

## SECT. IX.

**Y**OU say, the fourth Difference that I made between the Covenant of Grace, and that which the Jews entered into with their seed, was in respect of the Subjects thereof; the Subjects of the one are the Natural seed, the subjects of the other are the Spiritual, such as are truly regenerate and holy. This description of *Abraham's* seed, you say, I deny to be mine, and you grant it was not; it was your own, and that it's agreeable with the Scripture, for the regenerate only are true members of Christ, and that do imitate *Abraham* in Faith and Obedience, and they only that are Christs, and *Walk in the steps of Abraham's faith*, are properly *Abraham's* Children, *Rom. 4. 12. Gal. 3. 29.*

*Reply.* If such only are *Abraham's* Seed, and related to Christ, that are truly regenerate and holy, then such only are the Subjects of the New Covenant; *He saith not of seeds, as of many, Gal. 3. 16.* and you may observe that the Text you quoted, *Rom. 4. 12.* excludes a part of the natural seed; *He is the Father of circumcision, to them that are not only of the Circumcision, but also walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.* Why have you endeavoured all along to prove that the natural seed, considered as such, had an interest in the Covenant of Grace, when they were not properly *Abraham's* seed? they were properly his seed according to the flesh, but it should seem they were not so according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace; and why do you endeavour to bring in the Children of Believers, considered as such, that are neither his natural seed, nor yet his spiritual, that are not really regenerate and holy? for the Covenant of Grace takes in no more but *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gen. 17. 7. Gal. 3. 16, 29.*

Secondly,

*Secondly*, I deny that the regenerate are the only persons that are related to Christ; I have proved already that the Elect were given unto Christ before they were regenerated, *John* 17. 2. They were given unto Christ before Eternal Life was given to them by Christ; he prayed for none but those that were given to him by the Father, and yet he prayed for them that should believe as well as them that did believe; they were Christ's people before they were a willing people, *Psal.* 110. 3. And sure I am, *That those that are Christs, are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.* Union with Christ may come under a Threefold Acceptation, Federal, Actual, and Reciprocal. In the last Acceptation I grant that they are the regenerate only that are related unto Christ, but in the two former Acceptations all the Elect stand one with him.

*Secondly*, You say, that the Scriptures that you brought to prove that the promises of Pardon and Salvation are made to the wicked, on condition of Repentance and Newness of Life; I answer thus, that the Promises are offered to all where the Gospel is preached, but they are made to none but the spiritual seed.

*Reply.* First, That which is offered on Condition becomes not mine till the Condition be performed. You say your self, that Justification is promised on Condition of Faith and Obedience, but we have no right to it till we perform the Condition; so then the making a promise on Condition, does not prove their Interest in the Promise. You likewise confess the *Jews* had the offer of the promise before they believed, but had no actual right to it till they believed, *Acts* 2.

*Secondly*, When I denied that the Promise was made to more than the spiritual Seed, though it was a Negative, I proved it, *Gal.* 3. 16.

*First*, You say, if the Promises be offered to them, they must some way belong to them.

*Reply.*



*Reply.* You should have proved what you first laid down, if you would have done any thing; that is, that the Promises are made to wicked Men, but this you can't; and I know not how the Promise belongs to them otherwise than in the tender thereof: And can you say of wicked Men, that they have an interest in the Promise, that never received it, merely because they have the offer of it?

*Secondly,* You say, if the Blessings be offered to many, and not really intended to be given to them, what is that but plain deluding them, under the pretence of kindness? And such dealing is inconsistent with the Nature and Perfections of God.

*Reply.* First, That to delude Men under the pretence of kindness is inconsistent with the Nature of God, I grant, but that here is any such Delusion is denied.

*Secondly,* God offers nothing in the Promise, but if those to whom its offered will receive it, they shall have it; if they will not, the fault is their own, and the evil of rejecting it will one day be charged upon them; yet many that have the offer go without the Blessing.

*Thirdly,* You say, that what follows I made no Reply to, because there was no Scripture proof to it, which is an easie way of answering the most solid Reason.

*Reply.* I have reviewed what I then past over without a Reply, and I find nothing of Argument in it; there are some impertinent Similes of a Wife in Covenant with her Husband, and of a Servant with his Master, though both unfaithful, but what are these Similes to those that were never in Covenant? You do but beg the Question to say, that all that make a Profession of the true Faith are in the Covenant, though they do not walk answerable thereunto.

*Fourthly,* You say, that Text, Rom. 9. which I brought to prove, that all the Seed of Abraham had not an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, shews they were such of them



them as rejected Christ, and hardened their Hearts against him. My Reply to this, you say, is, that the Reason why they rejected Christ, was because they had no Interest in the Promise?

Reply. I think the Answer pertinent enough, and that there is ground for it in the Text, *verse 6.* it cannot be, *That the Word of God should have taken none effect, but all are not Israel that are of Israel:* That was the Reason why they went without the Benefit of the Promise, because they had no interest in it; they are the Children of the Promise that are accounted for the Seed, not the Children of the Flesh.

Secondly, You say, that when those Jews had rejected Christ, and continued obstinate in their iniquity, they had then no Interest in the Promise, nor were they the Children of God.

Reply. Interest in the Promise can't be lost; if they had no Interest when they rejected Christ, they had none before; nor Relation to God by vertue of Interest in the Promise can't be lost: *The Servant abideth not in the House for ever, but the Son abideth ever.*

Thirdly, You say, that whilst the Gospel was preached to them, and Grace offered, they had a possibility to have believed in Christ, and if they had believed, they would have been received as Children.

Reply. First, Here is a grant, that some of the natural Seed that were under Gospel means, were not the Children of God; and grant this, and it will necessarily follow, that they had no interest in the Promise, for they are the Children of the Promise that are accounted for the Seed.

Secondly, I deny, that barely the offer of Grace in the tender of the Promise puts Men into a capacity of believing; nothing short of the Principle or habit of Faith, which is infused in a Work of Regeneration, renders a Person capable of believing; there must be a Principle



ple of Life, or there can't be an Act of Life, men are spiritually Dead while in a natural State, *Eph. 2. 1.* the Understanding dark, wholly destitute of spiritual light, the Will non-compliant with the Will of God, and without a Principle of Grace, by which the Understanding is enlightened, and the Will reformed; it's impossible for Men to do what God requires, granted by your self, (*Page 31, 32.*)

*Fourthly*, You say, they had Grace and Means allowed them, sufficient to enable them to believe, otherwise they had not been bound to believe.

*Reply. First*, I affirm, that all are bound to believe where the Gospel comes, *1 John 3. 23.* Were not Men bound to believe where the Gospel comes, they could not be charged for unbelief.

*Secondly*, I deny, that all where the Gospel comes have Grace allowed them, sufficient to enable them to believe. We read of four sorts of Ground on which the Seed was cast, *Mark 4.* and there was but one of the four that had it's Nature changed, the other three remained the same, High-way, Stony, and Thorny Ground, as they were before; the good ground was antecedently good to the receiving of the Seed, it was immediately prepared by the Spirit, *1 Cor. 2.* *The natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, nor can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned: He wants a spiritual Eye, which is always supposed necessary to behold a spiritual Object: The carnal Mind is Enmity against God, and is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be, Rom. 8. 7. To you it is given to know the Mystery of the Kingdom of God, but to them it is not given, Mat. 13.* yet these were the Jews, and such as had the Gospel preached to them; so that now it will be expected that you should prove what you so boldly assert, that these Jews had Grace enough allowed them to repent and believe; and how that can be done, while the contrary lies so plain before you, I cannot tell,

*Fifth.*

*Fifthly*, You say, that it was their own fault that they did not believe.

