

SERMON 18

MOTIVES TO LOVE AND UNITY AMONG CALVINISTS, WHO DIFFER IN SOME POINTS

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN CHRISTOPHILUS, PHILALETHES, AND PHILAGATHUS.

Wherein is contained an ANSWER to Mr. ALVEREY JACKSON'S Question Answered, Whether saving Faith in CHRIST is a Duty required by the moral Law, of all those who live under the Gospel Revelation?

CHRISTOPHILUS and *Philaethes* were excellent Persons, firmly attached to the Christian Religion, and, many Years, intimate Friendship subsisted between them. But they had different Apprehensions, in some Particulars, about which they several Times conversed. And, as in this imperfect State, the best of Men may not think alike, in all Respects, thro' a Variety of Causes, Prejudice and undue Resentment sometimes get Possession in their Minds, both against Opinions, which they think are not true, and those who hold them.

It seems, this was the Fact, in the two worthy Persons above-mentioned: For, that Amity and Friendship entirely ceased, which they had a long Time cultivated to mutual Advantage; and Displeasure filled the Breast of each. *Philagathus*, receiving Information of it, was much affected with Grief, on Account thereof. He, therefore, formed a Resolution to make a particular Enquiry, concerning their Differences in Opinion, and, if possible, to bring, them unto a Reconciliation. That he might execute this generous and laudable Design, he gave each a kind Invitation to his House, which was gratefully accepted by both. They came at the Time he desired. He quickly acquainted them with the Information he had received, with the Grief it occasioned him, and with his good Intention, in desiring the Favor of their Company; and expressed his Hope, that Christian Friendship might be renewed, and continue to subsist between them, notwithstanding a small Difference, in their Apprehensions, about some particular Points of Doctrine.

He thought it very proper solemnly to address God, upon this important Occasion, for the Aid and Instruction of the holy Spirit, wherein they both agreed with him. He desired *Christophilus* to pray, which he did, with that Reverence, Humility, and Fervency, as greatly affected both himself and *Philaethes*. He requested the Favour of *Philaethes* to succeed him in that good Work; he readily consented; and, therein, he discovered such an Acquaintance with, and Savour of evangelical Truths, as much delighted not only himself, but *Christophilus* also. *Philagathus* closed this Service with a very suitable and pathetic Request to Heaven, for a Blessing upon the Conversation designed.

And, then, addressing himself to them, he said, My dear Brethren in Christ, (for such I acknowledge you both to be) it was with very great Grief I heard, that, that Friendship, which subsisted between you many Years, is now broke, and a mutual Animosity succeeds it in your Breasts, on Account only, I am persuaded, of some lesser Differences, in your Conceptions, wherein none of the Essentials of Christianity are affected, on which Side so ever the Mistake may be.

My Desire, therefore, is, that you would be pleased to permit me to mention the peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel, and that you will express your Assent, or Dissent, as you approve, or disapprove, of those Principles. Both agreed to this Proposal. Whereupon he thus said:

I. I will begin with the Foundation of our Recovery and Happiness, *viz.* Election. God chose a certain Number of Men to Salvation. This Act was eternal, and it is the mere Effect of sovereign Favor, without any Motive to the divine Will, in the Persons who are the Objects of this Choice. Farther, it is irrevocable; and it ascertains the Sanctification, in Time, of all those who are included in this Decree, and their complete Happiness and Felicity hereafter.

II. *Adam* was constituted the Representative of all his natural Descendants; they were included with him in the Covenant of Works, and, therefore, his Act of Disobedience was imputed to them; in and with him they came under the Condemnation of the Law, and from him they derive moral Depravity and Corruption. So that all Men naturally are Subjects of Darkness, Obstinacy, and Rebellion against God; are averse to Good, and inclined to Evil.

III. A Covenant of Peace was entered into, between the divine Persons; wherein, full and effectual Provision is made for the Salvation of all the Elect, in such a Way, as exalts the Glory of all the infinite Perfections of God. In this Covenant Christ engaged to do and suffer, what Law and Justice required, in order to the Salvation of the Elect, *viz.* to obey the Law, which he punctually did; his Obedience is accepted for, and imputed to them, and that is the sole Matter of their Justification, before God. He, also, voluntarily became obliged to offer himself a Sacrifice for their Sins, to redeem them from Curse and Wrath. Agreeably to this Obligation, which he took upon him, he bore their Sins, was made a Curse, endured the vindictive Displeasure of God, suffered and died, in their Room and Stead. His Sufferings and Death were satisfactory to the Law and Justice of God, for their whole Guilt; from hence, in Equity, results a Right to Pardon and Impunity, unto every one of them. And this Redemption is proper and peculiar to the Elect of God, or it is not of larger Extent.

IV. Regeneration and Sanctification are the proper Work of God, in the Souls of Men. Regeneration is absolutely necessary, none can be fared without it. Men are passive in it, and the human Will is not a concurring Cause, with the Grace of God, in its Production. God operates effectually herein, and is not, nor can be frustrated of his End in his gracious Influences on the Souls of his People. The regenerate

Principle consents unto the Law, that it is good, delights in, and serves it. So that true Faith in Christ is productive of holy Obedience, and *worketh by Love*.

V. Those who are effectually called, according to God's Purpose, in the Decree of Election, shall certainly persevere unto the End, and be eternally saved, notwithstanding the Treachery of their own Hearts, the Temptations of Satan, and the numerous Snares to which they are exposed in this World.

Christophilus. I cannot but express my Belief and great Approbation of the Doctrines, which you, *Philagathus*, have mentioned.

Philalethes. I declare myself no less satisfied of the Truth and Importance of those Principles; and hope, that I shall always most religiously regard them, as Doctrines calculated to promote the Glory of God, in the certain and complete Salvation of his Chosen.

Philagathus. Since you both are firmly persuaded of the Truth of the several Articles, which I have briefly mentioned, I cannot think it is possible, that either of you can embrace any Opinion which affects the *Essentials* of Christianity, what Difference so ever may be in your Apprehensions, or in the Mode of your expressing yourselves, in Relation to those Points; and, therefore, surely, Friendship may be revived and continue to subsist between you, notwithstanding some *lesser* Differences, in your Conceptions, and Mode of Language.

Christophilus. *I must be obliged to acquaint you, that Philalethes gives into some over nice and subtle Speculations, relating to the Doctrine of Election. He will needs have it, that God chose his People, considered as unfallen, or in the pure Mass, and that he decreed to permit the Fall, with a View to illustrate the Glory of his free Grace and Mercy, in the Salvation of the Elect, thro' the Mediation of Christ. This Notion of his he hath advanced in Public, which, in my humble Opinion, could not edify common Hearers; for which Reason, I took the Liberty to remonstrate against: it, whereby I incurred his Displeasure, not a little, it seems.*

Philalethes. This is the Fact, I acknowledge it.

Philagathus. Good, wise, and very learned Men have had different Apprehensions of this Matter; but, as to the Substance of the Doctrine of Election, they were fully agreed. The Difference of Rating this Doctrine, as above the Consideration of the Fall, or under it, is only *in Apice logico*, in a logical Point; it respects the Order, not the Cause of the Decree; Divines, who differ in this, are agreed that sovereign Favor is the Cause thereof. And, as to the Edification of common Hearers, I am of Opinion, that this Sentiment may be represented in such a plain and easy Light, as to answer that important End. If, indeed, *Philalethes* is not capable of representing it in a Manner intelligible to common Capacities, he would act more wisely to decline the Advancement of it. Which, it must be confessed, is not the Talent of everyone, who may discern the Truth in his Mind. There is certainly no Cause why the *Supralapsarian* and *Sublapsarian* should differ with one another; they are agreed in

the substance of the Doctrine of Election, and, therefore, ought to bear with one another in the different Manner of Rating it. Divines who lived in the former Century wisely did so.

Christophilus. *I have another Thing to object to Philalethes.*

Philagathus. What is that?

Christophilus. *He affirms, that the Elect are united to Christ before Faith.*

Philalethes. That is my Opinion. In the Act of Election, God considered its Objects in Christ, for he chose them in him. And, Grace was given them in Christ, before the World began. Besides, he represented the Elect of God, in his Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection; and he now represents his People, in his Session at the right Hand of God; hence they are said to *fit together in heavenly Places in Christ*. As Adam was constituted a representative Head to all his Seed, and they were considered in him: So Christ, in the Covenant of Grace, was constituted a representative Head to the Elect, and they were, from everlasting, considered in him.

