

tism, professing to be a believer ; and on that profession the rite is administered, and he is received into the church. But are they never deceived in regard to such professions ? Are the persons who make them invariably genuine believers ? Mr. Campbell, of America, a Baptist writer, confesses that, "in nine cases out of ten, through error of judgment, they admit unbelievers." "In nine cases out of ten !" Why, this amounts to a wholesale violation of our Lord's commission, as they interpret it. But when they have, "through error of judgment," baptized a man on his profession of faith, and ascertain afterwards that he was, at the very time of his baptism, a vile hypocrite, instead of a true believer, do they not amend the error by re-baptizing him, when the man afterwards repents of his wickedness, and gives every possible proof that he is now a genuine believer ? No, never, in any case. Then what becomes of their assertion that personal faith is essential to the validity of baptism, and that infants' baptism is not valid *because* infants cannot believe ? Either the baptism of the hypocrite was valid or it was not. If not, then they admit unbaptized persons into their churches, and retain them, knowing them to be unbaptized. But if the baptism *was* valid, and their practice says that in their judgment it was, for they do not repeat it, why do they talk so incessantly about *believers'* baptism, as alone valid, and declaim so confidently, not to say offensively, against the baptism of infants, on the ground that they are not believers ? Is not the practice in flat opposition to the creed ? Surely an innocent infant, who has never been guilty of actual sin, must be a better subject for baptism than a vile hypocrite ! And is it not an absurdity to say, that the baptism of the former was invalid, on account of the unsuitness of the subject ;