

Monergism

**TWO SOLEMN
COVENANTS MADE
BETWEEN GOD
AND MAN**

THE COVENANT OF WORKS
AND THE COVENANT OF GRACE

EDMUND CALAMY

Monergism

**TWO SOLEMN
COVENANTS MADE
BETWEEN GOD
AND MAN**

THE COVENANT OF WORKS
AND THE COVENANT OF GRACE

EDMUND CALAMY

The background of the lower half of the cover features a series of thin, golden, wavy lines that create a sense of movement and depth, resembling a stylized wave or a ribbon. The lines are set against a light, neutral background, and their overall effect is one of elegance and grace.

Two Solemn Covenants Made Between God and Man:

The Covenant of Works, And the Covenant of Grace.

by Edmund Calamy

These sacred pacts are elucidated, distinguished, and defended against numerous perilous doctrines. The proper understanding of them shall prove highly beneficial to those who have passed through the initial covenant and are firmly rooted in the second, especially during the Sacrament.

"Therefore as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous." - Romans 5:18, 19.

The Law was bestowed upon us by Moses, but grace and truth emanated through Jesus Christ. - John 1:16.

January 15, 1646.

Sanctioned.

John Downname.

London, Printed for Thomas Banks, and available for purchase at Blackfriars, near the summit of Bridewell stairs, and in Westminster Hall, at the establishment bearing the Seal sign, in the year 1647.

Two Solemn Covenants Made Between God and Man

The Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace, are now unveiled, distinguished, and defended against various perilous and destructive notions.

There exist several viewpoints concerning the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace, causing great confusion among many Christians. Some assert that there are four Covenants, two of Works and two of Grace: the first with Adam before the Fall and the second with Israel upon their return from Egypt. The Covenants of Grace, they say, include one with Abraham and another at the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. This assertion was made by Mr. Simpson before a Committee of the Assembly of Divines, witnessed by me. Others contend that there are only three Covenants: one with Adam, one with Israel upon leaving Egypt, and a third with Jesus Christ. According to them, the first two are Covenants of Works, and the last one is of Grace. This view was conveyed by Mr. Burroughs during his Exposition Sermon in Cornhill, in my presence. Some maintain that there are only two Covenants, one of Works and the other of Grace. They argue that the first Covenant was made with Israel at Mount Sinai, with no Covenant of Works preceding it. They assert that the Covenant of Grace was not established until the death of Christ, the testator. James Pope affirms this in a book titled "The Unveiling of Antichrist." Others, including myself, believe there are only two Covenants: one of Works, with the Tree of Life as a Sacrament or symbol of it, made with Adam before his Fall, and extended to all his descendants who inherit his nature. In this Covenant, if Adam had

remained faithful, he would have conveyed his righteousness and holiness to all his descendants. However, when he sinned, his entire human lineage became tainted by his transgression. He received a Covenant both for himself and his descendants, and by breaking it, he brought guilt not only upon himself but also upon all his progeny. Consequently, no one is pure; "How can he be clean that is born of a woman?" (Job 25:4). Thus, human nature is defiled, and every mouth is silenced concerning the Covenant, for the entire world stands guilty before God (Romans 3:19). "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23). "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned" (Romans 5:12). Hence, all by nature bear the pollution and guilt of Adam's sin and are liable to the curses and penalties due for breaching that Covenant.

Yet, there was also a Covenant of grace that God the Father established with Jesus Christ from eternity, intended to save some of Adam's descendants. Had this Covenant not been prepared and ready to take effect at the very moment of Adam's Fall, God's justice would have instantly seized upon the entire creation under Heaven and reduced them to nothingness. But then, Jesus Christ appeared with the Covenant in hand, saying, "Be gracious unto him, and deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom" (Job 33:24). Now, I shall demonstrate that the Covenant of Grace was made with Jesus Christ from eternity, serving as a divine contract or plan between God the Father and God the Son, who assumed the role of mediator for the salvation of the Elect.

Firstly, if God the Father promised eternal life before the foundation of the world when no creature existed, this promise must have been made to Jesus Christ, our mediator. Indeed, God promised eternal

life before the world began (Titus 1:2). Therefore, it must have been made to Jesus Christ, our mediator, before the world's creation.

Secondly, if Jesus Christ was ordained for this purpose from all eternity, then the Covenant of grace was established with Him before the world even existed. As Christ Himself attests, "I was established from everlasting, from the beginning, before the world began. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills, I was brought forth; while as yet He had not made the earth or the fields, or the primal dust of the world. When He prepared the heavens, I was there; when He drew a circle on the face of the deep, when He established the clouds above, when He strengthened the fountains of the deep, when He assigned to the sea its limit, so that the waters would not transgress His command, then I was beside Him as a master craftsman" (Proverbs 8:23-30). This cannot refer to Christ as God, for who could appoint Him or assign Him a task? Thus, it follows that the Covenant of grace was made with Jesus Christ as the Mediator, for He is the one whom God the Father has sealed (John 6:27).

Thirdly, if it was decreed before the world's creation that Christ would come and die for sinners, then the Covenant of grace was made with Him to save a specific number from all eternity. As Peter proclaimed, "Kings and rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against His Christ, to do whatever Your hand and Your purpose determined before to be done" (Acts 4:26-28). Moreover, "you were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, who indeed was foreordained before the foundation of the world" (1 Peter 1:18-20). Therefore, the Covenant of grace was indeed made with Jesus Christ before the world began.

Fourthly, if God appointed a specific time for Christ to come and redeem those under the Law so that they might receive adoption as sons, then the Covenant of grace was made with Jesus Christ from all eternity. This is undoubtedly true (Galatians 4:3-4). Therefore, the second statement is equally valid. This is further evident in God's proclamation when sending His firstborn Son into the world: "Let all the angels of God worship Him" (Hebrews 1:6), and to men, He declared, "This is My beloved Son, hear Him" (Matthew 17:3-5; 17:5). Thus, the Covenant of grace was established with Him.

Fifthly, if God declares of Christ, "Behold, My Servant whom I uphold, My Elect One in whom My soul delights; I have put My Spirit upon Him; He will bring forth justice to the Gentiles. He will not cry out, nor raise His voice, nor cause His voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed He will not break, and smoking flax He will not quench; He will bring forth justice for truth. He will not fail nor be discouraged, till He has established justice in the earth; and the coastlands shall wait for His law. I, the Lord, have called You in righteousness, and will hold Your hand; I will keep You and give You as a covenant to the people, as a light to the Gentiles" (Isaiah 42:1, 4-7), then it is undeniable that the Covenant of grace must have been made with Jesus Christ. This is supported by further passages such as, "You are My servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified. Then I said, 'I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for nothing and in vain; yet surely my just reward is with the Lord, and my work with my God.' And now the Lord says, who formed Me from the womb to be His Servant, to bring Jacob back to Him, so that Israel is gathered to Him (for I shall be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and My God shall be My strength), indeed He says, 'It is too small a thing that You should be My Servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved ones of Israel; I will also give You as a light to the Gentiles, that You should be My salvation to the ends of the

earth" (Isaiah 49:6, 7, 8, 9). Therefore, the new covenant was indeed made with Jesus Christ.

Sixthly, if the Lord looked down from Heaven and saw that there was no one to intercede, and His own arm brought salvation, sustaining Him by His righteousness, then this must necessarily be Jesus Christ with whom the Covenant of grace was made. This is evident from passages like Isaiah 59:16, 63:1, and Psalm 89:19. Thus, it is clear that the Covenant of grace was established with Jesus Christ.

