

AN APPENDIX,

Containing a full and modest Reply to Mr. PHILIP CARY'S Rejoinder to my *Vindiciæ Legis et Fœderis*.

Manifesting the badness of his Cause in the feebleness and impertinency of his Defence; and adding farther Light and Strength to the Arguments formerly produced in Defence of God's gracious Covenant with Abraham, G. v. xvii. and the Right of Believers' Infants to Baptism grounded thereupon.

SIR,

NEXT to the not deserving a reproof is the due reception and improvement of it. You deserve a sharper reprehension for your temerity and obstinacy than I am willing to give you from the press; yet, in love to the truth and your own soul, reprove you I must, and I hope God will enable me to be both mild in the manner, and convincingly clear in the matter and cause thereof: It is better to lose the smiles than the souls of men. I dare not neglect the duty of a friend for fear of incurring the suspicion of an enemy. Several learned and eminent divines, who hath seen what hath publicly passed betwixt you and me, have returned me their thanks, and think you ought to thank me too for the pains I have taken to set you right, hoping you will evidence your self-denial and repentance by an ingenuous retraction of your errors.

But how will you deceive their expectations, and unbecome the character given you by your friends when they shall find the true measure both of your ability and humility, drawn by your own pen in the following rejoinder!

I have thoroughly considered your reply in the manuscript you sent me, which I hear is now in the press; and in the following sheets have given a full, and (I think) a final answer to whatsoever is material therein: And, it so falling out, that my discourse of *Errors* was just going under the press, whilst your rejoinder was there also, I thought it not convenient to delay my reply any longer, but to have my antidote in as great readiness as might be to meet it.

One inconvenience I easily foresee, that the pages of your manuscript, which I follow, may not throughout exactly answer to the print; but every intelligent reader will easily discern, and rectify

that, if my bookseller save him not that trouble, as I have desired him to do.

As to the controversy about the right of believers' infant-seed to Baptism, you have altogether adventured it the second time with the consent of your partizans, upon the three hypothesis, which (if I mistake not) I have fully confuted and baffled in my first answer: but, if my brevity occasioned any obscurity in that, I hope you shall find it sufficiently done here. Mean time you have given, and I accordingly take it for granted, that our arguments for Infant's Baptism stand in their full strength against you till you can better discharge and free your dangerous assertions from the errors and absurdities in which they are now more involved and intricated than before.

The weaker any thing is the more querulous it is. If scripture argument and clear reason will not support the cause I undertake, I am resolved never to call in passionate invectives and weak evasions for my auxiliaries as you have here done. The Lord give us all clearer light, tenderer consciences, exemplary humility, and ingenuity.

VINDICIARUM VINDEX :

OR, A

REFUTATION of the weak and impertinent *Rejoinder* of Mr. PHILIP CARY.

Wherein he vainly attempts the Defence of his absurd THESIS to the great abuse and injury of the Laws and Covenants of God.

AND must I be dipt once more in the water-controvesy? It is time for me to think of undressing myself, and making ready for my approaching rest, and employ those few minutes I have to spend in more practical and beneficial studies for my own and the church's greater advantage. And it is time for Mr. Cary to reflect upon his past follies, which have consumed too much of his own and other's time without any advantage; yea, to the apparent loss and injury of the cause he undertakes to defend.

When I received these sheets from him in vindication of his *Solemn Call*, I was at a stand, in my own resolutions, whether to let it pass (without any animadversions upon it) as a passionate clamour for a desperate cause; or give a short and full answer to his confused and impertinent rejoinder. But considering that I had under hand, at the same time, the foregoing *Treatise of The Causes and Cure of Mental Errors*, and that though my honest neighbour discovers much weakness in his way of argumentation, yet it was like to meet with some interested readers, to whom, for that reason, it would be the more suitable; and how apt such persons are to glory in the last word; but especially considering, that a little time and pains would suffice (as the case stands) to end the unseasonable controversy betwixt us, and both clear and confirm many great and weighty points of religion: I was, upon these considerations, prevailed with against my own inclination, to cast in these few sheets as a Mantissa to the former seasonable and necessary discourse of *errors*, resolving to fill them with what should be worth the reader's time and pains.

As for the rude insults, uncomely reflections, and passionate expressions of my discontented friend, I shall not throw back the dirt upon him, when I wipe it off from myself; I can easily forgive and forget them too: The best men have their passions, James v. 17. even *sweet-briars* and *holy thistles* have their offensive prickles.

I consider my honest neighbour under the strength of a temptation; it disquiets him to see the labours of many years, and the raised expectations of so great a conquest and triumph over men of renown all frustrated by his friend and neighbour, who had done his utmost to prevent it, and often foretold him of the folly and vanity of his attempt. Every thing will live as long as it can, and *natura vexata prodit seipsam*. But certainly it had been more for truth's honour and Mr. C—'s comfort to have confessed his follies humbly to God, and have laid his hand upon his mouth.

The things in controversy betwixt us are great and weighty, viz. the true nature of the Sinai laws in their complex body: the quality of God's covenant with Abraham; and the dispensation of the New Covenant we are now under. These are things of great weight in themselves, and their due resolutions are at this time somewhat the more weighty, because my Antagonist hath adventured the whole controversy of infants baptism upon them.

I have, in my *Vindiciæ Legis*, &c. stated the several questions clearly and distinctly; shewn Mr. C. what is no part of the controversy, and what is the very hinge upon which it turns; desired him, if he made any reply, to keep close to the just and necessary rules of disputation, by distinguishing, limiting, or denying any of my propositions; that the matters in controversy might be put to a fair and speedy issue. But, instead of that, I meet with a flood of words rolling sometimes to this part, and then to another part of my answer, and so back again, without the steady direction of art or reason. There may, for ought I know, be some things of weight in Mr. Cary's reply, if a man could see them for words; but, without scoff or vanity, I must say of the rational part of it as the poet said of the over-dressed woman,—*Pars minima est ipsa puella sui*, it is the least part of it. To follow him in his irregular and extravagant way of writing, were to make myself guilty of the same folly I blame him for: I am therefore necessitated to perstringe them, and reduce all I have to say under three general heads.

- I. I shall clearly evince to the world that Mr. Cary hath not been able to discharge and free his own *thesis* from the horrid consequences and gross absurdities which I have laid to their charge in my first reply; but, instead thereof, in this feeble and unsuccessful attempt to free the former, he hath entangled himself in more and greater ones.
- II. That he hath left my *arguments* standing in their full strength against him.
- III. And then I shall confirm and strengthen my three *positions*,

which destroy the cause he manages by some farther additions of scripture, reason, and authorities, which, I hope, will fully end this matter betwixt us.

But, before I touch the particulars, two things must be premised for the reader's due information.

1. That the controversy about the true nature of the Sinai laws, both moral and ceremonial, complexly considered, is not that very hinge upon which the right of believers' infants to baptism depends; that stands as it did before, be the Sinai laws what they will: we do not derive the right of infants from any other law or covenant, but that gracious covenant which God made with Abraham, which was in being 430 years before Moses's law; and was no way injured, much less disannulled, by the addition of it, Gal. iii. 17. If Abraham's covenant be the same covenant of grace we are now under, the right of believers' infants to baptism is secured, whatever the Sinai covenant prove to be: which I speak not out of the least jealousy that Mr. Cary hath, or ever shall be able to prove it to be a pure Adam's covenant of works; but to prevent mistakes in the reader,

2. It must be heedfully observed also, that how free, gracious, and absolute soever the New Covenant be, (for God forbid that I should go about to eclipse the glory of free grace, on which my soul depends for salvation) yet that will never prove Abraham's covenant to be an abolished Adam's covenant of works, unless two things more be proved, which I never expect to see, viz.

First, That Abraham and his believing posterity, were bound, by the very nature and act of circumcision, to keep the whole law in their own persons, in order to their justification and salvation, as perfectly and perpetually, and under the same penalty for the least failure, as Adam was to keep the law in paradise.

Secondly, It must be further proved, That Abraham and all his believing offspring, who stood with him under that covenant, whereof circumcision was the initiating sign, were all saved in a different way from that in which believers are now saved under the gospel; for so it must be, if the addition of circumcision made it unto them an Adam's covenant of works. But this would be a direct contradiction to the words of the apostle, speaking of them who were under the covenant of circumcision, Acts xv. 11. "But we believe, that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved even as they." If he say, they stood, indeed, under that covenant, as a pure covenant of works, but were saved by another covenant; and so for many ages, the church of God stood absolutely under the covenant of works, and, at the same time, under the pure covenant of grace; the one altogether absolute and

free, the other wholly conditional: and though these two be, in their own natures, inconsistent and destructive of each other, yet so it was, that all the saints, for many ages, were absolutely under the one, and yet purely under the other: shall I then be censured for saying he speaks pure contradiction?

Possibly my reader will be tempted to think I abuse him, and that no man of common sense can be guilty of such an horrid absurdity: I must, whatever respect I have for Mr. C. once more tell him, before the world, that this is not only his own doctrine, but that very doctrine upon which he hath adventured the whole cause and controversy of infants baptism, which I therefore say is hereby become a desperate cause.

And this brings me to my first general head, viz.

1. First, *That Mr. Cary hath not been able to free his thesis from this horrid absurdity; but by struggling to do it, hath (according to the nature of errors) entangled himself in more and greater ones.*

Mr. Cary, in p. 174, 175. of his *Solemn Call*, was by me reduced to this absurdity, which he there owns, in express words, ‘ That ‘ Moses, and the whole body of the children of Israel, were absolutely under (without the exception of any) the severest penalties ‘ of a dreadful curse; and that the Sinai covenant could be no ‘ other than a covenant of works, a ministration of death and condemnation, and yet, at the same time, both Moses and all the ‘ elect, were under a pure covenant of gospel-grace: and if these ‘ were two contrary covenants in themselves, and just opposite the ‘ one to the other, as, indeed, they were, we have nothing to say, ‘ but, with the apostle, *O the depth*, &c.

This reader, is the position which must be made good by Mr. Cary, or his cause is lost; deformed issues do not look as if they had beautiful truth for their mother; no false or absurd conclusion can regularly follow from true premises. But hence naturally and necessarily follows this.

Absurdity 1. That Abraham, Moses, and all the believers under the Old Testament, by standing absolutely under Adam’s covenant of works, as a ministration of death and condemnation; and, at the same time, purely under the covenant of grace, (as Mr. C. affirms they did) must necessarily during their lives, hang in the midway between life and death, justification and condemnation; and after death, in the midway between heaven and hell. During life, they could neither be justified nor condemned; justified they could not be, for justification is the soul’s passing from death to life, 1 John iii. 14. John v. 24. Upon a man’s justification his covenant, and state are changed: but the covenant and state of no man can be so changed, as long as he remains absolutely under the

severest penalties* and condemnation of the law, as Mr. C. affirms they did.

Again, condemned they could not be, seeing all that are under the pure covenant of grace (as he saith they were at the same time) are certainly in Christ, and to such there is no condemnation, Rom. viii. 1. nor ever shall be. John v. 24. "He that believeth, shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." What remains then, but that during life they could neither be perfectly justified, nor perfectly condemned; and yet, being absolutely under the severest penalties of Adam's covenant, they were perfectly condemned; and again, being under the pure covenant of grace, they must be perfectly justified?

And then, after death, they must neither go to heaven nor hell; but either be annihilated, or stick midway in *Limbo Patrum*, (as the Papists fancy) betwixt both. No condemned person goes to heaven, nor any justified person to hell. His position, therefore, which necessarily infers this gross absurdity, is justly renounced and detested by learned and orthodox divines.

The learned and acute * Turretine, the late famous professor of divinity at Geneva, proving that the *Sinai law* could not be a pure covenant of works; brings this very *medium* to prove it, as a known truth, allowed by all men: 'The Israelites (saith he) with whom God covenanted, were already under Abraham's covenant, which was a covenant of grace, and were saved in Christ by it; therefore they could not be under the legal covenant. *Nemo enim simul potest duobus fœderibus tota specie distinctis subsesse*: because no man can be under two covenants, specifically different, at the same time, as these two are.'

That great and renowned divine, Mr. William Strong †, gives four irrefragable arguments to prove that no man can stand under both these covenants at the same time, which in co-ordination, actually destroy and make void each other. 'If the first covenant stand, there is no place for the second; and if the second stand, the first is made void. And this, saith he, will fully appear, if we consider the direct contrariety in the terms of those two covenants. For, (1.) The righteousness of the first covenant is in ourselves, but the righteousness of the second is the righteousness of another, 1 John v. 11, 12. (2.) In the covenant of works, acceptation is first of the work, and afterwards of the person, Gen. iv. 7. but in the covenant of grace, the acceptation is first of the person, and then of the work, Gen. iv. 4. (3.) The first covenant was a covenant without a *priest*, but the second is

* Turret, part 2. p. 290.

† Mr. Strong on the Covenant, p. 66. 67.

‘ a covenant with a *priest*. (4.) In the first covenant there is matter of glorying, but in the second there is none, Rom. iii. 27. So that these two can never consist, except you can compound, or reconcile these four opposites in the justification of the same person.’

To the same purpose, saith the excellent Mr. Samuel Bolton *. If the law were a covenant of works, then were the Jews under a different covenant from us, and so none of them were saved, which the apostle gainsays, Acts xv. 11. or else they were both under a covenant of works, and a covenant of grace; but that they could not be; they are utterly inconsistent, *Ergo*. And thus all sound divines speak. I may therefore say of Mr. Cary’s *position*, as Ruveus before me did; *omnem absurditatem excedere videtur*, it seemeth to exceed all absurdities. A man may more rationally suppose two natures, and essential forms, in one body, and place the same thing under divers *species*, in the *predicament of substance*; yea, it were more tolerable to affirm, that *ex duobus entibus per se fit unum ens per se*, than to place any (as Mr. C. places all) of God’s people under two opposite covenants. If Mr. C. were absolutely under the condemnation of the law, would he not be purely justified, think you? Yet he places Abraham, Moses, and all believers with them, absolutely under the severest condemnation of the law, and the pure gospel-covenant at once.

But, to cover the shame and nakedness of his assertion, which places believers absolutely under Adam’s covenant, he is fain to make use of two *fig-leaves*, as Adam did.

(1.) And the first attempt he now makes, p. 4, 5, 6, 7. of his *reply*, is by way of retortion, by telling us, ‘ That the same pretended absurdities do fall as heavily, and a great deal more, on our doctrine, who affirm the Sinai law (complexly taken) to be a covenant of faith, or grace, than upon his, who makes them two essentially different covenants: because we are forced to comprize perfect doing, with the curse for non-performance, under the same covenant with believing; and that it cannot be denied, but that all the people of God were absolutely under the Sinai covenant, Gal. iii. 23. and Gal. iv. 4, 5. and consequently under the curse, Gal. iii. 10.’ This is the sum and substance of his first answer.

Reply. I will not be tempted to expose my neighbour to derision for this his strange answer; but rather propound two sober queries to him, and the reader, *viz.* (1.) What orthodox divines he ever met with, and what are their names, who are forced to comprize perfect doing, with the curse for non-performance, under the same

* Bolton’s Bounds, p. 133.

covenant with believing; and so make the two opposite covenants to be specifically one and the same? Name your men, with their books and pages; or retract, with shame and sorrow, what you have here abusively affirmed of them. Cameron, indeed, makes it a subservient covenant; the most a true, though obscure covenant of grace; but none comprize Adam's covenant with its curse in the new covenant. (2.) Whether it be imaginable, That the same absurdity can follow from their doctrine, that make the whole complex body of the Sinai law a covenant of grace, though more obscure, and so place all the people of God in those ages under it; as does necessarily follow his doctrine, who makes it a pure Adam's covenant of works, and places the church of God absolutely under the curse of it, and also under the pure covenant of grace at the same time? If grace and grace (how different soever in degrees of manifestation) be as opposite and repugnant, as grace and works, as justification and condemnation are, it is time for me to lay down my pen, for I have certainly lost my understanding to guide it any further.

