

"root and fatness," did they not, like the Jews, carry their infant offspring along with them? If not, then the Jews had advantages under the Christian system which were denied to the Gentiles. But this would be contrary to the general tenor of the New Testament; which constantly states that the Gentiles were admitted to equal privileges with the Jews. Thus it is clear that as the native Jews who believed, and who, with their children, were natural branches in the "olive-tree," were not "broken off," but simply passed over into the Christian church; so the Gentiles, the "wild olive" branches, when they believed, were grafted into the olive-tree, and, having equal privileges with the Jews, carried their infant offspring along with them. Then, if St. Paul's argument proves anything at all, it proves, most conclusively, that the infant children of those who have embraced Christianity may have a place in the visible church of Christ, and therefore that they have a right to baptism.

Now, if infants have a right to baptism on the ground just stated, how much stronger will be their claim to this ordinance if we can prove also that they have a personal interest in "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," and are, therefore, if they die in infancy, heirs of future happiness! And this admits of very easy proof. When "they brought little children" to Christ, He rebuked His disciples for wishing to keep them away, and said,—evidently in justification of the conduct of those who brought them,—*"Of such is the kingdom of heaven."* That the expression, "kingdom of heaven," is to be understood in a spiritual sense, there can be no doubt. Therefore it must mean either the kingdom of grace on earth, comprehending those whom Christ claims as His subjects and servants, in oppo-

sition
His
our
we
volve
"littl
have
His
the c
kingd
sage
the S
neces
said
reason
childr
"littl
such,"
sampl
these
memb

We
this b
infant
In reg
either
infant
It is u
trainin
narrow
prosel