical Introduction, vol. ii. p. 147.) The above instances will, however, be sufficient for our purpose. To show how unintelligible the *transfer* of words from the Greek language, instead of their translation by equivalent English words, renders the passage in which they are transferred, I will quote two verses from the Rhemish Testament, in which two of the above words occur, in their *transferred*, or untranslated form, with the corresponding passage from the common version, where they are *translated*.

From the Rhemish Testament.

Luke xxii. 1.—And the festival of the Azymes approached, which is called Pasch.

V. 7.—And the day of the Azymes came, wherein it was necessary that the Pasch should be killed.

From the common English Version.

Luke xxii. 1.—Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover.

V. 7.—Then came the day of unleavened bread when the Passover must be killed.

Every Protestant will admit that these two words become much more intelligible when translated, as in the common version, than when transferred as in the Popish version, and that therefore they ought to be translated.

But is it not immediately perceived that the word βαπτίζω (*Baptizo*) is in precisely the same predicament with the other two words? What valid reason, therefore, can be assigned why ἄζυμος (*Azumos*) and πασχα (*Pascha*) should be translated, and βαπτίζω (*Baptizo*) should be transferred, or left untranslated? It will probably be replied; ‘though it be true that the word *Baptize*, is simply the Greek word *Baptizo* with an English ending, yet by long use it has become familiar to English ears, and may therefore now be regarded as an English word.’ We are satisfied with the answer as a sufficient reason for avoiding to make any alteration *at this late day*, in our common English version, with which, if we may judge from the attempts of Pædobaptists, to explain away “going down into,” and “coming up out of” the water (Acts viii. 38, 39,) we think we are as well satisfied as they are. Yet we still think, that when our translation was made, the translators neglected their duty in leaving *Baptizo* untranslated. But we would ask,—can the same reason be assigned for using the Greek term instead of a translation of it, in giving the bible to the heathen, to whom either βαπτίζω or *Baptize*, would be as perfectly strange and unintelligible, as a word of Burman or Shanscrit would be to the unlettered English reader?

It may not be out of place here to remark, that Baptists are the less disposed to complain of the word *Baptize* being continued in the English version from the fact that its true meaning is gradually, but surely gaining ground. The force of truth has constrained the author of the most valuable lexicon of the English language ever published, (Mr. Charles Richardson,) judg-

ing of the meaning of the word baptize (as he judges of the meaning of other words) from its derivation, to define it as follows: "to dip or merge frequently, to sink, to plunge, to immerge." (See part 2, of Richardson's Dictionary, just published by William Jackson, of New-York.) And we have little doubt, that the time is rapidly approaching, when it shall be universally acknowledged, that this is the precise and exclusive meaning of the word *baptize*. Supposing it be admitted then, that the word *baptize* by long use, has become an English word, and therefore may be safely retained in the English version; it will certainly not be pretended that *baptize* is a Bengalee or a Burman or a Karen word; and if it is not, then there is precisely the same reason for *translating*, and not *transferring* this word into those languages as there is for translating *Αζυμος* (*Azumos*) *πασχα* (*Pascha*), or any other Greek word. Supposing baptize were a native English word, still we should have no more right to transfer it into the Burman language, as it would be quite as unjustifiable to cover up the meaning of this ordinance from the Burmans, by employing an English word, as to use a Greek word, both of which would be equally barbarous and unintelligible to them.

This then, it will be acknowledged by all, is the true state of the case. The Baptist missionaries from the time that Dr. Carey printed his Bengalee New Testament in 1801, (37 years ago,) have invariably *translated* and never *transferred* the word denoting the ordinance of baptism. Up to the commencement of the year 1836, the American Bible Society aided those missionaries in the circulation of the translations they had made. On the 17th of February, 1836, resolutions were passed, which required the Baptist missionaries, either to substitute the Greek word for *baptism*, in place of the translation they had given of that word, or else to expect no further aid from the American Bible Society. They refused to make the required alteration, and consequently forfeited the patronage of that Society.

It remains for us to state the reasons which led the Baptists to refuse to *transfer* the words relating to Baptism, in their versions among the heathen; in order to show that they were not actuated by a blind party zeal, but by a conscientious regard to truth and

duty, and that therefore the charge of Bigotry and Ultra-sectarianism is both ungenerous and unjust.*

1. The first reason which prompted this refusal to transfer the words relating to Baptism was *a solemn conviction, that it would be UNJUST TO THE HEATHEN to conceal the meaning of any word in the inspired record, by leaving it untranslated.*

If we leave this or any other word untranslated in the Burman Testament, it is evident, as the Greek word will be entirely foreign to the native Burman, that he will be compelled to seek its meaning by applying to the missionary; but is it not unjust to compel the poor heathen to depend upon uninspired men for the meaning of that which he might learn just as well from the inspired record, if it were not concealed from him under the cover of a Greek word. Would it not excite the astonishment of the heathen when informed of the meaning of the untranslated word, that that meaning was not expressed in his own language, as well as the meaning of other words in his bible?

