

dip and nothing but dip and yet acknowledges that the disciples were baptized, when being initiated into the New Kingdom *without being dipped*, I leave with you to untangle. Having seen, therefore, that dip is out of the question in one case, it must follow that all must have been, and ought to be, initiated into the New Kingdom in the same manner. It has also been brought before your mind that those who in reading the New Testament can come to no other conclusion than, that those who are baptized were baptized with dipping; simply from the fact that we read of some going into the water; John baptizing at a place where there was much water, and being "buried with Christ in baptism." With regard to some going into the water, I have shown, that the baptism was essentially a different and distinct act. I have shown that John baptized with water, and Mr. Blenus himself has acknowledged that "buried with Christ in baptism," does not refer to water baptism. With this light on the subject, from what portion of the Scriptures can an enquirer learn that dipping is taught in the scripture?

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen :—I have thus from my stand-point clearly shown to you that the word *Baptizo* does not mean to dip. Mr. Blenus himself has acknowledged that it does not signify this in one place, therefore I maintain that it cannot do so in another. Hence the proposition that the word *Baptizo* dips a person as applied to the New Testament ordinance of Baptism into water is completely refuted, for if it were not then would the word of God contradict itself.

FINIS.