Philagathus. I cannot perceive any Error in this. *We were chosen in Christ, as a Head, says Zanchy. The same Author observes, because Christ our Head is risen, and sits in heavenly Places; therefore we are held and accounted of the Father to be raised, and sitting and living in Heaven. God's Choice did completely terminate itself on him (Christ) and us, us with him, and yet us in him; he having the Priority to be constituted a common Person and Root to us, for that is the Relation wherein we stand unto him, and in that Relation we were first chosen.* Thus Dr. Goodwin. *Christophilus, I am also somewhat dissatisfied with Philalethes, because he maintains, that Adoption precedes Faith.*

Philalethes. I apprehend that to be a Truth. Predestination to the Adoption of Children was an eternal Act of the divine Will, wherein God willed to be a Father to us, and that we should be Sons unto him, which made us such. For the Will of God to be a Father to us, and that we shall be Sons to him, constitutes our filial Relation unto him. Besides, all those who are the Subjects of Redemption by Christ, were considered therein as Sons and Children of God. *It became him for whom are all Things, and by whom are all Things, in bringing many Sons unto Glory, to make the Captain of their Salvation perfect thro' Sufferings.* In divine Repute, all were Sons for whom Christ died. Again, the holy Spirit is sent into our Hearts, because we are Sons; and, therefore, our filial Relation to God, is not *subsequent* upon, but *precedaneous* to the Mission of the Spirit, to regenerate and sanctify us: *Because ye are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your Hearts.* Regeneration is not Adoption, nor is the latter founded in the former, tho' they are sometimes not distinguished, but confounded; they are, I think, very distinct Blessings. If Adoption be understood of the Participation of those Honors, Privileges, and Blessings, unto which we have a Right as Sons, that is, at, upon, or after Regeneration, and doth not

precede it. Thus, it is sometimes taken, as in these Words: *Waiting for the Adoption, to wit, the Redemption of our Body.*

Philagathus. This hath been the Opinion of eminent *Divines*. *God putteth us into Christ, he chuseth us to be in him, to be married to him, and he hath betrothed us to him from everlasting; (for Jesus Christ then betrothed himself unto us, when in Election he undertook for us with the Father) and so we became Sons-in-Law to God. — I am in this of learned Mr. Forb's Mind: That Adoption, as primitively it was in Predestination be flowed upon us, was not founded upon Redemption, or Christ's Obedience; but on Christ's being personally God's natural Son.* Dr. Goodwin. **Christophilus.** *Another Thing in Philalethes is displeasing to me.*

Philagathus. What is it?

Christophilus. He embraces the Antinomian Error of Justification before Faith.

Philalethes. That is my Sentiment; and, if it is a Mistake, I think it is *abusively* called an *Antinomian, Error*. Justification, properly speaking, as it seems to me, is an immanent Act in God, *viz.* the Act of his Will not to impute Sin to his Elect, but to impute to them the Righteousness of Christ; wherefore, in his Mind, they are discharged of Guilt, and reputed righteous. Now, as this is not a transient, but an immanent Act, it requires not so much as the present Existence of the Object, much less the Being of Faith in the Object justified. God's Purpose to lay their Sins on Christ necessarily supposes, that it was his Intention not to impute them unto their Persons: And his Decree, that Christ should come under their Obligation to the Law, that he might obey it for them, as necessarily supposes a Will in God to impute his Obedience to them, which is their Justification in the divine Mind. Yet, I deny not Justification, when it is understood of the *declared manifest* State of this, or that *particular* Person, to be by Faith, and do not think that it is *previous* to Regeneration.

Philagathus. I am not able to discern the least Mistake in this Account of Justification. Permit me to recite what some *eminent* and *learned Divines* have said upon the Subject. *Justification is understood either actively in Respect of God, who justifies, or passively in Respect of Man, who is justified. Justification active Signifies the Absolution of God, whereby he absolveth a guilty Man from Guilt, on Account of the Satisfaction of Christ, and reputeth him just for the Sake of his Righteousness imputed. From hence, first, it is evident, that this differs from passive Justification, because it is done by one undivided Act: But passive, which consists in the Application of the Righteousness of Christ, is not; for, as often as we sin, we should apply to us the Righteousness of Christ. Hence, in the Lord's Prayer, we are commanded to pray daily that God would remit to us our Sins. Secondly, active precedeth Faith, passive followeth, as that which is thro' Faith. For, thro' Faith, we receive Remission of Sins, and an Inheritance among them that are sanctified. And, that active precedes Faith, may be proved. 1. Because every Object is prior to its Act, for this depends on that. 2. Because by the Act of believing, as Pareus teaches*

on Justification, *Remission of Sins is not effected, but received. 3. Because, thro' the Satisfaction of Christ, we not only obtain Justification, but also Faith itself, and Repentance, that is, the Circumcision of the Heart: For God hath blessed us with every spiritual Blessing in Christ. Ephesians 1:3. Yea, before Faith and Repentance, the Satisfaction of Christ is applied to us, as that on Account whereof we obtain effectual Grace to believe in Christ. The same Thing Daniel Toffanus teaches, who sometime was a most learned Divine in the Academy of Heidelberg, in an Epistle (a Copy of which Lucius published, Professor at Basil) to Vorstius, whose Words are: You confound, says he to Vorstius, the Acquisition of Justification, and the Blotting out of Sin, which is done by the Blood of Christ, with the Application of it: Wherefore you feign to yourself a Contradiction, where there is no Contradiction: All the Elect are justified in Christ, if you respect his Merit, yea before they are born; and so, before we believe, we, are justified and redeemed in Christ; but afterwards he (God) giveth Faith to his Elect, whereby they seek their Righteousness in Christ alone. Thus far Toffanus. Passive Justification is that by which a Person is absolved from Guilt, and reckoned righteous; or rather it is a Reception of Absolution from Guilt, and of the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ. The Sentence of Justification was:*

I. *Conceived in the Mind of God, by the Decree of Justifying. Galatians 3:8. The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen thro' Faith.*

II. *It was pronounced in Christ our Head when he rose from the Dead. 2 Corinthians 5:10. God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself, not imputing their Trespases to them.*

III. *It is virtually pronounced on the first Relation which ariseth out of Faith ingenerated. Romans 8:1. There is therefore no Condemnation to them, who are in Christ Jesus.*

IV. *It is expressly pronounced by the Spirit of God, witnessing, with our Spirits, our Reconciliation with God. Romans 5:5. The Love of God is shed abroad in our Hearts, by the holy Spirit, who is given unto us. In this Witness of the Spirit, Justification itself doth not so properly consist, as the actual Perception of it, before granted, by a reflex Act of Faith. We think, that the Form of active Justification is both a full Remission of Sins, and the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ; nor do we apprehend these Phrases to be the same, or to be confounded. Thus far these learned Professors and Divines, and many other eminent Divines agree with them. Says **Mr. Pemble**, Sanctification and inherent Righteousness goes before our Justification and imputed Righteousness, but with a double Distinction of Justification . 1. In Foro Divino, in God's Sight; and this goeth before all our Sanctification, for, even whilst the Elect are unconverted, they are then actually justified and freed from all Sin by the Death of Christ: And God so esteems them as a free, and, having accepted that Satisfaction, is actually reconciled to them. By this Justification we are freed from*

*the Guilt of our Sins; and, because that is done away, God in due Time proceeds to give us the Grace of Sanctification, to free us from Sin's Corruption still inherent in our Persons. 2. In Foro Conscientiae, in our own Sense; which is but the Revelation of God's former secret Act of accepting Christ's Righteousness to our Justification. The Manifestation of which, to our Hearts and Confidence, is the only Ground of our Peace and Comfort: And it follows our Sanctification, upon and after the Infusion of saving Faith, the only Instrument of this our Justification . This Distinction is needful to be observed, as giving Light to many Things. — 'Tis vain to think with the Arminians that Christ's Merits have made God only placabilem, not placatum, procured a Freedom that God may be reconciled, if he will and other Things concur, but not an actual Reconciliation. A silly Shift devised to uphold the Liberty of Man's Will, and the Universality of Grace. No, 'tis otherwise; the Ransom demanded is paid and accepted, full Satisfaction to the divine Justice is given and taken, all the Sins of the Elect are actually pardoned, God's Wrath for them suffered and overcome, he rests contented and appealed, the Debt-book is crossed, and the Hand-writing cancelled. This grand Transaction between God and the Mediator Christ Jesus was concluded upon and dispatched in Heaven long before we had any Being, either in Nature or Grace; yet the Benefit of it was ours, and belonged to us at that Time, tho' we never knew so much, till after that by Faith did apprehend it. As, in the like Case, Lands may be purchased, the Writings confirmed, the Estate conveyed and settled upon an Infant, tho' it know nothing of all, till it come to Age, and find by Experience the present Commodity of that which was provided for him long ago. And the Reason of all this, is, it is not our Faith that works God's Reconciliation with us, but Christ believed on by our Faith. Now his Merits are not therefore accepted of God, because we do believe, but because they of themselves are of such Worth and sufficiency, as do deserve his most favorable Acceptance of them for us. Mr. Crandon, speaking of the Non-Imputation of Sin, and of the Imputation of Righteousness to the Elect, say: To what Time shall we reduce this Imputation to find its Original, if not to Eternity? When began God to reckon and account us righteous in Christ, or not to impute Sin to us, if he did not actually do it in himself before Time from Eternity? The Reader, if he pleases, may consult him; he copiously treats on this Subject, with great Judgment and Strength of Reasoning. The late **Dr. Ridgley** hath these Words: When we speak of God's being reconciled to his Elect, according to the Tenor of his secret Will, before they believe, that is in Effect to say, that Justification , as it is an immanent Act in God, is antecedent to Faith, which is a certain Truth, inasmuch as Faith is a Fruit and Consequence thereof. — There are some, adds he, who not only speak of Justification before Faith, but from Eternity; and consider it as an immanent Act in God, in the same Sense as Election is said to be. I will not deny eternal Justification , provided it be considered as contained in God's secret Will, and not made the Rule, by which we are to*

determine ourselves to be in a justified State, and as such to have a Right and Title to eternal Life, before it is revealed, or apprehended by Faith. **Christophilus.** I am surprised to find so many *able and learned Divines* do maintain Justification before Faith, and agree that it is an immanent Act in God. There is no *material* Difference between the Opinion of *Philalethes*, and their Judgment, in this Point.

Philagathus. Why are you surprised?

Christophilus. Because, I have often heard that Notion spoken of with great Contempt by good Men, and have heard the Persons, who embrace it, represented in a very despicable Light, as Men of *very little* Consideration or Worth.