There seems nothing strange to the English ear in the sound of the word *Baptize*, because it has become familiar:—not so with the heathen who never before heard the word. In order to understand how strange and unintelligible this word would sound to his ear, we must transfer some other word which is as strange to the English ear, as this must be to the Burman ear.

Let us illustrate this remark by the following example: Matt. xiv. 25. And in the fourth watch of the night, Jesus went unto them *peripating* on the sea.

In this sentence the Greek word *περιπατῶν* (*peripaton*) (walking) is transferred and not translated.

* Lest it should be doubted whether our Pædobaptist friends admit that the words referring to baptism, are *untranslated* in our common English version, and whether they do actually *advocate leaving them untranslated*, in the versions which we give to the heathen; I would quote the following from a report signed by a committee consisting of the Reverend Doctors Macauley, Milnor, Dewitt and others, and presented to the board of the American Bible Society, October 1st, 1835. It is stated as one, among other reasons for refusing to patronise the versions, made by the Baptist missionaries.

“The words *Baptizo*, and *Baptisma*, and their cognates, *being left untranslated* as in the English, and many other excellent versions imposes no difficulty on any denomination of Christians, as it leaves every minister or missionary, at perfect liberty to explain them, according to the peculiar views of his particular denomination.”

Had we never seen an English Testament before, by what means, if ignorant of Greek, should we discover the meaning of this (to us) barbarous expression "*peripating* on the sea?" Plainly, in no other way than by inquiring of our teachers. They would of course tell us that it meant "walking on the sea:" but might we not then justly respond by demanding—Why should you leave us to discover from yourselves who are *uninspired* men, that which we might have learnt as well from the *inspired* record, if you had not covered up its meaning by refusing to translate it? The injustice of which we should have a right to complain in this case, is the same which is practised upon the heathen, by refusing to translate into their own languages the word expressive of the ordinance of baptism.

It will be easily seen that such examples as the above might be multiplied to any extent; we will content ourselves, with presenting but one more.

Luke ii. 25. "And behold there was a man in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, *prosdechoming* the consolation of Israel." In this sentence the Greek word *προσδεχόμενος*, the participle of *προσδεχομαι* (*prosdechomai*), *to expect, to wait for*, is transferred, and not translated. Suppose an unlettered Englishman who had never before seen a New Testament should read this passage, how would he be able to ascertain the meaning of this strange-sounding expression: "*prosdechoming the consolation of Israel?*" I reply he would understand it just as well as the unlettered Burman, would understand the Greek word *βαπτίζω* (Baptizo) when transferred into his language. The cases are precisely parallel, and if in the former case an Englishman might justly complain that the word *προσδεχόμενος*, was not translated by a word belonging to his own language, but merely printed in English letters; so in the latter case the Burman might justly complain that the word *βαπτίζω*, was not translated by a word belonging to his own language, but merely printed in Burman letters.

2. Another reason of our refusal was, *we conceived that by concealing the meaning of this word, we should be assuming a right, which did not belong to us, the right of obscuring what Christ has made clear, and should thus violate our alle-*

giance to *HIM* whom alone we acknowledge as our Lord and Master.

If it be lawful to conceal from the heathen, the meaning of *one word* in the book of inspiration, it would be hard to prove that it is not equally lawful to conceal the meaning of two or of twenty words. And if we have a right to do this, how can we prove that the Papists have not an equal right to lock up the whole bible in an unknown tongue? The principle is the same, whether we conceal one word, or the whole bible, from the people, in an unknown tongue. The difference is merely in the extent to which the principle is carried out.—Where did we obtain the right to conceal the meaning of one of Christ's commands from the heathen? If it were our own word we might keep back a part of it, or the whole of it, if such were our will and pleasure; but since it is God's word addressed to all nations, we conceive we have *no right* to conceal from the heathen the meaning of a single syllable. This remark is affectionately commended to the attention of those brethren who in our opinion, are assuming a right which does not belong to them, by concealing from the heathen the meaning of an important ordinance of Christ's appointment, by *transferring* instead of *translating* the word denoting baptism. Are the Baptists then to be accused of Sectarianism and Bigotry because they will not diminish from the word of God, by concealing from the heathen the meaning of baptism under the veil of an unintelligible Greek word? Let the charge be hurled at us, if it must be so, yet we cannot alter our course, so long as we read in the book of the Lord, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, *neither shall ye diminish aught from it*, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you." Deut. iv. 2.