But Mr. Cary will say, If you do not, yet Mr. Roberts doth comprize both in one covenant. I say you abuse Mr. Roberts * in so affirming; for he saith, in that very place you refer to, that believing in Christ was ultimately and chiefly intended in the Sinai covenant; and perfect doing was only urged upon Israel in subordination, and tendency to that believing. And upon that ground it is he affirms that covenant to be a covenant of faith, and so denominates it from the chief scope and intent of it. He sets not *doing* and *believing*, in co-ordination, or places the church under two opposite covenants, as you do; but places the law where it ought to be placed, in subordination to faith and Christ? and therefore you have abused that good man as well as me, and yourself most of all, in this your first impertinent and silly answer.

(2.) But you have one evasion more, p. 7. where you say, 'That how harsh and dreadful soever the terms, or conditions, of the legal covenant were to those that were under it, as Moses, and the whole body of the Israelites, then were; yet the grace of the gospel covenant far superseded, and was by far more victorious, powerful, and efficacious,' Rom. v. 17, 20.

Reply. Worse, and worse; your discourse mends like sour ale in summer. Here you fancy the two covenants (under which you place the whole church of God) to be in a conflict one with the other; condemnation and justification, struggling one with another

* Roberts on the Covenant, p. 775, 776, 777.

as I told you before they would : but, however, the grace of the new covenant prevails at last, and gets the victory over the covenant of works. Very good ; but then pray, Sir, if you please, answer me a plain question, or two, at your leisure.

First, How far did the covenant of grace prevail against the covenant of works ? Was it so far prevalent and victorious, as utterly to vanquish and disannul it, as a covenant of works to them ? Or was it not ? Was the victory, you speak of, a complete or a partial one ? If you say it was incomplete and partial, then you leave them (as I told you before you must) partly under the promise, and partly under the curse ; justified in part, and condemned in part. But if you say it was a complete and perfect victory, then it utterly dissolved its obligation as a covenant of works ; then they did not remain under two opposite covenants, as you affirmed they did ; but, on their believing, changed their state with their covenant, as we affirm they did.

Secondly, If you say it did not totally free them from the curse of the covenant of works, but, however, prevailed so far, that they were not actually damned by virtue of the curse ; then be pleased to answer me one question more, *How was it possible for them to be absolutely under the curse of the law, (as you affirmed they were) and yet that curse to be superseded by the covenant of grace, as here you speak ?*

To supersede the curse (though it be a phrase I never met with before) if it signify any thing it must signify this ; That the covenant of grace caused the law to omit, forbear, or give over to curse that people any more. But did, or can the law forbear, or cease to curse those that are absolutely under it, as a ministration of death and condemnation ? Pray consult Rom. iii. 19. and Gal. iii. 10. Are you aware what you say when you place believers absolutely under the curse of the law, and then talk of the new covenant's victory over it ; and, after all this, leave them as you do, absolutely under the cursing power of the one, and still under the victorious grace of the other ? For shame, my friend, give up your absurd notion, and repent of this folly ; I would not willingly shame you before the world ; I did all that in me lay to prevent it : but however, *Pudor est medicina pudoris*, the only way you have left me to prevent your glorying in your shame, is this way, to make you ashamed of your vain-glory. As for that scripture you allege to countenance your fancy, Rom. v. 17, 20. you might to as good purpose have opened your Bible, and have taken the first scripture that came to hand, and it would have done your *position* less harm ; for the apostle's scope there is to demonstrate the perfection of the abounding righteousness of Christ, for the full discharge of believers from the guilt of sin and curse of Adam's cove-

nant; and cuts the throat of your *position*, which it is alleged to prove.

I have stood the longer upon the clearing of this first point; because this being fully cleared, it runs through and clears the whole controversy betwixt us. For now it will be evident to all, that neither Abraham's, nor Moses's covenant (complexly taken, as Mr. Cary takes it) could possibly be, for this reason, an Adam's covenant of works; and if not a covenant of works, then, how dark or legal soever the dispensations of them were, they must needs be the same covenant of grace for substance, under which we are, and so the main controversy betwixt us is hereby at an end.

I know not how many covenants of works, or how many of grace Mr. C. fancies there are; but orthodox divines constantly affirm, * That, as there were never but two ways of life to mankind, the one before the fall, by perfect doing; the other after the fall, by sincere believing: so answerably, there can be but two covenants betwixt God and mankind, viz. the covenant of works, and the covenant of grace. The last of which hath indeed been more obscurely administered, and in that respect is called the old covenant; yet that and the new are essentially but one covenant; and the church of God, which for many ages stood under that old covenant, did not stand under it as an Adam's covenant, or the first covenant of works, for the undeniable reasons above given: and therefore Abraham's covenant, from whence we derive our children's title to Baptism, must of necessity be the very same covenant for substance with this new covenant, which all Abraham's believing offspring and their infant-seed, are now under. And in proving this one point, I have sufficiently confuted both Mr. C's *solemn call*, and this his feeble vindication of it together.

But, lest he should take this for the only absurdity proved upon him, though it be tiresome to me, and must be ungrateful to him, give me leave to touch one more among many; and that the rather because I make great use of it in this controversy, and Mr. Cary both yields and denies it. If his own words be the messengers of his meaning, either he or I must mistake their errand.

I had in my Prolegomena, distinguished of the law, as strictly taken for the ten commandments; and more largely and complexly taken, as including the ceremonial law: The former I considered according to God's intention and design in the promulgation of it, which was to add it as an *appendix* to the promise, Gal. iii. 19. And the carnal Jews mistaking and perverting the end of the law, and making it to themselves a covenant of works, by making it the

* Vide *Bolton's Bounds*, p. 148.

very rule and reason of their justification before God, Rom. ix. 31, 32, 33. and x. 3. I told him that the controversy depended upon this double sense of the law; for that it ought not to be denominated from the abused and mistaken end of it, but from God's chief scope and design in the promulgation of it; which was to add it as an *appendix* to the promise, as the word *πρὸςσετελεθῆ* there imports; and so must be published with evangelical purposes. Let us now hear Mr. C's sense of this matter.

In his Call, p. 131. he yields the distinction in these words:

“The Jews were right enough in reference to the true nature of the law, That it was a covenant of works, &c. though they were out in respect of its proper use and intention which was not that any should attain unto life and righteousness thereby; but to shew them the nature of sin, and the holiness and righteousness of God, to convince them of their sin and misery without Christ, and their necessity of a Saviour; which they being ignorant of, and still going about to establish their own righteousness, which was of the law, and refusing to submit themselves unto the righteousness of God, &c. they stumbled at that stumbling-stone, and were accordingly broken, snared, and taken, Rom. ix. 31, 32, 33. Rom. x. 3. And this (saith he) was the true ground of dispute between the apostle and them.” This was orthodoxly spoken, and would end the controversy would he stand to it. But,

In his reply, p. 43. proving the

law to be a covenant of works, from Rom. x. 15. he saith,

“This was the nature of it in the first sanction of it, as the fruit of God's special designation and appointment; and that it is the greatest violation and perverting of scripture that can lightly be met with, to affirm that this is uttered and declared by Paul, &c. only because the Jews had perverted it, and reduced it (as they thought) to its primitive intention. And again, p. 44. he saith, he hath proved that it was the same with Adam's covenant in both respects, that is intentionally as well as materially considered.” And once more, p. 20. he expressly denies that the law was added as an appendix to the promise; calls that a crude assertion of mine, and asks me, “Why it might not be added as an appendix rather to the first covenant of works, to reinforce that?” And after all, gushes out many slighting and opprobrious terms upon me, which I will not throw back again, but rather leave him to reconcile himself with himself.

I shall only ask Mr. C. a sober question or two, instead of re-
riminations, and rendering reviling for reviling.

First, How were the Jews right enough in reference to the na-

ture of the law, as it was a covenant of works, and yet *out* in respect of its proper use and intention, which was not that any should attain unto life and righteousness by it, but to convince them of sin, and of the necessity of a Saviour; and yet the law be a covenant of works, intentionally, as well as materially considered: and that in respect of God's special designation and appointment? If God designed and appointed it in his Sinai dispensation, to be to them an Adam's covenant of works, then certainly they were not out (as you say they were) when they sought righteousness by the works of it; nor could that mistake of theirs be the ground of the controversy betwixt the apostle and them; for it seems it was no mistake, being, by God's intention, as well as its own primitive nature, promulgated at Sinai, as a true Adam's covenant.

Secondly, You deny the law was added to the promise, and ask me why it might not be added to the first covenant to reinforce that, I answer, Because the scope of the place will not bear it, nor any good expositor countenance such a fancy*. You make the Sinai law to be the same with that first covenant, and by so expounding the apostle, you make him say, either that the same thing was added to itself, (which must, in your own phrase, be by a *correspondency of identity*) or else that there are two distinct covenants of works (when indeed there is but one) and that the latter was added to the former. This is your way of expounding scripture when driven to a strait by dint of argument: nothing beside such a pure necessity could drive you upon such an absurdity.

It was added to the promise, (saith Dr. Reynolds †) by way of subserviency and attendance, the better to advance and make effectual the covenant itself. Mr. Strong, upon the two covenants, saith, the apostle's meaning is, that the law was added as an appendix to the promise; but it may be you had rather hear Dr. Crisp's exposition ‡ than his: for you say had it been added to the promise, it would have given life. The doctor will at once give you the true sense of the text, and with it a full answer to your objection. *Though life*, (saith he) *be not the end of the law, yet there are other sufficient uses of it, requiring the promulgation thereof: it was published to be an appendix to the gospel, Gal. iii. 19. And this supposes, 1. The priority of the gospel to the law. 2. The principality of the promise of life by Christ above the law. 3. The consistence of the law and gospel. They may well stand one by another as an house and the addition to it may.* That it was with such an intention added to the promise, I have met with no man that had front enough to deny or scruple

* Προσθετηνη posita, pro apposita, hoc est, Promissioni adjecta. Beza.

† Vide Dr. Reynold's Use of the law, p. 273. full up to my sense, and p. 371.

‡ Dr. Crisp, lib. 4. serm. 9.

it before you; and that the Jews did mistake its chief scope and use, from whence we denominate it a covenant of grace, the generality of godly and learned divines constantly affirm. See Mr. Anth. Burg. *de lege*, p. 227. Bolton's Bounds, p. 160, 161. Mr. Samuel Mather on the types, p. 11. with multitudes more, whose citations would even weary the reader. And what you urge from Mr. Pool's Annotations on 2 Cor. iii. 6, 7. it makes nothing at all to your purpose; for it is manifest, the annotator there takes the moral law in itself, strictly taken, and as set in opposition to the gospel, which it never was since the fall, but by the ignorance and infidelity of unregenerate men.

You also labour to shelter your erroneous fancy under the authority of Dr. Owen; but you manifestly abuse him in your citation; for in that very place you refer to, he speaks strictly of the covenant of works made with Adam in paradise, and plainly distinguishes it from the Sinai covenant, which sufficiently shews his judgment in the point. For these are his own words which you suppressed in the citation, ' * As to the Sinai covenant, and the ' New Testament, with their privileges thence emerging, they belong not to our present argument.' This paragraph you wilfully omit, that you might include that which his words plainly exclude. In the same place he tells you, that David's and Abraham's covenant, was for essence the covenant of grace, notwithstanding the variations made in it: But you take and leave as best suits your design †.

Once more, in p. 16, 17, &c. of my *Vindiciæ legis*, you find yourself pinched with another dilemma, from Lev. xxvi. 40, 41, 46. whence I plainly proved, that there is a promise of pardon found in the Sinai dispensation, to penitent sinners. That this promise was given at mount Sinai, by the hand of Moses, is undeniable, from ver. 46. That it contained the relief of a gracious remission to penitent sinners, is as undeniable from ver. 40, 41. If you say, this promise belongs to Moses's dispensation, (as ver. 46. tells you it did) then, there is remission of sins found in the Sinai laws. If you say it only refers to Abraham's covenant of

* Dr. Owen of Justification, p. 596, 597, vindicated from Mr. C's gross misrepresentations.

† But if you see the Doctor's judgment, in concurrence with all his brethren, you have it in these very words: Although this covenant hath been variously administered in respect of ordinances and institutions, in the time of the law, and since the coming of Christ in the flesh; yet, for the substance and efficacy of it, to all its spiritual and saving ends, it is one and the same; upon account of which various dispensations, it is called the Old and New Testament. *Vide Declaration of the faith, and order of the congregational churches in England*, p. 16, at the Savoy. Oct. 12, 1658.

grace; then that covenant of grace appears to be conditional, which you utterly deny.

Now what is your reply to this? (1.) You object my own words in the *Method of Grace*, p. 326. as if you had never read the just and fair vindication I had before given you of them, p. 134, 135. of my first reply to you. At this rate men may continue controversies to the world's end. Sir, there are many witnesses, that you are very well acquainted with my *Method of Grace*. (2.) You say, p. 31. of your reply, that that covenant could not be conditional, *because a condition implies merit, either of congruity or condignity*. 'This is a further discovery of your ignorance of the nature of conditions, as well as covenants; but that point belonging to the last head of controversy between us, I shall refer it thither.

It were easy for me to instance in many more absurdities which Mr. C. cannot elucidate, and to prove them upon him as easily as to name them; but I will not press him too far; what hath been named and proved already, is more than enough to convince the reader that my first argument is left standing in its full force and strength against him, viz.

Argument 1. That proposition can never be true, which necessarily draws many horrid and gross absurdities after it, by just consequence. But so doth this: *Ergo*.

Arg. 2. My next argument, *Vindiciæ*, &c. p. 27. is as secure as the first. It was this: If Adam's covenant had one end, namely, the happiness and justification of men by their own obedience; and the law at Sinai had quite another end, namely, to bring sinners to Christ, by faith, for their righteousness; the one to keep him within himself, the other to take him quite out of himself; then the Sinai law cannot possibly be the same with Adam's covenant of works in paradise.

But so stands the case, Rom. x. 4. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

Therefore they cannot be the same, but two different covenants:

All that touches this argument, is but three lines in the 49th page of your reply; where you say you have sufficiently answered and cleared this, in p. 169, 172. of your former discourse, from the corrupt interpretation by me fastened thereon.

Now if the reader will give himself the trouble to examine those pages, he shall find that Mr. C. there allows that very interpretation which he here calls corrupt; and saith it comes all to one reckoning with his own. If this will overthrow my second argument, it is gone.

Arg. 3. My third argument was drawn from Acts vii. 38. in this form:

If Christ himself were the angel by whom the laws were delivered to Moses, which are there called *the lively oracles of God*; then the law cannot be a pure Adam's covenant of works: for it is never to be imagined that ever Jesus Christ himself should deliver to Moses such a covenant, directly opposite to all the ends of his future incarnation.

But it is more than probable, from that text, that it was Christ which delivered the law to Moses on the mount. *Ergo.*

To this argument he saith not one word, in p. 49. of his reply, where he cites a part of it, nibbling a little at that expression, [*The lively oracles of God,*] thinking it unimaginable the Sinai law should be such; when as the apostle Paul, Rom. vii. 10. found the commandment to be unto death; and the apostle, 2 Cor. iii. 6, 7. calls it a *ministration of death*. I must therefore leave Mr. C. to reconcile those two scriptures. And withal, I must tell him, that Spanhemius* gives the same sense I do of Acts vii. 38. as the current judgment of Christians against the Jews, that it was not a created angel, but Christ himself.

Arg. 4. The last argument I urged, was from Rom. ix. 4. and thus it may run.

No such covenant as by the fall had utterly lost all its promises, privileges, and blessings, and could retain nothing but curses and punishments, could possibly be numbered among the chief privileges in which God's Israel gloried.

