

subjects of the Covenant of Grace. There were more Marks of difference that I gave you of these two Covenants, among which this was one, the Covenant of Grace was a *better Covenant, established on better Promises*. There can't be a degree of comparison where there is but one. I shewed in what respects the Promises were better, but you were pleased to pass all without a reply, and to conclude from what was written, that there was no such difference between the Covenant of Grace and that Covenant that the natural Seed were in, but that in substance it was the same, though the Premises were far enough from being cleared.

S E C T. V.

YOU come now to challenge a repeal of Childrens Church-membership, though you had it before; I told you it was then repealed, when the Covenant by which they were constituted a Church was broken, *Zach. 11. 10*. I shewed you, there was a new Commission given out after Christ was risen, according to which the Apostles were to act, *Mat. 28. 19, 20*.

Your Answer to this, is, that the Ceremonial Law is sometimes called the first and old Covenant, *Heb. 8. 7, 13*. the Jewish shadows vanished, their carnal Ordinances and Sacrifices ceas'd.

Reply. The Apostle here speaks of the Covenant it self, and not of the Ceremonial Law, as distinct from the Covenant: Though I deny not, but when the Covenant was abolished, the Ordinances were abolished too, which Ordinances were but the adjuncts of the first Covenant, distinct from the Essence, *Heb. 9. 1*. Then verily the

the first Covenant had also Ordinances of Divine Worship, &c. to make the Covenant here to be but the Ordinances, is to destroy the Sence ; then it must be read thus, then verily the first Administration had also an Administration, or the first Tabernacle had also a Tabernacle.

Again, to take *Heb. 8. 7.* for the Ordinances, is to reflect upon God himself, who tells you it was not faultless; take it of the Ordinances, and then they must either be positively faulty, or privatively faulty : Positively faulty they were not, for they were Gods own appointments ; privatively faulty they were not, for they did answer the end for which they were appointed ; they did shadow out Jesus Christ, the Elect were brought to a sight of Christ by them, not one of them miscarried ; but the Covenant it self was faulty, not positively, for it was a good Covenant, though not so good as the new Covenant, yet it answered all the ends of God in making it ; one great end of which (as I conceive) was the keeping the Seed of *Abraham* in an entire Body, till the Messiah was brought forth, that it might appear that God had made good his Promise made to *Abraham*, that in his Seed all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed ; but though this Covenant was sufficient to answer all the ends for which it was made, yet it was not sufficient to answer all the ends of God, to relieve all the necessities of his People. Pardon, and Peace and Reconciliation, a new Heart, and a new Spirit, Grace here, and Glory hereafter, were never put into this Covenant : *If there had been a Law given that could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law.* Dr. Owen well observes upon this place, that though many of *Israel* that were under this Covenant went to Heaven, yet

yet there was not one of them that went to Heaven by vertue of this Covenant, but by vertue of the Covenant of Grace; if this Covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second; this second Covenant is a better Covenant, established on better Promises; Promises, *That God will write his Law in their Hearts, that he will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more.* If these are the better Promises that the new Covenant is established upon, then they were not in the first, for if these Promises had been in the first Covenant, that Covenant would have been as good as the second, and the same Promises would have been as good in the first Covenant as in the second; and this first Covenant which is said to be old, *ver. 13.* is distinguished from the Covenant of Grace, *verse 9.* by that same Mark that I have mentioned already; it was the Covenant he made with them, when he brought them up out of *Egypt*, which was that same Covenant that he made with them *Deut. 29. 10, 11.* as appears *verse 25.* and yet still you proceed to prove, that the Covenant last mentioned is the Covenant of Grace, by comparing *Gen. 17. 7.* with *Deut. 29. 13. Heb. 8. 10.* but seeing it is so near at hand, I shall return no other answer but this, pray compare *Heb. 8. 9.* with *Deut. 29. 25.* and consider what I have last written, and you may see that they are distinct Covenants.

Secondly, You say, you grant that the legal Ordinances being repealed, there was a new Administration of the Covenant of Grace, established by our Saviour after his Resurrection.

Reply. In granting a repeal of the legal Ordinances, you grant a repeal of the Jewish Church-state, in which their Children stood members, and
now

now hence forward you must prove their Church-membership by this new Administration that is established by Christ, the old Administration being out of doors, granted by your self. Its ridiculous for a man that grants the change of the Administration, to look to that which is done away; in this new Administration there is a new Constitution of Churches; the Church was national under the legal Administration, it's Congregational under the Evangelical; then all *Judea*, and I may say all the Regions round about, were but one Church; but now there were Churches in *Judea*, *Gal. 1. 22.* We read of the Churches of *Galatia*, *1 Cor. 16.* nothing lies plainer in the Word than this, that Churches are now Congregational, the matter whereof is visible Saints, and the form mutual Agreement, neither of which are Children in an Infant-state capable of; and if you can give me but one Instance by any one clear Text, that ever one Child was received into any one of these Churches in an Infant-state, I will give you the cause.

Thirdly, You say, you do likewise grant, that the chief Commission that the Apostles received from Christ, was to make Disciples by Instruction, and then to receive them into the Church by Baptism.

Reply. Their receiving into the Church by Baptism I have excepted against already, and have given my reasons to the contrary; but here is a grant, that the chief Commission that the Apostles had from Christ, was to make Disciples by Instruction, antecedent unto Baptism; but if this was not the only Commission, then pray shew me another; and if there be another, either it's larger, (with respect to the subjects of Baptism) or it is shorter; if it be larger, then this is not the

the chief; if it be shorter, it will not relieve you: But I believe there is no other that takes in Infants; if there had, if I had not found it my self, I should have heard of it by you e're this time.

Thirdly, You say, the Apostles were sent to convert Aliens to the Faith, and so the *Jews* being Aliens were to be discipled unto Christ before they were baptized; and though the *Jews* were members of the Church, and subjects of the Covenant of Grace under the legal Administration, yet they were not members of the Christian Church, and subjects of the Covenant of Grace, according to the Gospel Administration, till they were converted to the Christian Faith, and made Disciples of Christ.

Reply. (Setting aside their Interest in the Covenant of Grace, of which there has been enough spoken already) I know not what more can be granted; as to the repeal of the Jewish Church-state, and of that membership which Children once had, and were the controversie here to end, I suppose any unbiassed man would judge you had given up the cause; but you revive it again on the old bottom.

Fourthly, You say, that when believing Parents are baptized, and received into the Christian Church, their Children with them are interested in the Covenant of Grace, not by Nature, but by Vertue of God's Ordinance; for *Peter* saith, *The Promise is to you, and to your Children*, Acts 2. 39.

Reply. What right the Children are here said to have, they had before their Parents did repent and were baptized, and received members of the Church; the Exhortation was to every one of them, *repent, and be baptized*; the Motive to enforce the

the Exhortation was this, *The Promise is to you, and to your Children*; so that this right did not descend to the Children by the Ordinance of God, upon the Parents Repentance, nor yet upon their being baptized, and received members of the Church.

Secondly, I deny the subjects to be Believers, when the Apostle told them, *The Promise is unto you, and to your Children*; and its enough for me to deny it, its your work to prove it; yet will I offer somewhat for what I say.

