

authorized them to practice all their rites, Paul quoted to them Jeremiah 31: 31, to prove that all these rites had been superseded by a new covenant. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; *not* according to the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." That is, a covenant was to be made upon new principles—*not* in accordance with the old covenant. Where, then, are we to look for the laws of this new covenant, and for the rites which properly belong to it? I reply, in the words of the late Dr. Wardlaw himself, an accomplished defender of infant baptism: "It is surely natural and reasonable that not being Jews but Christians, and the subject of our controversy relating to the constitution, not of the Jewish, but of the Christian Church, we should have recourse for the settlement of the points in dispute to the New Testament rather than to the Old, to the records of the laws of Christ rather than to the laws of Moses."

What, then, are "the records of the laws of Christ" on this subject? I may here premise, that every witness I shall bring to the stand to sustain Baptist views, (if he lived after the fourth century), shall be a person who himself practised infant baptism. The subject of Christian Baptism presents itself under two inquiries.

1. WHAT DOES BAPTISM MEAN?

2. TO WHOM SHOULD IT BE ADMINISTERED?

It is a common notion that the whole controversy respecting this ordinance relates to a mere form—that all Christian people mean the same thing by baptism—and