

# THE BOND-WOMAN

## AND THE

## FREE

Mr. *Backus's* SERMON, Wherein is shewn who are the proper Subjects of the special Ordinances of the Gospel-Church.

A SHORT DESCRIPTION Of the difference between the *Bond-woman* and the *Free*; As they are the two Covenants, with the Characters and Conditions of each of their Children: Considered in a SERMON, Delivered at *Middleborough*,

By ISAAC BACKUS, Preacher of the Gospel.

Wherein is particularly shewn, that none are proper Subjects of the special Ordinances of the Gospel-Church, but real Saints.

Copyright (Public Domain)

[www.reformedontheweb.com/home/.html](http://www.reformedontheweb.com/home/.html)

(Reformed on the Web)

## THE PREFACE

THE chief occasion of publishing the following discourse, is because of what is said therein about the subjects of *Baptism*; which is a point that has been long controverted among the greatest and best of men. But since there has been so many volumes written upon it, *pro* and *con*, many will be ready to object against any more's being added now, especially from one that some are pleas'd to call *a young upstart*, and disdain to be taught by him. But without regard to such flings, I shall beg leave in answer to this objection to tell the reader a little of my own experience.—I was educated from a child in the contrary principles to what I now imbrace concerning baptism; and my education had this to inforce it, that it came from progenitors who were sundry of them eminently godly, whose instructions godly examples and prayers, I trust I shall bless God for to eternity. And after I trust my soul was brought to the saving knowledge of Christ, I made a publick profession in that way: to which may be added that I have since been called (though most unworthy) to preach the gospel, and to take the charge of a flock, in which I practis'd *Infant-baptism* my self: all these, and some other things concurred to bind me in that way; but the irresistable evidence of divine truth broke through them all. Though when this point was first brought in dispute among us, I labour'd under some peculiar disadvantages, having my mind heavily burdened with a sense of past neglect of duty in things of another nature, which at times made me afraid of looking into these matters, least I should be left of God to imbrace an error; and this, together with the hot disputes, and vehement urgings that we then had among us on both sides, occasion'd such tossings in my mind as seem'd, as if they would have *sifted* and shaken me (as it were) to pieces; after which I was much overwhelmed with melancholy, and discouragements for a great while. Yet having since obtain'd through divine mercy sweet deliverance and establishment, them words have often born with weight upon my mind, *When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.*

And being sensible that many of my brethren are labouring under some of the same difficulties that I did, and having some clear view of several things in this affair, that I have not lit of in any human writings, these and some other considerations have inclined me to yield to the request of those who have desired that this sermon might be published. I don't expect in this little piece to please the *Curious*; much less a *vain* carping world: but if it may benefit,

or be any help to serious inquiring minds, I have my end.—Of such I ask this one request, *viz.* That when you get near to God, you would remember your unworthy brother and Servant in the gospel.

Isaac Backus.

*Middleborough, Jan. 20. 1756.*

N. B. *The reason why I have said nothing in this tract upon the mode of baptism, is not for want of clearness therein in my own mind; but because this subject more naturally led to shew who might partake of this ordinance, than how it should be administered. And also, I scarce ever meet with any that deny immersion's being a gospel mode: and I believe that when men shall have done bringing infants to baptism, they'll generally have done with sprinkling therein likewise.*

# THE BOND-WOMAN AND THE FREE

GAL. 4:31 — *So then, Brethren we are not the children of the Bond-woman, but of the Free.*

ALTHOUGH mankind are awfully inclined to disregard God's law when in a careless state, yet when they are wounded by conviction, instead of coming to Christ, they fly to the law and their own works for relief. And though (as one observes) man's legal disposition has little need of being encouraged by legal preaching; yet some will teach people in this way: which it seems was the case among the *Galatians*, that occasion'd the writing of this epistle. Some teachers (it appears) had zealously brought in the same doctrine among them, which before was preached to the disciples at *Antioch*, viz. That *except they were circumcised and kept the law of Moses they could not be saved*. Which then was called a *subverting their souls*. (Act. 15:24.) And now 'tis called a *perverting the gospel of Christ*. (chap. 1:7.) Therefore the apostle warns them sharply against such snares: and he intimates that the reason why men cleave so close to the law, is because they don't hear the law, nor understand its true nature and strictness, (context ver. 21.) And in order to make this matter more plain, he sets before them the instance of *Abraham's* two sons that he had, one by a *Bond-maid*, the other by a *Free-woman*, which things he shews to be an allegorical representation of the two covenants:—and after some discourse upon each, he concludes with these words;—*So then, brethren, we are not the children of the bond-woman, but of the free.*

Which expressions naturally lead us to enquire who each of these women are; and also to look into the characters, and conditions of their children.

**I.** Who is this Bond-woman?

**Answer 1.** *The moral law, as it was first given to men, commonly called the covenant of works; the tenor of which is, Do this and thou shalt live, but in the day that thou sinnest thou shalt surely die. Gen. 2:17. Lev. 18:5. Gal. 3:12. which shews that in order to enjoy the blessing promis'd, we must perfectly, and constantly live in a conformity to this law without the least failure; for if we don't continue to do all things that are written in the law, we*

are immediately bound under the curse, (Gal. 3:10.) and so stand exposed to eternal damnation; from which nothing can deliver but a complete satisfaction to divine justice for the offences committed, (*and without shedding of blood there is no remission.* Heb. 9:22.)—This law, and covenant of works was evidently given to, and made with our Father *Adam* in Paradise, though we have it not so fully exprest, and recorded till *Moses's* time. Then as *Paul* says, *The law entered,* (Rom. 5:20.) or was published and proclaimed to the congregation of *Israel*, from mount *Sinai*, out of the midst of the fire and smoke, even the ten commandments. Hence the apostle says here (ver. 25.) that this *Agor* is mount *Sinai* in *Arabia*, i. e. 'tis the law that was deliver'd from thence, which gendereth to bondage.

2. *This bond-woman includes also the ceremonial law, which likewise was given to Moses, and from him to the children of Israel at Sinai, Exod. 25. &c.* I know indeed that the ceremonial law, as it was a *shadow of good things to come*, and typified Jesus Christ, and the blessings of his grace, brought very joyful news to perishing Souls; and those who were enabled by faith to look through them signs to the things signified, enjoy'd great blessings therein. But then those rites and ceremonies in themselves could never take away sin: and they seem to be given much after the tenor of the old covenant. If any man had sinned, then he must provide his own offering, and bring it for his sin that he had sinned: Lev. 4.—And so for any uncleanness—what a long train of ceremonial labours must they do in order for cleansing? Lev. 14th and 15th chapters. And from what the apostle says concerning the end of the law's being given, *viz. That the offence might abound; and that it was added because of transgression.* (Rom. 5:20. Gal. 3:19.) I humbly conceive that we may learn, that one great thing designed in those ceremonies, was to shew the heinous nature, and great evil of sin, and thereby to discover more clearly man's awful, and helpless Condition, and his necessity of a Christ.—That when he had brought the greatest, and most costly sacrifices, even thousands of rams, or ten thousands of rivers of oil, (Mic. 6:7, 8.) all would avail nothing for the taking away sin and guilt: As says our glorious mediator, sacrifice and offering, and burnt-offerings for sin, thou wouldest not (which are offered by the law;) then said he, *Lo, I come to do thy Will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.* Heb. 10:8, 9.—Indeed it is plain that the body of the forms and ordinances of the *Jewish* church are often represented as a yoke of bondage. In the council at *Jerusalem*, *Peter*

calls them, *A yoke which neither they, nor their fathers were able to bear.* Acts 15:10. And in our context, *Paul* shews that one part of the bondage which he warned them people against, consisted in being held under those *beggarly elements*; and in observing ceremonial *days, months and years.* ver. 9, 10.

**3.** And further, *by the bond-woman, seems to be intended the Jewish church, in her legal standing:* hence the apostle adds; *And answereth to Jerusalem that now is, and is in bondage with her children,* ver. 25. and in the beginning of the next chapter, he warns them as they would keep clear of this bondage, to beware of *circumcision.*—Should it be said that what is here designed, is not, that them ordinances were such a yoke in themselves; but only that the *Jews* had perverted them from their proper use. I reply, that 'tis in a measure so; though in themselves they were an insupportable task. In short by the bond-woman I understand the covenant of works in general, and all the ways in particular, wherein men seek for life, by what they can do; and think either in whole, or in part to satisfy for their sins, and purchase divine favours, either by duties of morality, or by observing any ordinances and forms of worship whatsoever.

**II.** Let us consider who her children are, and what a condition they are in.

*And here the case is very plain that the children of the bond-woman, are all that are born after the flesh* (ver. 23.) that is, all mankind in their natural condition. But should any say that *Ishmael's* being born after the flesh, intends an unlawful birth, his mother not being *Abraham's* lawful wife. I answer no, by no means for then he would have been a bastard, and such an one must not come into the congregation of the Lord. Deut. 23.—but he was circumcised and admitted to outward privileges as well as *Isaac.* This objection might as well be laid against four of *Jacob's* sons, as against this, their mothers being maids or handmaids before; yet they are ever reckned to make up the 12 tribes of God's *Israel.* But it is evident beyond dispute, that his being born after the flesh, does not intend a being *illegitimate,* but only that he had no other than a natural birth: he was never *born again,* without which none can enter into the kingdom of God. And so now all who have only a natural birth are children of the bond-woman. *Paul* says of himself, and other Saints,—*We are by nature, children of wrath, even as others.* Eph. 2:3. and he tells the *Romans,* that he had proved both *Jews* and *Gentiles,* that

they are all under sin, Rom. 3:9—*Jews, Pharisees, and all the world are guilty before God ver. 19.*

And never did a child more naturally run to its mother for help, than man when wounded with a sense of guilt flies to his own works for relief: his cry is, *Have patience with me, and I'll pay thee all:* but very sad is the condition of such souls.

***They may justly be called children of the bond-woman for these reasons.***

**1.** *Because their work is hard.* Slaves have often both hard work to do, and are drove hard in it to do a great deal: So is the case here; the law requires not only that which is hard, but that which is impossible, for us to do. It requires us to make us a new heart, and a new spirit, as we would escape death. Ezek. 18:31. And it demands that we make recompence for all past faults, and walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity, as we would hope to live. Ezek. 33:15. Yea, it follows the soul up so, that it says, *If thou keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, thou art guilty of all.* Jam. 2:10. I know some say that God cannot justly require of us more than we can do. But this discovers men's awful blindness, What! is it become an unjust thing for this glorious Creditor to demand his full due, because man is turned bankrupt, and is no way able to pay it! (Luk. 7:42.) O heaven-daring madness! Nay this sets aside all that Christ has done as vain, for he came upon this very footing; namely because we were *without strength, therefore in due time he died for the ungodly,* Rom. 5:6. *And what the law could not do, (i. e. justify a sinner) God sent his son to do.* Rom. 8:3.

**2.** *Souls under the old covenant are like bond-servants in this, that they can claim no right to the inheritance, or even to a continuance in the family, but may be sold away, or shut up in prison, notwithstanding all that they have done when the master thinks proper.—The servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the son abideth ever.* John 8:35. Since the law is broken, man can claim nothing by it, but wrath and damnation. *The law worketh wrath.* (Rom. 4:15.) *and as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse.* Gal. 3:10. So that after all their performances which they boast themselves in, the sentence will justly be given out, and executed upon them.—*Cast out the bond-woman and her son; for the son of the bond-woman, shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman.*

**3.** *Bond-servants, when they have toiled and laboured many years, are no*



*more released from their bondage, than when they began:* so all that are under the law, let them fast twice in the week, and make many and long prayers, and be as exact as ever the *Pharisees* were, in all their walk; yet our Lord assures us, that they must have a righteousness beyond all this, or they can in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. Matt. 5:20.—By the deeds of the law, no flesh living can be justified in the sight of God. So that every unbeliever, will eternally remain under condemnation after all their doing. Ah! deplorable case indeed! well might the apostle think that those who desired to be under the law, did not hear it, nor know its true nature and strictness. Surely if they did, they would soon cry (as *Israel* did at *Sinai*) for a mediator to stand between God and them.—Hence I proceed,

**III.** To shew who the free-woman is, here spoken of. And by this I understand, first the glorious covenant of grace, made between the Father, and the Son, before the world began. Therefore God says, *I have made a covenant with my chosen,—I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people.* Psal. 89:3, 19. The sum of which covenant (for I cannot be large in describing of it) is, That the Son of God should assume our nature, and in that nature perfectly obey the law which we have broken, and bear the punishment due unto us for sin, and so make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in an everlasting righteousness, thro' which God could be just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly:—As the fruit of which, the Father engaged by the influences of the holy Spirit, effectually to draw many of the sons of men to Christ; work faith in their hearts, justify and sanctify their souls, and keep them by his power, thro' faith unto eternal salvation: Heb. 2:9—17. Psal. 40:6—8. Dan. 9:24. John 16:7—13. Rom. 8:29, 30. 1 Pet. 1:2—5.

Which glorious plan, is so far from destroying, or setting aside the law, that it establishes, yea magnifies, and makes it honourable (Rom. 3:31. Isai. 42:21.) and shews how heinous every breach of it is, even so great that no transgressor of that law could escape eternal punishment without a perfect satisfaction for every offence against it. But by Christ's obedience and sufferings there is a way opened wherein the greatest sinner may be pardoned, and God's image be re-instamped on his heart, and that he may come to enjoy all divine blessings here, and for ever more. Hence the Lord says, *This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days;—I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts;*

*and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.* Heb. 8:10.

Further, by the free-woman is intended the gospel-church in her pure standing—Hence in our context she is called *Jerusalem* which is above—which is the mother of us all (*ver.* 26.) So in Heb. 12:18—24. it is said that *we are not come to the mount that burned with fire, but we are come to mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,—to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven—and to Jesus the mediator of the new-covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel.*—On mount *Sinai* the fiery law was proclaimed, which gendereth to bondage; but now on mount *Sion*, or in the church of the living God, is proclaimed the gospel of peace, and salvation: and souls are brought to embrace the same. All the saints in heaven and earth, make but one catholic church: but it is in the gospel church here below that God appears to publish his grace, and to draw others in: therefore we are told that, *The law shall go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and many nations shall flock in, Isai. 2.*—And again, *The Lord shall send the rod of his strength out of Zion;*—the effect of which will be, that his *people shall be willing, in the day of his power.* Psal. 110:2, 3.—In short, by the free-woman, we may understand the glorious plan of salvation, laid in the eternal mind from everlasting, which in time has been made manifest, first by gradual discoveries thereof in the old testament, and then by Christ's actually coming in the flesh, and working out salvation, which he began to preach himself, and 'twas afterwards confirmed unto us, by them that heard him, whereby the gospel church was gathered, and increased: His usual way of bringing others in, being to cause *Zion* to travel, and so to bring forth children; for God is the Father, and the church the mother, of all the saints.— The apostle here (*ver.* 27.) adds a passage from the 54th of *Isaiah*, where, note, that the foregoing chapter concludes, with the happy fruits of Christ's sufferings, viz. That he should *see his seed, justify many, &c.* upon which the church who had been desolate as a widow, is comforted with a declaration that her maker is her husband, and that she should have a numerous offspring, and her seed should inherit the *Gentiles, &c.*—Which leads us,

**IV.** To describe the character and State of her children. And here we are told, that (as the child of the bond-woman was *born after the flesh*, so) the child of the free-woman was *by promise*. God promis'd that son to *Abraham* long

before he was conceived in the womb; and he exercised a strong faith in that promise, by which *he gave glory to God*. Rom. 4:20. And 'twas thro' faith that *Sarah* also received strength to conceive this seed. Heb. 11:11.—There appear'd nothing more than the actings of nature in *Ishmael's* birth: but in *Isaac's* there was faith on both sides; which made him a wonderful type of the seed here pointed at. He was promised before he had a being; and so was every child of the free-woman here spoken of: They were *chosen in Christ, before the world began*. Eph. 1:4. And *God that cannot lie, promised eternal life, so early*. Tit. 1:2. Therefore Christ refers to this promise, in his glorious prayer. John 17:1, 2. *Father,—glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life, to as many as thou hast given him*. But this election of grace is not known to us, 'till we are born again: therefore, as *Isaac* was born according to promise; so every one of these who are promised to Christ shall be converted in due time: hence he says, *All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me: and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out*. Joh. 6:37. Such are *born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God*. John. 1:13.

