

babes, but also children of mature age (for *τέκνα* means children, full grown as well as young,) are entitled to baptism. Nay more, it would follow that the unbelieving wife or husband of a believer is equally entitled to the ordinance; since the sanctity, here mentioned, is asserted to belong to the infidel parent as well as the children. 'For the unbelieving husband is *sanctified* by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is *sanctified* by the husband.' But who would ever think of baptizing the unbelieving partner of a Christian? Yet who can consistently refuse to go even this length in misapplying the rite, if he professes to derive his warrant for baptizing infants from this passage? This consideration is sufficient proof, that the apostle had here no reference to baptism, and, that his words do not, even by implication, teach that infants are fit subjects of the rite.—ED.]

[*The design of baptism.*] The essential thing in baptism is to enter into fellowship with Christ, and, thereby, also to be incorporated in the spiritual body of Christ, to be received into the communion of the Redeemed, which is the church of Christ: Gal. iii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13. Baptism must, therefore, according to its characteristic design, have been distinguished as a baptism unto Christ, or unto the name of Christ; and, hence, it may have been the case, that this only was originally made prominent in the words spoken in its administration.

[*The act of baptism.*] The form of immersion in baptism which was in use among the Jews, passed over, therefore, also to the Gentile Christians. This form was certainly the best adapted to denote that which Christ wished to denote by this symbol, viz.: the immersion of the whole man in a new principle of life. But Paul makes use, besides, of what is accidental in the form of this symbol,

viz.: the two-fold act of immersion and emersion, to which Christ certainly had no regard in instituting the symbol. In as much as Paul found in it a reference to Christ as dead, and to Christ as risen, the negative and positive bearing of the Christian life, which, in one respect, consists in dying to all ungodliness in imitation of Christ, and, in another respect, in rising to a new divine life in fellowship with him; so he here employed that which is only accidentally given in the form of baptism, as handed down, in order, thereby, to make emblematically evident the idea and the design of baptism in its connection with the whole essence of Christianity.

[*The subjects of baptism.*] Since baptism signified the entrance into fellowship with Christ, it easily followed from the nature of the thing, that a confession of faith in Jesus, as the Saviour, was made at the time by the person to be baptized; and, in the later part of the apostolic age, are found traces which indicate the existence of such a custom.

As baptism was closely connected with the deliberate transition into the Christian community, and as faith and baptism were always bound together, it is in the highest degree likely that baptism took place only in cases where both could be united, and that the practice of infant baptism lay remote from this age. We can, by no means, infer the existence of infant baptism from the examples of the baptism of whole families, since the passage in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, shows the incorrectness of this inference; for, it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, that received baptism from Paul, consisted entirely of grown up members. We can conclude against the apostolic origin of infant baptism, not only from the lateness of the first distinct mention that is made of it, but, also, from the long continued opposition against it.