

5. *It will be of advantage to other churches.*—Have you ever heard of that remarkable vessel which had two peculiarities? The one was—that it sailed faster than any of the old steamers in the harbour; and the next was—that it made all the other steamers sail faster than they used to do! Apply this to yourselves, and try it. Yes, try to excel all your neighbours in heavenly love and zeal—and doubt not but it will make them *sail faster* than they used to do; and will not that be an advantage?

6. *It will be of advantage to distant nations.*—There is a man in the East Indies who was born a heathen, but at an early age was taken into the Mission School, and became a pupil. There his mind was enlightened, and his soul converted to God. Now, instead of being an ignorant idolator, he is a preacher of the Gospel, a translator of tracts, a superintendent of schools, and a teacher of babes. A letter has lately been received from this interesting man, in which he strikingly shows how the piety of churches at home promotes the piety of persons who live fourteen thousand miles from us. He says,—“When we translated and printed in *Tamul* the account given in English of a good woman in Russia doing much good to her neighbours, I sent a copy of it to a pious woman who read it with great delight, and was stirred up by it to go more about among her neighbours; and two or three times a year she walks as far as *Neyoor*, a distance of fifteen miles, to stir up the people in our neighbourhood.” See, then, how your conduct is likely to benefit distant lands; and will not that be an advantage?

Lastly. *It will be of advantage to you in heaven.*—Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Judge of quick and dead, had his eye upon the Church, and his heart upon the world; and he connects all their doing with the awful transactions of the judgment-day. Hear him: “Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me. Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.”

O! my friends, do you not wish to have the approval of the Lord Jesus? Do you not wish to be happy and useful on earth, and glorious in heaven? Then take heed that ye “shine as lights in the world!” And though we may never meet on earth, yet I trust, through the merits of Christ, we shall meet in heaven. PASTOR.

Christians who are fully alive to the awful state of perishing souls, will be energetic in their efforts to save them.

Burden of Proof of the Baptismal Controversy.

From the Baptist Penny Magazine.

The state of the controversy between ourselves and our Pædobaptist brethren is as follows:—They assert that Infant Baptism was an ordinance practised in the apostolic church; and this position we deny. Now, by all the laws of sound reasoning, the burden of proof lies upon them. They must first prove their affirmative before we can fairly be called upon to prove our negative; and, indeed, in the absence of proof on their part, our negative stands virtually proven. This has been demonstrated by Dr. Carson in his introduction to his last book on baptism, in which Dr. Whately's assumptions of an opposite character are vigorously refuted. Surely no man can be called upon to prove Infant Baptism unapostolical until something like proof is advanced that it is apostolical. And clearly if it were an apostolical custom to baptize the children of believers, proof of this may easily be found in the New Testament Records. We are willing, however, in this debate to perform a work of supererogation, and are prepared to prove that Infant Baptism could not have been known in apostolic times. But, before we proceed to do so, we entreat the reader's attention to the following excellent remarks of Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, in his Treatise on Rhetoric:—“It is to be observed that in many cases, silence, omission, absence of certain statements, &c., will have even greater weight than much that we do find stated; e. g., suppose we meet with something in a passage of one of Paul's epistles, which indicates, with a certain degree of probability the existence of such and such a custom, institution, &c.; and suppose there is just the same degree of probability that such another custom, institution, or event, which he does not mention anywhere, would have been mentioned by him in the same place, supposing it to have really existed or occurred; this omission, and the negative argument resulting, has incomparably the more weight than the other, if we also find that same omission in all the other epistles, and in every one of the books of the New Testament.” (p. 70.) It is precisely by this process of reasoning that we are able to show that Infant Baptism could not have been practised in apostolic times.

1. The New Testament relates many instances of the baptism of men and women, but does not contain a solitary instance of the baptism of an infant. Now surely, if in primitive days it had been the rule to baptize the infants of believers with their parents, some plain instance of such a practice would have been recorded. But the absence of the narration of any such case proves that infants could not have been baptized at that period of church history.

The four baptized households were *believing* households, and this explains the reason of their baptism along with their heads. The baptism of households was *unusual* even in those days, because it was a rare thing for all the members of a household to be converted at the same time; but in four cases it did take place, and in those four cases *alone* is it recorded that the household was baptized along with the householder. We affirm then, that not a single instance of Infant Baptism can be produced from the New Testament.

2. No precepts are given either by Christ or his apostles enjoining upon parents the baptism of their children. Now, the duties of Christian parents are not meagerly discussed in the New Testament, but are there fully exhibited. Surely, then, somewhere or other, we should have found the baptism of their infants presented to Christian parents as their solemn duty, had this been considered in those days a parental obligation. And would not parents have been reminded of the responsibilities incurred by them in consequence of having dedicated their children to God by baptism? But where are such responsibilities thus enforced? Where is the fact of having had his children baptized presented to a Christian man as an additional reason why he should train up those children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? Yet pious Pædobaptist ministers are in the habit of appealing in this strain to the members of their churches, and profess to regard such appeals as quite apostolical in their style. But the entire exclusion from the pages of the New Testament of all such methods of stirring up Christian parents to the discharge of their duties, proves that it was not the practice in apostolic times for believers to baptize their infants.

3. Nor are there any incidental allusions or passing references in the New Testament to the existence of such a ceremony as Infant Baptism. Even the ingenuity of the author of “*Horæ Paulinæ*,” would fail to discover any such allusion. The inspired canon contains repeated references to the baptism of believers, and to the Supper of the Lord; but we cannot find in it the shadow of an allusion, however incidental or fugitive, to the ceremony of Infant Baptism. This proves that such a ceremony must have been unknown in those days.

4. The controversies with which the primitive church was enmeshed respecting the continuance of circumcision, demonstrates that the apostles cannot have enjoined the observance of Infant Baptism as a substitute for Infant Circumcision. Had there existed in the apostolic church the ordinance of Infant Baptism coming in the room of Infant Circumcision, no disputes with regard to the perpetuity of the latter could have arisen, but it must of necessity