But the law given at Sinai was numbered among their chief privileges, Rom. ix. 4. *Ergo.*

To this he only saith, p. 57. of his reply, 'That the law, even as it was a covenant of works, was a privilege inestimable, beyond what all others enjoyed; because the very curses and punishments annexed thereunto, in case of the least failure, were of excellent use to convince them of their sin and misery without Christ, and their necessity therefore of a Saviour; which was the proper work of the law, as a covenant of works; which advantage all other nations wanting, it might well be numbered among the chief privileges they were invested with.'

But (1.) If the law were intended by God, to be an Adam's covenant to them, (as Mr. C. saith it was) where then is the privilege of God's Israel above other nations? (2.) If their privilege consisted in the subserviency of that law to Christ (as he here intimates it did) then he yields the thing I contend for. For this being its chief scope and end, we do hence justly denominaté it a covenant of grace, though more obscure and legally administered. And in this judgment most of our solid divines concur. Mr. Char-

* Fran. Spanhem. Elench. Coutrov. p. 552.

nock on the *Attributes*, p. 390. is clear and judicious in the point. * Mr. Samuel Bolton, in that excellent book called, *The Bounds of Christian Liberty*, gives nine solid arguments to prove the law was not set up at Sinai as a covenant of works. † Mr. Anth. Burgess gives us six arguments to prove the same conclusion. ‡ Mr. Greenhill on Ezek. xvi. gives us demonstration from that context, that since it was a marriage-covenant, as it appears to be ver. 8. it cannot possibly be a distinct covenant from the covenant of grace. The incomparable § Turretine, learnedly and judiciously states this controversy; and both positively asserts, and by many arguments fully proves, that the Sinai law cannot be a pure covenant of works, or a covenant specifically distinct from the covenant of grace. It were easy to fill pages with allegations of this kind; but I hope what hath been said, may suffice for this point.

But still Mr. Cary complains, that I have all this while but threatened his arguments to prove them fallacious, or to have four terms in them; and therefore he hath drawn out some select arguments, as he calls them, p. 37. to try my skill upon. I will neither tire my reader in a foolish chase of such weak and impertinent arguments as he there produceth, nor yet wholly neglect them, lest he glory in them as unanswerable. And therefore to shew him the fate of the rest, I will only touch his first argument, which being his *argumentum palmarium*, deservedly leads the van to all the rest. And thus it runs upon all four.

That covenant that is not of faith, must needs be a covenant of works, yea, the very same for substance with that made with Adam.

But the scripture is express, that the law is not of faith, Gal. iii. 12. *Ergo*.

The law is considered two ways in scripture. (1.) Largely, for the whole *Mosaical Oeconomy*, comprehensive of the ceremonial as well as moral precepts; and that law is of faith, as the learned Turretine || hath proved by four scripture arguments, *part second*, p. 292, 293. Because it contained Christ the object of faith, &c. Because it compelled men to seek Christ by faith. Because it required that God be worshipped, which he cannot rightly be with-

* Bolton's *Bounds*, p. 130, &c.

† Burgess, *de Lege*, p. 225.

‡ Greenhill, *in Loc*.

§ Turretine, *part 2*. p. 288, 289.

|| The law is said not to be of faith, Gal. iii. 12. Not as it is taken in a large sense, to denote the Mosaic Oeconomy, but strictly, as when it is taken for the moral law abstractly, and separate from the promises of grace; as the self-justiciaries did understand it who sought life from it; for it is proved that faith was also commanded in the Sinaitic covenant, &c.

out faith. And because Paul describes the righteousness of faith in those very words whereby Moses had declared the precepts of the law, Deut. xxx. 11, 12, 13. Again, the law in scripture is taken strictly for the *moral law* only, considered abstractly from the promises of grace, as the legal justiciaries understood it. These are two far different senses and acceptations of the law. Your *major proposition* takes the law in its large complex body, as appears by your 3d page. Your *minor proposition*, which you would confirm by Gal. iii. 12. takes the law strictly and abstractly, as it is set disjunctly from, yea, in opposition to faith and the promises; and so there are two sorts of law in your argument, and consequently your argument is fallacious, as all its fellows be, and runs, (as I told you before) *upon all-four*.

I hope this may suffice, with respect to the Sinai covenant, controverted betwixt me and my neighbour, to evince that it cannot be what he asserts it to be, even an Adam's covenant of works: And that I have discharged what I undertook to prove, with respect to this covenant, namely, That Mr. C. cannot free his position from the gross absurdities with which I loaded it, but endeavouring to do that, hath incurred many more: that his reply hath left my arguments standing in their full strength against him, and that the position I have set up against him, is well founded in scripture; and hath the general concurrence and consent of learned, holy, and orthodox divines.

To conclude, Let the grave and learned Dr. Edw. Reynolds, in his excellent treatise of *the Use of the Law*, determine this controversy betwixt us, p. 371, &c. where designedly handling this doctrine from Rom. vii. 13. 'That the law was revived and promulgated anew on mount Sinai, by the ministry of Moses, with no other than evangelical and merciful purposes,' he abundantly confirms my sense and arguments, and saves me the labour of refuting the principal, and most of yours: where carrying before him the whole context of Gal. iii. from the 15th to the 23d, he clearly carries his doctrine with it, proving from ver. 15. 'That God's covenant with Abraham was perpetual and immutable, and therefore all other subsequent acts of God (such as the giving of

P. 376. 'the law was) do some way or other refer unto it. (2.)

'From v. 16. he further proves, That as God's covenant with Abraham is most constant, in regard of the wisdom and unvariableness of him that made it; so it can never expire for

P. 377. 'want of a seed to whom it is made. (3.) From ver. 17. he proves, That if another law be made after the promise, which, *prima specie*, and, in strict construction, doth imply a contradiction in the terms, and nature of the former law; then it is certain, that this latter law must be understood

‘ in some other sense, and admit of some other subordinate use,
 ‘ which may well consist with the being and force of the former co-
 ‘ venant. (4.) From ver. 18. he proves, that the coming of the
 ‘ law hath not voided the promise, and that the law is not of force
 ‘ (as you vainly dream) towards the seed to whom the promise is
 ‘ made; and therefore if it be not to stand in a contradiction, it
 ‘ follows that it must stand in subordination to the gospel; and so
 ‘ tend to evangelical purposes.’ (5.) He further proves his con-
 ‘ clusion from ver. 19. which shews for what end the law was added,
 προσετιθη. ‘ It was not (saith he) set up alone, as a thing in gross
 ‘ by itself; as an adequate, complete, solid rule of righteousness,
 ‘ as it was given to Adam in Paradise: much less was it published
 ‘ to void and disannul any precedent covenant; but so far was it
 ‘ from abrogating, that it was *added to the promise* by way of sub-
 ‘ serviency, and attendance; the better to advance and make effec-
 ‘ tual the covenant itself, and that until the seed should come,
 ‘ which, whether it respect Christ personal, or mystical, in either
 ‘ sense (saith he) it confirms the point we are upon, *viz. That the*
 ‘ *law hath evangelical purposes.* If the seed be understood of the
 ‘ person of Christ, then this shews that the law was put to the
 ‘ promise, the better to raise and stir up in men the expectations
 ‘ of Christ, the promised seed. But if we understand by seed, the
 ‘ *faithful* (which I rather approve;) then the apostle’s meaning
 P. 379. ‘ is this, That as long as any are either to come into
 ‘ the unity of Christ’s body, and have the covenant of
 ‘ grace applied to them, &c. so long there will be use of the law,
 ‘ both to the unregenerate, to make them fly to Christ, and those
 ‘ that are already called, that they may learn to cast all their faith,
 ‘ hope, and expectation of righteousness upon him still. This then
 ‘ manifestly shews, that there was no other intention in publishing
 ‘ the law, but with reference to the seed: that is, with P. 380.
 ‘ evangelical purposes to shew mercy: not with reference
 ‘ to those that perish, who would have had condemnation enough
 ‘ without the law.’ And further strengthens his conclusion from
 the last words of ver. 19. ‘ That it was ordained by *angels* in the
 ‘ hands of a Mediator. This (saith he) evidently declares, That
 ‘ the law was published in mercy and pacification, not in fury or
 ‘ revenge; (for the work of a Mediator is to negotiate peace, and
 ‘ treat of reconcilement betwixt parties offended) whereas, if the
 ‘ Lord had intended death in the publishing of the law, he would
 ‘ not have proclaimed it in the hand of a Mediator, but of an exe-
 ‘ cutioner. (6.) From ver. 20. Those words (saith he)
 ‘ shew why the law was published in the hand of a Me- P. 381.
 ‘ diator, *viz.* that they should not despair and sink under
 ‘ the fear of his wrath. For as he made a covenant of promise to

‘ Abraham, and his seed ; so he is the same God still, one in his
 ‘ grace and mercy towards sinners. *God is one*, i. e. in sending
 ‘ this Mediator, he doth declare to mankind, that he is at peace
 ‘ and unity with them again. Moses was the representative, and
 ‘ Christ the substantial and real Mediator. *God is one*,
 ‘ i. e. he carries the same purpose and intention both in P. 382.
 ‘ the law and in the gospel ; namely, benevolence, and
 ‘ desire of reconcilment with men. (7.) To sum up all P. 384.
 ‘ that hath been spoken touching the use of the law in a
 ‘ plain similitude ; Suppose we a prince should proclaim a pardon
 ‘ to all traitors, if they should come in and plead it ; and after
 ‘ this should send forth his officers to attack, and imprison,
 ‘ examine, convince, arraign, threaten, and condemn them : Is
 ‘ he now contrary to himself ? Hath he repented of his mercy ?
 ‘ No, but he is unwilling to lose his mercy, desirous to have the
 ‘ honour of his mercy acknowledged unto him. The same is the
 ‘ case between God and us. To Abraham he made a promise of
 ‘ mercy and blessedness to all that would plead interest in it for the
 ‘ remission of their sins ; but men were secure and heedless of their
 ‘ state, &c. Hereupon the Lord published by Moses a P. 385.
 ‘ severe and terrible law ; yet in all this God doth but
 ‘ pursue his first purpose of mercy, and take a course to make his
 ‘ gospel accounted worthy of all acceptation ; which clears the
 ‘ general point, *That God in the publication of the law by Moses,*
 ‘ *on mount Sinai, had none but merciful and evangelical intentions.*
 ‘ And once more, The law was not published by Moses
 P. 386. ‘ on mount Sinai, as it was given to Adam in Paradise,
 ‘ to justify or to save men. And p. 385. it is not given,
 ‘ *ex primaria intentione*, to condemn men. In consequence to all
 ‘ which he saith, p. 388, 389. that to preach the law alone by
 ‘ itself, is to prevent the use of it ; neither have we any power or
 ‘ commission so to do. It was published as an *appendant* to the
 ‘ gospel, and so must it be preached. It was published in the
 ‘ hand of a Mediator, and must be preached in the hand of a Me-
 ‘ diator. It was published evangelically, and it must be so
 ‘ preached.’

See how this agrees now with p. 173. of your *call*, and how the
 several parts of discourse of this sound and eminent doctor (which
 I have been forced to sum up and contract) do abundantly confute
 your vain notions of the law, and cut the very nerves of your best
 arguments, if they had any nerves in them : for indeed it is *moles*
absque nervis.

It were easy for me to represent the sense of many other eminent
 divines in perfect harmony with the doctrine of this great and ex-

cellent divine, who have substantially proved the point I defend against you: But it is enough.

II. Let us next examine what execution his *reply* hath done upon my second *position*, set up in direct opposition to him; namely, *That God's covenant with Abraham, * Gen. xvii. Unto which circumcision was annexed, is for its substance, the self-same covenant of grace with that which the Gentile-believers, and their Infant-seed, are now under.*

Here I have abundant cause again to complain, that Mr. C. hath so formed his answers, as if he had never read the book he undertakes to reply to. And I do verily believe, the greatest part of his reply was made at random, before ever my printed book was in his hands. For he hath not at all considered the state of the question, as I there gave it him; nor kept himself to the just and necessary rules of disputation, as I earnestly desired he would. However, it is not complaints, but confirmation and vindication of my arguments, which is my proper work. I shall therefore recite them briefly, and vindicate and confirm them strongly; contracting all into as few words as can express the sense and argument of the point before me.

Argum. 1. If circumcision be a part of the ceremonial law, and the ceremonial law was dedicated by blood; whatsoever is so dedicated, is by you confessed to be no part of the covenant of works; then circumcision can be no part of the covenant of works, even by your own confession. *Vindicia legis, &c. p. 42.*

But it is so. *Ergo.*

Reply. To this Mr. C. returns a *tragical complaint*, instead of a *rational answer*. *Insinuates my false and gross abuse of him. Appeals to his reader. Tells him I have taken a liberty to say what I please, as if there were no future judgment to be regarded. And that I can expect no comfort another day, without repentance now. For those things that have thus passed betwixt him and me shall again be revised and set in order before me. That he is weary of noting my miscarriages of this kind. That there is hardly a page or paragraph in my whole reply but abounds with transgressions of this nature. He begs the Lord to forgive me; and wishes he could say, Father forgive him, for he knoweth not what he doth: as if my sin were greater than the sin of those that stoned Stephen, or crucified Christ.* p. 98.

Reply. Either I am guilty or innocent in the matter here charged upon me by Mr. C. If guilty, I promise him an ingenuous acknowledgment. If innocent (as both my conscience and his own book will prove me to be) then I shall only say, *He knoweth not what spirit he is of.* The case must be tried by his own book.

* Abraham's covenant; Gen. xvii. the covenant of grace.

and it will quickly be decided. These are the very words in his *Solemn call*, p. 148. ‘He (that is, Mr. Sedgwick) makes no distinction betwixt the ceremonial covenant that was dedicated with blood, and the law written in stones that was not so dedicated. How strangely doth he confound and obscure the word and truth of God, which ought to have been cleared, and distinctly declared to those he had preached or written to?’ With much more, p. 149, 150, 151. where he saith, ‘It is plain, that the law written in stones, and the book wherein the statutes and judgments were contained, were two distinct covenants, and delivered at distinct seasons, and in a distinct method; the one with, the other without a Mediator; the one dedicated with blood and sprinkling, the other (that we read of) not so dedicated.’

Now let the reader judge whether I have deserved such tragical complaints and dreadful charges for inferring from these words, That the ceremonial law being by him pronounced a distinct covenant from the moral law, which he makes all one with Adam’s covenant; delivered at a distinct season, and in a distinct method; the ceremonial law with a *Mediator*, the moral law without a *Mediator*; the ceremonial law dedicated with blood and sprinkling, the moral law not so dedicated: let him judge, I say, whether I have wronged him in saying, that by his own confession, circumcision being a part of this ceremonial law, it can therefore be no part of the covenant of works.

Exception. But Mr. Cary hath two things to say for himself, (1.) That in the same place he makes the ceremonial law no other than a *covenant of works*: And the wrong I have done him is not distinguishing, as he did, betwixt a *covenant of works*, and the *covenant of works*. Here, it seems, lies my guilt, upon which this dreadful outcry against me is made.

Reply. But if I should chance to prove, that there never was, is, or can be any more than one covenant of works; and that any one covenant which is distinguished from it (as he confesses the ceremonial law was) by a Mediator, and the blood of sprinkling, can be no part of that covenant of works; what then will become of Mr. C’s distinction of a *covenant of works*, and the *covenant of works*? Now the matter is plain and evident, That as there never were, are, or can be more than two common heads appointed by God, namely, *Adam* and *Christ*, 1 Cor. xv. 45, 46, 47, 48. Rom. v. 15, 17, 18, 19. so it is impossible there should be more than two covenants, under which mankind stands, under these two common heads. And the first covenant once broken, it is utterly impossible that fallen man should ever attain life that way, or that ever God should set it up again with such an intention and scope, ‘unless (as

‘ Mr. Charnock speaks *) he had reduced man’s body to the dust and his soul to nothing, and framed another man to have governed him by a covenant of works; but that had not been the same man that had revolted, and upon his revolt was stained and disabled.’ If Mr. C. therefore be not able to prove more covenants of works with mankind than one, let him rather blush at his silly distinction betwixt *a* covenant of works, and *the* covenant of works. For indeed he makes at least four distinct covenants of works, one with Adam, two with Moses; one moral, the other ceremonial; and a fourth with Abraham at the institution of circumcision, Gen. xvii.

