

of the covenant, appears from the fact that it is the rite of initiation into the Christian Church, just as circumcision was into the Jewish Church. Can this position be questioned? If then, the ancient seal was applied not only to converts but to their children, what valid reason can be urged against Infant Baptism?

(3.) There were under the ancient economy two standing ordinances, the Passover and Circumcision. It is generally, if not universally admitted, that the Lord's Supper is substituted for the Passover, and yet some deny that the same is true of Baptism and Circumcision, though both are confessedly alike, at least so far as this,—that they are initiatory ordinances. A little reflection will convince any one that the ordinance of baptism agrees as well with circumcision in its nature and design, as the Lord's Supper does with the Passover, if not better. Would it not be singular indeed for them to resemble each other closely in every particular except one, and in that one, viz.: their application to children, be perfect opposites? Circumcision introduced into the Jewish church, and was administered to children; baptism introduces into the Christian church, but must be denied to children? Wherefore?

(4.) The following passage settles the point in question. (Col. ii. 11, 12.) "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," &c. Now, whether from the scope of the passage, we conclude that the Apostle is speaking of the external ordinance, or of the inward work of purification to which the ordinance points, the argument from these verses is equally conclusive, showing that baptism is the Christian circumcision.

We conclude, therefore, that infants may now be baptized with as much propriety as they were anciently circumcised.

Perhaps it may be well here to advert to the most important objections commonly urged against the view of baptism which has just been presented.

1. It is said, "circumcision was a sign of carnal descent, a mark of national distinction, and a token of interest in those