

(4) That the saints of all dispensations have far more in common than they have in difference."

-- Roy L. Aldrich, "An Outline Study on Dispensationalism" in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. 118, No. 470 (April 1961), p. 134.

Earl O. Radmacher, writing in *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology*, speaks of "The growing rapprochement that has been taking place between covenant and dispensational theologians of orthodox persuasion over the last decade or so"

-- Earl D. Radmacher, "The Current Status of Dispensationalism and its Eschatology" in *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology*, ed. Kenneth S. Kantzer and Stanley N. Gundry (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979), p. 163.

And Kenneth L. Barker, in his presidential address to the 33rd annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society in December 1981, discussed four false dichotomies between the Testaments. He stated them as follows:

- "1. The first false dichotomy is that the OT only knows of the circumcision of the flesh while the NT speaks of the circumcision of the heart. . . .
- "2. The second false dichotomy is that the CT presents the letter of the Law while the NT reveals the spirit of the Law. . . .
- "3. The third false dichotomy (actually the first major one) is that the OT is the Testament of the law while the NT is the Testament of grace. . . .
- "4. The fourth false dichotomy is that the OT is concerned with Israel while the NT is concerned with the Church."

-- Kenneth L. Barker, "False Dichotomies Between the Testaments" in *JETS* 25/1 (March 1982), pp. 4-10.

As applied to the question of the subjects of baptism, this issue concerns the practical problem of whether only believers are to be baptized, or whether believers and their infant children are to be baptized. This question leads us into the arguments put forward in favor of infant as well as believer's baptism, and the arguments put forward in opposition to infant baptism and in favor of believer's baptism only.

b. Arguments put forward in favor of infant as well as believer's baptism

(1) First argument: New Testament ritual baptism has superseded Old Testament ritual circumcision as a sign and seal of the Covenant of Grace

(a) External circumcision was intended to signify and seal heart circumcision.

(b) External baptism was intended to signify and seal Spirit baptism