***These souls may well be called children of the free-woman, because,***

**1.** *They are set free from that condemnation, and dreadful load of guilt which they lay under before. There is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,—for the law of the spirit of life, in Christ Jesus, hath made them free from the law of sin and death; yea so that no things present, nor things to come, shall ever be able to separate them from his love*. Rom. 8:1, 2, 38, 39. Agreeable to this is what our divine Master tells us. John 5:24. *that he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life*.—

**2.** *These children are set free from satan's tyranny*. By nature they are his slaves: he is called the *prince of this world; and the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience*. Joh. 12:31. Eph. 2:2. Hence we are told that, *Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, Christ took part of the same: that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who thro' fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage*. Heb. 2:14, 15. Christ casteth satan out, and

takes from him all his armour, wherein he trusted, and *divideth the spoils*. Luk. 11:22.

**3.** *They may be called children of the free-woman, because they are made free from the dominion of sin.*—Christ tells us that, *Whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin; but if the Son shall make us free, we shall be free indeed*. Joh. 8:34, 36. And Paul told the Romans, that being made free from sin, they became the servants of God, had their fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life: yea says he, *sin shall not have dominion over you; because ye are not under the law, but under grace*. Rom. 6:14, 22. Sin takes occasion by the law, and often beats down, and overcomes souls, when they essay to reform and turn to the Lord, by throwing their past transgressions and guilt in their way, and representing to them, that such guilty creatures as they, can never come to a holy God; and therefore they had better go on and get what pleasure they can in sin, for they'll never have any thing better.—And God's own children are often worried here, when they have backsliden from him; and satan will not be wanting, to help to keep them back:—hence he is called *the accuser of the brethren, which accuseth them before God day and night*.—The spirit of God *convinceth* of sin, and the devil *accuseth* of sin; but one special difference between them lies here,—The one shews us our transgressions in order to awaken us to repentance and reformation, and says, *It is high time to awake out of sleep, and the time past of our lives may suffice, and more than suffice, wherein we have served sin*: but satan says, 'tis in vain to turn now for there is no help for you. Nay because souls are got once into his snare, he claims a sort of propriety in them, and if at any time they would attempt to reprove another for iniquity, he will immediately throw their own faults in their teeth, and tell them that 'tis in vain to pretend to deal with another, when they are so vile themselves; and so because we have once done *wrong*, he would make *that* a sufficient argument against our even doing right again. O this cruel adversary! how miserably are sinners befooled, that they'll hearken to him more than to Jesus Christ!—But what shall a poor soul do when the tempter throws such things in his way as he knows he is guilty of? he can't deny the charge. Why we are told that *they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death*. Rev. 12:11. Therefore, O Soul, if satan tells thee of thy guilt, learn to overcome him by flying immediately to the blood of the Lamb; who, if we confess our sins, is (not only merciful and

gracious, but also) *just and faithful to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* 1 Joh. 1:9. Does the tempter say thy sins are very heinous? learn to make that an argument with Christ, saying, *Pardon O Lord mine iniquity; for it is great.* Psal. 25:11.—Which leads me,

**4.** *To another point of their freedom, which is open access to God.*—When *Adam* had sinned, he was turn'd out of Paradise, and cherubims, and a flaming sword were set to keep him off, and to guard the way of the tree of life, Gen. 3:24. But now thro' Christ we have access by one Spirit to the Father. Eph. 2:18. Saints have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but they have received the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry *Abba Father.* Rom. 8:15. And they may come with as great freedom as children do to a father, for the blessings they need. Luke. 11:13. Yea, we are bid to be careful for nothing, but in every thing by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving to let our request be made known to God. Phil. 4:6.—Once more,

**5.** *They are made free to serve God, and walk in his ways, so that his commands are not a yoke of bondage; but a law of liberty to their souls.* Jam. 1:25. And as on the other side, the children of the bond-woman drag on like slaves, and they say of Gods service, *what a weariness is it:* so the children of the free-woman obey him, not out of slavish dread; (but like free born souls) they serve him WITHOUT FEAR, in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of their lives. Luke 1:74, 75. Hence *David* reckons it his freedom to observe the divine will; says he, *I will walk at LIBERTY: for I seek thy precepts,* Psal. 119:45. And the saints at *Galatia*, being brought into this freedom, the Apostle (in the words next after our text) chargeth them to stand fast in that liberty, wherewith Christ had made them free; and not to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

In short, the children of the free-woman are freed from the condemnation of the law, from the power of sin and satan, and have freedom of approach to God thro' Jesus Christ; and it is made their freedom and liberty to walk in holiness all their days, and they have the liberty of Christ's house, and have a right to all the priviledges of the sons of God here, and are heirs of an incorruptible inheritance above; and by and by they shall be received to that glory: and in the great day, their bodies shall be raised from the dust, and shall be delivered from the *bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.* Rom. 8:21, 23.—And when the bond-woman, and all her

children shall be cast out into outer-darkness: then shall these children of the freewoman be openly received to enjoy the kingdom, prepared for them before the foundation of the world.—Mat. 25.—

*Let us now proceed to some Improvement of what has been said.*

**USE I.** We may here see the great folly of all those that seek salvation, either in whole, or in part by their own doings. This mount *Sinai* gendreth to bondage, and those who would get life by the law, let 'em come before it and see the darkness, fire and smoke, and hear the thundrings and the fiery law, that comes from thence. Surely if souls come here, they will soon see the need of a Mediator to stand between them and this God, who is a consuming fire. Alas! how blind are men, that they should ever imagine that they can satisfy divine justice, or get life by a broken law! *Tell me ye that desire to be under the law; do you not hear the law? What does it say? Why it says, If the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life WITHOUT COMMITTING iniquity, he shall surely live, he shall not die.* Ezek. 33:15. Observe the terms well, you must restore the pledge, give again that you have robbed; not only what you have unlawfully taken, from your fellow men, but also what you have done against the eternal God; for he says, *you have robbed me, even this whole nation.* Mal. 3:9. You must fully pay that dreadful debt, and walk in the statutes of life for the future, without ever committing another sin, else there's no life by that law.—If you say, that this is too strait; be intreated to look a little farther into the nature of the law, and you will find it is so strait, that Heaven and Earth will pass away, before one tittle of the law can pass away, 'till all be fulfilled. Matt. 5:18. When God treats with men in the old covenant, he deals with them according to the strict tenor of it: and when he treats with them in the covenant of grace, then tho' their debts are very great, yet, *when they have nothing to pay he frankly forgives them all.* Luke 7:42. But sinners vainly expect some of the blessings of grace, while they yet cleave to the law.

**USE II.** Hence we may learn who have a right to the privileges of the new covenant: *viz.* those (and those only) who are born again. The children of the free-woman partake of her blessings; but the children of the bond-woman, shall not be heirs with the children of the free-woman.—I am sensible that there are many contentions among professors of religion about these things. Many think that sinners may claim a right to some of the *promises* of grace:

particularly such as these,—*Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find. And if any man lack Wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him.*—But if they look a little further, they are told that they must *ask in faith*, if they would think to receive any thing from the Lord. James 1:5, 6, 7.<sup>[1]</sup> Indeed here God appeals to their consciences, and says, *are not my ways equal?* (Ezek. 18.) *are not your ways unequal?* If you keep under the old covenant, I deal with you according to the tenor of it: if you perfectly obey its precepts, you shall have the blessings promised: but he that offends in one point is guilty of all; and then there is *tribulation and wrath, upon every soul of man that doeth evil.* Rom. 2:9. The promises and threatnings of the old covenant belong to the children of the old covenant: and the promises of the new covenant belong only to her children. Hence such alone are stil'd *heirs of promise*, who have *fled for refuge, to lay hold on the hope set before us:* Heb. 6:17, 18. None others can claim the promises of grace, for, *All the promises of God IN Christ Jesus, are yea, and IN him amen:* 2 Cor. 1:20. Therefore to those only that come to, and receive him does he give power (or privilege) to become the sons of God. John 1:12. And if sons, than heirs to all the blessings of heaven, Rom. 8:17.—And as these alone are heirs to those eternal blessings; so none others have a right to the special privileges of Christ's house here below:—this I shall enlarge more upon.

As for preaching, exhortation, &c. God has given them forth in general to the world, and calls all men every where to repent: But some imagine that the Lord's supper was appointed for a converting ordinance; and so that unconverted persons, if moral, ought to come to it. But if it was appoint- for conversion, surely the profane have as much need of that as any; though 'tis evident that this is children's bread, and therefore by no means to be given to dogs. Matt. 7:6. Many others think that Baptism is not confined only to saints, but that their natural off-spring are also to partake of it. And I find that the main arguments for both, are fetcht from the constitution of the old testament-church, holding that to be modeled according to the new covenant:—though here in our text we are told that, *This Agar is mount Sinai,—and answereth to Jerusalem that now is, and is in bondage with her children:* i. e. the *Jewish* church in her legal standing: that church and the gospel-church are set as wide apart as the old covenant and the new. In Heb. 8. the covenant at *Sinai*, is called *Old*; and God says expresly that the new-covenant is *not*

*according to that: and that old constitution we are told, was then ready to vanish away, ver. 9, 13. The original constitution of that church was such, that it took in whole households, and so a whole nation.—Natural generation (being born of professors of that religion) gave a right to circumcision, and so to all the privileges of that church: and a being bought with an Hebrews money, gave the servant a right both to circumcision and the Passover. Exod. 12:44. And the covenant that Moses mentions in Deut. 29. took in such as had not an heart to perceive, eyes to see, nor ears to hear. But Paul shews clearly that in the new testament, The children of the flesh are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. Rom. 9:8. And least any should say that a being born after the flesh, meant an unlawful birth, he immediately adds the instance of Jacob and Esau, as exactly parallel, who were not only both born of one mother, but also at one time; and yet Esau was in as bad a case as Ishmael, ver. 10,—13.*

But what will, I apprehend, set this matter in the clearest light, is, to consider it in the line of *type* and *anti-type*.—It is abundantly shewn in Scripture, that the *Jewish* church, and the forms and ordinances thereof, did shadow forth, and typify heavenly things, Heb. 8:2—6. and 9:9, 23, 24, &c. The seed of *Abraham, Isaac* and *Israel's* being selected out of other nations, and being redeem'd with almighty power, and bro't near to God, to be his peculiar people, and to partake of those ordinances and privileges which no other nation then enjoyed, did remarkably shadow forth God's spiritual *Israel*, whom he hath chosen and by almighty grace redeemed; *Out of every kindred, tongue people and nation. Rev. 5:9. And as the Lord said to Israel at Sinai; Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, (Exod. 19:6.) so these saints say, Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, ver. 10. And in the fore-mention'd 9<sup>th</sup> of Romans Paul evidently shews, that as Israel literally, was chosen out of other people: so that Israel spiritually are chosen out, from among both Jews and Gentiles. The same apostle calls the old testament dispensation the Letter; and the new testament, the spirit. 2 Cor. 3:6. That church had a literal house and temple where God's name was fixed, and his worship confined. Deut. 12:13. 1 Kings 8:29.*

But in the new-testament we are confined to no place, (John 4:21.) but the *saints are God's house, who are builded for his habitation thro' the spirit. Eph. 2:20—22. That old temple was built with stones which Hiram's servants hewed: but this with lively (or living) stones; that was a worldly sanctuary,*



(Heb. 9:1.) but this is a *spiritual house*;—there was offered fleshly sacrifices; but here *spiritual* ones, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. 1 Pet. 2:5.—  
[2]Hence, an outward cleansing was required, in order to receive the ordinances of that church: but here that which is spiritual, even the *purging of our consciences from dead works*, in order to *serve the living God*. Heb. 9:13, 14. And here let me remark one thing that is not generally observed, and that is, that a ceremonial cleanness was particularly requir'd in a child, before he might be circumcised; which plainly appears in the first appointment of that ordinance, in that he must not be circumcised, till eight Days old. Gen. 17:12. The reason of which is shewn in Lev. 12:2, 3. which is that when a woman had born a man-child, she should be unclean seven days; and in the eighth day he should be circumcised: *i. e.* he must be circumcised as soon as he was clean; which by the way proves undeniably, that circumcision in its original appointment, was design'd to be a part of the ceremonial law; notwithstanding what many say to the contrary. Therefore from hence I conclude, that as outward cleanness was necessary in order for circumcision; and none might partake of it without; so that spiritual cleanness is absolutely necessary now, in order for any to receive Baptism, or the Lord's Supper aright.—

These brief hints may furnish us with an easy answer to many objections, that are often urged against our refusing to give these precious ordinances to the unconverted. I shall speak more particular as to Baptism, and that will sufficiently answer the other; for none will plead for persons coming to the Lord's Supper, who have not a right to Baptism.

**Object. 1.** God says to *Noah*, *With thee will I establish my covenant—and come thou and all thy house into the ark*. Gen. 7:18. And *Peter* tells us that the *like figure whereunto, even baptism doth now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ*. 1 Pet. 3:21. Hence we conclude that now, children are taken into covenant with their parents, and they ought to answer a good conscience in having of them baptized.

**Answ.** That which sav'd 'em was the ark that *Noah* built, which was a clear type of Christ: and as the old world was destroy'd when *Noah* enter'd into the ark: So shall the wicked when the Son of Man cometh for the salvation of his people. Matt. 24:38, 39. But what is mostly hinged upon, is *Noah's* children's

going in, on their fathers right. Tho' they were sav'd only with a temporal salvation, which can't entitle to gospel church-privileges. But what will you do with this here? the dispute is commonly about *infant baptism*: but here is nothing like an infant, for they were all married men and women; *Noah* and his *wife*, and his *sons* and their *wives*: and where is the person in our days that will baptize such, only on their parents right? Thus by jumbling type and ante-type together, persons run themselves into a sad *dilemma*: whereas if we take them distinct, the case is easy. *Noah*, as well as the ark he built, did typify Christ: his children were saved, so are all Christ's children: *Noah's* children went voluntarily into the ark, at God's command. Gen. 7:1, 7; so must each one of us personally believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and answer a good conscience towards God in obeying his commands; or else *Noah*, *Daniel*, nor *Job* can never deliver son nor daughter from destruction. Ezek. 14:20.