*Reply*. I grant it: As a fault may be considered an evil, it was their Sin that they did not believe, but this proves not that they had a Power to believe.

*Sixthly*, You say, that Christ would often have gathered them, but they would not.

*Reply*. I grant it, in respect of the means that was afforded them, it was the revealed Will of Christ that they should believe, but was it his absolute Will? if it had, who could have hindered that?

*Secondly*, In that they would not believe, it appeared they could not; it's a sign their Wills were never changed, and if so, it's granted by your self that they could not believe, (Page 32.)

*Secondly*, It was a sign they were none of Christ's People, for if they had, they should have been a willing People; *Thy People shall be willing in the day of thy Power.*

*Seventhly*, Christ spake and did many things (you say) that they might be saved, but they would not come unto him that they might have Life, John 5. 34, 40.

*Reply*. Did he change their Hearts, or did he not? If not, then they could not come to him; if he did, they would not have remain'd unwilling; the change of the Heart is always followed with the assistance of the Spirit, causing to walk in God's Statutes, and to observe his Judgments.

*Eighthly*, You say, that he told them that he was the Messiah, and that he did many Miracles among them by the Power of God, which did sufficiently testify that he was sent by him, yet all this wrought no belief in them, all which did testify that they were not those Sheep that heard the good Shepherds Voice, John 10. 25, 26.

*Reply*. All this I readily grant you, and I think I can't argue it more strongly than you have argued it

for



for me, and the Text last quoted makes against you; *Ye believe not, because ye are not my Sheep*; as I said unto you, *My Sheep hear my Voice, and they follow me*: He did not say, ye are not my Sheep, because ye believe not; *But ye believe not, because ye are not my Sheep*; unbelief is certainly the Consequence, if not the Effect of Non-Relation unto Jesus Christ; *Ye believe not, because ye are not my Sheep*: It was a certain sign, that they were none of Christ's Sheep, their abiding in unbelief; had they been some of Christ's Sheep, they should have heard Christ's Voice, *John 10. 16.*

*Reply.* This grant is as much as I desire, they were *Abrahams Seed*, and yet not the Children of the Promise, so that the Promise then is distinct from that Covenant into which the Natural Seed was taken; and what is the Promise here but the Covenant of Grace? And this is, as I said at first, the ground why they did not believe, because they had no Interest in the Promise, and that they had not an Interest in the Promise you have at last confest.

Again, you say, I do farther urge, that God is said to have loved *Jacob*, and to have hated *Esau*, and Question, how a Person can be hated of God, and yet a subject of his Love, and in the Covenant of his Grace? To this you say,

*First*, That when the Prophet speaks of Gods loving *Jacob*, and hating *Esau*, he intends it of their Posterity, *Mal. 1. 2, 3, 4.* and so *Obadiah*.

*Reply.* Whatever the Prophet intends, the Apostle speaks of the same two individual Persons, as appears by the Coherence; and the same two individual Persons are mentioned by the Prophet: *Was not Esau Jacob's Brother? Yet I loved Jacob, and hated Esau.* That of *Obadiah* is impertinent, it only mentions a Judgment threatned against the *Edomites*.

*Secondly*, You say, that a Man professing the true Faith

Faith, may be within the Covenant of Grace, though God does not accept his Person, nor approve his Work.

*Reply.* If God does not accept his Person, he hath no Interest in Christ, for all that have an Interest in him are accepted in that beloved, *Eph. 1. 6.* and if no Interest in Christ, then no Interest in the Covenant of Grace, *Gal. 3. 16, 29.*

*Thirdly,* You say, there is a twofold Love in God, a Love of Pity, and a Love of Complacency: God loved us all with a Love of Pity; *Even when we were dead in Trespasses and Sins, Eph. 2. 4, 5.* He Loves those only with a Love of Complacency who love him, *John 14. 21.*

*Reply.* That there is a twofold Love in God I grant; a Love to his own, and a Love to Strangers; the Lord loveth the Stranger, in that he giveth him Food and Raiment; that the Love of God is so to be distinguished as you have stated it, I deny; neither are the Scriptures you bring, to be taken in the sense you give of them; that in the *Ephefians* is not to be applied to all, but to a peculiar People, nor to be expounded barely of a Love of Pity, but of the good Will of God to his People. *First,* It's applied to a peculiar People, that are distinct from the World, as appears by the preceeding verses; *You hath he quickned, who were dead in Trespasses and Sins, who in time past walked according to the Course of this World, among whom we all had our Conversations in time past, and were by Nature the Children of Wrath even as others: (As they stood related to the first Adam they were sentenced unto Wrath together with him,) But God who is rich in Mercy, for the great Love wherewith he loved us, When we were dead in Trespasses and Sins, hath quickned us together with Christ: By Grace are ye saved: This us, to whom this Love is applied, are distinct from others.*

*Secondly,* It appears by the Effect, that they are a pecu-



peculiar People, and that it's not only a Love of Pity, but the good Will of God, or the Free Grace of God, which was given to them in Christ Jesus before the World was. Those that were thus loved of God were quickened together with Christ, when they were dead in Trespasses and Sins. This quickening here is to be taken in Point of Justification, for it's the same with saving in the next Verse; *By Grace ye are saved*: In this sense is the Word taken, Col. 2. 13, 14. *And hath quickened you together with him, having forgiven you all Sins, blotting out the hand-writing, &c.* A Soul is then said to be quickened when his Sin is pardoned, and the bond that bound over to Wrath cancelled. If Justification was not extended to all, then this Love was not extended unto all; for love, and quickening, or saving here in the Text, are of equal extent, with respect to the subjects thereof; *Whom he loved, them he saved.*

Secondly, That Text in John speaks not of the bestowing of Love, but of the Manifestation thereof: God's Love to us doth not depend on our Love to him, our Love to God is but a Fruit of his Love to us; *We love him, because he first loved us*, 1 John 4. 19. but the Manifestation of his love to us, though it be not an Effect, yet is it a consequent of our Love to him: *He that loveth me (saith Christ) shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest my self unto him*: The latter Clause is Explanatory of the former; *And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.* And the Love of Complacency that you speak of, is not a love that hath its beginning in time, but is comprehended in the good Will of God, which was to his People from Eternity, Prov. 8. 31. *And my delights were with the Sons of Men*: When? why before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever the Earth or the World was made.

Fourthly, You say, that as for that Text, Gal. 3. 16. That

That the Promises that were made to him and his Seed, not to Seeds, in the Plural, which might make a difference between Jew and Gentile, but in the Singular, which is Christ, considered as Head of a Family, as appears in verse 14. and 1 Cor. 12. 13. so that all that are Members of that Body whereof Christ is the Head, have some Interest in the Promises; for all that profess Christ are externally in Christ, John 15. 6.

Reply. First, I grant, the Promises were made to Christ, as Head of a Body, and in him to all the Members of that Body, that Mystical Body whereof Christ is the Mystical Head, this is that I asserted at first; but the Question is, Who they are that are the Members of that Body? Not all that make a Profession of Christ, as you would gather from 1 Cor. 12. 12. there the Apostle speaks, as he does elsewhere, in the Judgment of Charity, but here in the Judgment of Infallibility: *To Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made*: This is certain, none can deny it. An infallible Mark or Character you have of the Members of this Body, verse 29. *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed*: He doth not say, *If ye profess the true Faith, but if ye be Christ's*; so that such as were given to Christ by the Father, and only such, are the Members of this Body, to whom the Promises were made.