(2.) If it appear (as it clearly doth) that as there never was, is, or can be any more than one covenant of works, so whatsoever covenant is distinguished from it by a Mediator, and dedication by the sprinkling of blood (as he saith the ceremonial law was) cannot possibly, for the reasons he gives, be any part or member of Adam’s covenant of works; then, I hope, I have done Mr. C. no wrong in my assumption from his own words, for which he so reviles and abuses me. But this will appear as clear as the noon-day light: For a covenant with a Mediator, and dedicated by sprinkling of blood, doth, and necessarily must, essentially difference such a covenant from that covenant that had no Mediator, nor dedication by blood. To deny this, were to confound law and gospel, Adam’s and Christ’s covenant; but the distinction betwixt them is his own, therefore my assumption was just. That this blood was typically the blood of Christ, and that the Holy Ghost signified the one by the other, is plain from Heb. ix. 7, 8. And I never met with that man that scrupled it before Mr. Cary. So then my first argument to prove Abraham’s covenant of circumcision to be the covenant of grace, and not an Adam’s covenant, or any part thereof, stands firm after Mr. C’s passionate reply, which I hope the Lord will pardon to him, though he had scarce charity enough left to desire a pardon for his friend, who had neither wronged the truth nor him.

Arg. 2. My second argument was this. If circumcision was the seal of the righteousness of faith, it did not pertain to the covenant of works, for the righteousness of faith and works are opposite.

But circumcision was the seal of the righteousness of faith, Rom. iv. 11. *Ergo.*

The sum of what he answers to this, p. 72, 73, &c. (as far as I can pick his true sense out of a multitude of needless words) is this, ‘ He confesses this argument seems very plausible; but, however, ‘ Abraham was a believer before circumcision; and though indeed

* Charnock on the Attributes, p. 590.

‘ it sealed the righteousness of faith to him, yet it sealed it to him
 ‘ only as the father of believers; and denies that ever Jacob, or
 ‘ Isaac, or any other enrolled in that covenant were sealed by it;
 ‘ but to all the rest, beside Abraham, it was rather a token of ser-
 ‘ vitude and bondage.’ This is the sum and substance of his reply.

Reply. But, Sir, let me ask you two or three plain questions.
 (1.) What is the reason you silently slide over the question I asked
 you, p. 41. of my *Vindiciæ*, &c. Did you find it an hot iron which
 you durst not touch? It is like you did. My question was this:
*Had Adam’s covenant a seal of the righteousness of faith annexed
 to it, as this had, Rom. iv. 11. The righteousness of faith is evan-
 gelical righteousness, and this circumcision sealed. Say not it was
 to Abraham only that it sealed it, for it is an injurious restriction
 put upon the seal of a covenant which extended to the fathers as well
 as to Abraham: however, you admit that it sealed evangelical
 righteousness to Abraham, but I hope you will not say, that a seal
 of the covenant of works (for so you made circumcision to be) ever
 did, or could seal evangelical righteousness to any individual person
 in the world.*

I find you a man of great confidence, but certainly here it failed
 you; not one word in reply to this. (2.) ‘ I told you your dis-
 ‘ tinction was invented by Bellarmine, and shewed you where it
 ‘ was confuted by Dr. Ames: but not a word to that.’ (3.) I shew-
 ‘ ed, ‘ That the extending of that seal to all believers, as well as
 ‘ Abraham, is most agreeable to the drift and scope of the apostle’s
 ‘ argument, which is to prove, that both Jews and Gentiles are
 ‘ justified by faith, as Abraham was: and that the ground of justi-
 ‘ fication is common to both: and that how great soever Abraham
 ‘ was, yet in this case he hath found nothing whereof to glory. And
 ‘ is not your exposition a notable one, to prove the community of
 ‘ the privilege of justification, because the seal of it was peculiar to
 ‘ Abraham alone?’ p. 47, 48.

Sir, you have spent words enough upon this head to tire your
 reader. But why can I not meet with one word among them that
 fairly advances to my argument? or answer the important *questions*
 before you, upon which the matter depends? If this be all you have
 to say, I must tell you, you are but a weak manager of a bad cause,
 which is the less hazard to truth.

Arg. 3. In the covenant of circumcision, Gen. xvii. God makes
 over himself to Abraham and his seed, *to be their God*, or gives
 them a special interest in himself.

But, in the covenant of works, God doth not, since the fall,
 make over himself to any to be their God, by way of special interest.

Therefore the covenant of circumcision cannot be the covenant
 of works.

The sum of your *reply*, in p. 76. is under two heads.

(1.) You boldly tell me, That ‘ God doth in the covenant of works make over himself to sinners to be their God by way of special interest; but it being upon such hard terms that it is utterly impossible for sinners that way to attain unto life, he hath therefore been pleased to abolish that, and make a new covenant;’ and bring Exod. xx. 1. to prove it.

Reply. This is new and strange divinity with me, (1.) That God should become a people’s God by way of special interest, by virtue of the broken covenant of works; this wholly alters the nature of that covenant: for then it was a law that could give life, contrary to Gal. iii. 21. unless you can suppose a soul that is totally dead in sin to have a special interest in God, as his God. (2.) This answer of yours yields the controversy about the nature of the Sinai law; for this very concession of yours is the *medium* by which our divines prove it to be a covenant of grace. (3.) This concession of yours confounds the two covenants, by communicating the essential property and prime privilege of the covenant of grace to Adam’s covenant of works. Either, therefore, expunge Jer. xxxi. 33. as a covenant of grace, “ I will be their God, and they shall be my people;” or allow that in Gen. xvii. 7. to be specifically the same; and that Exod. xx. though more obscurely delivered. (4.) You assert, ‘ That God may actually become a people’s God by way of special interest, and yet the salvation of that people be suspended upon impossible terms.’ You sent them before into *purgatory*, but by this you must send them directly to hell: for if the salvation of God’s peculiar people be upon impossible terms, it is certain they cannot be saved. And, lastly, it is an horrid reflection upon the wisdom and goodness of God, who never did, or will make any covenant wherein he takes fallen men to be his peculiar people, and make over himself to be their God; and yet not make provision for their salvation in the same covenant, but leave their salvation for many ages, upon hard and impossible terms, i. e. leave them under damnation.

(2.) I told you in my *Vindicia*, &c. p. 49. that you were fain to cut Abraham’s covenant, Gen. xvii. into two parts; and make the first to be the pure covenant of grace, which is the promissory part to the 9th verse, and the restipulation, as you call it, p. 205, to be as pure a covenant of works, which I truly said was a *bold action*; and in so calling it, I gave it a softer name than the nature of it deserved.

The sum of what you reply to this is, 1. By denying the matter of fact, and charging me with misrepresentation; * and in the next

* *Mr. C’s Defence*, p. 79.

page confessing the whole charge, saying, Though the promise and the restipulation mentioned, ver. 7, 8, 9. make but one and the same covenant of circumcision; yet there are two covenants mentioned in that context, the first between God and Abraham himself, ver. 2, 4. the other between God and Abraham, and his natural posterity also, ver. 7, 8, 9, 10. the former you call a covenant of grace, the latter a covenant of works. And p. 81. you affirm that after God had entered the covenant of grace with Abraham, verses 2, 4. page 81. that Abraham himself was required to be circumcised by the command of God, as a token of the covenant of works. And then, after some unbecoming scoffs for misplacing ver. 7, 8. where ver. 9, 10. should be; as also of Gen. xii. for Gen. xvii. (whether by the scribe, myself, or the press, I cannot say; but in each place sufficient light is given to set you right in the scope and argument of my discourse) you tell us, That *how harsh and unlikely soever it may seem to man's carnal reason, that the latter, to wit, the covenant of works made with Abraham, ver. 9, 10. must needs make void the covenant of grace made with him, ver. 2, 4. yet the apostle gives a quite contrary resolution of it, Gal. iii. 17.* And after all, p. 79. in return to my argument, That the circumcision of Abraham and his seed, ver. 9, 10. could not possibly be a condition of Adam's covenant of works from the nature of the act: because Paul himself circumcised Timothy, Acts xvi. 2, 3. and asserts it to be a part of his liberty, Gal. ii. 3, 4. which could never be, if in the very nature of the act it hath bound Timothy to keep the law for justification; and had been contrary to the whole scope of the apostle's doctrine: but it became an obligation only from the intention of the agent. All that you say to this, p. 95. is, 'That as for Paul's compliance with the Jews, however the case stood in that respect, this is certain, That the blessed apostle would never have expressed himself with that vehemency he doth, Gal. v. 2, 3. if this had been only the sense of the Jewish teachers, or that circumcision in its own nature did not oblige to the keeping of the whole law; and that this is only my corrupt gloss upon the text.'

Reply. If there be but one covenant made betwixt God and Abraham in that 17th of Genesis, and you make two, not only numerically, but specifically distinct, yea, opposite covenants of it, then you boldly cut God's covenant with Abraham in two, and are guilty of an insufferable abuse of the covenant of God: But the former is true; therefore so is the latter. You say, p. 223, 224. of your call, 'That at the second and fourth verses God made a covenant with Abraham himself alone, but at ver. 7. he makes the covenant of circumcision betwixt himself and Abraham, and his natural seed also: and saith, ver. 7. And, or according to the

‘old translation, *moreover*; as proceeding to speak of another covenant than what he had been before insisting on.’

Now I would soberly ask, (1.) What vouchers you have amongst expositors for this your rash and daring assertion? I find not a man that hath trod this path before you, and I hope none will be hardy enough to follow: you certainly stand alone, and it is pity but you should. (2.) Where do you find the just parts of the new covenant in the 2d and 4th verses? Is it not altogether promissory, on God’s part, without any restipulation on Abraham’s? For you have excluded ver. 1, 7, 10. from that which you call God’s covenant of grace with him. And then for your covenant of works, ver. 7, 8, 9, 10. you make this to be the promissory part of that covenant, “to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee;” and again, ver. 8. “I will be their God.” Was ever such a promise as this found in a covenant of works? Tell me whatever God said more in the new covenant, than he saith here? O blessed covenant of work, if this be such! (3.) Tell me whether you can satisfy your own conscience with the answers you have given to my first argument against your paradoxical, yea, heterodoxical exposition? I told you, That if ver. 7, 8, 9, 10. contain another covenant, viz. of works, entered by God with Abraham and his seed, it must needs make void the former covenant, ver. 2, 4. for wherever the covenant of works takes place, the covenant of grace gives place; they cannot consist, as I have abundantly proved before. Do you verily think those words of the apostle, Gal. iii. 17. which you bring as a foundation to support your singular and sinful exposition, viz. *And this I say, That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect*; do you think, I say, that in that, or any other text, the apostle opposes the two covenants made (as you fancy) with Abraham, Gen. xvii. Or doth he not there speak of God’s covenant with Abraham, as distinguished from the law made 430 years afterward? (4.) Have you satisfied your own judgment and conscience in the reply you made to that unanswerable objection from Paul’s circumcising of Timothy, Acts xvi. 2, 3. where you have the plain matter of fact before you, that he was circumcised by Paul; and this fact of his justified as a part of the liberty he had in Christ, Gal. ii. 3, 4. * from whence it evidently appears, That circumcision, in its own nature, did not simply and absolutely

* He is bound not simply and absolutely from the nature of the work itself, (viz. Circumcision) but in regard of the intention of him who performs it; and such an opinion being supported, &c. Pool on the place.

oblige men to the keeping of Moses's law for righteousness, but only for the intention or opinion of the person. And though you call this my corrupt gloss upon the text, therein you grossly abuse me: the gloss is neither corrupt nor my own; but the unanimous judgment of all sound expositors of the text, as you might see, were you capable of seeing it, in a collection of their judgments upon that text, Gal. v. 2, 3, 4. in Mr. Pool's Synopsis. And though Estius thinks the act of circumcision might be obligatory to the Gentiles, to whom the law was not given; yet it was not so to the Jews that believed, and such was Timothy. But why do I refer you to the judgment of *commentators*? The very reason of it may convince you. For,

If the very act of circumcision did, in its own nature, oblige all on whom it passed, to keep the whole law for their righteousness, then Paul so obliged Timothy, and all others on whom he passed it, to keep the law for their righteousness.

But Paul did not oblige Timothy, or any other on whom he passed it, by the very act of circumcision so to keep the law.

Therefore the very act of circumcision, in its own nature, did not oblige all on whom it passed, to keep the whole law for righteousness.

You may ponder this *argument* at your leisure, and not think to refute it at so cheap a rate, as by calling it a corrupt gloss of my own. And thus I hope I have sufficiently fortified and confirmed my third argument, to prove Abraham's covenant to be a covenant of grace. My fourth was this:

Arg. 4. That which in its direct and primary end, teacheth man the corruption of his nature by sin, and the mortification of sin by the Spirit of Christ, cannot be a condition of the covenant of works.

But so did circumcision in the very direct and primary end of it; therefore, &c.

Your reply to this, is, '*That when I have substantially proved that the Sinai covenant, as it contained the passover, sacrifices, types, and appendages, under which were veiled many spiritual mysteries relating to Christ, and mortification of sin by his grace and Spirit, to be no covenant of works, but a gospel covenant; you will then grant, with me, that the present argument is convincing;*' p. 66, 67. of your reply.

Reply. Sir, I take you for an honest man, and every honest man will be as good as his word; either I have fully proved against you, that the Sinai law (taken in that latitude you here express it) is not an Adam's covenant of works, or I have not. If I have not, doubtless you have reserved your more pertinent and strong replies in your own breast, and trust not to those weak and silly

ones, which you see here baffled, and have only served to involve you in greater absurdities than before. But if you have brought forth all your strength, (as in such a desperate strait no man can imagine but you would) then I have fully proved the point against you; and if I have, I expect you to be ingenuous and candid, in making good your word, that you will then grant, with me, that this *argument* is convincing, to the end for which it was designed. And so I hope we have fully issued the controversy between us, relating to God's covenant with Abraham. You have indeed four *arguments* p. 59, 60, 61, 62. of your Reply, to prove Abraham's covenant a covenant of works, of the same nature with Adam's covenant.

(1.) Because as life was implicitly promised to Adam upon his obedience, and death explicitly threatened in case of his disobedience, which made that properly a covenant of works; so it was in the covenant of circumcision, Gen. xvii. 7, 8. compared with ver. 10, 14.

Reply. This argument or reason can never conclude; because as God never required of Abraham and his children, personal, perfect, and perpetual obedience to the whole law for life, as he did of Adam; so the death, or cutting off, spoken of here, seems to be another thing from that threatened to Adam. Circumcision, as I told you before, was appointed to be the discriminating sign betwixt Abraham's seed and the Heathen world; and the wilful neglect thereof is here threatened with the cutting off by civil, or ecclesiastical excommunication from the commonwealth and church of Israel, as Luther, Calvin, Paræus, Musculus, &c. expound; not by the death of body and soul, as was threatened to Adam, without place for repentance, or hope of mercy.

(2.) You say Abraham's covenant could not be a covenant of faith, because faith was not reckoned to Abraham for righteousness in circumcision, but in uncircumcision, Rom. iv. 9, 10.

Reply. This is weak reasoning; circumcision could not belong to a gospel-covenant, because Abraham was a believer before he was circumcised. You may as well deny the Lord's Supper to be the seal of a gospel-covenant, because the partakers of it, are believers before they partake of it. Beside, you cannot deny but it sealed the righteousness of faith to Abraham: and I desired you before, to prove that a seal of the covenant of works is capable of being applied to such an use and service, which you have not done, nor ever will be able to do; but politically slid by it.

