

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

THOMAS W. TOBEY, Editor.

Devoted to Religion, Morality, Literature, Agriculture and General Intelligence.

M. A. MEREDITH, Publisher.

VOLUME XVII. NO. 10.

RALEIGH, N. C. FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1852.

WHOLE NO. 1085

Important Announcement!

The Dered Question settled! By Dr. N. L. Rice.

Our liberal offer of \$1,000, has at length attracted the attention of the leaders of Pedobaptism in high places, as it has for sometimes the preachers, elders and itinerants, all over the South-west.

We wished the attention of the public for once to be fixed upon the fact that God's promises are as good as a warrant for the redemption of infant baptism.

To accomplish this we offered the reward, and had the desired effect. Could we have had our choice, of all the men in the West or South, Dr. Rice, editor of the "Recorder," would have been chosen, because, since his debate with A. Campbell, he has been looked upon as the Theological champion of Pedobaptism—and Dr. Rice has at last stepped forth to wipe from Pedobaptism the reproach it has suffered from all ages. This reward to remain unaccepted for two years.

In no other thing he is worthy of praise.—While any of his editorial brethren have met the Pastor with jeers, abuse, and ridicule, Dr. Rice has met it with a respectful consideration.

In his first notice he declared that he had the best of texts, but did not wish the money.

He was immediately called upon by a large number of the Baptist press to favor them with the most positive proof, upon which he rested the case.

To this he at last consented, and has furnished the thousands of his own readers, and the world, with what he considers the most positive and decisive text for infant baptism in the Word of God.

There are several considerations which invest this article with more thrilling interest and weight than any publication made during the present century.

1. Pedobaptists have been unwilling to come to a direct issue upon the positive scripture testimony for the practice in question, when the public attention was called to it they have stayed off the decision, by evasion, and resorted to unfounded inferences and analogies; but in this instance the issue has been fairly and directly made, and consequently, if it has resulted in a clear and satisfactory scripture authority, Pedobaptists, if conscientious in their profession, rejecting tradition, and taking the Bible alone, for their faith and practice, must repudiate the dogma of infant baptism as a vestige of Popery.

2. Our second reason for the above declaration is that it will be admitted by all that Dr. Rice is able to find the Scripture precept or example for the practice, if any Pedobaptist in this Union or Universe is.

3. It will also be admitted that if Dr. Rice could engage to do it, he would give the strongest and most decisive proof texts the Scriptures afford—the strongest and most reliable known to the Pedobaptist world—since a failure or unsatisfactory ones would decidedly and so materially injure his cause—injure it far more than any success.

4. Dr. Rice has consented to the proof, and therefore we must conclude the Scriptures he offers to our criticism are the clearest and most decisive known to him or Pedobaptists—and if they are decided unsatisfactory by the world, the question must be settled in their favor—and if they are pronounced wholly irrelevant—possessing no proof for the practice, but against it, by the most eminent Pedobaptist Theologians themselves, then we have a reasonable right to conclude that all pious and conscientious Pedobaptists, (unless they can find) will renounce the practice or cease to claim a divine origin for it. Therefore, we conclude that this article of Dr. Rice, if pressed upon the attention of the public, will do more to settle this vexed question than all the publications of any age.

With these reflections, we submit the clearest precepts for infant baptism known to Dr. Rice, and the Pedobaptist world:

PRECEPTS FOR BAPTIZING INFANTS.—Some time since the editor of the Tennessee Baptist offered a reward of \$1000 for a precept or example in the New Testament sustaining infant baptism. We said, we are prepared to furnish the precept, though we have no desire for the editor's money. Two Baptist papers call for the precept. We will furnish two. The first is found in Matt. 19: 14. "But Jesus said, suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven." The Kingdom of heaven is admitted to mean the Church of Christ under the new dispensation, or the Gospel church-state. The reason given why these little children should be brought to Christ is, that of such is His church, or to such belong the privileges of His church. Is baptism the door into that church? Is it one of the privileges of those who have the right to enter it? Then baptism is required to be administered to children, such as these. Supposing the primitive church have called the kingdom of heaven, or have been *anti-pedobaptist* in its faith; how could it be said, of such is the kingdom of heaven? The church of Christ, it is certain, is composed in part of infant children, but the Baptist church is not so composed.

