understand anything else but immersion, as is evident from the testimeny of the sacred writings, and from the usage of the ancient Church, by which immersion had been so received that. as yet in the third century, the baptism of the sick, for example, because it was performed by the affusion of water, was by some entirely rejected, by others certainly it was esteemed far less than the baptism of the rest, who were baptized in health, that is, not perfused or sprinkled with the salutary water, in the manner of the sick, but were hathed. Otherwise the ancient custom, certainly among those who were baptized in health, even in the Western Church, was preserved a long time; ave. then also, when among some of the western churches, the ancient custom being changed, they had introduced affusion universally, there were not wanting others which continued to hold the ancient custom. Since these things were so, it is altogether to be lamented, that of the wishes which our Luther had equally with respect to the usage of immersion in the successive administration of baptism, and with respect to the common use of the cup in the sacred supper, he was permitted to accomplish only the latter."

Presbyterian Testimony.

John Calvin, in his comments on John iii. 23, says:

"But from these words it is lawful to conclude that baptism was celebrated by John and Christ by the submersion of the whole body." On Acts viii. 38, he says: "Here we see plainly what the rite of baptizing was among the ancients; for they immersed the whole body into water. Now the practice has come into vogue, that the minister shall only sprinkle the body or the head. But so small a difference of ceremony ought not to be of so great importance to us, that we should on that account divide the Church, or disturb it with strifes."

THOMAS CHALMERS, Prof. of Theology in the University of Edinburgh, commenting on Rom. vi. 4, says:

"The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion; and though we regard it as a point of indifferency whether the