(3.) You say it cannot be a covenant of grace, because it is contra-distinguished to the righteousness of faith, Rom. iv. 13.

Reply. The law in that place is put strictly for the pure law of nature, and *metaleptically* signifies the works of the law, which is

a far different thing from the law, taken in that latitude wherein you take it. And, is not this a pretty argument, that because the promise to Abraham and his seed, was not through the law, but through the righteousness of faith; therefore the covenant God made with Abraham and his seed, Gen. xvii. cannot be a gracious, but a legal covenant? This promise, mentioned Rom. iv. 13. was made to Abraham long before the law was given by Moses; and free grace, not Abraham's legal righteousness, was the impulsive cause moving God to make that promise to Abraham and to his seed; and their enjoyment of the mercies promised, was not to be through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. By what rule of art this scripture is alleged to prove God's covenant with Abraham, Gen. xvii. to be a covenant of works, I am utterly to seek: if it be only because circumcision was added to it, that is answered over and over before, and you neither have, nor can reply to it.

(4.) Lastly, It cannot (say you) be a covenant of grace, because it is represented to us, in scripture, as a bondage covenant, Acts xv. 10, &c. Gal. v. 1.

Reply. It is time, I see, to make an end; your discourse runs low and dreggy. Do you think it is one and the same thing to say, That the ceremonial law was a yoke of bondage to them that were under it, and to say it was an Adam's covenant? Are these two parallel distinctions in your *logic*? Alas! Sir, there is a wide difference; the difficulty, variety, and chargeableness of those ceremonies, made them, indeed, burthensome and tiresome to that people: but they did not make the covenant to which they were annexed, to become an Adam's covenant of works; for in the very next breath, ver. 11. the apostle will tell you, *they were saved*; yea, and tells us, that *we shall be saved, even as they*. So that either they that were saved under this yoke, were saved by faith in the way of free grace, as we now are: or we must be saved in the way of legal obedience, as they were. Take which you please, for one of them you must take. *We shall be saved even as they*, Acts xv. 10, 11.

If you can make no stronger opposition to my arguments than such as you have here made, your cause is lost, though your confidence and obstinacy remain: it were easy for me to fill more paper than I have written on this subject, with names of principal note in the church of God, who, with one voice, decry your groundless position, and constantly affirm, That the law in the complex sense you take it, as it comprehends the ceremonial rites and ordinances wherunto circumcision pertains, is, and can be no other than the covenant of grace, though more obscurely administered. But because Latin authors are of little use to you, and

among English ones, the judgment of Dr. Crisp*, I suppose, will be *instar omnium* with you; I will recite it faithfully out of his sermon upon the two covenants, where he makes the old and new covenant to be, indeed, two distinct covenants of grace, (for which I see no reason at all) but proves the former to be so in these words:

‘ It is granted of all men, that in the covenant of works there is no remission of sin, there is no notice of Christ; but the whole business or employment of the priests of the old law was altogether about remission of sins, and the exhibiting and holding forth of Christ in their fashion unto the people. In the 15th of Numbers, ver. 28. (I will give you but one instance) there you shall plainly see, that the administration of the priestly office had remission of sins, as the main end of that administration. *If a soul sin through ignorance, he shall bring a she-goat unto the priest, and he shall make an atonement for the soul that sinneth ignorantly, and it shall be forgiven him*: See the main end is administering forgiveness of sins.

‘ And that Christ was the main subject of that their ministry is plain; because the apostle saith, in the verse before my text, that all that administration was but a shadow of Christ, and a figure, for the present, to represent him, as he doth express in the ninth chapter of this *epistle*. And the truth is, the usual general gospel that all the Jews had, was in their sacrifices, and priestly observations.—

‘ So that it is plain, the administration of their covenant was an administration of grace, and absolutely distinct from the administration of the covenant of works.’ And what can be said more absolutely, and directly contradictory to your *position* than this is? And yet again, p. 250. speaking to that scripture, Heb. viii. 8. where the apostle distinguishes of a *better* and a *faulty*, of first and second; he saith, (finding fault with them) “The days come when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant I made with their fathers, when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt;” and (as Jeremiah adds it, for the apostle takes all this out of Jer. xxxi. 31. (*although I was an husband to them*, and in the close of all, *your sins and iniquities will I remember no more.*—Here are two covenants, a *new covenant*, and the *covenant he made with their fathers*. Some may think it was the covenant of works at the promulgation of the moral law; but mark well that expression of Jeremiah, and you shall see it was the covenant of grace. “For, saith he, not according to the covenant I made with their fathers, although I was an husband unto them.” *How can God be considered as a husband to a people*

* Vol. II. Sermon. 2. pag. 237, 248, 250.

‘under the covenant of works which was broken by man in innocency, and so become disannulled, or impossible, by the breach of it? The covenant of works run thus: Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law; and in the day thou sinnest thou shalt die the death. Man had sinned before God took him by the hand, to lead him out of the land of Egypt, and sin had separated man from God: How then can God be called an husband in the covenant of works? The covenant, therefore, was not a covenant of works, but such a covenant as the Lord became an husband in, and that must be a covenant of grace,’ &c.

How the doctor makes good his two distinct covenants of grace, I see not, nor expect ever to see proved, and is not my present concernment to enquire; but once it is evident, by what he hath here said, that the ceremonial law, whereof circumcision is a branch, can be no other than the covenant of grace. And nothing is more common among our divines, than to prove not only the Sinai law, but God’s covenant with Abraham, Gen. xvii. to be the covenant of grace, by this *medium*, *That God having entered into a covenant of grace with Abraham before, would never bring him under a covenant of works afterwards, which must nullify and void the former.* And, besides, such a covenant of works as you make this was never heard of in the world, wherein God promises to be a God to Abraham and his seed in their generations, upon the rigorous and impossible terms of Adam’s covenant.

By this time I presume you must feel the force of those arguments produced against your vain and groundless notions; and how little you are able to deliver your *thesis* from them, but the more you struggle, the more still you are entangled. Go which way you will, your absurdities follow you as your shadow,—*hæret lateri lethalis arundo.* Leaving, therefore, all your absurdities upon you till God shall give you more illumination and ingenuity to discern and acknowledge them, I shall pass on to the examination of your third position, which led you into these gross mistakes; and if God shall convince you of your error in this point, I hope it may prove a means of recovering you out of the rest; which, in love to your soul, I heartily desire.

3. Your third position is, *That God’s covenant with Abraham, Gen. xvii. can be no other than the covenant of works, because circumcision was the condition of it: For (say you) the new covenant is altogether absolute and unconditional.*

Of the Conditionality of the New Covenant.

This question, Whether the covenant of grace be conditional

or absolute, was moved (as a learned man observes) in the former age, by occasion of the controversy about justification, betwixt the Protestants and Papists. Among the Protestants some denied, and others affirmed the conditionality of the gospel-covenant: Those that denied it did so for fear of mingling law and gospel, Christ's righteousness and man's, as the Papists had wickedly done before. Those that affirmed it did so out of fear also; lest the necessity of faith and holiness, being relaxed, Libertinism should be that way introduced. But if the question were duly stated, and the sense of its terms agreed upon, the gospel-covenant may be affirmed to be conditional, to secure the people of God from Libertinism, without the least diminution of the righteousness of Christ, or clouding the free grace of God.

I did, in my first answer to your *call*, endeavour to prevent the needless trouble you have here given yourself by a succinct state of the question; telling you the controversy betwixt us, is not, (1.) Whether the gospel-covenant requires no duties at all of them that are under it? Nor, (2.) Whether it requires any such conditions as were in Adam's covenant, namely, perfect, personal, and perpetual obedience, under the penalty of the curse, and admitting no place of repentance? Nor, (3.) Whether any condition required by it on our part have any thing in its own nature meritorious of the benefits promised? Nor, (4.) Whether we be able in our own strength, and by the power of our free will, without the preventing, as well as the assisting grace of God, to perform any such work or duty as we call a condition? These things I told you were to be excluded out of this controversy. But the only question betwixt us is, *Whether in the new covenant, some act of ours, (though it have no merit in it, nor can be done in our own single strength) be not required to be performed by us untecedently to a blessing or privilege consequent by virtue of a promise? and whether such an act or duty, being of a suspending nature to the blessing promised, it have not the true and proper nature of a gospel-condition?*

In your *reply*, (contrary to all rule and reason) you include, and chiefly argue against the very particulars by me there excluded; and scarcely, if at all, touch the true question as it was stated, and by you ought accordingly to have been considered. I might therefore justly think myself discharged from any further concernment with you about it; for if you will include what I plainly exclude, you argue not against mine, but another man's position, which I am not concerned to defend. You here dispute against meritorious conditions, which I explode and abhor as much as yourself. You say, p. 34. of your *reply*, that a condition plainly implies something of merit, by way of condignity or congruity; which is false, and

turns the question from me to Papists. And were it not more for the clearing up of so great a point for the instruction and satisfaction of others, than any hope you give me of convincing you, I should not have touched this question again, unless I had found your replies more distinct and pertinent. But finding the point in controversy of great weight, I will once more tell you,

1. What the word [*condition*] signifies.
2. In what sense it is by us used in this controversy.
3. Establish my arguments for the conditionality of the new covenant.

And first, we grant, That neither our word [*condition*] nor your term [*absolute*,] are either of them found in scripture, with respect to God's covenanting with man; so that we contend not about the signification of a scripture term. But though the word *conditional* be not there, yet the thing being found there, that brings the word *conditional* into use in this controversy. For we know not how to express those sacred particles, εἰ, οὐκ, εἰ μὴ, μόνον, εἰ καὶ, &c. *if, if not, unless, but if, except, only*, and the like, which are frequently used to limit and restrain the grants and privileges of the new covenant, Rom. x. 9. Matth. xviii. 3. Mark v. 36. Mark xi. 26. Rom. iv. 24. I say, we know not how to express the true sense and force of these particles in this controversy by any other word so fit and full as the word *conditional* is. Now this word *condition*, being a law term, is variously used among the Jurists; and the various use of the word occasions that confusion which is found in this controversy. He, therefore, that shall clearly distinguish the various senses and uses of the word, is most likely to labour with success in this controversy. I shall, therefore, briefly note the principal senses and uses of the terms, and shew in what sense we here take it. Of conditions there be two sorts,

1. Antecedent.
2. Consequent conditions.

As to the latter, namely, *consequent conditions*, you yourself acknowledge, p. 100. 'That in the outward dispensation of the covenant many things are required of us, in order unto the participation or enjoyment of the full end of the covenant in glory.'

So then the covenant is acknowledged to be consequently conditional*, which is no more than to say with the apostle, "Without holiness no man shall see God;" or that, "If any man draw back, his soul shall have no pleasure in him, &c. Our contro-

* If the promises of the covenant concerning the end, as distinct from the means of salvation, are the promises meant, then no body can deny that these are conditional, because they are always made on condition of faith and repentance. *Turretine*.

versy therefore is not about consequent conditions, laid by God upon believers, after they are in Christ and the covenant; the covenant, so considered, *a posteriori*, will not be denied to be conditional. The only question is about antecedent conditions, and of these we are here to consider,

1. Such as respect the first sanction of the covenant in Christ.

2. Such as respect the application of the benefits of the covenant unto men*.

As to the first sanction of the covenant in Christ, we freely acknowledge it hath no previous condition on man's part, but depends purely and only upon the grace of God, and merit of Christ: So that our question proceeds about such antecedent conditions only, as respect the application of the benefits of the covenant unto men; and of these antecedent conditions, there are likewise two sorts which must be carefully distinguished.

1. Such antecedent conditions which have the force of a meritorious and impulsive cause, which being performed by the proper strength of nature, or, at most, by the help of common, assisting grace, do give a man a right to the reward or blessings of the covenant. And in this sense we utterly disclaim antecedent conditions, as I plainly told you, p. 61. of my *Vindicia*, &c. Or,

2. An antecedent condition signifying no more than an act of ours, which, though it be neither perfect in every degree, nor in the least meritorious of the benefit conferred, nor performed in our natural strength: yet, according to the constitution of the covenant, is required of us, in order to the blessings consequent thereupon, by virtue of the promise: And, consequently the benefits and mercies granted in the promise, in this order are, and must be, suspended by the donor or disposer of them, until it be performed. Such a condition we affirm faith to be. But here again, faith, in this sense, the condition of the new covenant is considered,

1. Essentially; or,

2. Organically and instrumentally.

In the first consideration of faith, according to its essence, it is

* If the covenant is viewed in respect of its being first set on foot, and established in Christ, it has no previous condition, but is founded only on God's free favour, and Christ's merit; but if it is viewed as to the acceptance and application in the believer, it has for its condition, faith, which unites a man to Christ, and so instates him in the fellowship and joint participation of the covenant. *Turret. Vol. 2. p. 203.*

contained under obedience, and in that respect we exclude it from justifying our persons, or entitling us to the saving mercies of the new covenant, as it is a work of ours; and so I excluded it p. 133. of my *Method of Grace*, which you ignorantly or wilfully mistake, when, in your reply, p. 88, 89. you object against me: Faith, considered in this sense, is not the condition of the covenant, nor can pretend to be so, more than any other grace. But,

We consider it organically, relatively, and (as most speak) instrumentally, as it receives Christ, John i. 12. and so gives us power to become the sons of God; it being impossible for any man to partake of the saving benefits of the covenant, but as he is united to Christ. "For all the promises of God are in him yea, and in "him amen," 2 Cor. i. 20. And united to Christ no man can be, before he be a believer; for Christ dwelleth in our hearts by faith, Eph. iii. 17. Upon which scriptural grounds and reasons it is, that we affirm faith to be an antecedent condition, or *causa sine qua non*, to the saving benefits of the new covenant; and that it must go before them, at least in order of nature, which is that we mean, when we say faith is the antecedent condition of the new covenant. And those that deny it to be so, (as the Antinomians do, who talk of actual and personal justification from eternity, or at least from the death of Christ) must consequently assert the actual justification of infidels; and not only disturb, but destroy the whole order of the gospel, and open the sluices and flood-gates to all manner of licentiousness.

And thus our picus and learned divines generally affirm faith to be the condition of the covenant. So * Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs, ' Faith, (saith he) hath the honour above all other graces, to be ' the condition of the second covenant; therefore it is certainly ' some great matter that faith enables us to do. Whatsoever keeps ' covenant with God, brings strength, though itself be never so ' weak; as Samson's hair. What is weaker than a little hair? ' yet, because the keeping that, was keeping covenant with God; ' therefore even a little hair was so great strength to Samson. Faith ' then, that is the condition of the covenant, in which all grace and ' mercy is contained, if it be kept, it will cause strength indeed to ' do great things.'

And as this excellent man, Mr. Burroughs, is in this sense for the conditionality of the new covenant, so are the most learned and eminent of our own divines. Dr. Edward Reynolds †, assigning the differences betwixt the two covenants, gives this for one: ' They differ in the condition (saith he); there legal obedience,

* Moses's Self-denial, p. 288.

† Dr. Reynold's Life of Christ, p. 512.

‘ here only faith; and the certain consequent thereof, repentance.
 ‘ There is difference likewise in the manner of performing these
 ‘ conditions: For now God himself begins first to work upon us,
 ‘ and in us, before we move or stir towards him. He doth not
 ‘ only command us, and leave us to our created strength to obey
 ‘ the command; but he furnisheth us with his own grace and Spi-
 ‘ rit to obey the command.’

Of the same judgment is Dr. Owen*. ‘ Are we able (saith he)
 ‘ of ourselves to fulfil the condition of the new Covenant? Is it
 ‘ not as easy for a man by his own strength to fulfil the whole law,
 ‘ as to repent and believe the promise of the gospel? This then is
 ‘ one main difference of these two covenants, That the Lord did in
 ‘ the Old only require the condition; now in the New, he also
 ‘ effects it in all the fœderates, to whom the covenant is extended.’
 This is the man you pretended to be against conditions.

