

Fifthly, You say, if I would have spoken to the purpose, I should have proved that the Members of the visible Church of Christ were not Disciples.

Reply. *First*, I would Query, Whether the *Jews* were not the visible Church of Christ? you say, *page 65*. They were the true Church of God: Were they the Church of God, and not the Church of Christ? you own them to be Christians, *page 64*. you make the Child of a *Jew* that was a Church-member, and the Child of a Christian, to be the same thing: Were they a Church of Christians, and yet not a Church of Christ? Either the *Jews* were the Church of Christ, or they were not; if they were, all your Objections are removed; if they were not, then tell me what Priviledge the Children of Believers have now lost, that once they had a right to, in their not being received Members of the Church of Christ? for if the Church of the *Jews* were not the Church of Christ, no Instance can be given that ever Children were admitted Members of the Church of Christ. I do not lay much stress on this, only I was willing you should see what might be built on a foundation of your own laying.

Secondly, If by the Visible Church of Christ you mean, a Church that is constituted to the New-Dispensation, (I hope you will bear with me if I keep a consistency in my own Writings) my work is to prove that each individual Member of such a Church is a Disciple of Christ, and not the contrary; but the Church of the *Jews* had many Members that were not discipled unto Christ, and yet they were all federally holy, so that federal Holiness and Discipleship are two things, the latter of which can't be argued from the former.

SECT. XV.

THE Second Objection that I brought against Infant-Baptism, you say, is this, there is no Example

in Scripture of any Infant that was baptized: In answer to which, you say, you gave me reasons why there was no Example delivered in Scripture: The *First* was, Because the Apostles were principally employed in teaching and baptizing Men: The *Second* was, Because that then there was no doubt made but Children were Church-members.

To this you say I reply, that the reason why the Apostles delivered nothing about the baptizing of Children, was, because it was no part of their work, there being no Precept for it, they had nothing to do with it.

Secondly, You say, the want of a Precedent is but a Negative Argument, and that's not valid in matter of Fact; and that I grant my self, that the Baptism of Children can't be denied for want of a Precedent, provided that there were any Precept for it; so that the matter is brought to this Issue, if there be any Precept for the baptizing of Children, then it may lawfully be done.

Reply. I am content to join issue with you, and to come to a fair Tryal, and to hazard the Cause upon the producing but one Precept; one such Evidence shall end the difference, and the Cause shall be yours at last.

You come now to bring forth your Evidences; you say that there is an implicate command for it, because it may be drawn by just consequence, drawn from clear grounds in Scripture, that Baptism doth of right belong to them; for if they be within the Covenant, and Members of the Church, and scederally holy, as hath been proved, then it must needs follow by necessary consequence that they have a right to Baptism; and a necessary consequence drawn from Scripture hath the force of a command.

Reply. *First*, I perceive the Controversie is not like to be issued yet, if this be all the evidence you have to produce; and I think it's all: You would leave out none of your Witnesses, being just come to the Trial; all the Testimony

testimony that you have here brought in will not amount to one command, either explicite or implicite, and so not issue the Controversie, unless you give up the cause.

First, You say, that there is an implicite command for it, and that implies that there is no explicite command; if there had, this had been the time to have brought it forth. Now the Commission is laid by, that will not be suborned for an evidence, Faith being required by that to precede Baptism, granted by your self, page 72.

Secondly, Here must be consequence upon consequence, to prove your implicite command, enough to weary a Man to keep all in mind till he come to the conclusion: For, *First*, You can't prove one of these Heads but by consequence, either that the Children of Believers are within the Covenant, or fœderally holy, (which is the same thing, though you make two Heads of it, that you may have a threefold-cord) nor that they are Church-members, but by consequence; for that is the way you have taken for each of them, and have laboured hard to little purpose. *Secondly*, When you have, as you think, proved one or all of these by consequence, you must to the same task again for each of these, to prove them the ground of Baptism.

Thirdly, I shall bring in two Evidences that will invalidate all the Testimony that you have here brought in, and that is the Evidence of the *Pharisees* and *Sadduces*, that had all these Qualifications that you have mentioned; they were fœderally holy, within the Covenant, they were Church-members, they were all the Children of *Abraham*, these came to *John* to be baptized, and were denied, *Mat.* 3. 7, 8, 9, 10. *Luke* 3. 7, 8, 9. That these were all put by is evident; for, *First*, *John* calls them a *Generation of Vipers*; who can think that he would set such a Brand or Black Mark upon them, and yet baptizethem? Would Baptism have wash'd it

of again. *Secondly*, He over-rules their Plea, *Begin not to say within your selves, we have Abraham to our Father*; Why, was not *Abraham* a Believer, and were not they the Children of a Believer? Yes, but this will not now pass for a ground of Baptism; if they will be baptized, they must bring forth fruits meet for Repentance, Birth-Priviledge will not serve the turn. *Thirdly*, It appears, they were denied, *Luke 7. 30.* But the Pharisees and the Lawyers rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him, (that is, of *John*;) What Counsel could this be, but that which God gave them by *John*, to bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance. *John* would not baptize them upon the ground they offered themselves, which was, that they had *Abraham* to their Father; they would not be baptized upon the ground that *John* proposed, and so they go without it; can any think that *John* would have denied these who were Church-members, who were sœderally Holy, if these qualifications had brought them under a Precept to be baptized? Having gone as far as we can in this Trial, I would now Query, on whom the Duty of Baptism is incumbent? (I mean Infant-baptism, which you are pleading for,) Whether on the Minister, on the Child, or on the believing Parent?

First, I can't think it's the Childs Duty, or that the Child shall be called to an account for the neglect of it, who is utterly incapable of knowing what Duty is, or of the performance thereof.

Secondly, It is not incumbent on the Minister. For, *First*, He has no Power to Baptize the Child, if the Parent deny it. *Secondly*, He has no Commission to Baptize more than are Discipled to Christ by the Word: And as for the believing Parent, either he is commanded to Baptize his Children, or he is not. If he be, produce it; if he be not, then is there no such thing as Infant Baptism of Divine Institution. Now this
would

would be the shortest way, were we come to a Trial once more, to shew me where the believing Parent is commanded to Baptize his Child; and truly I think you do nothing that will issue the Point, till you do this.

In the next place, you say you urged three Reasons for Infant-Baptism. The *First* was, Because the Primitive Church approved it, and held that it was derived from the Apostles themselves. To this you say I Reply, that the Custom of Baptizing Infants was not in use the first two hundred Years after Christ; and that if we receive one Tradition, we may receive more, and so deny the Scripture to be a perfect Rule. To this you say, that the Testimony of *Origen* and *Austin* are sufficient to Confute my groundless Assertion.

Reply. I did not positively assert this; I told you I had heard so; I do not pretend to much acquaintance with History.

Secondly, You do not know your self in what Age it began; you say, *Book 2. Page 28.* that the Baptizing of Infants was so early in the Church, that it can't certainly be known when it began; so that it seems by this, it was not from the beginning; and if so, then not of Divine Institution; No, though you could prove it to be of use the very next Age after the Apostles were deceased.

Thirdly, The Testimony of *Origen* and *Austin* is so mean a thing, that it is not worth a Reply; *Origen* reports, *That the Church hath received a Tradition from the Apostles, to give Baptism to Infants;* but by what hand hath she received it? that no Body can tell; and who can think that the Apostles would send this by Word of Mouth, for one to deliver it to another, and so to hand it along by Mortal Men, that might die before they had done their Errand, and not Record it in the Word, where it would surely have been preserved, over which the wing of Providence has been always spread; did they

they not write often enough to the Churches, to have opportunity to acquaint them of a Truth of so great concernment as this is? Did they not put Pen to Paper often enough to Record the Baptism of Men and Women too, and never mind to Register the baptizing of Children with their Parents? This is strange, if any such thing was done: Were they not to *teach them to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them?* And not one Word about Baptizing of Children in all the Records of the Apostles, but this must be sent by Word of Mouth: Yet as good hap was, the Church received it, so he tells you; but what Church it was, whether the Church of *Laodicea*, or the Church of *Rome*, or which of all the Churches it was that received it, that's not declared: Nor is it any great matter which received it first, for there is no doubt but it's to be had at *Rome* now, where the rest of the unwritten Traditions are. *Austin's* Testimony is to the same purpose, that the baptizing of Children is no otherwise to be lookt on than as an Apostolical Tradition; and if so, then I conclude, that *Austin* could see no Scripture Testimony for it. But I have written enough about Traditions, to let you know how little esteem I have for them; therefore if you write again, I desire you to leave them out; for I will assure you, I will waste no more Paper to answer them.

Secondly, You say, there is no such danger as I pretend in believing the Testimony of the Fathers, or the Traditions of the Church, concerning the ancient Practice of Baptizing Children; for Tradition herein consents with Scripture, and we retain Infant-Baptism, because there is Scripture-proof to it, and not barely upon Tradition.

Reply. First, If it had been recorded in Scripture, then the Apostles needed not to have sent it by Word of Mouth to the Church. *Secondly*, If it were recorded

in Scripture, why did *Austin* declare, that it ought no otherwise to be accounted than as an Apostolical Tradition? *Thirdly*, If you have Scripture-proof for it, send me that, and keep your Traditions for your self. *Fourthly*, It seems you can't credit the Testimony of the Fathers, nor yet the Traditions of the Church, unless you have Testimony from the Word to the same thing; and if you have Testimony from the Word, you have no need of the Testimony of the Fathers, nor yet of the Tradition of the Church.

The second Reason you brought for the probability of the baptizing of Children in the Apostles time was, because there were whole Households baptized, wherein it's probable there were some Children. To this you say I Reply, that two of these Households were said to believe; the third was the Household of *Stephanus*, and they were such as had addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints. The fourth was *Lydia*, and no Body knows whether she was Maid, Wife, or Widow.

Secondly, You say, there is no mention that the whole Household of *Stephanus* believe. I.

Reply. *First*, There is no mention that *Stephanus* himself believed; what then? May we conclude, that he was Baptized while an Unbeliever? *Secondly*, It's said, that the Household of *Stephanus* was the first Fruits of *Achaia*, and that they had addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints, which is tantamount to Believing. *Thirdly*, There is no mention of one Child in all those Households, therefore no probability that Children were baptized from those instances.

