

he was baptised by immersion, the text neither affirms nor intimates anything concerning it." Yet he translates the 38th verse as above, and the 39th he renders correctly, "and when they came up *out of* the water."

On Rom. 6, he makes the following comment: "Buried with Him—alluding to the *ancient manner of baptizing by immersion*," and on Col. ii: 12, "Which he wrought in you when you, as it were, were buried with him in baptism," and adds that the "Ancient manner of *baptizing by immersion* is as manifestly alluded to here as the other manner of baptizing by sprinkling or pouring of water in Heb. x: 22." And when we turn to Mr. W.'s notes on Heb. x: 22, to find "the other manner of baptizing by sprinkling or pouring of water" that was said to be taught here, we find nothing in support of it either in his translation or notes. He simply says: "Our bodies *washed with pure water*, all our conversation spotless and lowly, which is far more acceptable to God than all legal sprinklings and washings."

Such is a sample of Pedo-baptist testimony on the doctrine of Baptism—drawing comfort from every passage that has any semblance to their pre-conceived theory, and at the same time frankly acknowledging the *immersion* of BELIEVERS to be APOSTOLIC.

The writer does not doubt the sincerity of many of those men, but sincerity in error does not change error into truth. The reader can see, by referring to pages 40 and 41 of this work, an attempt made by some of those authors to justify the *change* from immersion to sprinkling and pouring; and can judge for himself whether the reasons given *will* justify so wide a departure from the Word of the living God.

It may be surprising to some to see so large a book written as a review of so small a work as "Baptisma," but an explanation is at hand. "Baptisma" consists of unsupported assertions with neither argument nor proof, and which do not need