Secondly, You grant, that this Body is made up both of Jews and Gentiles; now the Gentiles were not a professing People when the Promises were first made to them, Rom. 4. 17. *I have made thee a Father of many Nations*; speaking of those things that were not as if they were: These were all taken into Union with Christ, when he took our Nature upon him, Eph. 1. 10. the 2. 15, 16. *That he might make in himself of Twain one new Man, and that he might reconcile both unto God in one Body by the Cross*: Jew and Gentile were never one body politick, therefore it must be one body mystical; which could be no other way



way but by union with him who is the Mystical Head ; and thus they were, when they were reconciled to God by the Cross, or by the Blood of the Cross ; now those only that are united to Christ are that Body to whom the Promises were made ; they were made to no more than shall enjoy the good and benefit of them, Rom. 4. 16. *It is by faith, that it might be by Grace, to the end that the promise might be sure to all the seed :* That in the 14th. verse, that you brought to prove that Christ is the Head of a professing family, is not to the purpose ; that speaks not of the *Gentiles* as a Professing People, but of the *Gentiles* as redeemed by Christ ; and the blessing of *Abraham* that is there said to come upon them, is to be understood of all the positive good of the New-Covenant, Grace here, and Glory hereafter.

*Secondly*, You say, that all that profess Jesus Christ are externally in him, and so have some right to the Promises.

*Reply. First*, If by an External Interest in Christ you mean, that such as make a profession of Christ are in the Judgment of Charity to be lookt on as having an Interest in Christ, and consequently in the Promises, I grant it ; but if this be not your meaning, when you say they are externally in Christ, then I know not what you intend by it.

*Secondly*, If they are not really what they profess themselves to be, however they may be lookt on by others, they have no Interest in Christ, nor in the Promises ; they make themselves Hypocrites by their Profession, and such have no interest in Christ by being Hypocrites.

*Thirdly*, Though those that make a profession of Faith are in the Judgment of Charity to be lookt on as having an Interest in the promise, yet this lets not their Children into the Judgment of Charity that make no Profession.

Again,

Again, You say, you proved in your former that Abraham's Spiritual Seed can't certainly be known by their Profession and Conversion.

*Reply. First,* Then we may not conclude, that every Professor is a Member of that Body to which the Promises are made. You grant in your Reply to *Gal. 3.29.* that it's the spiritual seed only that is there described, and I think it can't rationally be denied, but that the seed in the *29th. verse,* and the seed in the *16th.* are the same, and so the Promises are made to no more but the Spiritual Seed.

*Secondly,* I grant, the spiritual seed can't certainly be known to any but themselves: It's possible that a gracious soul may know himself to be one of that number.

*Thirdly,* There are none among the *Gentiles* that are the seed of *Abraham*, but such as are his spiritual or his mystical Seed, for that is it that I intend by his spiritual seed.

*Fourthly,* There are none but the seed of *Abraham* that are the subjects of this Covenant, whence I conclude that you can no farther look on a person to be a subject of this Covenant, than you can look on him to be one of the spiritual Seed; nor can you look on him to be one of the spiritual Seed farther than you can look on him to be a Believer, and so walking in the steps of *Abraham's Faith.*

Again, You say, that I acknowledge that such as truly repent have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace; and seeing I grant this, it must needs follow that they had a conditional right to the promise before their Conversion.

*Reply. First,* They had more than a Conditional Right to the Promise, they had an absolute right, and their Conversion is a fruit of their Interest: *To us are given great and precious promises, that by them we might be made partakers of the Divine Nature, 2 Pet. 1.4.* But what is this to those that never repent? Such as do in time repent are the Subjects of the New-Covenant, that's granted; they that never repent, were never the Subjects thereof.



You say, it seems you were mistaken, when you thought I had lookt on the regenerate to be the only Subjects of the Covenant of Grace, and that I do now declare that they are the Elect, and only the Elect, that I own to be the Subjects of that Covenant; and having described the Elect, I endeavoured to prove it. You say, it's strange to you that I make a difference between the Elect and the Regenerate, when you thought that according to my Principles I had held that the regenerate should never fall finally from Grace, and consequently that they were Elect.

*Reply.* I grant, that the regenerate are Elect, but all the Elect are not yet regenerate.

*Secondly,* I grant, the Regenerate to be the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace, but not the only Subjects thereof, so that my distinction deserves no Objection.

*Secondly,* I suppose by this time you are satisfied that it is my Principle that the regenerate shall not fall away.

*Secondly,* You say, I seem to contradict my self, when I say, shew me a Believer, and I will shew you an Elect Person, and yet conclude that the regenerate are not the only subjects of this Covenant; for if all true Believers are the Elect, then all the regenerate are the Elect, because all the regenerate are Believers.

*Reply.* I wonder how you came to think I contradict my self, or that this should be such a Paradox to you: That all true Believers are the Elect, is granted; that all the Elect do yet believe, is denied; the reason why I said, shew me a true Believer, and I will shew you an Elect Person, was, because Faith is so peculiarly the priviledge of God's Elect, that their Election may be argued from it; *They were those only that were ordained to eternal life that believed,* Acts 13.

*Thirdly,* You say, there are as great Errors in my description of the Elect, and my endeavours to prove them the only Subjects of the Covenant of Grace.

*Reply.*



*Reply.* If they be no greater than the seeming contradictions you charged me with, it's well enough.

The first Error you say is this, that I tell you Men are not elected upon a foresight of Holiness, but that they should be holy, *Eph. 1. 4.* You say, that there is a great difference between Election to the end, and Election to the means: Election to the means is not of Works, but of him that calleth, for God affordeth us the means of Grace, *that we should be holy, Eph. 1. 4.*

*Reply.* Here is not one word of the means of Grace, but of Grace it self; *That we should be holy, and without blame before him in love.* I told you there were four things which lay in the very surface of the Text: *First*, That this choice was of particular persons, *Paul and the Ephesians.* *Secondly*, That it was made before the foundation of the World. *Thirdly*, That it was made in Christ. And, *Fourthly*, It was, that we should be holy. Now shew me my Error in any one of these four if you can; and from hence I concluded, that we were not chosen upon a foresight that we would be holy, but that we should be holy; and if need were, I could back it with several Scriptures, but till I have a more pertinent answer to this, I shall stand by the same.

*Secondly*, You say, that Election to the End hath respect to Faith and Holiness as the Conditions, *For God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the Truth, 2 Thes. 2. 13.* but if God elected Men absolutely, without any consideration of their Holiness, he might as well as bestow Salvation on them without Holiness, because the actual giving of Salvation is no more restrained than the willing of it.

*Reply.* Do you now deal fairly with me, in that you seem to intimate, that I have asserted Election to Salvation, without any consideration of Holiness as the means? You do not say that it's so laid down by me; but if you would not have it to be so taken by the Reader, why have



have you phrased it so dubiously? I gave you a description of the Elect, what was the reason you did not fairly recite it, but keep it dormant as it were? was it not that you might have the greater Advantage upon me to expose my Principles to reproach? but seeing you have dealt so unfairly with me, I shall briefly recite it my self. The Description that it gave you is as followeth, It's a choice that God hath made in Christ, before the foundation of the World, of a peculiar people to Salvation as the End, and to Sanctification as the Means. Here is no such thing as Election to the end, without any consideration of the means, I put both the means and the end in one decree; *That we should be holy*, and that we should be happy, and both were proved *2 Thes. 2. 13. Eph. 1. 4.* but where you will find a Text to prove that Election to the end hath respect to Faith and Holiness as conditions foreseen, I know not, nor is there any such thing as a conditional Election to be found in the Word. The Decree of God is absolute, in which there is both the end and the means, the means are as absolutely decreed as the end, and the Subjects shall in time enjoy both.

