

state by the gospel is dissolved, and is so incompatible with the ministrations of it that the introduction of the latter necessarily infers the abolition of the former, and therefore, this right and privilege of the Jews, which were the very foundation of their national church state as separated from the Gentiles, cannot be transferred into the gospel dispensation because it is inconsistent with it. Besides it is evident throughout the whole gospel, that right of membership in the Jewish church, could never give to any, either infant or adult a like right of membership in the gospel church; nor was there even any one received thereto, because he had such a right according to the state of the old covenant, and there is good reason to conclude, that the carnal seed of believers can derive no higher privilege from the covenant of circumcision than the carnal seed of Abraham obtained thereby. And if it could not bring the one into the gospel church, nor give them a right to baptism, without repentance and faith, it can by no means do so, for the other, although we should suppose them concerned in it, as indeed they are not. Dis. cov. p. 159, 160.

Again in page 10, you say, "Baptism is a seal of the same covenant made with Abraham, instituted in the room of circumcision, and therefore ought to be administered to the children of professed believers." Even supposing it were clearly evinced, that all the children of believers are interested in the covenant of grace, it would not necessarily follow, that they are entitled to baptism, this being a branch of positive worship, depending entirely upon the sovereign will of its author—and *his will* having been revealed by positive precepts, or by Apostolic example is the only rule for the administration of baptism.

Mr. Baxter, a Pedobaptist, has justly observed, that even in Abraham's time, circumcision was not made necessary to all the church, but only to Abraham's family. Shem and his family who were then living were not so much as commanded to be baptised. Not Melchisedec or any of the subjects over whom he reigned, or any of that church to whom he was Priest. It plainly appears, therefore, that as a positive divine command made it necessary, for multitudes to be circumcised, who had no interest in the covenant of grace, so at the commencement of circumcision many were interested in that benign constitution who were under no obligation to be circumcised, nor had any claim to the distinguished mark. So far is it from being a fact, that interest in the new covenant, and a title to positive institutes, may be inferred, the one from the other. This being the case, we may safely conclude, that all reasoning from data of a moral kind, and the supposed fitness of things, or from the natural relation of children to parents is wide off the mark.

That the title of infants to baptism, cannot be justly inferred from the absolute rite of circumcision, will further appear from the due consideration of what follows, namely, that baptism is an appointment purely religious, and intended for purposes entirely spiritual, while circumcision, besides the spiritual instruction which it suggested, was a sign of carnal descent,—a mark of national distinction, and a token of interest in those temporal blessings, that were promised to Abraham.

Dr. Eryskine in Theological Dissert. p. 3, says, "When God promised the Land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed, circumcision was