

tle says "The believing husband is sanctified, &c.," his meaning evidently is this—If both parents were heathen, their children would be unclean, that is, ecclesiastically unclean, or without the pale of the Church visible. But the one parent being a Christian, the unbelief of the other parent does not exclude the child from the covenant blessings of the Church. In virtue of the faith of the one parent the children are to be regarded as holy, and consequently are entitled to a place in the visible church. We learn from this passage:—1. That the child of the believer has an advantage over the child of the unbeliever, not in anything inward or experimental, but in the relation in which it stands to the church, the house of God, into which it is to be received, and to the instructions, oversight, discipline and prayers of which it is solemnly committed by command of God.

2. That this advantage and privilege is confined to the children of professed believers as taught in the standards of the Church. We can find no warrant whatever in the Word of God for recognizing the reception into the Church by baptism of those who are not the children of professed believers. The practice of extending baptism indiscriminately to all who apply, has arisen from unscriptural and superstitious views of that holy ordinance.

3. If the infant seed, the children of professing Christians, are entitled to a place in the visible Church, they certainly are entitled to that ordinance which is the initiatory rite of the Church, and the door of entrance into it, considered as a visible community.

Having established the point that the children of professed believers are federally holy, and therefore entitled to a place in that confederation of saints, called the Church, and to the ordinance of baptism which constitutes the entrance into the visible Church, we purpose briefly to review some of the objections urged against the position of infant baptism. A baptist brother might say to us, "your reasoning may appear plausible—if I admit your premises that holy and unclean in this text signify what you say they do, I must acknowledge that your conclusion is a legitimate inference from these; but whether I can or cannot assail your position—whether I can or cannot give you the true meaning of the text, this I know, that while you can lay your finger upon no positive precept in the Bible sanctioning infant baptism, I can give you both precept and example for our practice." Here we have the strong hold of our Baptist brethren, and if this objection can be established, that is, if the Baptist can give us both scriptural precept and Apostolic example for his practice, namely, his refusal of baptism to infants, we, too, whatever we make of this text, must at once surrender. We meet this objection then by observing

1. That no positive precept is required to sanction the practice of the Pedobaptist Churches. We have shown in the former paper that from the days of Abraham, infants obtained a place in the visible Church by the express command of God. Under the former dispensation they received the rite of circumcision,—the seal not of temporal blessings and privileges merely, but of spiritual, for it was "a seal of the righteousness of the faith"—a seal of that covenant through which the all-sufficiency of the infinite God was made over to his people. Temporal blessings were added *then* just as they are *now*, to the spiritual life. Every circumcised child was by this very ordinance recognized as a member of the spiritual commonwealth, as now every baptized child is recognized by us as within the membership of the New Testament Church, and is entitled, if faithful to the new covenant, to all the privileges of that Church. To say that all the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic economy have been abolished does not in any degree affect the position of the infant children of believers, for which we plead. The abolition of circumcision which was a Mosaic rite does not prove the abolition of infant membership which was not a Mosaic