

So I maintain that we cannot ascertain the meaning of baptize by its figurative use. Literally it means positive action, but as it was used figuratively respecting the apostles on the day of Pentecost, we cannot prove its meaning from its fulfillment on that occasion. When an inspired historian tells us, in plain language, that baptism was performed on a certain occasion, and we find out what was done, we know what the action is.

There are different baptisms mentioned in the New Testament: such as the baptism of the Spirit, the baptism of suffering, &c., &c. But the inspired historians, in recording events, call nothing but the baptism of water by that name. Paul could say, in his day, there is "*one baptism.*" To find out what that one baptism is, we have only to ascertain what the historians of the New Testament call baptism. They call water baptism, and nothing else baptism, therefore that is the *one baptism.*

### E.

When the advocates of infant baptism are pressed for a scriptural command for it, and can produce none, they resort to the best circumstantial evidence within their reach. God has commanded infant *circumcision*, and they infer that baptism came in the room of *circumcision*, and argue that children should now be baptized, because God had commanded infants to be circumcised. One passage is quoted to make it appear that baptism is "the circumcision of Christ," viz: Col. ii., 11—12. Now, it is true that in that passage both baptism and the circumcision of Christ are mentioned, but it is not true that they are mentioned as synonymous. It is there stated that the circumcision of Christ is made without hands. But baptism is not made without hands, therefore they are not the same. We will quote the passage—"In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead." Here we see that the circumcision of Christ is a work on the human heart made without hands by the invisible energy of the Holy Spirit, by which the love of sin is destroyed, the old man with his affections and lust crucified and put off, and the individual prepared to be buried with Christ in baptism, and to rise with him through the faith of the operation of God, who raised Christ from the dead. Nothing is plainer than that baptism is not the circumcision of Christ.

I have offered to show that both baptism and circumcision were practiced by inspired men at the same time—that they were both in together, and the consequent impossibility of one coming in the room of the other.

*First.* In Acts xv., 1—2, is the following:—"And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren, and said—Except ye be circumcised, after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When, therefore, Paul and Barnabas had no small dissention and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and