

THE CANADIAN UNITED PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.

TORONTO, SEPTEMBER 1, 1856.

No. 9.

Miscellaneous Articles.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

Continued from page 227.

In our former article we established the position, that, *The Children of God's people were ever regarded and treated as members of the Old Testament Church; and again, that it was not necessary to re-enact this law under the New Testament dispensation*, it was enough that it was not repealed and the children of believing parents deprived of privileges they formerly enjoyed. The Church of God is the same under all dispensations. It is the one church, consequently the only positive enactment required, was done to deprive the children of their place in the Church, but no such enactment exists, therefore we must conclude that they are still regarded and treated by God as connected with His Church. To this it has been objected, that the ordinance of baptism requires of those to whom it is administered, more than children can give, and in support of this objection it is said, it requires faith and repentance. We grant that it requires this of adults, but we deny that such requirements are made in reference to children. They are not and cannot be affected by these passages that relate to adult baptism. To prove adult baptism, does not disprove infant baptism. It establishes the point in which all are agreed, but it does not in the least affect the question in hand.

But admit for the sake of argument, that the ordinance requires of those to whom it is administered, more than children can give, does not this prove too much? Apply the same test to circumcision, which was also connected with duty: it required all who enjoyed it to conform to the laws and ordinances of that church, hence we read, "Ye must be circumcised and keep the law," "Every man who is circumcised is a debtor to the law;" but infants could not keep the law, or become debtors to it, and yet they were circumcised. Was not more required of them than they could give? In both cases the reasoning is the same; or test the objection in another way. We read in Mark xvi. 16: "He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." But children cannot believe, therefore they cannot be saved. If there is force in this objection, then this is the inevitable conclusion; but where is the Christian who will assert this—children not saved—all, all, lost, for ever lost! No, no! So long as the words of Jesus are found in the Bible, "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven," we will not, we cannot believe this. It is a glaring fallacy that would require such a conclusion, yet not more glaring than that which relates to infant baptism. So that the objection when examined is no more than a sophism, and does not in the least affect our position.