The second text is found in Matthew 28: 19. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations (or disciples) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c.—Here is the command to baptize, as well as to teach. It is a precept to baptize *whosoever*. Neither adults nor infants are mentioned, but "all nations." It is evidently a precept to baptize all who have a right to membership in the church of Christ. Who those are, the present precept does not determine. That question is to be settled from other parts of the inspired word. It is settled by the passage already quoted, as well as other passages. Here, then, is a precept which, interpreted by the Bible itself, requires the children of believers to be baptized. It has been so understood by forty-fifth of the christian world in all ages. There is no interpretation in question.—*Frederick of the West.*

And are these indeed the texts?!! We will bear the 80,000 weekly readers of our

paper exclaim. We assure them we are not playing off a hoax upon them, they are indeed the texts—the very best the Dr.'s research can discover and judgment approve.

They are very old, and have been answered and demonstrated to have no bearing upon and afford no authority or even pretext for infant baptism, by both Baptists and Pedobaptists, as to deprive an examination of them of all interest, unless that with which a presentation of them under those circumstances may invest them.

What is a fair and impartial exposition of the Matt. 19: 13-16?

Little children were brought unto him. The definite object for which they were brought is stated, "that he would put his hands on them and pray." Was there anything peculiar in this occurrence? Not the least. It was the custom of the Orientals to crave the blessing and prayers of those they esteemed holy men, or prophets for their children, as christian parents do now the prayers of pious ministers. Christ was esteemed a notable prophet, a teacher sent from God, and his prayers were solicited for these children.

What possible bearing has this text upon baptism? It is not asked for—is not mentioned or hinted at in the whole connection Jesus did precisely what he was asked to do—nothing more. "He laid his hands on them and departed."

But how much, to prove, that up to this time, that no infants had been baptized—and that not the least intimation had fallen from the Saviour's lips, upon the care of his disciples, that infants ought to be baptized—that the church of Christ and the old Jewish commonwealth were identical institutions—baptism coming in the room of circumcision, and consequently the infants of believers entitled to the rite, not one word of it—and yet how appropriate a place and time to have taught it to the offended disciples.

If Jesus had appointed infant baptism, and had baptized prior to this occurrence, why were his disciples offended—why did they rebuke these devout ones in the discharge of their religious duties?!! Does Dr. Rice, or do Pedobaptist ministers rebuke pious parents now for bringing their infant sons to "Holy baptism?"

All will—must admit—if Jesus had been wont, by his disciples to baptize infants, or had taught the propriety of the rite, the disciples would not have rebuked these! No one will say he baptized those, and therefore the PASSAGE MOST CLEARLY DISFAVORS THE DOCTRINE!!

The Saviour was accustomed to teach important lessons from almost every circumstance, and did not let this pass. These little children were around him—he loved their presence, and as every person of tender and benevolent disposition does—"Suffer them to come, and forbid them not," said he, and now for the illustrating the lesson, "for of such is the kingdom of heaven." He declares a great truth—that all the members of his "kingdom were to be not such, but "of such." We ask "of such" in what respect? In respect to age? Then was the question asked by Nicodemus extremely pertinent. No adult could become a member without a second natural birth!!! But if it means, they must possess some of the characteristics of little children, such as humility, meekness, truthfulness, diffidence, teachableness, docility, &c., then can it be predicated of all the genuine followers of Christ and members of his kingdom.

The Scripture is the best commentary upon the Scriptures. Had Matthew given Christ's explanation as given by Luke, Dr. Rice would never have produced the text. Turn to Luke 18: 16. "But Jesus said suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the Kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein."

Does any one ask, what is meant by receiving the kingdom as a little child, let him read the words of the Saviour, Matt. 18: 3, "Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven."

Reason as well as the Saviour himself, furnishes this exegesis of the passage, which goes decidedly against all idea of infant baptism being or involved in it, or to be inferred from it. This will still be, as it has been the verdict of the candid million.