**Object. 2.** But the Lord made the covenant of grace with *Abraham*, and said, *I will be a God to thee & to thy seed after thee*; and so took his seed into covenant with himself, which is called an *everlasting covenant*; and as a token thereof, ordered him to circumcise his children, Gen 17. So we believe that now children are in covenant with their parents and ought to be baptized:—hence *Peter* says on the day of Pentecost, to those who were pricked to the heart, *Repent and be baptized,—for the promise is unto you, and your children*. Acts 2:39.

**Answ.** This is the main hinge on which all the controversy turns; therefore I will be a little more particular upon it. And first let us observe that *Abraham* stood in a double capacity.—As he stood personally before God, the covenant of grace was no more made with him, than with any saint in the world. The gospel was preached unto him, (Gal. 3:8.) and he believed it, and it was counted unto him for righteousness, Rom. 4:3.—But as he stood a type of Christ, he appear'd as the visible head of the *Jewish Church*, and the covenant was made with him, and his seed after him, and they were all taken into the church, and many favours were granted, or promised to them,—Nextly, let us examine who his *seed* are:—and here I find that his seed is taken in three senses in scripture.

**1.** His natural seed, which includes all that descended from his loins: These were all taken into that typical covenant: and they had the privilege of the

oracles of God, and the outward ordinances of his worship, which no other nation then enjoy'd: they had the promise of the land of *Canaan*, and of many outward blessings there; and in conclusion that Christ should come out of that nation;— and they had the first offer of the gospel Rom. 3:1, 2, and 9:4, 5.

**2.** Christ is *Abraham's* seed, *in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed*. Gal. 3:16. and sundry of them ancient promises evidently point directly to him, in whom alone they are fulfilled.

**3.** All saints are *Abraham's* spiritual children.—*Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all*. Rom. 4:16. Now as to these seed, God is indeed their God in covenant, which covenant and the blessings of it are everlasting. But then take notice that, though all saints are *Abraham's* children, yet they are not all made *fathers* as he was. He is the father of us all; and they that be of faith are his children. Gal. 3:7. As he stood the head and father of that nation and church, he was as has been observed, a type of Christ who is our *everlasting father*. (Isa. 9:6.) and is *head over all things to his church*. (Eph. 1:22.) In which sense no meer man upon earth now stands as *Abraham* did.— Now if we take these things distinct, there is no difficulty; but to jumble them together leads into endless confusion.—Typically, all *Abraham's* posterity were in covenant, both believers and unbelievers: and ante-typically all his spiritual seed are in the covenant of grace, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. Rom. 4:11, 12. And so that text is limited in Act. 2:39. which is so much insisted upon. *The promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, EVEN as MANY as the Lord our God shall call*. There is the limits; as many of us, and of our children as are effectually called, are *heirs of promise*, and no others. Heb. 6:17, 18, and 9:15. And to cut this matter short, we in general don't pretend to be *Abraham's* natural seed; then shew me if you can, how the natural seed of believing *Gentiles* as such, ever become *Abraham's* spiritual children: *that which is born of the flesh is flesh*: and how came those who are only your fleshly posterity, any way to be *Abraham's* seed?—If you say that you are *Abraham's* seed, and they stand to you, as his did to him.— Then let me enquire where God has shewn you that you shall be a father of many nations, and that a church shall spring from you which shall be large, and that *natural*, instead of *spiritual* birth shall bring persons into it? Here lies the pinch of the point; a being born after the flesh did bring them into

*Jewish* church, which is evident because, if they were not circumcised, they must be cut off from their people. (Gen. 17:14.) which could not be if they were not in; for there is no casting any out of the church that are not in it. Which if it be the case now under the gospel, then we have a fleshly and not a spiritual church, directly contrary to many texts that I have mentioned, and scores more that might be brought to the same purpose.

Here some bring Rom. 11. to prove that the limits of the church stand the same now as formerly, only is changed into different hands. Because from a similitude of the *olivetree*, is represented the rejection of the *Jews*, and the reception of the *Gentiles*, to partake of that which is called the *root and fatness of the olive-tree*; which they take to be a partaking of the same, or like, external, as well as internal, privileges: from whence is argued the right of professors now to baptize their children, because the *Jews* circumcised theirs.—But by the root and olive-tree, I understand, *Abraham* typically, and Christ spiritually, who is plainly pointed at in ver. 26, 27. He *is the vine*, his people *are the branches*. (Joh. 15:5.) The *Jews* were broken off thro' unbelief, and the *Gentiles* were grafted in, and stand only by *faith*. ver. 20. So that what appears from hence is, that true faith is absolutely necessary, in order for any soul now to partake of these great blessings, described by the root, and fatness of the olive; which blessings the *Jews* lost by unbelief, though it is called *their own olive-tree*, ver. 24. and they had the first offer of grace when Christ came.—

Therefore whatever privileges are intended by the root, and fatness of the olive, it is evident that as the branch must have a living union to the tree or vine, in order to receive nourishment therefrom; so every person, both great and small, must by faith be united to Christ, in order to partake of them favours: which shews, that no arguments can be drawn from hence to prove that any others are subjects of baptism but real saints.

**Object. 3.** But it is evident that in old time, God did grant to the children of those who were eminently godly, many favours and privileges that he did not to others: and so the prophet speaking concerning the last times, tells the saints that they shall be *the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them*, Isa. 65:23. and there is much more in Scripture to the same purpose; from whence we cannot but think, that children now are taken into covenant with their parents, and therefore have a right to baptism.

*Answ. 1.* The first part of this objection is undoubted truth, but the consequence drawn from it, I think has no foundation in scripture: for a great part of the favours thus granted, are only of a temporal nature; and that not only to children, but also to other friends round. Thus for instance, not only *Noah's* and *Lot's* children were saved from being drowned and burnt up: but *Rahab* the harlots father and mother, brothers and sisters, also were preserved from being slain, for her sake, because she received the spies with peace. Josh. 2:13. and 6:23, 24.—And how often does God speak of preserving the kingdom, and the privileges of it, in the hands of the posterity of *David* his servant, for their fathers sake. 1 Kings 11:13, 32, 34, 36. 2 Chron. 21:7. Isa. 37:35. So that it appears that a great part of the favours, thus given are of a temporal nature, which no ways entitles to gospel church privileges:—If it did, parents or brethren of the godly might claim a right to them, as well as children, Yet.

*2.* If any spiritual favours are shewn to children for their parents sake, they are either the advantage of their godly examples, counsels and instructions, and the enjoyment of the outward means of grace, (*chiefly because unto them are committed the oracles of God.* Rom. 3.—) Or else out of regard to his saints, and in answer to their prayers, the Lord is pleas'd to power out his spirit on them, and savingly turn 'em to himself: then we readily own that they have a right to all the privileges of the sons of God.—*I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine off-spring:*—What then is the consequence? why, *one shall say, I am the Lords: and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob: and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and sir-name himself by the name of Israel.* Isai. 44:3, 5. Note, first God's spirit is pour'd upon 'em, and then they openly confess him. But what proof is there from hence, that unconverted children have a right to church privileges? The Lord in comforting Zion, in Isa. 54:13. says, *All thy children shall be taught of God:* which chapter the apostle quotes in our context, to describe the free-woman; and then adds, *We, brethren are her children:* all which shews, that the churches children in a gospel sense, are only real saints. The same appears also from what God said to *Jeremiah*, concerning the new covenant, that he would make with his people: not according to the covenant that he made with *Israel*, when they came out of *Egypt*: which new covenant, is a writing his law in their hearts, &c. and in describing the extent of it, he says, *They shall all know me, from the least of them, unto the*

*greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity; and I will remember their sin no more.* From which it is evident to a demonstration, that none are actually in the covenant, but such as know God, and have their sins forgiven. This is applied to the gospel-state in Heb. 8.

Further let it be observed, that this point, of favours being shewn to children for their godly parents sake, was no ways confined to circumcision of old, because it appears before, in the time, and after that was instituted.—*Before*, it appeared in *Noah's* family, as observed above.—*In the time* of it, we may see the same in *Lot's* house, and that not only to his immediate off-spring, but also many generations after, God shews some regard to his posterity for his sake, Deut. 2:9, 19. Yet none of them were circumcised.—And *after* circumcision was instituted in *Israel*, the same appears without any special reference to that, as may be seen in the family of *Phinehas*, *David*, and others, though all the rest of *Israel* were circumcised as well as they: which proves that God's bestowing some favours on saints children, that he did'nt to others of old, never could argue any right to circumcision, without an express command: then surely no proof can from hence be drawn for baptizing believers seed now, without the plain direction of the lawgiver.

**Object. 4.** According to this, you make as tho' saints in gospel-times have not so great privileges as they had under the law: but we believe them to be greater now than then.

**Answ. 1.** In order to solve this difficulty, 'tis necessary to consider what were truly the privileges that they enjoy'd, under the law. And *Paul* plainly shews that their chief privileges were the enjoyment of the oracles of God. Rom. 3:1, 2. which were as means for their conversion and salvation: and that they might not partake of these means without being circumcised is manifest, because that Christ himself when he sent out his apostles before he had by his death abolished the *Jewish* ceremonies, forbid their preaching to the *Gentiles* or *Samaritans*, but only to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*. Matt. 10:5, 6. But now our children may enjoy these means with vastly greater clearness than they, without being baptized.—

Should any here say that Baptism is a means for conversion, and as such ought to be used for children. I reply, that I conceive this was the footing upon which the baptizing of infants was first introduced into the world: though I don't pretend to be much acquainted with the history of those times,

yet I gather this from the account that *Paedobaptists* themselves give of this affair. Mr. *Clark* in his late *Defence of the divine right of Infant-Baptism*: though he can produce no express mention of infants being baptized in the two first hundred years after Christ; yet he would persuade us that the fathers of the third century had the apostles minds and practice right in this matter, who plainly mention it. But one of the first passages that he cites is from St. *Origen* in these expressions, *viz.*

It is for that reason because by the sacrament of Baptism the *pollution of our birth is taken away*, that infants are baptized. P. 111. And hence they frequently called Baptism, *regeneration*: which language the church of *England* retain to this day. But if all were regenerated who are sprinkled in infancy, surely we should see other men of them, than multitudes of them appear to be. And the notion of the pollution of our births, being washed away by this outward application of water, looks so absurd, that I would persuade myself that 'tis needless less among us to stand to confute it.— Were it needful, what the noted Mr. *Joseph Allen* (a *Paedobaptist*) in his *Alarm to the Unconverted*, P. 10. lays down, is somewhat to the purpose. Says he, “It is not the end of Baptism to regenerate,”

**(1.)** Because then there would be no reason why it should be confined only to the seed of believers, for both the law of God, and the nature of charity requires us to use the means of conversion for all, as far as we can have opportunity. Were this true, no such charity as to catch the children of the *Turks* and *Heathens*, and baptize them, and dispatch them to heaven out of hand, like the bloody wretches that made the poor protestants (to save their lives) swear they would come to *Mass*, and that they would never depart from it, and then put them forthwith to death saying, *They would hang them while in a good mind.*

**(2.)** Because it presupposeth regeneration, and therefore can't be intended to confer it. In all the express instances in scripture, we find that Baptism doth suppose their repenting, believing receiving the Holy Ghost. Act. 8:37. and 2:38. and 10:37. Mark 16:16.

I also observe in Mr. *Clark* that there is as early mention of *Godfathers*, and *Godmothers* as there is of infants right to Baptism. P. 105. He likewise speaks of a dispute that after rose among the churches whether infants might be baptized as soon as they were born, or not till eight days old; which affair

was settled by a council in *Cyprian's* time. All which make me think that instead of having this pattern from the apostles, these things were introduced gradually among many other corruptions of those times.

**Answ. 2.** If you think we must have as many external ordinances of worship as they of old, or else that our privileges are less, you are greatly mistaken, for 'tis justly reckoned a great favour to have that large *hand-writing of ordinances taken out of the way*. Col. 2:14.—The *Jews* had three stated *feasts* in which all their Males were to appear before God. (Deut. 16:16.) But there is but one stated ordinance in the gospel-church which is so called. 1 Cor. 5:8. and who will say that our privileges are less than the *Jews* because of that? Much of the glory of that church was outward (as of circumcision the Lord says, *My covenant shall be in your flesh*. Gen. 17:13.) and they had a great deal of outward splendor:—in particular their temple built by *Solomon*, doubtless far surpassed any house that any gospel-church now on earth have to meet in; yet that don't prove our privileges to be less than theirs.

**Answ. 3.** *Aaron* was chosen God's high-priest of old, and then the priesthood was limited to his natural seed; and the Lord says of his grandson *Phinehas*, *Behold I give unto him my covenant of peace: and he shall have it, and his seed after him, even the covenant of an everlasting priesthood; because he was zealous for his God, and made an atonement for the children of Israel*. Num. 25:12, 13. Now mark—here is an *everlasting covenant*, made with *Phinehas*, as well as with *Abraham*; but who will say, that gospel ministers privileges are less now, than those ministers of God's sanctuary were then; unless the ministry may now be limited to their natural posterity? A part of the priests work was to *teach Jacob Gods Judgments, and Israel his law*. (Deut. 33:10.) which is the work of gospel-ministers now. Natural birth, and some outward ceremonies then bro't persons into the church, and into the priesthood: but now spiritual birth, and the work of God's grace is necessary, in order to bring souls aright, into the church and into the ministry. As to both, it then ran in a *natural*, but now in a *spiritual* line: and there is every whit as much reason to plead that ministers in these times, must have all their off-spring maintained by the offerings of the people; and that none may come into the ministry, but their seed; (Deut. 18:1—5.) or else their privileges are cut short; as to say, that church-members now must have all their children baptized, to prevent a complaint of their privileges being abrid'd.



What has been said may be sufficient to answer that objection that is often urged, *viz.* That children were once in covenant, and where were they cut off? For they were only in a typical covenant, as has been shewn: But when *John* the baptist came to prepare the way for the evangelical administration, he told the *Jews* to think no more about having *Abraham* to their father; for God was able of stones to raise up children unto *Abraham*. q. d. *Abraham's* children are now to be reckoned in another line; therefore think no more of having a right to ordinances, only by virtue of natural generation. And he plainly shews that evidences of repentance are necessary now in order for any to partake of baptism; Matt. 3:8, 9. So that unconverted children were only in that old covenant, which was then *ready to vanish away* (Heb. 8:13.) None are in the new covenant, 'till God's law is written in their hearts (ver. 10.) and such never can be cut off.

Neither will there need much more to be said upon the distinction that is made between the external administration and internal efficacy of the covenant. This Mr. *Clark*, a late writer insists much upon:[3] And he owns that none are in the covenant in the latter sense, but real saints; but their children were in the former external administration, and so he thinks they are now. But if the former administration was *typical*, and the latter *spiritual*, as has been sufficiently shewn; and if he is not now a *Jew*, which is not one *outwardly*.—But that he only is a *Jew* which is one *inwardly*; and if now circumcision is that of the *heart*, in the *spirit*, and not in the *letter*, whose praise is not of men, but of God, Rom. 2:28, 29. then surely there is no more place here for children, than any others, till their hearts are chang'd.