First, *They were pricked at the Heart*, that's all the account is given of them; they were under some Conviction; now Conviction and Conversion are two things, a man may be convinced that is not converted; he must be convinced before he can be converted; *The whole need not the Physician, but they that are sick*.

Secondly, They were ignorant of the way of Salvation, *They cried out, Men and Brethren what shall we do?* and that a Person can't be that does believe; Faith is as well the act of the Understanding as of the Will.

Thirdly, They did not all believe at last, though many other Words were used by way of Exhortation to 'em, to save themselves from that untoward Generation, *verse 41. Then they that gladly received the Word were Baptized*; now there is no Argument to be drawn to prove a Priviledge to Believers and their Seed, from what was spoken to Unbelievers.

Secondly, I deny that Interest in the Promise is here intended, and that for these two Reasons. First, Such as have an interest in the Promise shall certainly enjoy the good of the Promise; the Heir of the Promise shall inherit in time; it cannot be that the Word of God should have taken none

Effect, *Rom. 9.* The Promise contains Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification. None will aver, that all the Children of Believers shall be saved; and yet they could not miss of it, had they an interest in the Promise.

Secondly, Once an Interest in the Promise, and for ever an interest therein, *Jer. 32. 40.* *I will make an Everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good: and I will put my fear into their Hearts, that they shall not depart from me.*

Thirdly, I deny that barely Interest in the Promise is the ground of Baptism: The Apostle did not lay it down here as the ground of Baptism, but as a Motive to enforce the Exhortation: *Repent and be Baptized*; that's the Exhortation; *For the Promise is to you, and to your Children,* is the Motive. If the Question then be, What must those do to whom the Promise is? The Answer will be this, *Repent and be Baptized*: If it be objected, Repentance was enjoined the Parents only, not the Children, I answer, Baptism also was enjoined the Parents not the Children.

Fourthly, I deny the Children were Baptized when their Parents were, *verse 41.* *Then they that gladly received the Word were Baptized*; in which number their Children could not stand.

Secondly, They were not added to the Church, though the number were about three thousand, yet were there no more added than continued in the Apostles Doctrine and Fellowship, and breaking of Bread, and Prayer, which Children were not capable of. No Church-member was ever debarred any one Church-Priviledge, till by their disorderly walking they debarr'd themselves.

SECT. VI.

YOU would again argue Childrens Church-membership, from the Jewish Children being received with their Parents by Circumcision.

Reply. The Administration being changed, granted by your self, *page 17.* we must not now take our measures from the old Administration, but from the new; we must see that we have Commis-
sion from Christ for what we do.

You say, the Priviledges of Christians are as great under the Gospel, as those of the *Jews* were under the Law.

Reply. I grant their personal Priviledges are as great, and in some respects greater, but then the Question will be, Who are the Christians you intend? *They were the Disciples that were called Christi-
ans, Acts 11. 26.* and these Disciples were Believers.

Secondly, You say, if the Children of Believers may be excluded from the Covenant and Church of God, then their Priviledges are less, and their condition worse than those under the Law.

Reply. First, Their Interest in the Covenant of Grace is no otherwise now than it was then, and as for their Church-membership and carnal Ordina-
nces, (as you your self call them) it was the pleasure of God they should enjoy them for a time; and then to repeal them, and to dissolve their Church-state, and our Wills must be resolved into the sovereign Will of God. All things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and that must stop the Mouth of all Objec-
tions; then from that time no Man was to be known after the Flesh, then Birth-priviledges

were utterly ceas'd, then a *Jew* which was before born a Member of an instituted Church, could no longer be owned so much as a Member of the universal visible Church, unless in the Judgment of Charity he were new-born: *By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one Body, and made to drink into one Spirit, whether Jew or Gentile.*

Thirdly, They have the Word now as well as then, as soon as they are capable of it, and that much clearer than it was then, and in this respect their Priviledge is greater than of the Children of *Turks* and *Pagans*, (though you say they have no more) and this the Apostle calls the chief Priviledge of the *Jew* above the *Gentile*, Rom. 3. 1, 2. and if by no means their Priviledges must be abated in any one thing, no not in a tittle, then tell me, what you allow them in the room of the Passover, which then they had a right to? *Exod. 12. 3, 4. A Lamb for a House*: That Children are a part of the House is your own Argument, therefore they had a right to the Passover.

Thirdly, You say, if the Children of Believers are not Church-members, nor any way in Covenant with God; How then can they be in any state of Salvation? For it is by the Covenant of God in Christ that we are saved.

Reply. I never denied Children to be in the Covenant, as I have clear'd it already: That which I deny is, that the Children of Believers are in the Covenant, considered as such; God knows what Children are in the Covenant, whether of Believers or Unbelievers, I cannot tell; sure I am, that all the Elect are in the Covenant, and they do not all come out of the Loins of Believers.

Fourthly, You say, there is good ground to hope, that the Children of Believers shall be saved;

For

For of such is the Kingdom of God, Mark 10. 14.

Reply. First, If you have such good ground of their Salvation, why do you not commit them to the Dust in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to Eternal Life, when they dye unbaptized?

Secondly, Christ speaks not here of the Children of Believers, but of Children, considered as such.

Thirdly, Christ does not say, that all such are saved, but of such is the Kingdom of God. I believe, that Children are capable of Salvation as well as grown Persons, and that such of them as are saved, are saved by vertue of the Covenant of Grace; but how many, and whose Children are saved, neither you, nor I can tell; its a secret lockt up in the Breast of the Almighty, it belongs not to us to enquire; but your Inference from this, that all the Children of Believers have an Interest in the Covenant, and have a right to Baptism, is a meer groundless Conclusion.

Fifthly, You say, I think you contradict your self in saying, if Infants have an Interest in the Covenant, they have a right to Baptism, when before you contended for their entrance in by Baptism; to this you say, the right they have to Baptism is by Interest in the Covenant, and unless they have an Interest in the Covenant, and be reputed Church-members, they ought not to be Baptized.

Reply. If they were in the Covenant before, then they are not entered in by Baptism: If they be entered in by Baptism, then they were not in before.

Sixthly, You say, I grant, that the Children of the Jews had an Interest in the Covenant before they were Circumcised.

Reply. That's true, I did grant it, but it's as true, that I denied, that they were entered in by Circumcision. I told you, the Female had an Interest in the Covenant as well as the Male, though they were never Circumcised.

Seventhly, You say, that your calling Baptism the Seal of the Covenant, you think the Nature of the Ordinance does afford ground for it.

Reply. I know no external Seal belonging to the Covenant of Grace, by which a Person may be known to have an Interest therein; nor do you well to call it so without Scripture-ground. I fear, that attributing so much to Baptism as some do, hath a great tendency to make Persons secure.

S E C T. VII.

YOU say, at last I take upon me the place of an Opponent, which is contrary to the rules of Disputation, and offer something against Infant-Baptism.

Reply. I never pretended to much skill in the rules of Disputation, nor do I yet: I know not but some of them may be broken now. If I keep within the bounds of Truth and Moderation, it's as much as I look for.

Secondly, You say, that men are bound to pray, and worship God, and perform Duties of Holiness and Righteousness; but Children that are not capable of performing these, are not guilty of any actual Sin in omitting of them.

Reply. Are not Children capable to worship God? why then must they be baptized? is not Baptism, that is so much contended for, a part of Gods worship? *Secondly,* Men are bound to repent, and

and be baptized, but Children that are not capable of the performance of these Duties, are not guilty of actual Sin in the Omission of them.

