

*narratives*—a mode of proof denied to us. Now is not this a grievous inconsistency? The admission of eminent English Churchmen that the Scriptures contain no express command to baptize infants, is triumphantly recorded by Baptists. Now, we are not more positive about retaining infant baptism than they are in prescribing immersion. We are, therefore, naturally led to apply to them their own principles, and to ask for a plain, express command for immersion, or against pouring or sprinkling. And really we might have expected such a command, if Christ intended to restrict baptism to Immersion. The essential elements in a sacrament would naturally have been such as could be everywhere easily procured, prescribed as they were by one whose motto was—"I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." Now, a large portion of the world is so arid, that in many countries it would be a matter of serious difficulty, if not altogether impossible, to procure water enough to immerse an adult. Again, a large portion of the world is so cold, that immersion would be dangerous! But, though we might reasonably have looked for an express precept; yet we do not require the Baptists to produce one. We are willing to take their arguments on their merits, because we think that the cavilling about express commands is unfair. If we can plainly *gather* from Scripture an argument which proves that a practice was coun-