3. Another important reason why we could not consent to leave the words referring to baptism untranslated, was that *by so doing*, WE SHOULD RECOGNISE A PRINCIPLE OF TRANSLATION, BY WHICH *not only an important ordinance, but EVERY FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE MIGHT BE OBSCURED, simply by transferring, that is, leaving untranslated, the words referring to such doctrine.*

Why are we called upon to leave the words denoting baptism untranslated? Evidently, for the simple reason that we are as-

sociated with other parties in giving the bible to the world, whose views and practice on the subject of baptism differ from our own.

The principles recognised in this demand may be thus stated :

(1.) Whenever the translation of a word will clash with our peculiar views, we *have a right to leave it untranslated.*

(2.) Whenever two parties holding different sentiments are united in furnishing the heathen with the bible, such words as, if translated, will conflict with the sentiments of either party, must be left untranslated.

Sufficient, it is presumed, has already been said, to show that the first of these principles is founded in error. It remains that we examine to what results the recognition of the other principle would lead us. It might easily be shown that all the doctrines which we have been accustomed to regard as the fundamentals of the gospel, might be obliterated from the bible, by this absurd doctrine of TRANSFER. The following are presented as examples of the results to which this principle would lead us.

(1.) In the Popish Rhemish Testament to which allusion has been made above, the word *μετανοεω* (*metanoco*) which signifies *to change one's mind, to repent*, is translated by the Papists for the purpose of sustaining themselves in an unscriptural dogma, *Do penance*. Example : Matt. iii. 1, 2. "And in those days cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the desert of Jewry, and saying *Do penance*, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." To use their own words, in the notes to the Rhemish Testament, they thus translate the word, because "perfect repentance" includes in it "*painful satisfaction*," i. e. as explained by their writers a *satisfaction* for sin performed by the sinner himself. Every evangelical Protestant will cry out against the vile treachery of thus mistranslating a word, for the purpose of supporting an unscriptural dogma, utterly subversive of salvation by grace. Now we do not affirm that the principle upon which we are required to *transfer* *Baptizo*, would sanction the above *mistranslation* (although it is a fact that the American Bible Society does circulate versions, containing the above corruption.)* Yet we

* It is not a little surprising that the American Bible Society, which refuses to patronise the versions of Baptists, because they have translated the word *Baptizo*,

passage, by a transfer of the Greek words, and we print it as follows :

“Into the fire *asbeston*; where their worm *teleuteth* not, and the fire is not *sbennuted*.” From *ασβεστος* (*asbestos*) unquenchable; *τελευτω* (*teleutao*), to die; and *σβεννυμι* (*sbennumi*) to quench. And thus, as recommended in reference to *Baptizo* and *Baptisma* in the report already quoted, (see page 12 note,) the words *asbeston*, &c. “being left untranslated” (to use the words of Doctors Macauley, Milnor and Dewitt,) “imposes no difficulty on any denomination of Christians, as it leaves every minister, or missionary, at perfect liberty to explain them according to the peculiar views of his particular denomination.”*

Surely it will be acknowledged by all, that a *principle leading to such results*, is unsound in theory, and highly inexpedient, unsafe, and dangerous in practice. If it be thus unsound and unsafe, I would ask again, are the Baptists to be charged with Bigotry, and Sectarianism, because they refuse to be governed by such a principle?

Rather, at length, let it be acknowledged, that the only safe

* Here it will possibly be replied—the Reverend gentlemen, whose words have been cited would never agree to the carrying out of the principle to such results, since they do not acknowledge Socinians and Universalists as Evangelical denominations. I have much pleasure in expressing my firm conviction that they would not consent thus to obscure these important doctrines; no one who is acquainted with these estimable, and highly respectable clergymen would doubt, but that they would reject with abhorrence the idea, of blotting out the doctrine of Christ’s Deity from the bible, by *transferring* and *refusing to translate*, those words which establish that doctrine. All we contend for is, that *the principle* upon which they call upon us to transfer *Baptizo*, would authorise the Socinian, if admitted into our Society, to demand that in none of our translations, should we translate those words which establish the Deity of Christ.—It is true, we might shut the Socinian out of our Society, and refuse his co-operation, and then he might have no right to demand any control over our translations. Still, if *the principle* is correct upon which we are required to transfer *Baptizo*, the Socinian or the Universalist would himself possess *the right*, to leave untranslated the words which, if translated, would appear to clash with his peculiar sentiments.—Our object in the illustrations employed above, has been, by no means to intimate that our Pædobaptist brethren would ever consent to such glaring obscurations of the sacred text, as are specified; but simply to show the unsoundness and injustice, of *the principle* upon which we are called upon to retain the Greek word for baptism, by showing the dangerous results to which it would lead.—The argument we have employed, is that which the Logicians call “*reductio ad absurdum*.”