Thirdly, You say, that though it be said, that the Jailor believed with all his House, yet by a common Synecdoche it may signifie no more than the grown Persons in his Family.

Reply. Though it be said, That the Jailor and all his House

House were baptized, yet by the same common Synecdoche may be signified no more than the grown Persons in his Family; and if I thought there were any need of it, I could argue the same way for the other three Families; but there is no need to run a Synecdoche in the Case.

The third Reason you urge, for the probability of Infant-Baptism in the Apostles times, was this; if Infants had been denied Church-membership in the Apostles times, those *Jews* that were by them Converted unto Christ would have made a stir about it, as they did about lesser things. To this you say I made no Reply at all; you think I would not have past it over so, if I had been able to return any reasonable answer to it.

Reply. I made this Answer to it, that your doubts proved no more than your probabilities did, and that was the Reason I said no more, nor do I see any great Reason to say more to it now: What have you proved by it? Or what have you offered to prove by it, that has not been answered already?

Secondly, What are those lesser things that they made a stir about? The fullest account that I can have of them, is in *Acts 21. 21.* *They were zealous of the Law, and were informed that Paul did teach the Jews to forsake Moses's Law, not to Circumcise their Children, nor to walk after their Customs.* First, Then I would enquire, Whether it does not lye fair before us to conclude, that they did make a stir about this very Matter, because their Children were denied Church-membership? Have you not declared, that they were entered in by Circumcision? And is not here a stir made about this initiating Ordinance, (as you call it)? so that they came near the Case, if not home to it; but if their Children had been baptized, it's probable they would not have contended about Circumcision; or if they had, that the Apostle would

would soon have pacified them, by letting them know, that they had Baptism in the room thereof.

Thirdly, If they did not contend about this, it's probable God might give them more light in this great and weighty Matter than he did in lesser things, the want of light in which would have occasioned so great a stir. If you say, that all the Answer I have now returned is but probable; I answer, your Argument was but to prove a probability, nor had it more than a probability in it, if so much, and a probable Answer may serve to a probable Argument.

Lastly, You say, that there is more need of an express Prohibition, to exclude Infants from the Church, than there is of an express Command or Example to receive them; for before Christ's coming they always enjoyed it, and if this ancient Priviledge be repealed, where is the Precept or President for it? To this you say I Reply, that the Legal Administration is done away, and in that there is a repeal of their Church-membership: To this you say, though the Legal Administration be done away, yet the Covenant remains, and all that are Church-members have right under the new Administration to be admitted into the Church.

Reply. First, All that are Church-members are in already; this might well have been spared.

Secondly, The Covenant it self, in which the natural Seed stood, is done away, *Heb. 8. ult. Zech. 11. 10.*

Thirdly, In the change of the Dispensation there is a change of the Constitution, from National to Congregational; and if you can produce but one Infant that was a Member in any one New-Testament-Church, I will give you the Cause at last.

Thirdly, You say I tell you, that there is no need of an express Prohibition to hinder Children from Baptism,

tism, because it was never commanded; and that which is not commanded in Matters of Worship, is implicitly forbidden; and that it was unlawful for *Nadab* and *Abihu* to offer Incense with strange Fire, which God commanded them not. To this you say, that if God command one thing in his Worship, it's unlawful to omit that, and do another; and this was the Case of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, who offered strange Fire, when the Lord had prescribed what Fire they should use, even Fire from off the Altar, *Lev. 9. 6, 23, 24.*

Reply. First, I confess the evil is the greater, when Men have a command, and omit what God requires, and proceed in a way of their own; yet observe, that the stroke came upon them for offering Incense with Fire that God commanded them not.

Secondly, If it be unlawful to omit what God requires, and take a way of our own that he hath not required, then we had need be sure that Sprinkling is Baptizing, before we lay by Dipping, and make use of Sprinkling. Had Baptizing been any other way than by Dipping, there had been no need to have made choice of a place where there was much Water, nor yet for the Administrator to have gone down into the Water with the subject: I had not mentioned this, if I had not been so fairly led to it; though I should be glad to see the Ordinances of Christ purely administered in respect of Matter and Form too.

Thirdly, If that which is not forbidden in express Terms may be brought into the Worship of God, how burdensom would the Worship of God soon be.

Sixthly, You say, that it's granted also, that the substance of Divine Worship is contained in the Word of God, or may be clearly proved thereby; and what is not commanded, either explicitly or implicitly, in Matters of Worship, is in Effect forbidden, and ought

ought not to be observed as a necessary part of Religion.

Reply. First, I acknowledge that here is ingenuity in giving a grant thus far, only here are two Words that are dubious: *First*, What you mean by the substance of Worship. *Secondly*, What you mean by a necessary part of Worship; but where things are dubious, Charity binds me to put the best Construction, and in things of this Nature, Prudence forbids me to enquire too far.

Seventhly, The Baptism of Infants, you say, is implicitly commanded in Scripture; and if such Baptism be justifiable, then there needs some express Prohibition to warrant the denial of Baptism to them.

Reply. Your implicate command for Infant Baptism is no where to be found in the Word; and what you have offered to prove it, has been answered, as I have met with it, and must now be left to the Reader to judge of it. As to the second part, I grant it, that if Infant-Baptism had been warranted by the Word, there had then been need of some Word to warrant us to deny them; but it was never warranted by the Word, and therefore there is no need of any Word to forbid it: You grant your self, that what is not commanded by the Word in matters of Worship, either expressly or implicitly, is in effect forbidden, and ought not to be made use of.

Eighthly, You say, that seeing the Priviledge of Church-membership, which belonged to Infants under the Legal Administration, is not repealed under the Gospel, it follows, that the Children of Believers have a right to be admitted Members of the Church.

Reply. You grant a repeal of the Legal Administration, Page 81. and if the Administration be repealed, the Priviledges that they enjoyed under that Administration are repealed: Take away the Charter, and the Pri-

Priviledges are lost : How could the whole of their Church-state be dissolved in the change of the Administration, as you grant, *Page 17. Book 2.* and the Priviledge of their Children remain? Can the whole be dissolved, and not the Parts? And did the Parents become Members again, or any of them, by vertue of the old Administration, or of the New? The Law of which New Administration you have *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* and can their Children claim it by vertue of the old Administration, when their Parents could not? Certainly if Children have a right, it's by vertue of the New Administration, and by that you must prove it, or you do nothing. To conclude then, I desire you to read over the new Deed, or the Law of the New-Administration, *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* and if you can find but one Clause in it that does Priviledge the Children of Believers to Church-membership and Baptism in an Infant-state, only send me that, and I will give you the Cause at last.

And now if you please to write again, in the Vindication of what you have asserted, I hope I may find an opportunity, and room enough to return you a fair Answer ; and in the mean time, *Fare you well.*

A BRIEF
 DESCRIPTION
 OF THE
 Covenant of Grace,
 OR THE
 New Covenant,

THE Covenant of Grace is a Mutual Compact between the Father and the Son, before the World was, (the Son considered in the Divine Nature only) in behalf of the Elect of God, wherein the Son undertook the performance of certain Conditions on his part : And the Father engaged himself by several promises on his part, some of which were peculiar to the Son, others made to the Son in behalf of the Elect, who were the Subjects thereof.

Having given this Description of the New-Covenant, I shall in the next place prove each part thereof by the Word.

First, It is a Mutual Compact between the Father and the Son, *Isa.* 49. from 3, to 10. We have in these verses a Transcript of the whole Compact or Agreement that was between them.

First, The Father proposeth, *verse 3.* *Thou art my*
 R *Servant,*

Servant, O Israel, in thee I will be glorified. This Propo-
sal was made to the Son, who was to be the Lords Ser-
vant, when he had taken our nature upon him, *Isa. 42. 1.*
*Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine Elect, in whom my
soul delighteth.*

Secondly, We have the Answer of the Son, *verse 4.*
*Then I said, I have laboured in vain, and have spent my
strength for nought, and in vain; yet surely my work is with
the Lord, and my judgment with my God.*

In which Answer there are two things to be consider-
ed: *First,* The Subjects here proposed were too small a
number for so great an Undertaking; *I have laboured in
vain:* Not that his labour was successless, in that sense
he did not labour in vain, nor shed one drop of his
blood in vain, he did see of the travel of his Soul with sa-
tisfaction, and was assured that the pleasure of the Lord
should prosper in his hands: But the Elect within the
confines of *Israel* were too small a number.

Secondly, So small a number as it was, he undertakes
it at the first Proposal; this is plainly intimated in these
words, *My work is with the Lord, and my judgment with my
God.* Though the Purchase would not answer the price,
he would leave that to the Father, whom he knew
would make it up.

Thirdly, The Son having granted the Proposal, the
Father speaks again to the Son, *verse 5, 6.* *And now,
saith the Lord that formed me from the womb, to be his Ser-
vant, to bring Jacob again to him, though Israel be not gathe-
red, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God
shall be my strength: And he said, it is a light thing that thou
shouldst be my servant, to raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to
restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light
to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be for salvation unto the ends
of the Earth.* In which Words there are three things
observable:

First, There is a Promise made to the Son, *That he
should*

should be glorious in the eyes of Lord, that God would be his strength. Secondly, A Grant given, that Israel were too small a number for so great an Undertaking: And he said, it is a light thing that shouldst be my servant, to raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. Thirdly, The Elect among the Gentiles added unto the Jews: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayst be for salvation to the ends of the Earth.

That the Son was a party Covenanting may further appear, Zach. 9. 11. As for thee, by the blood of thy covenant have I sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein there was no water. This is the Father speaking unto the Son, and he calls it his Covenant, as being made by him, Psal. 89. 28. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my Covenant shall stand fast with him. It's the Fathers Covenant, and it's the Sons Covenant, as being transacted between the Father and the Son. That it is the Sons Covenant is yet more evident, in that he laid down his life to confirm it, Heb. 9. 15, 16, 17. For this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, that they that are called might receive the promise of eternal Inheritance: For where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testator, for a Testament is of force when men are dead, otherwise it is of no force at all, whilst the Testator liveth. Had not Christ been the Testator as well as Mediator, there had been no need for him to dye, nor could the Testament have been confirmed by his death. If a thousand dye, if the Testator live, the Testament is of no force. Either the New-Testament is confirmed by the Death of Christ, or it is not; if it be, then was Christ the Testator; if it be not, then it's of no force at all, and what condition are we now in.

