

to get the idea of sprinkling out of baptize, the word has to be forced, and the spirit of scriptural interpretation violated.

The second point concerns the custom in early Church times. For the custom of New Testament days I simply ask you to read such passages as Matt. 3 : 16; Mark 1 : 10; Acts 8 : 38, 39, where the details of the ordinance are given. Does the language in these cases, so far as it indicates anything, favour the idea of sprinkling or immersion? I leave the question for you to answer, fairly and without prejudice. In the last passage, recording the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch, it has been claimed that, in the country traversed by the eunuch, enough water could not have been found to permit of immersion; but Dr. Thompson, author of "The Land and the Book," a standard work, speaks of a stream in that neighborhood thus: "A fine stream of water, deep enough in some places even in June to satisfy the utmost wishes of our Baptist friends." It is interesting to notice in passing that had sprinkling been considered sufficient for the purpose, the eunuch would have probably had sufficient water in his chariot to perform the ceremony, without stopping his whole cavalcade. It is impossible to suppose that, on a long journey such as he was taking, he would be dependent for two or three drops of water upon a chance stream. That the practice of the early Church was immersion every authority of any importance readily concedes. John Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, Adam Clark, Dean Alford, Dr. Schaff, Dean Stanley, John Wesley, Neander, Pressense,