Mr. William Pemble †, opening the nature of the two covenants,
 saith, ‘ The law offers life unto man upon condition of perfect
 ‘ obedience; the gospel offers life unto man upon another condi-
 ‘ tion, to wit, of repentance and faith in Christ.’ And after his
 proofs for it, saith, ‘ From whence we conclude firmly, That the
 ‘ difference between the law and the gospel, assigned by our di-
 ‘ vines, is most certain and agreeable to the scriptures, viz. That
 ‘ the law gives life unto the just, upon condition of perfect obedi-
 ‘ ence in all things; the gospel gives life unto sinners, upon con-
 ‘ dition they repent, and believe in Christ Jesus.’

Learned and judicious Mr. William Perkins ‡ thus, ‘ The cove-
 ‘ nant of grace is that, whereby God freely promising Christ and
 ‘ his benefits, exacts again of man, that he would by faith receive
 ‘ Christ. And again, in the covenant of grace two things must be
 ‘ considered, the substance thereof, and the condition. The sub-
 ‘ stance of the covenant is, That righteousness and life everlasting,
 ‘ is given to God’s church and people by Christ §. The condition
 ‘ is, That we, for our part, are by faith to receive the aforesaid
 ‘ benefits; and this condition is by grace, as well as the sub-
 ‘ stance.’

That learned, humble, and painful minister of Christ, Mr. John
 Ball ||, stating the difference betwixt the two covenants, shews that
 in the covenant at Sinai, in the covenant with Abraham, and that

* Dr. Owen’s Treatise of Redemption, book 3. chap. i. p. 103, 104. And in his
 Tract of Justification, p. 299, &c.

† Pemble of Justification, sect. 4. chap. i. p. 214, 215, 216, 217.

‡ Perkins’ Order of Causes, chap. xxxi. p. 17.

§ Reformed Catholic of Justification, p. 570.

|| Mr. J. Ball, of the covenant of grace, chap. i. Of the New Covenant, p. 198.

with David, that in all these covenant-expressures, there are for substance the same evangelical conditions of faith and sincerity.

Dr. Davenant * thus: ' In the covenant of the gospel it is otherwise; for in this covenant, to the obtainment of reconciliation, justification, and life eternal, there is no other condition required than of true and lively faith, John iii. 16. ' Therefore justification, and the right to eternal life doth depend on the condition of faith alone.'

Dr. Downname † harmonizeth with the rest in these words: ' That which is the only condition of the covenant of grace, by that alone we are justified: But faith is the condition of the covenant of grace, which is therefore called *lex fidei*. Our writers, saith he, distinguishing the two covenants of God, that is, the law and the gospel, whereof one is the covenant of works, the other the covenant of grace, do teach, That the law of works is that which to justification requireth works as the condition thereof: the law of faith that which to justification requireth faith as the condition thereof. The former saith this, *Do this, and thou shalt live*; the latter, *Believe in Christ, and thou shalt be saved.*'

But what stand I upon particular, though renowned names? You may see a whole constellation of our sound and famous divines in the assembly, thus expressing themselves about this point. ' The grace of God, say they, is manifested in the second covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation by him, and requiring faith as the condition to interest them in him, promiseth and giveth his Holy Spirit to all his elect, to work in them that faith with all other saving graces, and to enable them to all holy obedience, as the evidence of the truth of their faith,' &c. ‡

I could even tire the reader with the testimonies of eminent foreign Divines, as *Cameron. de triplici fœdere*, Thes. 82. *Ursinus et Paræus, explicato Catech. Quest. 18. de fœdere*. *Wendeline Christian Theology, lib. 1. cap. 19. thes. 9. Poliander, Rivet, Wallæus, and Thysius*, the four learned professors at Leyden, Synops. Dis. 23. sect. 27. &c. And as for those ancient and modern Divines whom the Antinomians have corrupted and misrepresented, the reader may see them all vindicated, and their concurrence with those I have named evidenced by that learned and pious Mr. John Craile, in his *Modest vindication of the doctrine of conditions in the covenant of grace*, from p. 58. onward; a man whose name and memory is precious with me, not only upon the account of that excellent sermon he preached, and those fervent prayers he poured out many

* *Davenant de justific. Act. cap. 50.*

† Tract. 1. of justification, b. 6. chap. 8. sect. 10. and b. 7. chap. 2. sect. 6.

‡ Larger catechis. 4^{to}. London 1648, p. 8.

years since at my ordination; but for that learned and judicious treatise of his against Mr. Eyre, wherein he hath cast great light upon this controversy, as excellent Mr. Baxter and Mr. Woodbridge have also done. But, alas! what evidence is sufficient to satisfy ignorant and obstinate men!

Sir, It pities me to see the lamentable confusion you are in; you are forced, by the evidence of truth, to yield and own the substance of what I contend for: you have yielded the covenant to be consequently conditional, in p. 84. of your Reply; you have also as plainly yielded that the *application of pardoning mercy unto our souls is in order of nature, consequent unto believing*, p. 31. of your Reply. From both which concessions, in your own words recited, this conclusion is evident and unavoidable, viz.

That no adult person, notwithstanding God's eternal election, and Christ's meritorious death and satisfaction, according to the constitution and order of the new covenant, can either be justified in this world, or saved in the world to come, unless he first believe.

For if the application of pardoning mercy unto our souls is in order of nature, consequent unto believing, (as you truly affirm it to be) then, according to the constitution and order of the new covenant, no application of pardoning mercy can be made to our souls before we believe. And if it be evident (as you say it is, p. 84.) *that unto a full and complete enjoyment of all the promises of the covenant, faith on our part is required*; then, as no man can be actually justified in this world, so neither can he be saved before, or without faith, in the world to come. And if you did but see the true suspending nature of faith, which you plainly yield, in these two concessions; you would quickly grant the conditional nature of it: for what is the proper nature and true notion of a condition but to suspend the benefits and grants of that covenant in which it is so inserted? And thus the controversy betwixt us is fairly issued. But I doubt you understand not what you have here written, or are troubled with a very bad memory; because I find you in a far different note from this, in p. 103. of your Reply, where you say, 'That if Jesus Christ fulfilled the law, and purchased heaven and happiness for men, (as all true Protestants hitherto have taught) then nothing can remain, but to declare this to them to incline them to believe and accept it; and to prescribe in what way and by what means they shall finally come to inherit eternal life. To affirm, therefore, that faith and repentance are the conditions of the new covenant required of us in point of duty, antecedent to the benefit of the promise, doth necessarily suppose, that Christ hath not done all for us, nor purchased a right to life for any; but only made way that they might have it upon certain terms,

‘ or, as some say, he hath merited that we might merit: but the conditions of the covenant are not to be performed by the head and members both, Gal. iv. 4. Christ, therefore, having in our stead performed the conditions of life, there remains nothing but a promise and the obedience of children as the fruit and effect thereof to them that believe in him, together with means of obtaining the full possession which here we want.’

Reply. Either these passages I have here cited and compared were fetched at a great distance of time, out of authors differing as much in judgment as you and I do, and so the dissonancy of them is the mere effect of oblivion and incogitancy; or else your intellectuals are more confused and weak than I am willing to suspect them to be. For if the application of pardoning mercy to our souls is in order of nature, consequent to believing, as you truly say it was, then, certainly, notwithstanding Christ’s fulfilling the law, and purchasing heaven and happiness for men, something else must remain to be done, besides declaring this to them, to incline them to believe and accept it, or prescribing to them in what way they shall finally come to inherit eternal life. For, besides those declarations and prescriptions you talk of, faith itself must be wrought in the souls of men, or else pardoning mercy is not in order of nature, consequent unto believing, as you said it was: for all the external declarations and prescriptions in the world are not faith itself, but only the means to beget it; which may, or may not become effectual to that end.

Secondly, Whereas you say, this (senseless notion) is consequent upon the doctrine of all true Protestants; you grossly abuse them, and make all the true Protestants in the world guilty of worse than Arminian, or Antinomian dotage. The Antinomian, indeed, makes our actual justification to be nothing else but the manifestation or declaration of our justification from eternity, or the time of Christ’s death. And the Arminian tells us, that the declaration of the gospel to men is sufficient to bring them to faith by the assisting grace of the Spirit. But your notion is worse than the very dregs of both, and yet you tack it as a just consequent to the doctrine of all true Protestants.

Reply, Thirdly, You say, *That to affirm faith and repentance to be the conditions of the new covenant required of us in point of duty, antecedent to the benefit of the promise, doth necessarily suppose that Christ hath not done all for us, nor purchased a right to life for any; but only made way that they might have it upon certain terms, or merited that we might merit.* Here, sir, you vilely abuse all those worthy divines before-mentioned, who have made faith the condition of the new covenant, pinning upon them both Popery and Judaism. Popery, yea, the dregs of Popery,

in supposing their doctrine necessarily implies that *Christ hath merited that we might merit*. And Judaism to the height in saying, *their doctrine necessarily supposes that Christ hath not purchased a right of life to any*. What can a Jew say more? Ah, Mr. C. can you read the words I have here recited out of blessed Burroughs, Owen, Pemble, Perkins, Davenant, Downname, yea, the whole assembly of reverend and holy divines, with multitudes more, (who have all with one mouth asserted faith to be the condition of the new covenant required on man's part in point of duty; and that men must believe before they can be justified; which is the very same thing with what I say, that it is an antecedent to the benefit of the promise) and not tremble to think of the direful charges you here draw against them? The Lord forgive your rash presumption.

Fourthly, Whereas you say, Christ hath, in our stead, performed the conditions of life, and that there remains nothing but a promise, &c. you therein speak in the highest dialect of * Antinomianism. Hath not Christ, by his life and death performed the conditions of life in our stead? Yet you yourself confess, that pardoning mercy is, in order of nature, consequent to our believing; certainly then there is something more to be done beside the mere making or being of a promise: there must be the effects of the promise in our hearts, yea, the effects of those absolute promises of the first grace, Ezek. xxxvi. Jer. xxxii. Or else, notwithstanding Christ's performance of redemption on his part, we can neither be justified nor saved. For I do not think you intend to lay the condition of repentance, or believing upon Christ, who, in the new covenant, hath laid them upon us, though, in the same covenant, he graciously undertakes to work them in us: and yet your words sound in that wild Antinomian note.

Objection, But, I suppose, you take my notion to be as self-repugnant as your own, when I say faith is an antecedent condition to justification; because I also say, this grace is also supernaturally wrought in us, and is not of ourselves. This staggers you, and is the very stone you stumble at all along this controversy: for in your sense, p. 34. every condition is meritorious, by condignity, or congruity.

Reply, First, What do I say more in all this than what those worthies before-mentioned, do expressly affirm? Doth not Dr. Owen (the man whom you deservedly value) make conditions both in Adam's covenant and the new, with this difference, that Adam's covenant required them, but the new covenant effects them in all the fœderates? Sir, We take it for no contradiction to assert, That the planting of the principle, and the assisting and exciting of

* Saltmarsh of free grace, p. 126, 127.

the acts of faith, are the proper works of the Spirit of God, and are also contained in the absolute promises of the new covenant, Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27. Jer. xxxii. 39, 40. And yet faith, notwithstanding this, is truly and properly our work and duty; and that upon our believing or not believing, we have, or have not, an actual interest in Christ, righteousness, and life. For though the author of faith be the Spirit of God, yet believing, is properly our act, and an act required of us by a plain command; 1 John iii. 23. *This is the command of God, That ye believe.* And if its being wrought in God's strength makes it cease to be our work, I would fain know what exposition you would give of that place, Phil. ii. 12, 13. *Work out your own salvation, &c. for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do.* And as this faith is truly and properly our work, though wrought in God's strength (for it is not God, but we that do believe) so it is wrought in us by him (by our own confession) before the application of pardoning mercy, which is consequent in order of nature thereunto: and therefore hath the true nature of an antecedent condition, which is that I contend for; and did you but understand your own words, you would not contend against it.

Object. 2. Oh, but say you, p. 34. every condition is meritorious, either by way of *congruity*, or *condignity*.

Reply. This is your ignorance of the nature of a condition, with which I find you as unacquainted, as with the nature of a covenant. A condition, whilst unperformed, only suspends the act of the law, or testament; it being the will of the *testator*, *legislator*, or *donor*, that his law, or testament, should act, or effect, when the condition is performed, and not before: But it is not essential to a condition, to be a meritorious, or impulsive cause, moving him to bestow the benefit for the sake thereof. A man freely gives another, out of his love and bounty, such an estate, or sum of money, which he shall enjoy, if he live to such a year, or day, and not before; is this *quando dies veniet*, this appointed time the meritorious, or impulsive cause of the gift? Surely no man will say it; but that it is a *causa sine qua non*, or a condition suspending the enjoyment of the gift, no man will deny, that knows what the nature of a condition is. An act meritorious, by way of *congruity*, is that to which a reward is not due, out of strict justice, but out of decency, or some kind of meetness. Merit of *condignity* is a voluntary action, for which a reward is due to a man, out of justice, and cannot be denied him, without injustice; our faith is truly the condition of the new covenant, and yet we detest the meritoriousness of it, in either sense.

Object. 3. But you object my words to me, in my *Method of Grace*, where I assert the impossibility of believing without the efficacy of supernatural grace, p. 102, 103.

Reply. Sir, I own the words you quote, and am bold to challenge the most envious eye that shall read those lines, to shew me the least repugnancy betwixt what I said there, and what I have said in my *Vindiciæ Legis*, &c. p. 9. of the *Prolegomena*, and p. 61. of that book. You shew your good-will to make an advantageous thrust, but your weapon is too short, and can draw no blood. But leaving these weak and impertinent cavils, let us come to your solution of my arguments, p. 98. by which I proved the conditionality of the new covenant. My first argument was this :

Argum. 1. If we cannot be justified, or saved, till we believe, and are justified when we believe ; then faith is the condition on which those subsequent benefits are suspended, &c.

Answer. The sum of your answer (without denying, distinguishing, or limiting one proposition) is this, That ‘ here faith is ‘ properly put into the room of perfect obedience, and is to do ‘ what perfect obedience was to do under the law : Whereas (say ‘ you) faith is only appointed as an instrument to receive and apply ‘ the righteousness of Christ, which is the alone matter of our ‘ justification before God ; and faith itself is not our righteousness, ‘ as it would be, if it were a condition,’ p. 105, 106.

Reply. Not to note the weakness and impertinence of this answer, I shall only take notice of what you here allow, and grant, That *faith is appointed as an instrument to receive, and apply the righteousness of Christ, which is the alone matter of our justification before God.* Whence I infer three conclusions.

First, That we cannot be justified before God till we believe, except you can prove, that the unaccepted and unapplied righteousness of Christ, doth actually justify our persons before God.

Secondly, That the justification of our persons before God, is and must be suspended (as by a non-performed condition) until we actually believe. Which two conclusions yield up your cause to my argument, which you here seem to oppose.

Thirdly, That hereby you perfectly renounce, and destroy your Antinomian fancy before-mentioned, That *if Christ have fulfilled the law, and purchased heaven for men, nothing can remain but to declare this to them, &c.* for it seems by this, they must receive, and apply Christ’s righteousness by faith, or they cannot be justified (you say not declaratively in their own consciences, but) before God. And thus, instead of answering, you have confirmed, and yielded my first argument, and only oppose your own mistakes, not the sense, or force of my arguments, in all that you say to it, or the scriptures produced to prove it.

Arg. 2. To my second argument, recited p. 94. where I argued from God’s covenant with Abraham, and proved it to be conditional ;

and yet by you acknowledged to be a pure gospel covenant: all that you say, is, That you have dispatched that before, in your discourse about the *covenant of circumcision*, and therefore will say nothing to it here.

Reply. In saying nothing to it here, you have said as much as you did before, in the place you refer to; and therefore finding nothing said here, or there, I conclude you can say nothing to it at all.