Secondly, The New-Covenant was transacted between the Father and the Son before the world was, Titus 1: 2.

In hope of eternall life, which God that cannot lye promised before the foundation of the World began. This promise was made to Christ, for there was none in being but the Son to whom a promise could be made; before the World had a being it was made to him for the Elect, or else the Apostle could not have bottomed his hopes upon it, *2 Tim. 1. 9. Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and Grace, which was given to us in Christ Jesus before the World was.* How could this Gift of his Grace have been bestowed on us in Christ, but in the transact of the New-Covenant? This Grace, or Love, or Good Will of God, it's a New-Covenant Blessing. God hath made over himself by Covenant, *Gen. 7. 7.* And in so doing he hath made over his Grace; he could not make over himself, but he must make over his Grace, it being essential in God; now this was done before the World began. It was promulgated as soon as *Adam fell, The seed of the Woman shall break the Serpents head;* therefore it was in being before he fell.

The Mediatorship of Christ commenc'd as soon as sin had a being, he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the World, therefore the New-Covenant was in being from the foundation of the World.

Thirdly, The New-Covenant was transacted between the Father and the Son, the Son considered in the Divine Nature only. This appears, *First,* In that it was transacted before the World began, before the Humane Nature had a being: *God did not send forth his Son made of a woman, till the fulness of time, Gal. 4. 4.* *Secondly,* It appears, in that the taking of the Humane Nature was an effect of the compact, *Heb. 2. 17. Wherefore it behooved him in all things to be made like to his Brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining unto God.* Merciful, with respect to us, faithful with respect to the Father. Now faithfulness doth imply

ply some pre-engagement. When Christ took our Nature upon him, he renders this as the reason, *That in the Volume of the Book it was written of him to do the will of God*, Psal. 40. 7, 8. This was not the Book of the Scripture, it was not written there antecedent to the penning of this Psalm, therefore take it of the Book of the Covenant, (to speak it after the manner of men) that which is called the Lamb's Book of Life, which the Subjects of this Covenant had their Names written in, *Rev. 17. 18.*

Fourthly, This Covenant was transacted between the Father and the Son, in the behalf of the Elect only. Here I shall premise two things. *First*, That God hath an Elect People. *Secondly*, That this Elect People were given to Jesus Christ. And then prove that this Elect People that are given to Jesus Christ, are the only Subjects of the New-Covenant.

First, That God hath an Elect People, a certain number of particular Persons, both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that he hath chosen in Christ Jesus to Salvation as the end, and to Sanctification as the means.

First, That God hath an Elect People, *Mat. 24. 22* For the Elects sake those days shall be shortned; *ver. 24* For there shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets, insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very Elect: But that is impossible, they are so secured by the Decree of God, the Merits of Christ, and the Promises of this Covenant, *ver. 31.* And he shall send his Angels, with a great sound of a Trumpet, and shall gather his Elect, from the four winds, from one end of Heaven to the other. *Isa. 65. 22.* And mine Elect shall long enjoy the work of their Hands.

Secondly, These Elect are a certain number of particular Persons, *Eph. 1. 4.* Who hath chosen us in him before the Foundation of the World, that we should be Holy, and without blame before him in Love. Paul and the Ephe-

sons in particular, to whom he wrote this Epistle, Rom. 9. 11. *For the Children being not yet born, neither having done either good or evil, that the purpose of God according to Election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth.* Ver. 12. *It was said unto her, Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated.* Now these Elect are known to God, they are not known to us, 2 Tim. 2. 19. *Nevertheless the Foundation of God standeth sure, having this Seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his: Each individual Person are known to him: The Lord knoweth them by Name: Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated. Their Names are written in Heaven,* Luke 10. 20. *They are written in the Book of Life,* Rev. 20. 15.

Thirdly, These Elect consist both of Jews and Gentiles; of Jews, Rom. 11. 5. *There is at this day a Remnant, according to the Election of Grace: Of Gentiles, 1 Theff. 1. 4. Knowing, Brethren, Beloved, your Election of God.*

Fourthly, They are chosen to Salvation as the end, and to Sanctification as the means, both in one Decree, 2 Theff. 2. 13. *We are bound to give thanks for you, Brethren, Beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to Salvation, through Sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the Truth: To Salvation as the end, and to Sanctification as the means, both in one Decree.*

The second thing to be premised is this, That this Elect People are given to Jesus Christ, John 17. 6. *Thine they were, and thou gavest them unto me: Thine by Election, and thou gavest them unto me by foederal Relation.*

Either they must be considered the Fathers in respect of Election, or in respect of Creation. In the second sense we cannot possibly take it; for, *First*, In respect of Creation the whole World is his, but these are not all given to the Son: Those that are given to the Son are distinguished from the World, Verse 9.

I pray for these, I pray not for the World, but for those whom thou hast given me, for they are thine. They are not only distinguished from the World, as they are given to the Son, but as they are the Fathers too: They are thine, and that in a peculiar sense.

Secondly, Christ declares; that all his Number is the Fathers, and the Fathers are his: All mine are thine, and thine are mine: They are the same individual Persons.

Thirdly, Christ gives Eternal Life to as many as are given him by the Father, John 17. 2. but Eternal Life is given to none but the Elect, Rom. 11. 7. The Election hath obtained, and the rest were blinded. Therefore they are the Elect only that are given to Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, I shall prove that they are the Elect only that are given to Jesus Christ, that are the only subjects of the New Covenant. First, It appears, that they only are blest with the Blessings of the New Covenant, Eph. 1. 3, 4. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual Blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. But who are they that are thus blessed? Are they not those that were chosen in him before the Foundation of the World?

Secondly, It was upon their account only, that Jesus Christ underwent all his Sufferings, Isa. 53. 5. For the Transgressions of my People was he smitten. He laid down his Life for the Sheep, John 20. 15. He loved the Church, and gave himself for them, Eph. 5. 25.

Thirdly, It was upon their account only he had his Name Jesus given him, Mat. 1. 21. And thou shalt call his Name Jesus, for he shall save his People from their Sins.

Fourthly, It's only they that are the Heirs of the Promise, Gal. 3. 29. And if ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.

A Brief Description of

Fifthly, They only are justified by his Blood, *Rom.* 8. 33. *Who shall lay any thing to the Charge of Gods Elect? it is God that justifieth; who is he that condemns? it's Christ that dyed.*

Sixthly, They only shall be glorified, *Rev.* 20. 15. *And whosoever was not written in the Lambs Book of Life, was cast into the Lake of Fire.*

Fifthly, In the Transact of this Covenant between the Father and the Son, the Son undertook the performance of certain Conditions; *He was to raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; He was to be a light to the Gentiles, and for Salvation unto the ends of the Earth.*

First, He was engaged to take our Nature upon him, he must be a merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining unto God. He had covenanted so to do, and he must make good his Covenant, *Heb.* 10. 5. *Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldest not, a Body hast thou prepared me: Ver. 7. Then I said, lo I come.* He hath respect to the Covenant here, as being engaged thereby to take a Body.

Secondly, He was engaged by Covenant to fulfil the Law in our Nature, *Mat.* 5. 17. *Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.* He came not only to fulfil the Law, but to fulfil it upon the account of the subjects of this Covenant, *Rom.* 10. 4. *Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness, to every one that believeth.* He hath yielded that very Obedience that the Law aimed at, He was in Covenant to do whatever the Will of God was, *Psalms* 40. 7, 8. *Then said I, lo I come, in the Volume of thy Book it is written of me to do thy Will, O God: Yea, thy Law is within my Heart.* Now this was one part of the Will of God, that he should fulfil the Law, by yielding active Obedience thereunto: God sent him into the World on purpose. He was not only sent to make an
end

end of Sin, but to bring in Everlasting Righteousness, Dan. 9. 24. *Seventy Weeks are determined to make an end of Sin, to finish the Transgression, and to make Reconciliation for Iniquity, and to bring in Everlasting Righteousness.*

Thirdly, He stood engaged to offer up himself a peace-making Sacrifice, for the satisfaction of Divine Justice, Heb. 10. 5. wherefore when he cometh into the World, he saith, *Sacrifice and Offerings thou wouldst not, but a Body hast thou prepared me.* Then said I, *to I come, in the Volume of thy Book it is written of me to do thy Will O God.* This was the Will of God, that he should offer up this Body; it was so the Will of God, that there was no avoiding of it, he must drink that bitter Cup: Therefore when he prayed, *Father, if it be possible, let this Cup pass from me;* he resigned up his Will to the Will of the Father; *Nevertheless, not my Will, but thy Will be done.* Whatever was the Will of God that Christ should do, that Christ was in Covenant to do; and therefore he saith, *that in the Volume of the Book it was written of him to do the Will of the Father.*

Fourthly, He was engaged by Covenant to bring in all the subjects thereof; to accept of himself on Gospel Terms, that so they might enjoy the good and Benefit thereof, John 10. 16. *And other Sheep I have, that are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one Shepherd, and one Fold.* He doth not say, I may bring, or I will bring, but I must bring. And why must he bring them in? but because he was in Covenant so to do.