My Second Error you say is this, that I make God's electing Men to be antecedent to his foreknowledge; this you say is directly contrary to *Rom. 8. 29. Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate*: Here Predestination is subsequent to Foreknowledge, and depends upon it, and if Election follows God's prescience of Faith, or his foreacknowledging us for his, then Faith in order of nature is before Election, because every object doth precede the act conversant about it.

*Reply.* How will you make good your charge against me here? where I have asserted Election antecedent to the foreknowledge of God, I said indeed that God did choose us, not upon a foresight that we would be holy; now I suppose there is a vast difference between that  
fore-

fore-sight Rom. 8. 29. and a bare fore-sight of what would be in time. *Leigh* in his Annotations, cited by *Wilson*, tells you, that the word is not "That he knew before, but he acknowledged before, 2 Tim. 2. 19. *The Lord knoweth who are his: The Lord hath not cast away his people whom he foreknew*, Rom. 11. 2. By prescience here we are not to understand simply the foreknowledge of God, but his foreacknowledging, which is a knowledge with approbation. The Learned Dr. *Hammond* reads it, "Whom God hath fore-approved and acknowledged to be his, according to the purport of the Gospel; whom he knew as a Shepherd doth his flock: *The Annotations* reads it "Those whom he marked out as it were from all the Men in the world, and set his affection upon: And you your self read it here, "God's foreacknowledging us to be his, which is the same thing with fore-choosing, *Rom. 11. God hath not cast away his people whom he did foreknow*: For there is at this time a remnant according to the Election of Grace. Foreknowledge and Election are here put one for another: Now to say that I make Election antecedent to this Foreknowledge, is an abuse offered me.

Secondly, You say, that Predestination is subsequent to Foreknowledge, and that it depends upon it.

Reply. This is yet to prove; though it be penn'd in the second place, there is no first and second in the decrees of God, but all things are at one act laid in the Counsel of the most High.

Thirdly, You say, that Faith was here foreseen.

Reply. That's yet to prove too; I may not take it upon your bare Word: The Text speaks of Persons, not of Quality; or Qualifications; *Whom he foreknew, or fore-acknowledged, to be his*, (so you read it) and if it be the Person that is here said to be foreknown, then it's not the Quality, and so Faith is not in order of nature



ture antecedent to Election, for that is not the object that the act is conversant about.

*Fourthly*, I deny, that predestination in this place is to the end : It's not to Salvation, but to be conformable to the Image of his Son. Predestination in this place is unto holiness : You your self expound it of suffering, page 21. he predetermined unto sufferings after the manner of Christ : Now there is a vast difference between suffering and reigning, the one preceeds the other ; *If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him.*

You say, my third Error is this, that I make some men to be the sheep of Christ whilst Unbelievers, and the Text I quote for it, is, *Joh. 10. 17. And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one shepherd and one sheepfold.*

*Reply.* I think you can't charge me with an Error in speaking Christs words, and not charge Christ also : What have I here spoken but what Christ spake before ? And wherein have I abused the sence of what Christ spake ? *First*, Christ tells you he hath other sheep, he doth not say he shall have ; he speaks not in the future, but in the present Tense ; in the 14<sup>th</sup>. verse he speaks of some sheep that knew him ; *I know my sheep, and am known of mine* ; in this verse he speaks of other sheep that he had, these are distinct from them that knew him.

*Secondly*, He saith, that they are not of this fold ; his sheep they were, but not yet folded ; that is, not in that fold where those were that did already know Christ, these were sheep that did not know him, therefore they did not yet believe in him. *Thirdly*, He saith, *Them I must bring* ; that is, into the same fold where those were that did know him ; for he saith, *There shall be one shepherd and one sheepfold.* *Fourthly*, He saith, *They shall hear my voice* ; they were his sheep at present, but they had not heard Christ's voice, therefore they had not yet believed.

*Secondly,*

Secondly, You say, that the Text speaks of the *Gentiles* only, and proves that they should in due time become his sheep; that is, *Hear his voice, and obey him.*

Reply. First, This Interpretation is too narrow, for not only the *Gentiles* are intended, but the *Jews* also, that is, the Elect among them; for by the fold here we are not to understand the *Jews*, as they are considered a National Church, but of such only as did know the Lord. In the first sence, the *Gentiles* were not to be brought into them; In the Second, the *Jews* were to be brought in as well as the *Gentiles*; that is, the Elect both of *Jew* and *Gentile*.

Secondly, I would Query, What Warrant you have to change the Tenses here, to put the future Tense for the present? Christ saith, *That other sheep I have*; you say, that other sheep he shall have.

Thirdly, You say, that Christ tells you, *His sheep hear his voice, and they follow him.*

Reply. It's granted, sooner or later they shall hear his voice, for they have a Promise in the Text, *They shall hear my voice*: But who are they that hear his voice? Are they not his sheep, his sheep antecedent thereunto? As for others, they do not hear his voice, they turn a deaf ear to the call of Christ, *John 10. 26. Ye believe not, because ye are not my sheep, as I said unto you: They had no Relation unto Jesus Christ, and therefore did not believe in Jesus Christ; they were not Branches in the Vine, how then could they bring forth the Fruit of the Vine?*

Fourthly, You say, that none are in Christ but such as are New-Creatures, *2 Cor. 5. 17.*

Reply. Interest in Christ may come under a threefold Consideration.

First, It may be considered in respect of Donation, as being given him by the Father, *John 17. Thine they were, and thou gavest them unto me: This Gift of the Father to*



The Son, was antecedent to the Gift of Eternal Life to them by the Son, *verse 2.*

*Secondly*, Interest in Christ may be considered in respect of actual Union: Christ in taking our nature upon him took us into union with himself, *Eph. 1. 10. the 2. 14, 16. He took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham, Heb. 2. or, He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham, Margent.*

*Thirdly*, Interest in Christ may be considered in respect of Reciprocation; and in this last sense I grant, that none are in Christ but such as are New-Creatures; but in the two former, the Elect are in Christ antecedent to the New-Creature. I think this is held as a Maxim, that Union is the ground of Communion; the New-Creature is communicated, *Tit. 3. 6. The branch cannot bear fruit of it self, unless it be in the vine: Christ is the Vine, the Believer is the Branch, Faith is the Fruit; the Branch must be in the Vine antecedent to the bringing forth the fruit of the Vine.*

My Fourth Error, you say, is this, that I appropriate all the Blessings of the Covenant of Grace to the Elect: Here you grant that none but the Elect or faithful persevering Christians shall inherit Eternal Glory, but there are many Blessings of the Covenant, as Vocation, and many offers of Grace and Mercy that are come upon all Believers.

*Reply. First*, I would Query, Whether by the Elect or faithful persevering Christians you intend the same Persons as I think you do? if not, then I would Query how it appears that there are faithful persevering Christians amongst the Non-Elect?

*Secondly*, If by Believers here you mean true Believers, then you do not convince me of Error; for if they do believe, they are Elect, and so you bring in no more to share in New-Covenant-Blessings than I do: If they be not true Believers, then whatever they do profess, they are

are but Hypocrites and Unbelievers, and the greater their profession is, the greater is their Hypocrisie: Now that there is any New-Covenant Blessing which belongs to those that live and dye Unbelievers, I deny.

*Thirdly*, There are some things that belong to the Elect by vertue of the New-Covenant, which are New-covenant Blessings unto them, that yet are not so to others, though they have them. Food and Raiment comes to the Elect by vertue of the Covenant of Grace, and the same things come to *Pagans* and *Heathens*, that have no Interest in the Covenant of Grace.

*Fourthly*, To be under a Gospel call, and not to Answer it, will be an Aggravation of a Persons Misery.

