

MR. BLENS :—

Mr. Moderator, Ladies and Gentlemen :—I have quoted Paul in Romans vi. to show you how he looked upon the subject of baptism—when he says, “we are buried with him by baptism into death,” and to show you that it is also entirely evident that Paul here is alluding to Christian Scriptural baptism in water. To prove this I quoted over thirty of the very ablest and best commentators of nearly every age since the Apostles’ days. Now, after I had done all this, when my respondent arises he tells you that I have conceded that in this passage (Rom. vi. 4,-5,) there is no allusion whatever to water baptism. I made no such concession and am sorry that although enough has been said on that point to satisfy the most exacting, that my respondent unwittingly, or otherwise, has grossly misrepresented my arguments. But they will speak for themselves—Paul in Romans vi. does *emphatically*, as I have proved, refer to immersion in water.

In regard to the Phillipian Jailor he has said that I have brought no evidence that Paul and the Jailor left the prison. I shall now read the account found in Acts xvi. 29,-30, “Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas. *And brought them out* and said ‘Sirs, what must I do to be saved’”. Here now the Scripture affirms that the Jailor *brought them out*. Now, if my respondent is a believer in the Bible why not believe this account of the “beloved physician,” they were certainly brought out for that simple reason as Holy Writ declares it,—but because it is against my opponent, he tries to dwell upon some far-fetched ideas of prison-rules, or some other ridiculous absurdity.

My respondent is again in trouble about Philip and the Eunuch,—well it is no wonder.—The scripture tells us “they both went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch” and he baptized him—and “when they came up out of the water” etc.—This certainly is very much against my opponent; and it is in beautiful harmony with the even tenor of the Bible. Mr. Archibald, labors hard at every place where baptism is spoken of, to try to show that it does not mean what the simple rendering tells us, it does mean.

He has also referred to the circumstance, that if the word *dip* should be substituted for baptize in the New Testament, there would be often a flat contradiction of terms. Let my friends substitute *immerse* for *baptize* and in every instance he will find the sense complete and the construction grammatical—now I am not particular which of the words he uses as long as the burial takes place.

The Bible teaches for baptism a burial in water.—Now, my opponent splits a hair before he can get anything to work with.—Every scholar knows that there are no two words in any language that are *exactly* synonymous.—Now the verbs *dip* and *immerse* are synonyms, and it matters little which is used, as long as the idea of a *burial in* is conveyed; but let him substitute *sprinkle* or *pour* or any of their synonyms in the place of *baptize*, and he will at once see that it gives