rule, is that which has always been followed by Baptist missionaries; the rule which is recognised in the following resolution, passed at the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, held at Salem, in April, 1833.

“Resolved,—That all the missionaries of the Board, who are or shall be engaged, in translating the Scriptures, be instructed to endeavour, by earnest prayer, and diligent study, to ascertain the exact meaning of the *original text*; to express that meaning as exactly as the nature of the languages into which they shall translate the bible will permit; and TO TRANSFER NO WORDS WHICH ARE CAPABLE OF BEING LITERALLY TRANSLATED.”

CHAPTER III.

A BRIEF ANSWER TO THE QUESTION—‘IF YOUR CONSCIENCES WILL NOT SUFFER YOU TO LEAVE THE WORDS DENOTING BAPTISM, UNTRANSLATED, WHY SHOULD YOU PERSIST IN TRANSLATING THEM BY WORDS SIGNIFYING, TO IMMERSE?’

To this inquiry we reply,

1. *Because we are solemnly convinced that this is the precise meaning of the word Baptizo.*

We are sustained in this our sincere conviction,

(1.) In the first place by *the uniform usage of the word, among classical authors, to whom the Greek language was vernacular, who employ the word to express the idea signified by the English verb, to immerse.*

It would be easy here to cite a multitude of examples to prove the above assertion. So long, however, as the works of Carson and Ripley and Judd, remain unanswered, we may be permitted to conclude that it is admitted, that this is the classical usage of the word, and that whenever an ancient Greek employed the word *Baptizo*, he meant *immerse*. As it is not our intention however to enter into this controversy, (if any controversy still exists as to the meaning of *Baptizo*,) we shall content ourselves with citing but one instance of the use of the word from a classical

author, and one from the Septuagint, and then refer the reader to the *unanswered* and *unanswerable* works above referred to, where he may meet with a multitude of similar examples.

Take the following as an instance of the classical use of the word *Baptizo*.

Pindar, the celebrated Grecian Lyric poet, (See Pindar, Pyth. ii. 139,) describing the malice of his enemies, as unable to effect his ruin, compares himself to a cork attached to a net in the sea, which, notwithstanding the weight of the net, continues to swim upon the surface of the water. His words are as follows: "As when a net is cast into the sea, the cork swims above, so am I ἀβάπτιστος (*abaptistos*) *not immersed*, or *not overwhelmed*, or (to transfer the word) so am I *unbaptized*. It may be as well to inform the English reader that the Greek ἀ (*a*) is a negative, meaning *no* or *not*, and in cases like the above, of the same meaning as the English *un-*; βάπτιστος (*baptistos*) is the participle of the verb *Baptizo*, and signifies *dipped*, *immersed*, *overwhelmed*, or (if transferred,) *baptized*.

Another Greek writer commenting on the above passage, says, "like the cork of a net in the sea, I am not *overwhelmed*; as the cork does not sink, so I am *unbaptized*. The cork remains ἀβάπτιστος (*abaptistos*) *unbaptized*, and swims on the surface of the sea." The attentive reader will immediately perceive, that if this cork, which is swimming on the water, and one half of which, in this situation, would be covered with water, is yet said by a Greek writer to be (*abaptistos*) *unbaptized*, *unimmersed*; then the word *Baptizo* denoted, among the Greeks, nothing less than total immersion. It will be seen therefore, that we are fully borne out, by the Greek language, in affirming that such as have not been *immersed* in water, in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, are in the strict and literal sense of the word, *unbaptized*; which is precisely the same thing as saying they are *unimmersed*. There is certainly a less portion of the body of an infant, who is sprinkled, covered with water, than there is of a cork, when swimming on the water; and if a native Greek, writing his vernacular tongue affirms that the latter is (*abaptistos*) *unbaptized*, certainly we cannot be incorrect in affirming, that the former also, is *unbaptized*.

