

- (c) If baptism took the place of circumcision, then why did both exist side by side in the New Testament?

Note: The transition to the New Dispensation was gradual among many Jews. Many still retained some of the ceremonies. As long as circumcision and some of the other ceremonies were not considered as essential to salvation, they were permitted. The book of Hebrews gives ground for the passing away of the ceremonies, as being shadows now fulfilled. Paul circumcised Timothy (Acts 16:3) for the sake of the Jews, not out of necessity.

- (d) Where in the New Testament do we find a command to baptize infants?

Note: This question could be countered by asking, Where is there a command to exclude them from baptism? They were always included in the application of the Old Testament sign and seal of the covenant; when and where were they excluded?

- (e) Is not infant baptism a product of the Roman Catholic Church?

Note: Origen was baptized as an infant. Tertullian argues against the practice of baptizing infants. Augustine pointed out that this doctrine was held by the whole church. These fathers certainly antedated the Roman Catholic Church as we know it today.

- (f) Is not infant baptism "responsible for sending more people to hell than any other cause"?

Note: What about church membership? What about adult baptism? Do persons trust in these things for their salvation? And are they therefore also responsible for sending millions to hell? The truth of the matter is that any human work or ceremony in which men trust for their salvation can be the occasion of their eternal damnation. The principle that must be applied to this question is this: The abuse of a thing never proves it to be harmful, false, or evil.