We will now turn to the decisions of Pedobaptists and Presbyterians themselves.

The verdict of the most eminent Pedobaptist commentators and scholars has ever been against the construction of this passage to favor infant baptism. We give the following, and will give a score of others, if Dr. Rice will call for them.

OSHAUSEN. "For entering into the Kingdom of God, there is enjoined the child-like feeling which enables us most easily to discern the gifts which have been bestowed upon each, and consequently puts us in circumstances to fulfill our calling."

Of that reference to infant baptism which is so common to seek in this narrative, THERE IS CLEARLY NOT THE SLIGHTEST TRACE TO BE FOUND!!" Notes on the passage.

Is not this a frank and honest comment? But Dr. Rice, or his friends, may ask who is this writer?

Kitto, in his Cyclopedia, says of him:—"The best example of commentary on the New Testament with which we are acquainted, has been given by this writer. It is a mode of exposition unrivaled in any language."

He investigates the thought, traces the connection, puts himself in the same position as the writers, and views with philosophic ability, the holy revolution of Christ in their comprehensive tendencies."

What does this "unrivaled commentator" further say, touching infant baptism? After asserting that Christian baptism is symbolical of a new birth, and therefore baptism necessarily presupposes faith, he adds:

"By the introducing of Pedobaptism the position which the ordinance occupied is changed. PEDOBAPTISM IS NOT APOSTOLIC FOR CERTAIN!!" Notes on Matt. 28: 16.

Again: "There is altogether wanting any conclusive proof passages for the baptism of children in the age of the apostles, nor can the necessity of it be deduced from the nature of baptism."

Si, however, the propriety of infant baptism is undoubted, and the condition of the church after the close of the third century imperatively

required its introduction. But in this way Christian baptism sank down to the position as it were of John's baptism, and it acquired its full significance, only when it was connected with confirmation. And as baptism, so also the church had fallen back to a position of legality, of which the clear consciousness first appeared at the Reformation, and then also the effort was made to return to the primitive Christian model.—Notes on acts 16: 14, 15.

Prof. J. Mueller a distinguished living theologian professor at the University of Halle. In a recent lecture he took the following position: "Quite as untenable are the proofs from Scripture for the necessity of infant baptism, since it is an error to regard the establishment of the ordinance as found in Matt. 19: 13-15; John 3: 5; Matt. 28: 19, while the first two passages have no manner of connection with baptism, and the last indicates plainly a limitation of its universality."

The appeal to the circumcision of infants under the Old Testament theocracy, can also prove nothing for infant baptism, on account of the difference between the Jewish and Christian Church.

Nevertheless the Christian Church (mark it well—not Christ or his Apostles) from a worthy consideration has instituted the baptism of infants while only by this means was the christianizing of the heathen possible."

If the decision of the above distinguished theologians of their own faith, will not be regarded, we appeal to the Rev. A. Barnes, the famous Presbyterian, and standard commentator, of Philadelphia. Surely they will hear him.

REV. A. BARNES. "Of such is the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven evidently means here the church. Note Matt. 3: 2: in Mark and Luke it is said he immediately added, 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall not enter therein.'—Whosoever shall not be humble, unambitious and docile, shall not be a true follower of Christ, or a member of his kingdom."

Of such as these—that is, of persons with such tempers as these—is the church to be composed. He does not say of those infants, but of such persons as resembled them, or like them in temper, was the kingdom of heaven made up."

So much for the first passage. If there was even a faint intimation of infant baptism in it, no advocate of the rite would repudiate it—proof being so scarce.

His second passage is the commission as given by Matt. 28: 19, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c.

He says, "the command is to baptize some body. Neither adults nor infants are mentioned but 'all nations.'"

Dr. Rice's own translation (which see) of this passage shows how conclusively and unmistakably who are meant. He translated it, "Go disciple all nations, 'baptizing them.' Baptizing whom? Not the waters indiscriminately, since the pronoun *autem* in the Greek does not agree with 'ta ethna' the nations, and therefore cannot refer to them, but it being in the masculine gender must refer to a noun in this gender. There are but two nouns expressed or understood in this verse to which 'them' can refer, *ethna*, and signifying disciples or the disciples." This makes sense, and corresponds to the example of Christ. Jesus made disciples before he baptized them.

"Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John." He is a disciple who believes with his whole heart and trusts in Christ, and such a disciple, the believer alone, Christ intended his church to baptize. This commission as given by Mark, decides this most clearly.

"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Laws are specific instruments. This commission is a law, enjoining a Christian ordinance, and limiting by specification the subjects of it. The subjects are limited by the character specified—any other is positively forbidden.

Specification in a law, cut off and forbid whatever is not specified.

God commanded Noah to make an ark of Gopher wood; but because the gopher was specified by the sacred Scriptures, that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or by the first Christians after the Apostles."

MELANCTHON and ZWINGLI admitted the same.

ERASMUS says in his notes on Romans: "Paul does not seem in Rom. 6: 14, to treat of infants. It was not the custom for infants to be baptized."

ECOLAMPADIUS, the fellow-laborer of Zwingle, says, "No passage in the Holy Scriptures has occurred to our observation as yet, which as far as the slenderness of our capacity can discern, should persuade us to profess Pedobaptism."

Here are five of the Reformers—the Fathers of the Reformation declaring that they were unable to find a passage in the Word of God to support infant baptism. Had they never met with these two passages given by Dr. Rice?!

TERTULLIAN in the beginning of the 3rd century denies a divine warrant for it, and

ORIGEN, A. D. 350, and after him AUSTIN declares "For this reason (to wash away the pollution of original sin) it was that the church had from the Apostles TRADITION to give baptism even to infants."

CURCELLANUS, Professor at Geneva, "The baptism of infants in the two first centuries after Christ, was altogether unknown; but in the 3rd and 4th, it was allowed by some few." Quoted by Pengilly.

Dr. FIELD. "The baptism of infants is therefore named a tradition because it is not expressly delivered in Scripture, that the apostles did baptize infants, or any express precept there found that they should do so." By Pengilly.

Dr. HOOK, a celebrated English divine, now living. "You know my hearers, that the Bible says nothing what ever of the baptism of infants; if then you reject the authority of tradition, how do you account for infant baptism?"

Dr. WALL. "Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the Apostles, there is no express mention of any infants."

Bishop BURNETT. "There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants."

RICHARD BAXTER, (author of Saints' Rest,) in discussion with Mr. Blake, a brother Pedobaptist, says, "I conclude that all examples of baptism in Scripture do mention only the administration of it to the professors of saving faith, and the precepts give us no other direction—

that which is true or rational; if they mean it absolutely as so spoken: else why should one be baptized more than another? . . . This is not like some occasional historical mention of baptism, but it is the very commission of Christ to his Apostles for preaching and baptizing, and purposely expresseth their several works in their several places and order. Their first task is by teaching to make disciples, who are by Mark called believers."

"The second work is to baptize them, whereto is annexed the promise of their salvation."

"The third work is to teach them all other things which are afterwards to be learned in the school of Christ. To contents this order, is to renounce all rules of order; for where can we expect to find it, if here? I profess, my conscience is fully satisfied from this text, that it is one sort of faith, even saying, that must go before baptism, and the profession wherof the minister must expect." Dis. of Right to Sac. p. 91-150.

Dr. F. G. HIBBARD, [Methodist.] "Comment on Matt. 28: 19, &c. It is well known that our English version does not give a satisfactory view of this passage. The word rendered teach, in the 19th is altogether a different word, in the Greek text, from that which is rendered teach, in verse 20. It should read, 'Go disciple—i. e. make converts to Christianity, of all nations, baptizing them,' &c."

"Here it is to be observed, first certain things are enjoined; viz: to disciple, to baptize, and to teach; secondly, these things are enjoined in a certain order; viz: the order in which they stand in the divine commission."

