

But they say the jailer, Acts 16. 33, was baptized by immersion. This also is mere assertion without proof. A common mode of arguing used by the Baptists. But let us for a moment examine the circumstance of this case, if it were for no other purpose but to excite our astonishment at their ingenuity and invention. In the 24th verse, we are told the jailer thrust Paul and Silas into the *inner* prison and made their feet fast in the stocks—When the earthquake awoke the jailer he was about to kill himself, supposing the prisoners had fled, the doors of the prison being open; but Paul prevented this rash act, upon which the jailer called for a light and sprang in (in where? into the inner prison) and came and fell down trembling before Paul and Silas and brought them out, (out of the inner prison) and enquired the way of salvation—When they directed him to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and he should be saved, &c. and he took them (not out as the Baptists read it,) the same hour of the night, washed their stripes and was baptized he and *all* his, straightway. Now is there one single circumstance in this case to found immersion upon—No mention of leaving the jail, or the jailer's apartment, or of going to a river for the purpose. Those who can believe that the jailer and all his were baptized by immersion, may with equal propriety believe any other foolish and absurd proposition.

In the case of Cornelius, Acts 10. 47, there is no mention of going to a river or to any water in order to his baptism, nor have we any reason to believe he was baptized by immersion, but quite the contrary. Was St. Paul baptized by immersion? Acts 9. 18. Did he go to any sea or river for the purpose? Was the Eunuch baptized by immersion? We read, Acts 8, that *the Eunuch and Philip went on their way and they came* (in the order of their journey) *to a certain water: and the Eunuch said, see, here is water; what doth hinder me from being baptized? and they went both down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him;* but here is not one word of plunging under the water, (for going down into the water and coming up out of it, proves just nothing to the purpose,) and every other case of this kind stands on the same foundation. The advocates for immersion, assert, beg the question, and take for granted what they cannot prove. But it is worthy of observation that although many baptisms are mentioned, none went from the place where they first offered themselves as candidates for baptism, (except in one instance of which I shall speak just now) to any river or other water, as our Baptists do to be baptized.

The instance to which I alluded above is in John 3. 23, John was baptizing in *Enon near Salem, because there was much water there.* This place contains the strength of their cause, for as they are Baptists, they think it as necessary now to believe in and submit to John's baptism, as it was before the Gospel was preached by our Saviour and his Apostles, whereas he was only sent to prepare the way of the Lord. Upon this I have made some observations in another place.

But

But