

and had their exclusion been intended, it would have been commanded. True, they are not expressly *included*, but the silence of the Saviour is an argument for Infant Baptism, and not against it. For consider;

1. Those to whom this commission was given, were Jews, strongly attached to Jewish practices. They had been accustomed to see Gentiles and their households circumcised on their embracing Judaism. This had been Jewish practice for ages. Now they are commanded to go forth teaching, and applying another seal similar to the former one in nature and design. Had the Saviour said to his disciples, "Go, teach all nations, circumcising them," &c., how would they have understood him, and what would they have done? The terms of the commission put baptism in the place circumcision had formerly occupied, and as nations include young children, and Christ did not prohibit the extension of the rite to them; but left the matter *just as it stood before*, they would naturally understand that they were to do in baptizing just as had previously, and up to that time, been done in circumcising. When a parent embraced Christianity, they would baptize him and his family.

2. A statute must be repealed as explicitly as it was first published. There must be a definite countermand. But in this case there is none.

3. The Apostles would not drop such a practice of their own accord, in the absence of a command from Christ to that effect.

4. Had children been excluded, it is impossible but that some trace of dissatisfaction would be visible either in the Acts or the Epistles. We know how tenacious the early Christians were of everything Jewish. How they clung to the ceremonial law! Would there not have been commotions, and invidious comparisons between the law and the gospel, had children been shut out from baptism? The New Testament gives us no account of any difficulty having taken place, so that we may fairly conclude that children were admitted to this ordinance.

5. The language of Peter on the day of Pentecost, so far from intimating a repeal of infant privilege, rather asserts its permanence. Acts ii. 38, 39: "The promise is unto you,