And a few words may also suffice to confute the argument that is fram'd from the similitude of a king's giving out a patent, or grant of land, and certain privileges to a number of persons, and their heirs sealed with red wax; and afterwards should call it in, and put a new seal, in white wax to to the same patent: that in such a case there would be no need of expressing anew, who were interested in it: from whence is argued that 'tis the same covenant and grant that believers have now, which was given to *Abraham*, only that was seal'd with a red or bloody seal, and this with a white one.[4] But, (to use this way of speaking) the difference appears vastly great, for the old patent to *Abraham* contained a promise of a numerous off-spring, that he should be a father of many nations, and kings should come out of his loins, that they should be God's visible covenant people, and they should have the land of

*Canaan* for an everlasting possession. (Gen. 17:2—8. The head and capital of which country was *Jerusalem*.—Whereas the new patent is given to Jesus Christ the ante-type of *Abraham*, which is justly called *a better covenant, established upon better promises*, Heb. 8:6. He has the promise of the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; and all that can claim a right to the blessings of this testament, are such as are effectually *called*: such have the promise of a better land than the old *Canaan* ever was, even an *eternal inheritance*, Heb. 9:15. The old patent promised that *some* of *Abraham's* posterity should be made *kings*; but this new one makes *all* Christ's seed *kings*, as well as *priests* to God; who shall reign, not for a few years only, but for ever and ever. Rev. 1:6. and 22:25. The royal seat of them old kings, was Jerusalem below; which in *Paul's* time was in *bondage with her children*: but these kings shall reign in *Jerusalem* that is above, and is *free, which is the mother of us all*.—They of old were God's covenant people for a while, yet afterwards for their breaking his covenant, he says, he *regarded them not*. (Heb. 8:9.) But those that are in this new covenant, *There is nothing present nor to come, that shall ever separate them from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord*. Rom. 8.—And as the articles in these two testaments are very different one from the other; so, should we suppose (but not grant) these external ordinances to be *seals*, yet there is a great difference between them also. For,

1. Circumcision was only for the males; baptism is both for males and females.
2. Circumcision might be administered by common persons: *Moses's* wife circumcised his son, (Exod. 4:25.) and *Zechariah's* neighbours came to circumcise *John*; Luke 1:58, 59.—But Baptism is to be administered only by Christ's messengers. Matt. 28:19, 20.
3. Circumcision was not to be administered 'till eight days old; but baptism has no other age fixed than only, if they believe with all the heart, they may be baptized. Acts 8:37.
4. Circumcision bound 'em to observe all those legal ceremonies, which baptism, does not. Gal. 5—
5. Circumcision was a type of what should come, even of Christ's being cut off, and also of regeneration; Col. 2:11. Whereas baptism is not a type of what is to come; but is an outward sign or manifestation of what is inwardly

wrought. *As many as are baptized into Christ HAVE put on Christ.* Gal. 3:27. —Here lies one special difference between the ordinances of the old testament, and the new. Old testament ordinances were typical of what was to come: Whereas the ordinances of the new, are open declarations of what is actually done. Thus for instance, in the Lord's supper, we do *shew forth the Lord's Death*: or from time to time, hold up a publick witness to the world that Christ has really died for sinners; and this we are to continue in the practice of, till his second coming. 1 Cor. 11:26.

Hence we may see the reason, why those might be the subjects of circumcision, that may not of baptism, *viz.* because that pointed forward to what was to be, and so might be administred to subjects who had not the thing typified, wrought in their hearts: but baptism is not a type that the subjects shall be converted; but an open sign or witness that he is so; and thus the worthy subject in attending that ordinance declares, that he has been *crucified with Christ, and is made dead unto sin and alive unto God, thro' Jesus Christ our Lord.* Rom. 6.—

This view I conceive may give us a true idea of that text which is considerably used in this affair. Rom. 4:11. *And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith.*—From whence many conclude, that the covenant of circumcision was the pure covenant of grace: and that circumcision then, and baptism now are seals thereof. But you may observe, that what the apostle is upon, is proving that great point of our justification by faith alone: and he brings in the instance of *Abraham* as an evidence in the case, and shews that he was justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. Upon this there arises another question, which is, whether this great blessings comes only on the circumcision, or on others also? To decide which he takes a review of *Abraham's* case; from whence it appears that *Abraham* himself was justified by faith, long before circumcision was instituted. *And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised.*—

Circumcision (as has been shewn) was a sign of what was to come; but *Abraham* had the thing signified then wrought in his soul; so that he had both the type and ante-type, and thus it was to him a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he then had: but how could it be a seal to *Ishmael*, and thousands of others of the righteousness of the faith which they had not?—

The apostle from hence goes on to shew that thus standing, *Abraham* was a father to all that believ'd, tho' not circumcised: and a father to those of the *Jews* that were not only circumcised; but also walked in the same faith that he had before he was circumcised; which brings out just the same thing, that has been observed before, *viz.* that typically he was father of all that church, both believers and unbelievers, and spiritually he is the father of all the saints, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. And without this distinction it seems impossible to reconcile many passages of scripture together.

Before I dismiss this point, I would shew something of the absurdities and enlargements which follow, upon holding, that all saints natural seed now are in covenant with 'em, according to *Abraham's* covenant. This leaves men at a loss about how large the church is; and who have a right to its ordinances. Some hold, that church members should baptize both their children and their servants; only it must be such as are young: yet then they can never tell exactly, what age to fix.—Numbers there are, who insist upon all baptized children's coming to the Lord's Supper at sixteen years old, if not openly scandalous: but most of the first Settlers of *New-England*, would receive none to the Supper, but such as they counted godly, and would baptize no children, but only where one of the parents were church-members: yet when these children were grown up, they began to plead that they were in covenant, and therefore must have their children baptized; or else they would be like heathens: and so by degrees they got into the practice of admitting such to own the covenant (as 'tis call'd,) and have their children baptized, who did not think themselves fit to come to the Lord's Supper: which seems to bring in a sort of *Purgatory*, or half way between the church and the world. This has been renounced by many in the present day, who still hold to infant-baptism: tho' other godly and learned men when they have owned some scruple in the case, yet have said, "What shall we do? they are in the covenant who have been baptized, and how can we deny 'em the privileges?"—Others say that tho' children baptized, have not a right to the Supper, nor to bring their seed to baptism, till converted; yet they are under the watch and care of the church, and if they are found obstinate transgressors, they must be disciplin'd and cast out. But we are commanded in any wise to rebuke our neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him; and to reprove even the unfruitful works of darkness, and would you cast 'em out from this? that is a great length indeed.

Now all these profess to hold to *Abraham's* covenant, and that they will shew themselves to be his children by doing his works; and yet there is not one of them all, that come up to what they profess: for *Abraham* circumcised himself, his son and all the MEN of his house; of which there were 318 trained soldiers. Gen. 17:23. and 14:14. But these several sorts of persons discover something in the new-testament that contradicts so large a practice as that,—therefore they take a part of it; some a greater part, and others less, according as it appears clearest to them.—The chief reason of all this confusion, I conceive to be men's jumbling the constitution of the old testament church, and the new together: whereas if we take them distant, the limits of each are exprest very plain. The limits of the old church are exprest as plain by *Moses*, as they were to *Abraham*.—If any man would join with that church and come to the Passover, he must have all his males circumcised: and every man's servant, bought with money, when he was circumcised, then should he eat the Passover. A foreign and an hired servant might not eat thereof: but all the congregation of *Israel* should keep it. Exod. 12:44—48. There are the bounds set exactly; and as plain are they in the new-testament. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.—They that gladly received the word were baptized; and the same day were added to the church: and they continued in her fellowship.—And the Lord added to the church daily, such as should be saved. Mark 16:16. Acts 2:41—47.—All who by *birth* or *purchase* were incorporated into an *Hebrew's* family, had a right to all the ordinances of that church:—So all that by Christ's *purchase* and the *new-birth*, are bro't into the *household of God*; have a right to all the privileges of the gospel church. Eph. 2:19—22. And to vary a step from this, leads men into a jumble; and rather than yield the case, they will say, that the scriptures have left this matter in the dark, about the subjects of baptism: when in truth all the darkness is in their own minds.

Let none improve any of these things, to lessen their obligations of discharging their duty faithfully towards their children's souls as well as bodies. I believe that those to whom God hath given children, ought to give them up to him again, acknowledging their obligations to bring them up in his ways; and let us bring them to Christ for his blessing as they did of old. But some say,

**Quest.** How can we bring them to him, but in the way of his ordinances? we know not how to bring them to him but by baptizing of them, as the seal of

our faith.

**Ans.** Sick persons were then frequently brought to Christ as well as children: and can't you find a way not to bring your sick to Christ either publickly or privately without baptizing of them? surely you can.—And since there is no more hint of baptism in one case, than the other, I think you may raise as good an argument from hence, for having baptism administred as a seal of your faith in bringing your *sick* to Christ, as your *children*. If it be urged that Christ says, *Of such is the kingdom of God*. I reply, that he does not say *all* such, but *of* such is the kingdom of God: and he immediately adds (both in Mark 10:15. and Luke 18:17.) an assertion that, *Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein*. Which seems to relate rather to the *tempers*, than to the *persons* of little children. But let all who have an interest at the throne of grace implore it for their children as well as others: and also use all their endeavours with them to bring them to know God, thro' Jesus Christ: and when once there appears evidence of their being in such a happy condition, then let them be as small as they will, it is readily granted that they have a right to all the privileges of the sons of God.

**USE III.** What has been said may lead us to an examination of our condition. Since all the world is divided into two families, as Christ says, *He that is not for us, is against us*; so here, all are children either of the bondwoman or, the free. Then surely 'tis of infinite importance for each soul to know which mother they belong to: and the scriptures have given many plain marks whereby we may come to know how our case is.—For brevity's sake I shall instance in but one, which is that, *If thou art a child of the free-woman, it is become thy LIBERTY to walk in holiness*. Herein lies a special difference between the least christian and the greatest hypocrite in the world. Both of them pay some regard to the same commands, and in many things their external walk may appear alike: but then the springs and motives of their obedience are vastly different. The hypocrite sometimes does things to be seen of men, though what most commonly moves him, is fear of hell if he neglects duty, and hopes of escaping it by his performances. Hence you'll often hear them pleading, that 'tis dangerous for persons to be too confident; and that 'tis needful for to always have some fear of miscarrying at last, lest we should grow remiss and careless in duty; and some will plainly say, that if the doctrine which many hold concerning perseverance and assurance is true, and if they knew that they were in Christ, and should never perish, they

would not care how they lived, for all would end well at last. But how plainly do these men discover themselves to be children of the bond-woman, for they look no further than their ways, or to escape the whip? We all know that the greater confirmations an obedient child has of his father's love, and the security of his favour, the more chearful, active and diligent he will be in doing his father's will, and careful not to do any thing to offend him. And since it is so often asserted, that saints love and delight in God's law, how can any rational soul, (if they would let reason, instead of their own experience decide the case) imagine that clear discoveries of God's love and favour, would make men less careful to serve him!—Don't we all know that what men love and delight in, they will seek and persue after, without being drove? as for instance, food that we love, we labour for earnestly, and eat of it frequently, without being told that we shall die if we don't. And *Job* says, that he *esteemed the words of God's mouth more than his necessary food.* chap. 23:12. and *David* counted the divine law, to be *sweeter than the honey-comb.* Psal. 19:10. Also *persons* that we love;—without driving, we seek all opportunities to enjoy their company. So will all those that truly love God, and his saints,—yea such as love the riches, honours, or pleasures of this world, not only voluntarily run after them, but they also earnestly crave a great deal of them: and so do those who love Christ and holiness; and they that are content with a little degree of grace; never knew the glory and excellency of divine things. *David* says, *I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.* Psal. 17:15. Nothing short of this can fill the desires of a gracious soul. The first epistle of *John* is peculiarly calculated to detect licentious hypocrites, and to press home a holy life upon all professors of religion: and observe well the beloved disciples method.—*My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not.*—But what if they should happen to be ensnared in sin? does he then set the terrors of hell before them? No, he presents the grace and blessings of heaven;—*If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the father;—and if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* chap. 1:9. and 2:1. And further to attain this glorious end, he sets saints to admiring the wondrous love of God in taking them to be his children, and asserts that now they are the sons of God, but what they shall be advanced to, does not yet appear; but says he, *We KNOW that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.* There is the strongest assurance

express; but will that make them slack in their obedience? No, quite the contrary, for *every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure*;—and he declares, that he that can run on in sin, *Hath not seen Christ, neither known him*. chap. 3:1, 2, 3, 6. And now, are not hypocrites ashamed of their notion that assurance is a licentious doctrine?—O my readers, I intreat and charge you before God, who shall judge us all, to search critically your own hearts, and see whether you are governed by a spirit of bondage, and slavish fear, or by the spirit of adoption, whereby you can cry *Abba Father*. Rom. 8:15.

I shall only answer a scruple that may arise here in some gracious souls, and then dismiss this head.—Methinks I hear some such say, "Alas, I fear that I am a child of the bond-woman, for I often drag on heavily in duty, and I feel my heart so dull and backward to spiritual exercises, that I can't think there is any grace in it." But this short question may easily decide the case, viz. Is it the divine command which are burdensome to thee, or thy vile heart that often hinders thee from doing the things that thou wouldest?—God's service is a *Weariness* to hypocrites. Amos 8:5. Mal. 1:13. But saints delight in his law after the inward man, tho' they find a law in their members warring against it. Rom. 7:21, 22, 23. Carefully observe this distinction, and you may come to know what your condition is.

*In the last place, I shall close with a short address to two or three sorts of persons. And,*

*First*, to those that hold the contrary from me concerning the subjects of baptism, many of whom are very near to me. *My dear friends*, it may be some of you will be offended, and others grieved with me, when you see the foregoing lines. But I think I can truly say, that 'tis not out of bitterness, but rather out of love to you, that I have pen'd what you here see. Therefore I would only beg this one favour of you, namely, that you would candidly weigh what is here said, in the balances of the sanctuary, before you censure or cast it by: and in order for this, let the characters of all that have held the one side or the other of this principle be put intirely out of the question, or you'll never come to the right of the case. That there have been good Men of both sentiments is no scruple to me, and I believe not to you neither; and 'tis as evident that there has been bad men on both sides: and should you try to find out which had the greatest number, it would be little to the purpose.—



The mischiefs that I have found by experience in these things makes me caution you against them. *David* was a man of a much better character than *Jacob*; yet *Jacob* had the right of the case concerning numbering the people. 1 Chron. 21.—Therefore let us all obey the divine command to *cease from man*, viewing that all flesh is but fading grass: and be willing that this matter should be decided alone by *the word of our God that shall stand for ever*. (Isa. 2:22. and 40:8.) And if after a diligent searching of the scriptures, you still remain of a different mind from me; yet still remember that to his own master each soul stands or falls, and so forbear all bitter censures. And O that each one would with greater earnestness *forget the things that are behind, and press towards the glorious mark*; believing that wherein we are differently minded, God shall in his own time reveal the whole truth unto us. Phil. 3:14, 15. Oh, when shall that blessed day come, when saints will have done with all misunderstandings of each other; when they shall all join with one heart and soul to praise our glorious King for ever and ever.

