much knowledge on the part of him who makes them, nor yet much space on the paper which contains them, e. g., on a single page of his little work Mr. Lathern gives what he calls a "resume of the principal patristic evidence" in favor of infant baptism, quoted from "the learned and valuable work by the Rev. W. H. Withdrew, M. A." To reply in this style would be simply to say-no-where our author says—yes; but there would be no argument there; and to him who wants truth and argument to support that which is pressed upon his attention, a review of "Baptisma," occupying no more space than "Baptisma" occupies, would be of but little more value than "Baptisma" itself. The writer, knowing that many are anxious to know the truth and ready to embrace it, has, first of all, removed out of the enquirer's way those unsupported and disconnected assertions, with which "Baptisma" abounds, and, secondly, built beside the ruins pillars of truth supported on every side by the Word of God, and acknowleged by the learned pious of every age in various communions. Let the reader carefully compare every statement with the Scriptures to which he is referred, and if it be not sustained by the "truth as it is in Jesus," reject it; but if it be sustained by a "Thus saith the Lord," reject it not, however uncongenial to your preconceived opinions, "but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it; 1. it haply ye be found even to fight against God."

It is sad to see such difference of opinion in the family of God. It cannot be pleasing to the Eternal Father, for "God is not the author of confusion:" it cannot be pleasing to Christ, for He prayed "that they all may be one:" it cannot be pleasing to the Holy Spirit, for He inspired Paul to say that "there is one body [Church] and one Spirit even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," etc.—(Eph. iv: 4–6.) (That the "one body" means the church is clear