

before were the body, but as the Jewes were no otherwise the body, but in relation to the head unto which they were united onely by faith: so the Gentiles had union with the Jewes no otherwise but through Christ the head of them both, being joyned to him by faith, and so to them.

Secondly, I say, that the Gentiles did not by conversion enter into fellowship with the Jewish nationall Church-state; for that state the Jewes possessed not by Christ themselves, (but a new Gospell-state which onely some few of the Nation, which were converted to the faith participated of) therefore much lesse could the Gentiles participate of any such Church state with them now: then, if neither Jewes nor Gentiles were the body of Christ considerably as a Nation; but only in respect of conversion, by which they were inheritors of the same body, and partakers of the same promise in Christ by the Gospell; then were not the Jewes meerly as Jewes of the body, and so consequently not their Infants.

But neither Jewes nor Gentiles were the body of Christ considerably as a Nation, but onely in respect of conversion by the Gospell. *Eph. 3. 6.* Therefore the Jewes meerly as Jewes are not of the body of Christ, and consequently not their Infants till they be converted; and therefore so are not the Infants of the Gentiles neither; and thus you may see your reasons of proving Infants in the Covenant to faile you, and therefore your next consequence will turely fall, which is this, that Infants ought now to be baptised, as then circumcised.

First, *Else the Covenant were not the same, nor Infants in it.*

I answer no more, it is not the same in respect of the naturall relation to *Abraham*, as I have shewed and therefore Infants not in it

Secondly, you say if they have the thing and substance, they cannot be denied the seale and circumstance, if the first grace, then the second confirming.

I answer true, when they manifest that they have the thing and substance, or any other can manifest it for them, then let them have the seale and circumstance; and surely none can forbid water, why they should not be baptised, when they are knowne to be in the Covenant.

Thirdly.

Thirdly, you say, *If by vertue of this word of God to Abraham I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, Infants are included, and therefore of old circumcised, and the same promises be continued in the same state to the Gentiles; when the Gentiles Infants are al, o in it, but the first is true; Ergo,*

I answer, that the same promises are not continued in the same state to the Gentiles who are not *Abrahams* children by naturall relation nor yet is it continued to the Jewes, neither seeing their being in the Covenant by a naturall relation ceased at the death of Christ, at which time the commandement of Circumcision ceased also, and had the naturall relation held the naturall seed within the Covenant still; then doubtlesse the commandement had remained still touching the circumcising of that naturall seed, for there is no more reason for the ceasing of the one, then for the ceasing of the other; and if Circumcision had remained, then I suppose none would have pleaded for the baptising of Infants; but if the Covenant be ceased touching the naturall seed, then there is no Infants to be circumcised, nor baptised neither; but the Covenant ceased at the death of Christ touching the naturall seed, *Act. 10. 28. Gal. 3 25. Eph. 2. 14. 15. Rom. 11. 20. 21. Gal. 4. 25, 26.* therefore this is no prooffe for Infants to be circumcised nor baptised neither.

And thus I have done with your first Argument; your second followes thus.

If in the whole body of Israelites as well Infants as men of yeares were baptised, and with the same baptisme that ours is, then Infants are now to be baptised, as then they were: but in the whole body of Israelites Infants were baptised, and that with the same Baptisme spirituallly that ours is.

Therefore Infants are now to be baptised as then they were.

I answer, this Argument is a sophisme and lies not true in his forme; for in the first part of your Argument it appeares as if you intended that the Israelites were baptised corporally, as now since Christ the Disciples of Christ were: and in the second part of your Argument you tell us it is the same Baptisme spirituallly that ours is; whereas if you had said so in the first part then I say your Antecedent would be too narrow to inferre the consequent; and this I shall manifest by laying downe your Argument

ment in such a forme as it may agree with it selfe; (for as it lies now it agrees not with it selfe.)

First, it in the whole Body of Israelites as well Infants as men of yeares were baptised, and with the same Baptisme materially and formally, that ours is; then Infants are now to be baptised as then they were.

But in the whole Body of Israelites Infants were baptised, and that with the same Baptisme materially and formally that ours is. Therefore Infants are now to be baptised as then they were.

Who would not see first that your *Minor* were false, the cloud and the Sea not being the same Baptisme materially and formally that ours is: and secondly neither would the consequence follow, because Infants were then baptised; therefore Infants must now be baptised, no more then because *Adam* was not to eat of the Tree in the midst of the Garden; therefore the eating of some kind of fruit by us is evill; or no more then this, Infants were circumcised then, therefore Infants must be circumcised now.

But secondly, I will supply your Argument in the first part with that which is expressed in the second part, and then see the force and power of it thus: if in the whole body of Israelites as well Infants as men of yeares were baptised, and with the same Baptisme spiritually that ours is; then Infants are now to be baptised as then they were.

But in the whole Body of the Israelites, Infants were baptised, and with the same Baptisme spiritually, that ours is.

And now I deny the consequence, and will shew you how the Antecedent is too narrow to inferre the same thus.

That although God did by the miraculous working of his divine providence, grace and goodnesse lead the People of Israel through the sea dry, and drowned the Egyptians which were their enemies, and did also afford them a cloudy Pillar, which was a defence from their enemies, and a guid to them in their way whither they were going, which must be in the nature of the things considered as great a Sacrament, signe or token of Gods love in Christ to that people, as Baptisme was to the Corinthians, and therefore called Baptisme: and (for no other reason will it from hence follow, that we should administer such

an Ordinance as Baptisme is to our Infants without a command from God so to do: for this is the force of your Argument; God did by the worke of his providence baptise the Infants of Israel spiritually, *Ergo* we may by our worke without Gods command baptise our Infants materially, ceremonially and formally; and is this good reasoning? who sees not that God hath no limits, but may by his providence testifie his grace as largely as he wil; therefore we may devise means to worship God as large as we wil, or may administer his means to whom we will, without any direction from him: who sees not that there is no force in such manner of arguing; but it is absurd and erroneous so to reason?

Thirdly, therefore the purpose of *Paul's*, to declare to the Corinthians that Ordinances would doe them no more good without faith and repentance, then Miracles (which were as great as Ordinances) could doe the Israelites good to prevent Judgements when they sinned; and that therefore it would be a vaine thing for these Corinthians to rest secure in the possession of these Ordinances, as if God respected them thereby without Faith in Christ, such a faith as preserved them from those sins which the Israelites committed; the which faith if they had not, they were no more exempt from Gods displeasure, plagues and Judgments then the Israelites were: and if Ordinances would secure these Corinthians, then those miracles would secure them: but these Miracles did not secure them; therefore these Ordinances cannot secure you; but you must have a better security then this, namely, faith in the blood of Christ, whereby you are to be carried on towards God in all things as a People professing and practising the truth: But his purpose is not to shew that Ordinances, namely Baptisme and the Lords Supper are required to be administered by these Corinthians to themselves and to their Infants, though they do not believe in Christ: because then God did exercise such Miracles to the Israelites which did not believe, which is the sequell of this Argument compared with the prooffe, as we shall see by the examination thereof; for your first prooffe is this.

