

consult our convenience or the climate, by administering the rite either by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion? The man who insists on immersion as the only valid mode of baptism, on the ground that *mode* is inseparably connected with the meaning of the word, ought, in order to be consistent, to insist that, as *supper* means an evening meal, and nothing else, every one is bound to receive the sacrament of the Supper *at night only*; and that the man who partakes of bread and wine, professedly to commemorate the love of Christ in dying for him, even in the most grateful and confiding spirit, at any other time than evening, does not really receive this holy sacrament.

Hitherto we have proceeded on the admission that *dipping* is the synonyme of *baptism*; and have proved that, even if it were so, immersion cannot be regarded as essential to the validity of the rite; unless we reason on a principle which would make it unlawful for a man to receive the Lord's Supper at any other time but at night.

We now take other ground, and affirm that dipping is *not* the synonyme of baptism; that the term is used in many cases, both in the New Testament and in the Greek Classics, in which we are quite certain that there was, and could be, no dipping.

The advocates of immersion are very fond of appealing to the Greek Classics, in proof of their statement that "*baptism* means dipping, and nothing else." Dr. Carson says, "I begin with the Classics, and end with the Classics at the time of the institution." It may be well enough to "*begin* with the Classics;" but why "*end* with the Classics?" Have the writers of the New Testament no right to be heard on this question? Or did the Doctor shrewdly conjecture, that he would be able to make out