The following is presented as an instance of the use of the word in the Septuagint Greek version of the Old Testament, a translation from the Hebrew into Greek, made at the command of Ptolemy, king of Egypt. Let the reader turn to 2 Kings v. 14, and he will read in our English version, "Then went he (i. e. Naaman) down and *dipped himself* seven times in Jordan." In the Greek of the Septuagint the word is εβαπτισατο (ebaptisato) (from *Baptizo*), exactly answering to the Hebrew verb טָבַל (Taval), and correctly rendered in this instance *dipped himself*.

Now why are we not called upon, in this passage, to employ the absurd doctrine of transfer, and to say either he *Tavaled* himself, or he *Baptized* himself? Plainly because in this case there is no allusion to the ordinance of baptism, and therefore we are at liberty to let the meaning of the word be known. Had this been an account of an administration of the *ordinance* of baptism, instead of an immersion for another purpose, it would have been thought "the very climax" of Bigotry to have dared to *translate* the word; and we must therefore have covered up its meaning by employing a Hebrew or a Greek word.

There is the less need to fortify ourselves by the citation of numerous instances of the use of the word among Greek writers, as we are sustained in our opinion, that *Baptizo* means to *immerse*;—

(2.) *By the expressed opinion of the most learned Pædobaptists.* Out of a multitude of instances, I will only select the following :

1. *Witsius*, the learned author of the *Economy of the Covenants* says, (Book iv. c. 16, sec. 14.) "It cannot be denied, that the native signification of the word *Baptizo*, is to *plunge, to dip*."

2. *Salmasius*, an eminent French scholar, who succeeded Scaliger in the university of Leyden, in 1632, says, "Baptism is *immersion*; and was administered, in ancient times, according to the force and meaning of that word. Now it is only Rhantism or sprinkling, not immersion or dipping."

3. Calvin, that prodigy of human learning, who at the early age of 27, published in elegant Latin, his "Institutes of the Christian religion," says, (Book, iv. c. 15, sec. 19.) "The word itself to *baptize*, signifies to *immerse*, and it is certain that *immersion* was the practice of the ancient church."

4. *Diodati*, the learned author of an elegant and faithful version of the bible into the Italian language, says in his annotations upon Matt. iii. 6, and Rom. vi. 4. “*Baptized*—viz. plunged in water. In baptism, *being dipped* in water according to the ancient ceremony, it is a sacred figure unto us, that sin ought to be drowned in us, by God’s Spirit.”

5. Dr. John Lawrence Mosheim, the chancellor of the University of Gottingen, the learned author of one of the most popular ecclesiastical histories ever written; although by too many proofs he shows, that he is no friend to the Baptists, is yet compelled by the force of truth, to express himself in the following language: (Century i. c. 3, sec. 3.) Describing the effect of John’s ministry, he says, “Those who, being moved by his solemn admonitions, had formed the resolution of amending their lives, were initiated into the kingdom of the Redeemer, by the ceremony of *immersion* or *baptism*.”

In another place, the same author remarks, (Cent. i. c. 4, s. 8.) “The sacrament of Baptism was administered in this century, by the *immersion of the whole body* in the baptismal font.”

Want of space compels me to confine myself to one more testimony, although it would be easy to fill a volume, with similar quotations.

6. *Dr. Campbell*, principal of Marischal College in Aberdeen, Scotland, a minister of the Presbyterian church, and one of the most profoundly learned men of modern times, in his Preliminary Dissertations, has expressed himself in the following language.

“The Greek word *περιτομη* (*peritome*), the Latins translated *circumcisio*, (circumcision) which exactly corresponds in Etymology; but the Greek word *βαπτισμα* (*Baptisma*) (baptism) they have retained, changing only the letters from Greek to Roman. Yet the latter was just as susceptible of a literal version into Latin as the former. *Immersio* (*immersion*) answers as exactly in the one case, as *circumcisio*, (circumcision,) in the other. When the language furnishes us with materials for a version so exact, such a version conveys the sense, more perspicuously than a foreign name. For this reason, I should think the word immersion, a better English name than baptism, were we now at liberty to make a choice.”

In the same author's notes upon Matt. iii. 11, he says,

"The word *Baptizo*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse."