Philagathus. I believe you. But this was not the Case, in the last Century, says **Mr. Crandon:** *The very Flower of all our Protestant Writers have asserted it in such Numbers as would fill up a Page to name them. Neither know I any one Writer, which (having not Occasion to manifest himself of the same Judgement) hath ever expressed himself to dissent from it, 'till Dr. Downham excepted against Master Pemble for delivering it, and that upon a strange Ground, that declared great Inadvertency in the Reading of the Dr. viz. that he believeth no Man had so written before Mr. Pemble. I think you pronounced it an Antinomian Error, did you not?*

Christophilus. I did, and esteemed it such.

Philagathus. Mr. Candon observes, that Mr. *Baxter* reproached it in the same Manner: *This, says he, I take to be the Sum of the Doctrine which Mr. Baxter asperseth with Antinomianism, which I believe no other, Papist, or Arminian, had done before him.* I shall say no more to wipe away that Reproach cast on the Opinion, than Mr. *Crandon* did in Answer to the same Aspersion of Mr. *Baxter's*, viz. *As well and properly might he have termed it Mahometanism; for as agreeable is it with the Principles of this, as of that.* **Christophilus.** I cannot but inform you, *Philagathus*, that *Philalethes* denies it to be the immediate Duty of unregenerate Men, who hear the Gospel, to believe in Christ, with special, or saving Faith. *Philalethes*, I must confess, that I have not as yet met with clear and convincing Proof of that Point, nor with satisfactory Answers given to those Objections, which occasion my Scruples about it. *Some Months since, a Friend of Christophilus's published a Pamphlet on that Subject, wherein he advances his Reasons for the Affirmative*, and attempts to answer one Objection to his Opinion. In this Piece, he hath been pleased to treat me with great Contempt, and more than insinuates, that there are no Consequences, so *bad and vile*, but what do unavoidably follow, not granting the Truth of that for which he contends. I have carefully considered what he urges to support his Assertion; but my Doubts are not removed, nor in the least Degree abated, by any Thing he offers to Consideration. His Manner of handling the Subject is such, that if I had not other Reasons, than what arise from the Performance itself, I should not be at all inclined to bestow any Animadversions upon it: But, as I have Reasons for it

of another Kind, which with me are not of little Moment, *I shall attend unto the small Labor of a thorough Examination of his 'Answer' to the Question propounded, viz. Whether saving Faith in Christ is a Duty required by the moral Law, of all those who live under the Gospel Revelation?* I think it not improper to acquaint you, *Philagathus*, that I am persuaded, if the Desire of the Author had been complied withal, respecting the Revisal of his Manuscript, and if the Publication of it had been thought *expedient*, by those, under whose Correction, he wished it to pass, much less Room would have been left for displeasing Remarks upon it. My Authority is unquestionable, for what I now say. ***But my Business is to consider it, just as the Editor thought it fit, to make its Appearance in the World. And I will begin with observing some Mistakes and Inconsistencies, which are in it.***

First, The Author apprehends, that there is no Difference between the Principle of Grace in Believers, and that holy Principle of Life which we had in Adam The Image of God, wherein Man was created, consisted in a perfect Knowledge of God, and of his Duty according to the Nature of the Covenant, under which he then was, in a holy Affection to God, and in a habitual Disposition to Obedience. These Things ought constantly to be maintained again, the *Socinians*, who deny original Righteousness, to the Disparagement of human Nature, in its primitive State, and unto the Dishonor of God our Creator. For, to imagine, that God gave Existence to a reasonable Creature destitute of Principles, suited to enable it to walk before, and with him, in all holy Obedience unto his Will, is to cast *impious* Reproach on his Wisdom, Goodness, and Holiness. Nevertheless, there is a great Difference, between that Life which we had in *Adam*, and that which we now have. The gracious Principle in Believers, springs from the Fountain of eternal Love, in the Heart of God towards them, as *the God of all Grace*. But the Life we had in *Adam* did not. Our spiritual Life is derived from Christ, and by him it is maintained, and influenced in all its Acts, which the living holy Principle in *Adam* was not. Again, the regenerate Principle is a Disposition to Acts towards God, agreeable to the Nature of the new Revelation, which he hath given of himself in the Covenant of Grace. But the holy Principle in *Adam* was n Disposition unto, and exerted itself, in Acts of God, suitable to that Revelation, which the Covenant of Works gave of him. As the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace differ in Nature: So our Life unto God is of a different Kind, according to the Difference and distinct Nature of the two Covenants: Says Dr. Owen: *For neither would the Life of Adam be sufficient for us, to live unto God according to the Terms of the new Covenant; nor is the Life of Grace we now enjoy, suited to the Covenant, wherein, Adam, stood before God. Wherefore some Differences there between them, the principal whereof may be reduced into two Heads.*

1. The Principle of this Life was wholly and entirely in Man himself. It was the Effect of another Cause, of that which was without him; namely, the Good Will and Power

of God; but it was left to grow on no other Root, but what was in Man himself, It was wholly implanted in his Nature, and therein did its Springs lie. Actual Excitations, by Influence of Power from God, it should have had. For, no Principle of Operation can subsist in an Independence on God, nor itself unto Operation without his Concurrence. But, in the Life, whereunto we are renewed by Jesus Christ, the Fountain and Principle of it is not in ourselves but in him, as one common Head unto all that are made Partakers of him. He is our Life, Colossians 1:3 and our Life (as to the Spring and Fountain of it) is hid with him in God. For he quickeneth us by his Spirit, Romans 8:10. And our spiritual Life, as in us, consists in the vital Actings of this his Spirit in us, for, without him, we can do nothing, John 15:3. By Virtue hereof, we walk in Newness of Life, Romans 6:4. We live therefore hereby, yet not so much we, as Christ liveth in us, Galatians 2:20.

2. *There is a Difference between these Lives with Respect unto the Object of their vital Acts. For the Life, which we now lead by the Faith of the Son of God, hath sundry Objects of its Acting, which the other had not. For whereas all the Acting's of our Faith and Love, that is, all our Obedience doth respect the Revelation that God makes of himself, and his Will unto us. There are now new Revelations of God in Christ, and, consequently, new Duties of Obedience required of us, as will afterwards appear. And other such Differences there are between them. The Life which we had in Adam, and that which we are renewed unto in Christ Jesus, are so far of the same Nature and Kind, as our Apostle manifests in sundry Places, Ephesians 4:23, 24; Colossians 3:10, as that they serve to the same End and Purpose. From hence he proceeds to observe, That, with respect to the Life we bare in Christ, unregenerate Men never had it, neither de Facto, nor de Jure, in any State or Condition. Wherefore, with respect hereunto, they are dead only negatively; they have it not; but, with respect unto the Life we had in Adam, they are dead privatively, they have lost that Power of living unto God which they had. Thus far he. Our spiritual Life, therefore, is not that Principle of Life, which we had in Adam restored to us, but another Principle, which we had not in him, either in Fact, or in Right.*

The Author assigns two Reasons to prove, that these Principles are the same. 1. The Use of the Terms *renewed*, and *renewing*, in Respect to the Work of Grace, in the Souls of Believers, *Ephesians 3:23, 24; Colossians 3:10; Titus 3:5. Renovation*, says he, *is not the making, producing, or bringing into Existence, a Thing that never was in Being before: But it is a new Framing of that which hath once existed; but hath been spoiled and defaced.* But, 1. This gracious Work is the Renovation of the Mind, and not of a Principle which was in the Mind, antecedent to it, and the Restoration of that Principle to its primitive Beauty, it having been defaced. 2. The Soul may be said to be renewed, with strict Propriety, by the Implantation of a new Principle of Life in it, when dead, even though that Principle differs from that living Principle, by Reason of the Absence of which, it was really dead. The Soul is renewed unto

Life; but that Life is of a higher and nobler Kind, than that which Man originally possessed. 3. There is a Revival of the Principle of Grace in Believers, which is meant by Renewing, in *Ephesians* 3:23 and *Colossians* 3:10. 2. The second Reason he calls a *cogent and demonstrative Argument*; it is this: *It is not possible in the Nature of the Thing, that there should be two specifically different Images of the moral Perfections of God impressed upon a reasonable Creature, any more than that there are two Gods possessed of two different Kinds of moral Perfections*. If by a specific Difference be intended, that the one is holy, and the other not so, it is Blasphemously absurd to admit the Thought. But, 2. If by it is meant, that it is impossible, that a reasonable Creature should bear a more glorious Image of God, to qualify it for, and dispose it unto *higher* Acts of Obedience, than that which *Adam* bore, it must: be a Mistake, unless we will affirm, that the second *Adam* did not excel the first, as he was in his human Nature the Image of the invisible God, and that he was not called and disposed unto a *higher* Obedience than the first *Adam* was. Which is what, I hope this good Man will not care to assert. And it is into the Image of the second *Adam*, and not into the Image of the first *Adam*, that the Saints are *changed, from Glory to Glory, by beholding the Glory of the Lord, with open Face*. That an innocent Creature, that *Adam*, particularly, while innocent, was capable of receiving a Revelation of new Truths from God: That he was under an indispensable Obligation to believe the Truth of what God did, or might reveal unto him: And that an innocent Creature is capable of discerning not only the Truth of the Evangelical Revelation; but the Wisdom, Goodness, Grace, and Mercy of God, therein discovered, are all freely granted. For, the holy Angels adore and bless God upon a Discernment of Gospel-Mysteries: They are *all Attention* unto them, and, with intense Desire and the highest Delight, they constantly contemplate on them. *The Grace of God, the Sufferings of Christ, and the Glory following thereupon*, are the Matter of their delightful Study, and of their holy Adoration, and will be so for evermore. But to say, that an innocent Creature could believe in Christ, on a Supposition of his being revealed to him in the Character of a Saviour, is to speak *palpable* Contradictions. And, therefore, the Author is grossly mistaken, in thinking that *Adam*, in a State of Innocence, would have been obliged unto, and could have believed in Christ, even upon the Supposition of a Revelation being given to him of Christ in the Character of a Saviour. Man must be, and must know himself to be lost, before he can believe in Christ to *the Saving of his Soul*.

