

**THE  
UNVEILING  
OF  
ANTICHRIST**

OR,

**ANTICHRIST Stripped naked out of all  
his SCRIPTURE ATTIRE, by  
which he hath deceived the Christian  
world;**

So that we may the more clearly see the very  
bottom root, from whence he sprang, and the very basis  
and foundation upon which he hath erected, and  
set up his kingdom.

**BY JAMES POPE**

**Gal. 3.1**

O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye  
should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus  
Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among  
you?

**Gal. 3.3**

Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye  
now made perfect in the flesh?

**Gal. 4.31**

So then brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman,  
but of the free.

May 8th LONDON

Printed by .... Coe, for Henry Overton, and to be sold at his shop  
in Popes-Head Alley, **1646**

Modern edition published by Mt. Zion Primitive Baptist Church, Crown Point,  
Indiana, July, 2012



## Forward to the Reader

The genesis of the present work which the reader holds in his hands occurred when my dear brother and Elder Leroy Rhodes placed into my hands a facsimile copy he had made for me of "The Unveiling of Antichrist." After carefully reading this work I became burdened with the conviction that this work deserved the widest possible decimation in our Old Baptist churches especially in the light of the fact that precious vital principles found in this work are sadly being lost sight of today in Baptist circles, also in our own Old Baptist churches. When Elder Rhodes and I discussed the value of the present work he readily concurred with my judgment that this work needed recirculation among our brethren. However the edition which he had copied was unfit for any significant recirculation. It was smudged in spots, of small tedious print, and in English spelling it used the spelling of a bygone era. All said and done, the conditions of the original work greatly limited it's usefulness and appeal to a new generation of Old Baptist brethren. Therefore Brother Rhodes and I co-la bored to produce a new edition with new typeset, a more user friendly layout and explanatory notes that we believed would be helpful to the reader which are included in footnotes. Any Scripture references which we have added are set in brackets [ ]. In the few places where the words could not be made out by us because of the poor quality of the facsimile copy we have simply put .....Therefore what the reader has in his hands is the edition exactly as James Pope wrote it only modernized for greater utility to the people of God.

Men like Elder Rhodes and Elder Ron Pound and his Old Baptist study group are to be commended for bringing up from the grave again many fine Old Baptist works which have long been forgotten. This is our small contribution to an effort that is ongoing and greatly needed in these days of declension.

It is also to be regretted that we cannot supply the reader with any biographical information on the author James Pope. We searched in vain for any significant biographical information on the author. This is no doubt due to the historical revisionists who routinely delete from the notice of history great saints of God in order to further their agenda which is to present a picture of our Baptist history which is often not in accord with the facts. Bro. Ron Pound has demonstrated this scandal repeatedly.

We now commend this work to your study. Prayerfully read and study it and become even more grounded in the faith once delivered to the Saints.

To the READER.

COURTEOUS READER,

Seeing it is so generally thought by the people of God, that the total rooting out of Antichrist draws near; and that the discovery of Antichrist, is the way to root out Antichrist: I thought it my duty to impart to others, what my self did conceive touching the same. That which I have endeavored to do in this ensuing discourse, by the Scriptures to strip Antichrist out of his Scripture covering, that we might see the very root from whence he springs: I confess many have written worthily in our age concerning Antichrist, in some particulars; and although I come short of them in those particulars whereof they have written, yet this may be as useful, if not more useful. First, because this touches not only some few, but almost (if not) all particulars, whereby Antichrist hath deceived the Christian World, as it is called. Again, other treatises have been very useful to the more able and judicious, but for the most part the less able have had but little profit, their being in most books so much school-language, that many do not know the phrase, nor the sense; but I have endeavored to be plain and familiar to every ordinary capacity, and it can be no wrong to the godly, wise, that are more taken with the excellency of the matter, than of the style. Reader, I entreat thy help against Antichrist, who is an Enemy to the truth; yea and to the Lord also. Oh therefore, wherein I have been deficient do thou supply and let us all join our forces against this great Enemy. Read diligently, peruse carefully, weigh the Scriptures quoted and I hope thou wilt be more abundantly enabled then myself to enlarge in thy meditations, which I have but briefly hinted at that it may be felt the earnest desire of him that daily prayers for the ruin of Antichrist.

