

objections come with an ill grace from those who assert that baptism came in the room of circumcision.

A. Others say that it was impossible for the apostles to immerse 3000 in part of a day.

B. I have heard it said that Peter baptized these 3000 himself, when asked for the proof, they had none. When asked to prove that Peter baptized one of them, it was equally wanting. There is no real difficulty in the case. If there were no other christian on the ground it could be all done in an hour. As soon as Peter baptized one, or twenty, he could authorize them to baptize others, and so on till the whole was accomplished; so that this objection is lighter than vanity.

A. It is said that John baptized with water and therefore the subject was not immersed.

B. This objection rests on the preposition *with*. All classical scholars know that this foundation is not good; for the Greek preposition *en* is more properly rendered *in* than *with*. Learned pedobaptists have severely blamed the King's translators for putting *with water* instead of *in water*. An object can be buried with an element more flexible than itself, so that this objection is lame in every leg.

A. It is said that baptism represents the gift of the Holy Spirit, and as the Spirit was poured on the apostles at Pentecost, pouring or sprinkling is more consistent than immersion.

B. The objection lays the most valid claims to a "show of wisdom" of any I have yet seen among the opponents of immersion. Baptism points to the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. The gift of the Holy Spirit is never called baptism, only in contrast with John's baptism. In a literal description of that gift the word is never used. But admitting that baptism was a broken word to denote the gift of the Holy Spirit it would argue nothing against immersion inasmuch as it fully expresses the idea in this case. The facts are as follows:—When the spirit came on the day of Pentecost a sound as of a rushing mighty wind filled the house where they were sitting. There appeared cloven tongues that sat on them and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and spake with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. I can see nothing here to oppose immersion.

A. It is said that the spirit fell upon the apostles and not that they were applied to it.

B. It matters not, so long as they were totally influenced by the Spirit or overwhelmed in it. There is nothing here that resembles