Secondly, *Another Mistake of the Author's is, he imagines, that the Life, which the Covenant of Works promises, is the same with that promised in the Covenant of Grace*. It is granted, that they are the same in Duration, both are eternal. They consist in Likeness to God: In the Enjoyment of him, and Communion with him. And, yet, they differ very much: In the former, Divine Benevolence to the innocent Creature is apprehended: A Sense of Divine Approbation of the innocent Creature is enjoyed:

Therein the Glory of God, as Creator, Preserver, and Upholder of all Things is seen and adored: The guiltless Creature, hath a Persuasion of the endless Fruition of God, the Origin of Blessedness, and, therefore, this is a happy and glorious State. But the State of Bliss, promised in the Covenant of Grace, *as much exceeds it in Glory, as the Ministration of the Spirit exceeds in Glory, the Ministration of Death*, which is not to be conceived in Thought, much less can Language express that vast Difference. This Subject is so *grand, sublime, glorious, and attractive*, that with *peculiar* Pleasure I could dwell and enlarge upon it in my Meditations; but my narrow Limits will not allow of such Enlargement. I can only give you brief Hints for your further Consideration, and may the good Lord, by his Spirit, guide your Thoughts, and assist you to fix your Meditations on this most delightful and ravishing Theme. In the heavenly State, God is known, in the endearing Character of *the God of all Grace*. The *exceeding Riches of his Kindness towards us, in Christ Jesus*, are clearly, steadily, and without any Interruption, viewed by the Blessed for evermore. The eternal Son of God, as *incarnate*, God and Man in one Person, is always beheld, and the Divine Perfections through him. He is with inconceivable Delight, perpetually viewed as the Head and Husband of the Church, and each perfectly happy Member of him enjoys a constant transporting Sense of the Assertion of his Heart, which is suitable to the near Relation, wherein he stands, unto the Church, which is his *Body and Fulness*.

They will all know the *Satisfaction, Delight, and Complacency* he takes, in their Blessedness, who once were the *Travail of his Soul*. The Saints will in Heaven be perfectly acquainted with the Dignity and Glory to which they are advanced, in being made Sons unto God, by Adoption. They shall for ever see Christ, as their Surety to God for them, and herein will open to View all the glorious Mysteries of Redemption, by his Sufferings and Death. And will contemplate on all the infinitely holy Properties of God, as they are displayed, in that stupendous Affair. Moreover, their Communion, with Father, Son, and Spirit, will be most near, and without the least Interruption. This is Heaven indeed. And such a State of Bliss and Glory it is, as the Covenant of Works neither knows, nor makes the least Discovery of. Says Dr. Owen, *the whole of what was intrusted with Adam comes exceedingly short of what God hath now prepared, as the Inheritance of the Church. There is Grace in it, and Glory added unto it, which Adam neither had, nor could have Right unto*. Now, though Adam had not that Principle of Life, which is in Believers, which capacitates them to live unto God according to the Covenant of Grace: He had a Principle of Life in him, suited unto the Nature of the Covenant of Works. That Principle he lost and we all suffer a Privation of it, and so are *dead in Trespasses and Sins*, or are *alienated from the Life of God*. And, though the first Covenant did not promise to him the Enjoyment of God in a Mediator, yet it promised unto him the Enjoyment of God, as Creator; by his Sin he lost his Title to that Happiness, and became

obnoxious unto eternal Death, or an everlasting Separation from God. And, therefore, it is true, that the Law promises Life eternal, on Condition of Obedience, though not the same with that promised in the Covenant of Grace, Right unto which could not result from Obedience yielded to the Covenant of Works. It is also Truth, and not an *idle Dream*, that we are naturally dead, for we have lost that Life we had in *Adam*.

Again, eternal Death in Hell is not a *Fiction*, but an *awful Reality*, threatened for Sin in the first Covenant. One would imagine, that this Writer was not thoroughly awake, and, therefore speaks, as here he does, *That Death in Sin is a Dream, and eternal Death in Hell a Fiction, if Adam had not the same Life in Possession, as Believers now have, and if he had not the Life in Promise, which they have in Right, and shall eternally enjoy.*

Thirdly, *The Author observes, That those who appear most warm against Faith in Christ being a Duty, do yet own and acknowledge that Faith to be the Duty of all Men to whom the Gospel is preached, which the Scripture declares is a saving Faith.* These Persons, then, are a Parcel of extremely *weak* and *silly* Creatures, who thus contradict themselves. But the Contradiction will be found in Mr. *Jackson*, not in them. What is that Faith which they maintain, is the Duty of unconverted Sinners? It is a Belief of the Truth of the Report of the Gospel concerning *Jesus Christ*, in his Person, Offices, and Benefits. This he asserts to be saving Faith, than which there is nothing more false. *Thus the Devils believe: Thus Simon Magus believed;* and such a Faith as this is a Man may *carry to Hell* along with him. It is merely a rational Act excited in the Mind by rational Evident. This is not a *Sinner's feeing to, receiving of, and resting on the Lord Jesus Christ alone for Salvation, which, Mr. Jackson has before observed, is true saving Faith*, in perfect Contradiction to what he here affirms. So that this Argument to prove his Point is absolutely and entirely lost. It was no Instance of Kindness in the Editor to permit such an Error and Self-Contradiction, as this is, to see the Light. Friendship would have made Use of the Sponge, and wiped it out.

Fourthly, *Another Mistake the Author is guilty of: viz. That regenerate, as well as unregenerate Persons, are under the Covenant of Works: The Subject of the moral Law is a reasonable Creature, considered as such; and it knows no Difference of Elect, or Non-elect, Regenerate, or Unregenerate, etc.* Since Unbelievers, as well as Believers, are by him spoken of, he must mean the moral Law (under which both are, as he affirms) in the Form of Covenant, and not consider it, as a Rule of Conduct only, and, therefore, Believers, if this is true, lie under the Curse of the Covenant of Works. But I will not press hard on this Mistake, for believe, it was mere inadvertency in him. This, I also think, the Editor should have corrected. ***I will now consider his Arguments, to prove, that special Faith in Christ is the immediate Duty of all who hear the Gospel.*** In Number his *general* Arguments are eight, and,

therefore, if they are forcible, the Point is abundantly confirmed: But, as to the first, he seems to be convinced, that it hath very little, if any Weight at all in it. And the second cannot justly be thought, to have more than the first. The fifth is already fully answered, and proved to be a gross Mistake, and a Self-contradiction. The sixth is entirely impertinent.

The seventh seems to be advanced only for the Sake of saying something, for no Man can possibly think it of any Force at all. The eighth is no other than an Objection to his Opinion, which he endeavors to prove absurd, and utterly destructive of all true Religion. The third and fourth *coincide*, or the fourth is nothing more, than a Conclusion arising from a Supposition of the Truth of the third, and, therefore, no great Skill in Disputation is discovered, in making that an Argument distinct from the third. So that, if his third Argument proves insufficient to bear the Weight of his Cause, it is likely to sink. However, there may be Reasons for taking some Notice of each Argument, and, therefore, I will not decline it.

First, Believing on the Lord Jesus Christ hath eternal Salvation inseparably affixed to it, by the Word and Promise of the faithful God, with which it is infallibly connected. This is readily granted, and thankfully embraced, as a precious Truth: It receives Confirmation from the whole Gospel: And cannot be denied, without dreadfully corrupting, at least, if not overthrowing the *Christian* Scheme. For he that believes shall be saved. But what Degree of Proof does this afford, that *special, supernatural* Faith is the immediate Duty of everyone who hears the Gospel preached? Not the least. Whereof the Author seems to be fully conscious, and, therefore, argues not at all from it, to establish what he had in View; but observes, what was not pertinent to be observed, under this Argument, *viz.* that those who obey not the Gospel, and receive not Christ, but oppose and reject him, sin, and perish. Which properly belongs to his second Argument. And that is this:

Secondly, It is equally clear, and as certainly declared in the Oracles of Truth, that the contrary to this Faith, even not believing on the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, is assigned as the Cause of Men's Condemnation, and stands reproved in the Word of God, as a damning Sin, which it could not possibly do, if Faith in Christ was not a Duty required by the Law. 1. This Argument ought to be considered in a Light directly opposite to the former, as expressing the contrary State of Unbelievers to that of Believers, according to the Gospel-declaration: *He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned.* But, 2. As it is not inferable from that Declaration, that the Faith of Believers is the procuring Cause of their Salvation: So it is not to be inferred from thence, that the Want of that *special* Faith in Unbelievers is the procuring Cause of their Damnation. That Declaration contains in it the different descriptive Characters, of those who are saved, and of those who are damned; but it assigns not special Faith to be the procuring Cause of the Salvation of the former; nor the Want of it to be a procuring Cause of the Damnation of the

latter. 3. Unbelief is *negative* and *positive*. 1. *Negative*; as such it is two- fold: (1.) The Want of Faith in Christ for Salvation, or of an *Affiance and Trust* in him to be saved by him. (2.) The Want of a Belief of, and *reverential* Regard to the Gospel. The *former* is not required by the Covenant of Works, and, therefore, the Want thereof brings not Men under its Curse: The *latter* is required in the Covenant of Works, and, consequently, the Want of that in Men is their Sin, and it renders them obnoxious to its dreadful Curse. It is *positive*: This is an Opposition to, and Rejection of God's appointed Way of Salvation, by *Jesus Christ*, as *unfit*, yea, as *Folly*. And this is in the Heart of every unregenerate Man, even though he may give an Assent to the Truth of the Gospel. And for this he stands righteously condemned by the first Covenant. For that Covenant requires Men, not only to believe those Truths, which God reveals; but also, that they are worthy of himself, or becoming his Goodness, Holiness, and Wisdom. It is not the Want of *special* Faith in Christ, but the Want of a reverential Regard to the Gospel, and a *positive* Act of rejecting it as *Folly*, which involves Men in Guilt, and demerits Punishment, according to the Constitution of God, in the Law. If Men are eternally damned for Want of special Faith in Christ, they will suffer endless Torments, for Want of a Principle of Life, that they never had in any State, either in Fact, or in Right.