Seventhly, if Christ became our surety, was bruised for our iniquities, and bore the chastisement of our peace, resulting in our healing through His stripes, then the new Covenant must have been made with Him. This truth is supported by Scriptures such as Hebrews 7:21, Isaiah 53:3, 5, and 1 Peter 3:18. Consequently, the second statement is valid.

Eighthly, if Christ is the messenger of the Covenant, and all the promises are made in Him, and there is no other name given by which we can be saved, then the Covenant must have been made with Him. This is evident from passages like Malachi 3:1, 2 Corinthians 1:20, and Acts 4:12. Thus, the Covenant of grace was indeed made with Jesus Christ.

Ninthly, if God has promised to Christ that He will see His seed, and that the pleasure of the Lord will prosper in His hand, and if we are chosen, adopted, accepted, gathered, and blessed in Christ, with our names written in His book of life, then the Covenant must have been made with Christ. This is confirmed by Scriptures such as Isaiah 53:10, Ephesians 1:3, 4, 5, 6, 10, and Revelation 13:8. Therefore, it is undeniable that the Covenant of grace was established with Jesus Christ.

The next aspect to consider is how we are delivered from the defilement and guilt of our state in which we are born and exist under the covenant of works. I answer, the holiness of Jesus Christ's person sanctifies our own unholiness. He is referred to as the holy child Jesus (Acts 4:30) and "that holy thing" (Luke 1:35). He is both the Son of God and the Son of Man, yet not two separate sons but one Son of God or one Christ. Although He took on our human nature, it was not through human generation but conceived by the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:36). Therefore, He was not conceived and born in sin as we are. For our sake, Christ says, "I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified" (John 17:19). Thus, it is through His holiness that we become holy, just as through Adam's sinfulness, we became sinful.

Secondly, through the merits of Christ's obedience to the covenant of works, He has freed His people from the guilt of their disobedience to that covenant. He was made under the Law to redeem those who are under the Law (Galatians 4:4-5). Christ's obedience to the covenant of works consisted of two aspects: first, His active obedience to that covenant, wherein He fulfilled it without any stain of sin. He affirmed of His obedience to the Father, "I do always those things that please Him" (John 8:29). He completed the work that His Father gave Him to do (John 17:4), and His Father declared, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matthew 3:15). Thus, the perfect obedience of Jesus Christ atoned for all the disobedience of His people to the covenant of works. Second, another part of Christ's obedience was passive, as He endured the penalty due to us for our disobedience to that covenant. Despite being the Son, He learned obedience through suffering (Hebrews 5:8), and in becoming perfect, He became the author of salvation for all who obey Him (Hebrews 5:9, 2:10). It was necessary for Christ to suffer and rise from the dead on the third day (Luke 24:26, 46). Christ has once

suffered for sins, the Just for the unjust, to bring us to God (1 Peter 3:18). He, who knew no sin and in whose mouth no deceit was found, endured the pains of hell alone (1 Peter 2:25). He trod the winepress of His Father's wrath, and there was no one with Him (Isaiah 63:3). He cried out as the anguish of hell seized Him, saying, "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?" Given the dignity of His person, being both God and Man in one Christ, His humanity's brief suffering made His obedience so meritorious that it freed us from the guilt and penalty due to us for violating that covenant.

In the next place, I am to explain how we enter into this new covenant with Jesus Christ. I answer, it is solely through faith. Faith is the grace on our part through which we are grafted into the second Adam (Romans 5:2, Galatians 3:26, 2:16). In this way, we enter into this covenant just as by nature, we are in the first Adam and his covenant. "He who believes in Christ shall not perish but have eternal life" (John 3:15, 16). "He who has the Son has life" (1 John 5:22). "Only believe" (Mark 5:36). By being justified through faith, we find peace with God (Romans 5:1). Just as through Adam's offense, judgment came upon all in his nature to condemnation, so through the righteousness of Christ, the free gift came to all who are in Him by faith, leading to justification of life (Romans 5:18). Faith, uniting us with Christ as the head and us as the members (1 Corinthians 12:12), causes all of Christ's active and passive obedience to become ours through imputation. Likewise, all our sinfulness and guiltiness become His, and as our surety, He takes upon Himself the payment of all our debts. Through our matrimonial union with Him, all His riches become ours (Hebrews 7:22). With the key of faith, we draw daily new grace from His treasury of grace to sanctify us increasingly until we reach our full measure according to the gift of Christ.

Thus, I have shown with whom the two covenants were made: the covenant of works with Adam, a mere man, and the covenant of grace with Jesus Christ, who is both God and Man. I have also discussed when they were made: one with Adam as soon as he was created, and the other with Jesus Christ from all eternity. Additionally, I have explained how all individuals enter into these two covenants. First, all people enter into Adam's covenant by nature, but only the Elect enter into Christ's covenant through grace. Furthermore, I have shown how Adam, through his breach of the covenant, defiled all his descendants and brought guilt upon them. In contrast, Jesus Christ sanctifies us through the holiness of His nature and acquits and justifies us from all our guilt through His active and passive obedience, perfectly fulfilling the covenant of works. If all of humanity is encompassed in one of these two covenants, it necessarily follows that God never made any other covenant regarding the eternal state of mankind. I have demonstrated that all people by nature enter into Adam's covenant, except Jesus Christ, who did not come into the world through ordinary means. They all remain in that covenant until Jesus Christ frees them from the covenant of works and establishes them in the covenant of grace. Therefore, God has never made any other covenant concerning the eternal state of mankind besides these two.

Now some will object and say God made a covenant with Abraham, Gen. 17. and another with Israel at their return out of Egypt, Jer. 11.3, 4. Deut. 4.13. and a third or new covenant at the death of Christ the testator, Heb. 8.8.10. and some deny the covenant of works with Adam in the time of his creation and the covenant of grace with Jesus Christ made from all eternity, affirming, there was no covenant made with man before Israel's return from Egypt, and this they call the covenant of works, and no covenant of grace made before the death of Christ, and this they call the covenant of grace; now when I

have answered these objections, I hope I shall give some satisfaction to those that are troubled with so many several opinions touching the covenant of grace and the covenant of works made with the two Adams, representing all mankind.

For answer to the first objection, if God made a covenant with Abraham, and that also a covenant of grace, then it will follow that God made two covenants of grace, and then we must have two redeemers, and if one of them was made to Abraham, this is to make him who saith he is but dust and ashes, Gen. 18. to be one of those redeemers or saviors who was but a poor creature himself, but they will say, to Abraham and Christ were the promises made, Gal. 3.16. I answer, as one King makes a league or covenant with another by an Ambassador, so Abraham represented Christ, for the promise of eternal life was made before the world began, Titus 12. therefore before Abraham had his being, or it may be answered thus: Abraham received the sign or token of this covenant, Gen. 17.10, 11. when as the covenant it self was made with Christ from all eternity, and those elect that fall in every age of the world since Adams fall God hath been in Christ, not in Abraham, reconciling them to himself, 2 Cor. 5.19, 20. and if Abraham should stand for all the Elect to receive a covenant for them, then he should stand for them with an Image also without sin, to answer for their lost Image by Adam; but this he could not do because he was defiled with sin as other men, then the covenant of grace was not made with him but with Christ, who took upon him our nature and our infirmities and yet without sin, Heb. 4.15. so then Abraham received circumcision the token of the covenant, but himself was saved by his faith in Christ, for saith Christ, Abraham saw my day and was glad, John 8.56. it was Christ that was given for a covenant, he is the redeemer of Israel that holy one, Isa. 49.7, 8. it was Christ's righteousness that was imputed unto to him and received by faith when he received the sign of

circumcision, Rom. 4.11. and Abraham did but receive a further confirmation of the covenant of grace made with Christ before the world was by the sign of circumcision when God took in that Nation into the visible Church, so much for answer to this objection.