Now our Baptist missionary brethren, are precisely of the same opinion, in reference to the meaning of the word *Baptizo*, as Witsius, Salmasius, Calvin, Diodati, Mosheim and Campbell, the learned Pædobaptist authors, whose sentiments are quoted above. Like their Presbyterian brother, Dr. Campbell, they think, to translate the word, and print *immersion*, is better than to retain the Greek word *baptism*; and whatever circumstances may exist to prevent the liberty of making a choice *at the present day*, in respect to the English version, they think *they are at liberty* to make a choice, in giving the bible to the heathen; and therefore that they not only *may* but *must*, translate the word by its true and proper meaning; they therefore uniformly render the word, *immerse*.

(3.) We are sustained in the opinion that immerse is the precise meaning of *Baptizo*, in the third place, because *the Greeks, to whom the Greek language is vernacular, have always understood it so, and consequently always have, and still continue to administer the ordinance of Baptism, exclusively by immersion.*

Common sense would certainly teach us that a nation who speak a given language, are the best qualified to teach us the meaning of any word in that language; and if the whole body of the people were to persist, both by their declarations and their practice, in maintaining that a given word has a particular meaning; it would certainly appear like presumption, or folly, or both united, for any foreigner or company of foreigners to undertake to prove it did not mean, what the former asserted it did mean, and always had meant.

Just in this light, does the conduct of such as attempt to prove that *Baptizo* means any thing besides immersion, appear to the natives of Greece themselves. I am indebted for the substance of this remark to an interesting young Greek, who is a graduate of one of our American colleges.

(4.) We are sustained in our conviction that immerse is the true rendering of *Baptizo*, in the fourth place, *from the incontro-*

vertible fact that many of the most valuable versions both ancient and modern, render the word precisely as our missionaries have done, by a word signifying to immerse.

It is so rendered in the old Syriac or Peshito, a translation made as early as the beginning of the second century, and which the learned Michaelis pronounced to be the very best translation of the Greek Testament which he ever read ; and in several other of the best ancient translations.

Among the modern translations in which it is thus rendered may be enumerated, the reformer Luther's excellent German version, the Lower Saxon, the Danish, the Swedish, and the Belgian. In the German and Lower Saxon, the word is *taufen* ; in the Danish it is *dobe* ; in the Swedish, *dopa* ; and in the Belgian, *doopen*. These words all mean the same as the English word *dip*, and are intimately related to it, both in derivation and in sound.

The above are some of the reasons why we think immerse is the precise meaning of *Baptizo*, and although they are briefly stated, we think them abundantly sufficient to satisfy the mind of any unprejudiced, honest inquirer. I may be permitted here to mention a fact which exhibits the force of truth on the mind of a sincere inquirer. A few months since, a Danish gentleman who had recently become pious, was present at the West Baptist church in this city, and listened to a sermon in which the above fact was stated in reference to the translation of the word in the German, Saxon, Danish, Swedish and Belgian languages. When he left the house he returned home, and examined his bible attentively, and though previously much prejudiced in favour of sprinkling, very soon applied for membership in that church, stating that it was precisely as it had been stated, and his greatest surprise was, that he had never discovered it, or noticed it before.

To the inquiry proposed at the head of this chapter, we reply not only by professing our conviction that such is the meaning of the word—but, in the second place,

2. *We translate Baptizo, immerse, because if we were disposed to translate it by either of the other meanings, which have been sometimes given to it (viz. to pour, or to sprinkle,) we could not do so without*

making the Scriptures speak the language of absurdity, and thus exposing ourselves to be convicted of unfaithfulness by the common sense of the heathen themselves.

To discover the force of this observation, let the reader take a concordance of the New Testament, and in every passage where the word baptize, or baptism occurs, let him substitute the word *pour*; and then let him make the same attempt with the word *sprinkle*, and he will immediately see why we say that to translate by using either of these terms, would make the Scriptures speak the language of absurdity, and expose the translator to be convicted of unfaithfulness by the *common sense* of the heathen themselves.

We can only present two or three examples, with each word as a specimen of the whole.

First—Suppose we translate by the word **POUR**. How will the following passages sound?

Mark i. 9. Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was **POURED** of John in Jordan.

Acts ii. 41. Then they that gladly received his word, were **POURED**.

Acts viii. 12. When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were **POURED**, both men and women.

Now, I ask, what would the heathen think of a book which contained language so utterly absurd as the above expressions? *Pouring men and women!* we may pour water, but to talk of pouring a man is ridiculous. If I were to present a bible translated in this manner to an untutored heathen, I should expect him to turn from it as a clumsy and absurd imposture. Nor shall we succeed any better if we translate by the word **SPRINKLE**.

