

LETTER I.

FIR,—

According to your doctrine, the turning point in the Baptist controversy rests upon arguments deduced from the covenant made with Abraham. You say that "the reasoning on this head goes on the ground that it was a covenant of grace—and the same in substance with that which we are now under, in the gospel dispensation. Unless it be so, the reasoning is certainly very inconclusive on this head; but if it really be so, thought to be looked upon as a grand turning point in this controversy." If the covenant made with Abraham was the same in substance, as the covenant of grace, under the gospel dispensation, it must be the new covenant spoken of by Paul, Hebrews viii. chap. and 8th verse, "Behold, the days shall come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." Hence, all the promises and all the privileges of that covenant, must be sure to the parties concerned in it: for God is not a man that he should lie,—nor the son of man that he should repent. If, then, the descendants of Abraham are included in this covenant, and along with them the offspring of believers, as you affirm, it follows as a matter of course that all who are born of believing parents are baptised in infancy, must be saved. Because, if all the children of believing parents, who are baptised in infancy, along with the natural seed of Abraham are not saved, the covenant made with Abraham, namely, the covenant of circumcision was not the covenant of grace,—for were it otherwise, those who perish could not be included in that covenant. Either side, however, of the alternative, completely overthrows all your arguments. That the former position cannot be maintained, is evident, for it is contrary to scripture, and opposed to the experience of all ages of the church. The latter position is equally untenable; because in direct variance with the whole tenor of the covenant. The covenant made with Abraham, therefore, is not the covenant of grace, nor in substance is it the same. This is further evident from this consideration, that, you have not been able to produce a single passage, in which the covenant of circumcision is called the covenant of grace; nor can you point out a text, in which the temporal blessings given to Abraham are mentioned in the covenant of grace; nor can you show (even admitting the term to be identical) how Melchisedec, Lot and others, should be included in the covenant of grace, which none will deny—and yet were not in the covenant of circumcision; or

how Ishmael, yet
able for
deral hea
of grace
nant, the
collection
take resp
subject,
things w

Your
by the A
firmed o
covenant
—It is c
and the
Romans
mit of
Here, I
many ye
of which
hundred
secured
circumci
blessing
circumst
another,
all it pr
tions ma
to script
nant, bu
promise

Let th
cision,
Let him
families
the first
same pr
Noah, v
ham, th
blessing
a descri
to the c
phrase
nants, p
ferent p
present
circumci
—wher