

communicants, their position while partaking, &c., are not essential ; so in the use of water in baptism.

*B.* This fallacy has only to be stated to make it apparent to all. It proceeds on the assumption that using water, and not performing an action, is the essential point; this is not the fact. Our Lord told his disciples to perform an action, and by example as well as the word used, showed them what that action was; they were, therefore, bound to perform that action. In the supper he told them all to eat of the bread, and drink of the cup, and showed them the example. Now if any argue that *using* bread, and not *eating* it, was the positive point, that some might eat it, and others, if they were so inclined, might lay it aside, and both equally please and obey Christ, as the *mode* was an unessential part of an institution: I appeal to the candid, if the argument would not be as valid as the one used for the different modes of baptism? In baptism there may be non-essentials: some might prefer a river, others a lake—some might object to salt water, others prefer it: but as persons in primitive times were baptized at different places, and no objections made, provided there was “much water” all these opinions are unimportant: but what can be said of the assertion that an action, the very opposite to what Christ has commanded, is obeying him in a positive institution. For those who plead for sprinkling to adhere to it as the positive action commanded by our Lord would show, at least, some consistency. Two opposites cannot be the same. The man who had water sprinkled upon him, and the man who had water poured upon him, and he who was immersed in water, have not equally followed the example of Christ, unless he went through these different actions in his baptism. Neither are they equally obedient unless the command was to pour water, or sprinkle water, or be immersed in water according to the wish of the subject or its proxy.

*A.* If we are bound to follow Christ in one thing why not in another? if in baptism why not be crucified?

*B.* Because he has not commanded us to be crucified; if he had we must as positively do it, and could not chose anything else.

*A.* Is it not surprising that the advocates of sprinkling do not adhere to that mode, and repudiate every other?

*B.* To deny in this enlightened age that immersion is baptism, would be sheer folly: it is hence deemed safer to contend, that, although *Bapto* positively means dip, yet when it has another termination, it only means the very opposite, or in fact, anything the sect to