*Secondly*, You say, that Vocation and several offers of Grace and Mercy belongs to all Believers: If by Vocation you intend an Effectual Call, this belongs to the Elect only, *Rom. 8. 30. Whom he did predestinate, them he also called*: But if by Vocation you intend a common Call, this is extended to all where the Gospel comes; this has been and may be to *Jews* and *Pagans* that reject it, and such you grant have no Interest in the Covenant of Grace.

*Thirdly*, You say, the whole Church of *Ephesus* were blest with all spiritual Blessings necessary to bring them to Heaven, *Eph. 1. 3.* But it can hardly be proved that they were all elected, and continued faithful unto the end; nay, some of them did fall, and were threatened unless they repented, *Rev. 2.*

*Reply. First*, If they were blessed with all spiritual blessings necessary to bring them to Heaven, then they were blest with perseverance; unless you will deny that to be a spiritual Blessing, or that Perseverance is necessary to bring to Heaven, but neither of these can be denied. For *First* Perseverance is a promised Blessing, and of a spiritual Nature, *John 10. 28.*

*Secondly*, It's so necessary to Salvation, that without it



it a Person can't be saved ; *He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.*

*Secondly*, You say, that it can hardly be proved that they were all elected, and continued faithful unto the End.

*Reply. First*, The one may be proved as well as the other ; he that saith, *They were blessed with all spiritual blessings*, doth likewise declare, *That it was according as he had chosen them in him before the foundation of the World, that they should be holy, and without blame before him in love.* Here is both their Election and their Perseverance asserted ; their Election in that they were chosen unto holiness, their Perseverance in the last Words, *Without blame before him in love.* Apostacy never leaves a Soul blameless : If they were chosen to a blameless state, then to a persevering state, but they were chosen to a blameless state, therefore to a persevering state.

*Secondly*, I suppose you are not ignorant, that when the Apostle writes to particular Churches, and declares what Blessings are bestowed upon them, he writes in the Judgment of Charity, looking on them to be such as they profess themselves to be, though the Rules he gives them to observe are infallible, *Phil. 1. 7. He that hath begun a good work in you, will not cease to perfect it, as it's meet for me to think so of you all : Did the Apostle Peter style the Church Elect according to the foreknowledge of God, 1 Pet. 1. 2. otherwise than in the Judgment of Charity ? If they were not in reality what they profess themselves to be, then they were not blest with all those spiritual Blessings ; and if some of these fall away, nay, grant that they did totally and finally fall away, all that can be said of them is this, They went out from us, but they were not all of us ; if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.*

*Fourthly*, You say, that all that can be gathered from *Rom. 11. 6.* is the remnant of the Jews that believed and obey-



obeyed the Gospel, obtained Justification, the rest that resisted the Gospel grew obstinately blind.

*Reply.* First, I would Query, Whether they did not obtain Sanctification as well as Justification? Whether Faith was the Improvement of Nature? was not that a New-Covenant Blessing?

Secondly, I grant that some of them believed, and obeyed the Gospel, and the rest did not; but who were they that believed and obeyed? were they not the Elect only? And who were they that rejected Christ? were not they the Non-elect? *The Election hath obtained, and the rest were blinded.* Do what you can, you can't bring in one person more than the Elect to share in New-Covenant Blessings.

Fifthly, You say, that though those that reject the Gospel are cast off and excluded the mercies of it, yet those that embrace the Gospel are in the Covenant of Grace, and in a good Capacity to obtain the Blessings thereof.

*Reply.* I grant it: Such as do truly embrace the Gospel, if they believe in Jesus Christ, they have obtained some of them already, and they shall obtain the rest; *He that believeth, shall be saved:* Yet are these the Elect still, for Faith is so peculiarly the Privilege of the Elect, that from the one the other may be argued, *1 Thes. 1. 4.*

My Fifth Error, you say, was this, that Christ suffered only for the Elect, which I endeavoured to prove by these Scriptures, *Isa. 53. 8. John 10. 15. Eph. 5. 25. John 17. 9.* where it is said, *That Christ was smitten for his people, and laid down his life for his sheep, and gave himself for his Church, and prayed for those that were given him of the Father, and not for the World.* You say, its true that Christ gave himself for his Church and People, and he died for all men too; *For Christ is the Saviour of all men,* (saith the Apostle) *especially of those that believe,*



believe; 1 Tim. 4.10. He is a special Saviour of the Faithful, in that he hath not only satisfied for their sins, but will confer on them the benefits of Redemption; and he is a General Saviour to all Men, in that he hath paid the price of their Redemption, and restored them to such a Capacity of Salvation, as that they may obtain it, if they be diligent; and they that perish do not perish for want of Redemption purchased for them, but through their own wicked wilfulness.

*Reply.* I must in the first place take a little notice how you read this Text, that you have so largely paraphrased upon; you say the Apostle tells us, *That Christ is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe*: I must object against your reading the Text, as well as against your Exposition, there is not a Word of Christ in the Text, nor is Christ considered there as Mediator; the Text runs thus, *For this cause we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the Living God, who is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe*: Now though Christ as Mediator is God as well as Man, yet he is not here considered as Mediator, nor as distinct from the Father and the Spirit: As he is in his Mediatory Office, the living God in this place is to be considered Father, Son and Spirit.

*Secondly,* This Text speaks not of Redemption, but of an outward Salvation, which by the providence of God is extended unto all, but especially to them that believe; that it intends an outward Salvation appears, *First*, in that it's opposed to suffering, and is a Ground of Encouragement to the people of God in suffering; *We therefore labour and suffer, because we trust in the living God*; but what do they trust in God for? I answer, it's for Salvation; and what is that Salvation? Why, such as is extended to all Men, it's a Common Salvation in respect of the matter of it, though it be extended to Believers in a special manner; it comes to them through  
the

the Covenant of Grace, they are under his special Providence, and nothing shall befall them but what shall be for their advantage: God hath promised them, *That he will not suffer them to be tempted above what they are able to bear*, 1 Cor. 10. 13.

Secondly, It appears that it is an outward Salvation, in that Believers, considered as such, are the subjects thereof; *He is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe*: But Believers, considered as such, are not the Subjects of Redemption: *Christ died for sinners, the just for the unjust, that he might bring them unto God.*

Secondly, You say, that Christ will confer on them that believe the Benefits of Redemption.

Reply. First, I would Query, Whether Christ will confer on them that believe all the benefits of Redemption, which will amount to a full, ample and compleat Discharge from all sin, past, present and to come? this I suppose you will not grant me, for it would interfere with your principle of falling from Grace; if all sin, past, present, and to come, were pardoned to every believer, then there could be no such thing as a Believer to fall away and be damned.

Secondly, I would Query, How Christ may be said to be a Special Saviour to them that believe, when some of them that believe may at last fall away and be damned as well as others? for so you hold; but how inconsistent such principles are, let the Reader judge.

Thirdly, I would Query, Whether Faith it self be not one of the Benefits of Redemption? Whether it be not one Branch of the Blessing of *Abraham* that comes on those that are redeemed from the Curse of the Law, Gal. 3. 13. and how it comes about that Faith comes on some that are redeemed by Christ, and not on all.

Secondly, You say, that he is a General Saviour to all Men, in that he hath paid the price of their Redemption.

Reply.



*Reply.* If Christ hath paid the price of their Redemption, then Justice is satisfied with the price paid, or it is not: If it be, then Justice it self pleads their discharge for whom the price was paid; if it be not, it's for want of Merit in the price paid, and that were blasphemy to assert.

*Secondly,* If Christ paid a price for all, then all are discharged, or they are not; if they are, then none shall perish; if they are not, then are they denied that which in Justice is their right.