JAMES POPE<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Brother Pope divides his work into two sections. In the first section Bro. Pope gives the 10 distinctions between the Old and New Covenants and then in the second section he gives the USE (or application) of each difference he had previously delineated.

## **THE UNVEILING OF ANTICHRIST**

Notwithstanding Antichrist hath been in the world this Sixteen Hundred years,<sup>2</sup> and notwithstanding all his great works, and the much talk that hath been of Antichrist; yet very few till of late have learned to know what is Antichrist, much less have made any discovery of him to their fellows, which may cause us the more to admire at the working of God in this present Age, that now it begins to be familiar among the people of God, what Antichrist is, which gives us good hope that the final consumption thereof is at hand;<sup>3</sup> and indeed God hath stirred up many of late to do worthily against Antichrist; our Parliament have struck hard against him in some of his Branches; which is well, for all cannot be done at once, seeing the rooting up of Antichrist is not the work of one day. Now Antichrist is that Spirit of Error, whereby men are deceived, and so deny Christ to be come in the flesh I John 4.3. Now to deny Christ to be come in the flesh in words, I conceive none do, except it be the Jews, no not the Pope himself; therefore it must needs be to maintain something to be still on foot that was before Christ, and pointed to Christ to come, who being come, hath ended all those things. Gal. 3.24-25. So that my work now is to examine what it is, which to hold forth now, doth deny Christ to be come in the flesh,<sup>4</sup> and to this end I shall declare by the Scriptures, that God made two Covenants with his people; with the end of them; and the differences between them. Romans 9.4; Gal. 4.24; Eph. 2.12. Hebrews 8,8,9 doth fully prove that God made two Covenants.

The end of these Covenants was to take people near unto God to walk before Him as His own people. Exodus 19.5,6; Hebrews 8; I Peter 2.9,10.

### **THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO COVENANTS.**

First, In regard of the time of the making of them. The first being made with the people of Israel, when God took them by the hand to lead them out of the Land of Egypt. Hebrews 8.9, Jer. 21.4 and 31.32.

---

<sup>2</sup> This statement by Bro. Pope reflects the prevailing Eschatology among Particular Baptists in the 16th and 17th centuries. Briefly, our Fathers held, we believe correctly, that the "mystery of iniquity" which came to full and concrete expression with the rise of the Papal Beast of Rev. 13.1 If had begun to work even in the apostolic period, cf. 2 Thess. 2.7

<sup>3</sup> It was the common view of 17th century Particular Baptist thought that the coming of Christ was not too far in the future, that it lay at their very door.

<sup>4</sup> It is the foundational thesis of Bro. Pope's work that the Old Covenant pointed FORWARD to the coming of Christ in the flesh. The New Covenant is the revelation of Christ come in the flesh. Therefore any system of theology which attempts to bring the churches back under the Old Covenant in whole or in part, is essentially a denial that Christ has inaugurated the New Covenant by His coming in the flesh.

OBJECTION,

But some may object, that in regard this is a Covenant of works, it must needs be the same that God made with Adam.<sup>5</sup>

ANSWER,

I answer, that Adams state was different from ours, and there is no mention of this Covenant to him, but he was near unto God by Creation, and this Covenant was to take SOME of the lost Seed of Adam near to himself, and the rest were strangers to the Covenants of Promise, Eph. 2.12

OBJECTION,

But it may be some will object, and say, was it not made with Abraham in the 17 of Genesis.

ANSWER,

I answer, that Abraham had the promises of both Covenants<sup>6</sup>, and had also the types of both, to wit, Hagar and Sarah [Gal. 4.23-29] and so virtually he had both; but always the types go before the thing typified, and the promises before the things promised; and God saith expressly that he made the first Covenant with that people, when he took them by the hand, to lead them out of the Land of Egypt: The second, or New Covenant was actually made out at the death of the Testator, Heb. 9.16-17.

OBJECTION,

If any ask what benefit then was to those that were before the death of the Testator?<sup>7</sup>

ANSWER,

I answer, they had the efficacy of His death, by faith, beholding Him in the Promises, and in the Types, for virtually He was a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, Rev. 13.8.

The Second difference is in regard of the people to whom, or with whom the Covenants are made; the first was made with Israel after the flesh; the second with Israel as they are considered in spiritual relation to Christ. Gal. 3.29.

