

raging the believing one to hope the best from the exercise of religious influences. A *holy* marriage,—so he argued,—being a marriage contracted in a lawful manner, the issue of such marriage is *holy*; that is, lawful. But if the change of religion in one of the parties rendered the marriage unlawful, then the children of such marriage would be unholy—unlawful, ‘unclean,’ illegitimate.” Now, if the passage before us be thus correctly interpreted, then there is in it no reference to baptism, and no authority for infant baptism. And indeed nothing can be more precarious than the attempt so often made,—and in the case of infant baptism so notoriously made,—to build up conclusions for which there can be found no clear, direct, Scriptural authority, upon obscure and uncertain premises.

#### INFANT BAPTISM NOT FORBIDDEN.

VIII. In the absence of direct proof as to the practice of infant baptism in New Testament times, it is pleaded, “Where in the New Testament is infant baptism forbidden?”

#### A DESPERATE QUESTION.

Surely we have here a desperate and fatal question. What sort of a cause must that be which is driven to a plea like this? Why, of all the mummeries of Rome, how many are directly forbidden in Scripture? If, moreover, to make any thing unlawful which is set up for a religious observance, it must be distinctly prohibited in the Word of God, the “world itself could not contain the books that should be written;” and the Bible must have been made as huge and unreadable as the Statutes at Large. And farther, if a plea like this were accepted as valid, there remains no reason why we, as Protestants, should persist in our prolonged and painful struggle against Rome; but there is every reason rather why we should cease from our anti-Papal warfare, and return to that Holy, Apostolic, Catholic Church whose pale our fathers ought never to have abandoned.

I bring my argument to a close with a few PRACTICAL HINTS. And first, I would say to my readers, *Beware of false views, and improper feelings* in regard to the ordinance of baptism. Let no man trust to his baptism. Nowhere in the New Testament is there any saving power associated with baptism. Nay, what says Paul, 1 Cor. i. 17? “Christ sent me, *not* to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.” And again, Rom. i. 16. he describes the “*Gospel of Christ*,”—not baptism, or any other outward ordinance, as “the power of God unto salvation.” So, in 1 John i. 7, we are told, that it is “the blood of Jesus Christ,” and not baptismal water,