

Congregationalists, especially the latter, who are most open to it, there these evils have been most abandoned, and infant baptism itself seems going by the board. Finally; in countries where Baptists are the fewest, there these evils remain most intact among all denominations; whereas, where Baptists are most numerous, and the social condition of the people raises the fewest barriers between them and other denominations, as in America, there the decline of these errors and of the infant baptism itself, has been the greatest. How these facts can be known and it be not admitted that Baptist influence has been chiefly instrumental in leading Pedobaptists to cast off baptismal regeneration etc.,—nay, that but for this they would not have rejected them,—I cannot imagine. Finally, while the peculiar principles of Baptists have done so much in the past, they must be maintained to continue the work so well begun, and to prevent a relapse.

When Baptist doctrine is not grappling the evils which are the outcome of Pedobaptism, this practice tends to lead back into them. To ordinary minds which take a common sense view of the matter, as the child cannot signify or profess or do any thing in baptism, baptism must do something in or for the child, to be really anything but a senseless form. Besides, if there is any force in what has been advanced to show that infant baptism must be supposed to effect regeneration and make the subject of it a church member, to make it at all consistent with the New Test., descriptions of baptism and the Pedobaptist appeal to the old economy to support it, then Pedobaptism, left to itself, must be in continual danger of gravitating back into these evils from which the power of Baptist principles has partially lifted it. Hence the Baptist position is to be maintained, if what has been effected by it is to be assured against overthrow. Besides, the work is but just begun. It is chiefly among the Congregationalists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians, that anything much has