You say, *That the other Ordinances there mentioned, are the same spirituall with ours; they eat the same spirituall meat, and drink the spirituall drink with us.*

I answer then by consequence belike the Corinthians must baptise themselves and their Infants, and both of them eat the Lords Supper, though neither of them doe believe, because then God led the Israelites through the Sea drie, and gave them the Cloud, and Manna, and the Rock which spiritually is the same with ours, which notwithstanding did not believe: the which thing thus laid open, I hope you will not affirm.

Secondly, I answer therefore that you erre in calling them (the other Ordmances there mentioned) whereas they are the ther Miracles, which had you well weighed, you would not have made them the ground of your Argument for the justifying of such a practice as the baptising of Infants is.

Fourthly, besides if after the Israelites were entred into the Land of Canaan, they were then neither baptised with the cloud nor sea, nor any other baptisme; then was not the baptisme which they had before in the cloud and in the sea an example of perpetuall practice of Baptisme: but the first is true, for they entred through the Sea but once, and the cloud ceased when they entred into Canaan, neither can any shew that they were baptised with any other Baptisme; therefore the Baptisme which they had before, is not an example of perpetuall practice of Baptisme.

Fifthly, Baptismes of different kinds depends upon different grounds, and are to be administrd upon different Subjects for different ends, but the Baptisme of the Cloud and Sea, and the Baptisme we have now are of divers kindes, ergo they depend upon different grounds, and are to be administrd upon different subjects for different ends.

Your second proote you say, *Otherwise the Apostles Argument were not of force against the Corinthians if they were not the same sacraments with ours, nor the conclusion containe that the Corinthians should be punished with the like punishment, if they committed the like finnes.*

I answer, denying the consequence, for although the Cloud and Sea, Manna and the Rock, were Sacraments of the same Christ that Baptisme and the Lords Supper is, yet they were not the same Sacraments; and it sufficeh to the Apostles purpose, that the Cloud, Sea, Manna, and Rock, were as great and efectuall tokens of Christ, and so they were in the nature of the things simply considered) as Baptisme and the Lords Supper

is, though they were different Sacraments of the same Christ and not the same Sacraments, and except they were dipt in water, and did eat and drinke bread and wine as we do, yee cannot say they were the same Sacraments with ours; and thus have I refuted your second argument.

Your third argument followes, which is this:

There is one and the same consideration of the first fruits and the lump the roote and the branches: but the first fruits and roote believing Parents are holy and must be Baptized, therefore Infants the lump and branches are holy and must be Baptized.

I deny the assumption or second part of your argument, assumed out of the first, *viz.* That believing Parents are the roote or first fruites; neither doth, *Rom. 11. 16.* nor the *1 Cor. 7. 14.* prove any such thing; we will consider of the places distinctly, and first of the first, in *Rom. 11. 18.* It is said (speaking to the believing Gentiles) boast not thy selfe against the branches, for if thou boast thy selfe thou bearest not the roote but the roote thee; now if they beare not the roote but the roote beareth them, then they cannot be the roote, and yet they stood by Faith verse the 20. and were but branches, verse 21. this first place is therefore abused to make believing parents the first fruits and roote, and their Infants naturally descended from them to be the branches, whereas beleivers are but branches themselves: and secondly, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* doth prove no such thing neither, which as it neither expresseth roote nor first fruites, so hath it no such sence and meaning as that the holinesse of Faith in the parents, should cause the holinesse in the children.

But before I expresse my reasons of the exposition, either negative or affirmative, I conceive it necessary to observe what you say (on the contrary you say, you suppose it is mistaken when expounded to be the same holinesse spoken before of Infidels person sanctified to the beleiver, and further you say, the Apostle speaking therefore of a two-fold holinesse, the one (*n r*) in the thing it selfe but to anothers use, the other of the thing it selfe is cannot but be sinfull to confound them.

To which I answer, that I will not contend nor gainsay any of this, but further you say.

That the Apostle saith two things, that to the pure all things are pure, and sanctified; therefore a beleiving husband or wife may dwell with an Infidell

In fidell yoke-fellow, the second thing is, that by vertue of a believers state in grace, all his fruite is holy, and a partakers of the same state of grace, with him, unlesse they doe by some act of theirs deprive themselves of it as *Esau*, *Ishmael*, &c.

To which I answer, that the former of these two things, I grant. but the latter I wholly deny, that it is any of the purpose of *Paul* so to speake.

For first, it is the purpose of *Paul* to conclude such a holinesse in the children, as was inseparable to their very being. or else it would not have been a sufficient reason to have proved the sanctification of the unbelieving yoke-mate by the believer, and therefore to suppose some Act of theirs to deprive them of the holinesse there spoken of is a coarcted and farre fetch't exposition.

Secondly, if by a believers state in grace be understood the covenant that *Abraham* and all believers doe possesse by faith: then first I say, that *Esau* nor *Ishmael* were never of it. *Rom.* 9. 8. and therefore could not by any Act of theirs deprive themselves of it.

Secondly, if they were and deprived by some Act of theirs; then we must fall upon *Arminius* tenet of falling away which understanding Christians doe utterly abhorre.

Thirdly, then the being in the everlasting covenant of grace, and peace with God by Christ, should be conveyed and derived by naturall descent, and not by the Gospell, which is absurd and contrary to many Scriptures. *Rom.* 1. 16. 17. chap. 10. 17. *Gallathians* 3. 2. *Ioh.* 3. 5. 1 *Pet.* 1. 23. *Ians.* 1. 18. *Ioh.* 1. 13.

The first of these Scriptures saith the Gospell is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth; whereas this position saith, that some are partakers of a state of grace and salvation by vertue of their parents, being in the state of grace, which is directly contrary the one to the other: and all the other Scriptures, and many more proves that Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God, by which conversion and regeneration is wrought, by which onely and alone we become Sons of God by adoption and grace; now therefore to say that some are partakers of the same by generation,

by vertue from their parents is directly contrary, yea contrary to the whole Gospell of Christ, *Rom. 4. 14.* where the Apostle saith, if they which be of the Law (that is naturally descended and circumcised onely) be Heires: Faith is made voyde and the promise (that is, the whole Gospell or Covenant of grace) is made of none effect.

But if you meane by a State of grace such favour as it pleased God to bestow upon the posterity of *Abraham*, according to the flesh whereby (being circumcised) they were segregated and distinguished to be possessed of Ordinances leading them to Christ, which was then to come above other neighbour Nations: I grant that this distinction agrees to them, yet neverthelesse: to this I say first that this distinction was taken away at the death of Christ *Ephes. 2. 14, 15. Act. 10. 28.*

Secondly, neither is it *Pauls* purpose to conclude these children spoken of, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* within the Limits of such a distinction, first because the Lord in the time of the Law did account of children, in the very case and consideration that these children were in, to be a polluted and unholy seed, and to be put away with their Mothers which were not members of the Church according to the Law, *Exra. 9. 2, 10. 3.* Therefore that State did not allow even while it lasted children to be of that state, when one of the parents were forreigners to the Church, therefore much lesse hath it any consequence to conclude it, so now when the State it selfe is nullified.

