

Bushnell, with much confidence. We present it in his own words, p. 153: "What is said in the New Testament of household baptism, or the baptizing of households, is positive proof that infants were baptized in the times of the apostles—baptized, that is, in and because of the supposed faith of the parents. The fact of such baptism is three times distinctly mentioned; in the case of 'the household of Stephanas,' of Lydia 'and her household,' and the jailor 'and all his.' In the first case, nothing is said of faith at all, though doubtless he was baptized as a believer. In the second, every thing turns on the personal faith of Lydia—'if ye have judged *me* to be faithful.' In the third, it seems to be said, according to an English translation, that all the house believed—'*he* rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house.' But the participle believing is singular and not plural in the original, and the phrase—'with all his house'—plainly belongs to the verb and not to the participle. Rigidly translated, the passage would read—'he rejoiced with all his house, himself believing.'"

The argument is easily answered. In the first case, that of Stephanas, in 1 Cor. i: 16, "I baptized also the household of Stephanas," we need only compare this with what is said near the close of the epistle, xvi: 15: "Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." Here the household is described as converts, who ex-

erted themselves to supply the wants of their poor and afflicted fellow-disciples.

In the second case, that of Lydia, in Acts xvi: 15, "When she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there'—we have only to read on to the end of the chapter, where it is stated, respecting Paul and Silas, when about to leave the city, after being released from prison, that they "entered into the house of Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them and departed." With Lydia, doubtless, were her household. She, a seller of purple, it seems, had a mercantile establishment at Philippi. Of course, she would need persons to assist her; and who can doubt that her household who had been baptized were, in part at least, the brethren who were seen and comforted?

In the third case, that of the jailor, in Acts xvi: 33, "He was baptized, he and all his, straightway," we have only to read the preceding verse, "They spake unto him the word of the Lord, and *to all that were in his house.*" "All his," who, as stated in the thirty-third verse, were baptized, are manifestly the same as "all that were in his house," to whom, as stated in the thirty-second, the word of the Lord was spoken. Besides, in the thirty-fourth verse, we are informed that he rejoiced, with all his house, having believed in God. He, with all his, or all that were in his house, having believed the word of the Lord

spoken to them, rejoiced. They all rejoiced, having believed. What is said of the jailor is here said also of his household. This is clearly indicated by the phrase *with all his house*. If the word of the Lord was spoken to all that were in his house, and if he rejoiced *with all his house*—that is, he and they rejoiced together (and this is the obvious and undeniable meaning), surely we must admit that not only he but they also could and did believe. The rejoicing was a consequence of believing; and how could they participate in the joy of believing, if they had not believed? The effort to make it supposed that *they* did not believe, by inserting the word *himself* before the word believing—“himself believing”—is a very grave error. We are sorry to see it; especially in so excellent a man as Dr. Bushnell. The correctness of our interpretation is further confirmed by the case of Crispus, mentioned in Acts xviii: 8. “And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized.”

In view of what has been stated respecting these and other passages, we hope that our readers will feel the duty of searching the Scriptures, and of letting the light of one portion shine upon another, till the whole subject is illuminated. This they can easily do. The Bible is at hand; and, in many cases, it is furnished with references, to facilitate comparison or examination. generally. Besides, there is an excellent little work prepared with special reference

to the examination which we are now proposing. It is entitled "*The Scripture Guide to Baptism; or a faithful Citation of all the passages of the New Testament which relate to this Ordinance; with the sacred Text, impartially examined, and the sense supported by numerous Extracts from the most eminent and learned Writers. To which is added a short examination of the Rise and Grounds of Infant Baptism. By R. Pengilly.*" It is written with care and with candor. It breathes the spirit of Christian love and fidelity. And the author in his final address to the candid and pious inquirer, says: "Do not allow the observations contained in this pamphlet to influence you in the smallest degree, on a subject of so sacred a nature. I would advise you to peruse the passages of Scripture again, omitting all the rest; and then form your sentiments, and govern your practice, by the pure unerring word, and that alone."

There is also another help which ought to be mentioned in this connection. It is the Rev. Dr. Hackett's Brief Statement of the best established Results at which Biblical Interpreters have arrived respecting Infant Baptism. It may be found in a small volume entitled *Baptismal Tracts for the Times*.* He introduces the statement by saying, "No decision in biblical criticism, not absolutely unanimous, can be considered as better established at the present time,

* See also his Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (xvi: 15), second edition, pp. 259-261.