Fifthly, He was engaged not only to seek, and to save that which was lost; but also to keep them, when he had sought them out, that they should stray away no more, John 6. 38. *I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that sent me, and this is the Will of him that sent me, that of all that he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.*

Sixthly

Sixthly, Jesus Christ stood engaged to confirm the Covenant by his Death, *Heb. 9. 15.* For this cause he is the Mediator of the New Covenant, that by means of Death, for the Redemption of the Transgressions that were under the first Covenant, they that were called might receive the Promise of Eternal Inheritance. For where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the Death of the Testator. Verse 17. For a Testament is of force after Men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all, whilst the Testator liveth. The Promises made to the Fathers were not confirmed 'till Christ was offered up, *Heb. 11. 13.* These all through Faith obtained a good report, not having received the Promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect. This Provision was made in the New Covenant, where all our Mercies are wrapt up: These are the Conditions that the Son undertook the performance of. Now what he was engaged to do and suffer, he hath made good, *John 17. 1.* I have finished the Work that thou gavest me to do. *John 19. 30.* He cried out, it is finished, and he bowed the Head, and gave up the Ghost. So that the Covenant is compleated on Christ's part, with respect to what he was to do and suffer, both which are of Eternal Efficacy, and being compleated on the Sons part, all the Promises made by the Father are confirmed and fulfilled, *Acts 13. 32, 33.* And we declare unto you glad-tidings, how that the Promise that was made to the Fathers, God hath fulfilled to us their Children, in that he hath raised Christ from the dead. The Promises were confirmed by his Death, and his Resurrection was a signal Manifestation of the fulfilling or Confirmation thereof; so that the New Covenant is now of force, the Death of the Testator hath confirmed the Testament.

Sixthly, In this Compact between the Father and the Son, the Father engaged himself, by several Promises,

les, some of which were peculiar to the Son; others made to the Son in behalf of the Elect, who are the Subjects thereof, *Isa. 49. 5, 7, 8.* The Promises that are peculiar to the Son are as followeth: *First, That he should be glorious in the Eyes of the Lord, that God would be his Strength,* ver. 5. *Secondly, That God would stand by him, and help him,* ver. 8. *In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in the day of Salvation have I holpen thee.* Here are two things to be considered: *First, Jesus Christ took hold of these Promises, and bottomed upon them, Isa. 50. 7, 9. My God will help me, therefore have I set my Face as a Flint, and I know that I shall not be confounded. Behold! the Lord God will help me, therefore I shall not be ashamed.* *Secondly, The Father made good these Promises to Christ when he was offered up,* 2 Cor. 6. 2. *For he said, in an acceptable Time have I heard thee, and in the day of Salvation have I holpen thee; behold now is the acceptable Time, behold now is the day of Salvation.* When God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself, not imputing unto them their Trespases, then were these Promises made good: Then was the acceptable Time, then was the day of Salvation, then did God hear him, *Heb. 5. 7. He was heard in the things he feared;* then was he holpen under all his Sufferings.

Secondly, The Father engaged himself by several Promises made to the Son in behalf of the Elect, Isa. 49. 8, 9. Thus saith the Lord, in an acceptable Time have I heard thee, and in the day of Salvation have I holpen thee; and I will give thee for a Covenant of the People, to establish the Earth, and cause to inherit the desolate places, ver. 9. *That thou may'st say to the Prisoners, go forth, to them that sit in darkness shew your selves: That he should be a light to the Gentiles, and for Salvation to the ends of the Earth.* Tit. 1. 2. *In hope of Eternal Life, which God has cannot lye promised before the World began.* I suppose that Eternal

Life here, comprehends all the good of the New Covenant. As Death is a comprehensive of all Misery, so is Eternal Life a comprehensive of all Happiness. *This Promise was made to Christ before the World began*: And it was made to him in behalf of the subjects of this Covenant, or else *Paul* could not have grounded his hopes upon it. I doubt not but all the Promises that are now in the New Covenant, containing Temporal, Spiritual, and Eternal Blessings, were made in the first Transact of the Covenant. As *Christ* did then engage to perform all the Conditions, so the Father engaged to bestow all the Blessings that were contained in the Promises; he did give *Christ* for a Covenant to the People in the very first Transact; and are not all the Promises *Yea* and *Amen* in *Christ Jesus*? All the Promises were confirmed by *Christ*, as he was considered the Testator; therefore I conclude, that they were all made in the first transact of the Testament. There are Promises put into the Covenant with respect to the subjects thereof, and nothing but Promises: The New Covenant is a bundle of Promises, there is not one Precept, nor one Threat to be found there; (on the Sons part it contained Conditions, that were to be performed by him, and that upon account of the subjects thereof;) On the Fathers part it contained only Promises, the fulfilling of which depended on the performance of the Conditions by the Son. These are the two parts of the Covenant, and the whole thereof; there is not a third part to be produced. That this Covenant is made up all of Promises, with respect to the subjects thereof, will appear in a few particulars.

First, There are nothing but Promises to be found in that which God calls the New Covenant, *Jer. 31. 33, 34.* *But this shall be the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Laws in their inward parts, and write them in their*

their Hearts: And I will be their God, and they shall be my People: And they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest of them, for I will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more. God himself calls this the New Covenant, *verse 31.* Behold the day is come, that I will make a New Covenant with the House of Israel: And this is that New Covenant which is contained in the 33, & 34. *verses.* And sure I am, there are none but Promises here: If we look *Gen. 17. 7.* *Ezek. 36. 25, 26, 27.* *Heb. 8. 10, 11.* in which Scriptures the New Covenant is most largely described, you will see nothing but Promises.

Secondly, It appears, in that the New Covenant is styled the Promise, or Promises.

First, The Promise, in the singular Number, *Acts 13. 32, 33, 34.* And we declare unto you glad-tidings, how that the Promise that was made to the Fathers, God hath fulfilled to us their Children, in that he raised him from the Dead, now no more to return to Corruption: He said, on this wise, I will give you the sure Mercies of David. By the Promise in the 32d. *verse* is intended the Covenant, for he presently addeth, I will give you the sure Mercies of David. And these are the Mercies of the New Covenant, *Gal. 3. 29.* And if ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise. *Gal. 3. 17.* The Law that was four hundred and thirty Years after could not disannul, that it should make the Promise of none Effect. That which is there called the Promise, is in the former part of the same *verse* called the Covenant that was afore confirmed of God in Christ.

Secondly, It is sometimes called Promises, in the Plural Number, *Rom. 15. 8.* Now, I say, that Jesus Christ was a Minister of the Circumcision, for the Truth of God, to confirm the Promises made to the Fathers. *Gal. 3. 16.* To Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, It appears, in that the subjects of this Covenant are stiled the Heirs of the Promise, *Heb. 6. 17.* *Wherein God willing more abundantly to shew to the Heirs of the Promise the immutability of his Council, confirmed it by an Oath.* What did God confirm by an Oath? Was it not the New Covenant? *Gal. 3. 17.* And what was the New Covenant but the Promise?

Fourthly, It appears, in that it was a free Covenant, in respect of the subjects thereof; there was no Condition put into it, the performance whereof doth entitle to the Blessings therein contained. It's their Union with Christ entitles, and not any thing done by them, *1 Cor. 3. 22, 23.* *Gal. 3. 29.* You can't find one Condition put into the Covenant, with respect to the subjects thereof, in all the places where it is most largely described: All the Conditions were to be, and are performed by Christ. Now if this be granted, that the New Covenant contains nothing but Conditions on Christ's part, and nothing but Promises on the Father's part, it will follow, that such as have no interest in the Merits of Christ, that have no Interest in the Promises of the Father, have no Interest in the New Covenant. There is not an internal and an external part in the New Covenant, (as some would have) the Covenant containing nothing but Promises, with respect to the subjects thereof. What can we suppose the external part to be, that a Person may have an interest in, that hath no Interest in the Promises? Such as have an Interest in the Covenant, have certainly an Interest in the Promises; *To Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made.* And here take notice of a few things:

First, There is not one Subject of the New Covenant that shall go without the Blessings thereof, Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification, *Jer. 31. 33, 34.* *This is the Covenant that I will make with the House*

House of Israel, after those days saith the Lord; I will write my Laws in their Hearts, I will be their God, and they shall be my People; they shall all know me from the least to the greatest of them: For I will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more. There is not one subject that shall not know the Lord, not one that shall miss of the Pardon of Sin: And consequently not one that shall come short of Salvation; for such as are Justified, and Sanctified, shall certainly be Glorified.

Secondly, There can't be one subject brought into this Covenant by the Faith of the Parent, there are as many in already as ever will be: *Their Names were written in the Lambs Book of Life from the Foundation of the World, Rev. 17. 5.* And all the World wandered after the Beast, *Whose Names were not written in the Lambs Book of Life from the Foundation of the World.* We are not here to understand every individual Person of the World; but only such, *Whose Names were not written in the Lambs Book of Life from the Foundation of the World.* God had his two Witnesses at the same time, these did not admire the Beast, they bore their Testimony against him: And if so, then *their Names were written in the Lambs Book of Life;* and that long before they began to bear their Testimony against him, *even from the Foundation of the World.* We can no more add to the Subjects of this Covenant, than we can add to the Decree of Election.

Thirdly, It is not possible for a Person that was once a subject of this Covenant to lose his Interest therein, *Jer. 32. 40. I will make an Everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good: And I will put my fear in their Hearts, that they shall not depart from me.* God Covenants here for himself and them too: *First, For himself, That he will never turn away from them to do them good.* He hath engaged all his Attributes to be exerted as the Case required,

quires, his Wisdom to direct, his Power to protect, his Grace and Mercy to save. He Covenanteth for them too, *That he will put his fear into their Hearts, that they shall not depart from him.* This Covenant is free and absolute, and is now confirmed by the Death of the Testator; and therefore, there is no disanulling or adding thereunto: No Name to be struck out, nor yet put in, no Legacy to be altered or changed. This appears by the instance that the Apostle gives of a Man's Covenant, *Gal. 3. 15. Brethren, I speak after the manner of Men.* If it be but a Man's Covenant, when it is confirmed, no man disanulleth it, nor addeth thereunto; this he brings to shew from the very Nature of a Covenant, (or Testament) how unalterable the New Covenant (or Testament) is, being confirmed by the Death of the Testator. But here are some Objections that must be answered before I leave it.

Objection the First, That the Covenant that was made with the Lord Jesus Christ, was the Covenant of Redemption, not the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant.

In Answer to this I shall propose a few Queries:

First, I desire to know where this Distinction is to be found? for I cannot find it in the word of God; or by what mark the Covenant of Redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant, may be known one from the other, if they are distinct Covenants? for I cannot find any Marks or Characters in the Word that are peculiar to each of these. I have met with many that have made the Distinction, but I could never meet with one as yet that could make it Intelligent to me, whatever they fancy to themselves: No, not *Gelapsy* himself, who I think was the first Founder of it. The Author to the *Hebrews* mentions but two Covenants, the first and the second, an Old and a New, one that is confirmed,

confirmed, and another that is done away; and yet he handles the Covenants more largely and distinctly than any other of the Pen-men of Scripture had done before; and doth plainly shew, that Christ was the Testator of the New Covenant, *Heb. 9. 15, 16, 17.* And if so, then was the New Covenant made with Christ as a party Covenanting.