Thirdly, in the time of the Law from which this succesive being in the state of grace, is concluded to come the Protelite Jew was required to circumcise all his males, *Exod. 12. 48.* and he should be as one that was borne in the Land, and it must be conceived that the Females were included in the Males, and did enter into the state with them; there being no circumcision, or other Sacrament of entrance appointed for them, whereupon it followeth that there can be no President or rule, no not in the time of the Law it selfe; that ever any one parent comming to be of the *Iewish* state and leaving their married yoke-mate, our did possesse their seed of the same state, and the reason was, because the Law did injoyne the Protelite to possesse all of the state that were under his Jurisdiction by the authority of that Law which required him to circumcise all his males. And

And therefore the state now which takes in upon Faith onely, and thereupon takes the husband which believeth and leaves out the wife which beleiveth not and takes the wife which beleiveth, and leaves out the husband which believeth not; can receive no rule from that state to take in the children before they doe believe no more then the wife which then was brought into that state by the law of the husbands being a Profelite, and left out of this state untill such time as they doe believe.

Fourthly, the Apostle speakes indefinitely of their Children young or old, which it may be, some were 10, 20 or 30. yeares old; and it must be considered, that age doth not make them ceate to be Children in relation to those Parents, whose children they are, and againe it must be considered, that *Pauls* purpose is not to speake of Children in respect of yeares, but in respect of relation only for his Argument is an Argument of relation.

Now it is an absurdity of such a nature, as no body I thinke will owne to conclude, that Children of 20 or 30 yeares old which are apparently wicked, are holy in such a sence as by vertue of their Parents state in grace to be partakers of the same state of grace with him, so as to be Baptized by vertue of this relation.

Therefore holynesse here cannot in the Apostles meaning be so understood, neither will the exception take it off, (*viz.*) unless they do by some act of theirs deprive themselves of it) as *Esa* and *Abimeael*, &c.

To which I Answer, that the Apostle speakes positively of a conclusion drawne from the State of the relation which can admit of no exception, which if it could, then will it bee of no absolute validity to enforce the conclusion; and according to this Argument if the Children doe by some Act of theirs deprive themselves of their estate in grace, then their Parents can have no sanctified use of their unbelieving yoaik mate though they have never so much faith in themselves; whereas contrary to this the Apostle saith, to the pure all things are pure *Ti* 1. 15. without reference to the children, therefore the childrens state in grace or not in grace, addeth not nor diminisheth any thing to that purpose.

Fiftly,

Fiftly, therefore I fay that the holynesse spoken of here, is such a holynesse as must prove the unbelieving Parent sanctified to (or by) their unbelieving yoke-mate, but if the Parents be not lawfully married, the grace of the child (if it have any though never so much) cannot prove the unbelieving Parent sanctified to or by their believing yoke-mate: Now if any shall object, that if their Parents were not lawfully married, then were they not husband and wife each to other: I answer: that upon the same ground that the Corinthians did question the dwelling with their unbelieving yoke-mate, upon the same ground they did question their being lawfully husbands and wives each to other, which if they were not, all the grace that can be imagined in the Children, will never prove the unbelieving Parent sanctified to or by their believing yoke-mate, therefore the holynesse here spoken of is not a state of grace, neither inward nor outward neither, seeing that answers not the Corinthians scruple, nor proves the thing in question by them.

Sixty, therefore I answer positively, that the holynesse here spoken of is legitimacy, and the uncleanness Bastardy, and the reason is partly because such an exposition hath force to prove the thing in question, and the other hath not; and partly because such a holynesse is derivative from all Parents lawfully married, and the other is not, *Mal. 2 15.* and it must be such a holynesse as is derivative from all Parents lawfully married because one of the Parents being come to the Faith, and the argument standing in the Children which were begotten and borne before, which therefore could not receive any vertue from the faith of the Parents by the course of generation to have any holynesse thereby derived unto them; Therefore it must be such a holynesse as is derivative from all Parents lawfully married, and that is no other then Legitimacy, and that such an exposition of holynesse so understood hath force sufficient to prove the thing in question, is cleare; because if one of the Parents do believe there can no objection be made why Legitimacy should not prove the unbelieving Parent to be sanctified to or by the believing yoke-mate, whereas if there be no children Legitimate, the question may lie as it did with the Corinthians, whether they were bound together as husband and wife, and whether

whether the unbeliever be sanctified to the believing yoke-mate, yea or no : but taking it for granted that they have Children each by other legitimate, it is then out of question; the conclusion then is, that there can be no such holynesse understood of Children in this place of *Paul* as by which they must be Baptised; and thus is your third Argument refuted.

Your fourth Argument is this, *If Baptisme succeed Circumcision then if Infants were to be Circumcised, Infants are to be Baptised; but Baptisme succeeds Circumcision, therefore as Infants were to be Circumcised so Infants are to be Baptised.*

To which I answer, I deny the consequence of the proposition for it doth not follow, because Baptisme in a sence succeedeth Circumcision, that therefore the same subjects that were to be Circumcised then, are to be Baptised now; no more then this consequence, the Gospell succeeds the Law, the Sons of *Aaron* were Ministers of the Law, therefore the Sons of *Aaron* are to be Ministers now, or no more then this, Baptisme succeeds Circumcision, then if they Circumcised all the Males servants though they were men and had no Faith, then so they are to Baptise them now; and so in restriction, also Baptisme succeeds Circumcision, Females were not to be Circumcised then though they had Faith, therefore not to be Baptised now: or thus; the Lords Supper succeeds the Passover: then if the little Children and servants ate it, namely the Passover, with the rest of the Family distinctly by themselves in a house, then so are little children and servants to eat the Lords Supper with the rest of the Family distinctly in one house by themselves now: and is this good reason? and yet what ever objection can be made against any of these consequences, will lie against yours also.