Object. 2. Some object and say the Law at Mount Sinai was a covenant of grace, and others say it was a covenant of works, but I shall prove that it was neither, but only given to those that were in covenant as a rule of obedience, so runs the preface, I am the Lord thy God, that is by the covenant of grace made with Jesus Christ and confirmed to Abraham, therefore thou shalt have none other God's but me, and in all those places where doing is required it is first said, I am the Lord your God, therefore ye shall keep my Statutes and judgments, which if a man do, he shall live in them, Deut. 18.2.4.5. Exod. 2.1. and saith the Lord God in the day that I chose Israel and made myself known to them in the land of Egypt, saying, I am the Lord your God, then it follows, I gave them my Statutes and shown them my Judgments, which if a man do he shall even live in them, Ezekell 20.5.11. Thus they were in covenant before the rule of obedience was given, for the Law is not of faith, but the man that doth them shall live in them, Gal. 3.12. that is, he that obeyeth that rule being in the new covenant by faith in Christ shall live, yet not for his doing but for his believing, Rev. 5.1, 2. Gal. 3.26. it was given as a glass to see their sin, James 1.23, 24, 25. by the Law is the knowledge of sin, see Rom. 3.20.7.7. it was given them as a schoolmaster to drive them to Christ, Gal. 3.24. as the pursuer of blood drove the murderer to the City of refuge, Joshua 20.3. then the Law at Sinai cannot be a covenant of grace.

2. If it was a covenant of grace with every particular person in Israel, this were to make them all to be their own saviors and redeemers;

but this cannot be, for with many of them God was displeased, and their carcasses fell in the wilderness.

3. The faithful amongst them were saved by their faith in Christ crucified, which the brazen Serpent signified, and they did eat the same spiritual meat with us, and drink of the same spiritual drink, for they drank of the rock which was Christ, and those that were profane are said to tempt Christ, 1. Cor. 10.4.9.

4. It is plainly said that they were in covenant with God before the Law at Sinai was given, for God is said while they were in Egypt to remember his covenant and to have respect unto them, Exod. 2.23, 24, 25. and the Lord calls himself the God of the Hebrews, and the God of Israel, and bids them say to Pharaoh, let my people go that they may serve me, and sacrifice to the Lord their. God, and I will be to you a God, and ye shall be to me a people, which is the very tenor of the covenant of grace, see Exod. 3.6, 7, 8, 9. and 5.3. and 6, 7. but Mr. Anthony Burgess (whom in respect of his great worth I much reverence, although in this particular point I dissent from him till I be convinced with more evidence of truth) saith the Law at Sinai is a covenant of grace, because it bears the name of covenant, Deut. 4.13. I answer, it bears that name from the old tenure when it was given to Adam for a covenant of works; but it will not follow that it is still a covenant no more then the calling Rahab a harlot will conclude her still to be a harlot, after her faith is so highly commended, Heb. 11. but he saith it hath the properties of a covenant, there be the parties God and Man, and it is written with penalties and promises.

I respond by saying that the covenant at Sinai was directed towards Adam; thus, those elements remained to reveal their misery due to his fall. Those who were not redeemed by Christ were still bound by that covenant, never freed from it. If it were not so, it would have

been meaningless to provide them with that old bond as a covenant to which they were still bound and condemned forever. Therefore, I assert that it was given to them for the purposes I mentioned, and not as a covenant.

However, he argues that it was a covenant of grace because God did not deal with them in absolute terms but as their God. He references Romans 9:4, which states, "To them belong the covenants, the giving of the Law and the promises."

In response, I maintain that God was in covenant with them before the Law at Mount Sinai was given. Therefore, the Law at Sinai did not bind them as a covenant, obligating them to obey it or face its penalties. Furthermore, this text distinguishes between the giving of the Law and the promises. While the Law was given as a rule, it was still referred to as a covenant. On the other hand, the people received many promises concerning Christ, which constitute the Gospel, revealing the covenant of grace. The Gospel was preached to them (Galatians 3:8; Hebrews 4:2; 1 Peter 4:6; John 8:56). However, this does not prove that the Moral Law is a covenant of grace.

He presents a second argument, suggesting that if we consider the good things associated with the covenant at Sinai, it must be a covenant of grace. He mentions that there was remission of sins and mercy extended to thousands (Exodus 20:5).

I agree that these blessings were indeed granted to those who obeyed the Law as a rule of righteousness, but not because of the Law itself. Rather, it was because they were already within the covenant of grace. All grace and comfort flow from the covenant made with Christ, not from the covenant made with Adam or its copy provided as a rule to Israel at Mount Sinai. As stated in John 1:16, "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

His third argument revolves around the duties commanded in the Law when considered in a general sense. He asserts that it must be a covenant of grace, as the first Commandment implies having one God in Christ as our God through faith.

I acknowledge that this is true for those who are already in the covenant of grace. However, the copy of Adam's covenant cannot reconcile individuals to God in Christ; that can only be accomplished through the covenant of grace. Since those in the covenant of grace are already bound by it, the Law at Sinai can command them to walk accordingly. He asks, "Shall we think that anyone can fulfill the Law without any sin or without God's grace to pardon them?" I respond, "No." The Law was not given to them or us for that purpose. It was given with a mediator, and now God accepts the will for the deed. The preface is related to the covenant of grace that preceded it. Therefore, although the Law is a perfect copy of the covenant of works, it serves a different purpose. It cannot annul the covenant of grace that was confirmed by God in Christ beforehand, nor render its promises null and void (Galatians 3:16). Thus, this copy of the Moral Law is not a covenant of grace.

His fourth argument concerns the Ceremonial Law, which many theologians say was incorporated into the Moral Law. Sacrifices were commanded under the second Commandment, and these sacrifices were seen as Evangelical and symbolized the remission of sins through the blood of Christ.

I respond by acknowledging that those who were already in the covenant of grace and who saw Christ in those sacrifices by faith may grant that the Law at Sinai commanded them to walk accordingly, as it served the covenant of grace. Similarly, the positive laws of the land are useful and serve the covenant of grace. Therefore, anyone

who violates either man's or God's law, as it is now useful to us, greatly exacerbates their sin and stores up wrath against themselves for the day of wrath. However, neither God's law nor man's law is the covenant of grace.

His fifth argument hinges on the visible seal used to ratify the covenant, which included sacrifices and sprinkling the people, symbolizing Christ as the mediator of this covenant. I respond by stating that the covenant of works with Adam did not require sacrifices for sin as a seal of that covenant. Moreover, the copy of this covenant given to Israel at Mount Sinai was not presented as a covenant but as a rule of life for those who were already in the covenant of grace. Therefore, the Moral Law at Sinai did not require sacrifices, which served as seals for the covenant of grace, not the Law at Sinai. Additionally, these seals predated the giving of the Law at Sinai. For instance, Abel's offering symbolized the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world (John 1:29), and Christ was already the true Lamb sacrificed (Revelation 13:8). Thus, it is clear that the moral Law at Sinai did not require such sacrifices, as they were meant for the ceremonial Law that contained types and shadows of Christ to come. These sacrifices pointed to Christ, with whom the covenant of grace was made from all eternity.

