

Rejecting Christ does not bind any man to keep the Jewish ceremonies. It is not true that the man who turns away from Jesus is bound to offer the blood of bulls and of goats, &c. ; but it is true that for such there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversary.—Heb. x., 26—27. Again, when Paul wrote these things the ceremonial law of the Jews was abolished, and no man under any circumstances could be a debtor to keep it.

I have no doubt that Paul here refers to that law which binds all men to love God supremely, and their neighbor as themselves. These two commandments, like pillars of eternal justice, are represented by our Saviour as holding up all the law and the prophets. This law has been broken by all men—Jew and Gentile—and all by nature and practice are under its curse. Paul could say of himself, and all christians, “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law having become a curse for us, for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.”—Gal. iii., 13.

Here were Gentiles whom Christ had freed from the curse of the law. While they trusted in him, and obeyed his voice, the law would not condemn them. They stood justified by his grace. But if they renounced Jesus, they would fall from his grace, and he would profit them nothing. They would have to assume all the responsibilities of that violated law. Paul assured these Galatians that this would be their history if they were circumcised. They would fall from grace and be debtors to obey all the law of God, or feel its dreadful curse. Circumcision was a national rite belonging to the family of Abraham, and if Gentiles who were not of his family used it religiously, as a ground of acceptance with God, they would renounce Christ and be debtors to that law that condemns all transgressors.

### F.

A plea for infant baptism is founded on the words of the apostle Peter, Acts ii., 39 :—“The promise is to you and to your children,” &c. This promise is said to be the promise which God made to Abraham—“To be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee.”—Gen. xvii., 7. It is alleged that Peter told these convicted and enquiring Jews to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sin, and they would obtain pardon, for God had promised to be a God to Abraham and to his seed after him, and inasmuch as they were the seed of Abraham, they would now obtain pardon in the name of Jesus if they thus obeyed his voice. Their little children, too, were the seed of Abraham, and shared in the same promise. And although they were too young to repent or believe they should be taken in with their parents by baptism, as Abraham’s children were circumcised with himself, although they might be too young to believe. This sophism seems the more plausible when it is understood that circumcision was now done away, and that baptism had taken its place.

It has been fully proved that circumcision was *not* done away, and that baptism did not take its place, but that it still held its own place. So this part of the argument is demolished.