Secondly, I would know, Whether the Covenant of Redemption may not properly be called the Covenant of Grace? Whether God did ever manifest more of his Grace and Mercy, either to *Jew* or *Gentile*, than in giving Jesus Christ, *To raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel, to be a light to the Gentiles, and to be for Salvation to the end of the Earth?*

Thirdly, Whether the New Covenant be not the Covenant of Redemption, as well as it is the Covenant of Grace? My meaning is, Whether Redemption be not a Branch of the New Covenant? Whether Jesus Christ was not *the Mediator of the New Covenant, that by means of Death, for the Redemption of the Transgressions that were under the first Covenant, that they that are called might receive the Promise of Eternal Inheritance.* I find Redemption, Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification, put into the New Covenant, and all confirmed by the offering up of the Lord Jesus Christ. So that I see no room for a Covenant of Redemption, distinct from the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant.

Objection the Second, The Covenant of Redemption was made with Christ, but the Covenant of Grace, or New Covenant, was made with us, *Heb. 5. 8. Behold the day is come, saith the Lord, that I will make a New Covenant with the House of Israel, and the House of Judah, &c.* To this I Answer,

First, We are not here (by the Word *make*) to understand the first Transact of the New Covenant, for in that respect the New Covenant was made long before.

fore; it was promulgated as soon as *Adam* fell, therefore it was in being when he fell. If the Covenant of Grace was not from the beginning, I desire to know by vertue of what, *God did write his Law in the Hearts of his People*, from the beginning.

Secondly, By the Word *make*, we are to understand the Confirmation of the New Covenant, which was made long before. It is observed by those that understand the Greek, that the Word signifieth the Consummation thereof, and that it should be read thus, *I will consummate a New Covenant with the House of Israel*; and it's applied to the offering up of Christ, by whose Death the New Covenant was confirmed, *Heb. 10. 14, 15, 16. For by one Offering he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified.* This Perfection consists in the Remission of Sin, and this Remission is that the Spirit bears Witness unto; *Their Sins and Iniquities will I remember no more.* And from hence the Apostle draws this Inference, *Where Remission of these is, there is no more Sacrifice for Sin.*

Objection the Third, The Covenant of Redemption is absolute, but the Covenant of Grace is conditional: Faith is the Condition thereof, *Mark 16. 16. He that Believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved.* To this I Answer,

First, If Faith be the Condition of Interest in the Covenant of Grace, then Baptism is the Condition also; the Text saith, *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*: God hath joined them together, and no Man may put asunder what God hath joined. Now should this be granted, that Baptism is the Condition of Interest in the Covenant, then the Argument for Infant-Baptism, which is this, that Children have an Interest in the Covenant, therefore they must be Baptized, is gone, there being no Interest in the Covenant antecedent thereunto. And should the Objection it self be granted, that

that Faith is the Condition of Interest in the Covenant, the Argument for Infant-Baptism will fall to the ground, unless you will say, that all the Children of Believers do believe as well as their Parents.

But this I think is a task too hard for any to undertake; sure I am, it is too hard for any to go through withall. Faith comes not by Generation, but by Regeneration, in respect of the Principle, and by hearing in respect of the Act.

Secondly, The Text doth not say, He that believeth, shall have an Interest in the Covenant, but that *he that believeth, shall be saved*: Salvation here intends Glorification, for it is put in opposition to Damnation. Now though it be granted, *That he that believeth shall be saved*; yet it doth not follow, that Faith must be considered as a Condition, the performance of which doth entitle us to Salvation. Salvation may be considered as an end following, Faith as a means preparing, fitting and disposing, but not as an end depending on Faith, as a means procuring, or as a Condition, the performance of which may be considered that which doth entitle us thereto.

Secondly, Faith is so far from being the Condition of the Covenant, that it is a Fruit of Interest therein, both in respect of the Principle and Act too.

First, In respect of the Principle, it's a New Covenant Blessing, held forth in a free Promise, *Ezek. 36. 26. A new Heart also will I give unto you, and a new Spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the Heart of Stone out of your Flesh, and will give you an Heart of Flesh.*

First, This Promise is not made to all, but to a peculiar People: This is evident, *First*, In that the Promise is absolute, it doth not hang on Conditions to be performed by us, what can be considered as a Condition antecedent unto a new Heart. *Secondly*, In that all do not enjoy the Benefit of it.

A Brief Description of

Secondly, Those to whom this Promise is made have an Interest therein, antecedent to the change of the Heart.

Thirdly, This new Heart that is here promised, is a Heart renewed; it's not new in respect of Matter, but in respect of the Form; which new Form consists in those new Principles that are infused in a Work of Regeneration, so that the Principle of Faith is held forth in a free Promise.

Secondly, In respect of the Act: *First*, As 'tis considered the Act of the Understanding, *Isa. 54. 13. All thy Children shall be taught of God. Jer. 31. 33. They shall all know me, from the least to the greatest*: This is the Act of Faith, as it is considered the Act of the Understanding, which is always followed with the Act of the Will; *John 6. 45. Every one that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me.*

Secondly, As it's considered as the Act of the Will, so it's held forth in a free Promise, *Psalms 110. 3. Thy People shall be willing in the day of thy Power: John 6. 37. All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me.* Now if Faith be a fruit of Interest in the Covenant, then it is not a Condition; but it is a fruit of Interest, it doth not precede but follow Interest, and is an effect thereof.

Objection the Fourth, The Covenant of Redemption had no Mediator, but the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant had. To this I answer:

First, If there were no Mediator in the Transact thereof, yet it's apparent that the Son engaged to be a Mediator in the Transact thereof. Had there been no Mediator, there could have been no Redeemer; Christ was no otherwise a Redeemer, then as he was a Mediator, *Heb. 9. 15. For this Cause he is the Mediator of the New Covenant, that by means of Death, for the Redemption of the Transgressions, that were under the first Covenant, they that were called might receive the Promise of Eternal Inheri-*

Inheritance: He must be a Mediator, that he might be a Redeemer. By vertue of the same Covenant that Christ is a Redeemer I find he is a Mediator, and that is the New Covenant: He is both Redeemer and Mediator, and also the Testator thereof. Having now done with the New Covenant, I shall make some Remarks on the Old.

Observing the various Apprehensions that are among Professors, concerning the Covenant that God made with *Abraham*, and the natural Seed, considered as such, *Gen. 15. 18.* which Covenant was signed with Circumcision, *Gen. 17. 10.* dedicated with the Blood of the Sacrifices, *Exod. 24. 8.* and renewed with all the Congregation of *Israel*, *Deut. 29. 10, 11.*

And likewise the Extreame that Men have run upon, according to their various apprehensions; some making it to be the Covenant of Works, or so many New Editions of that Covenant that God made with *Adam* in a state of Innocency, others erring as much on the other hand, making it to be the Covenant of Grace: I shall endeavour to free it from the absurdities that will necessarily follow these two Extreame. But, *First*, I shall prove that the Covenant *Gen. 15. 18.* is the same that is mentioned in the other three places quoted before. And that it is so, appears,

First, In that the Subjects are the same in each of these, the Natural Seed, considered as such. *Secondly*, In that the Inheritance is the same in each of them, the Land of *Canaan*: This is sufficient to prove it the same Covenant, in these four Texts of Scripture. Either the Covenant spoken of in all these places is the same, or it is not; if we say they are distinct Covenants, we shall be to seek for Names to distinguish them by, one from the other; if we say it's the same Covenant often repeated, then the Question will be, whether it be the Covenant of Works, the Co-

nant of Grace, or a distinct Covenant from each of these.

First, It's not the Covenant of Works, it differs from that in many respects.

First, It differs from the Covenant of Works in respect of the Persons covenanting: That was made with *Adam*, this with *Abraham*; tho' *Abraham* was a subject of that, yet *Adam* was not a subject of this.

Tho' he lived long after he brake the Covenant of Works, yet he was dead long before this Covenant was in being.

Secondly, *Adam* was a Representative in that Covenant; while he stood we stood, when he fell we fell; *Rom. 5. 12. Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the World, and Death by sin, and so Death passed upon all men, for that all had sinned, or, In whom all had sinned,* Margent. But this Covenant had no representative, each subject stood and fell by himself, *Exod. 32. 33. And the Lord said unto Moses, whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book,*

Thirdly, They differ in respect of the Subjects thereof: That Covenant took in all Mankind that descended from *Adam* by ordinary generation, *Rom. 15. 18. Therefore as by the Offence of one judgement came upon all men to condemnation*: If all Men had not had an interest in that Covenant, and stood really under the threat thereof, the Sentence would not have been clapt on all for the breach thereof, but this Covenant took in no more with respect to the inheritance thereof but the natural seed of *Abraham*; such as were born of *Sarah*, *Ishmael*, and the Profelited *Gentiles*, had nothing to do with the Land of *Canaan*. Now as the Seed of *Adam* were abundantly more than the Seed of *Abraham*, so the Subjects of that Covenant were abundantly more than the Subjects of this; they were many whole Nations that were in being when this Covenant was in being, that were never taken
into

into this Covenant, as the Subjects thereof. This Covenant was never intended for comprehension, but for separation, *Exod. 19. 5, 6.* Now therefore if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my Covenant, you shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people, for all the Earth is mine; and ye shall be to me a Kingdom of Priests, an holy Nation; that is, a separate Nation. It was this Covenant that was the Partition-wall between Jew and Gentile, that was broken down when Christ was offered up.