**Secondly**, I shall say a word to such as are of my sentiments concerning baptism.—Brethren, what I have to speak to you is, *Live up to your principles*.—How inexcusable will those appear, who insist upon it that persons must believe in order to be baptized; and yet admit such to this ordinance who give no proper evidence of any thing more than an historical or doctrinal faith? whereas a believing with all the heart is necessary to give a right thereto. Act. 8:37. And though God alone can search the heart; yet *fruits of repentance* should be carefully looked after in this case.—And as little excuse can be found for them, that while they plead that we must be *buried with Christ in Baptism*, yet behave as though sin lived and reigned in their hearts still, instead of being *dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God thro' Jesus Christ our Lord*. Rom. 6:4, 11. Therefore let none while they profess to know God, deny him in works: but be exhorted so to walk as to *adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things*.—This would have a much greater tendency to bring others to imbrace the truth in these things, than many warm disputes without a good life. 'Tis not easy to imagine how much use is made of the corrupt lives of numbers of those in the land who are called *Baptists*, to bar the minds of thousands against *receiving*, or even candidly *weighing and examining* what I firmly believe are truths which they hold. And tho' I am not excusing such conduct; yet I would earnestly persuade you all as much as may be to *cut off occasion from those that desire occasion* thus to treat the

truth and them that hold it. And if others say that we disregard, and are cruel to our children, because we don't baptize them before they are converted: let each head of a family, walk in his house with a perfect heart, and behave so towards the little ones that God has given him, as to evidence that he has a much greater regard for the spiritual, than the temporal welfare of his children.

*Lastly*, I will close with a word to all the children of the bond-woman, *My dear fellow Men*, be intreated to consider how sad your case and condition is. If you flourish in the world more than the saints, and are let alone to live as you list: this is but a miserable portion, which presently will be all stript from you, and God will say, *How much they have glorified themselves, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give them.* Jam. 5—Rev. 18:7.—Many of you are ready to think, that there is too much ado made about religion, and can laugh at the devotions of the godly. But Oh! remember and take warning by your old father *Ishmael*: he made a *mock* of his fathers joy, in seeing the accomplishment of God's promise; which is here (ver. 29) call'd *persecution*, for which he was *cast out*, not only from his fathers house, but also from the blessings of Salvation, which he had despised. *Now therefore be ye not mockers least your bands, be made strong,* (Isa. 28:22) but fly to Christ, that your souls may live.—And are there any of you that are seeking help by the life of your own hands; how does Christ expostulate with you (Isa. 55:2, 3) saying, *Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your Soul delight itself in fatness. Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear and your souls shall live, and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.*

**AMEN.**

## AN APPENDIX,

Containing an Answer to a late Piece, intituled, "A Letter treating upon the Subject and Mode of *Baptism*; wrote to a Friend:" By Mr *Ebenezer Frothingham*, Pastor of a Church of Christ in Middletown, Connecticut.

I Suppose all considerate persons will allow, that in searching after truth, it is very necessary to avoid having our passions inflamed, or our minds biased, before the question is truly stated, and the arguments on each side fairly examined; yet how commonly is the contrary method taken by the advocates for *infant-baptism*? Of which Mr. F—'s preface is a notable specimen.

1. He tells the reader of, "Great divisions that have rose in this day of reformation about baptism, thro' which means the cause of Christ has been greatly wounded."—P. 3. Now it is certain that Christ and his Truth have occasioned divisions in all ages, though all the blame belongs to those who are opposite thereto; therefore our principles must first be proved not to be true, before they can justly be charged as the blamable cause of division.

2. He begs the very point in debate, and then charges us with the horrid crime of sacrilege; for, referring to Prov. 20:25. he says, "Water separated to a sacred use, and used in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in baptizing an infant or adult person, is God's ordinance and is holy—and those that reject it *devour that which is holy*."—P. 4, 5. Whereas the very question between us is, Whether water applied to an infant in the sacred name is GOD's ordinance or not? And for him to say it is, without proof, is a plain begging of the question; and if we may take his word for it, is a shrewd token that he has fallen on the wrong side: For in another case he says, "Mr. *Bartlet* has made a sad mistake, which is common for all persons to do, that are so unhappy as to fall on the wrong side of the question. He has beg'd the whole matter in debate."<sup>[5]</sup> Yet,

3. As if this was not enough to prejudice the reader's mind, he says, "Search through the land, in this day of reformation, and you may find that all those that have run into those wild antinomian schemes, that put away their lawful wives and husbands, and took others possessed with unclean spirits of devils, who were dreadful blasphemers also: All these rejected *infant-baptism* as a limb of antichrist, and most of them have been rebaptized by dipping. Not a mortal who holds to *infant-baptism*, who seriously and solemnly practises

therein, has been left of God to any of these awful delusions that I have ever heard of."—P. 5. Thus he would persuade the reader that good is intailed, to infant-baptism, and evil to its opponants; but this is so far from truth, that the most awful delusion of that nature that I have known in our day, was in a member of the church in *Canterbury*; who after he had declared a revelation for another woman, for which the church justly excommunicated him, procured poison to dispatch his wife out of the world, in order to accomplish his horrid prediction: Yet I never heard him called a *baptist* in all my life. And though a letter from *Middletown* informs me, that Mr. F. has named *Dowglas* and *Abbe*, in his sermons, as beginning their antinomianism with denying infant-baptism; yet I can truly declare, that I was called to preach to a society in *Windham*, in April 1747, soon after they broached their delusions there, and I preached there frequently till the next *September*, had converse with these men, and was sometimes interrupted in my preaching by them; yet I can't recollect that I ever heard them say one word against infant-baptism; and I cannot learn by my brethren in the next town, that they have ever heard them called *baptists* to this day.

I am not willing to charge him with known falshood in this affair; and rather think that as there have been a number who were called baptists in our day, who have gone into the delusions he speaks of, therefore he has been carried away with the custom which has been followed these two hundred years, to impute all that is evil to the baptists. But when will men have done with thinking it will do to *talk wickedly for God!*

4. Having represented our way in such a horrid light, Mr. F. proceeds to tell the reader of a number, who have been convinced of its being an error, and have returned to the practice of infant-baptism, of which he was one; and says he went so far, that if he had met with a baptist elder, he should have been re-baptized. And while he would represent that we act upon scruples and negatives, he says, "I was bro't to see, inasmuch as I was baptized, it was necessary for me to see from the written word, that infants had not a right to baptism before I went forward to answer a good conscience," &c. p. 6. Here again he begs the question, which is, Whether he is truly baptized or not? And concludes that he *was* baptized, and then resolves to hold the same till he can see from the *written* word that infants have *not* a right; that is, till he can see the *letter* of the word condemn infant-baptism, which is never named in any writings either divine or human, till two hundred years after Christ.

This is one instance among many of our short-sightedness; for while others are charged with sticking to the letter, and acting upon negatives, he determines to hold his practice till he can find in the letter a universal negative against it: Yet in other cases he would doubtless tell people, that in ordinances of worship it is not enough for us to say, It is not forbidden; for we must be able to answer that demand, Who hath *required* this at your hand? Isa. 1:12. After this account of himself, he proceeds to tell us, that beside private Christians he has known eight ordained elders that had been re-baptized, who have since retracted it. But if they did it upon the same principle that he did, ten thousand times that number would not give us a warrant to follow them. The truth is, about 20 years ago in a season of awakening and hopeful conversions in several places, the two denominations were brought to greater freedom toward each other, than in former times, which was a means of bringing many to a better understanding of the baptists principles, than they formerly had, and many embraced them; which caused others to rise in great opposition thereto, and some leading men gave the alarm much as Mr. F. does in this preface. And a number were frightened and turned back; though I should think they have no great cause of glorying therein; for two of the eight ministers that he speaks of, fell so much out of credit, as to drop preaching, and enlisted as soldiers into the army, and laid their bones in the wilderness. Two more of them, parted from their flocks, and though they were settled over others, yet they did not continue there, but are now in an unsettled state; and others can hardly treat their baptist brethren with a good temper. On the other hand, I have heard many confess that they have been afraid of the light in this matter, and after many years opposition, have given as rational and scriptural accounts of their being convinced that our principles were right, as I ever heard in any case whatever.

Mr. F. says, "All the sober solid baptists, would likely renounce their conduct in this case also, could they calmly, and with a single eye, search the scriptures in this matter."—P. 6. But whether he has taken a proper method to introduce such a *calm* search or not, is left to the reader's judgment; and whether he has or not, yet oh that such a temper may be now granted to us!

As to the rule itself, I agree with him, that satan lays two snares to hinder our taking of it right; one is to impose upon the judgment by an elevated imagination of something new and wonderful in the scriptures, taking plain passages and turning them into an allegorical strain or figurative sense, so

that the judgment misseth the duties taught or doctrines contained in the text: Or else, when it will suit his turn, he will try to keep us to the bare letter of the word, without regarding the true nature of God's will contained therein. And I fully concur, that when we take the scriptures right, they have "a natural tendency to lead the mind into a conformity to God's pure nature, which also tends to humble and purify the heart, and lead the mind into an understanding of the divine *harmony* of the scriptures, which opens a path that leads home to glory."—P. 7, 8. In that path may we ever walk! I would here add, that our Lord's constant method of repelling the tempter, was by saying, It is written. And when the adversary attempted to insnare him in the same way, he would not depart from it to mystical meaning, but brought another text which cut directly across the partial sense which the devil would put upon scripture. It is a known rule in divinity, not to depart from the literal sense of a text, when it will clearly agree with the rest of the bible; but if that sense will not agree with other texts, then we may know it has a mystical, and not a literal meaning. As for instance, David says, *My flesh shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy One to see corruption.* Now other scriptures evidence that *David's* flesh saw corruption, from whence *Peter* demonstrates, that it is not literal but spiritual *David* who is there intended, Acts 2:25—31. Yet the rest of the text stands good in its literal sense, else the apostle could not have proved his point (Jesus's resurrection) from it; for only turn the words flesh and corruption, to a mystical sense, and the resurrection of the Messiah's body could never be proved from that text. Hence we may learn that the literal sense of every text, and part of a text, is not to be departed from, when it clearly agrees with the analogy of faith. At the same time the plainest passages may admit of many mystical or spiritual improvements, while the literal sense stands good. It was never the less true in a literal sense, that *Abraham* had two sons, the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman, because *Paul* drew an allegory from thence concerning the two covenants: Yea, so far from it, that the literal facts are the foundation he goes upon in his allegory.

Now let us come to apply these rules to the case before us. Mr. F. agrees with us, that, "Read where you will in the scriptures, faith is put before baptizing, as to adult persons, that never were baptized." And he says, "The point in debate is, whether the infants of believers are subjects or not?"—P. 4. He holds that they are, and to prove it turns us to *Abraham's* covenant; and

attempts to prove,

1. That it was the covenant of grace.
2. That *Abraham's* children were included therein.
3. That the Gentile church is grafted into the same covenant. And,
4. That their children are taken in with them.

But in order to settle this matter, it is needful to explain what we mean by these terms. I fully concur with Mr. F. that, "Since *Adam*, our first natural head, fell from the covenant which he was placed in, the tenor of which was, *do and live; transgress and die*, the Most High has never come to commune with any of the race of *Adam*, nor to offer good to them, but only in the second Head, the Lord Jesus Christ."—P. 9, 10. And if by covenant of grace, we mean the glorious plan of salvation, which was laid in the divine mind from eternity, and was discovered at *sundry times and in divers manners* to the *fathers* in the old testament, and is brought into clear light in the new; and that one of those *divers manners*, was by *Abraham's* covenant: In this we have no difference. But if by the covenant of grace, he means the constitution, and limits of the *Jewish* church, which descended in the line of natural generation, taking in with the parents all their natural offspring, which is evidently his meaning; in this I cannot concur with him, for these reasons.

**I.** Because this is an attempt to *make man wiser than God*. For *Paul* in treating of the blessings which the gospel reveals, says, *Which things we speak, not in the WORDS which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the HOLY GHOST teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual*, 1 Cor. 2:13. And in explaining the design and end of the Hebrew covenant and ordinances, he says, the *new covenant* is *not according* to that which was made with their *fathers*, Heb. 8:9. Yet Mr. F. will dare to assert, that the apostle, "Is not in this text speaking of two covenants, distinct in their nature and original; but of the same covenant, under two different administrations?" P. 11. And he charges us with "ignorance," p. 13. because we will not contradict the Holy Ghost as he does! He would have it that we bring those words in a wrong sense; but instead of following our Lord's example, and bringing another text which is *written*, contrary to our sense of this, he brings the language of *man's wisdom* to contradict the language of divine inspiration; for he owns that, "we do not read the word, Christ, nor grace, nor faith, nor the new covenant in Gen. 17." P. 9. And yet will venture to bring

that chapter to contradict what is expressed in Heb. 8. 9.

**II.** I cannot concur with his plan, because it contradicts the *spirit as well as letter of the new covenant*. And that,

**1.** In the seal of it; the flesh of their foreskin was to be circumcised, and God said to *Abraham, My covenant shall be in your flesh*: While he says of the new covenant, *I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts*.

**2.** In the way they are brought into covenant. Natural birth, or purchase for money, brought persons into *Abraham's* covenant; while 'tis only Christ's purchase and the new birth that brings any into the new covenant.

**3.** The tenor of *Abraham's* covenant enjoins conditions and works to be performed by men; the neglect of which exposed them to be *cut off from their people*, because they had *broken that covenant*, Gen. 17:14. Therefore the *letter* of it was, *Do and live*; and the reason here given for setting of it aside is, *because they continued not in it, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord*. But the tenor of the new covenant is, *I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people*, Heb. 8:9, 10:4. These covenants differ greatly as to the state of those who are under them. The state that *Israel* were in when they were called forth by *Moses* to enter into covenant, *As God had sworn to their father Abraham*, was such that they had *not an heart to perceive,—eyes to see, nor ears to hear*, no not unto that day, Deut. 29:4—13.<sup>[6]</sup>

But the state of those who are under the new covenant is, they *all know the Lord from the least to the greatest, and their sins and iniquities he will remember no more*, Heb. 8:11, 12. and 10:17.

Mr. F. has two ways to evade the force of this reasoning: The first is to tell us we stick to the *letter*. If in this he has any reference to 2 Cor. 3:6. I desire it may be noted that *Paul* is there opening the difference between the *Jewish* and christian ministry, and shews that the *Jews* stuck so close to the letter, both of the moral and ceremonial law, that they could not *stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished*; and this veil kept them from seeing the glorious fulfilment of the law in Jesus Christ, who *giveth life*; but the *letter killeth*. In short, with the *letter* of the old testament, they would exclude the *truth* of the new; and the reader is left to judge who comes nearest to such conduct now.



His other evasion is by charging us with, "Not distinguishing between a soul's being internally united to Christ, and a person's being in visible covenant relation." P. 31. But this charge is very unjust, for we are well sensible of that distinction, and the dispute is not whether some may not, through man's imperfection, be admitted as true believers who are not so; but it is, whether the rule gives us warrant to baptize any without a personal profession of their being such or not? Those who were baptized in the first christian church, were they that *gladly received the word*; and those which the Lord added to that church were *such as should be saved*, Acts 2:41, 47. And when two persons had crept in, who were false hearted, they were awfully struck dead, as a warning to others, and it had that effect; for we read that, *of the rest durst no man join himself to them; but believers were the more added to the Lord*, Act. 5:13, 14. And when the people of *Samaria* believed and were baptized, yet as soon as one of them discovered his unsoundness, *Peter* said to him, *Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter*; and for this reason, *because thy heart is not right in the sight of God*, Acts 8:21. Here this distinction is plain; they were received to baptism as true believers, and were rejected when they discovered that they were not such. The same may be observed in Rom. 11. compared with John 15. Christ is the *Vine*, his members are *grafted* in, and *stand by faith* in him; but if any are received as branches of him who is the Head of his church, that prove fruitless, they will be *broken off*, and *taken away*, while living branches are *purged* that they may bring forth *more fruit*. Take the distinction thus, and the sense is clear; but take it as Mr. F. does, that the *Gentiles* are brought into the *same* covenant with the *Jews*, p. 18. and the natural consequence is a national church; for all know the *Jewish* church was national. At the same time *Arminians* draw an argument from hence for their doctrine of falling from grace; and the sense given above, is the best guard against both of these abuses of the apostles discourse.