Thirdly, You say, that all those Scriptures that require Faith and Repentance before Baptism, are to be restrained to those that are made Disciples first at Age; but Infants of Believers have a right, by vertue of the Gospel-Covenant, before they can repent and believe.

Reply. Here again you offer no proof to what you bring, and that is still expected by me, and a bare denial is all that I shall return, till proof be offered.

Fourthly, You say, that Children are capable of entering into Covenant with God, though at present they know not what Baptism means, or what they are engaged to. In *Moses's* time the little ones entered into Covenant, *Deut. 29. 11, 12.*

Reply. I do not dispute their Capacity, but the Authority of it: Shew me as good Authority for it as *Moses* did, *Deut. 29. 1.* *These are the words of the Covenant, that the Lord commanded me to make with the Children of Israel: Do but shew me where the Lord hath commanded it, and I will give you the cause.*

Fifthly, You say, the first Objection that I offer against Infant-Baptism is this, that if those that are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only subjects of Baptism, according to Christs Commission, then Infants are not: But such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only subjects of Baptism according to Christs Commission, therefore Infants are not.

Your answer to this is, that if by those that are discipled to Christ by the Word are meant such as are discipled by actual Instruction, then
you

you deny the Minor: You say, that Christ commanded, that those that be discipled to Christ by teaching, or otherwise, should be baptized.

Reply. First, I wonder, that you have so soon forgotten what you granted, *Page 17*. You declared, that you did acknowledge, that the chief Commission that the Apostles had from Christ, was to make Disciples by Instruction, and then to Baptize them, and now it's quite another thing with you.

Secondly, I deny, that there is any other way of discipling to Christ by the Word, but by actual teaching: Produce an instance if you can, of any one that ever was discipled to Christ by the Word, without actual teaching.

Thirdly, I deny, that Christ hath commanded to baptize any more than are discipled by Instruction or Teaching. The Commission is, *Go and teach all Nations, baptizing them*: See whether you can find one more in the Text to be Baptized by them than were taught: The Word *them* is relative to all Nations taught and discipled. *Erasmus* in his Paraphrase upon the New Testament reads the Commission thus, *Go and teach all Nations*, and when they have learned, *dip them*: I desire to know, how Ministers can Disciple to Christ by the Word, otherwise than by actual Instruction; it was by preaching the Gospel that they were to Disciple, so *Mark* has it, *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*: Men cannot preach the Gospel without actual Instruction: He that is called a Disciple, *Mat. 28*. is called a Believer, *Mark 16*. and if Faith cometh by hearing, as the Apostle tells us, *Rom. 10*. this can't be without actual Instruction. I conclude then, that to baptize such as are discipled to Christ, either by teaching or
other-

otherwise, is not in the Commission; the word otherwise is not in the Translation, nor in the Greek, but is an Addition of your own.

Sixthly, You say, the Children of Believers are Disciples of Christ, though they are not capable of Learning.

Reply. You had as good say, they have learned Christ, though they are not capable of Learning.

You say, Disciples may be taken two ways, either for such as are made Disciples by teaching, or for such as are in a state of Disciples; you say, the Infants of Believers are born Disciples, by vertue of the Gospel-Covenant, and that Christ himself would have the Infants of Believers received in his Name, and accounts the receiving of them the receiving of him, *Mark 9. 37. Luke 9. 48.*

Reply. First, There is no mention whether this was the Child of a Believer or not; that there were many of the Jews that did not believe, is beyond dispute, *John 10. Ye believe not, because ye are not my sheep, saith Christ*; and whether this was the Child of a Believer or not, you do not know.

Secondly, You should have compared it with *Mat. 18.* by which, as the Addition to *Pool's Annotations* observes, *Mark* and *Luke* must be expounded, and then you might have seen, that it was not a little Child, considered as such, nor yet as considered the Child of a Believer, but a Disciple of Christ that hath humbled himself, and is become as a little Child, *Mat. 18. 5. Whosoever shall offend one such child that believes on me.* Where three Evangelists do speak of the same thing, as here they do, its good to examine all, and take the sense from him that speaketh most large and clear.

Seventhly,

Seventhly, You say that *Peter* doth in effect call Infants Disciples, *Acts* 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples*: The yoke that the false Apostles would have put on their neck was Circumcision, as engaging them to keep the law; this was circumcision after the manner of *Moses*, and then Children being the subjects thereof, must needs be included under the name of Disciples.

Reply. There is not one Word of Children in this whole Controversie, *verse* 1. *They taught the Brethren, that they must be circumcised after the manner of Moses*: The Brethren are the Subjects the manner of *Moses* respects, the form the cutting off the fore-skin; the Brethren are the Subjects that were thus to be circumcised, among which Children of eight days old could not be numbred. For,

First, They were such as had received the Holy Ghost, *v.* 8. *Secondly*, They had purified their hearts by Faith. *Thirdly*, They were such that from among the *Gentiles* were turned unto God, *v.* 19.

Secondly, It was not circumcision barely considered, but circumcision together with the false Doctrine that was this intollerable yoke; for circumcision barely considered was born by Children of eight days old, but circumcision in point of justification, as here it was urged, was a yoke that neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear; now though circumcision might have been imposed on Children of eight days old, yet the false Doctrine could not.

Thirdly, To expound this of Children, is to expound it contrary to the sence of the word disciple, as you well know, and contrary to *Luke* 14. *Except*

cept a man hate Father and Mother, yea, and his own life, he cannot be my disciple.

Eighthly, You say, if Children of Believers are holy in such a sence, as to have right by the Covenant of Grace to be admitted members of the visible Church, then they must needs be disciples of Christ; but they are so, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy*; that is, *scæderally* holy.

Reply. I deny both the *Major* and the *Minor*.

First, I deny the Holiness to be *scæderal*; there was a case sent to the Apostle for resolution, whether it was lawful for the believing Husband or Wife to continue with his or her unbelieving Yoke-fellow? which he answers in the affirmative; but how doth he clear it? *First*, He proves the lawfulness of their continuance from the lawfulness of their state; *The unbelieving husband is sanctified in or to the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in or to the husband*; they were sanctified each to other by the ordinance of God, when both were Unbelievers, according to that Text, *Marriage is honourable among all, and the Bed undefiled*: This he illustrates by an instance of the lawfulness of their product, *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy*.

Secondly, The holiness of the Child does not arise from the faith of the believing Parent, but from the sanctification of the unbeliever, and none does call that sanctification *scæderal* holiness; now such as the fountain is, such are the streams, the effect is not greater than the cause.

Thirdly, He speaks of their Children indefinitely, as well those that were born when both were unbelievers, as those that were born after one Parent believed, some of which might remain profess'd

fess'd *Pagans* as well as one of the Parents, and yet holy.

Secondly, I deny that all who were federally holy were Disciples of Christ, *John* 4. 1. Christ and *John* made Disciples among the *Jews* of those who were federally holy, antecedent thereunto: *We are Moses Disciples*, say some, *as for that fellow, we know not whence he is*; and yet they were federally holy, *John* 9. 28, 29. and many instances more might be given, if need were, to prove that persons might be federally holy, and yet not the Disciples of Christ.

SECT. VIII.