Regarding the Laws given at Mount Sinai, three types were provided in writing. Firstly, the eternal Moral Law in Exodus 20, which was not only written for them but also for us (Romans 15:4; 1 Corinthians 10:11). This Law applies to saints, angels, and all eternity (Psalms 119:89, 103, 20). Not one aspect of this Law will fail, and the apostles sought not to nullify it but to establish it (Romans 3:31). Secondly, there was the Judicial Law found in Exodus 21-23, which does not belong to us any more than our own laws of the land do, except when they are grounded on the Moral Law. Thirdly, there was the

Ceremonial Law in Exodus 24-31, which consisted of types and shadows of Christ. All these ceremonies ended when Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many (Hebrews 9:28; 10:11-12). The sacrifices were not seals of the Moral Law but of the ceremonial Law, representing Christ with whom the covenant of grace was established from all eternity. To further illustrate this, consider the circumstances under which the Moral Law and the ceremonial Law were given at Mount Sinai. The Moral Law was given with thunderings and earthquakes, causing the people to fear, and they requested that God not speak to them directly (Exodus 20:18-19). However, when the ceremonial Law was given, the people saw the God of Israel, and there was a pavement of sapphire under His feet, as well as a clear, heavenly body above Him. They even saw God and partook in a meal (Exodus 24:3-4, 10-11). Thus, the Moral Law was presented with darkness and terror, while the ceremonial Law was given with light and comfort. Therefore, the Moral Law cannot be considered a covenant of grace.

His sixth argument suggests that if the Law is the same covenant and oath God made with Isaac, then it must be a covenant of grace. He refers to Deuteronomy 7:12, which states that if the people hearken to these judgments and obey them, the Lord will keep the covenant and mercy He swore to their fathers.

I counter this argument by stating that if the Law at Sinai were the same as the one God swore to Isaac, it would mean that the Law and the Gospel are the same, which is not the case. However, I need not further consider this one text to refute this claim. In Deuteronomy 7:12, God says that if the people heed these judgments, which serve as the rule for their obedience, He will keep the covenant made with their fathers before the Law at Sinai was given. While the Law at Sinai is referred to as judgments, the other is called a covenant. The

term "judgments" is used in opposition to the latter, which involves oaths and promises. Therefore, the copy of the Moral Law given at Mount Sinai as a rule of obedience was not a covenant of grace.

Furthermore, Mr. Burgess mentions strong objections from Romans 10, Galatians 3:18, Romans 4:14. However, these objections are not expanded upon, and it appears that they are quite potent. He suggests that if these arguments were strictly and universally true, they might align with the beliefs of Socinians, who deny the presence of grace, faith, and Christ among the Jews. Nevertheless, this is unnecessary, as Christ was offered through the brazen Serpent, as seen in John 3:14. Moses also lamented their lack of faith, calling them a froward generation in whom there was no faith (Deuteronomy 32:20). Additionally, they were punished at Meribah due to their disbelief (Hebrews 3:19). However, faith in Christ was offered through the ceremonial Law, not the moral Law. I do not intend to exclude either the Law or the Gospel, nor do I aim to divide them in the process of a sinner's conversion. The Law reveals our misery, while the Gospel provides our remedy. Denying either of them during this process is contrary to the truth. Nevertheless, this does not establish that the Law at Sinai was a covenant of grace.

However, he argues that just as the law brings death, the gospel can be the source of death for some. He suggests that if Christ had not come, people would have had no sin. Those who despise Christ will face greater judgment than those who despised the Law. He claims that this effect is accidental due to our corruption. He also asserts that God does not bestow grace and justification in a legal manner through the Law at Sinai but rather evangelically. However, I contend that if grace was conferred, it was through the ceremonial Law and not the moral Law. At the very least, the moral Law revealed their misery, while the ceremonial Law revealed Christ as their sole

remedy. Therefore, the moral Law cannot be considered a covenant of grace.

Thirdly, he argues that although the Apostle's words may seem derogatory, they also pertain to the ceremonial law, which is acknowledged to represent Christ and grace. However, I maintain that Paul did not want to rely on his own righteousness, which comes from the moral law. Instead, he relied solely on the righteousness that comes from faith in Jesus Christ (Philippians 3:9). The righteousness obtained through the moral law is inherent in us, whereas the righteousness obtained through the gospel is in Christ and imputed to us, justifying us in God's sight. One is obtained through the first Adam, and the other through the second Adam. Whether these distinctions appear minor or significant, let the reader be the judge. Similarly, in Romans 4:13-14, it is stated that the promise to Abraham was not through the law but through the righteousness of faith. If it had been through the law, the promise of Christ or the covenant of grace would have been void. Therefore, these objections are not merely superficial, and it remains valid that the moral Law at Sinai was not a covenant of grace.

Fourthly, he acknowledges that the law can be a killing letter to those who approach it without Christ, but he questions how anyone can extract Christ from the moral law at Sinai when Christ was never presented through that law. Christ is exclusively offered in His own covenant of grace established from eternity, and the promises in Christ are unchanging (2 Corinthians 1:19). He argues that if someone had told Moses that his doctrine was a killing letter and not a doctrine of life, they would have been considered blasphemers against the law of Moses. However, I respond by stating that while the Law at Sinai served as a rule for believers to follow, those who despised it demonstrated that they were not believers and therefore

not part of the covenant of grace previously confirmed to Abraham. Thus, the law at Sinai served as a rule of life, but the gospel is the primary instrumental cause of life. Those who sin against the gospel will face severe punishment. Nevertheless, these arguments do not establish the law at Sinai as a covenant of grace.

Finally, he insists on retaining the distinction between a broad and strict interpretation of the law. However, I maintain that regardless of whether one interprets the law at Sinai broadly or strictly, it cannot be considered a covenant of grace. It was given to both them and us as a rule to live by, and we should continue to obey it to the best of our ability. However, it should not be regarded as a covenant of grace but rather as a rule of life.

Next, I shall demonstrate that the Law at Sinai was not a covenant of works. If the Lord had established a covenant of works at that time, it would have nullified the covenant of grace given 430 years earlier. If salvation came through works, it would no longer be a matter of grace (Galatians 3:17-18; Romans 11:6). However, as Paul states, the law is not against the promises of God (Galatians 3:21). Therefore, the Law at Sinai was not a covenant of works.

Secondly, if the Law at Sinai had been a covenant of works, it would have required them to save themselves through their own efforts. However, Israel's happiness lay in being saved by the Lord (Deuteronomy 33:29). Therefore, the Law at Sinai was not a covenant of works.

Thirdly, if all of mankind was already dead in sin, under the guilt and penalty of the covenant of works, they would be incapable of entering into another covenant of works. Since all people are indeed dead in sin (Ephesians 2:1; Romans 5:12; 3:19), the Law at Sinai was not

given to Israel as a covenant of works but as a rule of life, considering they were already in the covenant of grace.

Fourthly, if Israel was a unique, special, and holy people to the Lord despite being born into the world dead in sin and incapable of working for their salvation, it must have been through a covenant of grace. Israel is described as such a people (Deuteronomy 7:6), and they became such a people not by their works but by faith in the covenant of grace confirmed to Abraham 430 years earlier, not through the Law at Sinai.

Fifthly, if Israel was married to the Lord as a spouse to her husband and in the relationship of children to their Father, it was accomplished through the covenant of grace confirmed to Abraham. Israel is indeed described in such terms (Jeremiah 3:14; Isaiah 54:5; Hosea 2:19-20; Psalm 103:13; Isaiah 49:15). Therefore, the Law at Sinai served only as a rule of life and not as a covenant of works to make themselves such a people.

Sixthly, if the Lord had required those who were dead in sins and under the curse and penalty of the covenant of works to work their way out of that misery by obeying the works of that covenant, it would not have been a mercy to Israel. However, the Law at Sinai was a great mercy to Israel, as God had not dealt with any other nation in such a way, giving them His laws and statutes (Psalm 147:18-19). Thus, it was not given to them as a covenant of works like that given to Adam but as a rule of life.