Which to imagine, I must confer, is an Idea so severe, that I think, it cannot be reconciled, either to divine Goodness, or unto divine Justice. But there are sufficient Reasons for Men's Condemnation, without allowing this to be the Cause thereof, *viz.* original Guilt: By *the Offence of one, Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation*: Again, the Want of perfect Obedience to the Law: Human Nature was furnished with Ability to yield such Obedience, and the Loss of that Power is the Consequence of Sin, and, therefore, it is just still to require it, and to punish Men for the Want thereof, which, I suppose, this Writer will acknowledge, though, in order to press me with a Difficulty, he expresses himself in such a Manner, as is not to the Advantage of the Doctrine of original Sin. That I do not impute to his Disbelief of that Doctrine, but unto *Unskillfulness*, for the Management of the Business, which he took in Hand. Besides, Men's Opposition to God's appointed Way of Salvation is another just Cause of Condemnation, of which every unregenerate Person is guilty. So that my Opinion leaves all the *Fuel to feed the Flames of Hell*, this Author can possibly desire, though he seems to be greatly afraid, that *they will be extinguished*, if it is admitted. But this Fear is entirely *causeless*. And, inasmuch as Men are capable of suffering Punishment for Sin, it is just with God to inflict Penalty upon them, though they cannot make Satisfaction for their Crimes, by all the Sufferings, which they are able to endure. Nor does my Opinion suppose the contrary. And I cannot but say, that the Author's *Unfitness* for the Talk, he imposed upon himself, in no small Degree, appears, in suggesting that it doth. The Equity of the Infliction of Punishment arises from Sin's Demerit, and, therefore, it is just to inflict it, though

the Sinner is not able to make Satisfaction, by suffering Penalty. It is exceedingly weak, in our Author, to object Man's Incapacity to make Satisfaction for Sin, by suffering Penalty, unto the Justice of the Infliction of Punishment, which he does. It is a full Evidence, that he did not understand the Business wherein he was engaged, that he suggests my Opinion supposes it. How could the Editor suffer such Weakness to come forth into the World?

Surely, he understood better; if not, the good Man's Performance had very *ill Hap*, in being referred unto his Correction. 4. The Author, in order to prove the Justice of punishing Gospel-Sinners, (as he speaks) *arminianizes*, for, he insinuates, that God hath promised to unregenerate Men, that he will give his holy Spirit unto them, if they ask it, and that *the Faith of the Report of the Gospel, that is an Assent to it, is abundantly sufficient to enable and encourage them to call on the Name of the Lord, or to pray for Faith*. Which are *gross Mistakes*. God hath made no Promise of bestowing spiritual Blessings on unregenerate Men, upon their Performance of any religious Services. Duties, not discharged in a spiritual Manner, are unacceptable to God, *for without Faith it is impossible to please him*, and no Promise of the Communication of Grace is made to them, or unto Performing them. And such are all the Duties of unregenerate Men.

Besides, if Promises of Grace, and of Heaven itself, were made to the Unregenerate, on Condition they would humbly, and in earnest ask for both, at the Hand of God: Such is the cursed Opposition in their Hearts unto God, and all spiritual Good, that nothing could *drive, draw, or encourage* them to petition in earnest, for either. I can dare to affirm, that, if an Offer were to be made to a Sinner of enjoying Heaven, after his suffering Punishment for his Sins, a Million of Years, that Offer he would not accept. A Release from Hell is eligible, but the Enjoyment of Heaven is not desirable to a depraved Mind. For, Enmity neither can, nor will desire the Enjoyment of an Object, against which it is Enmity. Lust, or evil Concupiscence, is in a rational Nature; but itself is *unreasonable and outrageous too*: Hence it is represented as *Madness, or irrational Fury*. What good Men say sometimes, in expostulating with Sinners, upon this Subject, contradicts their own Experience; if they duly attended to that, they would never suggest, that any Considerations whatever, are sufficient to excite and encourage corrupt Nature to desire Holiness, Communion with God, and the Enjoyment of him. If that is possible, then, the *Flesh* may be prevailed upon to cease *Lusting against the Spirit*, and to unite with it, in its spiritual Acting's. But alas! the *Coldness, Formality, and Wanderings* of Mind, in Prayer to God, *even in the best*, are a *sad Evidence* of the Mistake of all such Suggestions. If good Men were more cautious to express themselves, agreeably to what they discern in themselves, we should have fewer of such Kind of Addresses to Sinners, than we have, through a Want of that Caution. I know not any Thing, wherein the *genuine* Acting of the gracious Principle in Believers, more clearly discovers itself, than in

Desires of Holiness, of Communion with God, and after the Fruition of him, through *Jesus Christ*, If the *carnal* Mind may be wrought up hereunto, by any Sort of Motives and Considerations, I am sure it will be impossible to distinguish between Regeneracy, and Unregeneracy. It is no more possible, by any Means whatever, to cause the *Flesh* to choose, adhere unto, and delight in God, than it is to draw the *Spirit* into *hostile* Acts against him. The Reason is clear; no Principle of Operation can ever be prevailed with, to act contrary to its Nature. And, therefore, no unsanctified Heart, will ever pray to God for Grace and Holiness. This is Men's *dreadful* Sin, and it justly exposes them unto *direful* Vengeance. But in his third Argument lies almost the entire Strength of his Cause, which, therefore shall be thoroughly weighed, and, whatever, properly belongs unto it, in the whole Performance, shall not be paired over, without Notice. It is this:

Thirdly, The holy Scripture declares, that Faith in Christ is a commanded Duty; and proves, that it is a Work, which, God, by the moral Law, requires of all Men, to whom the Gospel is preached. That we may proceed clearly, in our Enquiries, into what we have now before us, I would observe, that the moral Law is to be considered, either *as a Covenant of Works*, or, *merely, as a Law and Rule of Conduct*: This twofold Consideration of the Law is absolutely necessary. For, without it, we must grant, that Believers, are under the Covenant of Works, or deny, that they are under the Law. Whereas, neither may be allowed. *They are not under the Law*, as a Covenant, *but under Grace*; nevertheless, *they are not without Law to God, but under the Law to Christ*. Now the Question is plainly this: Whether Faith in Christ for Salvation is required by the Law as a Covenant? The Answer must be, I think, in the Negative; my Reasons for it are these: 1. *The Law is not of Faith*: It doth not present the Object of Faith, that all will allow. Nor doth it direct to the Act of Faith in Christ, as a Saviour. The Law, as a Covenant, requires Obedience, in order to Acceptance, and receiving the promised Reward. *Do and live* is the Language of it, but not *believe and be saved*: Yea, it is so far from requiring Faith in Christ for Salvation, that it allows not the Subject of it to hope for Deliverance from Misery. That Constitution is nothing but Death to the Sinner: *The Soul that sins shall die*. How, therefore, can it require Faith in Christ in order to Salvation? The Grace of the Gospel, by its Revelation, makes no Change in the legal Constitution; that is the same it was before the Discovery of Salvation in the Gospel, and so it will eternally remain.

But this is no Bar to the Hope of a regenerate Man: For, 2. A Believer is *dead to the Law, as a Covenant*: He is brought from under its Power; and therefore, in acting Faith on Christ, he yields not Obedience to the *first Covenant*, which he must be supposed to do, if that Covenant required it. *No Acting's of Grace, which the new Covenant gives, are Obedience to the Commands of the old Covenant*. 3. The Law is *dead to a Believer*. Now, that which is dead to him can't reasonably be thought to

give him Direction about, and oblige him unto, the Acting's of a Principle, in Consequence whereof its Death to him follows. The Exercise of Faith in Christ, therefore, *is not Obedience to the Covenant of Works*. 4. Until a Man, *thro' the Law, is dead to the Law*, he hath *no Warrant* to receive Christ as a Saviour, or to hope for Salvation through him. Conviction of Sin, a Sense of Misery, as justly deserved, and despairing of Relief from the Law and Works of it, in Order of Nature, at least, precede the first: Act of Faith on Christ for Salvation. The Act is of that Kind as necessarily supposes it. And as, in the Nature of the Thing, such an Act cannot be put forth, previous unto the Relinquishment of all Hope of Life by the Law, there is not any Thing, in the whole Gospel, which directs and encourages Men to exert such an Act, without the Supposition of that Conviction wrought in them; which Conviction is the Effect of Regeneration; and, therefore, a Man is not under the first Covenant, even when he puts forth the first: Act of Faith on Christ.

