

are born of God overcome the world." Now, can any man believe that all this is true of every one "rightly baptized?" Is it not true on the other hand, that many who have been baptized in every way,—baptized in infancy and baptized in mature age,—baptized by sprinkling and baptized by immersion;—baptized by those who have been episcopally ordained and by those who have received no ordination at all; live as the world live,—without fearing God, and having no hope? Again; the doctrine which we oppose would lead to the belief that all who are not baptized are lost. The Lord Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God," if regeneration then is effected in or by baptism, and if to be baptized is to be regenerated, then all who are not baptized do perish; they cannot see the Kingdom of God.—All unbaptized children are consequently lost.

Besides, are there not instances of persons who have become believers by reading the Word of God, and who have never had an opportunity of enjoying religious ordinances? Is there not a whole denomination of professing christians who conscientiously disbelieve in an outward baptism—the Quakers—these are of consequence all lost;—they have not been, according to the doctrine above stated, regenerated, and the Lord says that whoever is not regenerated cannot see the Kingdom of God. Once more. In the case of an adult, a person must be regenerated before he can be baptized. John baptized those who were penitent and confessed their sins, Philip baptized the Ethiopian Eunuch on the assurance that "he believed with all his heart," Peter baptized Cornelius and those gathered together in his house *after* the Holy Ghost had fallen upon them, Paul was baptized by Ananias after he had been converted, and does not every christian church require in adults a profession of their faith in order to their being baptized,—and they are baptized when there are evidences that they are believers. Adults, then, are baptized, not that they may be regenerated, but because they are regenerated already or believed to be so.

2. The other opinion respecting the uses of baptism which we regard as erroneous, is the opposite extreme to the one now stated,—It is an error in defect, while the other is an error in excess. It is this, that baptism is of no use to an infant while it is an infant; but that when the infant arrives at the years of discretion, and when told that he was baptized in his infancy, and in that ordinance devoted to God, he may regard himself as already pledged to believe in God and to serve Him. According to this, there is nothing in baptism but its moral influence, and that influence amounts to nothing till the baptized person become old enough to feel the influence of moral obligations.

That an obligation of a moral nature lies upon those who have been consecrated to God in their infancy by their believing parents, in an ordinance of God's own institution, is an opinion which we think few persons will deny. But, whatever the nature or the amount of that obligation be,