YOU say, my second Objection is this, if the Apostles, who well understood their Lords Commission, did first disciple before they baptized, then are Disciples the only Subjects of baptism; but they did so, *Acts* 2. 41. Your Answer to this is, that the chief business of the Apostles at the first planting of Churches, was to make Disciples by instruction, and then to baptize them; and this seems to be one cause why they have said little or nothing about baptizing of Children.

Reply. Till you can shew me that they had other business, I shall take it for granted that this was their only business, first to disciple by instruction, and then to baptize, and that was the reason why they said nothing about the baptizing of Children (as you here confess) because it was no part of their business; and if the Apostles said nothing about baptizing of Children, I take that to be the reason, why you and others that have written about it, have had no more to say to the purpose than you have.

Secondly,

Secondly, You say, a second Reason seems to be this, that at that time there was no doubt made, but that Infants ought to be received with their believing Parents, into the visible Church.

Reply. How doth it appear, that there was no doubt made? you do not affirm it your self, and if you did, you could not prove it; yet, I suppose that there was no doubt in the case, it was clear that there was no such thing, there being neither precept no president for it, there could be no such thing of Divine Appointment,

Thirdly, You say, that though there be no such thing in express terms recorded, yet it can't be concluded from thence, that they baptized none. A negative argument is not valid in matter of fact.

Reply. Though it may not be concluded merely for want of a President, yet there being neither precept nor president, it may be concluded; for without a precept for it, the Apostles would not do it, and had there been a precept, I doubt not but there would have been presidents enough.

Fourthly, You say, that Christ did many things not recorded in Scripture, *John* 20. and so did the Apostles.

No record in Scripture by Christ or his Apostles of Infant-Baptism, therefore it must be supposed they spake it but did not practice it.

Reply. What is not recorded, is no rule for us to go by.

You say, its very probable that the baptizing of Infants was one of them.

Reply. Probabilities prove nothing, only you do by this seem to intimate that you have nothing in Scripture for it, nor do you know whether to go to fetch any thing.

You say, that the practise of the baptizing of Infants

fants was so early in the Church, that it can hardly be known when it began.

Reply. If it can't be known when it began, then it can't be proved by Scripture; if it could, it would be known when it began. *Secondly*, If it was not from the beginning, then it was not of divine institution, no, though it was in the next age after the Apostles were deceased. *Thirdly*, So early as it was, you can't conclude it more early than can be known, and I have understood that it can't be proved to be in use the first two hundred years after Christ, and that's more to me than the the other fourteen hundred wherein it has been in use.

Fifthly, You say, that *Origen* and *Austin* reports an Apostolical Tradition for it.

Reply. I suppose you do not lay much stress upon unwritten Traditions: For, *First*, You know if we own them, we deny the Scriptures to be a perfect rule: And, *Secondly*, If we receive one, by the same rule we may receive more, and when shall we know when we have recieved all: I suppose there are plenty of them in the same shop out of which this came. *Thirdly*, It's a sign you have not Scripture to prove it, in that you run to unwritten Traditions, if you had ground for it in Scripture, there were no need to fly to them.

Sixthly, You say, there are some probable grounds in Scripture, that the Apostles upon the Parents faith baptized their Children; when the Goaler was converted, it's expressly said, *That he and all his were straightway baptized*, Acts 16. 33. and it's probable some of these were Infants.

Reply. It's not only more probable that here were no Infants, but it's certain there were none: For, *First*, It's said, *They spake to him the word of the Lord,*

Lord, and to all that were in his house, ver. 32. that was before they were baptized. Secondly, He believed in God with all his house, ver, 34.

You say, it's probable there were some Infants baptized, in that there were whole Housholds, and Infants are part of a Household.

Reply. It's more probable that Infants were not baptized, from the instances that are given of these four households, then if there had been no instance given of them: For, *First*, Had it been the practice of the Apostles, to baptize the whole family upon the profession of the Head of the Family, I see no reason why these families should be mentioned more than others. *Secondly*, The Goalers family are proved already to be all believers. The second is *Crispus*, *Acts 18. 8.* Then *Crispus*, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed in God with all his house, and many of the Corinthians believed, and were baptized: If whole families believe, then whole families are baptized; if but a part believe, then but a part is baptized. The third is the household of *Stephanus*, and they are said to be the first fruits of *Achaia*, and to have addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints, *1 Cor. 16. 19.* The fourth Household is *Lydia*, and no body knows whether she was Maid, Wife or Widdow.

Seventhly, You say, if Children had been denied Church-Membership, doubtless those Jews that were converted to Christianity at first would have raised a storm about it, as they did about lesser matters.

Reply. Your doubtless proves no more than your probabilities did, and therefore I shall return no Answer to it at present.

Eighthly, You say, there is no express prohibition, forbidding us to recieve infants into the Church by baptism.

Reply.

Reply. There is no need of a prohibition, because it was never of Divine Appointment.

Nimbly, You say, there is more need of an express prohibition, forbidding infants to be admitted into the Church by Baptism, than there is of an express Command or Example for the admitting of them, because, before Christ's coming they always enjoyed the privilege of being enter'd into the Church, and if this ancient privilege be taken away, where is there any plain precept or president for it.

Reply. First, You have granted a repeal of that ancient privilege already, that the old or legal administration is done away, that there is a new administration established by Christ, that the Jews stood as aliens as well as others.

Secondly, You have not proved, that Children stood Church-Members under the new administration, and therefore it's in vain to call for a Repeal.

Tenthly, You say, that one or both of these is necessary to warrant us to deny Infants-Baptism.

Reply. One or both of these is necessary to warrant to baptize them, lest God should say, who hath required this at your hands, but there is no need of either to warrant us to deny them baptism, for where there is no law there is no transgression.

Eleventhly, You say, for a conclusion, it can never be proved that Christ or his Apostles hath expressly forbidden Infants to be admitted into his Church by baptism, therefore they may and ought to be baptized.

Reply. First, I perceive you are almost out of breath, in that you have but a negative argument left for your practice.

Secondly, It can never be proved, that God did expressly forbid *Nadab* and *Abihu* to offer incense with

with strange fire, and yet they were destroyed by fire from Heaven, for doing it with fire that he commanded them not.

Thirdly, It's none of our business to enquire after Prohibitions in matters of worship, that which we are to enquire after is, whether it be of Divine Institution, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of World:* If we expect the presence and blessing of God with us, and on us, in what we do, we must be sure to keep close to his commands: *Thou meetest him that rejoiceth and worketh righteousness, that remembreth thee in thy ways, Isa.* 64. 5. God's ways are the ways of his Commands, *Psal.* 119. 1, 2, 3.

Fourthly, That which is not commanded in matters of worship is forbidden: Under the Old Testament it was not expressly forbidden, *Deut.* 12. 32. *Whatsoever thing I command you, that observe and do, thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it:* And we may not suppose, that Christ has left his Worship more imperfect, or his people more at liberty under the Gospel. *Moses* was faithful in God's house as a Servant, but Christ as a Son, *Heb.* 3. 2. under the New Testament dispensation, that which is not commanded in matters of worship, is forbidden implicitly and consequentially, *Joh.* 4. 24. *God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth:* That God that doth expressly require men to worship him in truth, doth implicitly forbid all false ways of Worship, that are not ruled by the Word of Truth.