*Thirdly,* If Christ hath paid a price for all, then he hath his purchase, or he hath not: If he hath, then are all justified, *Isa. 53. 11. By his Knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many, for he shall bear their Iniquities.* Those whose Sins were born by Christ were justified by Christ, *1 Pet. 2. 24. By whose stripes ye were healed.* If he hath not his purchase, then the Promise fails to Christ, *Isa. 53. 10. When thou shalt make his Soul an offering for Sin, he shall see his Seed, he shall see of the travel of his Soul, and shall be satisfied:* Who can think that Christ sees of the travel of his Soul with satisfaction, when so many thousands for whom he travelled in Soul, and for whose Sins he made his Soul an offering, to go without the Benefit of it?

*Thirdly,* You say, that all Men are restored to such a Capacity of Salvation, that they may attain it if they are diligent to do their Duty.

*Reply.* Is there a Power given to all to do what God requires, or is there not? If you say there is, then I would desire you to answer those Scriptures that seem to me to speak the contrary, *Rom. 8. 7, 8. Heb. 11. 6. 1 Cor. 2. 24.* If you say, that all Men have not a Power to do what God requires of them, then they are not restored to such a capacity as to be saved, let them do what they can.

*Secondly,* Are all called by the Word and Spirit? have

have they the first Degree of Grace, by which their Understandings are enlightened, and their Wills renewed, or have they not? If you say they are, then I would desire you to prove it too, and shew me how those may be said to be called by the Word and Spirit, that never had the Word vouchsaf'd to them; if you say, they are not so called and qualified, then they can't possibly do what God requires of them, granted by your self, pag. 31, 32.

*Fourthly*, You say, that none do perish for want of Redemption purchased for them, but through their own wicked Wilfulness.

*Reply. First*, If there be Redemption purchased for all, then all have the Benefit of it, or they have not: If they have, then have all their sins pardoned, for Redemption and Remission of Sin is the same thing, *Eph. 1. 7. In whom we have redemption through his Blood, even the forgiveness of our sins*: If they have not, then are they denied that which in justice they ought to have. It's inconsistent with the justice of Man to hold a Captive still in bonds when his Friend hath paid his Ransom. But you will say, that some will not consent to be discharged upon the account of the Ransom paid by Christ. I answer, the Question is not what men will consent to, but what the Father by vertue of the Compact between the Son and himself hath consented unto: Either the Father did consent that those for whom the Son paid this Ransom, should be discharged, or he did not; if he did, then are all discharged, if not, then none could be discharged, for it was not the price paid, (though it was of infinite worth) that could procure the Discharge of any, but the consent of the Father, to receive the satisfaction in the payment of it. A Creditor may refuse a Debt, when tendered by another, he may require it of the Debtor, but when he hath consented to take it of a Surety, then he can't refuse it, nor can he hold the Debtor



Debtor under Obligation, having received full satisfaction by the Surety.

*Secondly*, Christ hath purchased Redemption from all sins, or he hath not; if he hath, then for their Unbelief, then for their wicked Wilfulness, so that there is now nothing left to damn where Christ died to save; if he hath not, then do they still perish for want of Redemption purchased for them.

*Thirdly*, The Efficacy of the price paid by Christ did depend on the Will of the Creature, or it did not: If it did, none could have the Benefit of it. Naturally men are averse to Jesus Christ, and to Salvation by Christ: Men will not come to Christ that they may have life. A Will to come to Jesus Christ is one of the Positive Blessings of the New-Covenant, held forth in a free Promise, *Psal.* 110. 3. But men must be at liberty from the Curse of the Law, antecedent to the enjoyment of this Blessing, *Gal.* 3. 13, 14. If the Efficacy of the price did not depend on the Will of the Creature, then all for whom the price was paid shall have the Benefit thereof.

*Fourthly*, Either Jesus Christ redeemed all from final Unbelief, or he did not; if he did, none shall perish for Unbelief; if he did not, then some shall perish for want of a Redeemer.

*Secondly*, You say, that in this sense the Scripture plainly teacheth that Christ died for all, *John* 3. 16, 17. 1 *John* 2. 2. You say, *God so loved the World, that, &c.* and that Christ came to save the World, and that he is a Propitiation for the sins of the whole World.

*Reply*. I suppose that one Answer may serve to all these Scriptures, for it's the word *World*, or the *whole World*, that you insist upon.

*First*, This word *World* hath various Acceptations in Scripture, and nothing may be concluded barely from an equical word farther than the Scope of the place leads to it. There are three Acceptations of the word

word in one verse, John 1. 10. *He was in the World; that is, the Habitable Part of the World; and the World was made by him; the whole Universe, Heaven and Earth, and all things therein; and the World knew him not; the poor, blind, unregenerate part of the World.* In this last Acceptation the Word is taken, 1 John 5. 19. *Beloved, we are of God, and the whole World lieth in Wickedness: There were some that were born of God, therefore it can't be understood of every individual person, but of the unregenerate only.*

Secondly, The word is sometimes to be taken of all Believers in the World, Col. 1. 6. *The Gospel that is come unto you, as it is unto all the World, and bringeth forth fruit in them, as it doth also in you.*

Thirdly, It's sometimes to be understood of the Non-elect, John 17. *I pray for these, I pray not for the World.*

Fourthly, It's taken for the Elect only, 2 Cor. 5. 19. *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing unto them their Trespases: The Non-imputation of Sin is their Discharge from sin, and such are in a blessed state, Rom. 4. Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sin is covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord does not impute sin.* In this last sence I take the word in the three Scriptures that are before us, that in John 3. 16, 17. tells us, *That God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, &c.* This is the greatest and most special Love of God, such a love that can withhold nothing from those to whom or for whom Christ is given: *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things?* Rom. 8. 31. *He that hath given his Son will give his Spirit too, he will give Grace and Glory to those to whom he hath given his Son, verse 17. God sent not his Son to condemn the World, but that the World through him might be saved: This is the same World for whom his Son was given in the verse before. If it were the end of*



God in sending Jesus Christ to save the World, then that World for which Christ was sent shall be saved; there is no frustrating the end of God. You grant *page 51.* that none shall be saved but the Elect, or Faithful Persevering Christians, (which is the same thing) and if none but the Elect shall be saved, then that world that Christ came to save are the Elect only. As for the third Scripture, *1 Joh. 2.2. He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world;* the Word signifies a peace-making Sacrifice: Now those for whom he hath made this peace, shall in time enjoy it, they shall enter into peace, and these are the Elect only, for they only shall be saved, *Rom. 5. 10. If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life.* Reconciliation was the hardest part of Christ's Undertaking; it's easie for Christ to sanctifie and glorifie, in respect of what it was to reconcile; and having performed the most difficult Task of all his Undertakings, he will not fail to perform the lesser part; those that are reconciled by his death, shall certainly be saved by his life.

*Thirdly,* You say, that Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost, *Luke 19. 10.*

*Reply. First,* What Christ came to do, that he did, or he did not; if he did, then are those saved, and if saved, it is from sin; if he did not, either it was for want of Will, or for want of Power, neither of which can be charged on Christ.

*Fourthly,* You say, that Christ was made under the Law to redeem those that were under the Law, *Gal. 4. 4.* but all were lost by transgression, and were under the Law, therefore Christ came to redeem and save all.