Secondly, I say the body of the Jewish Nation were subjects Circumcised according to the Law, even when Christ died, yet the same were not subjects of Baptisme according to the Gospell untill they gladly received the word of God, *Act. 2. 41.*

Thirdly, therefore I answer, that as Baptisme succeeds Circumcision, so doth the commandement of Baptisme succeed the commandement of Circumcision, and the Subject commanded to be Baptised doth succeed the subject commanded

to be Circumcised: as therefore of old when persons were to be Circumcised, they had recourse to the commandement of Circumcision for direction of themselves in the parties to be circumcised; so now ought we to have recourse to the commandement of Baptisme for direction of our selves in the parties to be Baptised, now therefore for to have recourse to the commandement of Circumcision, for to have direction in the parties to be Baptised, is not onely a failing in method, order, and good decorum, but also causeth a necessity of erring because the commandement of Circumcision and the commandement of Baptisme is of different subjects; and if we should take the parties to be Baptised from the commandement of Circumcision, then we must Baptise none but Males, and that on the eighth day too; and the Profelyte must Baptise all his Males whether they have Faith or no, and the Females must not be baptised though they have never so much faith; whereas contrariwise the commandement of baptisme requireth the baptisme of Disciples, and onely Disciples, and that both men and women, *Mat. 28. 18. Ioh 4. 1. 2. Act. 2. 38. 41. chap. 8. 12. 37. chap. 10. 47. Gal. 3. 26. 27. 28. 29.* and what is the description of a Disciple, see *Luke 14. 26, 27, 33.*

Fourthly, That which was the reason of the change of the Sacrament was the reason of the change of the subject which the Sacrament was to be administred unto, wherupon it followeth, that by the same reason that we take Infants to be baptised, because Infants were formerly Circumcised, by the same reason we may Circumcise them now, because they Circumcised them then, and so consequently the question of baptisme ended, unless it should be pleaded, that Infants should be baptised and circumcised both: Now if it be absurd to circumcise Infants now, notwithstanding they circumcised them then, because Christ is now come, who hath put an end to Circumcision and all the Ceremonies of the Law, surely it is no lesse absurd to baptise Infants now in relation to their circumcising of them then, because Christs coming doth put an end to the subject also, and hath instituted another Subject to be Baptised, and they are those that first taught to believe in Christ, and onely those; and thus is the consequence of baptisme succeeding circumcison taken away.

And

And thus have I made a full answer to your discourse touching *Infants Baptisme*, and now it remaines I should make some answer to your discourse touching the forme of the Church.

And first you speake of *Agreement* in this, *viz. That matter and forme do constitute a Church, (to which we do agree)*

As to you say, *That the matter is a company of visible Saints, professing faith in the righteousness of Christ, and living accordingly.*

To this I answer, that this definition agreeth not to Infants, which you would make the subjects of baptisme, who are borne in sinne, and are by nature the children of wrath, *Psal. 51. 5. Ephes. 2. 3.*

Secondly, neither doth it agree with the constitution of the Jewish Church (which you make to be a patterne for ours, by bringing your grounds from thence for the baptising of Infants) who never were required to make any such profession at the time of their admission, as all the Churches since Christs coming are; and all the Members added, or to be added, do when they are added, *Act. 2. 41. chap. 8. 12, 13, 37, 38. 10. 47, 11. 15, 16, 17.*

So then after you have set down wherein we do agree, (as indeed it were well if you did agree with your selfe in it) then you make a *Quære Whether Baptisme be not the forme of it*, and your answer is *No*, and then you give your reasons of that denyall, and then you affirme, *That a Covenant acted is the forme*; to all which I answer, first in generall, that we are to dittinguish betwixt that which formeth and the forme which is formed, becaule the forme of any thing according to the common and vulgar acception of forme is that outward frame, fashion or figure that the thing hath, wherby it is distinguished or hath its denomination, and to apply it to the question in hand, the Church being an Assembly, the forme, fashion, or figure thereof is the relation or state that every Member possesseth from Christ their King and common head, and each with other, wherby every Law in every office or service is communicable and executed; so then neither Baptisme nor a Covenant is the forme of the Church, but Baptisme of believers is the instrumentall meanes by which the Church commeth to be made partakers of that forme which it hath, and by which it comes to be a Church, and

and to have such a name settled upon it, and without which it can have no such name agree unto it.

The Instrumentall meanes then of the being of this Church, both for matter and forme is by consent of love, issuing forth from the Covenant of grace made in from one Lord through one Spirit, one Faith, one Baptisme: *Eph. 4. 4. 5.* and if any of these meanes be wanting, then something is wanting that causeth the Church to be, and except that want be supplied, the Church can have no visible existence or being, and from hence the conclusion ariseth, that although Baptisme be not the forme, frame, fashion, or figure of the Church, yet seeing Baptisme is an essentiall part of the meanes conducing to the being of the visible Church, yea and the last meanes too; That where true Baptisme is wanting, there can be no true visible Church.

Secondly, whersoever true baptisme is administred according to the will of Christ revealed in the Scripture, *there the true visible Church is by that meanes, truly constituted and stated in his true being.*

It is therefore called the birth of water, *Joh. 3. 5. Titus 3. 5.* As therefore the birth which we receive from our naturall Parents, is that by which we receive the beginning of our natures being among the common state of mankinde in the affaires of this corporall life, even so Baptisme being the birth of water, is that whereby we receive the beginning of our visible being in our Spirituall estate among the Church and people of God, in the affaires appertaining to eternall life, but the first is true from the analogy that baptisme hath with naturall birth, therefore the second by force of consequence is also true.

Secondly, I argue from the forme of baptisme, it being a dipping of the body into the water, and in that respect called a buriall with Christ, *Rom. 6. 4. Col. 2. 12.* betokening our death and relurrection.

As therefore the rising out of the grave at the last day is the beginning of our being bodily in the state of glory, so the rising out of the water of baptisme is the beginning of our being in the visible state of grace, and the beginning of our visible spirituall life is from that day, &c. in respect of their outward station.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, I argue from the end for which baptisme is appointed, which amongst other, is to unite them to the visible body of Christ, *1 Cor.* 12. 13. *Gal.* 3. 27. 28. *Eph.* 4. 5, 6. and to distinguish them from the rest of the world which are not baptised as they are, *Col.* 2. 12. compared 20. and so Circumcision did distinguish and denominate the Profelite Jewes from what they were before, and from all other Heathens *Ex.* 12. 48 49. *Rg.* 3. 1. 2.

From whence I reason thus; if union and communion with the visible body of Christ, and distinguishment from the rest of the world be the end for which baptisme is appointed, then whensoever it is administred according to appointment, it must necessarily be concluded to be such a meanes as is effectually to accomplish the proposed end, and unlesse baptisme as a meanes be administred to persons which are believers, subjects only capable of such union, communion, and distinction, such an end can no waies else be effected, and that way it may be and is; but the former is true by the ground before laid, *Ergo* the latter is also true.

Fourthly, I argue from the Irreiteration of baptisme, it being to be administred but once, the Lords Supper often, in which respect baptisme is the signe of our birth, the Lords Supper is the signe of our growth: baptisme is the Sacrament of our entrance or initiation, the Lords Supper is the Sacrament of our continuance and conservation in the visible body of Christ, and therefore by the same reason that a man may be conceived to have a being in the visible Church for a time without baptisme, the signe and Sacrament of his birth, entrance and initiation, by the same reason he may have a continuance of his being there without the same also, and so consequently baptisme needlesse: but baptisme is not needlesse but needfull, (being a signe of our birth, entrance, and initiation) to be administred as a meanes of our visible birth, entrance initiation or the beginning of our visible being in the visible body of Christ (which therefore in that respect is called the birth of water) which thereby do visibly enter into the Covenant of Grace.

