

rite. Until the Baptist can point us to a positive repeal of infant membership, until he can quote the words of our Lord or his inspired Apostles curtailing the privileges of *Christian* parents, we must hold to the faith for which we now contend.

(2.) But while we insist on positive precept *before we can exclude* infants from the Church, we are also prepared to prove what may startle many of our good friends, who are accustomed to hear a great deal of bad declamation about "plain commands," "example of believers' baptism, &c." that there is neither command nor example in the Bible which gives the slightest countenance for believers' baptism exclusive of infants as contended for by Anti-pedobaptist. A Baptist opens his Bible and reads us those texts in which it is said "Repent or believe and be baptized," or in which we have some instances of baptism being administered upon the evidence of repentance or on a profession of faith, and thinks the question settled. But we ask what do these texts prove on either side? Why they are just so much common property, which prove literally nothing for or against either view. Here is a question which we think settles the point;—Is there a single historical case in the word of God, in which a Pado-baptist minister would not act, and would not be compelled by his principles to act in the case of adults, just as Philip or Peter or Paul acted, and require of them a credible profession of faith before administering the ordinance? If there is not, as we assert, *there is not*, then let Baptist preachers and writers no longer appeal to such instances, as though we did not believe as they believe in believers' baptism as regards adults. We do hold the doctrine of believer's baptism, but not to the exclusion of infant baptism. It would be just as logical for a man to infer upon reading of the baptism of some of the converts in India, of whom a *credible profession of faith* was required, that the Free Church of Scotland held Anti-pedo-baptist views, as to infer from parallel instances recorded in the New Testament that Peter and Paul held such views. When the Baptist asks us to point to a single example of infant baptism in the New Testament, we reply by demanding of him, a solitary instance in the whole inspired history of Apostolic times, extending over a period of over thirty years, of one who had grown up under the influences and instructions of a christian home, presenting himself as a candidate for this ordinance. Such a case as that would go far in his favour, though the mere fact in itself would not be decisive. But till such a case can be instanced let him cease that incessant cry about Apostolic example.

The same logical fallacy appears in the argument founded on the command, "*Believe and be baptized.*" There is more in the conclusion than is warranted by the promises. The Baptist reasoning put in the form of a syllogism runs thus:—

All who believe should be baptized.

Infants cannot believe.

Therefore, infants should not be baptized.

Let us apply the same mode of reasoning to another matter in which faith is concerned,—the salvation of infants.

All who believe shall be saved.

Infants cannot believe,

Therefore, infants cannot be saved.

The same logic which excludes infants from the Church militant, excludes them also from the Church triumphant. If the Baptist object, "that's bad logic—the major proposition is not "All who believe, &c." but, "Only they who believe, &c." we reply, "It may be bad logic, but your theology demands it, for you have no more Scriptural authority for limiting the major proposition in the case of baptism than in the case of infant salvation. Disputing then the pre-