Now, some may wonder why the Old Testament frequently mentions phrases like "do this and live" and "if you keep my Covenant, then you shall be a peculiar people unto me above all people" (Exodus 19:5-6). I answer that similar statements are made in the New Testament, such as "he that does the will of my Father shall come to

heaven" and "he that keeps my Commandments has a right to the tree of life and shall enter into the holy City." These passages do not negate the concept of a surety, for it is not stated that no one else shall do it on your behalf. Rather, they imply that you must do it yourself or have a surety do it for you, and then you shall live. There is also an Evangelical doing of the Law, where, with our desire and endeavor, we obey the entire Law. This applies to those in the covenant of grace, who perform all in the strength of Christ, with His perfect obedience to the Law imputed to them as if they had done it. They obey the Law not as a covenant of works but as a rule of life, and God accepts it as if they had done it themselves, perfectly. Those who thus fulfill the Law shall live. However, this does not transform the moral Law into a covenant of works.

Now, some may argue that there are more than two covenants made with mankind, for the Lord said, "Behold, the days come that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah" (Jeremiah 31:31). If it is a new covenant, it cannot be the covenant of works with the first Adam or the covenant of grace with the second Adam. In response, I say that this promise was made to Israel and Judah at their return from captivity. Nevertheless, even if it is understood to refer to the time since the coming of Christ, it essentially signifies a new revelation or a more extensive manifestation of the covenant of grace made with Christ as the mediator before the world began. This covenant was first revealed to Adam immediately after his fall when God declared that the seed of the woman would crush the serpent's head (Genesis 3:15). Subsequently, in the course of time, when Cain and Abel offered their offerings to the Lord, Abel's lamb symbolized the true Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, for He was sacrificed from the beginning of the world (Revelation 13:8; John 1:29). God accepted Abel's offering (Genesis 4:3-4), and He commanded Noah

to bring clean animals and birds into the Ark for sacrifice (Genesis 7:2-3, 8, 20-21). All of this acceptance was possible only because they had faith in Christ as the true sacrifice, as evidenced by their faith in Hebrews 11:4, 7.

Following these events, the ceremonial Law was detailed, covering the entire book of Leviticus and extending from Exodus 24 to 32. During this period, they saw God with comfort and clarity. This indicates that the covenant of grace was manifested more clearly than before. Subsequently, the Lord revealed to them that a virgin would bear a son and call His name Immanuel. Furthermore, Isaiah prophesied, "For to us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government shall be on his shoulders" (Isaiah 9:6). The covenant was established after the world began. Later, there was an even more profound revelation in Ezekiel's vision, where the four aspects of Christ were vividly portrayed: His humble birth represented by a man's face, His courageous life symbolized by a lion's face, His sacrificial death depicted as that of an ox, and His ascension resembling an eagle (Ezekiel 1:4, compared with Revelation 4:7). These aspects became the emblems or motifs of the four Evangelists, who vividly depicted Jesus Christ's birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension. Consequently, this last and most comprehensive manifestation of the covenant of grace signifies that the preaching of the Gospel is the highest and most complete revelation of Christ in the covenant of grace, which was established before the world began (Titus 1:2). As Paul declared, the preaching of Jesus Christ had been kept secret since the world began but was now revealed by the Scriptures to all nations for the obedience of faith (Romans 16:25-26).

Some may argue that when the new covenant is established, the old one shall vanish away (Hebrews 8:13). In response, I acknowledge

that this is true. When Christ was sacrificed, He brought an end to all the sacrifices and ceremonies that foreshadowed Him as the crucified Savior. These types and shadows, known as the first covenant, were superseded by the manifestation of Christ crucified, as seen in the narratives of the four Evangelists, referred to as the new covenant (Hebrews 8:7-9). However, when some mention that with the new covenant, God will write His laws in their hearts (Hebrews 8:10, 10:16), I clarify that this transformation is not limited to the era following Christ's Incarnation, although grace has abounded more since His death. Christ's priestly office was most evident before His resurrection through sacrifices, but after His resurrection, His prophetic office is more prominent and will endure until the end of the world. The knowledge of God will now be as abundant as the waters that cover the sea (Isaiah 11:9). Furthermore, Christ's kingly authority will be visibly established and will never end (Luke 1:13). Human power will be overthrown (Daniel 7:9), and Christ's reign will be uncontested (1 Corinthians 15:24; Psalm 2). In that day, all will willingly obey Him or suffer the consequences for eternity. Therefore, even though a greater number of people now have God's Law written in their hearts since the coming of Christ, the same principle applied before His birth. As David said, "I have hidden your Law in my heart that I may not sin against you" (Psalm 119:11, 40:8). Thus, the preaching of the Gospel is not a new covenant but a clear manifestation of the covenant of grace, established with Christ before the world began.

Now, let us consider what James Pope has to say in his exposition of Antichrist regarding these two covenants mentioned in Hebrews 8:8-9: the ceremonial law, which foreshadowed Christ to come through various types and shadows, and the glorious preaching of the Gospel, which proclaims that Christ has already come and completed the

work of our redemption. We will explore the differences between these covenants and their implications for us.

Firstly, it is suggested that to maintain something that points to Christ's future coming, when He has already come and fulfilled those things, may be considered Antichristian. However, to those with understanding, this resembles Judaism more than Antichristianism. It is important to note that Papists do not practice circumcision or animal sacrifices, which were types pointing to Christ's coming. Regarding the moral Law, it is implied that it ended with the coming of Christ, as it served as a tutor to lead people to Christ for justification by faith. However, I have previously shown that the moral Law of God is an eternal guide for both Saints and Angels (Psalms 119:89, 103, 20). It continues to serve as a tutor to awaken individuals to their corrupted state due to the misery that accompanies both this world and the world to come.

Next, James Pope discusses the purpose of these covenants, which is to draw people closer to God (Exodus 9:5-6, Hebrews 8:10, 1 Peter 2:9-10). If he is referring to the ceremonial Law and our preaching of the Gospel, I have demonstrated that these are simply manifestations of the covenant of grace. In this covenant, God intended His own glory through the salvation of the elect. However, if he is speaking of the covenant of Works with Adam, it is important to note that Adam and Eve were created near to God in holiness and righteousness before that covenant was established. This should have reinforced their relationship with God, much like the angels who never sinned. But let us move on to his differences between these two covenants.

Firstly, he differentiates them based on the time of their establishment. The first covenant was made with Israel when God led them out of Egypt. However, as I have previously explained, the

covenant of grace was made with Christ before the world began, and the covenant of Works was established with Adam as soon as he was created. If these covenants were not made before Israel's departure from Egypt, what happened to all those holy men who lived before Christ's coming? What of their relationship with God? Furthermore, it seems improbable that Christ would pay the price before establishing the covenant, and if Adam's fall condemned all of mankind, how did God withhold His wrath until the covenant of grace, as Pope suggests? We know that the angels who sinned were immediately cast down. Therefore, despite Pope's objections, it appears that the first covenant was not made at Israel's departure from Egypt. If he is referring to the ceremonial law, it dates back as far as Abel and Cain.

Then, it is argued that some may object that this covenant of works is the same as the one God made with Adam. Pope responds that our state is different now. However, I disagree because when Adam stood, we stood, and when he fell, we fell with him. Subsequently, he claims that this covenant was intended to draw some of Adam's lost seed near to God, while the rest were strangers to the covenant of promise (Ephesians 1:12). I counter that this is true of the covenant of grace, and this manifestation of it served as a means to bring them into that covenant.

Lastly, it is suggested that the second covenant was actually established at the death of the testator (Hebrews 9:16-17). Yet, I have already provided ample evidence that this covenant was made with Christ before the world began. If one asks about the benefits received by those who lived before this covenant was made, Pope argues that they experienced the efficacy of Christ's death through faith, as they beheld Christ in the promises before the covenant was formally established. However, if their faith lacked a better foundation, it

would not withstand the fiery trial. Before the covenant was made, there was little basis for faith, making such belief presumptuous in the absence of a promise.