Therefore without baptisme they have noe visible being in the Church, and by it they have.

Fifthly, I argue from the nature of baptisme as it is a seale of

the Covenant, and so consequently a part of the Covenant, an Ordinance of mutuall ingagement between God and man, *Act. 2. 38. chap. 22. 16. 1 Cor. 1. 13.* even as circumcision was an ingagement to all the duties or Ordinances of the Law, *Gal 5. 3.* so is Baptisme an ingagement to all the Ordinances of the Gospell, which is therefore called Christs bond or yoke, *Psal. 2. 3. Mat. 11. 29.* his badge or livery of his professed Disciples, there being no other visible Ordinance of God appointed to passe upon persons, to note out their being in the Covenant before this; from hence I reason

They that are baptised upon profession of Faith have sealed to the covenant, & are known thereby to belong to the covenant, and to have a visible being in the same, whereas they that are not baptised by vertue of profession of Faith by them made cannot by any Ordinance of God be knowne to belong thereunto.

But God hath appointed some Ordinance to be administred upon persons which make profession of Faith, whereby they may be visibly knowne to belong to the covenant of grace, whereas others that partake not thereof cannot be so knowne, and there is nothing before Baptisme appointed so to doe.

Therefore Baptisme administred to persons professing Faith and repentance, is it alone by which they may be knowne according to Gods Ordinance, to be in the covenant of grace, and to be of the visible body of Christ.

Lastly, I argue from the Commission for Baptisme, *Mat. 28. 18.* given to the 11. which was, that they should make Disciples, all Nations baptising them, where note that baptising is a *participle* to the making of them, to beare the name of Disciples or Shollers in Christs schoole, hereupon the words of Christ in the Commission, *Mar. 16. 16.* are, *he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved;* Faith puts a man into the State of salvation before God: Baptisme before men; and alsoone as they were Disciples baptised, and so stated a visible assembly, then to teach them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them, *ver. 19.* where note, they were first to be a Church of Christ; Secondly, they were to doe and observe as a Church of Christ, from whence I reason.

If the Commission for Baptisme given to the first Church-planters

planters of the new Testament, did require Baptisme, and that only to be administred upon persons, as the last thing to make Disciples or Schollers in Christs schoole, in a visible state of saluation, seated in the observation of all the rest of the Ordinances of Christs Kingdome, then Baptisme administred upon those which are first taught, is that by which the true visible Church is constituted, and stated in its true being: but the former appeares by the ground before laid *Ergo.*

Thus have I cleared and proved my position, that Baptisme is the thing or instrument and meanes forming and constituting of the Church, though it bee not the outward fashion, frame, figure, or forme of the Church formed; yet never thelesse because your Arguments seeme to lye against the question thus stated, I will consider them in order as they lie; First therefore you say, *that which groweth being to a Church must be removed, if the Church cease to be a Church.*

But Baptisme cannot be removed from a Church.

To which I answer, that it is as easie to remove Baptisme from a Church, as to remove a Church from being a Church.

Secondly, you say *that which being wanting to a Church constituted, doth not cause it to be no Church, that cannot be the forme of the Church,*

But Baptisme may be wanting in a Church constituted, and yet it be a Church as circumcision to them Joshua 5. Ergo.

Answer. I deny the second proposition, namely, that Baptisme may be wanting in a Church constituted, because it is constituted by Baptisme, as we have prov'd before, neither will, *Joshua 5* helpe you herein, the case of the Israelites being extraordinary, having speciall dispensation from God himselfe in the supply of miraculous Sacraments in the cloud and Sea. Manna and the rock *1 Cor 10. 1. 2.* which God gave them while their travailes necessarily required the forbearance of circumcision, and the Pasleover, which if such necessity had not been, would not have beene dispenced with, but the parties so neglecting should have been cut off, *Gen. 17. 14.* If it be replied they were members of the Church of Israel, yet not circumcised: therefore we may be members now though not baprised. I deny the consequence, unlesse that any can shew the like case and president of the supply of miraculous Sacraments, to serve in their room; which
when

when they can, we will then grant that those new meanes from God may serve to effect the same thing, which till then we must be contented with the rule of his Word, namely, to have the Church constituted by baptising of believers in ordinary cases, and not otherwise.

Thirdly, you say, *That which is but an adjunct to a thing cannot be the forme of it: but Baptisme is but an adjunct of a Church: Ergo.*

To which I answer, this argument lyeth not against my question, as I have stated it, because that which is but an adjunct may be a meanes of forming and constituting of the thing to which it is adjoynd: so Baptisme being administred upon believers, may be a meanes to constitute and forme them into a true visible Church-state.

Fourthly, you say, *That which is the scale of the Covenant, cannot be the forme of the Church: but Baptisme is the scale of the Covenant,*

Ergo.

To which I answer, That which is the scale of the Covenant may be a meanes to constitute and put the Church into an outward visible form, for the which I have spoken somewhat before in the 5. Argument: unto which I referre the Reader for brevities sake.

Fifthly, you say, *That which remains when a man is no Church-member and is not to be administred to restore him unto Membership, that cannot be the forme of the Church.*

But Baptisme remains when a man is no Church-member, *Ergo.*

To which I answer, denying the assumption, but yet because many seeme to stumble at this argument most, I will indeavour a more satisfactory answer.

That by which a person professeth Christ with, is that onely by which he truly professeth Baptisme and Membership with the Church and body of Christ; whereupon it followeth, that upon the same reason that any person is dispossessed of Membership with the Church, upon the same reason he must be concluded to be dispossessed of Christ and of Baptisme also, and the reason is because he is to be concluded destitute of all the ends for which Baptisme is appointed, yea and the grounds also upon which it is administred; in that he possesseth not
Christ

Christ, he possesseth neither ground of Baptisme, nor end, and therefore no true being of Baptisme it selfe.

As for the restoring of a person to Membership, we are to note that repentance is but an effect of the same faith by which he possessed Christ at first, and by which he had right to, and possessed Baptisme in deed, and in truth, though it did seem otherwise to us whiles error or sin did appeare to be predominat in him; which repentance is that by which he is to be restor'd to communion with the Church againe after Excommunication, which if he repents not, and so hath no such effect of faith appearing in him, by which he did apprehend Christ at first, then it doth appeare that he never did possesse Christ the ground of Baptisme, and consequently not Baptisme in its true being: for though men may deceive themselves, and may deceive other men like themselves, yet they cannot deceive God, whose Ordinance it is, and upon whom Baptisme and all other divine Ordinances have their dependance, who hath ordained that onely believers should be baptised, which if therefore men have no faith, though they pretend to have faith, then have they no right to Baptisme before God, who knoweth them to be destitute of faith. Yet because they seeme to men to whom the power of such administration is committed, to have faith, they therefore are bound to baptise them; yet hath this baptisme no true being from God, unlesse and untill the parties do believe in deed and in truth, as they seeme to do by their profession.

