

tures that infant baptism was instituted by Christ or begun by the first Christians after the Apostles." (1.) Bunsen, in referring to Luther and his co-labourers in the Reformation, uses the following language: "The Reformation accepted Pedobaptism, although its leaders were more or less aware that it was neither Scriptural nor Apostolic." (2.) The *North British Review*, for August 1852, the well known and able organ of the Free Church, frankly admits that "the *only* baptism known to the New Testament was that of adults." Candid English scholars long ago made similar concessions. Bishop Burnet says: "There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants." (3.) Baxter defies Mr. Blake "to produce *one* example or precept for the baptism of any but believers." (4.) Thomas Baston affirms: "There is no example of baptism recorded in the Scriptures where any were baptized but such as appeared to have a saving interest in Christ." (5.) Saurin says: "In the primitive church, instruction preceded baptism, agreeable to the order of Jesus Christ, 'go teach all nations, baptizing them,' &c." (6.) And Goodwin says: "Baptism supposes regeneration sure in itself first. Read *all* the Acts, still it is said they believed and were baptized." (7.) As in regard to the mode, so in regard to the subjects of baptism, it would be easy to increase such testimony four-fold. Alas, for Protestant Christianity, when institutions are openly maintained, while it is confessed that they are unscriptural! If we knowingly depart, in one particular, from the commands or precepts of God, why may we not in two or in twenty? Where shall we stop? Does not the Bible, the Bible alone, contain the religion of Protestants? How

---

1. *Pedo. Bap. Ex.*, vol. 2, p. 4.

3. *Expo. Arts.*, Art 37.

5. *Works*, p. 384.

7. *Works*, vol. , p. 200.

2. *H. pointus*, vol. 2, p. 10.

4. *Disput. of Right to Sacram.*, p. 166.

6. *Pedo Bap. Exam.*, vol. 2, p. 274.