

tinguished. Under the old testament there were the circumcision of the flesh, and the circumcision of the heart; in like manner, under the new testament, there are baptism with water, and baptism with the Holy Spirit: under each dispensation, many had the former, who never attained the latter. When these two ordinances are compared, this distinction should be kept in view, and the circumcision of the flesh compared with baptism with water, and circumcision of the heart with baptism with the spirit. You have taken a contrary course; in circumcision you consider nothing but the carnal part, and in baptism you keep your eye on the spiritual part. Now, the present controversy is concerning the external ordinance only. Agreeably to this, there is a two-fold relation to God recognized in scripture, the one merely professional, the other real and saving, Isa. lxiii. 19, *We are thine: thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by thy name.* None will suppose, that all the people of Israel stood in a saving relation to God in the days of Isaiah. The same is the case under the present dispensation. All the members of the seven Asiatic churches stood in external relation to Christ, and were called christians after his name; but can you suppose, they all stood in a *saving* relation to him? There is a plain contrast between your address to Baptists and Christ's to the churches. You send all the Baptists to heaven, but Christ confines salvation to him that overcometh, and adds *He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.* Compare Rev. ii, iii. with your address, and admire your own faithfulness to your fellow-professors if you can. I may here answer one of your cavils, as a specimen of