

dered he sprinkled Crispus and Gaius, but they cannot be rendered he dipped Crispus and Gaius. (Some readers may have a better idea of its meaning, by being informed, that tingere is adopted into the English language, and expressed tinge.)

Your manner of reasoning against the admission of infants into the church under the New Testament dispensation, is as strong against their admission under the former dispensation.

In order to see this, it is necessary to remark, that the church has been under three distinct dispensations, the first from the creation of man to the giving of the law at mount Sinai, called the Patriarchal dispensation, the second from the giving of the law to the death of Christ, called by different names, but in scripture frequently the Old Covenant or Testament. Heb. viii. 8, 9, 10, 13. The New Testament dispensation commenced from the resurrection of Christ, and in a fuller degree, from the day of Pentecost, and is to continue to the end of time.

To illustrate my assertion let us suppose a sect among the Jews, towards the end of the Old Testament dispensation who denied the right of circumcising infants. You would allow they were wrong, but how could you refute them, in consistency with your principles. They could urge every argument against infant circumcision, which you use against infant baptism. You say we are under a new covenant, and insist on proof of the readmission of infants. They might likewise use the same argument, and say, infants were, during the Patriarchal dispensation, admitted to the seal of the covenant, but God brought our fathers under a new and distinct covenant at Mount Sinai, and gave them a law