

nient as the substitute for a conclusive argument;—but every lover of the truth must deprecate such a course and think the less of the cause whose supporters have to resort to it. We propose then to establish our position, *that the children of believing parents are to be baptized.* “We put you always in remembrance of these things though you know them and be established in the present truth.”

Of the many proofs that might be advanced, we select the following, convinced that if they are clearly established, this article of our belief will be as sufficiently proved as though the proofs were more numerous.

1. *The children of God's people were ever regarded and treated as members of the Old Testament Church.* When God enters into covenant with his people, their children are included.—So far back as the flood God is pleased to own Noah as his servant and to enter into covenant with him, “behold I establish my covenant with thee and thy seed.” The covenant he makes with Abraham in like manner includes the children, “behold my covenant is with thee, behold I establish my covenant with thee, and with thy seed after thee.” In renewing this covenant with the Israelites immediately before the death of Moses the little ones are expressly mentioned. Deut. 29, 10–13. But not only are they included in the terms of the covenant, they have the sign and the seal of the covenant administered to them, and this places the question beyond a doubt; for if their parents were members of the church—by right of the covenant and had the sign and seal administered to them, then assuredly their infant seed were members too, for they were brought into the same covenant relation and had the same covenant seal impressed upon their flesh. Confirmatory of this was the fact, that when proselytes embraced the Jewish religion, their children were by divine appointment admitted along with them, “and when a stranger shall sojourn with thee and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised and then let him come near and keep it. Here then we have infants of the tenderest age in the visible church of God for nearly 2000 years, admitted into the church by the express command of Infinite Wisdom; they had a place and a name among God's people.

While this position cannot be denied, attempts have been made to weaken its face, by asserting that the covenant had respect to temporal blessings only, and that circumcision was in no way connected with spiritual promises.—A very slight acquaintance with the scriptures that treat on this subject, especially with the 3d chap. of Gal. must convince every one that the Abrahamic covenant was just the gospel covenant—it was not the law delivered from Sinai, for it was made 430 years before, it was confirmed before of God in Christ—it was a covenant in which all nations of the earth shall be blessed, and hence circumcision is declared by the apostle to be the seal of the righteousness of faith,” in other words, the seal of the covenant of grace. Accordingly, if children had an interest in that covenant, and their interest was publicly acknowledged, then it is plain that they were regarded and treated as members of the Old Testament Church.

2. It was not necessary to re-enact this law under the New Testament dispensation; it was enough that it was not repealed, and the children of believing parents deprived of privileges they formerly enjoyed. We are often asked for a positive enactment in regard to infant baptism, and the plausibility of this demand has startled and stumbled some; but a little consideration will show that the demand goes upon the assumption that the connection of children with the Church is a new thing under the gospel—that it was never heard of before,—that is an unwarrantable innovation; whereas, the truth is under no period of the church's history is it known, that the children were not regarded and treated as connected with it. And it is certain that for nearly 2000 years before Christ, *i. e.*, from Abraham downwards they are so regarded and treated. Now if positive enactment is necessary, it is necessary not to establish the right of children, but to deprive them of the right already established. And where is the law of repeal? It does not rest with us to produce a new covenant to