By all which it doth appeare plainly, that in every Excommunicate person, there is a necessary and unavoydable mistake of him first or last, either therefore first he was no believer, and so had no right to baptisme, and so baptisme had no true being in him, although he seemed to have faith, or else secondly he is a believer, when Excommunicate, and hath Christ and baptisme in its true being, although now through the prevalency of error or sinne he seemed to have no faith.

Therefore from hence it followeth, that as a man falleth from his faith, he falleth from his baptisme too, and as he returnes to his faith so he returnes to his baptisme againe also; then if he seemeth to fall from his faith and doth it not really, then so likewise he seemeth to fall from his baptisme also. Then like-

wife if he fall wholly from the faith indeed, which he professed to have, as a man may do, then doth he fall wholly from his baptism indeed, and shall never have benefit by it.

From whence I reason, as a man cleaveth to his baptism so he cleaveth to the Church which is constituted by it, but as a man forsakes his Baptisme so hee forsakes the Church.

But he that forsakes the ground and ends of baptism forsakes baptism which is administred upon those grounds, and appointed for those ends. *Ergo*

Baptisme cannot be concluded to remaine when a man is no Church Member indeed and in truth.

Secondly I reason, he that returneth to his baptism, returneth to the Church which is constituted by it.

But he that returneth to the grounds and ends for which it is appointed and upon which it is administred, returneth to baptism in respect of its true being. *Ergo*

Hee that returneth to baptism returneth to the Church which is constituted by it.

And thus have I done with the negative arguments, and now I come to the affirmative, first therefore you say, *That an outward Covenant acted betwene God and a company of believers to become one and anothers, and so the like amongst themselves is the forme of a Church.*

To which I answer, that the Covenant of God makes the Church, I grant, but that any can be concluded to have an outward being in the Covenant of the Gospell now in the time of the Gospell without baptism, is it which I deny, and require you to prove, having formerly proved the contrary.

But whereas you speake of a company of believers acting a Covenant to become one anothers amongst themselves to be the forme of the Church.

To which I answer, that by the same reason, that if a Covenant acted to become one & anothers amongst themselves, should be the forme of the Church without being baptised for the present, by the same reason they may receive the forme of the Church without all the administrations of the Gospell for the future, which I conceive would be absurd to affirme.

Secondly, neither is there any warrant that God hath appointed

red men to *all* any such covenant for any such end, and therefore so to do is will-worship, vanity, the invention of man, and mens inventions in Gods worship are plaine superstitions and flat breaches of the second commandment, *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe, &c.*

And therefore if it be the forme of the Church, it must needs be a Superstitious Church, which is formed by such a *Superstitious* *action*.

Thirdly, a Covenant acted by believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves, may be with ignorance both of the nature and duties of a true Church, as is proved by the presupposition of it to be the forme of the Church without baptisme, how then should it be the forme of the Church, for if they be ignorant that the visible Church must subsist of baptised ones, how can it be avoyded, but that they are ignorant of the nature of the true visible Church? and being ignorant of the nature thereof, they are necessarily ignorant of the duties thereof: for if they conceive that persons should be imployed in the services of relation in the Church unbaptised, then they be ignorant of the duties of the Church, because all the externall services of relation must flow from the visible union and relation made in baptisme, *1 Cor. 1. 13. chap. 12. 13. Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5. Gal. 3. 26, 27. Eph. 5. 26. Col. 2. 12. 20. compared chap. 3. 1. 2. Heb. 10. 22, 23, 24, 25.* therefore it cannot be the forme of Christs true visible Church.

But let us examine your proofes, you say *First, if the Kingdome of Heaven that is the Church-state that we now have be the same that the Jewes had, then what was the forme of that is the forme of this.*

To which I answer, that if the Church-state we have now, be not the same with theirs, then the forme of that is not the forme of this: and then your argument is grounded upon an *if*; that is upon nothing: but the Church-state we have now, is not the same that the Jewes had, that being constituted of a naturall seed, according to the course of a naturall generation, this being constituted of a Spirituall seed according to Gods gracious effectuall working by the powerfull preaching of the Gospell by Spirituall regeneration, *Act. 2. 41. Ergo*

Secondly, whereas you said a little before, that a Covenant acted

acted by believers to become one anothers amongst themselves to be the forme of the Church, and then argue from the State of the Jewes to prove this forme which never did forme themselves to this; therefore surely tends to overthrow your selfe, and to argue from your prooffe to overthrow your principle.

But you say, *That the forme of the Jewish Church-state was such a Covenant as is by you above expressed, this you cleare by 4. particulars as you say, first their entrance into it with Abraham and his seed, was by a visible and outward Covenant, into which Reprobates aswell as Elect were admitted, as Ishmaell and Elaw Gen. 17. and Circumcision was not the Covenant but a token of the Covenant, ver. 11*

First I answer, this proves not the forme of the Church to be such a Covenant as is by you above expressed, acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves, for *Abraham* and his seed, Reprobates aswell as Elect enter into it: Now *Abraham* was but one believer, and *Ishmaell* his seed which entred with him, you instance to be a Reprobate.

Secondly, I answer, that Circumcision was not only a token of the Covenant, but a part of the Covenant it selfe, being that whereby the parties circumcised were bound to keepe the whole Law, *Gal. 5. 3.* and therefore God saith, *Gen. 17. 10.* This is my Covenant let every Man-child be circumcised, and ver. 13. He that is borne in thine house and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised, so shall my Covenant be in your flesh: but the uncircumcised Man-child, in whose flesh the fore-skin is not circumcised, even that person shall be cut off from his people, because he hath broken my Covenant: therefore the Covenant here spoken of was such as was entred into by Circumcision, and not such as was acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves to be the forme of the Church

But you would seeme to cleare it by a *second particular* (viz.) *by the establishment of it in the plaine of Moab.*

But this establishment was by a Church-Covenant *Deut. 29. 10. 16.* in which they avouched God to be their God, and God avouched they were his people. *Deut. 26. 17. 18.* neither could circumcision be any ingredient here, because they had not circumcised any of 40. yeares ever

since

since they came out of Egypt; nor did they circumcise any till after Moses and Joshua, had brought them through Iordan into the Land of Canaan, Joshua. 5. 5.

To this I answer, that this covenant which was now established, with the people of Israel in the plaine of *Mozab*, was the same covenant which was made with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, v. 13. which they entered into with God in the behalfe of themselves, and their posterity by being circumcised, *Gen.* 17. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 compared 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. *Act.* 7. 8. and therefore being in the covenant before, they did not begin to be a Church now, and therefore this proves not that a covenant acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers, should be it, that should constitute them to be a Church now.

