one divines, ten Lords, and twenty Commissioners of the Parliament of England, under the question 165, "What is baptism?" quote John in. 5, Titus iii 5, to prove that baptism is a washing with water, and a "sign of remission of sins"

Michaelis, Horne, Lightfoot, Beveridge, Taylor, Jones of Nayland, Bp. Mant, Whitby, Barkit, Bp. Hall, Dr. Wells, Hooker, Dr. G. Ridley, Bp. Ryder—but why attempt a list of great names. There are a thousand more who assert it.

Bp. White says, that "regeneration, as detached from baptism, never entered into any creed before the 17th century."

whithy, on John ii. 5, says, "That our Lord here speaks of baptismal regeneration, the whole christian church from its earliest times has invariably taught"

Our modern "great divines" even in America, have taught the same. Timothy Dwight, the greatest Rabbi of Presbyterianism the New World has produced, says, vol. iv. pp. 300, 301, "to be born again, is precisely the same thing as to be born of water and the Spirit."—"To be born of water is to be baptized." And how uncharitable!—He adds, "He who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter into the visible nor invisible kingdom of God."—Vol. iv. p. 302. So preached the President of Vale Cullege

kingdom of God."—Vol. iv. p. 302. So preached the President of Yale College.

George Whitfield, writing on John III. 5, says, "Does not this verse urge the absolute necessity of water baptism? Yes, when it may be had. But how God will deal with persons unbaptized, we cannot tell."—Vol iv. p. 355. I say with him, we cannot tell with certainty. But I am of opinion, that when a neglect proceeds from a simple mistake or sheer ignorance, and when there is no aversion, but a will to do every thing the Lord commands, the Lord will admit into the everlasting kingdom those who by reason of this mistake, never had the testimony of God assuring them of pardon or justification here, and consequently, never did fully enjoy the salvation of God on earth. But I will say with the renowned President of Yale, that "he who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter the visible nor invisible kingdom of God." By the "visible and invisible kingdom," he means the kingdom of grace and glory He adds on the same page, "He who persists in this act of rebellion against the authority of Christ, will never belong to his kingdom." Vol. iv. p 302.

John Wesley asserts, that "by baptism we enter into covenant with God, as everlasting covenant, are admitted into the church, made members of Christ, made the children of God. By water as the means, the water of baptism, we are reger

nerated or born again." [Preservative, pp. 146-150.]

13. Why is the conversion of Nicodemus read at the baptism of adults,* if you do not believe that it has any "reference whatever to baptism?" That the originator of the book of "Common Prayer" un derstood "born of water" as referring to baptism you do not question for it is too plain to admit of a doubt; and that these were also the sen timents of your "venerated Founder" you cannot dispute. Why call yourself a Wesleyan clergyman, and then oppose Mr. Wesley's doctring Why cal -a doctrine too which is approved by the "English Conference!" Ar not Mr. Wesley's notes on the New Testament, and his sermons, approved by the Conference equally with the "Institutes" of Mr. Watson? "Out distinguishing sentiments," said a Wesleyan clergyman to me, " are found in Mr. Wesley's notes on the New Testament, and in his sermons;" M Sleep says, "in the works approved by the English Conference." And thèse contradict each other, who is to decide? Ah! the works approve by a human conference sounds so much like the decrees of councils, synode &c., that I cannot help thinking of the &c., that I cannot help thinking of the one hundred and thirty five hug volumes of the traditions of the Romsh hierarchy in addition to the Apochryphal books of the U a and New Assuments, all appended to the Oracles of God, which make them of no effect by their traditions! To me, Sir, when you refer to books "approved by the English Conference.

See Sunday Service, p. 163.