

let us go down and bring others on board to fill our places. The idols, respectability and popularity, are to be dreaded. May the Lord deliver us from the snares of the wicked one.

TITUS.

EXTRACTS.

"UPSIDE DOWN."

"These that have turned the world upside down, have come hither also" (Acts vii. 6)

CHAPTER IV.

The gentlemen whose conversation furnished the last chapter, with several others, having again assembled the Curate, according to promise entered upon his defence of infant baptism. He begged them to notice the most ample proof of its very early existence. "IRENEUS," he continued, "wrote about eighty years after the Apostolic age and was then an aged man. He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John. Permit me to read his words from *Wall's History of Infant Baptism*—'He (Jesus) came to save all persons by himself; all, I mean, who by him regenerated unto God, infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons.'" Mr. Vapid remarked that "the quotation says nothing about baptism," to which it was replied, "that though baptism is not named it is nevertheless implied, as the early writers used *regeneration* to denote baptism." "Granting that interchange," responded Mr. Clearthought, "are you able to affirm that the one invariably stood for, or implied, the other? If not baptism might not have been at all in the mind of Irenæus when he wrote that sentence." "Do you know of any writer earlier than TERTULLIAN who has actually mentioned infant baptism?" asked Mr. Bell.

"I do not, and I admit that proof of an earlier mention has not been found."

"Did Tertullian, who so far as we can discover, is the earliest writer who names infant baptism, advocate or oppose it?"

"He," continued the Curate, "urged the delaying of baptism and wrote against the baptism of infants."

"Then, Sir, you admit that there is no proof that any one earlier than the third century named infant baptism?"

"Yes so far as actual mention is concerned, but they implied it. Justin Martyr, for instance, who was born near the close of the first century, wrote about the middle of the second century, 'There were many of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who were made disciples in a jancy.' Now the Baptists generally admit that all disciples were baptized, and therefore though baptism is not named, it is without doubt implied."

"No, Sir," resumed Mr. Bell, "nothing of the sort. It is written that 'the Lord made and baptized more disciples than John.' The disci-

ples were first made and then baptized. He baptized disciples and not babes in order to make disciples by baptism. The young persons spoken of by Justin were made disciples by teaching—a disciple is a learner, a scholar, and it is quite clear that in the ancient church catechumens were trained before they were baptized, a fact which cannot be accounted for upon the supposition that infant baptism prevailed."

"But," replied the Curate, "the young persons referred to could not have been of that order. They are expressly called *infants* and therefore if disciples, they have been made so by baptism and not by teaching."

"Here, Sir, you repeat the error into which Dr. Wall and others have fallen. The word *pais*, used by Justin Martyr, is applied to persons of from twelve to thirty years of age. Jesus when twelve years of age is designated by the same term, and it is also applied to him at the time of the combined opposition of Herod and Pilate (Acts iv. 27.) Eutychus, the young man mentioned in Acts xx. is called *pais*. Justin Martyr's *infants*, then, may have been from twelve to twenty years of age. At all events they were old enough to be taught, for only the taught can be disciples. You may rely upon it, gentlemen, that infant baptism has no historical basis. Not one of the five Apostolic Fathers—Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, or Polycarp—either named it or allude to it, but they do say what implies believer's baptism and that only. The like may be said of the oldest of the Greek Fathers. Papius, Dionysius, Tatian, Melito, Irenæus, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria, never mention it. In saying this I do not wish to insinuate a doubt as to its early origin. The Mystery of Iniquity advanced with rapidity, and no doubt infant baptism had commenced by the time of Tertullian, as his protest against it proves. But then those early writers who do name it also indicate that infant communion in the Holy Supper was at the same time common. Let me read two or three passages from my note-book—

"The Lord's Supper was considered as essential to salvation, for which reason it was even thought proper to administer it to infants."—*Mosheim's Church History, century III.*

"St. Augustine, I am sure, held the communicating of infants as much an Apostolic tradition as the baptizing of them."—*Chillingworth.*

"That in the primitive church children received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is obvious from what Cyprian relates concerning a sucking child, who so violently refused to take the sacramental wine, that the deacons were obliged to open her lips and pour it down her throat."—*Dr. Hook, Dean of Chichester.*

"The reason for laying aside infant communion in the Latin church was, lest by *putting* up the holy symbols the sacrament should be dishonored."—*Bishop Jeremy Taylor.*

"The Roman church, about the year 1000, *enter-taining the doctrine of transubstantiation*, let fall the custom of giving the holy elements to infants; and the other Western churches mostly did the like, upon the same account; but the Greeks, not