mode not recognized at all by modern immersionists. It is a curious fact that the scholars usually quoted in favor of the theory of modern immersion never were immersed and never identified themselves with the theory After considering all the evidence, they believed in sprinkling or pouring. Thus to give the impression that scholars who find "immersion" in the post-A postolic Church regard such as scriptural, or therely sanction the modern theory of total immersion as alone Baptism, is to impose a meaning which they by their whole teaching and conduct reject. The; lived and died in other churches or still remain in churches baptising by sprinkling or pouring. Speaking for the Presbyterian Church alone, with her thirty-five millions of people, with a system of thought and prin-iple of action, which have contributed very largely to the success of nodern civilization, with her strenuous demand for education-lay and clerical-her great universities and her scholars who have been in the forefront of scientific and Biblical research, it is to be olserved that these now accept the principles declared in the practice of the church. To assume and innly that the Presbyterian Church gives any support to the theory which unclurches all except the inmersionist, is utterly false. Individuals in every church inconsistent with their professed belief, may deny their confession, hut no church can be held responsible for such hypocrisy. The faith of people and churches is expressed by their standards and practices. The scholarship of the Presbyterian Church, embodied in her standards, is before the world. There has been much agitation in favor of revising these standards, but there has never been any serious question regarding the subjects or mode of Baptism, and until there is, it is slanderous to represent her scholarship as favoring an entirely different view. The same remark applies to all other churches and their position on this question. Fortunately the scholarship of the world speaks for itself.

