

present) would speedily settle the vexed question of MODE, by showing that *dipping* cannot be essential to its validity. That baptism is a symbolical rite, is admitted by all. Water is a purifier, and its use in baptism symbolizes our purification from the defilement of sin by the Holy Spirit. Moral purification is the "inward and spiritual grace" signified by the "outward and visible sign." Now where is the symbol? In the *water*, or in the *mode* of its application? It must be either in the one or the other: it cannot be in *both*; for that, as will be seen on reflection, would sometimes produce confusion in our conceptions, besides being inadmissible on other grounds. If it is said that the symbol is in the *mode*, and that therefore the only right mode is immersion, we must demur, and ask what does immersion symbolize? To this it is said, it symbolizes our "burial with Christ," according to a passage in the Epistle to the Romans, where St. Paul says, "We are buried with Him by baptism." But the believer's "burial with Christ" is obviously not a literal truth, but a figurative mode of expressing his "death unto sin." And baptism, according to Dr. Carson himself, cannot be the symbol of a figure; it can only be the symbol of a truth. Some few have maintained that sprinkling and pouring are the *only* valid modes of baptism; and that immersion is altogether unwarrantable, on the ground that it cannot symbolize the "pouring out of the Holy Spirit." To this Dr. Carson replies, "Pouring of the Spirit is a phrase which is itself a figure, not a reality to be represented by a figure." This reply is correct; and proves that to set up exclusive claims in favour of sprinkling or pouring, is unwarrantable. We wonder, however, that the Doctor did not perceive that his argument, while refuting the narrowness which would re-

strict
the m
says
ing o
repre
Then
cann
is a
repre
the m
the g
valid
cates
satisf
sive
the p
great
concl
water
For i
you s
as sy
Imm
And
ever
it, no
Carso
logic
For
pour
to m