Arg. 3. My third *argument* was this: if all the promises of the gospel be absolute and unconditional, then they do not properly belong to the new covenant. That cannot properly and strictly be a covenant, which is not a mutual compact, and in which there is no restipulation, nor re-obligation: it is a naked promise, not a covenant.

To this you answer three things. In the first branch of your answer, you impudently beg the question, by saying, That *you have proved already*, *Answer.* p. 113, 114. *in your replies to my former arguments, that the new covenant is wholly free and absolute.* Upon this absurd *Petitio principii*, you make bold to invert my argument thus, in your second reply: ‘If all the promises of the gospel be wholly absolute and unconditional, they do properly and truly belong to the new covenant; but so they are: therefore, &c.’ O rare disputant! In the last place, in opposition to the sequel of my major proposition, you tell me, You will oppose the judgment of Dr. Owen on Heb. viii. 10. where he saith, ‘That a covenant properly is a compact, or agreement, on certain terms, stipulated by two or more parties, &c. and that the word *διαθήκη*, there used, signifies a covenant improperly, &c.

Reply. If you call this an opposition to the sequel of my *major*, either your brains or mine do want Hellebore. Doth he not say the very same thing I do, That there must be a restipulation in a proper covenant? And as for the word *διαθήκη*, which, he saith, signifieth a covenant improperly, but properly is a testamentary disposition, I fully concur with him therein; but I hope a testamentary disposition may have a condition in it; to be sure such a one as I assert faith here to be, which is the free gift of God: and in this sense I shewed you before, where the *Doctor* yields faith to be the condition of the new covenant.

Arg. 4. My fourth argument was this, If all the promises of the new covenant be absolute and unconditional, and have no respect nor relation to any grace wrought in us, or duty done by us; then the trial of our interest in Christ by marks and signs of grace, is not our duty, nor can we take comfort in sanctification, as it is an evidence of our justification, &c.

Your answer, p. 120. is, That ‘at this rate I may prove *quidlibet a quolibet*; for it doth not follow, that, because the new covenant is absolute, therefore it hath no respect nor relation to any grace wrought in us, nor duty done by us, or that we may not justly take comfort in sanctification, as an evidence of our justification.

Reply. If I had a mind to learn the art of proving *quidlibet a quolibet*, and make myself ridiculous to others, by such foolish attempts, I know no book in the world fitter to instruct me therein than yours. Certainly you have the knack of it, and give us an instance of it but now, in confuting the sequel of my *major*, by an allegation out of Dr. Owen, which expressly confirms and establishes it. But to the point; I would willingly know how it is possible for sanctification to be a true and certain mark and sign of justification, when (according to the Antinomian principle, which you here too much comprobate and espouse) a man may be justified before he believe, yea, before he is a man, even from the time of Christ’s death, and (as others of them speak) from eternity. A true mark and sign must be proper to, and inseparable from that which it signifies. Now, if that be true which you said before, That *after Christ’s fulfilling of the law in his own person, &c. nothing can remain, but to declare this to men to incline them to believe and accept it, and to prescribe in what way they shall come to inherit eternal life.* If this be all that can remain to us, then nothing but the declarations and prescriptions of the gospel, which are things without us, can remain to be marks and signs of justification to us: and consequently all those to whom those declarations and prescriptions are made and given, have therein the marks and evidences of their justification. But I am truly weary of such stuff; I am sure the apostle places *vocation* before *justification*. Rom. viii. 30. “Whom he called, them he justified.” And without an immediate testimony from heaven, I know not how to evidence and prove my justification, but from, and by my faith, and other parts of sanctification; whereby I apprehend and apply the righteousness of Christ: if you can prove it from the declarations and prescriptions of the gospel, I cannot.

Arg. 5. My fifth and last argument, ran thus: If the covenant of grace be altogether absolute and unconditional, requiring nothing to be done on our part to entitle us to its benefits, then it cannot be man’s duty, in entering covenant with God, to deliberate the terms, count the cost, or give his consent by word or writing, to the terms of this covenant: for where there are no terms at all, (as in absolute promises there are none) there can be none to deliberate. But I shewed you, this is man’s duty, from clear and undeniable scriptures, &c.

You say, by way of answer hereunto, that ‘ You must tell me, that the scriptures do make a plain distinction between the new and everlasting covenant, which God hath been pleased to make with sinners in Jesus Christ; and the return of that sincere and dutiful obedience which he requires of us, by way of answer thereunto. (2.) You say, there are many things, which though promised in the covenant, and wrought in us by the grace of God; are yet duties indispensably required of us in order to the participation of the full end of the covenant in glory: and in respect hereof, we are indeed to deliberate the terms, count the cost, and give up ourselves solemnly to him, with sincere resolutions, &c. But then you thought I had understood there had been a vast difference betwixt God’s covenant with us, and our covenant with God, citing Ezek. xvi. 59, 60, 61. where God promiseth to “ give them their sisters for daughters, but not by their covenant.” And with this you compare Psal. lxxxix. “ My covenant will I not break;” where (you say) we find a plain distinction betwixt God’s covenant with them, and their duty to God. And lastly, you say, p. 105. that the want of a due observation of this plain scripture-distinction, betwixt God’s free and absolute covenant made with sinners in Christ, and our covenants with God by way of return thereunto, is the true reason of all our mistakes about the true nature of the gospel covenant, whilst we jumble and confound together that which the scriptures do so plainly distinguish.’

Reply. To your first answer, I say; it is true, the scriptures do distinguish betwixt covenant and covenant; that of works, and that of grace. It also distinguishes the same covenant of grace for substance, according to its various administrations into the old and new covenant. It also distinguishes betwixt the *promissory* part of the same covenant of grace, and the *restipulatory* part; not as two opposite covenants, (as you distinguish them, Gen. xvii.) but as the just and necessary parts of one and the same covenant. It also distinguishes betwixt vows made by men to God in some particular cases, and the covenant of grace betwixt God and them. But what is all this to your purpose? Or in what point doth it touch my argument? You desire me to cast mine eye upon Ezek. xvi. and Psal. lxxxix. I have done so, and that impartially; and do assure you, I admire why you produce them against my argument. That in Ezek. speaks of the enlargement of the church by the accession of the Gentiles to it; and the sense of those words seems to me to be this: That this enlargement of the church is a gracious addition, or something beyond what God had ever done in his former dispensations of the covenant to that people. And for Psal. lxxxix.

I know not what you mean to produce it for, unless it be to prove what I never denied, That notwithstanding our failures in duty towards God, God will still keep his covenant with us; though he will visit the iniquities of his covenant-people with a rod.

To your second answer, That we are to deliberate the terms and count the cost, with respect to those duties, which are in order to the participation of the full end of the covenant in glory: by which I suppose you mean self-denial, perseverance, &c. I have no controversy with you about that. Our question is, Whether there be no deliberations required of, or to be performed by men who are not yet in Christ by justifying faith, but under some preparatory works towards faith? And whether at the very time of their closing with Christ, there be not a consent of the will unto those terms required of them? If you say there be, (as by the places I alleged it evidently appears there are) then you yield the point I contend for. If you say they are not before, or at the time of believing, to consider any terms, or give their consent to them by word or writing; such an answer would fly in the very face of those scriptures I produced: for then a man may be in covenant without his own consent; he that deliberates not, consents not; *non consentit, qui non sentit*. And therefore you durst not speak it out (for which modesty I commend you) and so leave me with half an answer, not touching that part, viz. Antecedent deliberations, which were concerned in this argument. And now let your most partial friends judge, whether from this performance of yours, you have any just ground for that vain boast which concludes your answer, viz. 'That the covenants themselves, which those privileges are bottomed on; are now repealed, and that there is no room left for any other argument to infer the baptism of infants: at least, I shall willingly commit it to the judgment of all intelligent and impartial readers, Whether Mr. Cary hath any real ground in this performance of his, for such a thrasonical conclusion, such a vain and fulsome boast?

I find that with like confidence he hath also attempted a reply to Mr. Joseph Whiston, a reverend, learned, and aged divine, who hath accurately and successfully defended God's covenant with Abraham against Mr. Cox, and doubt not, if Mr. Cary and his party have but confidence enough to expose it to the public view, and to adventure the cause of infant-baptism upon it, the world would quickly see an end of this long-continued and unhappy controversy, which hath vexed the church of God, and alienated the affections of good men; and that the wisdom of Providence hath permitted and over-ruled this last attempt to the singular advantage of the truths of God, and the tranquillity of good men, whose concernment (at this time especially) is rather to strengthen their

faith and heighen their encouragements from God's gracious covenant, than to undermine it when all things beside it are shaking and tottering round about them.

And now, Sir, for a *coronis* to all those things that have been controverted betwixt us about the covenants of God, and the right of believers' infants to baptism, resulting from one of them which I have asserted and argued against you in my first answer, and you have silently and wholly passed over in your reply, hoping to destroy them all at once, by proving God's covenant with Abraham, Gen. xvii. to be a pure Adam's covenant of works; I judge it necessary, as matters now lie between us, to give the reader the grounds and reasons of my faith and practice with respect unto the ordinance of infant baptisin, and that as succinctly and clearly as I can in the following *Thesis*; which being laid together by an unprejudiced and considerative reader, will, I think, amount to more than a strong probability, *That it is the will of God that the infant seed of believers ought now to be baptized.*

P. 61, 62. But here I must remind the reader, and beg him to review what I have said before in the third *Cause of errors*, That to arrive to satisfaction in this point, requires a due and serious search of the whole word of God; with a sedate, rational, and impartial mind; comparing one thing with another, though they lie scattered at a distance in the scriptures; some in the *Old Testament* and some in the *New*. Bring but these things to an interview, as we do in discovering the change of the sabbath, and we may arrive unto a due satisfaction of the will of God herein. This I confess, calls for strength of mind, great sedulity, attention, and impartiality; and yet what man would think all this too much, if it were but to clear his children's title unto a small earthly inheritance? I intend not to give the reader here an account of all the arguments drawn from several scripture-topics by the strenuous defenders of infant's baptism; but to keep only to the arguments drawn from God's covenant with Abraham, Gen. xvii. which is the scripture mainly controverted betwixt us: You affirming boldly and dangerously that covenant to be no other than an Adam's covenant of works; and I justly denying and abhorring your position upon the grounds and reasons before given, which you neither have, nor ever will be able to destroy. Now that the reader, who hath neither time nor ability to read the larger and more elaborate treatises on this subject, may, *ως εν τυπω*, in one short view, see the deduction of believers' infants right to baptism from this gospel covenant of God with Abraham, I shall gather the substance of what I contend for, and lay it as clearly as I can before the eyes of my reader in the following *Thesis*; which being distinctly considered as to the evident truth of each, and then rationally compared one with the

other, he will see how each fortifies another, and how all together do strongly confirm this conclusion, That the infants of believers under the gospel, as they naturally descend from Abraham's spiritual seed, are therefore partakers at least of the external privileges of the visible church, and therefore ought now to be baptized.

Thesis 1. It hath pleased God, in all ages of the world, since man was created, to deal with his church and people by way of covenant, and in the same way he will still deal with them unto the end of the world.

God might have dealt with us in a supreme way of mere sovereignty and dominion, commanding what duties he pleased, and establishing his commands by what penalties he pleased, and never have brought himself under the tie and obligation of a covenant to his own creatures: but he chuses to deal familiarly with his people by way of covenanting, being a familiar way, 2 Sam. vii. 19. *Is this the manner of men, O Lord God, or, (as Junius renders it) and that after the manner of men, O Lord God!* it is a way full of condescending grace and goodness: he is willing hereby his people should know what they may certainly expect from their God, as well as what their God requires of them. Hereby also he will furnish them with mighty pleas and arguments in prayer, succour their faith against temptations, strengthen their hands in duties of obedience, sweeten their obedience to them, and discriminate his own people from the world.

As soon therefore as man was created and placed in paradise, being made upright and thoroughly furnished with abilities perfectly and completely to obey all the commands of his Maker, the Lord immediately entered into the covenant of works with him, and all his natural posterity in him: And in this covenant his standing or falling was according to the perfection and constancy of his personal obedience, Gen. ii. 17. Gal. iii. 10. But in this first covenant of works no provision at all was made for his recovery (in case of the least failure) by his repentance or better obedience; but the curse immediately seized both soul and body: and sin, by the fall entering into man's nature, totally disabled him to the perfect performance of any one duty, as that covenant required it to be done, Rom. viii. 3. nor would God accept any repentance or after-endeavours in lieu of that perfect obedience due by law. So that from the fall of Adam to the end of the world this covenant ceaseth as a covenant of life, or a covenant able to give righteousness and life unto all mankind for evermore, Rom. iii. 20. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Gal. ii. 16. "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Gal. iii. 11. "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, is evident." And it being so evident, that righteousness and life being for ever impossible to be

obtained upon the terms of Adam's covenant, it must therefore be a self-evident truth, That *since the fall God never did, and to the end of the world he never will open that way or door to life (thus blocked up by an absolute impossibility) for the justification and salvation of any man.*

Thesis. 2. Soon after the violation and cessation of this first covenant, as a covenant of life, it pleased the Lord to open and publish the second covenant of grace by Jesus Christ, the first dawning whercof we find in Gen. iii. 15. where the seed is promised which shall bruise the serpent's head. And though this be but a very short, and somewhat obscure discovery of man's remedy and salvation by Christ; yet was it a joyful sound to the ears of God's people, it was even life from the dead to the believers of those times. For we may rationally conclude, That that space of time betwixt the breaking of the first and making * of the second covenant was the most dismal period of time that ever the world did or shall see. This covenant of grace now took place of the covenant of works, and comprehended all believers in the bosom of it. The covenant of works took place from the time it was made until the fall of Adam, and then was abolished as a life-giving covenant. The second covenant took place from the time it was made soon after the fall, and is to continue to the end of the world. And these only are the two covenants God hath made with men; the latter succeeding the former, and commencing from its expiration; but both cannot possibly be in force together at the same time, and upon the same persons, as co-ordinate covenants of life and salvation. For in co-ordination they expel and destroy each other, Gal. v. 4. "Whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." The first covenant was a covenant without a mediator; the second is a covenant with a mediator. Place a believer under both at once, or put these two covenants in co-ordination, and that which results will be a pure contradiction, viz. That a man is saved without a mediator, and yet by a mediator. Moreover, if there be a way to life without a mediator, there was no need to make a covenant in and with a mediator; nor can those words of Christ be true, John iv. 6. "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me."

The righteousness of the first covenant was within man himself; the righteousness of the second covenant is without man in Christ. Put these two in co-ordination, and that which results is as pure a contradiction as the former, viz. That a man is justified by a righteousness within him, and yet is justified by a righteousness without him, expressly contrary to the apostle's conclusion, Rom. iii. 20.

* That is, the revelation. Editor.

“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight.” It is therefore an intolerable absurdity to place believers under both these covenants at the same time; under the curse of the first, and blessing of the second. For whensoever the state of any person is changed by justification, his covenant is changed with his state, Col. i. 13. It is as unimaginable that a believer should thus stand under both covenants, as it is to imagine a man may be born of two mothers, Gal. iv. 22, 23, 24, 25. or a woman lawfully married to two husbands, Rom. vii. 1, 2, 3, 4. and more absurd (if it be possible any thing can be more absurd) to attribute the most glorious privilege of the covenant of grace, (*viz.* “I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee,” Gen. xvii. 7.) to the impotent and abolished covenant of works; both which absurdities are asserted in defence of *Antipædo-baptism*.

And though it be true, that after the first edition of the covenant of grace, the matter of the first covenant was represented to the Israelites in the moral law; yet that representation was intended and designed to be subservient, and added to the promise, Gal. iii. 19. and so (as an acute and learned divine * speaks) the very decalogue or *moral law* itself pertained to the covenant of grace; yea, in some sort flowed out of this covenant, as it was promulged by the counsel of God to be serviceable to it; both antecedently to lead men by the conviction of sin, fear of wrath, and self-despair, to the covenant of grace; and also consequently as it is a pattern of obedience and rule of holiness. For had it been published as a covenant designed intentionally to its primitive use and end, it had totally frustrated the covenant of grace.

