

been able to live as

three thousand on
t would have been
o have *dipped* this
and been physically
at they could have
e it was so scarce
l to the people in
this case without
nit several others
ument.

he immersionists,
nchor (or at least
tism of the Ethio-
down both into
and he baptized
of the water, the
(Acts viii. 38,
ism by *dipping*?
emine it. They
f the water," are
this was a case
the words ren-
ight have been
iginal, "to" and
ten thus trans-
ke this render-
hoose,) there is
all; they might
e do not insist
ontroversy we

can well afford to be liberal. Let us keep, then, to the authorized version, "*into*" and "*out of*." How does it appear, from these words, that the eunuch was *dipped*? They *might* go "*into*" the water only ankle-deep, to enable Philip the more conveniently to lift up some of it in his hand, and pour it on the head of his convert. Certainly it cannot be said that the word *necessarily* means more than this. But if it be insisted upon that the words "*into*" and "*out of*" must mean *immersion* and *emersion*, (though no proof of this is furnished,) then, as nothing is said of the eunuch in relation to them that is not said of Philip, the passage would prove that the eunuch was dipped *three times*, and Philip *twice*! "They went down both *into* the water,"—*both dipped*; "and he baptized him,"—Philip dipped the eunuch: and "they came up," both of them, "*out of* the water,"—Philip and the eunuch *emerged*, which implies of necessity that they had been previously *submerged*. Thus, if we concede all that is asked in regard to the meaning of "*into*" and "*out of*," we fear that the passage will prove rather inconvenient to our friends, by establishing a good deal more than they wish. It is impossible, as we have seen, to prove that the eunuch was *dipped at all*, without proving at the same time that he was dipped *thrice* and Philip *twice*. Are our opponents, then, prepared to stick to this passage as a proof of baptism by dipping? If so, they must take the consequences; which, besides showing their own practice to be defective, would place a solemn religious ordinance in a very ludicrous light.

We cannot but think that correct views respecting the nature of baptism as a symbolical rite (of course it is *more* than a symbol, but with that we have nothing to do at