

read of it as renewed apparently with Noah (Gen. vi., 18), not as a covenant, but "*my covenant*"—a phrase implying even then a previous establishment; and this view is further borne out by the declaration of the Apostles (Gal. iii., 17) that it was "confirmed" with Abraham, and is still in force with all his spiritual seed. It was, therefore, Abrahamic, only in so far as it was made more specific than before, and included certain temporal blessings peculiar to the Hebrew race; its much greater spiritual privileges are the portion of all who believe. The only change that has taken place (with the change of dispensation from the Jewish to the Christian) is the substitution of the seal of baptism for that of circumcision, as more in harmony with the new economy than the bloody and painful rite which it replaced.

Hence, in the absence of command to restrict baptism to adults, it is justly argued that it must be administered to the same parties as before—to children as well as to their parents. The burden of proof, therefore, lies not upon those who baptize infants, but upon those who, without warrant from their King and Lord, have altered the provisions of His covenant, and refuse to baptize them. Had the great commission run—"Go, teach all nations, *circumcising* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," no one could have doubted for a moment that, although our Lord did not specifically mention children, He intended them to be associated with their parents as formerly. How, then, can we hesitate as to His will, now that the command is to *baptize*, instead of to *circumcise*, the converts to the Christian faith?

With this view, the records of the Christian Church, as contained in the Acts of Apostles, and in the history of early post-apostolic times, entirely harmonize. For example—we have no instance in the New Testament of the baptism of parents alone in the presence of their family. Again, we have no instance of the baptism of any child of Christian parentage, in adult age, on profession of faith, although the inspired record covers a period of over sixty years after the planting of the first Christian church. Still further—out of twenty-eight instances of baptism particularized in the New Testament, four were certainly household, or family baptisms—those, viz., of Cornelius, Lydia, the Jailer at Philippi, and Stephanas, while four other households are mentioned in such a manner as to imply their baptism, viz., those of Crispus, Aristobulus, Narcissus, and Onesiphorus. And, once more, no trace is found of any complaint on the part of Jewish converts or of Judaizing teachers, of the exclusion of their children from the covenant in which formerly they had a part, which were undoubtedly would have been, had baptism been withheld from them. Add, now, to these facts, the further facts that all the early Christian writers confirm the testimony of Augustine, that infant baptism was not instituted by any council, but has always been in use, and that Antipedo-baptism had no existence as the distinct tenet of any Christian sect until the appearance of the Waldenses in the latter part of the twelfth century, and we have an amount of evidence in support of infant baptism that to us, at least, is perfectly overwhelming.

Pædo-Baptists, however, differ as to the proper subjects of infant baptism, some of them holding with the late Dr. Wardlaw, and the late revered Principal Lillie, of our own college, and many others, that the rite is to be administered to the children of believing parents only; while others adopt the view of the Rev. Dr. Halley, and of the English, in distinction from the Scottish churches generally,—that the great commission, "Go ye therefore, and teach (disciple) all nations, baptizing them, &c.," requires us to baptize all who come, or may be brought by their parents, to be instructed in the way of the Lord. To quote from Dr. Halley, (The Sacraments, Part II., page 6:)—"Let it be understood, that in our opinion, the great argument for the baptism of infants, is the plain grammar of the only commission which we have received to baptize at all. If there are any restrictions to this commission, let them be produced, and let the limitation of the word "them," in the phrase "baptizing them," deriving its breadth of meaning from the antecedent, "all the nations," be fairly considered. To any part of the commis-