

children, and no notice taken of it by the parents? Was it at all likely that the parents would submit to such a change, without demanding a reason for it? Many of the Epistles were written to rectify mis-conceptions, to answer objections, and obviate difficulties, but there is not a word on this subject. Yes, there is one passage 1 Cor. vii. 14. The Corinthians had asked the Apostle the question in respect to the Christian law of marriage, and he replies, that "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." This reply plainly shows that there was no difficulty about the children of believing parents, the only difficulty was when the one parent was a Christian, and the other a Pagan, and even here the Apostle declares that their children were to be treated as if both belonged to Christ.

4. It only remains to complete our argument, to refer to *the testimony of the early Christians*, which shows that infant baptism was practised by the Church from the Apostolic times. The earliest Christian writers mention infant baptism, not as a new thing, but as the general practice in their day. Tertullian (200, A.D.), it is true, objected to it, but not because it was a novelty, but because he conceived baptism to be connected with pardon of sin in such a way, that it should be delayed till Christians were married. Hence his objection was as strong against baptizing young people as infants. Now if Tertullian could have said, such baptism is a new thing, it was not practised from the first, would not this have been his strongest argument; and yet he never speaks of it in this light, from the simple fact, it was not so. Origen, his co-temporary, and of Christian descent as far back as his great grandfather, had every possible opportunity of informing himself on this subject; he travelled through the Churches, planted and watered by the Apostles, he conversed with those who had been set over them by their immediate successors, he laboured during the greatest part of his life in Syria and Palestine, and it is impossible to conceive him mistaken as to a plain matter of fact. His language is, "The Church received from the Apostles the injunction or tradition to give baptism even to infants." Fifty years after, sixty-six bishops or pastors met in council at Carthage, and in answer to the question, "whether it was necessary in the administration of baptism, as of circumcision, to wait until the eighth day, or whether a child might be baptized at any earlier period after its birth;" (there is no dispute about the baptism of infants, this is not questioned) replied, "ye ought not to hinder any person from baptism, and this rule as it holds for all, we think more especially to be observed in reference to infants, even to those newly born."

Like clear and convicting testimony is given by other early writers. It is unnecessary, however, to adduce more instances—enough has been brought forward to show that from the earliest period infants were baptized.

Now look at this line of argument throughout, and say could you wish a clearer and a fuller statement on this subject. Is it not plain to every unprejudiced mind, that infant baptism is a divine institution, and to deny this rite to our children, is to deprive them of a privilege appointed by the Great King himself for them. We have endeavored to compress into a narrow compass the proof for this doctrine—our object has been to remind our readers that infant baptism is founded on the Word of God, and that the compilers of our Catechism, were warranted from Scripture in saying, "the children of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized." In another paper we will examine the proper modes of baptism.

D. D.