

argument, that when the Jew became a believer, and thus passed into the Christian church, he was *not* "broken off;" that he did not unchurch himself by becoming a Christian. What, then, became of his children? They, as well as himself, were native branches in the olive-tree; members of the visible church by hereditary descent; and had therefore received the initiatory rite of circumcision. Were they, then, "broken off" when their parent became a Christian? *None* of the Jews were "broken off," except for unbelief; that is, for the rejection of Christ. Now, if the Jewish children, who were certainly native branches in the olive-tree, *were* "broken off," it could only be either on account of their own unbelief, or the unbelief of their parents. If a Jewish parent rejected Christ, both he and his infant children were thereby unchurched,— "broken off" from the olive-tree. But when the parent was a believer, his children could not, of course, be "broken off" for *his* unbelief. Nor could they be broken off for *their own*; for they were incapable of wilfully rejecting Christ, which was the sin of the unbelieving Jews. Then, clearly, as both the Jews and their children were native branches in the olive-tree,—and, as in the case of those who believed, there was nothing to break off *either*,—when the parent became a member of the Christian church, he carried his children along with him. Besides, would it not be utterly incredible to suppose that, while the parent retained his connexion with the Jewish church, he should have his children along with him, as the recognised members of that church; but that, when he became a Christian, he should be required to enter the church alone, and to leave his children outside of the pale?

And when the Gentiles—the "wild olive" branches—became grafted into the "olive-tree," and partook of its