

is it, then, that so many Protestants cling yet to institutions which the Bible confessedly repudiates. This is Papist ground. They receive tradition—they believe their church can “decree ceremonies”—but consistent Protestants maintain that the Bible is their sole rule of faith and duty. A single acknowledged departure from Scripture lays down a principle, which if fairly carried out, would overturn the whole word of God. The ordinance of which I have been writing derives its sole value from its being an act of obedience to the supreme authority of God. The grand inquiry in Christianity is, not what may we leave undone, or alter, and yet be saved, but what has the Lord required of us? We are not appointed judges of God's commands but doers of them. God is too great, too wise, and too good to require *anything* of us which is unimportant or foolish. He never trifles. The mere fact that the great God requires anything of us, clothes it with an importance and dignity which no hoary antiquity, no human grandeur or power, which no merely finite authority could ever impart. And he who feels as he should will glory in obeying God in small things as well as in great. We cannot conceive of anything which the great God commanded which would be beneath the dignity of an archangel to obey.

In conclusion, I would say to my readers who have followed me thus far; that, as baptism is a positive institution, it must have positive precept or example on which to rest. All we ask, is a single positive command, or one clear example of infant baptism in the Scriptures. Is this too much to ask? In fact, baptism must be required by the Head of the Church, or it is not. If it be required, how is it that Pedobaptist churches do not discipline their members for neglecting to have their children baptized? In New England, nearly one-half of the Congregational churches