

tithe of his converts, even if he had been able to live as comfortably in the water as on land.

We might dwell on the baptism of the three thousand on the day in Pentecost, and show that it would have been physically impossible for the apostles to have *dipped* this large number; and that, even if they had been physically adequate to the task, it is not credible that they could have obtained sufficient water in a city where it was so scarce that, according to Josephus, it was sold to the people in separate measures. But we pass over this case without further notice, and for want of space omit several others which would have strengthened our argument.

We come now to the great passage of the immersionists, that which they regard as their sheet-anchor (or at least one of them) in this controversy,—the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch by Philip. "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." (Acts viii. 38, 39.) Was this, then, a clear case of baptism by *dipping*? It is affirmed that it was; but let us examine it. They went "*into* the water," and came up "*out of* the water," are the words which are supposed to prove that this was a case of dipping. Almost every one knows that the words rendered, respectively, "*into*" and "*out of*," might have been rendered, in equal harmony with the original, "*to*" and "*from*," and that, in fact, they are very often thus translated in our English version. Now, if we take this rendering, (and we *have a right* to take it if we choose,) there is no proof that they went into the water at all; they might merely have gone to the water's edge. But we do not insist on this rendering; for we feel that in this controversy we