

VI.

As far as I can judge from the many large and learned volumes written in favour of immersion, and the verbal arguments adduced by its abettors, the Baptists base their immersion on *inference, mere conjecture or thinking*, for they have never yet given from the bible, a single instance of any one having been immersed in water, nor any command for it.

VII.

The Baptists *think* that John administered baptism by immersion,—Christ was baptized with water, they say *immersed*, we are to follow Christ : therefore, be *immersed, plunged, dipped in water* as they say he was ; now for various reasons, I think differently. Among the most prominent are, 1st. The learned, when not influenced by prejudice or party zeal, both among the Baptists and Pedobaptists inform us that the word Baptism can be applied with as equal propriety, or superior authority to ablution and sprinkling, as to immersion. 2d, John lived under the old dispensation—his baptism *was not Christian Baptism*, Acts 19, 4,—but typified the Christian Baptism : if so then it could not be by immersion, but by pouring or sprinkling, for we frequently read of the Holy Spirit being applied in the form of the latter, but not a solitary instance of the former. 3d, for a believer in Christ, whose conscience has been sprinkled by his all cleansing blood to submit to immersion in water because they *think* John did—constitutes a complete paradox—going backwards and not forwards ; and when the ablest writer that ever wrote in favour of immersion, can adduce no stronger proof than “ *it appears to me* ”—“ *it must be so* ”—“ *I think so*,” &c. &c. &c., I think it as well to have nothing to do with it.