"Suppose we say that the things commanded are to be done, but the order observed in the commission is a subject of indifference. Now, what will be the consequence of this position? What, but total and irretrievable confusion? The apostles go forth; they are intent upon doing all that Christ commanded them, but the order of the duties is a subject of indifference. The consequence is that some are baptized before they are converted from heathenism, some receive the holy supper before either baptism or conversion; others are engaged in a course of instruction before they are disciples, and the most ineffectual and unsuitable practice everywhere prevail."

A. BARNES. Matt. 28: 19. Teach all nations. The word rendered teach here is not the one that is usually so translated in the New Testament. This word properly means disciple or, make disciples of all nations. This was to be done, however, by teaching them, and then administering the rite baptism."

CALVIN. Because Christ requires teaching before baptizing, and will have believers only admitted to baptism; baptism does not seem to be rightly administered, except faith precede.—Under this pretence the Anabaptists have loudly clamored against Pedobaptists."

POPE'S CONTROVERSIALS. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations." The Greek is *matheteuete*, make disciples of all nations; but the first by preaching and instructing them in the principles of the Christian faith, and Mark expounds it, telling us our Saviour said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," that is to every reasonable creature, capable of hearing and receiving it. I cannot be of their mind who think that persons may be baptized before they are taught; and we want precedents of any such baptisms in Scripture."

SAVRIN. "In the primitive church instruction preceded baptism, agreeably to the order of Jesus Christ, 'Go teach all nations, baptizing them,' &c."

GOMARUS. "In Matt. 28: 19, our Lord speaks not concerning infants, but adults, who are capable of instruction."

MR. SAMUEL PALMER. "There is nothing in the words of the institution respecting the baptism of infants."

In conclusion, we will submit a few of the scores of *ex cathedra* admissions of Pedobaptist standard divines:

MARTIN LUTHER, the moving spirit of the Reformation, declared, "It cannot be proved by the sacred Scriptures, that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or by the first Christians after the Apostles."

MELANCTHON and ZWINGLI admitted the same.

ERASMUS says in his notes on Romans: "Paul does not seem in Rom. 6: 14, to treat of infants. It was not the custom for infants to be baptized."

ECOLAMPADIUS, the fellow-laborer of Zwingle, says, "No passage in the Holy Scriptures has occurred to our observation as yet, which as far as the slenderness of our capacity can discern, should persuade us to profess Pedobaptism."

Here are five of the Reformers—the Fathers of the Reformation declaring that they were unable to find a passage in the Word of God to support infant baptism. Had they never met with these two passages given by Dr. Rice?!

TERTULLIAN in the beginning of the 3rd century denies a divine warrant for it, and

ORIGEN, A. D. 350, and after him AUSTIN declares "For this reason (to wash away the pollution of original sin) it was that the church had from the Apostles TRADITION to give baptism even to infants."

CURCELLANUS, Professor at Geneva, "The baptism of infants in the two first centuries after Christ, was altogether unknown; but in the 3rd and 4th, it was allowed by some few." Quoted by Pengilly.

Dr. FIELD. "The baptism of infants is therefore named a tradition because it is not expressly delivered in Scripture, that the apostles did baptize infants, or any express precept there found that they should do so." By Pengilly.

Dr. HOOK, a celebrated English divine, now living. "You know my hearers, that the Bible says nothing what ever of the baptism of infants; if then you reject the authority of tradition, how do you account for infant baptism?"

Dr. WALL. "Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the Apostles, there is no express mention of any infants."

Bishop BURNETT. "There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants."

RICHARD BAXTER, (author of Saints' Rest,) in discussion with Mr. Blake, a brother Pedobaptist, says, "I conclude that all examples of baptism in Scripture do mention only the administration of it to the professors of saving faith, and the precepts give us no other direction—

And I provoke Mr. Blake, (and so do we Dr. Rice,) as far as is seemly for me to do, to name one precept or example for baptizing any other, and make it good if he can."

LIMBORCH, a distinguished Professor of Theology, says, "There is no express command for it in the Scripture; nay, all those passages wherein baptism is commanded, do immediately relate to adult persons, since they were ordered to be instructed and faith is a prerequisite, as a necessary qualification. The necessity of Pedobaptism was never asserted by any Council before that of Carthage, held in 418. We own that there is no precedent or undoubted instance in scripture of infant baptism." System of Div. B. 5, c. xxii, § 10.

