

us the most ridiculous nonsense.—Would my friend be willing to translate the New Testament, and everytime *baptize* was used, substitute sprinkle or pour? Would he as a scholar be willing to do this? I can answer for him. He would not—for the simple reason that he could not, the Scriptures would not admit of the change—while editions of the New Testament have been and are now being issued with the word *immerse* in the place of the word *baptize* and are recognised as correct translations of the original.

He also quotes 2 Kings xviii. 33, to show that here we have a bullock baptized (according to the translation of Origen), but he forgets to tell us that four barrels was twice filled to accomplish it—plainly showing a complete submersion or overwhelming in water, even although poured on the thing commanded.

He has also referred unto the sprinkling of sand on an individual who was sick, and water not being procurable,—before I close I shall have something to say on this point in the history of sprinkling. But, before I leave this part of the discussion I will here say—I challenge my opponent to produce from the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation one single instance where sprinkling or pouring mere water on any person or thing, for any moral ceremonial or religious use was ever done.—It was never done by the authority of God since the world began.—Notice the expression *mere water or water alone*.

Next, I shall briefly notice the history of sprinkling. 1st, I shall quote the "Edinburgh Encyclopaedia" Article on baptism :—"The first *law* for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner, Pope Stephen II. being driven from Rome by Adolphus King of the Lombards in 753, fled to Pepin who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. Whilst he remained there the monks of Crossy in Brittany, consulted him whether in case of necessity water poured on the head of the infant would be lawful—Stephen replied that it would—but though the truth of this fact be allowed—which, however some Catholics deny—yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted only in *cases of necessity*. It was not till the year 1311, that the Legislature in a council held in Ravenna declared immersion, or sprinkling to be indifferent.—In Scotland, however, sprinkling was never practised in ordinary cases till after the Reformation, about the middle of the 16th century, from Scotland it made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized in the "Established Church."

Next, we will quote Dr. Wall, acknowledged to be the most learned and able of Pedobaptists, who gives us a volume of evidence in one paragraph in his book entitled, "History of Infant Baptism" Part II. chap. 9. He says,— "France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health and in the public way of administering it. They (the assembly of divines at Westminster) reformed the font into a basin. This learned assembly could not remember, that fonts to baptize in had been always used by the primitive christians long before the beginning of Popery, and ever since churches were built, but that sprinkling for