

Ans.—Having the Spirit is the reason why you should have the baptism of water. Acts x : 47, 48.

Ques.—Were not infants circumcised under the old economy ?

Ans.—Yes ; *male* infants were. Gen. xvii : 10-14.

Ques.—Did not baptism, in the Christian Church, take the place of circumcision in the Jewish nation ?

Ans.—Not at all. Our blessed Lord was circumcised when eight days old (Luke ii : 21), but He was baptized on entering upon His public ministry (Matt. iii : 13-17). Saul, of Tarsus, was "circumcised the eighth day" (Phil. iii : 5), but he was baptized when converted (Acts ix : 18). Circumcision continued among Jewish Christians, for its own purpose (a badge of their nationality and a seal of the covenant yet in part to be fulfilled ; see Rom. ii), long after baptism was introduced for *its* purpose, namely ; a personal profession of faith in Him through whose death, burial and resurrection the sins of the penitent are cancelled ; as also a profession of death to sin and cleansing from it. For proof that circumcision was not "done away" to make room for baptism, see Acts xi : 2, 3, to find that about *eleven* years *after* baptism was introduced, "they that were of the *circumcision* contended with Peter," etc. And *eleven* years later still Paul circumcised Timothy (Acts xvi : 3). See also the trouble Paul got into by the *false* report circulated that he "taught all the Jews that were among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying, that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the custom," Acts xxi : 21. Those who brought this charge against Paul were some from among the "many thousands of Jews *who believe* and they are all zealous of the law," Acts xxi : 20. See also Acts xv.

ARGUMENT.

1. If Christ intended that baptism, in the Christian Church, should "take the place of circumcision" in the Jewish nation, there would have been some intimation of the change given in the New Testament.