

prove that the connection that has always existed in the church of God exists still, it lies with those who deny this to bring forward the positive enactment which repeals the previous law and deprives the children of privileges they so long enjoyed; and where, we ask again, is this law of repeal? The commission of our Lord to his disciples, so often quoted, contains no such law, children are not mentioned in it, and no other passage can be adduced. Are we not warranted then to believe that they are still owned of God and honoured with a place and a name among his people.

There is only one way in which we can conceive this position to be shaken, viz., by supposing that religion under the Christian dispensation is essentially different from religion under Judaism, and consequently, though children were connected with the church under the latter, they might not be connected under the former. Let us therefore examine this point. From the comparison instituted between Mohamedanism and Hinduism or another pagan worship, and Christianity, then it would be readily admitted that what was essential in the one must therefore be found in the other—but when the comparison is between Judaism and Christianity it alters the case—for both are the one religion—the church of God is the same under all dispensations; we sometimes speak of the Jewish church and the Christian church as if they were two churches, but it is not so—they are different dispensations of *the church* of God, but both are the one church in different stages, with their own peculiarities, yet the same church; when Judaism was brought to a close the church of God did not then terminate, it still existed and flourished, greatly enlarged, and with capabilities of enlarging; hence the same God, the same covenant promises, the same purifying blood, the same sanctifying spirit in both, in a word, the identity is complete, and the inspired writers speak of it in this light in writing of the Hebrews, says, “unto us was the gospel preached as well as unto them,” and again to the Corinthians, ‘they did all eat the same spiritual meat and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ.’” Abraham was rejoiced to see Christ’s day though afar off. If then God had a church among the Jews, that was the gospel church. There is another passage that could not have been more for the point, though it had been written expressly for this argument. Rom. 11. Under the figure of the Olive, God speaks of his church; the natural branches represent the Jews. they were lopped off and the Gentiles were grafted on the same tree; and still farther on it is stated that the Jews would be brought back and grafted on to their own olive tree—this refers to their restoration, and to what church will they be added if not the Christian, which is represented as their own olive tree.

It is true, several institutions did cease when Christianity was introduced, but such a change could not affect the membership for all institutions whether typical or ratifying are to be considered as means of grace and thus change cannot affect the elements of religion any more than a change of clothes can constitute a change in the man who wears them. There is another way in which, it has been said, our position may be shaken, viz.:—the ordinance requires of those to whom it is administered more than children can give. On this objection we would remark at the outset, that the church membership of Jewish children shews that there is nothing in the state of infancy incompatible with church membership, for had there been incongruity here, God would never have so ordered it. But the objection takes for granted what requires to be proved that the ordinance requires of children more than they can give. It is true it requires faith and repentance of adults, but it is not stated that these are required of children to deduce these passages of Scripture that refer to adult baptism to disprove infant baptism is away from the point—is a glaring sophism—it brings children into the conclusion while they are not in the premises. To prove adult baptism does not disprove infant baptism. It establishes the point in which all are agreed, it does affect the question in hand.

(To be continued.)