Fourthly, They differed in respect of the Bond thereof, the Bond of that Covenant contained the Moral Law only. The ten Precepts that were first written in the heart of Man by Nature, afterwards in Tables of Stone, *Deut. 4. 14.* He declared unto you his Covenant, which he had commanded you to perform, even ten Commands, and he wrote them upon Tables of stone. The Lord spake these Words, and he added no more, *Deut. 5. 2.* but the Bond of this Covenant contained besides these a great many Political Laws, which respected *Israel*, as they were considered a Common-wealth, and reached no more but the stranger that was within their Gate, and Ecclesiastical Laws, with respect to their Church-state, which were all put down in the Book of the Covenant, *Exod. 21. 22, 23. Chapters.*

Fifthly, They differ in respect of the Tenor thereof; that Covenant was a Covenant of Life, the Tenor whereof was, *Do this and live*; had *Adam* kept that Covenant, he had never returned to the Dust again; but this was not a Covenant of Life, *Gen. 15. 15.* *Thou shalt go to thy Fathers in peace, thou shalt be buried in a good old age:* This was spoken to *Abraham* the same day the Lord made a Covenant with him. And here observe, it was not spoken as a Threat, as the Lord spake to *Adam,* *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt dye;* here was no Proviso in the case, but dye he must: Yet was it not a Threat but a Gracious Promise. Life was never put into
this

this Covenant, neither to be continued here, nor to be enjoyed hereafter.

Sixthly, The first sin broke that Covenant, *Rom. 5. 16.* *Nor as it was by one that sinned, so is the free gift, for the judgment was by one to condemnation, (that was by one act of sin) but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.* But the first sin did not break this Covenant, *Abraham* was guilty of a foul Miscarriage as soon as this Covenant was made, in going in to *Hagar*, and many transgressions were committed by his Seed before they were possessed of the inheritance, yet this Covenant remained.

Seventhly, That Covenant admitted of no Repentance: Had *Adam* broke his Heart with Grief, he could never have been reinvested with the Priviledges of that Covenant: The threat was, *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt dye,* Or, *In dying thou shall dye:* Which threat was immediately turned into a Sentence, as soon as ever *Adam* fell, *Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return:* *Rom. 5. 18.* *Therefore by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, &c.* The Sentence was immediately past, and remains unrepealed to all not redeemed by *Jesus Christ*. I cannot see how that Covenant can be said to be renewed, when the Curse that was clapt on all for the first transgression, remains on all, but such for whom *Jesus Christ* hath born it; nor to what purpose it should be renewed, seeing Justification was never to be had by the Works of the Law since the first transgression, *The Law being become weak through the flesh:* So that it could not give Life, whatever Obedience might be supposed to be yielded thereunto. I say, the Covenant of Works admitted of no Repentance, but this Covenant did, *Levit. 26. 41, 42.* *If their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their Iniquity, then will I remember my Covenant with Jacob, and also my Covenant with Isaac, and also my*

Covenant with Abraham will I remember, and I will remember the Land. Now an uncircumcised heart may be humbled, tho' not sincerely, as *Ahab's* was, *1 Kings 21. ult.* Seeft thou how *Ahab* humbleth himself, this evil shall not come in his days: There might be an outward Humiliation and Reformation, where the Heart was not upright, upon which Reformation God might remove the Judgment, *Pfal. 78.* from 34, to 39. this Covenant is not then the Covenant of Works.

Secondly, This Covenant is not the Covenant of Grace; there are a great many Marks and Characters by which they may be distinguished one from the other.

First, They differ in respect of the Persons with whom they were transacted: The Covenant of Grace was transacted with the Lord Jesus Christ, *Isa. 49.* from 3, to 10. this I have cleared p. 1. therefore shall say no more to it now; but this Covenant was transacted with *Abraham*, *Gen. 15. 18.* The same day the Lord made a Covenant with *Abraham*, saying, unto thy seed have I given this whole land.

Secondly, The Covenant of Grace was transacted between the Father and the Son, before the World was, *Titus 1. 2.* In hopes of eternal life, which God that cannot lye promised before the World began. *2 Tim. 1. 9.* Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our Works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given to us in *Christ Jesus* before the World was.

I do not amplify on these Scriptures, having done it already, p. 2. But this Covenant was not in being till *Abraham* had a being; it bears Date but four hundred years before *Israel* came up out of *Egypt*, *Gen. 15.* from 13, to 19. This Covenant was never heard of before, no instance can be given of it till then.

Thirdly, They differed in respect of the Subjects thereof: The Subjects of the Covenant of Grace are the Elect only, *Abraham* and his Mystical Seed, *Gal. 3. 16.*

To Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not to seeds, as of many, but to thy seed, as of one, and that is Christ: Christ, not personally considered, for then all the Promises would have terminated in the person of Christ, but mystically considered, Christ and the Elect, Head and Members, Gal. 3. 16. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the Promise. This Scripture is sufficient to decide the Controversie about the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace; clear your relation to Jesus Christ, and you may conclude your relation to Abraham, and consequently your interest in the Covenant of Grace: It was To Abraham and his seed that the promises were made; not to every Believer and his seed. Nor did the Promise take in all the seed of Abraham, there were some that were properly his Seed according to the flesh, that yet were no part of his Mystical Seed, to whom the Promises were made, Rom. 4. 12. And the father of the Circumcision, to them that are not of the Circumcision only, but that walk in the steps of that faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised. It was not enough to demonstrate them to be the Mystical Seed of Abraham, that they were circumcised, though they were his Natural Seed, Rom. 9. 7, 8. Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all Children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called; that is, they that are the Children of the flesh, these are not the Children of God, but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed: (Here Ishmael is put by.) It was not the Children of the flesh, considered as such, but the Children of the Promise that were accounted for the seed. Some you see were the Children of Abraham, that were not the Children of the Promise, and such as were not the Children of the Promise were never accounted nor intended as a part of that seed with whom the Covenant was established, Gen. 17. 7. nor were all the Posterity of Isaac accounted for the seed, There was an Esau as well as a Jacob, the one hated, the other loved;

nor were all the Posterity of *Jacob* accounted for the seed, *For all were not Israel that were of Israel*. I say, the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace are the Elect only, and to this agree the Assembly in their larger Catechism, p. 81. their Words are as followeth, 'The Covenant of Grace was made with the Lord Jesus Christ as the Second *Adam*, and in him with all the Elect of God, as his Seed. But this Covenant took in all the Natural Seed, considered as such, both Elect and Non-elect, there were none put by, it was made with all the People, *Zach. 11. 10*. With all the Congregation of *Israel*, the Captains of their Tribes, their Officers, with all the Men of *Israel*, from the Hewer of the Wood to the Drawer of the Water, it took in the whole Camp, their little Ones, their Wives, and the Stranger that was among them; the *Egyptians* that came up with them out of *Egypt* as well as the *Israelites*, for they came up a mixed multitude, *Exod. 12. 13*. when it was dedicated with the blood of the Sacrifices, *Exod. 24. 8*. *Moses* sprinkled the Book and all the People, and said, behold the blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.

Fourthly, The Covenant of Grace was absolute, *Jer. 31. 33, 34*. *This shall be the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their hearts, and write it in their inward parts, I will be their God, and they shall be my people; and they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest, for I will forgive their iniquities, and remember their Sins no more*: And it denotes thus much, that pardon of sin doth precede Sanctification. Here is not one Condition in the Text, nor any thing that looks like a condition; but this Covenant is partly absolute, and partly conditional, that some of *Abraham's* Seed should possess the Land of *Canaan*, that was absolute, *Gen. 15. 18*. *The same day the Lord made a Covenant with Abraham, saying, unto thy seed have I given*
this

this whole land, &c. but their continuance in it, and their Posterity in the enjoyment of it, did hang all on Conditions of their Obedience, Deut. 28. 1, 2. If thou shalt diligently hearken unto the Lord thy God, to do all that he commandeth thee, then all these blessings shall come upon thee, &c. ver. 15. But if thou shalt not hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, to do all that he commands thee, then all these Curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee, &c. Now according to all the words of the 28th. Chapter, was Moses to make a Covenant with them in the 29th. Chapter, ver. 1.

Fifthly, They differed in the matter of the Promises, so that they differed in the very Essence and Substance thereof, and not only in the Circumstances, (as some would have it.) The Promises are an essential part of a Covenant, the Promises of the Covenant of Grace are better Promises than the Promises of this Covenant, Heb. 8. 6. But now hath he obtained a more excellent Ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was established on better promises: The Promises are better on a twofold respect; First, In that they are absolute, when the Promises of this Covenant are conditional, but this I have spoken to in the preceding head. Secondly, They are better, in that they contain in them better blessings, Justification, Sanctification and Glorification, Jer. 31. 33, 34. Psal. 84. 11. God hath put spiritual Blessings into the Promises of the New Covenant, but the Promises of this Covenant contain only outward blessings, temporal Enjoyments; if you look Deut. 28. from 1, to 15. where you have a List of the Blessings of this Covenant, you will find none but outward and temporal Enjoyments there.

That this Govenant contained outward and temporal blessings only, doth farther appear, Rom. 3. 1. What advantage then hath the Jew, or what profit is there in Circumcision, much every way, but chiefly because to them were com-

mitted

mitted the Oracles of God. Now I suppose that by circumcision here is to be understood the Covenant which was signed with circumcision, into which God put all those blessings that were peculiar to the Jew, distinct from the *Gentile*, the chief or top of which Blessings were the Oracles of God, and yet it was in it self but an outward and temporal benefit, there were many among them that reap't no advantage at all by it: The Word preached did not profit them, not being mixt with Faith in the hearts of them that heard it. Now if the highest Privilege that they enjoyed by vertue of this Covenant, was barely to have the Word of God vouchsafed to them, then this was not the Covenant of Grace, for there are greater Blessings to be found there: There is a Promise of *Writing the Law of God in the heart*, that they shall all know the Lord, Jer. 31. 33. That God will put his Spirit within them, and cause them to walk in his statutes, to observe his judgments, and do them. A Heart to understand and conform to the Word of God, is a greater blessing then barely to have the Word vouchsafed to them, and that is a New Covenant Blessing.