Fifthly, If that which Christ hath not expressly forbidden may be admitted into the worship of God, then may all the burthensom Ceremonies imaginable be admitted in.

I come now to reply to your third Paper, which you entitled, *The vindication of Infant-Baptism vindicated.*

In your first *Section* you say, I charge you with misrepresenting my words; in saying, I granted that such as ought to be admitted Members of the visible Church have a right to baptism, when I granted it only with respect of an instituted Church: But seeing my Words were doubtful, (you say) you took them, as you conceived, in the best sence.

Reply. First, I have not abused you in this, but have stated it as it was.

Secondly, My Words were plain; I said, if by the visible Church you meant an instituted Church, I granted it.

Your Answer is this, that Baptism is more likely to be the means of admitting Members into the universal visible Church, than into a particular Congregational Church; for if a Man were admitted into a particular Congregation by baptism, then when he left that, and is admitted into another, he must be baptized again.

Reply. Here you grant my Argument, (though under another term) that Baptism could not be the formal, constituting cause, because it could be but once administered, and there may be cases in which a person may be twice formed a Member: I instanced in a person justly ejected, and afterwards repenting; you instance in a persons removing from one Church to another, which is the same thing in effect; and this is the Church I intended, when I said an instituted Church. I told you in my last, I knew no formal way of admission into the universal visible Church, unless you call the preaching of the Word the formal way. A Person called
out

out of the World by the preaching of the Word, is upon his embracing of Christ to be owned a Member of the universal visible Church.

Secondly, You say, there is a great deal of difference between constituting a Man a Member of the Church, and receiving of one that was a Member before; a Man must be a real Member of the Church, before he can be solemnly received by baptism, and declared a visible Member.

Reply. If I do rightly understand this, here is a grant, that those that you baptize are not Members of the Visible Church, antecedent thereunto, and I think I am not mistaken, for in *page 67.* you say, that Children are invisibly, and before God interested in the Covenant, and Church-members before they are baptized: Now pray tell me how you know, that such as you baptize were really Members of the visible Church; if they were not visibly such, we cannot judge but by visibility.

Thirdly, You say, that Baptism is a means to admit persons into the visible Church, and as you take it, the Scripture is on your side in it, for which you bring three Scriptures, *Rom. 6. 3. As many of you as were baptized into Christ.*

Reply. This speaks not of baptizing into the Church, but into Christ; and these that are here said to be baptized into Christ, were not only real, but visible Members of the universal visible Church, antecedent thereunto; they were Believers, they had made a verbal profession of their Faith, which was enough to declare them Members of the universal visible Church, before they were baptized.

Your Second Text is, *Acts 2. 41. Then they that gladly received the Word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand Souls.*

Reply. First, They were members of the universal visible Church before they were baptized, their professed Reception of the Word declared them such. — *Secondly*, Their being added, was to a particular instituted Church, or a Congregational Church, where the Supper of the Lord was to be enjoyed. You grant your self, that Baptism does not form a Person a member of an instituted Church; for if it did, a Person must be as oft baptized as he is received.

Your third Text is, *1 Cor. 12. 13. By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one Body, &c.*

Reply. I confess this is the universal visible Church, but here I have two things to Object: *First*, These were not members before. *Secondly*, This is not Water-baptism, but Spiritual baptism, or Regeneration, so that neither of these Scriptures do prove what they are brought for.

Fourthly, You say, that a Person justly excommunicated is not wholly unchurched, but only excluded from the outward Communion till he repent. Against this you say, I object, that an excommunicated Person is cut off from that particular Body whereof he once stood a member. The Scripture that I brought to prove this, it seems does not satisfy you; that in *Matthew* you say declares a Person to be in the same circumstances as a Heathen-man, in regard of outward Communion, but this is your own distinction, there is no such thing in the Text; the charge is, *Let him be to thee as a Heathen-man or a Publican*, and such a one is no member of that particular Body; and as for that in *1 Cor. 5.* They are bid to *put away from among themselves that wicked Person*: How he should be put away from amongst them, and yet continued a member with them, I do not know.

Fifth.

Fifthly, You Object, that a man excommunicated may retain the Profession of his Faith, and be heartily grieved for his Sins, which strongly argues him a member of the universal visible Church.

Reply. First, If he be truly humbled and grieved for his Sins, he ought not to be excommunicated; therefore want of this is necessarily supposed, when a Person is justly ejected.

Secondly, If Grief and Humiliation do appear after he is ejected, it argues him a member of the universal Church, I grant; but not a member of that particular Body out of which he was cast, as they are considered an instituted Church.

Sixthly, You say, the Apostle writes to them to forgive him, and comfort him, that is, to absolve him from the punishment, which strongly argues he was not received in as an Alien.

Reply. The Question is not, after what manner he was to be received? but whether he was cast out, and that you do not deny; now to be cast out from among them, and at the same time be continued a member with them, are terms inconsistent; and if he were formally cast out, as it appears he was, he must be formally received again, before he could be owned a member of that particular Congregation.

SECT. II.

YOU say, I blame you for not taking notice of the excluding of Bastards under the legal Administration, which seems to contradict your present practise in receiving them. You say, you made no Answer, because you thought it impertinent to the true sense of the Text, which is *Deut. 23. 2.* where a Bastard is forbid to enter into the

Congregation of the Lord to the tenth Generation. The Criticks (say you) expound it thus, that a Bastard was not to bear Office in the Church to the tenth Generation.

Reply. First, You had done well, if you had told me, who those Criticks are that give this Critical Exposition. *Pool* in his *Synopsis*, whose work it was to collect them, mentions no such thing, as I am informed.

Secondly, I know not how the Criticks do expound the Words, I know the Text is plain, and a Text may be wrier-drawn in the Exposition of it, beyond what the sense will afford: Nor do I see what ground there is either from the coherence of this or any other Text thus to expound it.

Thirdly, I cannot yet accept of that Critical Interpretation, and that for these Reasons:

First, I do not find that the Females were admitted into ordinary Offices at all under that dispensation, (and of such I suppose you intend it) but a Bastard might be Female as well as Male.

Secondly, God chose the Tribe of *Levi* to officiate in that Church-state, but a Bastard might be of any other Tribe as well as of that.

Secondly, You offer one Argument to prove, that the Text did not intend an Exclusion from the means of Salvation; for God hath declared, *That the Son shall not bear the Iniquity of the Father*, *Ezek. 18. 20.* and never did God punish the Children with spiritual Punishment, as sometimes he doth with Temporal, for the Fathers fault.

Reply. First, Your Quotation is Impertinent, for that respects a temporal Punishment, their being in *Babylon*, which they thought was a stroke laid upon them meerly for their Fathers fault.

Secondly, Your assertion will not hold good.
God

God threatned that the Man-child that was not Circumcised the eighth day, should be cut off from the Congregation of his People; and yet the fault lay not in the Child, but in the Parent, Gen. 17. 14.

SECT. III.

YOU say, I own the Covenant, Gen. 17. 7. to be the Covenant of Grace; but that I deny the Covenant Gen. 17. 8. and so to 15. to be the Covenant of Grace, and that because it was made with the natural Seed, considered as such, and contained temporal Blessings only; and that I would have all this granted to me without proof.