Now, tho' *special, supernatural* Faith is not required by the Covenant of Works, it requires a Belief of the Truth of every Revelation, which God, at any Time, shall be pleased to make of his Will to his Creature, Man, who is the Subject of that Covenant. 1. The first Covenant most certainly obliges Man to believe that is true, which God expresses. 2. The Christian Revelation hath such *evident and indelible* Characters of its divine Original, or that it really is a Revelation from God, as are abundantly sufficient to satisfy any rational, *unprejudiced* Enquirer. 3. That Covenant obliges Man to conclude upon the Wisdom and Holiness of all God's Designs and Acts about and towards his Creatures, both in a Way of Justice and Mercy. 4. The Mysteries of Redemption by Christ are expressed in Language, which is not above the Capacities of Men; and, therefore, they are able to perceive the Truth of those Mysteries, though they are not capable of understanding the *real* Nature of them, without an additional supernatural Revelation, or Illumination of the Mind, is graciously vouchsafed to them. Hence it follows, 5. Contempt cast upon the Gospel, or a Disapprobation and Rejection of the wise and gracious Method of Salvation by Christ, involves Men in Guilt, and justly subjects them to Punishment. And, especially, 6. If they, thro' Prejudice and Pride, throw off all Regard to Christian Doctrines, after a Conviction of their Truth, or being the Matter of divine Revelation. Many *awful* Instances of this Kind our *perilous Times* furnish us with. The *first Covenant* requires of Men a Belief of, and *reverential* Regard to, *the Doctrine of the new Covenant*, tho' it doth not oblige them unto acting Faith on Christ for Salvation. Every Man, who despises the Grace of the *second Covenant*, by so doing brings himself under the dreadful Curse of the *first*. This is what an holy innocent Creature would never do; but, upon the Revelation of it, he would give Credit to, and *reverentially* regard it. Thus do the holy Angels, as I before observed. And it is thro' *Ignorance, Pride, and corrupt Prejudices*, that Men disbelieve, and reject it as *Folly*, unto their *just* Condemnation, But thus far of the *Law*, as a Covenant, and of the

Obligation it says Men under to believe, and not reject, the Gospel of the Grace of God.

Again, the moral Law is to be considered as a Law *merely*, or Rule of Action; as such, regenerate Persons are under it, and by its Authority they are obliged unto all the Acting's of the regenerate Principle, in Faith, Repentance, Love, and evangelical Obedience. For, 1. The *new Man*, or the Believer, as a *new Creature*, is under the Command of the Law, to *love God*, and to *love his Neighbor*; and, consequently, he stands obliged unto all those Acts, by Virtue of that Command, unto which that new Principle in him is suited. 2. As by a *new Revelation*, both external and internal, *new Objects* of Love, Adoration, and Delight, are presented to his View, those Acts are the Matter of his Duty. Yea, 3. All the Acting's of this Principle, in the future State of Glory, will be due unto God, by Virtue of the moral Law, which is no other than his *Will*, that *his Creature, Man, should yield Obedience unto him in every State, suitable to those Principles wherewith he furnishes him, and unto those Discoveries of himself, which he graciously affords him*. I am so far from thinking, that Believers are not, in this State, under the moral Law, or that their Acts of Faith, Repentance, Love, and filial Fear of God, are not Obedience to it in the present State, that I am most firmly persuaded, that they will be under that Law *in Heaven*, and that all their holy Acts of Love, Adoration, and Delight, in that *blissful State*, will be Obedience due to their heavenly Father, by Virtue thereof. Mr. *Jackson* proposes two Things in this third Argument: 1. *To prove that special Faith is required of unregenerate Men.* 2. *That it is the moral Law which requires that Faith.*

1. For the Proof of the former, he produces several Scriptures: These Words of our Lord; *This is the Work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath sent*: Which Words contain a Declaration, that Believing in Christ for Salvation is necessary to the Enjoyment of eternal Life, and that Faith in him is an Act acceptable and pleasing to God; but afford no Proof, that it is required of Men in a State of Unregeneracy. To declare to unregenerate Persons the Necessity of Faith in order to Salvation, which is what our blessed Lord here does, falls very far short of asserting it to be their present Duty *According to the Commandment of the everlasting God, the Gospel is made known to all Nations*: That Commandment refers to the Publication of the Gospel among all Nations, and not unto *the Obedience of Faith*: And it is a Discovery of Inattention in Mr. *Jackson*, that he did not observe it. It is positive Unbelief, or an Opposition to, and Rejection of, the Gospel, as *Foolishness*, that is intended in *Romans 10:16*; *1 Peter 4:17*; *2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8, 9*, which is highly criminal, and will be awfully punished by God. But what Proof arises from hence, that *special, saving Faith* is the Duty of unregenerate Men? Not the least. **2.** He attempts to prove, that *special Faith* is a Duty required by the Covenant of Works: He means by the moral Law that Covenant, because he speaks of Unbelievers being under it, as I have before observed. I deny, that the Covenant of Works requires

Believing in Christ for Salvation of any Man in the World, for the Reasons above-mentioned: And it is with some Degree of *Boldness*, that I shall insist upon this. That which requires Working for Life, as the Covenant of Works does, cannot injoin Believing unto Salvation and Life. It is wholly inconsistent with the Nature of that Covenant. But he thinks, if this Faith is not commanded by the moral Law, if it is required at all, then it must be by the Gospel, and so we shall make a Law of that. We are in no Danger of this, tho' the good Man seems to be greatly afraid of it: For, tho' we deny, that *special Faith* is required of any by the moral Law, considered as a Covenant of Works, we grant, that it requires it, considered as a Law merely, or Rule of Action, of all who are under it, and there are regenerate Persons. All others are under it, as a Covenant, and in that Form it requires it not. But I proceed to consider what the Author calls a fourth Argument:

Fourthly, For any Man to affirm, that this Faith in Christ is not required by the moral Law, is no less than in Effect to oppose and contradict the express Word of God, spoken unto us by Jesus Christ himself; by his beloved Disciple John, and by the great Apostle Paul. This is not a new Argument; it is not distinct from, but the *same* with the Third, or at least a Conclusion arising from it, as everyone will see. The Words of the Apostle *John*, which he produces, are these: *And this is his Commandment that we should believe on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ.* It is granted, that God requires regenerate Persons to act Faith on Christ: for Salvation; none deny it. The Author's Reasoning must be this: God requires those who are born again to exercise *special Faith* in Christ, therefore, he commands unregenerate Men who hear of him to act *saving Faith* in him: Or, his Reasoning must stand thus: We who are Believers, and not under the Law, as a Covenant of Works, but as a Rule of Conduct, are required to receive Christ for Salvation, therefore, Unbelievers, who are under the Law, as a Covenant. are commanded to believe in Christ to the Salvation of the Soul. The bare mention of which, I suppose, will be acknowledged a sufficient Refutation of it. The Words of the Apostle *Paul*, which are brought to prove the Point, are these: *Now the End of the Commandment is Charity out of a pure Heart, and of a good Conscience, and of Faith unfeigned* (1 Timothy 1:5). If by the Commandment is intended the *Ministration of the Gospel*, as it is in 1 Timothy 6:14, then the Gospel, and not the Law, is that whereof the Apostle speaks: But I will not now insist upon that Sense, tho' something might be offered from the Context in Favour of it, because I will cut off all Cause of a Charge of *Evasion*. Be it so then, that the Commandment means the Law, it must not be understood as a Covenant of Works, as Unbelievers are under it; but as a Rule of Action, in which Sense Believers are under it: For, as a Covenant of Works, it knows nothing at all of a pure and sanctified Heart by the Grace of God, nor of a good, that is, a Conscience purged from Sin by the Blood of Christ, nor of unfeigned Faith in Christ for Salvation; there Things are not the End of the Law, as a Covenant of Works; but

perpetual Purity of Mind and constant perfect Obedience in Life, unto all its Precepts. They are the End of it, as a Law merely, or Rule of Action unto the Saints, in which Sense only they are under it, and not as a Covenant. Nor do the Words of our Lord afford any Proof of this Matter: *And have omitted the weightier Matters of the Law, Judgment, Mercy, and Faith (Matthew 23:23)*. Trust in God, as the Upholder and Preferer of his Creatures, and as a bountiful Benefactor to them, and *Credit* to his Word, or a Belief of the Truth, Importance, Wisdom, and Holiness of whatever he reveals, is that Faith, which the Covenant of Works requires; but not Faith in Christ for Salvation. For, *the Law is not of Faith*, in that Sense. *Obey, and live, are the Command, and the Promise of that Covenant: Not believe, and be saved*. The Consequences, which the Author draws from the Denial of special Faith in Christ for Salvation being a Duty contained in, or required by the Covenant of Works, are *merely imaginary*. No Liberty is hereby given to Men to transgress the righteous Precepts of the first Covenant. *They may not plunder their Neighbour, and fall to Cutting of Throats, because special Faith in Christ, is not their Duty*. What the Author expresses of this Kind in several Places, is nothing but *Rant*, not *Reasoning*. And it is an *extremely unkind*, and also a *most false Insinuation of his, that I think Believers are freed from the Obligation of the moral Law*. Freed from it, as a Covenant, they are; if not, they are under its Curse. But, there is no one Principle, that I more firmly believe, than I do this, that Believers are *now*, and eternally will be under the moral Law, as a Rule of Action; nor shall I ever think otherwise, unless, I should happen to fall into such a *wretched Infatuation*, as to imagine, *that there is no God, and that Believers are not Creatures*. This leads me to his sixth Argument. ***Sixthly, Such a Faith and Repentance, Love, and Fear of God, as are no Duties required by the Law of God, can have no Concern at all in the Holiness and Happiness of Men.*** 1. The Covenant of Works now requires of its subjects, and it required of *Adam*, Faith, but not Faith in Christ for Salvation; Love to God as supremely good and the Origin of Blessedness, but not, as *the God of all Grace*, for that Covenant makes no such Discovery of him. A Fear, or Reverence of God, as a Being possessed of all possible and infinite Perfections; but not a Fear of him, *as a Sin-pardoning God through a Mediator*, for he had no Revelation of him, as such. And in these Things his Holiness very much consisted. Repentance was not required of him in a State of Integrity, for that necessarily supposes Guilt, in the Creature of whom it is required. And, therefore, there is a Faith, a Love to God, and a Fear of him, which bear no Relation to the Evangelical Scheme of Salvation by *Jesus Christ*, wherein the Holiness and Happiness of Man have a Concern. And, there are Duties required of all Men. 2. The Covenant of Works, by Implication, requires Repentance: And to repent and turn to God is the Duty of all Men; it would have been so, if no Provision had been made for the Salvation of one Individual of Mankind. Yea, it is the Duty of the *Devil*, of *all the Devils in Hell*, to repent and turn unto God, by