*Reply. First,* If we consult the Coherence, we shall find that this Scripture treats of a peculiar people. In the preceeding verses you have a simily of an Heir, while in his Nonage he differs not from an hired Servant, though

though he be Lord of all, but is under Tutors and Governours, till the time appointed of the Father: This he applies to a Peculiar People, verse 3. So we, when we were Children, were in bondage under the Elements of the World, but when the fulness of time was come, &c. Now to what end did God send forth his Son to redeem? Was it not that we might receive the Adoption of Sons? He applies it still to a peculiar people. Adoption is an act of Grace without us, that works no inherent Change in us; it gives us relation to God, but makes us not like unto God. Adoption may come under a threefold Consideration: First, In respect of Predestination, Eph. 1. 5. *Who hath predestinated us to the adoption of Children, &c.* Secondly, In respect of the Covenant, as it was transacted between the Father and the Son, and in this respect they were his Children before he took their nature on him, Heb. 2. 1, and the Children that the Lord hath given me; and because the Children were partakers of flesh, he also himself took part of the same. Thirdly, In the respect of the Consummation of the Covenant, by the offering up of the Lord Jesus; and in this sense I take it here, *That we might receive the adoption of Sons; not in respect of any act of ours, but in respect of the Confirmation of the Covenant of Grace by the Oblation of Christ; and so the Word Received is taken elsewhere, Heb. 9. 15. For this cause he is the Mediator of the New-Covenant, that by means of death for the transgressions that were under the first Covenant, they that are called might receive the promise of Eternal Inheritance:* They that were called, though they had received the promise by Faith, yet they had not received the promise in respect of the Confirmation thereof, till Christ was offered up. A Testament is not of force till men are dead; when the Testator is dead, then the Testament is of force, Heb. 11. ult. *These all died in faith, not having received the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.* They



applied the Promise before us; they died in Faith, but they did not receive the Promise in respect of the Confirmation of it before us; upon that account their Perfection and ours was together and at once, and in this sense I take the Word *received*, Gal. 4. 6. and that for this Reason; there could be no Act of Application on our part, antecedent to the sending forth of the Spirit of his Son into our Hearts; but this Reception of the Adoption of Sons is antecedent to the sending forth of the Spirit of his Son; *Because ye are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your Hearts, crying, Abba, Father*: So that this Text speaks of the Children only, not of others, of such as are so redeemed as never to come under Bondage more: *Wherefore thou art no more a Servant, but a Son.*

*Secondly*, To be redeemed from the Curse of the Law, and yet to remain under the Curse, are Terms inconsistent; but some are under the Curse of the Law, since Christ was offered up; *As many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curse*; but who are they? I Answer, they are such as have no Relation unto Jesus Christ, such as are not Abraham's Seed. This Text divides the whole World; *So then they that are of Faith*; that is, they that are of Christ, Faith being here considered objectively; *are blessed with faithful Abraham*, but others are under the Curse.

You say, that all were lost by Transgression, all were under the Law, therefore Christ came to redeem and save all.

*Reply*. What Christ came to do, that he did; *I have finished the Work that thou gavest me to do*, John 17. 4. but all are not redeemed by Jesus Christ, some are under the Curse of the Law still; all will not be saved by Jesus Christ, some will perish in their Sins, therefore Jesus Christ did not come to redeem and save all.

*Fifthly*, You tell me, that it's expressly said, that Christ

Christ gave himself a ransom for all, 1 Tim. 2. 6.

*Reply.* First, This word *All* is an equivocal Word, and may be taken more largely, or more strictly, therefore nothing may be concluded from it, farther then the scope of the place leads to it, or than the Harmony of the Scripture may be preserved, *John 12. And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all Men unto me;* take the *All* here of every individual Person in the World, and it will not hold good; for all Men are not drawn to Jesus Christ, all Men have not Faith, and without Faith they can't come to Christ; all Men have not the means by which Men are drawn to Jesus Christ; but take it of those that are given unto Jesus Christ, and it will hold good; *All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me, John 6. 37.*

*Secondly,* The Word *All* in the Text before us can't possibly be extended beyond those that have the Word vouchsafed unto them; for this ransom was to be testified in due time, it was to be published and proclaimed; but to whom? I Answer, to those for whom he gave himself; and when? it must be in due time; and when is that, but while Men are in the Land of the living, while they are in a Capacity of coming unto Jesus Christ, and believing on him? but there are many that have not the Word vouchsafed to them, to whom it was never testified, therefore this ransom was not given for all.

*Sixthly,* You say, that Jesus Christ died for all, 2 Cor. 5. 15.

*Reply.* The Word *All* in this place can't be understood of more than do in time answer the end of his Death; that is, that they should live to him that died for them. The end of Christ can't be frustrated, he did not only die to justify, but to sanctify also, *Eph. 5. 25, 26.* he did not only die to redeem from guilt, *But to purifie to himself a peculiar People zealous of good Works,*



*Tit. 2. 14.* but all do not live to Jesus Christ, therefore he did not die for all.

*Seventhly*, You say, that he *tasted Death for every Man*, *Heb. 2. 9.*

*Reply.* This Word *every Man*, as well as the Word *all*, may be restricted to a peculiar People, *1 Cor. 4. 4.* *Judge nothing before its time, till he cometh that shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the secrets of all Hearts, and then shall every Man have Praise of the same*: This can't be understood of *every Man* that shall be judged, but of every one that hath in a measure conformed to the Will of God; of them that stand at his right hand, not of them that stand on his left: He will say to them, *I was hungry, and you fed me not, &c.* These shall never have Praise of the same.

*Secondly*, The subjects of the Apostles Discourse, *Heb. 2.* are the Children of God, the Seed of Abraham, as appears in the following Verses, and to these must the Word *every Man* be restricted; it is not Reason to think, that the Word was intended of more than were the subjects of the present Discourse.

*Eighthly*, You say, how these and such like Scriptures may be reconciled with a particular Redemption, you do not know.

*Reply.* I have in my Answer shewed you as well as I can, how these Scriptures may be taken, so as that not one of them may interfere with particular Redemption; and have opened them so, as that the Harmony of Scripture may be preserved; but to take these general Terms in the sense that you do, neither you nor any Man else can preserve the Harmony of Scripture. Should the Word *World* be always taken for every individual Person in the World, then must we conclude, that none knew Jesus when he was in the World, *1 John 10.* *The World knew him not*: This would interfere with *John 10. 14.* *I know my Sheep, and am known of mine*, *1 John*

5. 19. *We know that we are of God, and the whole World lieth in Wickedness:* It can't be supposed, that those that were born of God did lie in wickedness, and yet the whole World did lie in wickedness; *John 17. I pray for these, I pray not for the World.* Did Christ pray for some, or did he not? If he did, then by the Word *World* can't be meant every individual Person; if he did not, then tell me what he means, when he saith? *I pray for these.* Take the Word *every Man*, 1 Cor. of all that must be judged, and then those that stand at his left hand, of whom Christ will say, *I was hungry, and you fed me not*, must have Praise of the same, as well as those that stand on the right hand. And as great a sor-dities would follow if the Word *All* should always be taken in the utmost extent, for then those that never heard of the Gospel should be drawn to Jesus Christ, as well as those that have, *John 12. I will draw all Men to me.*

Ninthly, You say, if Christ died for the faithful only, then he can't in any sense be said to die for others, but if he died for all, then he may truly be said to die for his People in a special manner.

Reply. First, I never said that Christ died for the faithful only, nor do I believe that he died for the faithful at all, considered as such; he died for Sinners, *The Just for the Unjust, that he might bring them unto God*; he died for the unfaithful, that he might make them faithful.

Secondly, I deny, that Christ died in a special manner for some, and in a common manner for others; the Scripture makes no such distinction, and I hope I have removed what you have offered in the Case already.

Tenthly, You say, that though it be granted, that Christ interceded only for the faithful, and not for the World, yet that proves not that he did not die for the World.



*Reply.* I desire no such grant: I did not say, that Christ prayed only for the faithful; I told you, he prayed for them that should believe as well as them that did believe; he prayed for all that were given him of the Father. However, here is a grant, he prayed not for the World, and that is ground enough for my Conclusion: If he prayed not for the World, he died not for the World; I think I may safely argue (here) from the lesser to the greater; if he would not breath out a Request for them, he would not breath out his Life for them; if he would not offer up a Prayer for them, he would not offer up his Soul for them.