Reply. I offered proof to what I asserted, but if you take no notice of it, the fault is yours, and not mine. As for the Seed mentioned in the eighth verse, its granted that they were the natural Seed, that needs no proof, and for the spiritual Seed I quoted the fourth verse of the same Chapter; *As for me, my Covenant shall be with thee, and a Father of many Nations will I make thee; and thy Name shall no more be called Abram, but Abraham shall thy Name be, for a Father of many Nations have I made thee:* These are the spiritual Seed, as appears Rom. 4. and this is the same Covenant with that in the 7. verse, as appears in that the Lord hath made himself over to Abraham, and to his Seed absolutely, and so he hath not to any but the spiritual Seed, or the mystical Seed, which is that I intend.

Secondly, You say, here is but one Covenant mentioned, Gen. 17.

Reply. First, Here is a Covenant mentioned in which the Land of Canaan was not put as the Inheritance, verse 4, 5. the Gentiles had no Title thereunto, and they are the many Nations there intended.

Secondly, Here is a Covenant, in which the Land of *Canaan* was put as the Inheritance, *verse* 8, 9. therefore there are two Covenants mentioned.

Thirdly, The Lord makes himself over absolutely with respect to the spiritual Seed, *verse* 7. and he makes himself over conditionally with respect to the natural Seed, *verse* 8, 9. which is sufficient to prove that there are two Covenants mentioned.

Thirdly, You say, there is a spiritual Promise exprest in the 8th. *verse*, in the same words as in the 7th. *And I will be their God*; which confutes my Interpretation, and defeats my Design.

Reply. *First*, I desire you to stay a little, I have not yet replied to it. *Secondly*, The Promise is not in the same words, there is some variation in them. *Thirdly*, It is not in the same Sense, now if it be worded never so much alike its nothing, if it differ in the sence; in the 7th. *verse* it's absolute, in the 8th. there is a Condition annexed, *You shall keep my Covenant*; a failure in the performance of which Condition was a breach of the Covenant, *verse* 14.

Thirdly, It confutes not my Interpretation, for when I said, the Covenant of Grace contained spiritual Blessings, this temporal only, I explained my meaning, that God never promised a new Heart and a new Spirit, by vertue of that Covenant into which the natural Seed were taken, considered as such; for which I brought *Dent. 28.* where you have a Catalogue of the Blessings of that Covenant, but the Covenant of Grace contains spiritual Blessings, *Jer. 31. 33, 34.* *That God will write his Law in their Hearts, that they shall all know him, that he will forgive their Sins.*

Fourthly, It defeats not my Design, though the Lord

Lord promised to be their God ; you have here found nothing that is new to me, nor more than I offered you in my last ; wherein I shewed you the vast difference between the Lords making himself over to the spiritual Seed, by vertue of the Covenant of Grace, and his making himself over to the natural seed, by vertue of this Covenant.

First, In that the Promises of the Covenant of Grace were better Promises, *Heb. 8. 6.* better in that they contained spiritual Blessings, Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification ; but the Promises of this Covenant contained temporal Blessings only, and these for the most part hung on Conditions too. Now according as the Tenor of the Covenant is, by which God makes himself over unto a People, such is the Priviledge of the People that have an Interest in him, by vertue of the Covenant of Grace ; he was their God to bless them with Grace here, and to crown them with Glory hereafter. You say your self, *Book 2. Page 3.* That God promised *Abraham, Gen. 17. 7.* *That he would be a God to him, and to his Seed after him ;* implying, that he would afford to them that were in Covenant with him, all blessings that could be expected from a gracious God ; and what can be expected less than Grace here, and Glory hereafter ? But I never found that God did afford all these Blessings, or any of them, to the natural Seed, considered as such ; but for God to be their God, by vertue of that Covenant into which they were taken, was but to give them those outward Blessings that were put into that Covenant, as the Land of *Canaan*, and a flourishing Estate in that Land, and most of these hung on Condition of their Obedience too ; who could expect more from God by vertue of that Covenant, than what the Lord put into it ?

Second.

Secondly, Interest in God by vertue of the Covenant of Grace cannot be lost, *Psal.* 48. 14. *This God is our God, even our own God, for ever and ever, he will be our guide to Death*, *Jer.* 32. 40. but interest in God by vertue of this Covenant might be lost, *Hos.* 1. *Call his name Loammi, for ye are not my People, neither will I be your God.* Ten Tribes cut off at once. So though God be an eternal God, yet was their Relation to him by vertue of this Covenant but Temporal, and in this respect it may well be said, that this Covenant contained Temporal Blessings only. I cannot yet see, that my Interpretation is confuted, or my design defeated.

Fourthly, You say, that though there be nothing in *Gen.* 17. to demonstrate that the Covenant of Grace was made with *Abraham* and his spiritual Seed, yet I think I have an unanswerable one, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.* Your Answer to this is, that the Apostle doth not here mention all that are in Covenant with God, in regard of external Priviledges, but only describes the spiritual Seed of *Abraham* in regard of saving Grace.

Reply. First, How shall I know, that the Apostle would have us thus to distinguish: He only tells us, *That those that are Christs are Abrahams seed, and Heirs according to Promise.* I would now Query; First, Whether some of the Subjects of the new Covenant have a right to saving Grace, and not all? God promised it to all, *Jer.* 31. 33. without excepting any; *I will write my Law in their Hearts, and they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest.* You say your self, page 14. that God will not fail to do us good, and to afford us Grace
suffi-

sufficient to enable us to keep his Covenant; and I suppose, by this you mean all the subjects of this Covenant, or else you do nothing, and is not this saving Grace? I know no difference between Grace to enable us to persevere, and saving Grace. *Secondly*, I would Query, Whether the Covenant of Grace be made with any but *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gal. 3. 16.* Now to *Abraham* and his Seed were the Promises made; he saith not, of Seeds, as of many, but unto thy Seed, as of one, which is *Christ*. Give me but one Scripture that extends the Promises beyond the Seed of *Abraham*. *Thirdly*, Whether *Abraham* had any other Seed among the *Gentiles* to whom this was spoken, but the spiritual Seed? *Abraham* had but two Seeds, a natural and a spiritual; the *Gentiles* are not his natural Seed, they must be his spiritual, or not at all.

Fourthly, Whether there be any more of the *Gentiles* that are his spiritual Seed than those that are *Christ's*? And *Fifthly*, Whether those that are *Christ's* can be known by us to be the Seed of *Abraham*, till they walk in the steps of *Abraham's* Faith? The substance of these things I offered you twice before, but as yet have not obtained one Answer.

Fifthly, You say, that none but true Believers and sound Members of *Christ* are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, and none but such shall receive remission of Sins and Eternal Life.

