

by Moses, settling every punctilio of our religion, to this law we must attend, and it contains no precept for circumcising infants. They might say, prove to us that Moses or any of the prophets ever circumcised an infant, or taught that an infant should be circumcised, and then we will grant their right. What would you say to this?

You would exclude infants from the seal of the covenant, because they are not capable of professing their faith, but this would exclude them equally under every dispensation. If you suppose faith less necessary under the former dispensations, please read Heb. xi. with attention.

Again you reckon the silence of the historians of the first two centuries on the subject of infant baptism, a decisive argument against it. Now, those Jews might say, we have the history of the church from the giving of the law by Moses, to the time in which the canon of scripture was closed by Malachi, and, during all that period, not a single instance of circumcising an infant. Do you suppose that the silence of the sacred historians during all that period, is a proof against infant circumcision during the Mosaic dispensation? And if you do not, what weight can you attach to the silence of the historians of the New Testament?

I would remark farther, that you take a strange view of the New Covenant, and, without any reason which I can see, suppose it different from all other covenants recorded in scripture, and that, in a point in which they all agree, viz. including infants. Several covenants are mentioned in my first letter, and the benefits conferred in each extended to infants, as well as to a-