

we have not the slightest authority to narrow its meaning,) when applied to the baptism of Christian "households." It must mean that the heads of the families and their children were baptized. Now, as among the thousands of families who were baptized in apostolic times there must have been infants, we are morally certain that infant baptism was practised by the apostles. The objector must assume, either that there were no infants in any of the baptized "households," or that they were excepted, (and he must make this assumption, not only *without* proof, but in opposition to proofs on the other side, which amount very nearly to mathematical demonstration,) or he must admit that the apostles practised infant baptism.

It will be admitted that, if the infant children of professing Christians may be included in the visible church, they have a right, on that ground, to baptism. That they *may* be thus included, is clear from St. Paul's argument in the eleventh chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. In this argument, the visible church is represented as an olive-tree ; and believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, as branches. The believing Jews are spoken of as "*natural*" branches, who were in the tree by hereditary descent ; the believing Gentiles as "*wild olive*" branches, *grafted* into the same stock, and partaking of the "*root and fatness of the olive-tree* ;" while, on the other hand, the unbelieving Jews are represented as branches "*broken off*,"—broken off on account of their unbelief. The Gentiles are reminded that they were "*grafted in*" by faith, and could only retain their connexion with the olive-tree by continuing to believe ; and are, therefore, solemnly warned against unbelief, which, as it had already "*broken off*" some of the "*natural branches*," would certainly break them off. It is plain, then, from the entire

argu
pass
that
Wha
self,
visib
ceive
"bro
of th
for t
who
"bro
own
paren
there
But
of co
be b
fully
Jews
were
of th
—wh
churc
woul
paren
shoul
mem
Chris
and t
An
becar