His second distinction pertains to the nature of the parties involved. The first covenant was made with Israel after the flesh, whereas the second is related to Christ (Galatians 3:29). It appears that neither covenant was made directly with Christ, as both had men as their initial recipients. Even though one covenant has a connection to Christ, its foundation rests upon men. This is analogous to how some Papists consider themselves agents who must utilize Christ as an instrument for their salvation. However, both the ceremonial law and our preaching of the Gospel serve to reveal the eternal covenant made with Christ. They involve divine ordinances, as noted in Hebrews 9:1, rather than being confined to the physical realm.

His third distinction centers on the conditions of the covenants. The first covenant prescribes, "Do this and live," but I have previously explained that this does not exclude the possibility of a surety. Furthermore, an Evangelical adherence to the entire Law is found in their desire and endeavor, serving as a guideline within the covenant of grace. However, James Pope asserts that the new covenant does not require any conditions from the creature's part. Yet, he acknowledges that the Lord will inscribe His laws in their minds and hearts. These can be seen as conditions because they are followed by the covenant's declaration: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (Jeremiah 31:33).

His fourth distinction pertains to the promises associated with each covenant. The first covenant offers promises of temporal rewards (Deuteronomy 28:1, 10, 15; Jeremiah 11:5), whereas the new covenant exclusively consists of spiritual promises (Jeremiah 31:32;

Hebrews 8:9, 10, 11). However, we must note that in Exodus 6:4, 7, God's covenant with Israel included promises related to both temporal and spiritual aspects. Furthermore, Paul asserts in 1 Timothy 4:8 that godliness has promises for both this life and the one to come. If we consider the ceremonial law, it pointed to Christ; if we consider the moral law, it was not given as a covenant but as a rule of obedience.

His fifth distinction revolves around the mediators of the covenants. He suggests that Moses was the mediator of the first covenant based on Hebrews 3:25, Galatians 3:19, Exodus 32:11, 14, and Psalm 106:23. However, the mediator of the new covenant between God and humanity is Christ Jesus (Hebrews 8:6). If we are discussing the moral law, it was not given as a covenant but as a guide for life. In this sense, Moses represented Christ, the sole mediator. When Christ came, He took the Law in His first sermon and delivered it personally, indicating that it should be followed as a rule for life. In the case of the ceremonial law, Moses did not mediate for it; our one mediator is Jesus Christ (1 Timothy 2:5). Moses, like Hezekiah and others, prayed for the people, but he did not mediate the covenant.

His sixth distinction involves the blood associated with the covenants. The first covenant relied on the blood of calves and goats (Hebrews 9:19, 20), yet it is referred to as the blood of the covenant (Exodus 24:8). In the new covenant, the blood is that of Jesus Christ (1 Corinthians 11:25). When considering the moral law, it requires no blood at all, as Adam, under the moral covenant, had not sinned. The ceremonial law's use of the blood of calves and goats was symbolic of Christ's blood, just as the wine in our Sacrament symbolizes His blood. When Moses instructed the people to "behold the blood of the covenant" (Exodus 24:8), he referred to the blood of Christ, as confirmed in Hebrews 10:29 and 13:20.

His seventh distinction concerns the inscription of the law within the covenants. The first covenant was written on stone tablets (Exodus 32:15, 16), while the law of the new covenant is inscribed in the heart (Hebrews 8:10; 1 Corinthians 11:25). If we consider the moral law, it was not given as a covenant but as a guide for life. Both the moral law and the Gospel are recorded in ink on paper in the Bible. When a person has the law of God in their heart, their steps are secure (Psalm 37:31). Although humanity naturally follows the principles of the law, demonstrating remnants of it in their hearts, it is as a covenant of works (Romans 2:15). When it is written in the heart, it serves not as a covenant but as a rule for a sanctified life.

His eighth distinction pertains to the obscurity of one covenant and the clarity of the other. It is indeed true that the moral law was given amidst darkness and gloom (Hebrews 12:18; Exodus 20:21). In comparison, the ceremonial law appeared as the clear expanse of heaven (Exodus 24:10). Through the preaching of the Gospel, we now not only witness the clarity of heaven but also its opening, revealing Christ at the right hand of God (Acts 7:56). They had only obscure types and shadows of Christ, whereas now Christ has unveiled Himself to us (John 14:22). The fundamental similarity lies in the fact that these are not two distinct covenants, but rather varying degrees of manifestation within the same covenant of grace.

His ninth distinction pertains to the worship associated with these covenants. The worship of the first covenant consisted of types and shadows of future blessings (Hebrews 10:1). In contrast, the worship of the new covenant proclaims that these blessings have already arrived. I have addressed this matter in my previous responses.

His tenth distinction states that the first covenant has been done away with to establish the second (2 Corinthians 3:11; Hebrews 8:13;

10:9). I acknowledge this if he is referring to the dim ceremonial law with its types and shadows of Christ. It has indeed been abolished to make way for the clear manifestation of Christ through the preaching of the Gospel. However, I dispute this notion if he intends to include the moral law, which, as he claims, was given in darkness (Hebrews 12:18). The moral law remains an eternal guide for Saints and Angels (Psalms 109:80; 103:20).

Now, let us consider the implications and applications of these distinctions as presented by James Pope.

In considering his first distinction, he argues that if the first covenant was established when Israel returned from Egypt, then not all actual sins can be considered violations of the first covenant, as some believe. He denies that it was made with all nations, referring to Psalm 147:19-20. Furthermore, he claims that the first covenant no longer exists. In response, I assert that the first covenant, the covenant of works, was indeed made with all humanity through Adam. When Adam fell, all of mankind became guilty before God (Romans 3:19). This covenant predates Israel's exodus from Egypt and encompasses all of humanity. Therefore, all actual sins are violations of this covenant, particularly when it is given as a rule of life through a mediator. However, this covenant's implications and obligations are more immediate for those who have received it in written form, as Israel did. This perspective aligns with Psalm 147:19-20, which may refer to the distinction between possessing the written law and not.

Moreover, he disputes that all sins are forgiven by Christ, yet he later admits that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were insufficient and that faith in Christ is necessary for forgiveness. He also mentions that some believe unbelief is the only sin against the new covenant,

to which he offers no counterargument. Therefore, I move on to addressing his second distinction.

In his second distinction, he claims that if the first covenant was made with Israel according to the flesh and the second with Israel according to the Spirit, then asserting that infants are holy through their believing parents implies a covenant in the flesh, which he deems as denying Christ's incarnation. In response, I argue that rejecting the doctrine of Christ's apostles amounts to a denial of Christ. Notably, he contradicts himself by suggesting that the heathens were under the first covenant, contrary to his previous denial based on Psalm 147:19-20. He later seems to acknowledge that children of believing parents may be considered holy. This concept signifies separation for a holy purpose within the visible church, not a genuine spiritual holiness. Ishmael's descendants, outside the covenant, were referred to as "seed of the flesh" (Galatians 4:29). Those within the visible church may similarly be called "holy" in this context, signifying their set-apart status for participation in the church's ordinances. Consequently, they have a claim to the visible church's rituals in public worship.

Finally, he digresses into a lengthy discussion, which I opt not to follow. He asserts that regarding nations such as England, Scotland, and Germany as the Church of God in covenant denies Christ's incarnation and is therefore Antichristian. I argue that denying Christ's incarnation is more akin to Judaism rather than Antichristianism. Furthermore, opposing Christ's mandate to disciple entire nations constitutes Antichristianism (2 Thessalonians 2:4). He opposes Christ's work of discipling and incorporating nations into the Christian Church. Consequently, this opposition qualifies as Antichristian. The major premise, that Christ sent His apostles to disciple whole nations, is undisputed, and the minor

premise is validated by his rejection of any nation, such as England and Scotland, that has embraced the Christian faith, as being the Church of God.

