

the words of Christ,—“Suffer the little children to come unto me.” We mark what followed upon these words. The little ones were brought to the Saviour. And what did he do with them? Did he baptize them? Surely if he had done so, the evangelist would have told us so. But what did the Saviour do? “He took” the little ones “up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.” That was all. It is clear that he did *not* baptize them. Has any painter of this touching story presumed to turn it into a story of baptism? The theologians argue about it as though it were such a story. But no painter, no matter what his views on the baptismal question, has ever thought fit, I believe, to put the theological assumption upon his canvass. No! infant baptism finds no support here. For let us look now at ver. 15. in the narrative of Mark. “Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.” Our Lord says nothing, and does nothing that can be construed into a sanction for infant baptism. But, as he never lost an opportunity for sowing the seeds of heavenly truth, he does take occasion here to inculcate an important spiritual lesson; which lesson relates rather to the faith of adults than to the baptism of unconscious babes. And thus this charming incident in the life of our Lord, so far as it suggests any thing at all on the subject of baptism, supports our views as Baptists rather than militates against them.

## THE CASE OF ZACCHÆUS.

But now there is Luke xix. 9. “This day is salvation come to this house,”—that is, the house of Zacchæus,—“forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham.” But how this should testify on behalf of infant baptism is to me utterly inconceivable. To be sure we have “Abraham” here, and “a son of Abraham,” and “salvation come to the house” of this “son of Abraham.” And these expressions doubtless suggest to minds duly prepossessed certain ideas of the Abrahamic covenant, and of the claims of the children of the covenant to its signs and seals, and of the participation of the “house” of this “son of Abraham” in the spiritual heritage of their father. Yet, after all, what should we really seem to have here? “Salvation is come to this house.” And was it not so? and had not the whole house a lively interest in the blessed, and mighty, and manifest change which had occurred in the case of the head of that house? And was not this man fitly styled “a son of Abraham,” not in the flesh only, but much more in the spirit? the one having beheld with gladness the day of Christ while yet afar off; and the other seeing the day of that Christ as at length arrived, and having joyfully welcomed him, not to his house only, but also