Dr. KNAPP, one of the first theologians of Europe, whose Theology is a standard in all our Theological schools, says, "there is no decisive example in the Scriptures for infant membership." Page 438.

Dr. NEANDER. "It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism." (See Neander.)

Professor STRAUB, of Andover, says—"Commands, or plain and certain examples in the New Testament, relative to it, I do not find."

Dr. WOODS, in substance the same.

Dr. MILLER, "the patriarch of the Presbyterian church," says, "The fact is, that during the whole three-score years after the ascension of Christ, which the New Testament history embraces, we have no hint of the baptism of infants born of Christian parents."

Will not these three last have some weight with Presbyterians?

We only need space to extend this list, but these must suffice. Will Dr. Rice weigh his individual opinion and positive assertion in the face of all these?

That Roman Catholics deny scripture authority for the practice and support it upon the traditions of their Church, is too well known to be denied.

We add the following:

Dr. PISE, a minister of the Roman Catholic Church, and of high standing among that order in New York, second perhaps to none but Cardinal Hughes, delivered a lecture recently at the church of St. Charles, Barrocco, Brooklyn, in which he said:

"There are many things believed by all Christians at the present day, not to be found in the Scriptures."

"This, he said is true "with regard to Infant baptism, that we and all Christians believe in, for there is no authority for it in Scripture. We no where find that the Apostles baptized infants, and if it be proper and necessary to baptize infants as well as adults, we have no other authority and must depend entirely on tradition."

"In this we think Dr. Pise is correct. We know of no precept or example in the Scriptures for infant baptism. And if the practice does really rest on the authority of tradition, we submit it to our Pedobaptist friends, whether it is not in fact a relic of popery, which the Reformation failed to east off."

"If you deny tradition affords a ground for infant baptism, where can you find any authority for the practice?"—Father Pirazza to Mr. Danham.

We offer here a few admissions—more properly assertions of several of the most eminent German Theologians of the present age—living witnesses.

The first is from the pen of the great Leibnitz. It is remarkable that our greater or equally great Newton, who was the compeer of Leibnitz, should have borne substantially the same testimony in his celebrated remark, that "the Baptists are the only denomination of Christians who have not symbolized with the Church of Rome!" Certainly the concurrent opinion of two of the greatest philosophers whom the world ever saw, and great scholars too, is entitled to some consideration,—an opinion given, too, in opposition to educational prepossessions only.

From Leibnitz's System of Theology, according to the Hanover Manuscript, translated into German (with the Latin text in parallel columns) by Dr. Rass and Dr. Weiss, with a preface by Mr. Lorenz Doller, formerly Professor of Aesthetics at Heidelberg. Third enlarged edition, with an introduction by both the translators, with the approbation of the Right Reverend Grand Vicarate. Mainz, 1825:

"We will now speak particularly of the sacraments, and, first, of baptism; but briefly since the controversies respecting it, up to the present time, are not very numerous or important—it must be confessed that without the authority of the church, the baptism of children could not be adequately defended. For there is no example in its favor in the Sacred Scriptures, which appear, besides water, to demand faith also. To attribute faith, however, as some do, to those who cannot yet use their reason, is far too arbitrary and delusive, and destitute of probability. For as St. Augustine says, in his letter to Dardanus, 'If we wish to show in words, that children who are not acquainted with human things, yet comprehended divine things, I fear, lest we do injustice to our senses, since we use speech to persuade in a case where the evidence of the truth surpasses all the powers and purposes of speech. Hence it appears to me, that those who reject church authority, cannot sustain the attacks of the Anabaptists.'"

Dr. CHR. LUDW. COUARD, of Berlin, says: "The 'Who believeth and is baptized,' says the Lord, 'shall be saved.' As faith and baptism are constantly so closely connected together, men might reasonably hesitate to baptize infants, inasmuch as faith would with them be impossible. Neither has the Lord himself ordained infant baptism. As little also can we strictly and convincingly, that the apostles baptized children, although we know that they baptized whole families, and we might justly suppose that there were children among them."