Let us make the attempt in the following passages:

Luke xii. 50. “I have a **SPRINKLING** to be **SPRINKLED** with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished.” If a heathen had perused the affecting account of the amazing agonies of the blessed Saviour, as recorded in the 22d and 23d chapters of the same gospel, would he think that mere **SPRINKLING** were an adequate emblem of such overwhelming sufferings?

John iii. 23. “And John also was **SPRINKLING** in Enon, near to Salim, *because there was much water there.*”

Would not an untutored heathen, if he read such a passage as the above, immediately exclaim, ‘I should have thought it did not require *much water to sprinkle*, even a multitude; a gallon of water might answer the purpose as well as a river. Why should it be said he was **SPRINKLING** in this neighbourhood, **BECAUSE there was much water there?** I do not understand this. There must be some mistake here, or else the book itself is an absurdity?’

Rom. v. 3, 4. Know ye not, that so many of us, as were **SPRINKLED** into Jesus Christ, were **SPRINKLED** into his death. Therefore we are **BURIED** with him by **SPRINKLING** into death.

Would not a Hindoo or a Burman, accustomed as he is to the beautiful and appropriate figures of Oriental imagery, such as are used in the Scriptures, upon reading language like the above, instantly suspect there was something wrong here? ‘**BURIED** with him by **SPRINKLING!**’ he would exclaim—‘I always supposed in the use of figurative language, there must be a correspondence between the figure and the thing represented by it;—and in the other parts of this book, there is a beautiful propriety in the figures employed;—but what resemblance can there possibly be between **SPRINKLING** and a **BURIAL?**’

Surely, if a translation containing the absurdities produced by either of the above renderings, were to be presented to a heathen possessed of good common sense; that common sense would lead him to contrast the lofty sublimity, noble sense, and beautiful propriety of all the other parts of this book, with the evident absurdity of these passages, and to conclude in his mind, either that the passages themselves were interpolations, or else that they had been corrupted by the duplicity of the translator. I need scarcely add, that by using the words *immerse*, *immersion*, all these absurdities are avoided, and a noble and consistent sense produced in every instance.*

I ask, therefore, once more—are the Baptists to be charged with Bigotry and Ultra-sectarianism, because they translate the word

* To the reader, who has carefully perused the above remarks, it will not be difficult to discover *one powerful reason*, at least, why our Pædobaptist friends are so extremely desirous to retain the word *Baptizo*, untranslated in the versions which they give to the heathen, viz. *that they must keep it untranslated, or else they must translate it immerse*, unless they would produce a version, which in a short time would destroy itself by its own absurdity.

Baptizo, *immerse*, since it is their solemn and deliberate conviction, that this is its precise meaning; since they are sustained in this conviction, by the meaning of the word among Greek authors; by the expressed opinion of the most learned Pædobaptists, that such is its meaning; by the well known fact, that the Greeks themselves have always so understood, and so practised; and by the equally undeniable fact, that it is thus translated, in some of the best versions of the New Testament, both ancient and modern; some of which translations are actually at the present time patronised and circulated by the American Bible Society? And more than all this, since the translation of the word uniformly, by any other term besides *immersion*, would make the Scriptures speak the language of absurdity, and render the translator liable to be convicted of unfaithfulness by the heathen themselves? If, after this, any shall be so unreasonable as to reiterate the charge; we merely reply, we do not wish to *be* uncharitable, or to be *thought* so; if however, kind words are to be bought by the SACRIFICE OF TRUTH, we can never consent to purchase them at a price so dear. GREAT IS THE TRUTH, AND IT WILL, IT MUST PREVAIL.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHARGE OF EMBARRASSING MISSIONARY OPERATIONS SHOWN TO BELONG, NOT TO BAPTISTS, WHO TRANSLATE LITERALLY THE COMMAND OF CHRIST RELATING TO BAPTISM, AND STRICTLY ADHERE TO THAT COMMAND BY PRACTISING IMMERSION ONLY; BUT TO PÆDOBAPTISTS WHO COVER UP THE MEANING OF BAPTISM FROM THE HEATHEN UNDER THE VEIL OF A GREEK WORD, AND BY PRACTISING SPRINKLING, EXHIBIT BEFORE THE HEATHEN WORLD THE SPECTACLE OF TWO BAPTISMS, WHEN CHRIST HAS ESTABLISHED BUT ONE.

In the extract quoted at the commencement of this pamphlet, the Baptists are harshly charged with "the sin of embarrassing, hindering, and delaying the conversion of the world."