**III.** I can't concur with Mr. F—'s scheme, because it tends to destroy that *distinction* between the church and the world, which was designed by all those covenants. In the first discovery of grace which God ever made to fallen man, he made a distinction and declared an irreconcilable enmity between the *two seeds*; which was verified in the two first children who were born: And after the wicked son had killed his brother, and *Seth* was born, he was said to be *another seed instead of Abel whom Cain slew*. And for many generations the distinction was kept up between the *sons of God*, and the

*children of men*: And when they had *corrupted their way*, and lost this distinction, God said to *Noah*, *The end of all flesh is come before me;—I will destroy them with the earth; but with thee will I establish my covenant*, Gen. 6:13, 18. Accordingly he and his family were saved, while the world was destroyed, and religion was handed down among his posterity for some ages; and when they had turned to idolatry, God called Abraham *alone and blessed him*, Isa 51:2. And carried his seed through an *iron furnace* in *Egypt*, and wrought great wonders for them in the wilderness, and in the promised land, and gave them such laws and ordinances as were sufficient to keep them a religious people, in distinction from all others, if it was possible for outward means to do it. *But the chief of the priests, and of the people, transgressed very much, after all the abominations of the Heathen;—therefore the Lord brought upon them the King of the Chaldees*, 2 Chron. 36:14,—17.

Hitherto covenants had included parents with their natural offspring; but at this time the Lord said to the prophet, *Behold the days come that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel; NOT ACCORDING to the covenant that I made with their fathers*, Jer. 31:31, &c. And the new testament shews abundantly that the difference lies in this, that the covenant now runs in a spiritual and not in a natural line. The apostle in the ninth of the *Romans* shews, that the line runs, not in the *children of the flesh*, but in the *children of God*, who are a *remnant* that *shall be saved*. And in the tenth chapter he opens the order of the gospel;—*that faith cometh by hearing the word of God*, (not by natural descent) which word is *believed with the heart*, and then *confessed with the mouth*. And these only are God's people in a gospel sense. Upon this the eleventh chapter begins with this objection, *Hath God cast away his people?* In answer to which the apostle shews that he and a number more of *Abraham's* natural seed, were not cast away; even a *remnant according to the election of grace; and if by grace, then it is no more of works: Otherwise grace is no more grace*.

I suppose Mr. F. will agree with me, that the believing Gentiles were grafted in among *spiritual Israel*, and yet he would bring his natural offspring in with him; but what the apostle here says of grace and works, is as true of flesh and spirit; they are distinct, and ought never to be confounded together: Yet since they are in this case, I would observe that the priesthood was as expressly given to *Aaron's* posterity by an *everlasting covenant*, Num. 25:13. as ever church-membership was to *Abraham's* seed; yea much more strictly; for none

but *Aaron's* lawful seed might ever minister in the priests office in that church, and the stranger that came nigh was to be put to death, Num. 18:7. while strangers were freely admitted into *Abraham's* covenant: And why is not *Aaron's* everlasting covenant regarded as much as *Abraham's*? And those ministers who often tell us of David's error in not having the ark carried upon the priests shoulders, which they design as a warning against any persons preaching that they have not approbated, how dare they introduce any into the ministry who are not ministers natural seed? If they say, *Aaron* was a type of Christ, and his children a type of the saints; we readily grant it: And ministers, in distinction from other saints, are never called priests in the new testament; therefore how dare they attempt to take the ark from these priests shoulders, who are the *pillar and ground of the truth*, 1 Tim. 3:15. and assume it to themselves?— This leads me to say,

**IV.** I cannot join with Mr. F. in his way of construing the new testament by the old, because it opens a door for the greatest part of the *superstitions* and abominations that have ever been imposed upon the christian church. When we interpret the old testament by the new, then it appears plain that all those covenants which included the children with their fathers, were figures of the great Head of the church and his members: And that since he is come, those covenants as well as ordinances are done away. But when men turned to interpreting the new testament by the old, then they must have a *Pope* to answer to the high priest; and as gospel privileges are allowed to be greater than those of the *Jews*, they must have more orders of office than the priests had, with *surplices* instead of their *ephods*; yea *tythes*, and what not? And as the priests sentence decided abundance of cases in the *Jewish* church, what pleas have been made from thence for the pope's power, and for ministerial authority, to the depriving of the saints of their precious right of judging for themselves in religion, instead of allowing the government of the church now, to be in this *holy priesthood*? 1 Pet. 2:5.

He before whom all things are naked and opened, gave early warning against these snares, and not only told his people that the *covenant* which literal *Israel* stood in was *old*, and ready to *vanish away*; but also that Jesus has *blotted out* that *hand-writing of ordinances*, and taken it out of the way, *nailing it to his cross*: And this he gives as a caution not to let *philosophers judge them*, nor with their *vain deceit* introduce *ordinances* among them after the *commandments and doctrines of men*, Col. 2:8, 14, 16, 20.

Another pernicious effect of this way of construing scripture, is the breaking down the walls of Christ's vineyard, and laying it as an open field, so that all sorts of persons may come to the Lord's table, almost without distinction. This evil in the national church was a principal cause of our fathers leaving it, and coming to this country. And they held strictly that none ought to be received into the church, without a declaration of a work of grace in their hearts; and that none but such might bring their children to baptism, till those children began to have families. Then came on a trial concerning what should be done with their infants; and Mr. *Henry Dunstar*, president of *Harvard* college, (soon after he had finished that version of the Psalms which has been used in *New-England* ever since) was convinced so that he "thought himself under some obligation to bear his testimony in some sermons, against the administration of baptism to any infant whatsoever."<sup>[7]</sup> And Mr. Mitchel, pastor of the church in *Cambridge*, was by his means brought to great scruples of infant-baptism, yet he soon concluded they were from the *evil one*, and to guard against them says, "I resolved on Mr. Hooker's principle, that I would have an argument able to remove a mountain before I would recede from a truth or practice received among the faithful."<sup>[8]</sup> And having *resolved* and prayed and strove against them for nine years, he got furnished so, that the author of his life informs us, that the determination of the point, in the Synod of 1662, about persons owning the covenant and bringing their children, "Was more owing to him than to any one man in the world." And the ground he introduced them upon was that, "If the parent be in the visible church, his infant child is so also." Yet whether these persons should be baptized as in a *catholic*, or in a *particular* church state, this says he, "Is another question: And I confess myself not altogether so peremptory,—as in the thing itself, viz. That they ought to be baptized."<sup>[9]</sup>

Thus the influence of tradition and a fond conceit of securing religion to their posterity, caused such as were otherwise worthy men, to be *peremptory* in putting the badge of membership upon them, before they knew whether they were members of the universal church, or of a particular one; notwithstanding they had declared a few years before, in the *Cambridge* platform, that the church under the gospel is *not national*, but *congregational*. And Mr. Mitchel, after this, took much pains to shew that none ought to be received to full communion in the church, but such as gave an account of a work of grace in their souls, and concluded what he wrote on that subject with these words,

viz. "The power of godliness will soon be lost, if only doctrinal knowledge and outward blamelessness be accounted sufficient for all church privileges, and *practical confessions* (or examinations of men's *spiritual estate*) be laid aside; for that which people see to be publicly required and held in reputation, that will they look after, and usually no more, but content themselves with that. Consider, if this hath not been a reason of the formality and deadness that have overgrown many churches." January 4. 1664.[10]

To this the author of his life adds the testimony of the churches of *Bohemia*, who observe that, "Christ hath forbid our giving of *holy things unto unholy persons*:[11] And that Christianity is to begin with *repentance*, and not with the *sacraments*." Astonishing, that men should know all this, and yet go on as they did, to begin it with the sacrament of baptism before repentance! Yet thus they proceeded for above 40 years, and then Mr. *Solomon Stoddard* of *Northampton*, thought it unreasonable to admit persons to one ordinance and not to the other, and published a sermon from Exod. 12:44, &c. where all who were circumcised were expresly commanded to keep the Passover; from whence he argued that all those who were baptized, if not debared by open scandal, ought to come to the supper, as they did to other means for conversion. Dr. *Increase Mather* wrote against this; to which Mr. *Stoddard* replied in a book called an *Appeal to the learned*. Of which Mr. *Frothingham* said some years ago, that, "It appears somewhat strange and unaccountable, that Mr. *Stoddard*, or any body else (who experimentally know God, and the clear doctrines of the gospel) should hold such principles as gospel institutions, and not have gospel truths and light to support the same, but must be under a necessity to repair to the more dark and *abolished* dispensations under the law to support their principles; for this is the very case with the author in his *appeal to the learned*; and were it not for the *ceremonial* institutions of *circumcision* & the *Passover*, the author would have been nonplus'd to have maintained his arguments to support his principles." [12]

So he would; and Mr. F. would be as much nonplus'd to support his principle of infant-baptism without one of those *abolished* ceremonies, as any would be to support the principle he condemns, without the other. Nay, to make circumcision a type of water baptism, is to involve himself in the absurdity he now would charge upon us, viz. make it a "Type of a type, or a shadow of a shadow." P. 16.

President *Edwards* wrote 20 years ago, and Mr. *Jacob Green* of *New-Jersey*, has done the like lately, to shew that persons ought to profess sanctifying grace, in order to be admitted into the church; but against the one and the other, Mr. *Blake's* words have been quoted, who says, "I have often marvelled what men mean, when they speak of admission of members into churches, when the parties of whom they speak have already equal right with themselves, to membership: If baptism is admission, then their title is as good that were thus before admitted, as their's that give them admission."<sup>[13]</sup> And how can Mr. F. stand before this reasoning, while he holds as he does, that the children of believers, "are blessed of Christ, and belong to his *visible* kingdom, which is the essential part; baptism is but a consequence that followeth?" P. 23. If so, why does not the other ordinance follow also? For both equally belong to Christ's visible kingdom? His consequence therefore proves either too much, or too little for his purpose; for he has long been contending against an half-way covenant, so that if these children are "in covenant with God;" as he asserts in the same page, then they have a right to all the ordinances of Christ's visible kingdom; but if he limits the matter to those only who are truly "blessed of Christ;" or where *Peter* did, "Even to as many as the Lord shall call;" then he gives up the point, and comes into our sentiments. And how is it possible to hold a right to baptism from circumcision, and yet deny baptized persons right to the supper; unless ministers do by divine rules, as 'tis loudly complained, that rulers at this day do by human laws, viz. assume a *discretionary* power to take what suits their turn, and neglect the rest!

These things naturally tend as I said, to lay Christ's vineyard as an open field, and a great part of the ministers of our land now apply to the *church* what he said of the *world*, in Matt. 13:30, 38. So Mr. *Beckwith*, in his late answer to Mr. *Green*, says, "*Let both grow together until the harvest*, is Christ's direction to his churches." P. 21. According to which, those who *appear* by their *fruits* to be *children of the wicked One*, must be let alone in the church 'till the harvest, and what a church is that! And this construing of the new testament by the old, has greatly corrupted the doctrines as well as the order of the church. Dr. *Taylor*, one of the greatest champions that has appeared in our day against *Calvinism*; in his discourse which he calls, '*A key to the apostolic writings*,' takes the conditional and figurative language of the old testament to explain the new with, by which key he would take Paul's words,

where he speaks of *Adam's* posterity becoming sinners in and by him, and of justification by Christ alone, &c. and turn them from their plain meaning, to some figurative sense, in order to evade the evidence which they give for the doctrines which he dislikes; though herein he does nothing less than make the inspired Apostle a liar, who says, *We use great PLAINNESS of speech, and NOT AS Moses which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished*, 2 Cor. 3:12, 13. I say, he does nothing less than make the apostle a liar, representing that *AS Moses* he uses obscure figures, and not *great plainness*! And oh! that my fathers and brethren saw how much they countenance such horrid conduct, while they take the figurative covenants and ordinances in the old testament to construe what the gospel says concerning the new covenant by, and stigmatize those who take the gospel *plainly* to mean as it says, with the name of sticking to the *letter only*!

Mr. *Beckwith* pretends to hold to the *Calvanistic* doctrines, yet he thinks Mr. Green is "much mistaken," in supposing that a person's coming to gospel ordinances *implies* a declaration of repentance and saving faith. And (with Mr. *Williams* of *Lebanon*) comparing it to a marriage, says, the bride "does not profess that she has performed the articles of the marriage covenant; but that she *will* perform them thenceforth, to the end of her life." And calling the ordinances seals, he says, "God's giving or setting on his seal, by the hand of his ambassador, implies his gracious and sure engagement to fulfil and make good to that soul, all the blessings of grace and salvation promised in the covenants; *provided*, or on *condition* that person keeps or fulfils the *obedience* and *duty* engaged for on his part; so that both ways, ordinances seal conditionally.<sup>[14]</sup> It seems then according to him, that persons are espoused to Christ in infant-baptism, but not married to him till they make an open profession; yet then the tenor of their marriage covenant is, *I will, if they will*, instead of *I will, and they shall*, Heb. 8:10. But they have no need of ministers to help them into that covenant, for we are all naturally wedded to it; and the apostle expressly shews that a pretence of being married to Christ when we are not *dead to the law*, is *adultery*, Rom. 7:3, 4. And how much such adultery is there at this day in our land! What an awful account will ministers have to give, if instead of opening to sinners who come to them, the nature and strictness of the divine law, teaching them that the *scripture hath concluded all under sin*; and that *as many as are of the works of the law, are*

*under the curse; and that Christ was made a curse for us, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith?* Gal. 3:10—14, 22. I say, who instead of this, invite them to the ordinances, and tell them that, "All the blessings of grace and salvation are promised to their souls, on *condition* that they fulfil the *obedience* and *duty* engaged for on their part!"

This is the same scheme that was introduced among the churches of *Galatia*, the tenor of which was, *The man that doth them shall live in them*, ver. 12. Neither can the word, grace and salvation, make it to be gospel now, any more than the words *Abraham* and circumcision could then; for both then and now it is doing in order for life, instead of *receiving by faith* in order to do, ver. 2.

