

and weigh them in the balances of God's truth ere he passes judgment. From those who will calmly, candidly, and prayerfully do this, the writer fears nothing. To those who will pass judgment without thought, (and these are they who will find fault) he would simply say that the approbation of Jesus is infinitely more desirable than theirs, and "if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." (Gal. 1: 10).

The reader will see that every statement made is proved by clear and unmistakable reference to the Word of God, and sustained by quotations from pious and learned men of the various Pedit-baptist communions. It is true that many of the authors quoted are not consistent. While commenting on passages that are so clear and conclusive as not to admit the thought of a contrary view (*e. g.*, "Buried with Him in baptism . . . we also should walk in *newness of life*." Rom. 6,) they acknowledge faith to be prerequisite to baptism, and *immersion* to be the act commanded by Christ and practised by the apostles; yet wherever they meet any passage that *appears* to give room for the shadow of anything approaching an argument in favor of the innovation of infant sprinkling, they dwell upon it and advance it in support of the practice which, though of human origin, they are unwilling to give up because of the prejudice of their early education.

To justify the above statement the writer will quote from Mr. Lathern's chief evidence—The Rev. John Wesley. On Matt. 3:6, Mr. Wesley says: "Such prodigious numbers could hardly be baptized by immersing the whole bodies. It seems therefore that they stood in ranks on the edge of the river and John, passing along, cast water on their hands or faces."

Mr. Wesley renders Acts viii: 38, "*they went down both into the water,*" and in his note adds: "It does not follow that