Now, admitted that the difference of opinion and practice upon the subject of Baptism, and the different modes adopted by the one party, of *translating* the word, and by the other party, of

leaving it untranslated—admitted, I say, that this does produce embarrassment in missionary operations; to whom, I ask, is this embarrassment chargeable? To those who are guilty of an obstinate adherence to truth, or to those who are guilty of an obstinate adherence to error? No one will deny that the charge belongs to the latter class, whether they are Baptists or Pædobaptists. Such as would censure any denomination for undeviating (call it, if you will, *obstinate*) adherence to truth, imitate the conduct of the Roman governor Pliny, who, when writing to Trajan the emperor, concerning the early Christian martyrs, says, “Such as persisted in the profession of Christianity, I ordered away to be punished: for I had no doubt, whatever might be the nature of their opinions, they ought to be punished for their *inflexible obstinacy*.”

The question then arises, which party are wrong, in this case? The Baptists, who preach, and practise, and print *immersion*, or the Pædobaptists, who preach and practise *sprinkling*, but *print* nothing but the Greek word? If the Baptists are wrong, and *it* is their duty to give Greek words to the perishing heathen, instead of words in their own language; if they do not translate the word by its true meaning; if they do not obey the command and imitate the example of Christ, when they go down into the water; but if they have introduced a baptism which Christ did not command; then, we confess, that the charge of embarrassing missionary operations belongs to the Baptists. But if, on the other hand, the Pædobaptists are wrong in giving to the heathen a Greek word for baptism, instead of a word in their own language; if they do not act in accordance with the command and the example of Christ, when they sprinkle a few drops of water on the face of an infant, and say, “I baptize thee;” then I contend that the charge of embarrassing missionary operations belongs to them. If the Baptists believed that sprinkling was one mode of baptism, equally valid with immersion, while their brethren believed that nothing but sprinkling was baptism; and if they yet refused to conform to the example of their brethren, that the heathen might see, that as they had one Lord and one Faith, they had also *one Baptism*, though they could conscientiously thus conform; then I admit, they would be chargeable with all the

confusion, and embarrassment, which arises from exhibiting to the heathen *two baptisms*. But they do not believe that sprinkling is baptism, and they therefore cannot conscientiously either practise sprinkling themselves, or acknowledge sprinkling to be baptism when performed by others.

Now, let it be remembered, that the Pædobaptists do universally know and acknowledge immersion to be baptism, and might, therefore, invariably practise it without violating their own conscientious opinions ; that notwithstanding this, they do persist in the introduction of sprinkling wherever their missionaries go ; thus presenting before the heathen, the painful spectacle of *two baptisms*, while he reads in the sacred book which they put into his hands of “one Lord, one Faith, **ONE BAPTISM.**”

Upon whose heads, then, does the charge rest, of embarrassing missionary operations among the heathen ? Let candor and honesty answer the question, and the charge will rebound from those at whom it has been hurled, and alight upon the heads of those who have cast it at us.

One word more to my Pædobaptist brethren, and I have done. If aught in the preceding pages has the appearance of harshness or severity, believe me, when I say, it was not intended ; the cause of **TRUTH** required that the arguments should be placed in as strong a point of light as the writer was capable of presenting them ; but nothing has proceeded from unkindness of spirit. Beloved brethren, you and we, and your missionaries and ours, must in a little while stand before the great tribunal, to give an account of our stewardship ; then it will be seen whether you or we are guilty in introducing *two baptisms*, when Christ has established but *one* ; then it will be seen whether, in this matter, your practice or ours, was agreeable to the mind of Christ ; then it will be seen whether you or we were guilty in embarrassing the efforts of the church for the conversion of the heathen.—Are you prepared, beloved brethren, at that tribunal, to justify yourselves in this matter ? Excuse us, if we express our solemn conviction, that the weight of this awful responsibility rests upon you—and that you alone will have to answer for all the embarrassments which result from introducing among the heathen *two* kinds of baptism. As for ourselves, as Baptists, we rejoice that,

in this matter, we have the testimony of our consciences, that we are pleasing God ; and if any apology be demanded of us for strictly and literally adhering to the command of Christ, in reference to this divine ordinance, this is our defence, and with this we contemplate with pleasure the account we shall have to give of our conduct in this respect, at the tribunal of the Judge. *It is written in the Statutes of the King in Zion, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it."*

We are contending only for THE TRUTH ; we cannot, WE DARE NOT sacrifice truth to expediency, even though we were entreated to make the sacrifice upon the altar of charity. Our allegiance to our Master is superior to every other consideration, and we are commanded in the Statute-book of His kingdom, to

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."

THE END.