

right to hold and advocate their own principles, we strongly object to their thus virtually asserting that the point is settled in their favour. We unhesitatingly avow our firm conviction, that it never has been so settled, and that it never will be. Our brethren who do not believe Infant Baptism to be a Bible doctrine and practice, should choose and employ some designation which does not imply a begging of the question at issue. We have no disposition to thrust "Anabaptist" upon them, since they regard it as an offensive epithet; but they should remember that "Baptist" is as unpleasant to others, as "Anabaptist" is to them. Let a name be adopted which characterizes their peculiarities, without ungenerously reflecting upon others. As the nature of our subject will compel some reference to our opponents, and some use of the name by which they are commonly known, we put in at the outset, this decided disclaimer against the inference involved in it. Believing firmly that the practice of Infant Baptism is scriptural, I shall proceed to notice—

- I. The direct arguments which support it; and
- II. The objections made against it.

I. DIRECT ARGUMENTS FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

1. I argue that children have a Scriptural right to this ordinance, because Baptism sustains the same relation to the Gospel dispensation, that Circumcision did to that of the Old Testament.

In proof of this; let me adduce the following train of thought:

1. A peculiar covenant relation existed between God and his ancient people, *as parents*.

2. This same covenant relation exists under the Christian dispensation:

3. Circumcision was the Divinely-appointed token of this covenant in Old Testament times.

4. Baptism has taken the place of Circumcision, as the token or seal of the same covenant under the Christian dispensation:

I will endeavour to establish these positions: