

## PREFATORY NOTE.

---

THE following pages are merely a reprint, with correction of typographical errors and the addition of a short note, of certain articles on Baptism, which appeared in the *Messenger*, the *Witness* and the *Wesleyan*, of Halifax. The design of the re-publication, in this connected form, of the articles referred to, is to afford a facility to Baptists or Pedobaptists, which they might not otherwise enjoy, to learn what has been written on both sides in the present argument: and to introduce a series of tracts, if God will, in vindication of the claims of the Divine Word, Old Testament as well as New, to be heard and accepted, in respect to all things which pertain to life and godliness, in the family, the church, or the world. I have the most unbounded confidence in submitting to the examination of Baptists my appeal to Scripture, of old or in the present case, in opposition to their professional tenets on Baptism: and I am more than willing that Pedobaptists should read and ponder what the *Messenger* or his allies have to advance against my argument.

I have, in the discussion, studiously confined myself to the consideration of the *mode* of Baptism, while the replies have mixed up the questions of the *mode* and of infant baptism, which are so entirely independent that a thorough Immersionist might be an advocate of infant baptism, and one opposed to infant baptism might be in favor of baptismal sprinkling. It may be that the *Messenger* and his fellow-labourers have the two things so blended in their minds that they cannot separate them, and seem to think that *immersion* involves infant exclusion, and *sprinkling*, infant baptism: or it may be that they cherish the vain hope of dragging me from my position: or it may be that they desired, when their supercilious assertions respecting infant baptism are disregarded, the impression might be made on the minds of Baptist readers that their assertions were too formidable to be met.

The *Messenger* chuckles over the fact that I am left alone in this argument, and accepts it as an evidence that other Pedobaptists believe me to be in error or that the argument is inconclusive. He was never more mistaken than in supposing I am disappointed in that I had not the co-operation and support of others. I neither sought, nor expected, nor desired their co-operation or aid. My appeal is to the divine testimony, and to that alone, and I accept its dogmatic statements and any inference legitimately drawn from its statements as sufficient and decisive in all matters of which it treats,