

only rule of Christian ordinances,"\* and represents an appeal to the Old Testament on this subject as "inconsistent with the dictates of common sense." *We*, on the contrary, can neither admit the principle, nor divest ourselves of the impression that there is much more rudeness than reason, in charging us with a want of common sense for rejecting it. The great anxiety which our opponents indicate to confine us to the New Testament is, in our estimation, a very suspicious circumstance. It involves a hypothetical admission that the practice of baptizing infants, which they oppose, may be proved to have the support of Divine authority by allowing the Bible, including the New and Old Testaments, to decide the point.

A correct and adequate knowledge of the Christian ordinance of Baptism, cannot, we maintain, be derived from the New Testament apart from the Old. If—and we here use the sentiments and nearly the words of one who, Mr. Crawley seems to think, possessed rather *uncommon* sense†—the Rev. Richard Watson, the late talented Secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society,—if the Abrahamic covenant and the Christian covenant is the same gracious engagement, on the part of God, to show mercy to man, and to bestow upon him eternal life, through faith in Christ as the true sacrifice for sin, differing only in circumstances; and if the sign and seal of this covenant under the Old dispensation was circumcision, and under the New is baptism, which has the same federal character, performs the same initiatory office, and is instituted by the same authority;—if none could have authority to lay aside the appointed seal, but the Being who first instituted it, who changed the form of the covenant itself, and who has in fact abrogated the old seal by the appointment of another—even baptism—which is made obligatory upon "all nations" to whom the gospel is preached, then, Antipedobaptist writers are bound to employ all their strength to prove that baptism was not appointed in the room of circumcision, since if they fail in establishing this position, one of their main objections to infant baptism is rendered wholly nugatory. Could they persuade us to treat the Old Testament, in this controversy, as though its authority and use were alike superseded by the New, their endeavours to give *plausibility* to their system would, we have no doubt, be materially facilitated, —although even then, it would behove them to assign reasons, of a very conclusive character, to justify their conduct in precluding from the church of Christ those whom he himself enfolded in his arms, and respecting whom, while he blessed them, he said,—

\* Treatise on Baptism, p. 5.—† p.