Secondly, whereas you say, neither was circumcison any ingredient here, because they had not circumcised any of 40. yeares, I answer, I conceive notwithstanding, that circumcison was an ingredient in their parents who thereby entered into a covenant for themselves, and these children even as the covenant here specified, did comprehend the posterity to come, ver. 15.

Thirdly, the case of the Israelites was extraordinary, having speciall dispensation from God, in the supply of miraculous Sacraments, and signes of his grace as meanes of manifestation, in speciall of the testification of the covenant, as leading them through the red Sea dry, giving the cloudy pillar by day, and the Pillar of fire by night, to guide and defend them miraculously, causing their clothes and shoes to remaine sutable to their bodies and feete, without new supplies, and without waxing old, who were fed miraculously without bread, even by *Manna*, and water out of the Rock, that they might thereby know that he was the Lord their God, *Deut.* 29. 5. 6. Whiles their travailes necessarily required the forbearance of Circumcison, and the Paschever which necessity if it had not been; it should not have been so dispenced with, *Numbers* 9. 13. *Gen.* 17. 14. which necessity, seeing it came to passe by Gods commanding them, to journey in the Wildernesse, therefore did in the roome of Circumcison for that time, supply with such miraculous Sacraments which are no rules in ordinary cases, as may appeare by their cessation as soone as they came into the Land of *Canaan*,

who then were presently led by ordinary rules, as circumcision, and the Pascheover, *Iosh. 5.* wherefore in ordinary cases circumcision was the distinction of Jew and Gentiles, and the meanes of the constitution of the Church of *Israel, Gen. 17. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. Exodus 12. 48. Att. 7. 8. Rom. 3. 1. 2. Ezek. 44. 9. Att. 11. 2. 3. chap. 16. 1. 3. Rom. 2. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. chap. 3. 30. and 4. Ephes 2. 11. Phil. 3. 2. 3. 5. Col. 2. 13. 1 Sam. 17. 26. 36.*

Hereupon it followeth, that although the Church of *Israel* were a people in covenant with God, yet the way of entrance into this covenant visibly, and so the constitution of this Church was ordinarily circumcision. Therefore as a covenant acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers, was not the forme of that Church then, but a speciall communication of Gods covenant by circumcision ordinarily, with the whole Nation believers and Infidells, and whosoever of any Nation that would be circumcised, and come to *Jerusalem* to worship; much lesse hath it any consequence to prove it so now.

But the third particular by which you would cleare it, is by the Jewes, renewing themselves after some Apostacy, 2 Chron. 15. 12. 13. 16. and 34. 30. 31. Neh. 9. 38. 10. 1. From whence you reason.

That without which they could not stand in a right Church-estate, that is the forme of the Church, but without the renewall of their covenant, they could not stand in a right and pure Church-Estate.

Ergo.

To the assumption I answer, that the Jewes made a covenant to seeke the God of their Fathers, I grant; that they did well in so doing, I grant also; but they could not be in a Church-estate without so doing I deny, and you have not proved, and I will prove the contrary: first because they were the Church of God before. Secondly that which was now renewed had a being before, and the making of this covenant was but animating, and in-abling them to doe that which they were engaged, and bound to doe before by their circumcision, *Gal. 5. 3* and therefore as this renewing of their covenant, is not by your Argument proved to be the forme of the Church, then much lesse hath it any consequence, to prove that a covenant acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves, is the forme of a Church now.

But

But the fourth particular by which you would cleare it, is from their dissolution, from whence you reason thus.

That which being taken away makes them cease to be a Church, that is, the forme of the Church, but the dissolving of the covenant is the making of them cease to be a Church. Ergo,

That the taking away of the covenant maketh them cease to be a Church you say, is cleare from Zach. 11. 10. 14. Whence it was prophesied off, and from the New Testament, whence it is shewed how it is accomplished after the death of Christ.

To which I answer, first that the covenant of grace is eternall, the things thereof remaining unshaken, the Kingdom that comes by it cannot be shaken, *Heb. 12. 27, 28.* the Ordinance of Baptisme which belongs unto it, the fruit and benefit of it is eternall; the Church which is constituted by it is never dissolved, but remains to all eternity for it to be administr'd onely to believers, *Act. 8. 37.* And Christ saith, *hee that believeth in him shall never die. Iohn 11. 26.*

Secondly, as the taking away the covenant makes the Church to cease: so it onely proves the covenant to be the ground of the Church, and the Church only to have a being, as it is stated upon that ground, and that is in participating in the covenant, and not otherwise: now the question being of the visible Church, then there must needs be a visible participation of the covenant, or otherwise there can be no visible being; now there was no visible participation of the covenant made with the people of *Israel*, before the comming of Christ ordinarily, and by ordinance before circumcision, neither is there any visible participation of the covenant since Christ, by order of appointment without, or before Baptisme: therefore circumcision then, and Baptisme now must be it, by which they are constituted, or concluded to have a visible being in the covenant, and consequently the Church to have a visible being, in respect of this visible participation in the covenant, whereupon it followeth that if the covenant be dissolved, or ceaseth, or be taken away, needs must the circumcision or baptisme, which is the ordinance of participation be dissolved, cease, or be taken away, whereby their relation or being a visible member doth consist.

Now then, seeing that the covenant which was before Christ did

did ceremonially lead to Christ and is in that respect dissolved, ceased and taken away; then circumcision by which persons had visible participation thereof is also dissolved, ceased and taken away, and so consequently the visible Church of the Jewes ceased as was prophesied, *Zach. 11. 10. 14.* and was accomplished at the death of Christ at which time the partition wall was broken, *Act. 2. 41. 10. 28. Ephe 2. 13, 14 15.*

And also seeing the covenant since Christ is ratified by the death and blood of the Lord Jesus the Testator, cannot be removed, dissolved, ceased and taken away (as you your selfe affirme in your third proposition, and fourth period) then Baptisme administred upon believers, by which they have visible participation thereof, cannot be removed, dissolved, ceased, and taken away.

Therefore the true visible Church now in respect of the ground of it, cannot be removed, dissolved, cease, or be taken away.

Onely two exceptions need explication: first the true Church may possibly die, and none survive them in the same visible state: *Ergo*, the true visible Church may be removed, dissolved, ceased, and taken away.

Secondly, persons may seeme to be, and not be true members of the true visible Church, which afterwards may shew themselves otherwise, and so the Church may cease.

To the first I answer, that the cessation of the Church by death is but onely to our outward view, for to our Faith it is no more ceased, then their relation to the covenant is ceased, and the relation which the faithfull have in, and to the covenant when they die doth not cease; no more then the covenant it selfe, whereupon such a relation is grounded doth, which is as firme as God himselfe the maker of the covenant is.