He later contends that during the time of the old covenant, there were multiple congregations in Israel. However, when combined, they constituted a single congregation. This point aligns with Psalm 74:2-4. Similarly, in the New Testament, individual congregations form the broader Church (Revelation 2:1, 7). Therefore, those who advocate for a national church are not necessarily acting against the faith.

In his third distinction, he suggests that if the conditions of the first covenant were "do this and live," this explains why God dealt severely with Israel in outward matters when they sinned. This severity would align with the conditions of the covenant. I respond by emphasizing that those who remain under Adam's covenant, whether Jews or Christians, are still subject to various punishments. This does not mean, however, that everyone punished in outward matters remains under the covenant of works. Even though they are still under the Law given at Mount Sinai, it functions not as a covenant but as a guide for living. Punishments in response to sin may be administered out of love, aimed at reclaiming individuals from their sin.

He then states that the people of the new covenant live to do, not do to live. They do not act to earn God's favor, but rather to acknowledge, to the praise of God, that all is of grace and election (Romans 11:5-6). Christ died, justified, and saved them, and all of this is by grace. I agree that all these blessings are of grace, but I disagree with the notion that we may not act to maintain God's favor. Elihu in the Book of Job warns against giving flattering titles to men,

as it could lead to God taking them away (Job 33:21). David also affirms that if he regards iniquity in his heart, God will not hear his prayer (Psalms 66:18). Therefore, one should neither flatter nor harbor iniquity in their hearts to avoid losing God's favor. In the Song of Solomon, the bride, having experienced the consequences of her negligence, held onto Christ firmly (Song of Solomon 3:4). So, she acted to maintain His favor. David also prayed for God's favor, saying, "O visit me with that favor thou bearest unto thy people" (Psalms 106:4).

He argues that holding forth works as conditions of the first covenant denies Christ's incarnation. While I agree that obeying the Law as a covenant of works denies Christ, obeying the moral Law as a rule of righteousness aligns well with the covenant of grace. As many as obey this rule have peace and mercy (Galatians 6:16). We should walk by this same rule (Philippians 3:16). The tables of the covenant were kept in the Ark, symbolizing Christ.

Regarding his fourth distinction, if the promises of the new covenant are only spiritual, it might lead to silencing those who do not walk in the same path. However, I disagree with the assertion that the promises of the new covenant are exclusively spiritual. Godliness has the promise of life in this world and the world to come (1 Timothy 4:8). Blaming those who walk obediently according to the rule is unwarranted. Those who refuse to admit the poor into their congregations or charge money for admittance cannot be considered Anabaptists. They may rationalize this by claiming that the money that sustains their minister is spiritual.

He expresses his concern about being called Sectaries and criticized for their actions in Germany, as if all share the same views. He then praises the Anabaptists in England who stand up for a lawful

Magistracy and criticizes those who expose their wrongdoing. Finally, he returns to his own faction, addressing them as the people of the new covenant and offering them comfort against falling away. He mentions that Israel received similar promises at their return from captivity (Jeremiah 31:34, 32:40). However, if he meant that the first covenant was made with Adam and the new one with Christ, this would be accurate, as Adam could break his covenant but Christ, being both God and Man, cannot sin. Even Adam, after his fall, could not fall away when he believed in the promised seed, which was Christ. His faith admitted him into the covenant of grace.

Regarding his fifth distinction, if the covenant in which Christ, not Moses, is the mediator is the better covenant, then having any other mediator besides Christ is to deny Christ's incarnation and is therefore Antichristian. I argue that this is simplistic logic. Acknowledging that Moses served as a mediator does not equate to denying Christ's incarnation and being Antichristian. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth" (Romans 14:22). I contend that Moses did not establish a covenant but received a rule for those already in the covenant. Moses also foreshadowed Christ, and as soon as Christ began His mediatorship, He gave the Law in His own name, showing that He is the ultimate Mediator (Matthew 5). However, he seems to deny this benefit to those before Christ's resurrection.

The use of his sixth distinction: If the blood of Christ, not the blood of beasts, is the blood of the new covenant, then there is a privilege for the Saints. The blood of the first covenant purified only the flesh (Hebrews 9:13), but the blood of Christ cleanses the conscience from dead works to serve the living God (Hebrews 9:14). I respond that in the very text where Christ took the cup and said, "This is my blood" (Matthew 26:28), referring to the wine in the cup, that wine cannot

cleanse the conscience any more than the blood of beasts did. The wine in the Sacrament signifies the blood of Christ already shed, just as the blood of beasts signified the blood of Christ to come in the faith of the people. He speaks highly of their privilege, suggesting that for the people of God to mourn for sin as if they were still under sin is sinful. However, Jesus Christ Himself said, "Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted" (Matthew 5:4). This contradicts the notion that mourning for sin is sinful. While it is true that we are not under the reigning power of sin, many dear children of God still struggle with a law in their members that leads them captive to the law of sin (Romans 7:23). They are under sin as under a tyrant. He claims that this devalues the blood of Christ as if it needs to be offered up yearly. I respond that while we are fully justified, we are not fully sanctified, and our sins are not fully taken away in this world. Being under the guilt of sin may hinder duty, but the guilt is removed even if the presence of sin remains. As grace grows, sin diminishes, and those who are spiritually dead are freed from sin (Romans 6:7; 1 Peter 4:1).

The use of his seventh distinction: If the law of the first covenant was written on tables of stone and the law of the new covenant on the fleshly table of the heart, then we should consider a nation not to be in a covenant with God. Nations assuming the title and practice of Churches are Antichristian. I have already addressed this in my response to his second distinction.

He mentions that some may argue that the invisible Church consists of Saints, but the visible Church now has some members as bad as those among the Jews. He answers that these bad members will be removed (1 Corinthians 5:1, 6-7; Revelation 2:20). I agree that such actions should be taken against unrepentant wrongdoers. However, he then claims that nations calling themselves God's Churches are

the waters that carry the whore (Revelation 17:15). This doctrine seems questionable, especially considering that when Christ sent His Apostles, they were to disciple and baptize all nations. If just one of those nations embraced their teaching, it would be absurd to label them as carriers of the whore. While he accuses others of crying "whore," he is also tainted by Babylon's whoredoms and joins in opposing Christ.

The use of his eighth distinction: If the new covenant is so plain and full of light, then its people should strive to walk as children of the light and proclaim the praises of the One who called us out of darkness into His marvelous light (1 Peter 2:9). I respond that, previously, the moral law was given with terror and thick darkness (Exodus 20:18, 21), but not as a covenant; it served as a rule of life for those already in covenant. When the ceremonial law was written, it was like seeing the body of heaven in its clearness compared to the previous times (Exodus 24:4, 10-11), though those types and shadows were still dark compared to our clear manifestation. He states that the Scripture's way to determine if someone is in the light is if they love the brethren (1 John 1:7), implying Anabaptists. Those who desire to have Anabaptists imprisoned, banished, or executed do so with the spirit of Antichrist. However, I counter that God, under the Old Testament, decreed that some offenses should be punished by death (Numbers 15:36). In contrast, cutting off by excommunication is the contemporary practice, except for heresy and only when confirmed by two or three witnesses. While he claims that those under the Old Testament were in the same covenant of grace as we are, though with different levels of revelation, the New Testament fulfills the Old, and both share one heart and one way to fear the Lord forever (Jeremiah 32:39).