Reply. First, If none but true Believers are the spiritual seed of *Abraham*, then none but true Believers are the subjects of the Covenant of Grace; To *Abraham*, and to his Seed, were the promises made, he saith not of seeds, &c. Why then do you labour to bring in such to be the subjects of this Covenant

nant that are not the spiritual seed? The *Gentiles* are not his natural seed, nor can they be made partakers of the promise, but in *Christ*, *Ephes. 3. 6.*

Secondly, I deny that none but true Believers are the seed of *Abraham*; the Text saith, *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abraham's seed*: Now if I prove them to be *Christ's*, antecedent unto Faith, I prove them to be *Abraham's* seed, antecedent unto Faith; for the proof of this take two Scriptures, *John 17. 23.* *That he may give eternal life to as many as thou hast given unto me, and this is life eternal to know thee to be the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*: This is faith, as its considered the act of the understanding, but these were given unto *Christ*, before Eternal Life was given unto them by *Christ*; and if they were given to him, they were *Christs*, *Psal. 110.* *Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy Power*: Thy People before they were a willing people, and if they were his People before they were a willing people, they were his People before they did believe; and if they were *Christs* before they did believe, then were they *Abraham's* seed before they did believe; such as were given him by Covenant, *Rom. 4.* *A father of many Nations have I made thee*; speaking of those things that are not, as if they were. If *Abraham* was their Father, then were they his Children; tho' they are not so in our Eye, yet they are so in God's Eye.

You say, that none but those that do believe shall receive remission of sin, and inherit eternal life.

Reply. It's true, if you respect grown persons; and it is as true, that such who in time believe, had their sins pardoned, and a title to eternal life antecedent thereunto; but I shall find another place to handle this.

Sixthly,

Sixthly, You say, tho' none but Believers do inherit Eternal Life, yet there are many Gospel-Priviledges which come on those that embrace and profess the Gospel; they have many offers of Grace, and Promises of Pardon made to them, on condition of Repentance and new Obedience, which clearly shews, that they are subjects of the Gospel-Covenant, in respect of External Priviledges.

Reply. First, I would know what you mean by embracing the Gospel? whether it be heartily or feignedly? if it be heartily, then they have not only external Priviledges, but internal also; if it be but feignedly, then they have no more privilege than others have to whom the Gospel comes, that never do embrace it; they have the tender of the promise of Pardon and Salvation as well as these; the Jews, that contradicted and blasphemed, *Acts* 13. had the offer as well as others; those that did not receive the Word, *Acts* 2. had the offer as well as those that did, the Pagans or Heathens had the offer, wherever the Apostles preached to them.

Secondly, The Offer is free; *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*, *Mark* 16. 15. Christ freely offers himself in the Word; *The Spirit and the Bride say come, and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him come and drink of the water of life freely*: Sinners, as Sinners, are invited; Such as have no money, are bid to come without money and without price, *Isa.* 55. 2. *Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the Earth.* The reason why Men go without it, is, because they will not accept of that which is freely offered; there is no prequalification required in any to the accepting of Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, The Offer of Grace does not at all argue

argue persons to be the Subjects of the Covenant, for then those *Jews* that had the offer, and rejected it, Pagans and Heathens also, to whom this Gospel was preached, were the Subjects of the Covenant, and this is contrary to your own principle. You say your self, that the *Jews* were Aliens as well as others, and were not subjects of the Covenant, till they were converted, and yet they had the offer before.

Seventhly, You say, if many of those that are externally in Covenant, do not obtain the special benefits and promises of the Covenant, the reason is, because they do not perform the conditions thereof. The Promise is firm on Gods part, he will not fail to perform what he hath promised to all true Believers, but it is too possible for man to fail of his duty, and so to come short of the Benefit promised.

Reply. First, I desire to know, whether there be no benefit promised to any but true Believers? whether Faith it self be not a New-Covenant Blessing or Benefit? or whether it be to be found in Natures Garden? this I desired in my last, but could not obtain an answer, at least not in words at length. However, there is this granted me, page 31. that the first degree of Grace, by which our Understanding is enlightned, and our Wills renewed, is absolutely promised, and if so, then is faith promised; for the Essence of Faith lieth in the Act of the understanding, and of the will, and when the Lord hath performed this promise, then is a Soul a true Believer; and if the Lord will not fail to perform what he hath promised to all true Believers, then he will not fail to save them, for that is his promise to all true Believers, *Mark* 16. 16. *John* 3. 16. *He that believeth, shall be saved.* Nor is

it possible for any of the subjects of this Covenant, to whom God will give the first degree of Grace, by which the Understanding is enlightned, and the Heart and Will reformed, (which you say are absolutely promised) so to fail of their duty, as to come short of the benefit promised, seeing its as absolutely promised, that when God hath given them a new heart, that he will put his Spirit within them, and cause them to walk in his Statutes, and observe his Judgments.

SECT. IV.

YOU say, the main thing contended about, is, Whether the Covenant, *Deut. 29.* be the Covenant of Grace or no: You say, the very Tenour of the Covenant of Grace is, *I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people, Heb. 8. 10.* and the Tenor of the Covenant, *Deut. 29.* is the same, *That I may establish thee a people unto my self, and that I may be to you a God:* And sure the Tenor of the Covenant is the best Evidence to know the nature of the Covenant by.

Reply. First, I deny that the Tenor of the Covenant, *Deut. 29.* is the same with that *Heb. 8.* there is a manifest difference; the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, *Heb. 8.* is, *I will write my Law in their hearts, and in their minds, and will be their God, and they shall all know me from the least to the greatest, for I will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their sins no more;* but the Tenor of the Covenant in *Deutr.* is only this, *That the Lord may establish thee to be a people unto himself, and that he may be to thee a God:* Here is not a Word of writing his law in their hearts; not a word, *That they shall all know him, from the least to the greatest;* nor yet

yet, *That he will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and remember their sins no more.*

Secondly, The Blessings of the Covenant of Grace were never promised to the Natural Seed, as such, nor did they ever enjoy them; yet when God makes himself over to a people by covenant, it is to give out to them, and bestow on them the blessings of that covenant. When the Lord made himself over to the natural seed by covenant, it was to bestow on them the blessings of that covenant, according to the Tenor thereof, a Catalogue of which blessings you have, *Deut. 28.* but not one spiritual blessing among them; it was according to those words *Deut. 28.* that God made a Covenant with them *Deut. 29.* as appears *verse 1.* the note that I gave you, *verse 25.* by which its distinguished from the Covenant of Grace, you have deferred the Answer too till some other place, only you say, if it be such an essential mark of difference, it is to be applied to the ceremonial Law that gave to *Israel* when they came out of *Egypt.*

Reply. The Ceremonial Law was but annexed to this covenant, it was distinct from the essence thereof, *Heb. 9. 1.* *Then verily the first Covenant had also Ordinances of Divine Worship, &c.* The Ordinances contained in the Ceremonial Law were but the adjuncts of the first covenant: Now that mark, *Deut. 29. 25.* refers to the covenant itself, and not to the adjuncts thereof.

Secondly, You say, that the very words of the covenant, *Deut. 29. 13.* are declared by the Prophet, *Jeremiah 7. 22, 23.* to distinguish the Covenant of Grace from the Ceremonial Law: *I spake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded I them, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of Egypt,*

concerning burnt-offerings, but this thing commanded I them, saying, obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my people. To this you say I replied, that there is not one word of the Covenant of Grace in this place.

Reply. I do yet stand to it, nor is there one mark by which the Covenant of Grace may be known; and in that it was spoken to them, or a covenant made with them, in the day that God took them by the hand to lead them out of the Land of Egypt, it plainly appears, that it was not the covenant of Grace, for that covenant that he made with them in the day he brought them up out of Egypt, is distinguished from the covenant of Grace Jer. 31, 32. Barely for God to be the God of a People, tho' by covenant, is not sufficient to demonstrate it to be the covenant of Grace. God was a Husband unto Israel, by vertue of the Covenant he made with them, and if their Husband, then he was their God, yet was that Covenant distinct from the Covenant of Grace, *verse 31, 33.* compared.