Obedience, though they never will. 3. I most freely allow, that Faith in Christ for Salvation, Evangelical Repentance, Love to God in a Mediator, and a holy Reverence of him, as a new Covenant-God, are Duties of the moral Law, though not, as it is in the Form of a Covenant; but as a Rule of Conduct to Believers, who are under it as a Law, but are not under it as a Covenant; in that Sense the Law is *dead* to them, they are *dead* to it, and none of the Acting's of the gracious Principle in them is Obedience to the Covenant of Works. I am fully of Opinion with Dr. *Owen*, who says: *There are some Graces, some Duties belonging unto Evangelical Holiness, which the Law knows nothing of: Such are the Mortification of Sin, godly Sorrow, daily Cleansing of our Hearts and Minds; not to mention the more sublime and spiritual Acts of Communion with God by Christ, with all that Faith and Love, which is required towards him. For although these Things may be contained in the Law radically, as it requires universal Obedience unto God, yet they are not so formally.*

And it is not used as the Means to beget Faith and Holiness in us: This is the Effect of the Gospel only. An Answer is before given unto what he offers under this Argument, to prove, that the holy Principle in *Adam*, and the gracious Principle in Believers, are the same; and also unto what he advances to prove, that the Life promised in the Covenant of Works is the very same with that Life, which is provided and promised in the *new* Covenant; this Argument may therefore be dismissed. Proceed we now unto the Seventh:

Seventhly, It is no where declared, affirmed, nor taught in the Word of God, that Faith in Christ is not a Duty; or that it is not the Duty of those to whom he is made known to believe in Christ. I have never yet found the Place where it is written, it is not the Duty of those who have a Bible to believe in Christ. Doth not the Author know, that he who affirms is to prove, and, that, if Proof cannot be given of what is affirmed, it is reasonable and just to embrace the Negative? This Argument seems to be formed merely to add to the Number of his Arguments, and for the Sake of laying something, whether to Purpose, or to no Purpose. What if a Papist should ask him, if he hath anywhere read in the Scripture, that *Bells are not to be baptized*? I believe he could not point out the Place where it is so written. Would he, for that Reason, grant to the Papist, that the Baptizing of Bells is lawful? I am persuaded he would not. I am not a little surpris'd, that the Editor suffered such Impertinency, to be exposed to public View. In the Revisal of any Piece for Publication, Amendment of Style, and the Correction of *Peccadilloes*, in Language, are of small Importance, unto expunging what the Public will deem impertinent to the Case argued. Indeed I must confess, that, if, this Method had been taken with this Piece, very little would have been left for the World to see. But my Suprize is much heightened, by what is advanced to prove the Absurdity of an Objection unto his Opinion, *viz.* this,

Eighthly, The only Argument produced to prove, that Faith in Christ is not a Duty, (he means the Duty of unregenerate Men) is both unscriptural and utterly destructive of all true Religion. Both natural and revealed. This Objection, then, is a *Blow at the Root*, and, if you will believe him, there are no Principles *so bad*, nor any Practices *so vile*, but what may be defended eternally by it. Doubtless, your Curiosity is much excited to know, what this Objection can be, which is calculated to serve every *impious* Purpose. The Objection, as he states it, is: *Adam had not Faith in Christ, nor was obliged to have it before the Fall; and neither did nor could lose it, either for himself, or for his Offspring, and, therefore, none of his fallen Posterity are obliged to believe in Christ.* I do not know, that any one Person in the World ever objected thus, unto its being the Duty of unregenerate Men to act Faith on Christ for Salvation.

The Objection, in Fact, is this: The holy Principle connatural to *Adam*, and, concreated with him, was not suited to live unto God through a Mediator; that kind of Life was above the Extent of his Powers, though perfect; and, therefore, as he in a State of Integrity had not a Capacity of living unto God, agreeably to the Nature of the *new* Covenant, it is apprehended, that his Posterity, while under the *first* Covenant, are not commanded to live unto God after that Sort, or, in other Words, to live by Faith on God, through a Mediator. Capable he was of receiving a Revelation from God of other Truths, than what are contained in the *first* Covenant, if it had been the Pleasure of God to make such a Revelation unto him. He was able to give an Assent, to the Truth, of what God should please to reveal to him, and had a Capacity of reverentially regarding Truths divinely revealed to him, though not included in that Covenant, wherein he was to walk with, and live unto God. And I would observe,

1. He did not become incapable of receiving a Revelation of *new* Truths from God, nor of yielding an Assent unto them, nor could he, without he lost his Reason and became a *Brute*. And, therefore, *Heresy*, and *Deism*, are not at all countenanced by this Objection, much less will it clear all the *Deists* and *Infidels* in the World of all Sin, and secure them from Punishment, which the Author, says it will. I am amazed, and cannot Possibly conjecture, for what Reason, the Editor suffered such Stuff as this is to come abroad into the World. Surely, the End could not be, that the Writer might be exposed to Contempt.

2. Nor, does this Objection give the least Support to *Arminianism*, though *Arminius* was convinced of its Truth. For, if *pure* Nature was not furnished with a Power of believing in Christ, much less is *corrupted* Nature. All the Use that *Arminius* could make of it, was only to urge it as a Difficulty upon those *Calvinists*, who maintain, that Faith in Christ is required of all Men, upon Pain of eternal Damnation, who hear the Gospel. Many of them in order to get clear of this Difficulty, endeavored to prove, that *Adam* had a Power of believing in him. And, that, therefore, this Faith

may justly be required of Men, because the Loss of Power for that Act is the Consequence of Sin. If Proof could be given, that *Adam* had such Power, their Reasoning is most certainly right. But the Truth is, this is a Difficulty, that is *insuperable*, upon the Scheme of *Arminius*, though he did not discern it. For, if that holy Principle of Operation, which *Adam* had, was not sufficient for, nor suited unto the Act of Faith on Christ, as a Saviour, it undeniably follows, that, without Existence is given unto a Principle of Operation, which in its Nature is fitted and disposed unto that Act, in the Hearts of Men, they neither can, nor ever will believe to the Saving of the Soul. *All kind of Assistances whatsoever will eternally, be insufficient for producing an Act, in any Subject, who hath not a Principle of Operation, in its Nature agreeable to the Act.* And, consequently, if this Opinion is true, the whole Scheme of *Arminianism* must fall to the Ground. Sometimes, Men of great Abilities, designing to clog an adversary with a Difficulty, advance that, which embarrasses themselves, as much, or more, than it does those whom they oppose. Whereof this is an Instance. I should not desire any greater Advantage against *Arminianism* to be granted, than this is, that, *Adam*, in his innocent State had not Power to believe in Christ, as a Saviour; that is to say, that he had not a Principle of Operation, in its Nature ruttet to that Act. For, that being allowed, it follows by necessary Consequence, that, unless such a Principle is created and infused into the Minds of Men, the Act of Faith in Christ will be impossible to them, whatever Helps, Impulses, and Excitations they may receive. And, therefore, the Opinion of conditional Election, conditional Redemption, of Free-will in Man to Good, *etc.* must unavoidably sink. In a Word, by this one Thing being granted, with much Ease the whole *Arminian* Scheme may be demolished.

3. Nor, is any Encouragement given to *Antinomian* Principles and Practices, by the Opinion, that *Adam* in a State of Integrity, had not a Power, of living unto God, according to the *new* Covenant. Ability he had of living unto God according to the *first* Covenant, and it is the Duty of his Descendants, who remain under that Covenant, so to live unto him.

4. Neither, Is God, by it, *precluded* from demanding Satisfaction for the Breach of the Law. For, though human Nature, is incapable of making Satisfaction for Sin, by Suffering, capable it is of Suffering, and it is just with God to make it suffer, and that forever; because no Satisfaction arises to Law and Justice, by all the Sufferings it is able to endure. And such Obedience is still due from Men, as the Law requires, because, though they have not Power to yield it, that Power was lost in Consequence of Sin, on the Part of Man.

