time but at night? Unquestionably, our Lord instituted this sacrament in "the same night in which He was be-Indeed, the element of time is implied in its And yet the Baptists have no hesitation about receiving the "Lord's Supper" in a morning. How do they justify their conduct? How easy would it be to say, reasoning on their own principle, "Supper signifies an evening meal, and nothing but an evening meal; and therefore we are bound to receive this ordinance only at night!" The proper answer, of course, is, that time is not essential to the ordinance; and therefore if, in a proper spirit, we partake of bread and wine in commemoration of Christ's death, we are allowed to consult our own convenience in regard to time, and to observe this sacrament either merning, noon, or night. We accept the answer as perfectly satisfactory. It is the only answer that either a Baptist or any one else could give, to justify his conduct in receiving the Lord's Supper in a morning. But will not the same principle establish the validity of sprinklin, or pouring in baptism, even on the admission that the word primarily refers to dipping? We are told that mode is implied in the very name of the initiatory rite; that to baptize means "to dip, and nothing else." Now, suppose this were true, (which it is not,) might we not reply, "Is mode more deeply engrained in the word 'baptism' than time in the word 'supper?'" If, then, our common sense enables us to perceive that the element of time in the Lord's Supper is not essential to the ordinance,—and if our Christian liberty allows us to eliminate it, and partake of the sacrament of the Supper at any time of the day,why should we not be allowed, on the same principle, to eliminate the element of mode in regard to baptism, and to

the rit
man w
baptism
with t
sistent
and no
ment o
partak
the lo
gratefu

Hith ping is even in sential princip receive

ing, do

we not the many of Classic could

The to the "baptis says, "sics at to "be Classic right t

shrewd