Secondly, He was their God on condition of Obedience, and that was sufficient to discriminate it from the Covenant of Grace.

Thirdly, You say, there is the substance of that Covenant Jer. 31. 33. to be found in this, therefore there is ground to conclude that this is the Covenant of Grace: *This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will write my Law in their hearts, and put it in their inward parts, I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*

Reply. First, That covenant Jer. 31. 33. is absolute, I will be their God; that in Jer. 7. is conditional, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my People.

Secondly, There is a promise, Jer. 31. That God will

will write his law in their hearts, that they shall all know him, that he will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their sin no more; but there is no such promise Jer. 7. therefore the substance of the one is not in the other.

Secondly, You say, that when God is said to do all in the work of our Sanctification, there our endeavours are always supposed.

Reply. First, The principle of Grace must be wrought in us without our own endeavours, granted by your self, pag. 31. That by which the understanding is enlightened, and the will renewed, these Blessings (you say) are freely bestowed upon us, not for any work of righteousness that we have done.

Thirdly, Whatever endeavours are put forth by us, they are the fruits of his Grace, Phil. 2. 13. *It's God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his own good pleasure, Ezek. 36. 27.*

Fourthly, Where there are the greatest endeavours put forth by us, future Blessings do not depend on them as means procuring, Rom. 9. so then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.

Thirdly, You say, that where the Scripture seems to lay the whole work of Sanctification on us, and requires us to purifie the heart, as it doth James 1. 5. Ezek. 15. 31. Isa. 1. 17, 18. there the Assistance and Operation of God's Grace is still supposed.

Reply. First, It's one thing to have the assistance of God's Grace supposed, and it's another thing to have it promised: I deny, that God hath promised Grace to enable all to cleanse and purifie the heart; that he requireth so to do, produce a promise if you can.

Secondly,

Secondly, Nothing short of true Faith will enable us to cleanse and purifie the heart, and that's not afforded unto all; all men have not Faith, no, nor all men where the Gospel cometh, *John* 12. 37.

Thirdly, We can't purifie our hearts till God giveth a new heart, and when that is done, he will put his spirit within us, and cause us to walk in his statutes.

Fourthly, You say, we cannot will nor do, without the Grace of God concurring with us.

Reply. This is somewhat obscure; do you mean the grace of God without us, or the principles of grace within us. If you mean the grace of God without us, as I suppose you do, then I would query, whom you intend by the subjects? whether the regenerate or the unregenerate? If you intend the regenerate, it's sound, for we are not sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves, but then it is not pertinent, for God requires sinners as well as Saints to purifie their hearts; if you mean the unregenerate, such whose hearts and wills are not reformed, they can do nothing of what God requires, granted by your self pag. 32. *The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject unto the Law of God, neither indeed can be, Rom. 8. 7.*

Fifthly, You say, God will not put his fear in our hearts, make us holy, and preserve us in the way of Salvation without our own consent and endeavour.

Reply. First, God doth never ask our consent when he bestows on us the principles of Grace; they are freely given, granted by your self page 31. the promises that God will put his fear into our hearts, *Jer. 32. 40.* that he will write his Law there,

there, *Jer.* 31. 33. are both absolute ; the promise of the Spirit also is absolute, *Ezek.* 36. 27. and whatever endeavours are put forth by us, are the fruits of his Grace, *Phil.* 2. 13.

Secondly, The fear of God once planted in the heart, will so operate in the Soul by the Influence of the Spirit, that the Soul shall not depart from God ; it's a great means of perseverance : Where the fear of God is, the Soul dares not to allow it self in sin, it cries out, how shall I do this wickedness and sin against God ? and it's a means to put us forward in duty, we are bid *To perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord*, 2 Cor. 7. 1.

Sixthly, You say, *We must work out our Salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in us, both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.*

Reply. I grant it ; to deny this is to deny the Word, yet our Salvation doth not depend on what we do, as a means procuring, but only follows it as a means preparing.

Seventhly, You say, when God affordeth us sufficient grace to obey the Gospel, it's possible for us, through our own perverse wills, to abuse his Grace, and to depart from him.

Reply. *First*, Nothing short of a New Heart, in which are all the principles of Grace, is sufficient to make us capable of Gospel-obedience.

Secondly, When that is bestowed on us, yet is not that sufficient to enable us to yield obedience to the Gospel without Divine Assistance, 2 Cor.

3. 5.

Thirdly, When God hath given us sufficient grace to obey the Gospel, he will not fail to assist us by his Spirit, so as that the principle shall be exerted

exerted in actual Obedience, *Ezek. 36. 27.*

Fourthly, It seems harsh to me to hear you call a renewed and sanctified will a perverse will, tho' I grant that there is perverseness remaining in it, yet that does not denominate it a perverse will, no more than the remainders of Hypocrisie in a sanctified soul do denominate him an Hypocrite.

Fifthly, It seems more harsh to hear you say, that a Soul may abuse the Grace of God, and depart from him, when God hath said, *He will put his fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from him.*

Eighthly, You say, that if we forsake him, he will forsake us, *2 Chron. 15. 2.*

Reply. First, It's granted, that interest in God by vertue of that covenant that took in the natural seed, considered as such, might be lost; if they departed from God, he was under no obligation to continue with them.

Secondly, I grant, that where a person doth totally and finally forsake God, God will forsake him; but this proves not that a Gracious Soul may so forsake God; and till you do that, you do nothing. Every *Hypothesis* in Scripture does not suppose a possibility; *If I go up to Heaven, thou art there*; but this supposeth not a possibility of his going up to Heaven.

Ninthly, You say, the Severity and Goodness of God are both on conditions, severity on them that fell and rejected the Gospel, but towards Believers goodness, if they continue in his goodness, otherwise they also shall be cut off, *Rom. 11. 22.*

Reply. This Quotation is impertinent, either those that are here said to be Believers were really such, or they were not; if they were, they could not

not fall away, if they were not ; their falling away proves not that a gracious soul may so fall ; a person may fall from his profession totally and finally, but that a gracious soul may so fall, is denied.

S E C T. V.

YOU say, you come again to examine the differences that I make between the Covenant of Grace, and that into which the *Jews* entred with their seed, and to vindicate your Answers to them against my Exceptions. The first Difference you say I made was this, that the Covenant into which the *Jews* entered with their seed was a covenant that might be broken, that it contained curses as well as blessings, *Deut.* 29. 20, 21. that the Covenant of Grace cannot be broken, and that it contains only blessings, and threatens no curse. Here you say I blame you for adding to what I said, that the Covenant of Grace threatned no curse is put in by your self.

Reply. I did not only blame you for adding, but also for diminishing ; I told you, that the curses of the first covenant might fall on the subjects thereof, without a sanctified use of them, as they did on the evil figs, *Jer.* 24. this you left out then, and now too.

Secondly, You say, that it seems my Opinion is now altered, and that I do now own that it threatens a curse.

Reply. If it seems so to you, yet it does not to me, for my Opinion is still the same ; I gave you no grant of any such thing, I only blamed you for adding to my words : Sure I am, there is no curse threatned in that which you say *page* 30. contains the substance of the Covenant of Grace, there are only