

strict us to sprinkling or pouring, was equally valid against the narrowness which would restrict us to immersion. He says that sprinkling or pouring cannot symbolize the pouring of the Spirit, because that is only a figurative mode of representing the bestowment of the Spirit's influences. Then may it not be said, with equal truth, immersion cannot symbolize our burial with Christ, because "that is a phrase which is itself a figure, not a reality to be represented by a figure?" If the argument is valid against the man who advocates exclusive sprinkling or pouring, on the ground that the mode is symbolical, it must be equally valid against the man who, on the very same ground, advocates exclusive immersion. Dr. Carson is so thoroughly satisfied with his argument against the advocates of exclusive sprinkling or pouring, that he thinks "it must settle the point for ever with all sober men." Let us look at the great principle of this argument. Does it not prove, most conclusively, that in baptism the symbol must be in the water, and that it cannot be in the mode of its application? For in whatever way you use water in baptism, whether you sprinkle, pour, or immerse, you cannot regard the mode as symbolical without making it the symbol of a figure. Immersion symbolizes no truth, and can symbolize none. And this is equally true of sprinkling or pouring. However the water may be applied in baptism, the symbol is in it, not in the mode of using it. We cordially thank Dr. Carson for his argument: let it only be carried out to its logical consequences by all parties, and we ask no more. For as soon as it is admitted that water, not dipping, nor pouring, nor sprinkling, is the symbol, the controversy as to mode must be at an end "with all sober men," for it