*Eleventhly,* You say, the special Benefits of Redemption belong to the faithful, and Christ intercedes with the Father for to give them out to them.

*Reply.* Here I would Query, *First*, What you mean by the special Benefits of Redemption? Whether Remission of Sins be one of them? If it be, then none are redeemed but such as have this Blessing bestowed on them; you can't sever Redemption and Remission of Sin, *Eph. 1. 7.*

*Secondly,* Whether Faith be not one special Benefit of Redemption? Whether it be not one Branch of the Blessing of *Abraham*, that comes on those that are redeemed from the Curse?

*Thirdly,* Whether it be given to all to believe? if it be, then all shall enjoy the special Benefits of Redemption, Pardon of Sin, and Eternal Salvation. If you say, its given to all to believe, I would then enquire, How such as never heard the Word came by it? Faith (in respect of the Act) cometh by hearing, if Faith be not given to all, how it appears that all are in a capable way of Salvation, according to your own Principles? For you say, that the prime Blessings of the Covenant, as Justification and Glorification, are bestowed on none, but on Condition of Faith and Repentance.

*Twelfthly,*

*Twelfthly*, You say, it's not true, that Christ never prayed for the wicked, for he made Intercession for his Enemies.

*Reply*. If it be not true, it does not at all reflect on me, for I never asserted it; you must charge the untruth on such as are guilty. My Assertion was this; *That he prayed not for the World, but for them that were given him of the Father*; some of which did believe, others should in time believe, and till they did I grant that they were Enemies unto Christ. He prayed not for the World, granted by your self, and yet he prayed for some that did not then believe, therefore such are considered distinct from the World, antecedent unto Faith. You say, he prayed for some that were wicked, and yet you grant he prayed not for the World, therefore those wicked ones must be considered distinct from the World whilst wicked ones.

I shall now offer one thing to your Consideration, and to pass from this Head. If Christ died for all, as you have here asserted, then none shall perish in their Sins.

*First*, Jesus Christ in dying did design to redeem from all Sins, not from a part, but from the whole, *Tit. 2. 14. Who gave himself for us, to redeem us from all Iniquity*: Either Christ did what he gave himself to do, or he did not: If he did, then are they discharged from all Sin, then there is nothing left to damn, for God damns none but for Sin; if he did not, it was for want of Merit in his Blood, and who dares charge this on Christ?

*Secondly*, He paid the full price, as much as Justice did require; he gave his Life a ransom, and that was all that was expected; he made his Soul an offering for Sin, upon the performance of which he had the Promise he should see his Seed, *Isa. 53. 11. see them, that is, that he should see them delivered*; he saw them in Bonds before, but now he should see them at Liberty.

*Thirdly*,



*Thirdly*, He did by that one offering obtain their discharge, *Heb.* 10. 14. *Zech.* 9. 11. *As for thee, by the Blood of thy Covenant have I sent forth thy Prisoners out of the pit wherein there was no Water.* There was not a Prisoner left behind for whom a ransom was paid by Christ.

*Fourthly*, That Redemption that Christ obtained was Eternal, they were never to return to bondage more, *Heb.* 9. 12. he entred once into the Holy Place; *having obtained eternal Redemption for us*; and now I hope, that to an impartial Eye, that will as well weigh what is said for, as what is said against the five Errors that you charge me with, will appear to be Gospel Truths, and such as wherein Free-Grace does abundantly shine out, and that the Elect only are the subjects of the new Covenant, which was the fourth Note of Distinction that I gave between this Covenant and that into which *Israel* entred with their Seed, *Deut.* 29. 10.

In the next place, you say, that there is one remarkable Note of difference between these two Covenants that you have past over, and that is, the Covenant of Grace is *A better Covenant, established on better Promises.* To this you say, you grant, that the Covenant of Grace is a better Covenant than the Ceremonial Law was, which was called the first Covenant, *Heb.* 8. from the 1<sup>st</sup>. verse to the 8<sup>th</sup>. but this doth not prove any difference between the Covenant of Grace and the Covenant made with the *Israelites*, *Deut.* 29.

*Reply.* First, The Apostle makes not the Comparison here between the Covenant of Grace and the Ceremonial Law, but between two Covenants properly considered; he calls them the first and the second Covenant. The first Covenant is distinct from the Ceremonial Law as well as the second, *Heb.* 9. 1. *Then verily that first Covenant had also Ordinances of Divine Worship, &c.* These Ordinances were appointed by the Ceremonial

nial Law, they were but the adjuncts of the first Covenant ; and the Ceremonial Law that is mentioned Heb. 8. 3, 4, 5. contains those very things that are called the Ordinances of the first Covenant, that are distinct from the Essence thereof ; there was not one of these Ordinances appointed in fourteen Years after the Covenant was made, Gen. 15. 18. compared with Gen. 17. and some of them were not appointed in four hundred Years after.

Secondly, The Comparison lies not between Promises and Precepts, but between Promises and Promises ; the Covenant of Grace is *established on better Promises* ; here is the Promise of *writing the Law in the Heart, that all the Subjects thereof shall know the Lord ; that God will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more* : Produce such a Promise in that Covenant, Deut. 29. if you can. And these Promises are absolute, there is no Condition required of the Subjects thereof entitling them thereunto. Had these Promises been in that Covenant into which the natural Seed were taken, considered as such, they would have been as good in that as in this, and they should all have enjoyed the Benefit of them.

Secondly, You say, that though this Covenant under the Law was clouded with Mosaical Ceremonies annex to it, yet the Nature of it was not hereby changed.

Reply. It was the first Covenant that had the Mosaical Ceremonies annex to it, (as I have shewed you already) Heb. 9. 1. now this first Covenant was distinct from the Covenant of Grace, between which and the second Covenant the Comparison lieth.

Thirdly, You say, the Prophets did sometimes declare the spiritual Promises thereof, and the wisest among the Jews did discern the spiritual Blessings contained in them, and the Moral Duties enjoined by it, to be the greatest and the most principal.

Reply.



*Reply. First,* That the Prophets declared the spiritual Blessings of this Covenant, I grant; and that there were some amongst the *Jews* that did discern them to be the greatest Blessings; but had this been the Covenant into which the natural Seed were taken, they would all have had a sight of them. The Promise is, *They shall all know the Lord, from the least to the greatest of them.*

*Secondly,* I would enquire, How it appears that the Moral Duties were prescribed by the Covenant of Grace? That Moral Duties compared with Ceremonial are the greatest, I grant, but that they are prescribed by the Covenant of Grace, I deny.

## SECT. X.

**Y**OU say, the next thing debated was, Whether this Covenant into which the *Jews* entered, be repealed, and Childrens Church-membership be abolished, or no? And whereas I attempted, in my first Reply, to prove that it was made void by the Death of Christ, you returned this Answer, That this Covenant being the Covenant of Grace, it was not then abolished, but only the Ceremonial Law, which is sometimes called the first and old Covenant, *Heb. 8. 7, 8, 13.* but instead of giving you a satisfactory Answer, I did Nicely distinguish between the first Covenant and the Ordinances thereof; and that I then took a great deal of needless pains, to shew in what respects this Covenant was faulty, and in what not.

*Reply. First,* What I spoke in that Nice Distinction, (as you call it) shewing in what respects the first Covenant was faulty, and in what not, is but poorly answered by a bare recital thereof, without one Word of Reply to it. I should have thought, that a Nice Distinction should have been taken into Consideration, so far as to have shewn the Nicety and the Unsoundness thereof,