But here is one Objection that must be Answered; but some may say, That God did make over himself to *Israel* by vertue of this Covenant, Gen. 17. 8. *And I will be their God.*

To this I answer, It's true he did, but there is a vast difference between the Lords making himself over to a People by vertue of the Covenant of Grace, and his making himself over to *Israel* by vertue of this Covenant; when God makes himself over to a People by Covenant, it is to make good that Covenant, and to give out the Blessings contained therein, to be enjoyed by the Subjects thereof according to the tenor of the Covenant; such as the Covenant then is, such are the Priviledges of that People that have an interest in God by vertue thereof.

First,

First, The Covenant of Grace is absolute, and God hath made himself over to the Subjects thereof absolutely, *Jer. 31. 33. I will be their God, and they shall be my people:* Here is no *if* in the case, but this Covenant is conditional, and God did make himself over to *Israel* on conditional terms, *Jer. 7. 23. Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my People.*

Secondly, The Covenant of Grace contains Spiritual Blessings, Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification, so then by vertue of the Covenant of Grace he is their God to justifie, sanctifie, and glorifie them, but this Covenant contained outward and temporal blessings only, *Deut. 28.* from 1, to 15. they could expect no more than God had put into the Covenant.

Thirdly, By vertue of the Covenant of Grace he is their God for ever, *Jer. 32. 40. I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good, and I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me:* And if God will never turn away from them to do them good, and to do them all the good that they need from a God, they may then conclude with the *Psalmist,* *This God is our God, for ever and ever, he will be our Guide to death.* But that Interest that *Israel* had in God, by vertue of this Covenant, might be lost, *Hosea 1. 9. Call his name Loammi, for ye are not my people, neither will I be your God:* Ten Tribes cut off at once, and such of them as had no other interest in God but what they had by vertue of this Covenant, have now no interest in God at all, no Enjoyment of him, but are for ever shut out of his Presence; so that though God be an eternal Good, yet their relation to him by vertue of this Covenant was but temporal; therefore I said, that this Covenant contained temporal Blessings only.

Sixthly, They differed in respect of the Mediator: *Jesus Christ* is the Mediator of the Covenant of Grace,

Heb. 9. 15. For this cause he is the Mediator of the New-Covenant, &c. Heb. 12. 24. But Moses was the Mediator of this Covenant, Exod. 32. 30. And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, ye have sinned a great sin, and now will I go up unto the Lord, peradventure I may make an attonement for you: He was a middle Person between the Lord and them, but Jesus Christ was never the Mediator of this Covenant, no instance can be given where Jesus Christ is called the Mediator of this Covenant; He is said to be the Mediator of a better Covenant, Heb. 8. 6. but he is not said to be the Mediator of this: If he had been the Mediator of this Covenant, he had been the Redeemed also of the Subjects thereof, considered as such, but he was not their Redeemer, therefore he was not their Mediator; those for whom he is a Mediator, for them also he is a Redeemer, Heb. 9. 15.

Seventhly, They differed in the Dedication thereof; the Covenant of Grace was dedicated or confirmed by the Lord Jesus Christ, and that with his own blood.

First, It was Christ confirmed it, he was the Testator, and he confirmed the Testament by his Death, Heb. 9. 15, 16. the Promises made to the Fathers were fulfilled by him, Acts 13. 33.

Secondly, He confirmed it by his own blood; it was by a bloody Death: His blood is called *The blood of the Covenant*, Zach. 9. 11. Even as Moses called the blood of the Sacrifices, Exod. 24. 8. with which this Covenant was confirmed, *The blood of the Covenant*; so is the blood of Christ called *The blood of the Covenant*. That he confirmed the New Covenant with his own blood, appears,

In that we have a Symbol of it to this day by his own Ordination, in the Supper of the Lord: Christ tells us, that the Cup in the Supper is his blood of the New Testament, Mat. 26. 28. that is, it's a Symbol of Christ's blood, with which the New Testament was confirmed, and

and we should look on it so when we come to the Supper of the Lord; but *Moses* dedicated this Covenant not with his own, but with the blood of Oxen, *Exod. 24. 8.* And *Moses* took the blood that was in the basons, and sprinkled the Book and all the People, and said, behold the blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you, concerning all these words. *Jesus Christ* never confirmed this Covenant by his blood, no instance can be given thereof.

He was so far from confirming this Covenant, that he made it void when he confirmed the Covenant of Grace, *Zach. 11. 10.*

Eighthly, The Covenant of Grace is an undivided Covenant, he that hath an interest in a part hath an interest in the whole; the branches of that Covenant are so concatenated and knit together, that he that can clear his interest in a part, may conclude his interest in the whole: It is interest in *Christ* that gives us a right to any part thereof; he that can't clear his interest in *Christ*, can't challenge an interest in one New-Covenant Promise; and he that can clear his interest in *Christ*, may conclude his interest in the whole, *Gal. 3. 29.* And if ye be *Christ's*, then are ye *Abraham's* seed, and Heirs according to the promise. But this Covenant was a parted Covenant, a Person might have an interest in a part that had not an interest in the whole; *Ishmael* and the *Professed Gentiles* had a right to Church-membership, and to the Ordinances of this Covenant, that had no right to the Land of *Canaan*, that was the inheritance thereof.

Ninthly, Once an interest in the Covenant of Grace, and for ever an interest therein, *Jer. 32. 40.* I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good, and I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me: We do not hold falling from Grace, and yet we can't deny it, if interest in the Covenant of Grace may possibly be lost; but interest in this Covenant might be lost, *Hosea 1. 9.* Ye are

not my People, neither will I be your God; and yet they were once his people. By vertue of this Covenant the Lord gives a Bill of Divorce to ten Tribes at once.

Tenthly, The Covenant of Grace contains Blessings only, there is no Curse put into it, there is no Plague that shall come near the dwellings of those that are the subjects of the New-Covenant; the Summ and Substance thereof is blessedness, *Gen. 22. 18. In thy seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed.*

Secondly, There are nothing but Promises put into the Covenant of Grace, and therefore there can be nothing but Blessings contained in it. Curses are held forth in Threats, not in Promises, but there are no Threats put into this Covenant, therefore there can be no curse there.

Thirdly, The Subjects thereof are all blessed, *Gal. 3. 8. They that are of faith, (that is, of Christ, Faith being taken objectively,) are blessed with faithful Abraham.* That there are nothing but Blessings in the Covenant of Grace, appears, in that those very things that are in themselves the matter of the Curse, (as Death, and other Afflictions) being in the Covenant of Grace, are turned into Blessings unto the Subjects thereof, *1 Cor. 3. 21, 22. Rom. 8. 28.* But this Covenant contains Curses as well as Blessings, *Dent. 28.* from 15, to the end; and 29, 20, 21. *The Lord threatens that he will separate them out of all the Tribes of Israel, according to all the Curses of the Covenant.* The Curses then that were written in the book of the Law were the Curses of this Covenant.

Secondly, These Curses might fall on the Subjects of this Covenant, without a sanctified use of them, as they did on those that were compared to the evil figs, *Jer. 24. 8, 9, 10. The Lord threatens that he would give Zedekiah, and his Princes, and the residue of the men of Judah, to be removed to all the Kingdoms of the World, for their hurt, to be a Reproach, a Taunt, and a Curse: Yet these were the Subjects of this Covenant.* But those that were compared to the good
figs,

Figs, such as had an interest in the Covenant of Grace were sent away into the same Captivity for their good, *verse 5.*

Eleventhly, The Covenant of Grace can't be broken, it's confirmed by the Lord Jesus, and now there is no disannulling of it; the Subjects thereof have all their sins pardoned by that one Oblation, *Heb. 10. 14. By one Oblation he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified:* By perfection here we are to understand remission, and this Word *For ever* shews, that it is all sin, past, present, and to come, this is witnessed by the Holy Ghost, *ver. 15, 16. Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more:* Pardoned Sins will never break this Covenant, and the Subjects thereof have no other but what are pardoned: God hath covenanted, *That he will not turn away from them to do them good, that they shall not depart from him:* How then can they break Covenant with God? but this Covenant might be broken, and was broken by the Subjects thereof.

First, It might be broken, *Gen. 17. 14. That Man-child that is not circumcised the eighth day, shall be cut off from his People, he hath broken my Covenant.*

Secondly, It was broken, *Jer. 31. 32. The which my Covenant they brake, altho' I was an Husband unto them:* This very Covenant that God made with *Israel,* *Deut. 29. 10.* when he brought them up out of *Egypt,* they brake, as appears by comparing *ver. 25.* with *Jer. 31, 32.*

Twelfthly, The Covenant of Grace was the Second Covenant, *Heb. 8. 7. If that first Covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the Second;* but this Covenant was the first, *Heb. 9. 18. So neither the first Covenant was dedicated without blood, for when Moses had spoken every Precept, he sprinkled the Book and all the People, and said, this is the blood of the Testament which the Lord hath enjoined you:* This carries us back to *Exod. 24. 8.*

and

and shews plainly, that the Covenant that was there dedicated with the blood of Sacrifices was the first Covenant, and that it was distinct from the Covenant of Grace. It was the first Covenant; not in respect of the Transact thereof, in that sense the Covenant of Grace was the first that ever was; but it was first, in that it was first confirmed by Blood.

Thirteenthly, The Covenant of Grace was faultless, there was no deficiency in it, it was *A Covenant ordered in all things, and sure*, 2 Sam. 23. 5. That Covenant made Provision for satisfying the Justice of God, and for magnifying his Mercy, there was enough in it to relieve all the necessities of the People of God, but this Covenant was not faultless, *Heb. 8. 7. If the first Covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second; but we see there was place sought for the second, and found too, and therefore the first was not faultless.*

It was not positively faulty, it was a good Covenant, considered in it self, and did answer the ends of God for which it was made; but it was negatively faulty, there was not that in it which did answer all the ends of God, he had higher ends than could be answered by this Covenant, which were the Exaltation of his own Glory in the Salvation of his People. This Covenant could not answer these: Pardon, Peace, Reconciliation, Sanctification, and Glorification, were never put into this Covenant; if they had, all the Subjects thereof should have enjoyed the benefit of it. God is a faithful God, a Covenant-keeping God.

