were legitimate. But "holy" means "set apart," "dedicated to God," and the meaning here plainly is, that though only one parent be a Christian, the children are not excluded from the blessing of the covenant on that account, since the unbelieving partner is "reputed as if sanctified," because of one flesh with the believer. No other interpretation seems so common sense and natural as this. From this passage we conclude, that the seal of the covenant can only be applied, with propriety, to the children of believers; and further, that if only one of the parents be a Christian, that one may claim the privilege.

3. I argue the propriety of Infant Baptism from the instances of family baptism recorded in the New Testament,

1. The case of Lydia and her family. Act, xvi, 14, 15. Observe, when the Lord opened her heart, not the hearts of the whole family—when she believed, not when all her family believed—"she was beptired and her household," (literally, "family,") and she said, "If ye have judged me to be be faithful," &c. Lydia became a Christian, and for this reason her family were baptized with her.

With regard to this family baptism, it is alleged by our opponents that all were believers. But this is not stated by the inspired historian. It is a mere conjecture. There is not a word about the faith of any besides Lydia. Moreover, the very point at issue is assumed in this supposition, that none but those who were personally believers were ever

baptized by the Apostles.

It is also said that Lydia's household might have been servants. But which is more likely, that this "seller of purple" had a family of children, or that she had several servants? Besides the original word "oikos" here translated "household," forbids this supposition. This term properly means "family," and is generally used to denote children exclusively. When other relatives or servants as well as children, or servants only are intended, another term "oik,a" is used. Thus, Phil. iv. 22, "Cæsan's household" is mentioned. Here the word "oikia" is used pointing out domestics or servants.\* No reason can be given for the

In the account of the jailer's conversion, we have the distinction be-