Secondly as the outward view of the Church ceaseth, so the outward view of their relation to the Church by Baptisme ceaseth also, by which they had visible participation with the body of Christ and therefore this exception hinders not, but that the true visible Church of the New Testament constituted by the Baptisme of believers, by which they have visible participation cannot be removed, dissolved, ceased or taken away.

To the second exception I answer, that the covenant cannot

properly be said to be dissolved, or taken away from such as only seemed to be in the covenant, and were not indeed and in truth in it, but when they manifest themselves to bee what they are, they doe declare that they never were in covenant with Christ at all, and therefore the dissolving of the Church, in respect of hypocrites, is not by dissolving or taking of the covenant from them, but by discovering of them to be such as never had any true right to Baptisme, which therefore hath now, no true being in them, and consequently were never in the covenant, 1 John 2. 19.

From all which it doth appeare that the covenant (no not of God himselfe) cannot be the forme of the Church, but only the ground whereupon the Church is stated, and it is constituted by participation, and visibly by visible participation, and that is onely Baptisme, and the continuance in the Church, is the continuance of the manifestation of the same participation, possessed by Baptisme, therefore Baptisme of believers is the constitution of the visible Church of Christ.

But from these 4. particulars, you argue, *That if an outward Covenant was the forme of the Church under the old Testament, then is it the forme of the Churches under the new Testament: But the former is true.*

Ergo.

To which I answer, denying both antecedent and consequent also: for if the Covenant of God himselfe is not the forme of the Church of the old Testament (but only the ground upon which the Church was stated) much lesse can it be said that an outward Covenant acted by the people of Israel, a company of them to become one and another, is the form of the Church: but least of all doth it prove such a thing to forme the Church now: But the former is manifested by what is above said: Ergo.

Your arguments from the new Testament follow. First, but you further prove it from the new Testament, you say from *Mat. 18. 20. That it is a company not baptising themselves, but gathering themselves together in his name, where the word used doth properly and commonly signifie a Church assembling or Synagoguising, as Job, 20. 19. Act. 4. 31. & 11. 26. 13. 44. & 14. 27. & 1 Cor. 15. 6. 30. & 20. 8. 15. 8.*

To which I answer, that though it be a company not baptising themselves, yet do none of the Scriptures prove that a company of unbaptised persons have this name of true visible Church given un-

o them: and therefore the assembling of persons meerly is not the cause of that denomination in the Scripture sence: but when their Baptisme is the cause of their assembling, wherby they do assemble, in the name of Christ, in whose name they are Baptised, that is the reason why the Scripture affords them the denomination of Christs true visible Church; for they were the assemblies of Disciples, and Disciples were all Baptised, being first taught, *Ioh. 4. 1. 2. Mat. 28. 18.*

You say, *Looke what makes a member of a Church to be a member, or no member, that makes a Church to be a Church or no Church: and so that is the forme of it, there is the same reason of the whole that is of every part.*

But the making, or dismembering, or restoring of a member, is by a Covenant, (acted, to become one and another.) *Esay 56. 4. 6.*

To which I answer, that the Covenant of God is the ground upon which the Church and every member therof is stated, I grant, and have formerly proved: but that a Covenant acted by any to become one and anothers amongst themselves, should forme the member or Church, either is by me denied; neither doth *Esay 56. 4. 6* prove any such thing, for it only saith, The Eunuches that take hold of my Covenant; and the stranger that embraceth my Covenant, that is, were Circumcised, and performeth the duties which they were bound to performe by Circumcision, *Gal. 5. 3.* should have a place in his house, and not by acting a Covenant to become one and anothers, and neglecting of Circumcision.

3. You say *The comparison is of a Church with a candlestick. Rev. 1. 12. 20. looke what is the forme of a candlestick, the same by proportion is the forme of a Church; as the matter signifies the matter of a Church proportionably.*

But the form of a candlestick is the jayning together the shaft and the branches, which signifies Christ and many member sunited together, which cannot be but by agreement or Covenant.

To which I answer, I grant the comparison and the proportion also, but that this cannot be but by an outward agreement or covenant acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves, is the thing that I deny; for persons may be united to Christ by faith and baptisme, and so stated in the Covenant of Grace, and members of the visible Church proportionably, like as the forme of a Candlestick is

The joyning together the shaft and the branches.

Fourthly, You say, *If the removing of the Candlestick, and so the unchurching of them be by dissolving of the Covenant and their fellowship as to them, Zach. 11. 10. 14. by dissipation, then that was the forme of it.*

But removing of the Candlestick is the dissolving of the Covenant and their fellowship thereby; as to them by dissipation, Zach. 11. 10. 14.

Therefore that was the forme of it.

To which I answer, deaying the second proposition, because the everlasting Covenant of the new Testament established by the blood of Christ, cannot be shaken, removed, dissolved, but remaineth for ever, *Heb. 12. 27, 28. 13. 20.* and therefore the Covenant upon which the Church is stated, now doth differ from that which was before the coming of Christ, upon which the Jewish Church was stated seeing that was dissoluble, but this is undissoluble, *Heb. 8. 13.* and therefore their Kingdom of heaven was shaken and taken away, *Zac. 11. 10. 15. Heb. 12. 26, 27, 28. Mat. 21. 43. Hag. 2. 7.* and this Kingdome cannot be shaken and taken away in respect of the ground and foundation upon which it is built, *Heb. 12. 28. Mat. 16. 18, 19.*

And as for the removing of the Candlestick, and so the unchurching of them, it is only by a discovery or laying open, or manifestation of a people to be void of any participation of the Covenant which formerly they professed, were esteemed, and had a name to have, *1 Joh. 2. 19. Rev. 3. 1.* and not the dissolving or taking away of a Covenant from them, which once they had and enjoyed, much esse is it the dissolving the outward Covenant, acted by a covenant of believers, to become one and an others amongst themselves: The unchurching of them, which as the acting of it is will-worship, and disobediance of God, and so the church so constituted meerly Antichristian, so the dissolving of such a Covenant cannot be the unchurching of any true churches, because Iesus Christ hath no Churches, a true visible being so constituted.

FINIS.

Some



Some Principall matters handled in this BOOKE.

- 1 **T**HAT the old Covenant is one and the same as well between the time of Abraham and Moses as between the time of Moses and Christ, page 3, 4.
- 2 The typicall nature of the old Covenant with the cessation thereof described. page, 11, 12, 15, 16.
- 3 That the Covenant now since Christ is not the same that was before with Abrahams posterity in the flesh. page 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.
- 4 That the grace of God is never the more strained, but enlarged to our seed after the flesh, though they be not in the Covenant, now as they are our seed according to the flesh. p 19, 20.
- 5 That the circumcising of Infants, nor yet the Old Covenant hath no consequence to prove the baptising Infants. page, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 33, 34.
- 6 That only baptising of beleivers is the meanes of constituting true visible Churches in the times of the Gospell. page, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42.
- 7 That a Covenant asked to become one and anothers among themselves cannot be the forme of the visible Church. page, 43. to the end.