I am satisfied that Mr. F. does not commonly teach persons in such a way; yet I thought it might be of some benefit to him and others to expose these dangerous snares here; and if he should think it an injury thus to be introduced into the company of ministers who invite souls to ordinances to be converted, let him look into his 28th page, where he says, "The parent has an advantage to improve the child's early dedication in baptism (as the child grows up to years of understanding) in order for the child's conviction and conversion." If baptism then is a converting ordinance, why not the supper also? However I would ask, Was you convicted of sin, and converted to Christ, by being told by your parents that you was born "Holy, or in covenant with God;" and that you in your infancy was, "Blessed of Christ, and belonged to his visible kingdom?" P. 23. I am far from believing that, and rather credit your former account, where you say, we are "Utterly slain by the holy law of God, and compleatly conquered into the hands of a sovereign God, where we see justice clear, and God's throne guiltless, if we were eternally damned. Thus being conquered, the holy Ghost revealed Jesus Christ to our souls, in his glory, power, love and all-sufficiency,—and our souls accepted him freely upon gospel terms; and so the Lord wrought in our souls, faith and love, which was accompanied with a living union to Christ, and a new obedience, which flows from an immortal principle of likeness to God."<sup>[15]</sup>

This looks like conversion, but the other is the same point that the *Jews* contended so much upon formerly, who, as Mr. *Edwards* observes, looked



upon themselves, "As by nature holy and favourites of God, because they were the children of *Abraham*." And in order to convince them of this great error, he takes notice that the Apostle laboured in Rom. 5:12—14. "To take off their eyes from their father *Abraham*, who was their father in distinction from other nations, and direct them to their father *Adam*, who was the common father of mankind, and equally of *Jews* and *Gentiles*."<sup>[16]</sup> Here the matter centers when all is said and done. The children of believers are, *by nature children of wrath* EVEN *as others*; Christ hath *broken down the middle wall of partition*, and *came and preached peace* to all: And the *promise is given to them that believe*.<sup>[17]</sup> And whoever pretends that the natural offspring of professors have a better claim thereto than others, let it be a *Peter* or *Barnabas*, they ought to be withstood to the face for *building again* that wall of partition between *Jews by nature* and *sinner of the Gentiles* which *they once destroyed*, Gal. 2:11—18. This affair carried away those great Apostles with *dissimulation*, and I never saw so much deceit discovered among good men in my day, in any other concern, as in this. And the way that 'tis often covered, even from themselves as well as others, is by the ambiguity of words. It was a solemn demand which was made to *Job*, after his long dispute with his friend, "Who is this that *darkneth counsel* with *words* without *knowledge*?" And it surely calls for our special notice in the present debate. To use *words* without distinct, or without a steady meaning, ever tends to *darken counsel*; yet, as Mr. *Locke* observes, we often see this to be the case in disputes, and that with words on, which the argument chiefly turns. And I think his censure is just upon such conduct. "One," says he, "who should speak thus in the affairs and business of the world, and call eight sometimes seven, sometimes nine, as best served his advantage, would presently have clap'd upon him one of the two names men constantly are disgusted with, (i. e. fool or knave); and yet in arguings and learned contests, the same sort of proceeding passes commonly for wit and learning: But yet to me, it appears a greater dishonesty, than the misplacing of counters, in the casting up a debt, and the cheat the greater, by how much truth is of greater concernment and value than money."<sup>[18]</sup>

Now let us see if we have not something of the same nature in the present controversy. The words on which it chiefly turns, are, "The covenant of grace was made with *Abraham*, and believers are now in the same covenant," We readily grant that the covenant of grace was made known to him, and that he

was saved by faith, as saints are now; but the covenant of circumcision, as it contained the constitution and limits of the *Jewish* church, we cannot look upon to be the same that believers are in now. Well they allow some difference; for the *Jews* are broken off, and the Gentiles are grafted in, and have greater privileges. How? why tis said, Then the church was limited to one nation, now it is open for all believers to come in with their households. Yet when the matter is examined, they don't mean to have all the *men* of their households baptized as *Abraham's* were circumcised, but only their *infants*; neither do they mean that every one of them *when* they have baptized them, shall then eat the Lord's supper, as all *Israel* did the Passover. So that they cannot hold the constitution of the church to be the same; but *constitution* is not a scriptural word, and they still assert that the covenant is the same as it was with *Abraham*; and when we bring *Paul's* words, which shew it is not the same, then we stick to the letter, and tis declared that he does not mean two distinct covenants, only the same under two administrations. Just now the word *constitution* was unscriptural, but now *administration* must come in to prove that *Paul* did not mean as he said!

Another turn for those words in Heb. 8:9. is that the new covenant there means the internal efficacy of the covenant; as if it had no internal efficacy till that time: Whereas Rom. 4:11. speaks plainly of its inward efficacy to *Abraham*; but they often attempt from that text to prove that the external covenant now is the same with the covenant of circumcision.

Thus we have a covenant that is the same, and not the same; larger than the covenant of circumcision, yet not so large; a different administration, yet they administer ordinances to the same subjects,—believers and their households; though still it is only to part of them, to wit, the infants therein. Upon another turn there is a great difference, for the old covenant was external, the new one is internal;—yet after all it is as external as the *Jewish* covenant was, and only has different ordinances, but the same subjects! I must confess this makes me think of the beast which *mystery Babylon* sat upon, which *was, and is not, and yet is*, Rev. 17:8. I read also in an ancient record that, *her ways are moveable, that thou canst not know them*, Prov. 5:6. And does it not give us reason to think, this practice was derived from her, since it requires such movings and shifting to support it?

The divine command is, *Make strait paths for your feet*. Which if we obey,

and come *strait* up to the point, we may find that as baptism is an external ordinance of the gospel church now, as circumcision was of the *Jewish* church formerly; and that neither of them were introduced by man's conjectures, but by express command: So that the subjects of each are plainly exprest in the command, and not left for men to find out by uncertain consequences. The first administrator of baptism warned the *Jews* against thinking to come to it with a plea that they had *Abraham* to their father; and when a complaint was made against *Paul*, that he taught the *Jews* which were among the Gentiles to forsake *Moses*, saying, that they *ought not to circumcise their children*, *James* says, *As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded, that they observe NO SUCH THINGS*, Acts 21:25. Yet now a common pretence is, that we ought to *observe such things*, as bringing children to the ordinance on their parents right; and they say, "The parent sealed by baptism is (so to speak) the very same parchment that was given to *Abraham*, and therefore necessarily contains all the *same* privileges and benefits, and makes these over to the *same subjects*; there is nothing altered, but the seal *only*."<sup>[19]</sup> And this is given as a reason why we have no *express declaration* for bringing infants to baptism.

Is not this affair much like the *Jews* traditions, which the learned could not read in *the book*, because it was sealed; and the unlearned could not read it, because he was *not learned*? Yet they propose a very good end in it, which is to keep their children in the *fear of God*. But we are assured that it is *in vain*,—while this fear is *taught by the precept of men*. And as vain are their *turning things upside down*, and *seeking deep to hide their counsel*, Isa. 29:11—16. Matt. 15:7—9.

Here many will turn their address to people's natural passions, and a declaration that we condemn all our good fathers, and that we are cruel to our children, will often carry the point, even where scripture and reason both fail them. Yet if we could hear our fathers, one of the most eminent of them told his people when they were coming to this country, that "It was not possible the christian world should come so lately out of such antichristian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once." Therefore he charged them before God and his blessed angels, to follow him, "No farther than he followed Christ;" but to act according to their covenant, wherein they, "engaged with God and one another, to receive whatever light

or truth should be made known to them from his written word."<sup>[20]</sup> What an abuse then is it of mankind, to bring the name of our good fathers to hinder our acting agreeable to their covenant with God, & their solemn charge to us! They knew themselves to be imperfect, and perhaps some of them gave as full evidence that they were so, by their conduct relating to this affair, as in any of their behaviour. Governor *Hutchinson*, in speaking of the baptists, says, "In Mr. *Hooker's* time, soon after the year 1640, it appears by his letters that *many* were inclined that way, and he expresses his apprehension that the *number would increase*."<sup>[21]</sup> And likely it was his fondness for infant-baptism that carried him into the *resolution* which Mr. *Mitchel* adopted from him in 1653, viz. he "*Resolved* he would have an argument able to remove a mountain before he would recede from it." And Mr. *Mitchel* owns that he was "fearful" of going to Mr. *Dunstar*, who had been an instrument of shaking his confidence about infant-baptism, notwithstanding he looked upon him to his dying day to be "a worthy and a godly man." Who yet was removed, "from the government of the *college*, and from his dwelling-place in *Cambridge*," for no other reason only, than because he "thought himself under some obligation to bear his testimony,—against the administration of baptism to any infant whatsoever."<sup>[22]</sup>

We are often accused of *wilfulness* in our way, but has any thing ever appeared to support the charge, comparable to what is here proved on the other side? And I have before shewn something of the pernicious effects which these things have had in our land. And as, to *remove a mountain*, is to work a miracle, must we now have a miracle wrought to convince us that we ought not to follow our fathers in that which cannot be supported by the bible! The day is hastning when all things will be laid open in their true nature; then will be made manifest, who have been cruel to their children, either those who have laboured to convince them that they are sinners by nature and practice, and have used gospel methods to bring them to Christ, and then to his special ordinances; or those who have cried *peace, peace, when there was no peace*. Yea, I think the charge of cruelty may be justly turned back upon them, even as to such of their children as afterwards prove to be godly persons; for there are great numbers of them at this day in *New-England*, who will readily own, that if there had been nothing done, they should be at no loss how to act now; and I have heard some of them say plainly that, "It appeared to them a great privilege if they might follow their

Lord *into the water*," but their parents had laid a block in their way by telling them that they are already baptized, and that to be rebaptized is a dreadful thing. Thus they, and not we, cut children off from the precious privilege of *answering a good conscience* in baptism: For Mr. F. owns, that "In order to the conscience being good, it must be informed from the word of God, and act in the knowledge of the truth." P. 5. I say amen thereto; and since what the apostle says concerning *invented objects* of worship, is as true of *invented forms*, viz. *We know that they are nothing in the world*, 1 Cor. 8:4. therefore it is no crime to leave what mistaken mortals have invented, to practice what God calls baptism in his word.

***Before I close I must answer some charges of inconsistency which are laid against our principles.***

1. Mr. F. says, "I think it is beyond them to make their practice consistent, in denying infants right to baptism, because the letter does not shew where an infant was baptized; and yet at the same time keep the first day as a Sabbath, when the latter duty is far less plain than the former." P. 4.

Let us try the point. If it is asked why we keep the first day? We can shew that Jesus arose on that day, and as the Fathers resting from the works of creation, is given as a reason why the *Jews* should keep the seventh day; so the SON's resting from the works of redemption appears a reason why we should keep the first day. Hence when the Apostle is opening the difference between the *jewish* and christian dispensations, he says, *There remaineth therefore a rest* (or keeping of a *Sabbath*, as the margin reads it) *to the people of God: For HE that is entered into his rest, hath ceased from his own works, AS GOD did from his*, Heb. 4:9, 10.<sup>[23]</sup> And we have express examples of the Apostles and others meeting on that day for worship, to break bread, and to offer their liberality, John 20:19, 26. Acts 20:7. 1 Cor. 16:2. And when the apostle *John* would let the churches know when he had his first vision in *Patmos*, he tells them it was on the *Lord's day*, Rev. 1:10. As to the stupid cant of some, that, Every day is the Lord's:—It is as true that every table, and every supper is also his; but what mockery would it make of the bible, to say when it speaks of the Lord's-table, and the Lord's-supper, that it means no more than every table, and every supper! 1 Cor. 10:21. and 11:20. No, serious minds give in that it means a table and supper, which is set apart from a common to a sacred use, as an ordinance of divine worship. So we take the

*Lord's-day* to mean this day as set apart from other days for his worship, and known by that name among the churches to which *John* wrote.

What a bias of mind then is discovered, in saying that this duty is, "Far less plain," than infant-baptism, of which we have neither precept nor example in all the bible! Nay, I must turn the argument, and observe, that the apostle names the *Jewish sabbath-days*, as well as *circumcision*, among the *hand writing of ordinances*, which Christ has *blotted out*, Col. 2:11, 13, 16. And if infant-baptism is held from thence, why not the seventh day also?

2. Mr F. says, "I look upon the baptist brethren inconsistent with themselves, for rejecting infants from being subjects of baptism, because the letter does not shew where an infant was baptized; and at the same time will not allow any person to be baptized, unless put all under water, when the letter nowhere shews that a person was put under water in all the bible." P. 34. Here let the reader remember how far I have concur'd with him in the beginning about the letter: This being observed, I shall at present only fix upon one point, which is, that *Paul* says in one place, we are *buried by baptism*, and in another that we are *buried in baptism*, Rom. 6:4. Col. 2:12. And among all the critics upon our translation, I never knew any object against the translation of these words, neither do we differ about the meaning of the word *buried*: All the dispute is concerning what is here intended by baptism. The word is used in the scripture, for an ordinance in the church, for a work of the spirit, and for sufferings. Well let water, spirit, or troubles be intended here, yet still the word is express, we are *buried by it*,—*buried in it*. So that let men go to which they will to find out the meaning of the word, still it is *burying*; and unless they can make out that to be *buried* is not to be *covered*, they must know, that to be baptized with water, is to be covered with water.

Our author inclines to the old absurdity, of running to places where the word baptism is used in a *figurative* way, to find out its *literal* meaning: But what work should we make if we should determine the full meaning of the word *thief*, by Rev. 16:15! He tells us of God's "pouring out his spirit, and of raining down righteousness." P. 34. So he does, and who does not know that waters which compose *rivers* were first rained down from above? And the blessings which flow from Christ are called, *Rivers of water in a dry place*. Isa. 32:2. And the account which divine inspiration gives of the disciples being baptized with the Holy Ghost, says, *It filled all the house* where they

were sitting:—And they were *all filled* with the Holy Ghost, Acts 2:2, 4. So as to Christ's sufferings which are called a baptism, we have scarce a clearer prophecy of them any where than in the 69th Psalm; and in that Psalm, the same person who says, "They gave me gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink;" also says, "I am come into *deep waters*, where the *floods overflow me*," ver. 2, 21. How plainly do all these carry the idea of immersion in the meaning of the word? Mr. F. cites a great number of texts, in order to prove that sprinkling, and washing or bathing, mean the same thing; but they are far from answering his design. For instance, in Num. 19:18. to *dip* and to *sprinkle*, plainly convey two ideas, as distinct from each other as the words are; and so does *sprinkling* and *bathing* in the next verse. And in the epistle to the *Hebrews*, where the design of these ceremonies is explained, it appears that *sprinkling* referred to the removal of guilt, and *washing* or *bathing*, to the taking away the filth of sin; or in other words, the first referred to justification, the other to sanctification. The *sprinkling of blood* protected from the stroke of vengeance, and *sprinkling the conscience* removes its guilt; but having our *bodies* (or whole man) *washed with pure water*, is also necessary in order to *draw near to God in his house*. Heb. 10:21, 22. and 11:28. Now since all allow that Rom. 6:4. signifies our obligation to die to sin, and to walk in newness of life; which is as much as to own that it signifies our sanctification, why are they so fond of a mode which typified justification, unless they mean to confound them together, as too many do? It was not *Israel's* holiness or good works that secured them from the destroying angels stroke, but it was the *sprinkling of blood*, which pointed directly to *Christ our Passover* who is *sacrificed for us*, 1 Cor. 5:7.

