

This conclusion is much strengthened by the consideration, that infant church membership was a blessing conferred upon parents and children. And that the New Testament dispensation, has not curtailed the privileges of the people of God.

That infant church membership, was intended to promote and perpetuate religion, in the families of the people of God ; is evident from this one consideration, that it was appointed by an infinitely wise and gracious God for that purpose.

That the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh, and the change that has taken place in his church, in consequence of it ; has not lessened the privileges of the people of God, is a fact that no one will venture to deny. But if infant church membership has ceased, both we and our children have sustained a loss. Hence I infer that it has not ceased but exists still.

The deduction of infant baptism from infant church membership, is easy and natural. Hence Dr. Gill says, " let it be proved, that infants are or ought to be members of gospel churches, and we are ready to admit them," *i. e.* to baptism. See his answer to Dickenson, p. 89, as quoted by Mr. Pond.

Hence brethren you see the propriety and necessity of resorting to the Old Testament scriptures, to ascertain who were constituted members of the visible church, when first established ; whether that church were founded on the covenant of grace or not ; and consequently, whether that church was the true church of God—the same church in which we now are. These are questions of great importance to every person, who wishes to know the truth respecting the doctrine of infant baptism.

I am of opinion that infant baptism, may be proved from the New Testament taken in connection with the early history of the Christian church ; but not in that satisfactory manner, in which it can, when the voices of the prophets are joined with those of the apostles.

I remain &c,