

if the Jewish infant were to be admitted into the Church on the eighth day, it would be cruel, it would be profane, to exclude the heir of "*a more excellent ministry*" from the very earliest consignation of its blessings.

Nothing, therefore, but necessity is deemed by the Church a sufficient excuse for delay, and while by her article she affirms her judgment that "the baptism of young children is to be retained," as most agreeable to the institution of Christ, she directs, by her Rubric, "that it be not deferred longer than the first or second Sunday after its birth."

The Circumcision of the infant Jesus ought to be sufficient to settle the question of Infant Baptism, which with striking fidelity is called by the Apostle, "*the Circumcision of Christ*," or, as it is sometimes called, Christian Circumcision, or the Circumcision of Christians.\* In all the baptisms of the Apostles, no exception of children is ever made. The baptism of the woman of Thyatira and "*her house*,"† of the Philippian jailer "*and all his*,"‡ and of "*the household of Stephenas*,"§ are all recorded in a manner to show that neither doubts nor scruples were entertained upon the subject. The argument of St. Paul, that a believing parent sanctifies the children, is another convincing proof that such children could enter into covenant. For "*the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, BUT NOW ARE THEY HOLY*,"||—that is, dedicated, or capable of being dedicated to God, for in no other way could they be considered holy; while the invariable practice of the Catholic Church for many hundred years confirms this view of the case, as it is presented to us in the word of God;¶ and although at various times, as at the present, there have been contentious men to hinder and find fault with the baptism of children,\*\* there are none bold enough to dispute *the fact* that such was the custom in all the Churches in every age; and all true believers in the primitive Church allowed its validity, and valued it as their promise and their privilege. Again, I repeat, *the fact was never denied*; and it proves the undisputed custom of the apostolic age, that at the

\* Col. ii. 11.

† Acts xvi. 15.

‡ Acts xvi. 33.

§ 1 Cor. i. 16.

|| 1 Cor. vii. 14.

¶ Peter Bruis, a Frenchman who lived in the eleventh century, was the first Baptist who had a regular congregation. The Baptists of Germany, a turbulent and enthusiastic sect, took their rise in the beginning of the fifteenth century; and there was no congregation of Baptists in England before the year 1640.

\*\* St. Denis, the Areopagite, calls them "unholy persons and enemies to the Christian Religion."