

Finally, was not infant baptism dependent for its support upon the assumed essential identity of the two economies, and was not all schism in the old punished with unsparing sternness, and must it not then, if this assumption be true, be thus punished under the new? John Cotton uses this very argument against Roger Williams, and if the latter had been a Pedobaptist he could not have evaded its force. We know also that this same argument has been ever used in the interests of intolerance, and to Pedobaptists it seems unanswerable. And so also we believe that to-day, so far as pedobaptism tends to make church members of all, to unite church and state, to attach saving efficacy to rites or make them necessary to salvation, or to make the New Test. church but the antitype of the Jewish nation, it has in its very nature the virus of intolerance, and Pedobaptists are not intolerant only when they are not what their system would permit them to be. In harmony with this reasoning are the facts that all Pedobaptist bodies have been intolerant in the past, and that no church which has rejected infant baptism has ever persecuted.

Thus we have attempted to show that it has not been by chance that baptismal regeneration, an unregenerate church, church and state, and intolerance, have been associated with pedobaptism, but that they all have sprung from it naturally, and are its logical results.

Need we proceed to affirm

II. That these consequences of pedobaptism have wrought dire and widespread evil.

In which of her offices and works is not the church crippled when the unregenerate are openly admitted into her membership, or allowed to remain there? How can such a church be as a city set on a hill whose *light* cannot be hid? What is the power of her influence to lead men to religion and a higher life? Nay; a church which receives to the most sacred of its privileges those who are preying upon the vices of others—