The Life of Christians during the first three centuries, p. 202. Clark's Cabinet Library, vol. 33.

Ch. FRIEDR. ROSSLER says: "Our first question is, Whether the ancient church in the times of which we speak (the first three centuries) generally baptized children, or deemed it essential to baptize them? I must truly confess, that so far as I have hitherto pursued the fathers, no clear and certain proof has come before me, adequate to establish it prior to Origen, although there are a few passages which render it not without probability."

Lehrbuch der Christianen Kirche in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten, p. 229.

Dr. J. AUG. STARCK, chaplain to the Court of Hesse, says: "It cannot be denied, that no example can be cited from the books of the New Testament that the apostles and disciples of the Lord baptized children and babes; for though, again and again, it is said that the apostles baptized whole households, there is, nevertheless, in this nothing to constrain us to think that little children were baptized; rather, the contrary may with good reason be presumed, if we look back to those places in which assent is given to the preaching of the apostles. At least, in these places there is no stronger proof for infant baptism than is that which might be drawn from corresponding passages in favor of the participation of little children in the supper of the Lord. Therefore have there been learned men who have esteemed infant baptism, no less than the admission of children to the supper, as an institution which first arose after the times of the apostles."—*Geschichte der Taufe*, &c., p. 10.

Dr. LOBEGOTT LANGE, Professor in the University of Jena, says:

"Would the Protestant Church fulfil and attain to its final destiny, the baptism of new born children must of necessity be abolished. It has sunk down to a mere formality, without any religious meaning for the child, and stands in contradiction to the fundamental doctrines of the Reformers, on the advantage and use of the sacraments. It cannot, from any point of view, be justified by the Holy Scriptures, and owes its origin, as well as its retention by the Reformers, to the anti-scriptural and irrational idea, that children, because of original sin, are born under the power of the devil, and exposed to eternal condemnation."—*Geschichte der Protestantismus*, pp. 34, 35.

"It must now be granted by every unprejudiced reader [Kenner] of Holy Scripture and Christian antiquity, that the baptism of new-born children was altogether unknown to primitive Christianity."—*Ibid.*, p. 221.

Dr. J. W. I. BOHNER, Professor of Practical Theology at Erlangen, says:

"Truly a historical proof of infant baptism cannot be cited from the Holy Scriptures; for, although children may have been baptized by the apostles in those passages in which the baptism of entire families is spoken of, these passages are to be no mention made of the existence or presence of young children in them." [des Vorhandensehens von unmündigen Kindern in jenen Häusern nicht zugehörig Erwähnung geschieht.]—*Das Sacrament der Taufe*, vol. 1, p. 99.

"As to the history of infant baptism, sure enough it cannot be denied that prior to Tertullian, no where is it mentioned in express and altogether precise terms, and even Tertullian himself speaks out against it."—*Ibid.* p. 104.

"Finally, Dr. Rice does not believe—he has no confidence himself in the argument he has given above. Proof—Why does he not practice it? Why does he not teach it in his pulpit and from his press?!! "Why then does he not allow all children all the privileges of Christ's Church? If he has interpreted this passage correctly, it invites all little children indiscriminately, whether born of pious or ungodly parents, not only to baptism but to the Lord's Supper, and to all other church privileges.—Does the Presbyterian of the West carry out this precept?" Far from it; he teaches the very opposite doctrine,—that only a few, a very few infants are to be baptized—the seed of believing parents, or of at least! Where does he find the authority for that? When he finds it, he finds what will overthrow his comment upon both the passages he has given!! We cannot believe he has the least faith in his own argument, for his practice and teaching positively contradict it. In which is he sincere?!!

So much has been said about the reward and "the bond" offered to Mr. Fly, pursuant to a call from him, we will now introduce it in this connection to the reading world.

We are willing to test it before a jury in any town or city in the Union.

It has four times been offered, and as many times forced the acknowledgment that God's Word contains no precept for the practice.

The endorers of the Bond are men worth from \$10,000 to \$200,000 each. It is solvent.

THE BOND.