

people in the river. Again—"And were all poured in Jordan." *Pouring* people into the river would also be heavier work than immersing them. Reader, take any place in the scriptures where the word baptise occurs, and you will see the same difficulties attending pouring and sprinkling. We will notice a few more: Rom. vi.—"We are buried with him by *sprinkling* into death!" "Buried with him in *sprinkling*, wherein also you are risen!" I Cor. xv.—"Else what shall they do who are *poured* for the dead," &c. But I can proceed no further. The reader will think that the subject is not treated with that seriousness which its importance demands. Far be it from us to hold up the subject to ridicule; but if the quoting of the scriptures in the sense in which Paido-Baptists receive it causes it to sound so ridiculous to them, how must it appear to those who view its performance with a full conviction that it has no foundation in the word of God; but is the production of an age which spread blight and desolation over the fair face of God's moral vineyard!!

6. Not only does the connection in which the word is found require immersion as its invariable meaning, but the prepositions used in describing it, and the circumstances connected with its administration, go still farther to establish the meaning of *baptizo* to be nothing but immerse. If the prepositions have their literal and primary signification, and no honest translator gives a secondary meaning to a word, if the primary will possibly give the sense of the original, then, in every instance the language is one—and that is immersion. It is baptised *in* water; they go down *into* the water; they come up *out of* or *from* the water. We are aware of all that can be said about substituting *with* and *to*, &c. for *in* and *into* and *out of*; but the subterfuge is so miserable that we shall not stop to notice it, until we take up the objections generally.

The argument drawn from the prepositions, and the circumstances of baptism, is not one of minor consideration, although it is often ridiculed.

The justly celebrated Dr. Doddridge says, "I am more and more convinced that the vulgar [common] sense of the New Testament, that is, the sense in which an honest man of plain sense would take it, on his first reading the original, or a good translation, is almost every where the true and general sense of the passage. I choose to follow the plainest, and the most obvious and common interpretation, which indeed, I generally think the best." Now, no intelligent, candid Paido-Baptist can doubt that a common reader of the New Testament would, without hesitation, conclude that immersion was the meaning of baptism in every instance; unless he had had his mind previously warped by the prejudices of education.

In illustration of the above, we shall here introduce a well authenticated narrative, the truth of which cannot be disputed:

#### HOW INDIANS READ THE BIBLE.

While on a visit to the State of A——, in the summer of 182—, an occurrence was related to me, which, if you think it worthy of publica-