Thesis 3. Though the primordial light or first glimmerings of this covenant of grace, were comparatively weak and obscure; yet from the first publication of it to Adam, God in all ages hath been amplifying the privileges, and heightening the glory of this second covenant in all the after expressures and editions of it unto this day, and will more and more amplify and illustrate it to the end of the world.

That first promise, Gen. iii. 15. is like the first small spring or head of a great river, which the farther it runs, the bigger it grows by the accession of more waters to it. Or like the sun in the heavens, which the higher it mounts, the more bright and glorious the day still grows.

In that period of time, betwixt Adam and Abraham, we find no token of God's covenant ordered therein to be applied to the infant seed of believers. But in that second edition of the covenant to Abraham, the privileges of the covenant were amplified, and his infant-seed not only taken into the covenant (as they were

* *Turretini Pars 2da loc. 12. p. 218.*

before) but also added to the visible church, by receiving the token of the covenant, which then was circumcision; and so here is a great addition made to the visible church, even the whole infant off-spring of adult believers.

From that period, until the coming of the Messiah in the flesh, the Jewish church, and their infant-seed, except only some few proselytes out of the Gentile nations, made up the visible church of God, and the poor Gentiles were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world, Eph. ii. 12. but in this glorious third period the covenant again enlarges itself more than before, and the privileges of it are no longer limited, and restrained to the Jewish believers, and their infant-seed; but the Gentiles also are taken into the covenant, and the door of faith was opened unto them, Acts xiv. 27. the partition-wall was now broken down, which separated the church from the Gentile world, Eph. ii. 14. This was a glorious enlargement of the covenant, and many glorious prophecies and promises were fulfilled in it; such as those, Isa. xi. 10. and xlii. 1, 6. xlix. 22. liv. 3. lx. 3, 5, 11, 16. lxii. 2, &c.

And though the covenant, as to its external part, seems to have lost ground in the breaking off of the Jewish nation from the church; yet, like the sea, what it loses in one place, it gains with advantage upon another: The addition of many Gentile nations to the church, more than recompenses for the present breaking off of that one nation of the Jews. And indeed they are broken off but for a time, for God shall graff them in again, Rom. xi. 23. This therefore being the design of God, and steady course of his covenant of grace, more and more to enlarge itself in all ages; nothing can be more opposite to the nature of this covenant, than to narrow and contract its privileges in its farther progress, and cut off a whole species from it, which it formerly took in.

Thesis 4. It is past all doubt and contradiction, that the infant-seed of Abraham, under the second edition of the covenant of grace, were taken with their believing parents into God's gracious covenant, had the seal of that covenant applied to them, and were thereby added to the visible church, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. which was a gracious privilege of the covenant superadded to all the former, and such as sweeps away all the frivolous and groundless cavils and exceptions of those that object the incapacity of infants to enter into covenant with God, or receive benefit from the external privileges of the visible church. Nor can the subtlest enemy to infant-baptism give us a convincing reason why the infants of Gentile believers are not equally capable of the same benefits that the infants of Jewish believers were, if they still stand

under the same covenant that the former stood under; and God hath no where repealed the gracious grant formerly made to the infant-seed of his covenant-people.

Thesis 5. It is to me clear, beyond all contradiction, from Rom. xi. 17. "If some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in amongst them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree:" I say I can scarce desire a clearer scripture-light than this text gives, to satisfy my understanding in this case, that when God brake off the unbelieving Jews from the church, both parents and children together, the believing Gentiles, which are as truly Abraham's seed as they were, Gal. iii. 29. yea, the more excellent seed of Abraham, were implanted or ingrafted in their room, and do as amply enjoy the privileges of that covenant, both internal and external, for themselves and for their infant-seed, as ever any members of the Jewish church did or could do.

Our adversaries in this controversy do pitifully and apparently shuffle here, and invent many strange and unintelligible distinctions to becloud the light of this famous text. What they are, and how they are baffled, the reader will easily discern from what hath already past betwixt my antagonist and me, in p. 108, &c. of my *Vindiciæ Legis et Fœderis*. It is plain that Abraham is the root; the olive-tree, the visible church; the sap and fatness of the olive, are church-ordinances and covenant-privileges; the Gentile believers, who are Abraham's seed according to promise, are the ingrafted branches standing in the place of the natural branches, and with them, or in like manner as they did, partaking of the root and fatness of the olive-tree, that is, as really and amply enjoying all the immunities, benefits, and privileges of the church and covenant (among which the initiating sign was one, and a chief one too) as ever the natural branches that were broken off, that is, the Jewish parents and their children, did or might have done. And to deny this, (as before was noted) is to straiten covenant-privileges in their farther progress.

Thesis 6. Suitable hereunto we find, that no sooner was the Christian church constituted, and the believing Gentiles by faith added to it, but the children of such believing parents are declared to be fœderally holy, 1 Cor. vii. 14. and the unbelieving Jews, who were superstitiously fond of circumcision, and prejudiced against baptism as an injurious innovation, are by the apostle persuaded to submit themselves to it, Acts ii. 38, 39. assuring them that the same promise, viz. *I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee*, is now as effectually sealed to them and their children by baptism, as it was in the former age by circumcision: And that the Gentiles, which are yet afar off, whenever God shall call them,

shall equally enjoy the same privilege, both for themselves and for their children also.

We also find a commission given by Christ to the disciples, Mat. xxviii. 19, 20. *To disciple all nations, baptizing them, &c.* from which discipleship, infants ought not to be excluded, Acts xv. 10. Yea, we find, that as at the institution of circumcision, Abraham, the father and master of the family, was first circumcised in his own person, and then his whole household, Gen. xvii. 23, 24. answerably, as soon as any person by conversion or public profession of faith became a visible child of Abraham, that person was first baptized, and the whole household with him or her, Acts xvi. 15, 33. It is unreasonable to put us upon the proof, that there were infants in those houses; it being more than probable that in such frequent baptizing of households belonging to believers, there were some infants; but if there were none, it is enough for us to prove from their fœderal holiness, 1 Cor. vii. 14. and the extent of God's promises to them, Acts ii. 38, 39. if there had been never so many infants in those households, they might and ought to have been baptized. How the true sense and scope of the two last mentioned scriptures are maintained and vindicated against Mr. Cary's corrupt glosses and interpretations, see my *Vindiciæ Legis et Fœderis*, p. 90, 91. We do not lay the stress of infant-baptism upon such strictures as the baptizings of the household's of believers, or Christ's taking up in his arms, and blessing the little ones that were brought to him. These and many other such things found in the history of *Christ*, and *Acts of the apostles*, have their use and service to fortify that doctrine. But if we can produce no example of any believer's infant baptized, the merit of the cause lies not in the matter of fact, but covenant-right. For our adversaries themselves, if we go to the matter of fact, will be hard put to it to produce us one instance out of the New Testament of any child of a believing Christian whose baptism was deferred, or by Christ or his apostles ordered to be deferred, until he attained the years of maturity, and made a personal profession of faith himself.

Thesis 7. The change of the token and seal of the covenant from circumcision to baptism, will by no means infer the change or diversity of the covenants, especially when the latter comes into the place, and serves to the same use and end with the former, as it is manifest baptism doth, from Col. ii. 11, 12. as hath been, I think, sufficiently argued against Mr. Cary's glosses and exceptions, p. 100, 101. of my Vindicia Legis et Fœderis. The covenant is still the same covenant of grace, though the external initiating sign be changed. For what is the substantial part of the covenant of grace now, but the same it was to Abraham and his seed before? Is not this our covenant of grace, Heb. viii. 10. "I will be to them a God, and they

shall be to me “a people?” And in what words was Abraham’s covenant expressed, Gen. xvii. 7. “I will establish my covenant “between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations “for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy “seed after thee.” This makes Abraham’s covenant, sealed to him and his seed, as truly and properly the *covenant of grace*, as that which baptism now seals to believers and their seed. The rash ignorance of those that affirm, God may become a people’s God in the way of special interest, by virtue of the broken and abolished *covenant of works*, rather deserves sharp reprehension and sad lamentation, than a confutation; which, nevertheless out of respect to my friend Mr. Cary, I have given it in its proper place in this rejoinder.

I hope by this time I have made it evident, that the defenders of infant-baptism, as it is established upon God’s covenant with Abraham, Gen. xvii. have not so mistaken their ground, as Mr. Cary hath, by his endeavours to carry that covenant as an Adam’s *covenant of works*, through such a multitude of other errors and absurdities, as he draws along with it in his way of reasoning.



A POSTSCRIPT TO MR. CARY.

SIR,

I RESOLVED not to disturb my mind with your passionate provoking language, at least whilst I was busily employed in searching for reason and argument (two scarce commodities) amongst heaps of vain and fulsome words: Nor will I now imitate your folly and rudeness, lest I become an *offender*, whilst I am to act the part of a *reprover*. When I read your title, *A just and sober Reply*, and presently fell in among rude insults, silly evasions, and such inartificial discourses as follow in your book, I began to challenge you in my thoughts for matching such bad stuff with so fair and lovely a title: But a second thought quickly corrected the former; for I considered, no man living could justly forbid the marriage betwixt your book and its title, since there is not the least kindred or relation between them.

Had your answers been just, you would have observed the rules of a respondent, which you have not done; and if they had been sober, you had never been so free in your reproaches, and sparing in your arguments, as you have been. Is this the man, of whom it is said in the Epistle to his *Solemn Call*, That *his lines are free from reflection and reproach towards those of the persuasion he contends with?* Is this my old friendly neighbour? It calls to my mind

the Italian proverb, *God keep us from our friends, and we will do what we can to keep ourselves from our enemies.* And though you act the part of an enemy, you shall be my friend whether you will or not. If you will not be my friend out of love, I will make you so by a good improvement of your hatred.

I have been musing with myself, what might be the true cause of all your rage against my book; one while I thought it proceeded from want of discretion, that you were not able to distinguish betwixt an adversary in a controversy, and an adversary to the person; but thought every blow that was given to your error, must needs be a mortal wound to your reputation. But, Sir, how close and smart soever my discourses against your errors be, I am sure they are more full of civility and respect to you, than such a reply as you have made deserves: And if, in exposing your errors, your reputation be exposed, you must blame them for occasioning it, and not me.

Sometimes I thought it an effect of your policy, that when followed close, and hard put to it, you endeavoured an escape this way. Camero, speaking of this kind of subtilty in his adversaries, saith, *Faciunt quod quarundum ferarum ingenium est, ut fectore et graveolentia, defectæ jam viribus, ac fractæ, venatorem ubigunt.* Some cunning animals, as foxes, &c. when pursued at the heels, drive away both dogs and huntsmen with their intolerable stench. And Hierom long ago told Helvidius his adversary, *Arbitror te veritate convictum ad maledicta converti;* being vanquished by truth, he betook himself to ill language. After the same manner you act here, being no longer able to defend yourself by solid and sober ratiocination, you trust to your faculty in crimination; bad causes only drive men into such refuges.

In a word, I am satisfied that nothing but your extravagant zeal for your idolized opinion, could have thrown you into such disingenuous methods and artifices as these. The Ephesians were quiet enough till their Diana began to totter. Your passionate outcries signify to me, something is touched to the quick, which you are more fondly in love with than you ought. When one told Luther what hideous outcries his enemies made against him, and how they reviled him in their books; *I know by their roaring (saith he) that I have lit them right.*

You tell me in your reply, p. 24. That you perceive *I have a mighty itch to find out your absurdities.* I wish, Sir, you were no more troubled with the itch after them than I am after the discovery of them. Had I affected such employments I could easily have gathered three to one out of your book more than I did; and have represented those I gathered much more odiously (and yet

justly) than I did: but friendship constrained me to handle them (because yours) as gently as I could.

I might have justly charged you from what you say, p. 174, 175. of your Solemn Call, where you place all the believers on earth, without exception of any, under the covenant of works, as a ministration of death and condemnation, and the severest penalties of a dreadful curse: I might thereupon have justly charged you for presenting to the world such a monstrous sight as was never seen before since the creation, viz. a whole church of condemned and cursed believers. This I might as well have charged upon your position, and done it no wrong.

I could tell you from what you say, p. 76. of your reply, *That God doth indeed, in the covenant of works, make over himself to sinners, to be their God in a way of special interest; but it being upon such hard terms, that it is utterly impossible that way to attain unto life, &c.* I could justly have told you, that these passages of yours drop pure nonsense upon the reader's understanding; as if salvation were impossible to be attained by the same covenant, wherein God becomes our God, and makes over himself by way of special interest to us.

Had I had an itch to expose the burlesque and ridiculous stuff which lies obvious enough in your book, I should then have told your reader, That according to your doctrine, how opposite and inconsistent soever the two covenants of works and grace are, yet the same subjects, viz. believers, may, at once, not only stand under them both, but that the same common seal, viz. circumcision, equally ratifies and confirms them both: For you allow, in your Call, p. 205. *That it sealed the covenant of grace to believing Abraham, and yet was a seal of the covenant of works,* yea, the very condition of that covenant, as you frequently affirm it to be. *Vide* p. 81. of your Reply, and *Passim*.

I could as easily and justly have told you, That the most malicious Papist could scarcely have invented a more horrid reproach against our famous orthodox Protestant Divines than you (I dare not say maliciously, but) ignorantly have done; when you charge such men as Mr. Francis Roberts, Mr. Obadiah Sedgwick, and, indeed, all that assert the law, complexly taken, to be an obscurer covenant of grace; that they comprise perfect doing with the consequent curse for non-performance and believing in Christ unto life and salvation in one and the same covenant: This is an intolerable abuse of yours, p. 5. of your Reply. They generally assert the law in that complex sense and latitude you take it, to be a true covenant of grace, though more obscurely administered; and that the distinction of the covenants into old and new, is no parallel

distinction with that of works and grace, or of Christ's and Adam's covenant. Your public recantation of the injury you have done the very Protestant cause herein, is your unquestionable duty, yet scarce a due reparation of the injury.

In a word, I cannot but look upon it as a discovery of your great weakness, That when you meet with such a difficulty as poses your understanding, and you cannot possibly reconcile with your notion; as that of Paul's circumcising Timothy, and you affirming that the very act of circumcision did, in its own nature, oblige all on whom it passed to the perfect observation of the law for righteousness, you will rather chuse to leave the blessed *apostle* in a contradiction to his own doctrine, than to your vain notion: For what do you say, p. 95, of your Reply? *That however the case stood in that respect, this is certain, &c.* It also argues weakness in you to insist upon, aggravate, jeer, and reproach at that rate you do, p. 38. of your Reply, for the mistake and mis-placing of one figure, viz. Gen. xii. for Gen. xvii. as if the merit of the whole cause depended on it. The like I may say of your charging me with nonsense, for putting Gen. xvii. 7, 8. for Gen. xvii. 9, 10. when yet yourself, p. 205. of your Call, tell us, That circumcision was appointed as a sign, or token of the covenant, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, 9. What pitiful trifles are these to raise such a mighty triumph upon? When Dureus accused our famous Whitaker for one or two trivial, verbal mistakes, Whitaker returned him the same answer I shall give you, *Bene habet, his in rebus non vertuntur fortunæ ecclesiæ*; It is well the case of the church depends not upon such trifles.

For a conclusion; I do seriously warn all men to beware of receiving doctrines so destructive to the great truths of the gospel as these are. And I do solemnly profess I have not designedly strained them, to cast reproach upon him that published them; but the matters are so plain, that if Mr. Cary will maintain his positions, not only myself, but every intelligent reader, will be easily able to fasten all those odious consequents upon him, after all his apologies.

Sir, in a word, I dare not say but you are a good man; but since I read your two books, you have made me think more than once, of what one said of Jonah after he had read his history, that he was a strange man of a good man: Yet as strange a good man as you are, I hope to meet you with a sounder head and better spirit in heaven.