Fourteenthly, The Covenant of Grace is a New Covenant, *Heb. 9. 15. He is a Mediator of the New Covenant, &c.* but this is an old Covenant, *Heb. 8. 13. In that he saith a New Covenant, he hath made the first old.*

Fifteenthly, The Covenant of Grace is a better Covenant, *Heb. 8. 6. He is a Mediator of a better Covenant,*

established on better promises. I have shewn already in what Respects the Promises are better, in that they are absolute, and contain spiritual blessings: Now if the Promises are better, the Covenant must needs be better, for the Promises are an essential part of the Covenant.

Secondly, As the Covenant of Grace is a better Covenant, in respect of the Promises, so it's a better Covenant in respect of the conditions, for they are all performed by Christ, (but this was a worse Covenant, Heb. 8. 7. *This first Covenant was not faultless*, there can't be a better, but there must be a worse; there cannot be a degree of comparison where there is but one:) The conditions of this Covenant were to be performed by the Subjects thereof.

Sixteenthly, The Covenant of Grace still remaineth, Heb. 12. 24. *We are come to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant*: He remains a Mediator, therefore the New Covenant still remains; he is not a Mediator of any other but the New Covenant, but this Covenant is done away, Heb. 8. 13. *In that he saith a New Covenant, he hath made the first old; now that which is old decayeth, and is ready to vanish away*: The Geneva reads it, that which is old is abrogated, and so it was by the death of Christ, if you look on the Contents, placed before this Chapter, you will see the Author was of the same mind, that this Covenant was distinct from the Covenant of Grace, and that it was made void by the Oblation of Christ; it runs thus, That by the Eternal Priesthood of Christ, the Levitical Priesthood of Aroon is abolished, and the Temporal Covenant with the Fathers, by the Eternal Covenant of the Gospel. When Christ was offered up, then was this Covenant made void, Zach. 11. 10. *Then I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my Covenant that I had made with all the People, and it was broken in that day*: That was, when they weighed for his price thirty pieces of silver.

silver. Dr. Owen observes on the place, that when the Covenant of Grace was confirmed by the offering up of Christ, that then the peculiar Covenant that God made with *Israel* was made void, and *Israel* ceased to be a Church. If this Covenant that was made with all the People, and that was broken when Christ was offered up, was not that Covenant that was made with *Abraham*, and all the Natural Seed, *Gen. 15. 18.* that was signed with circumcision, *Gen. 17. 10.* that was dedicated with the blood of the Sacrifices, when *Moses* sprinkled the Book and all the People, *Exod. 24. 8.* and that was renewed with all the Congregation of *Israel*, *Deut. 29. 10, 11.* then shew me what Covenant it was; shew me another Covenant if you can, that was made with all the People of *Israel*, and that was made void when Christ was offered up. But here are some Objections that must be removed out of the way:

Object. 1. The Covenant that Christ brake, *Zach. 11. 10.* was the Covenant of Grace, for it was that Covenant that Christ himself had made, and he did not make a Covenant of Works with all the People. To this I answer,

First, I grant that Jesus Christ made this Covenant with them, as he was considered in the Divine Nature, and so one with the Father: I deny that he made it with them, as he is considered as Mediator. Christ is not always to be considered as Mediator in what he is said to do, but sometimes as Creator, in respect of the Divine Nature, *Col. 1. 16.* For by him were all things created, &c. By him, not considered God-man as Mediator, but as one with the Father, in respect of the Divine Nature, and in this sense he may be said to make this Covenant with the People, *Exod. 23. 20, 21.* Behold I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place that I have prepared, beware of him, obey his voice, (His Voice is no otherwise obeyed, but in their

Obe-

Obedience to the commands of God, nor is it heard but in the commands of this Covenant, which are the commands of God) *Provoke him not, he will not pardon your iniquities, my Name is in him, my Nature is in him, he is God : Now if he will not pardon their iniquities, he is no Mediator for them, for those for whom he is a Mediator, for them he is a Redeemer, In which redemption there is remission of sins, Heb. 9. 15. Eph. 1. 7.*

Secondly, If this Covenant which Christ brake when he was offered up was the Covenant of Grace, that was a bad fruit of his Oblation, for that Covenant that was then broke was never renewed again, so that there is now no Covenant of Grace, this would render our estate very deplorable.

Thirdly, The fallacy of this Objection appears, in that the Covenant of Grace was then confirmed when this Covenant was made void, the Death of the Testator confirmed the Testament, and therefore it was not the Covenant of Grace that was then broken.

Object. 2. Tho' the Covenant of Grace was then confirmed in respect of the substance thereof, yet it was broken in respect of the Administration or Dispensation thereof; and in that respect, the Covenant might be said to be broken. To this I answer,

First, That the Dispensation of the Covenant was then changed I grant, the Old Administration done away, and a New Administration appointed, a New Commission given out as soon as Christ was risen, *Mat. 28. 19.* according to which all Ordinances are to be administered in respect of matter and form. *Secondly,* The Dispensation of the Covenant is now extended larger than before, the Commission is, *to Teach all Nations, to preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

Thirdly, The Covenant could not be said to be broken in this sense, with respect to the *Jews*, tho' the Dispensation was changed, for it was extended to them as well as the *Gentiles*, and to them primarily, *Luke 24. 47. That Repentance and Remission of sins should be preached unto all Nations, beginning at Jerusalem.* Hence then I conclude, that the Covenant that is here said to be broken, is not the Covenant of Grace, neither in respect of the Essence, nor in respect of the Administration, but a distinct Covenant.

Object. But if the Covenant that was made with all the People of *Israel* was made void when *Christ* was offered up, then the Moral Law or Ten Commands was made void, for that was a branch of that Covenant, and comprehended in those Laws that *Israel* was bound to observe, *Deut.* 28. 2.

To this I answer, it doth not follow that we are discharged from the Moral Law, as its considered a rule of Life, tho' it be most certain that this Covenant be made void, the Moral Law was in being as a Rule of Life, tho' not written in Tables of Stone before this Covenant was in being.

Secondly, The Moral Law reached farther than this Covenant, when this Covenant had a Being; my Meaning is, it was a Rule of Life to the *Gentiles*, that were not the Subjects of this Covenant.

Thirdly, He that made void this Covenant hath confirmed the Moral Law, that same Law that was given out upon Mount *Sinai*, signifying that it is perpetual binding, as a Rule of Life to all, *Mat.* 5. 17, 18, 19. *Till Heaven and Earth pass, one jot or tittle shall not pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled.*

Now by all the Marks and Characters that I have laid down, by which I have distinguished the Covenants one from another, it doth appear that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and the Natural Seed, considered as such, was a peculiar Covenant, distinct from the Covenant of Works made with *Adam*, and all Mankind; and also from the Covenant of Grace made with the Lord *Jesus Christ*, and in him with all the Elect of God. But some may say, if this be neither the Covenant of Works, nor the Covenant of Grace, what Covenant is it? By what Name may we call it? I answer, you may call it the Covenant made with all the People, that's a Name the Scripture gives it, *Zach.* 11. 10. and if you consult the four forementioned places, you will find that it was made with all the people of *Israel*, but the Covenant of Grace was never made with all the People, that took in the Elect only, the Mystical Seed of *Abraham*, or you may call it the Covenant of Circumcision, so *Stephen* calls it, *Acts* 7. 8. or you may call it the first Covenant, that's a Name it's known by, *Heb.* 9. 18. a Name by which it is distinguished from the New Covenant; or if you will, you may call it the Typical Covenant, that's a Name according to its Nature. *First,* The Subjects thereof were Typical, *Exod.* 4. 22, 23. *Israel is my son, my first born, let my sons go, that they may serve me.* *Secondly,* The Inheritance was Typical, the Land of *Canaan*, and that Rest that *Joshua* gave them therein, *Heb.* 4. 8. Their Rest in *Canaan* pointed out that Eternal Rest that came in by *Christ*, *ver.* 9.

Thirdly, The Mediator was typical, *Moses* was the Mediator of this Covenant, *Exod.* 32. 30. He typed out the Mediatorship of *Christ*, *Heb.* 8. 6.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, The Dedication was typical, the blood of the Sacrifice, *Exod. 24. 8.* that typ't out the blood of Christ, by which the New Covenant was confirmed, which is also called the blood of the Covenant, *Zach. 9. 11.*

Fifthly, Their Priesthood, and also their going into the Holy of Holies, with the blood of Calves, and of Goats, was typical, that typ't out the Priesthood of Christ, and his going into the Holy Place not made with hands, and that with his own blood, *Heb. 9. 12.*

Sixthly, All the Ordinances of this Covenant were typical, *Heb. 9.* from 1, to 11. they were all figures for the time then present. That this Covenant was typical, appears, in that it vanished, as all the Types did, when the substance was come, *Heb. 8. 13. Zach. 11. 10.*

There is but one thing more that I would note, by which it appears that this Covenant was distinct from the New Covenant, and that is, the Apostle calls them Covenants, in the Plural Number, *Eph. 2. 12.* *At that time ye were strangers to the Covenants of Promise*; I think he would not have spoken in the Plural Number if there had been but one Covenant.

Object. But some may say, by Covenants is intended Dispensations of the same Covenant, for tho' there be but one Covenant, yet there hath been two Dispensation of the Covenant of Grace. To this I answer,

First, We had better read it as God by his Servant wrote it, who knew how to phrase it better than we: To read it Covenants is better sense than we can make by reading it Dispensations.

Secondly, Tho' there have been two Dispensations of the Covenant of Grace, yet there were not two Dispensations at the same time. The time that this Text relates to was antecedent to the offering up of Christ, and then there was but one Dispensation; the New Dispensation of the Covenant of Grace was not till after Christ was risen again.

That it refers to a time antecedent to the offering up of Christ, will appear, if we consider *ver. 11, 12, 13.* In *v. 11.* he tells them, *That in times past ye were Gentiles, in the flesh*; that was before the offering up of Christ. In *v. 12.* *At that time they were strangers to the Covenants of Promise.* In *v. 13.* He tells them, *That they who sometime were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ*: If they were made nigh by the blood of Christ, then the time in which they were far off (which was the time in which they were strangers to the Covenants of Promise) was antecedent thereunto. So that it's in vain to turn the Word Covenant into Dispensations, unless you can clear it, that there were two Dispensations of the Covenant of Grace at the same time, both antecedent to the offering up of the Lord Jesus.

