prepositions do not necessarily exclude sprinkling and include immersion. But the circumstances make it almost impossible to conceive that baptism was by sprinkling. Why, on this suppo- sition, were places chosen for baptism where there was much water, or many waters, or at the Jordan river. Why unless they went into the water should they take the trouble to go down to it? Why unless to immerse did they go into it, both baptizer and baptized, and incur, according to our opponents, all the fear- ful danger of cold and the inconvenience of wet clothing for nothing? On the supposition that baptism was an immersion, however, all is consistent. They resort to the plentiful waters because they are needed, they go down both into the water, be- cause the candidate was to be buried therein and the baptizer was to bury him. From the prepositions and the circumstances, then, there is another strong presumptive argument for the Baptist view, although we do not regard it as demonstrable.

SUMMARY.

Thus we have striven to meet objections to immersion fairly. The reader must judge whether they have not been met sufficient- ly—nay, whether the most have not proved arguments for us, scarcely disguised. In every case but one or two, we have referred the reader to the passages of the author where our quotations may be found, so that they can verify for themselves. In the course of the discussion, also, the following facts, among others have been made apparent.

In the assumption that immersion was the baptism practiced by Christ and the apostles, all is clear and consistent.

The Greek word *baptizo* is taken in the sense in which the people used and understood it—in the sense in which the Greeks of to-day, and the church of which they form a part, use and understand it—instead of having forced upon it a meaning not only totally foreign to it, but also that of another common word