5. And, therefore, The Undertaking, Obedience, Sacrifice, and Satisfaction of Christ for us, is not *totally subverted forever*, by this Opinion, which our Writer says it is. It does not deny, that Obedience is due from us to the holy Law of God; it does not suppose, that we are unable to suffer Punishment, though we cannot satisfy the Law,

by what we suffer; and, consequently, for any Thing, that, this Opinion implies, God might require, as he graciously has required, Obedience of Christ as our Surety, and his Offering himself a Sacrifice to atone for our Guilt, with a View to our Justification . But I am ashamed to dwell upon the Refutation of such *senseless* Stuff as this is. I think it exceeds, in *Impertinence* and *Extravagance*, any Thing, that I ever read, in the Course of my Life, to this Time. Surely, the Author, could not hope to be believed, when he says: *It Justifies the Principles and Practice of the Deist, Socinian, Arminian, Antinomian, and Libertine, and saves us the Labor of disputing any longer, whether it is our Duty to believe in Christ; for it leaves us no Christ to believe in, nor any Thing for which to believe in him.* What can be said of this? But that the Author *is transported* through Heat, and a much-mistaken Conception of Things, *quite beyond his Reason.* I shall not trespass any farther on your Patience, in animadverting on this Piece; I suppose it wholly needless to add any Thing more, by Way of Answer unto what is advanced by that Author. ***It will be very agreeable to me, if Christophilus pleases, that you, Philagathus, should now offer, to our Consideration, what you apprehend may heal the Breach between us, and be a lasting Foundation of our mutual Friendship.***

Christophilus. I am not less inclined to give Attention to you, *Philagathus*, with the same View.

Philagathus. *I shall most gladly attend unto this Service;* and, if I may be instrumental to bring you, my dear Brethren, unto a Reconciliation, it will give me a much greater Degree of Pleasure, than I can express. ***Some Motives unto Love and Unity between you I beg Leave to mention.***

I. You both hold the Head, or are agreed in every fundamental Point. I must tell you, *Philaethes*, that *Christophilus* resolves the *Whole* of Salvation into the *free, sovereign* Love and Mercy of God. He believes Election to be an Act of *sovereign* Mercy in God, and that all Holiness, in the Persons chosen, is the *Result*, and not the *Cause*, of that Decree, He is persuaded, that the Covenant of Grace, from everlasting, was made with Christ, as the *Head of the Elect*, and with them *in him, as his Seed*: That, therefore, they then stood *related* to him, in Virtue of that *federal* Transaction; and speaks of this, as a *Fountain* and *fundamental* Union between Christ and the Elect. He denies, the *universal* Extent of Christ's Death, affirms that to be a *pestilent Heresy*, and maintains, the Reality and Persecution of Satisfaction for the Sins of all the Elect, by the Sacrifice of Christ: That Right to Forgiveness is the *proper, and immediate* Effect of his Death, tho' that Right is not *actionable* by the Persons for whom it is obtained, until they believe. He says, that there is no such *Placability*, or Reconcilableness, in God, as the Effect of Christ's Death, which some speak of: That this *Placability is neither in the Covenant of Works, nor in the Covenant of Grace; that is, that truly it is not at all.* But Peace with God is made, and that Reconciliation itself is effected, by the Sacrifice of Christ. He *strenuously* insists

upon it, that the Righteousness of Christ is the *sole* Matter of our Justification before God; and denies, that there is a Free-Will in Men, naturally, to Good; and, therefore, is firmly of Opinion, that the Grace of God alone can purify their Hearts, and make them *meet* for Heaven; that it is certainly *effectual* unto that important End in all the Elect, and that this good Work will be *performed in them all until the Day of Christ*, and, consequently, their Salvation is not *precarious, but sure and certain*. Now, *Philalethes*, since *Christophilus* is fully persuaded of the Truth of these Things, you cannot have just Reason to charge him with any Mistakes, which affect the *Essentials* of Christianity, tho' his Apprehensions are different from yours, respecting some Points, which have been before mentioned; and, therefore, it is your indispensable Duty to esteem and love him, as a Brother in Christ.

I pray you, *Christophilus*, permit me to observe some Things to you concerning *Philalethes*. He believes that the Elect of God are under the Covenant of Works, *until they are regenerated*, and stand *condemned* by it, notwithstanding their *federal* Union with Christ, and the *secret* Acceptation of their Persons with God, through him, the *Beloved*. That they are not, *as to themselves* in a *Manifest* State of Justification, nor can *know and plead* their Right, to Pardon, Impunity, and Life. This Right *actually subsists*; but by them, it is not *actionable*, even in the Opinion of *Philalethes*, and, consequently, no Countenance is by him given unto *carnal Confidence and Presumption* in Men. He believes, as firmly as you do, the *absolute* Necessity of Regeneration and Sanctification, or that, *without Holiness, no Man shall see the Lord*. And, he is fully persuaded, that the moral Law continues in the whole of its Force. That unregenerate Men are under it, as a Covenant, and, by it, are obliged unto all that Obedience, which, as a Covenant, it requires: That the Regenerate are under it, as a Law, or a *binding* Rule of Conduct, and that the Compass of their Duty is not *lessened*, but, on the contrary, *greatly enlarged*, by that *new* Revelation of God, which the *new* Covenant gives. And, therefore, when you pronounce him an *Antinomian*, you abuse him. Besides, he neglects not to *preach the Law*, he explains its Precepts, vindicates the Equity of its Curse, treats of the Nature of the Punishment, it threatens for Sin, and demonstrates the Justice of that Constitution. Nay, he affirms, that *none can well understand the Grace of the Gospel, without an Acquaintance with the true Nature of, the Doctrine, of the Covenant of Works*. What Reason, therefore, can you possibly have to treat him unkindly? I am free to tell you plainly, that it is your Duty to cherish Affection for him, as a Brother, in the Lord. For, wherein, his Sentiments differ from yours, no *Fundamental* Principle, I am certain, is in the least affected. And, though, he differs from you, in thinking, that *special* Faith in Christ is not a Duty enjoined by the Covenant of Works: He believes the *Necessity* of that Faith in order to Salvation, and agrees with you fully, in respect to the *Author, Object, Nature, Fruits, and*

Effects of it. So that, there is no just Cause of *ill* Resentment against him, on that Account, or indeed on any other.

II. *If you, Christophilus, think of gaining the Esteem of such who are somewhat inclined to Baxterianism, or Arminianism, by censuring Philalethes, for what you account Peculiarities in him, you will find yourself mistaken.* For, provided you continue to insist upon it, which I believe you will, that the *Infusion* of a gracious Principle, into the Hearts of Men, is *Pre-requisite* unto gracious Acts; and that Right to Pardon and Life is the *immediate* Effect of Christ's Death, with respect to all those for whom he died; how, much, so ever, they may *fatter* you, for condemning the *Peculiarities* of *Philalethes*, I know, that you will never find them your *heartly* Friends. The Difference between you and them is *fundamental*, but the Difference between you and *Philalethes* is not so. No *essential* Point is affected, if he is mistaken, wherein he differs from you.

III. Let me intreat you both to consider how numerous they are already, who oppose those important Principles, wherein you are agreed, and that the Number of such is every Day increasing. **If that Consideration hath** its proper Weight with you, I think, that you cannot long keep at a *disrespectful* Distance from one another. Those *bold* Attacks, which are made upon Principles, that you both esteem *fundamental*, should cause you *heartily* to unite in their Defense, while you agree to differ in *lesser* Matters.

IV. *Take into your most serious Consideration, from what Spring of Action, your mutual Animosity arises.* It is not the *Spirit*, or the gracious Principle in you, but the *Flesh*, and, therefore, you ought to be *ashamed* of it, and *humbled* for it before God, as a great Offence unto him, who is a God of Love, and Peace.

V. *Are you not Subjects of the same Grace? Objects of the same Love? Children of the same Divine Father? Members of the same spiritual Head? And are you not embarked in the same Cause?* Do you not both aim to advance the Glory of the Grace of God, as the *entire* Cause of Salvation? Are you not both concerned to promote the Interest of Holiness, to the *Praise, and Glory of God*, by *Jesus Christ*? What a *Shame* then is it, for you, who agree in there important Views, to *cherish Wrath* in your breasts, one against another, because of some lesser Differences, in your Apprehensions, wherein, no one *fundamental* Principle is affected? Surely, you may allow one another Liberty of Thought, and Freedom of *modest* Expression, upon those subjects, about which, your Conceptions are not exactly alike. Be *scrupulously* cautious, in what Manner you express yourselves. My Meaning is, be sure to use *sound Speech that cannot be condemned*. If I may be permitted to say it without Offence, you have both been *too much wanting*, in this very necessary Caution, and have made Use of such Phrases, as are at least *capable* of an *ill* Construction, and which may be taken in a *bad* Sense, though, your Meaning hath been *good, and*

wholesome. Not only take Care, that your Thoughts be *just*, but also to express them in such Language, as will need no Explication *to qualify* it.

And I beseech you, forbear charging one another with *dangerous* Consequences, which you neither allow, nor do *naturally* arise from your differing Sentiments. In Disputes, this sometimes is done, unto a great Discovery of the *Weakness* of the Head, or *Badness* of the Heart, of the *heated* Disputant. And, the Effect, thereof, cannot be good. I am sorry, that I have Reason to say it, *neither* of you are fully clear in this Matter. And, lastly, ***For I must conclude, well consider how excellent, and beautiful, Unity among Christians is.*** It is *ornamental* to their Profession, *pleasing* unto God, and greatly *advantageous* to themselves. If you fail not of your Duty, in this Thing, I am persuaded, that, your *mutual* Anger will *subside*, and a lasting Friendship be renewed, between you. I close my *humble* Advice, with the *elegant* Commendation, which the Spirit of God, gives of Peace and Concord among the Saints: *Behold how good and how pleasant, it is for Brethren to dwell together in Unity. It is like the precious Ointment upon the Head, that ran down upon the Beard, even Aaron's Beard, that went down to the Skirts of his Garments. As the Dew of Hermon, and as the Dew that descended upon the Mountains of Zion; for there the Lord commanded the Blessing, even Life for evermore (Psalm 133).*