He asserts that Presbyterians will argue they have more than two or three witnesses to prove their heresy, but he suggests their interest blinds them, and they cannot acknowledge their opponents' views as truth. I respond that if their salvation or damnation hinges on this matter, they must exercise fair judgment. Those whose salvation is at stake may be more likely to judge rightly in matters of truth and heresy. He then brags about what the Sectaries have accomplished and condemns ministers who align with the Parliament, as well as their dedicatory epistles, sermons, and petitions for power to suppress them. However, this part of his argument is not worth addressing.

The use of his ninth distinction: If the worship of the first covenant pointed to Christ's coming, and the new covenant declares that Christ has already come, then teaching any part of that old worship now is to deny Christ's incarnation and is thus Antichristian. He should specify what types and shadows of Christ's coming we supposedly still observe. It seems he interprets these as the worship being tied to one nation and one place (Psalm 147:19-20; Deuteronomy 16:5-6). However, it's a misrepresentation to claim that we believe God should only be worshipped in England or in one place within England. We affirm that God is worshipped in other nations as well as in various places within our own country, such as London. He argues that their worship was carnal based on Hebrews 9:1, where it is said to be ordinances of divine service. While these ordinances were indeed instituted by God (Exodus 40), they may have been considered carnal to those without faith. Similarly, our Sacraments may seem carnal to those without faith in what they signify, just as theirs may have been spiritual to those who understood the meaning behind the blood of Christ, which is the blood of the everlasting covenant (Hebrews 10:29; 13:20), symbolized by the blood of beasts (Exodus 24:8).

He claims that people of God question whether a whole nation can be compelled to public worship today, as was done in Israel because they were God's people in covenant. I argue that this shouldn't be a question for those in covenant with God, as their situation is comparable to that of Israel. Anabaptists should not take offense, but rather profane individuals who might question their right to attend and be concerned about entering without a wedding garment. He argues that this doesn't make them hypocrites, but I contend that it's not the command of God or man that makes them hypocrites; rather, it's their own wicked hearts that refuse to obey those commands. He is reluctant to attend our assemblies lest he deny Christ's incarnation, believing that obeying the Magistrates' command to attend public worship equates to that denial. However, now that Christ has come, Magistrates have no relation to the Church; their power pertains only to matters of this life. He cites 1 Timothy 2:2, which calls for a godly life under authorities, but this argument has been addressed by many.

He argues that if we object, suggesting that everyone can do as they please, his response is that if Magistrates are commanded to rule the nations and Christ to govern His Kingdom, the objection is resolved. However, he cannot prove that Christ is confined solely to ruling His Church, as God raised Him from the dead and set Him above all powers, making Him head over all things, both in this world and the world to come, for His Church (Ephesians 1:20-22). Magistrates are not restricted in ruling the State; they also have a role in guarding the Church and punishing those who disturb it (Romans 13).

The use of his last distinction: If the Lord has taken away the first covenant to establish the second (Hebrews 10:9), we should be cautious not to reintroduce what God has removed. Those who seek to bring the rights of the first covenant back into the worship of God

effectively contradict the Spirit of God, as they imply that the first covenant is superior when the Spirit affirms that the second is better, founded on superior promises. I argue that Christ and all His benefits were promised in both covenants (Galatians 3:8, 16). Is anything better than Christ and His benefits? The promised blessings were the same; the difference lies in the manifestation or revelation of those blessings, which is now clearer. The promises of grace were sealed to them by the blood of beasts (a type of Christ's blood), and to us, the promises of grace are sealed by Christ's own blood. Christ and His benefits remained the same for both them and us.

Then he is convinced that every godly heart earnestly desires the complete downfall of Antichrist, which will be accomplished as soon as it is widely understood that upholding the first covenant is equivalent to upholding Antichrist. The Apostle marvels that despite the clear presentation of Christ's crucifixion, which put an end to all aspects of that covenant, some were so bewitched as to reintroduce its elements. However, I would ask him who is attempting to reintroduce circumcision or any of their ceremonies, which he accuses us of without evidence, as the Galatians were ensnared by those elements, and we have no connection to them. He asserts that circumcision was the sign of the covenant that deceived them, citing Galatians 5:2-3: "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing, ye are debtors to the whole law." I reply, following M. Perkins' interpretation, that circumcision should be understood differently depending on the time: before Christ, it was a Sacrament and seal of the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith (Romans 4:1); after Christ's death, it became a lifeless ceremony, still used by some as an indifferent matter until the destruction of the Temple; after that, it became a pernicious ceremony and ceased to be an indifferent thing. While it would now be a renunciation of Christ for us, to the Jews, it was a Sacrament or seal of the righteousness of

Christ for their faith, similar to how our Sacraments function for us. Thus, Jews who believed were under the covenant of grace, although not under the same revelation of it. They had the promise of Christ in the Old Testament, whereas we have it fulfilled in the New Testament. Their promises have been realized in our experiences, and their types and shadows were fulfilled when Christ, the substance, came. Their ceremonies were a gospel message that revealed Christ to them, but these ceremonies are now obsolete and are merely rudimentary elements to us. They saw a glimpse of heaven's glory through those rituals, while we cannot see anything of the sort in them. Their gospel has become obsolete for us, but our proclamation and acknowledgment of Christ's arrival is the eternal gospel preached by men and angels in the heavenly realm, proclaiming, "Fear God and give glory to him, and worship him that made the Heaven and Earth, and Sea, and Fountain of waters" (Revelation 14:15-16). We will sing both the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb, signifying our devotion to the moral law as a rule of righteousness and our praise for the Lord's mercies. So, even though the ceremonial law has ceased, the moral law endures eternally (Psalm 103; 119:89). It doesn't function as a covenant of grace or a covenant of works but as a guide for righteous living. Moses wrote down all the Lord's words concerning the ceremonial law (Exodus 24:3-4). Then, the Lord summoned Moses to the mountain, where He gave him the tablets of stone and a law and commandments that He Himself had inscribed (verse 12). This was intended to serve as a guide for righteousness, so that Moses could teach them their duty after they had witnessed God's reconciliation with Israel (verses 10-11). The righteous, being in the covenant of grace, will eternally enjoy its blessings, while the wicked, still under the covenant of works, will endure its penalties forever.

Some may argue that Christ's yoke is easy and His burden is light (Matthew 11:30), whereas the law was an unbearable yoke that neither their forefathers nor they could bear (Acts 15:10). Therefore, they assert that their forefathers were not in the covenant of grace or under Christ's yoke. I respond that it was the same covenant of grace, although administered differently in their time. Circumcision served as a seal of the righteousness of faith for them (Romans 4:11), but it was indeed a heavy burden for the flesh (Exodus 4:25). Baptism now replaces it as an easier rite. Similarly, their Passover was costly, as they had to sacrifice numerous cattle. We have been relieved of this burden, and the Lord's Table demands far less of our resources. Additionally, they undertook arduous journeys to attend the Passover in Jerusalem (Psalm 84:6-7), whereas God now accepts our Passover or Sacrament near our own homes. Therefore, Jews and Christians share the same covenant, with the only difference being the ease of its administration. For this, we are profoundly grateful and should praise the Lord forever.

FINIS.

MONERGISM BOOKS

Two Solemn Covenants Made Between God and Man, by Edmund Calamy. Copyright © 2023

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. By payment of the required fees, you have been granted the non-exclusive, non-transferable right to access and read the text of this e-book on-screen. No part of this text may be reproduced, transmitted, downloaded, decompiled, reverse engineered, or stored in or introduced into any information storage and retrieval system, in any form or by any means, whether electronic or mechanical, now known or hereinafter invented, without the express written permission of Monergism Books.

ePub, .mobi & .pdf Editions November 2023. Requests for information should be addressed to: Monergism Books, PO Box 491, West Linn Or 97068