

Christ, when he instituted the new dispensation, did not deprive infants of the ancient privilege which belonged to children when the Gospel was preached to Abraham. Not one word of evidence can be adduced from the Scriptures, or the history of the Church for the first four hundred years, to prove that infants ought not to be baptized. It is alike unjewish and unchristian to refuse them the initiatory rite of the Church.

6. The Head of the Church has seen fit to make baptism occupy an important place in his economy of salvation, and he has not shut the children out. This ordinance belongs to them. Through the grace of the Lord Jesus, infants belong to his kingdom. Can we, then, rightly refuse them the sign and seal of their relationship and heirship? There were disciples who rebuked those who brought infants to Christ during his sojourn on the earth, and it was *just like him* to be displeased with them. How much alike is human nature in every age! There are disciples *now* who rebuke those who bring them. With such disciples the Master can not but be displeased. Can you stand between those little children and their privileges and be blameless? And if ye have done this wrong to one of these little ones, does not the Judge of all the earth say: *Ye have done it unto me?*

#### XV.—CIRCUMCISION AND BAPTISM.

82. What relation has baptism to circumcision?

Baptism occupies the place under the evangelical dispensation that circumcision did under the Levitical.

83. By what evidence can you sustain that position?

1. Baptism does for us what circumcision did for the Jews.

2. Persons were initiated into the Jewish Church by the rite of circumcision. Persons are initiated into the Christian church by the rite of baptism.

3. The only way of admission into the Church of God, under either dispensation has been by circumcision in the one case, and by baptism in the other.