And since we are so often refer'd to the baptism of the spirit, let it be noted that it is only an extraordinary degree of it which is called a baptism. The disciples surely had a measure of it when they were converted, and when Jesus appeared to them after his resurrection, he breathed on them and said, *Receive ye the holy Ghost*, John 20:22. Yet all this is not called a baptism; but on the day of his ascension he commanded them to wait at *Jerusalem* for that promised blessing, *For*, said he, *John truly baptised with water; but ye shall be baptized with the holy Ghost, not many days hence*, Acts 1:5. Also let it be observed that we are often referred to the baptism of the Spirit, in order to find the meaning of the word, which they say is by sprinkling or pouring; yet when we come to Rom. 6:4. they would have it, that *burying* there has no

reference to literal, but to spiritual baptism. Thus again their ways are *moveable*, and not *strait paths*. I leave it therefore to the readers judgment, who are "confused and superstitious about the mode," p. 31. either those who hold that we are *buried* in baptism, or those who say tis as well to be *sprinkled*, without being able to produce one text in the bible where that word is applied to baptism.

To sum up all, I think I have made it appear that Mr. F. is not just in charging us with sticking to the letter, so as not to regard the nature of God's will contained therein, and have shewn that we regard the "divine *harmony* of the scriptures," which he holds to be a sure token that we understand them right. And I leave it to be considered, whether he has not been taken in both of the snares which he cautioned others against: That is, whether his imagination has not been so elevated with *households* being in covenant, while at the same time he sticks so close to the letter of the words, *To thee and to thy seed*,—as to mistake what the divine will is therein. The main body of his discourse is taken up in proving that the blessings of grace were discovered to *Abraham*, which no body will deny; but what is that to his purpose, so long as it appears that all those covenants that included parents was their children, were in that respect figurative of Christ and his saints? Yea *Adam*, as he stood the covenant head of his posterity, was a *figure of Him that was to come*, Rom. 5:14. Therefore if the substance of those shadows is come, how can the external covenant be the same? And if he still thinks it is, then I desire he would shew why *Aaron's* covenant does not entail the ministry to a natural line, as much as *Abraham's* can church-membership, or a right to ordinances.

He frequently charges us with antinomianism, yet all the colour of proof that our principles have any tendency that way, that I can find from him, lies in three things.

1. He says, if the holiness in 1 Cor. 7:14. "Respects not something of a religious right, or what is sacred, then I grant, it means as the baptists say; and the consequence I think cannot be avoided, that all children that are not begotten so faith, or in the new covenant, must be bastards: A rank antinomian principle, against the light of nature!" P. 24. This is notable reasoning! It is as much as to say, "because we hold, that a man's being brought into the faith no ways dissolves his former marriage, that therefore the unavoidable consequence is, that his children which he had then are



illegitimate!" Rather is not the conclusion plain in the text, that if the cohabiting as man and wife were not warranted by the law of Christ, then their children must be unclean in our sense of the word? Here also we have another instance of the *moveable ways* of our opponents; for they all own that this text shews that the ceremonial law (by which the *Jews wives and such as were born of them*, were *put away*, Ezra. 10:3.) is not now in force; and they take the sense of the word *sanctified*, as we do, from the gospel, 1 Tim. 4:3—5. Yet they turn directly back, and take their sense of the word holy from the ceremonial law, which is out of date: And call us antinomians, because we will not go in these *crooked ways* with them!

2. Mr. F. insinuates that our doing what he calls rebaptizing, leads to antinomianism, p. 4, 5. He calls it a devouring that which is holy: But if a soul is convinced that infant-sprinkling has no warrant from the bible, what crime can it be to leave it, and practice what is plainly commanded therein? Yea, he allows such acting to be right; but presumes to assert that we do not act so. P. 30. However, as long as we know that we do, his censure will not move us; unless it be with pity for his rashness. A third thing that he repeatedly brings, is, that some persons of our denomination have run into antinomian errors; which, unless he had proved that our principles had a tendency that way, is about as good reasoning, as it is for an infidel to bring *Judas* and *Simon Magus* to prove Christianity to be a delusion. And since Mr. F. has declared his intention of enlarging upon that subject, if I publish my answer to him; I shall only desire him to take his late book, and turn to what he has wrote concerning the like treatment, which he and his brethren have received from those called standing ministers; where he justly observes that he and his brethren, "are no more to account for those out of covenant, than the standing ministers are for every corrupt, profane, immoral person, that waits upon their ministry."<sup>[24]</sup> And if he acts according to his own rule, I am not afraid of his hurting us; and if he acts contrary thereto, he will only expose himself in trying to expose others.

I suppose what I have now wrote, together with the foregoing sermon, may serve as a sufficient answer to what Mr. *Frothingham* has printed on the subject; and shall only add, that in a letter to me, he says, "You may remember, brother, that some years back we stood in union together in the spirit and practice of the gospel, and now it is broke, thro' your practice." On which I would observe, that he knows our covenant (like that of our fathers)

was, "Still to be looking for more light from God, which is contained in the sacred scriptures."<sup>[25]</sup> Which covenant I conscientiously adhere to unto this day, though I have been harshly treated by many therefor.

This brings to mind what I met with in a late journey into the northern part of our country. A learned minister of the common denomination, had challenged a public dispute about baptism, which, as the case happened, I could not fairly avoid accepting. It was held in his own pulpit on October 30. 1769, before a considerable congregation. We were favoured so as not to have an angry word, that I know of, on either side; yet near the close of above five hours dispute, he charged us with want of *charity*; and said they could have charity for us, if we would for them. I told him, charity was love, and we desired to exercise love towards all, according to their different circumstances; but as to the extending of christian fellowship, the apostle says, *Charity rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth*: And just so far as we can unite in any spiritual exercise in the truth, with any persons we desired to do it, and no farther. And as all who hold to the external use of the ordinances, agree that persons ought to be baptized before they come to the ordinance of the supper; therefore we are no more rigid than they, in refusing to partake of that ordinance with unbaptized persons.

Soon after this he shut up his books, and gave a specimen of his *charity* before all the people; for many of them expected, as he had prayed at the beginning, that he would give me the same liberty in the conclusion; but instead of that, after a little pause, he made a motion for me to go out, and the assembly dispersed without any social worship at all. This looks something like what I heard an aged father say some years ago, to wit, That many when they preach up charity and a catholic spirit, only mean to have others drop their different sentiments and come in and join with them; but where is the man upon earth, who will not allow as much liberty as that?

I have elsewhere shewn that our fathers and brethren on Mr. *Frothingham's* side, first broke the union between us;<sup>[26]</sup> and I could easily shew how it appears that many of them are the most rigid unto this day, but as it is an unpleasant task, I chuse to omit it. We are all in danger of a party spirit, which we ought to be on a strict watch against, on all hands. Some accuse us with not allowing them to be visible Christians, because we do not hold them to be truly baptized; but what a strange mistake is that? When the point we

contend for is, that baptism should be administered to none but visible Christians, so that if they are not such before baptism, they cannot be baptized at all.

I shall conclude with the words of a late worthy author, who says, "Why do I trouble the reader about the communion of saints, in this or the other particular form? We are fallen in a day when many devoutly disclaim it. It is now very common to make light of ordinances, and even for serious persons to talk as if they valued themselves on being of no denomination of Christians; if a man, say they, loves Jesus Christ, or a preacher sets forth the mercy of the Father in him, we have no concern about his form of religion; yet they cry up the martyrs, many of whom might have saved their treasure and blood, had they made no conscience of the authority of Christ in his house. The upright will deprecate a meer name, under any form, however agreeable to the dictates of scripture, but if a man intends by his being of no denomination, that he regards not the manner of service appointed by the Lord; where is his religion?—If Christ is preached, and the power of godliness prevails, by whomsoever, or whatever particular form of profession, his ministers and people rejoice; yet, if judicious; not so but that wherein a man appears defective, in any doctrine of the gospel, or article of instituted worship, they must wish him to know the way of the Lord more perfectly, and consequently, rather in meekness point out his mistake than join him in his error.—In a word, that notion of charity, that renders the subject indifferent about any thing which he is persuaded to be the will of Christ, is false and pernicious; it tends to captivate the minds of men from the authority of God, and sap the foundation of all true religion; it is therefore dangerous, when under any pretence, persons are taught to be unconcerned about the appointed form of worship; it should rather be commended to every one to search the scripture, and keep to that which his conscience directs, and regard not the censures of men."[\[27\]](#)

## ADVERTISEMENT

Published by the Author of this Pamphlet, and sold by Philip *Freeman*, in *Union-Street, Boston*, and by *Thomas Green*, in *Newport*.

- I.** THE nature and necessity of an internal call to preach the gospel. 1754.
- II.** A short description of the Bond-woman and the free, as they are the two covenants. 1756. A second edition, with an answer to Mr. *Frothingham*. 1770.
- III.** A sermon on spiritual ignorance, from Acts 13:27. 1763.
- IV.** A letter to Mr. *Lord*. 1764.
- V.** A sermon on family prayer. 1766.
- VI.** A discourse on faith, with remarks on Mr. *Sandeman*. 1767.
- VII.** An answer to Mr. *Fish*. 1768.
- VIII.** A funeral sermon for Mrs. *Elizabeth Backus*, with account of her life. 1769.

## ERRATA.

Page 10. l. 2. fr. bot. r. magnifies.—P. 21. l. 2. r. were, instead of was.—P. 27. l. 13. r. pour, f. power.

PAGE 17. l. 13. from the Top, r. appointed. and l. 23. in the same Page, for text r. cotext.

## FOOTNOTES:

[1] I readily grant that all the blessings of grace are held forth to the world by way of *promise*. (See Act. 2:39. Gal. 3:14.) But I wonder how any think to claim a right to the promise without believing it. The instant that the sinner receives the promises as truth, he commences a believer: Hence, the *scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe*. Gal. 3:22.

[2] Should any think that my discourse here, too much favours the scheme of those who deny the outward use of Baptism. I reply, that a persons experiencing of this spiritually, is so far from disproving the need of the outward use of that ordinance, that the Apostle Peter makes the evidence of persons being baptized with the Holy Ghost, to be a sufficient proof that such are meet subjects of, and ought to be baptized with water Baptism. Act. 10:47, 48. and 11:16. which is such an evidence for our practice, as I never yet see any writings on that side pretend to confute.

[3] In his answer to Dr. Gill, on infant baptism; I will recite some of his words, p. 246. He says, "A man may be in the covenant of grace, in respect of its visible administration—and yet he may not be in the covenant of grace in regard of it's spiritual dispensation and efficacy. This is the case of all *close* hypocrites, p. 248. The invisible church consists of all, and only real Saints.—all the members of this invisible church, it will be granted, are in the covenant of grace, in regard of its spiritual efficacy." And further on he declares, that Christ hath promised salvation to those only who believe in their hearts, as well as confess with their mouths, p. 149. And now what place has Mr. *Clark* got in the church to put children in, before they believe? I confess I can see none but only along with hypocrites, to whom he acknowledges Christ has *not promised* salvation, but to those *only* who believe in their hearts; and if it be a very great privilege to be in such a place, then he may have some colour for complaining of our cutting children off from some valuable privilege, by not baptizing of them before they are converted.

[4] Vide Mr. Dickinson's dialogue on infant-baptism.

[5] Mr. Frothingham's late Key to the constitution in Connecticut, Pag. 13.

[6] Dr. *Bellamy* in his late dialogues against a half-way covenant; Mr. *Green* and others, have asserted that all the members of that church were received

upon a supposition that they were true believers; whereas *Moses* was so far from receiving them upon that supposition, that in this text he openly declared the contrary, as plainly as words can express. And Mr. *Beckwith*, makes use of this text, against Mr. *Green*, to prove that a profession of saving faith is not necessary in order to come into a gospel church P. 71, 72. Such are the effects of confounding the two covenants together; for Mr. *Beckwith* declares that the grand point in this debate is, "Whether the Gentile church is not taken into the *same* covenant God established with the *Jewish* church?" P. 101. And he has confused and darkened things so much in this way, that he at last ventures to assert that we have no reason to think that "any thing more is intended," in the *Eunuch's* profession, in Acts 8:37. but a belief, "upon moral evidence," and therefore, that it did not imply a profession of saving faith. P. 55. Which notion of his is as certainly false, as Rom. 10:9, 10. is true.

[7] Mitchel's life, p. 67.

[8] Ibid. p 70.

[9] Pag. 78.

[10] Mitchel's life, p. 88.

[11] Matt. 6:7.

[12] Mr. Frothingham's discourse on the churches privileges, pag. 78, 79.

[13] Beckwith, against Green, 1769, p. 37.

[14] *Beckwith* against *Green*, p. 27. In p. 22. he says, "Ministers and churches have a right to enquire into, and judge of the visible standing of their members, but not the invisible state of their hearts: *Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?*"—And he insists much upon it, that if baptism belonged only to real saints, then "we could not with any safety or satisfaction, administer it at all." P. 43. Well what is this *visible standing* which we have a right to judge of? Why he says, "Then we have a *sure* foundation to go upon, in determining who have a right to the seals and who not, viz. such as are of *sound principles* in the christian faith, and *morally sincere* in their covenanting; this gives a right to all the seals." P. 44. I wonder what Mr. B. thinks *sound principles*, or *moral sincerity* is; whether something inward, or only an outward shew! It makes me think of an affair that happened some years ago, not far from him: A man of note declared that a person might externally keep all the precepts of the moral law, out of regard

to *Molock*; and when several things were said to expose the absurdity of this notion, it was objected that they did not take notice that he said, *externally*. Yes, says the other, I observe he means that a person may love God with *all his heart, externally!* In reality it is quite as difficult to know when a person has moral sincerity, as saving faith; one lies in conviction and restraints upon the conscience, the other is the love of the truth in the heart: And it often happens that when a person that has had some conviction, gets into the church, so as to *eat and drink* in the divine presence, he shakes off his concern, and his *last state is worse than the first*.

[15] Discourse on the churches privileges, pag. 6, 7.

[16] Mr. *Edwards* against Dr. *Taylor*, p. 272.

[17] Eph. 2:3, 14, 17. Gal. 3:22.

[18] Essay on human understanding, B. III. chap. 10. S. 5.

[19] *Dickinson's* dialogue, p. 17.

[20] Mr. *Prince's* chronology, p. 89, 90.

[21] History of the *Massachusetts*, vol. I. p. 227.

[22] *Mitchel's* life, p. 67.—70.

[23] Should any say that this text has no reference to any particular day, but only to spiritual rest. I answer, that baptism and the supper have reference to spiritual blessings, yet that is far from rendering the literal observation of them useless: So I look upon the case here. God said of *Israel*, *I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them*, Ezek. 20:12. And a change from the seventh to the first day, seems to be a sign of the difference between the two covenants, for as one required our work before the reward; so the other gives the soul *rest* in Christ, in order to work for his glory.

[24] His Key, p. 29. 35.

[25] His discourse on the churches privileges, 1750. p. 19.

[26] Answer to Mr. Fish, p. 118, 119.

[27] *Lectures on primitive Christianity*, by Mr. *Benjamin Wallin*, preface, pag. 7—11. As this, and another work I have lately met with, are but newly come into the country, I would beg leave here to speak my thoughts of them. The other is, *A body of doctrinal Divinity*; or a system of evangelical truths,

deduced from the sacred scriptures: By *John Gill*, D. D. And I think I can heartily recommend this latter for doctrinal, the other for practical divinity, as being as excellent composures on those subjects as any human writings that I have seen; and wish they may spread much in this country. They were both printed last year in *London*, and Mr. *Freeman* of *Boston* has a few of them to dispose of. Dr. Gill's work contains 1091 pages in large quarto, at 36s. lawful money, if bound in two parts, or 34s. bound in one. Mr. *Wallin's* lectures contain 507 pages in handsome octavo, at 8s.