The Third difference is in regard of the Conditions of the Covenants; the Condition of the first, Do this and live;<sup>8</sup> and upon that Condition only God did promise to be their God, Jer.

---

<sup>5</sup> The judicious reader should note that the objection ASSUMES what was a GIVEN amongst first generation Particular Baptist churches viz. That the Old Covenant was not a form of the "Covenant of Grace" but was in fact a covenant of works.

<sup>6</sup> That is, the Old Covenant and the New Covenant.

<sup>7</sup> That is, to God's Elect. Most of the Nation were reprobate, rejected of God. cf. Hebrews 4.2.

11.4, 2 Chron. 15.2 and all the Promises were upon condition of doing, Jer. 11.3,4. Deut. 28. But the New Covenant **REQUIRES NOTHING BY WAY OF A CONDITION ON THE CREATURES PART**, [emphasis ours] without which it is not made good, and without which the Promises are not made good, as appears by Hebrews 8.9, where he saith, Not like the Covenant which he made with their Fathers, which Covenant they broke, and he regarded them not. So that his not regarding them, proceeded from their not keeping the conditions of his covenant; but it is not such a Covenant; for (saith he, vs. 10,11) This is the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and in their hearts will I write them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall not teach every man his Neighbor, and every man his Brother, saying, know the Lord: for all shall know me from the least to the greatest; for I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and I will remember their sins and iniquities no more: See also the Prophecy of this Covenant, Jer. 31.31-34. In all which, we find nothing as a condition put upon the Creature, but God **HATH ENGAGED HIMSELF TO DO THE WHOLE WORK FOR THEM**, [emphasis ours]

The fifth difference is between the Mediators of these Covenants; the first being (as I conceive) Moses, and therefore he is said to be faithful in all his house. Heb. 3.2,5. Gal. 3.19. And we see Moses performing the office of a Mediator, as need did require, as Exodus 32.11. Let me alone saith God that I may destroy them, but Moses would not give over God till he was appeased; as vs. 14 and Psalm 106.23. But the Mediator of the New Covenant is Jesus Christ, Heb. 8,6,9,15. It is Christ lone that is the Mediator between God and man with reference to the new Covenant.

The sixth difference is the Blood of the Covenants. One, was the blood of Calves and goats (to wit, of the first covenant) as Heb. 9.19,20 where it is called the blood of the Covenant; so also Exodus 24.8. But the blood of the New Covenant is the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit hath offered up himself without spot to God; so also, I Cor. 11.25.

The seventh difference is the writing of the Law of the covenants; the first was written in Tables of Stone, Exodus 32.15,16 but the Law of the New Covenant was written in the heart, as Hebrews 8.10; I Cor. 11.25<sup>9</sup>

The eighth difference, is in regard of the obscurity of the one, and plainness of the other, as in 2 Cor. 3,13-15. There was blackness and darkness at the delivery of it, Heb. 12.18 but the New Covenant is plain and clear, 2 Cor. 3.18 and it must needs be so, seeing the law of it is written in the hearts of the people; The people of the first, could not look to the end of that which is abolished, and this obscurity was shadowed out by the veil upon Moses face, 2 Cor.

---

<sup>8</sup> This, the majority reprobate tried to meet. cf. Rom. 10.5. They were ignorant of Christ; their spiritual eyes were "veiled." Romans 10.3; 2 Cor. 3.14-15. The Elect remnant in the nation saw the efficacious death of the Messiah in the promises and types and by faith embraced Christ. Hebrews 11.13,39.

<sup>9</sup> Notice the contrast presented in 2 Cor. 3.3-8. "The Letter killeth" BUT "The Spirit giveth life." The "ministration of death" contrasted with "The ministration of the Spirit."

3.13. Therefore this veil is said to remain upon their face until this day for the reading of the Old Testament, vs. 14. but we with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, and are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. vs. 18.

The ninth difference is in regard to the worship that did appertain to these Covenants.; for that which did belong to the first Covenant, did consist of types and shadows of good things to come, Heb. 10.1; [Col. 2.16-17].<sup>10</sup>

But the worship under this Covenant, is such a worship as declares that these good things are already come; and is a spiritual worship, John 4.23 and Phil. 3.3.

The tenth difference that I shall name, is, that the first covenant IS DONE AWAY [emphasis ours] that the second might be established. 2 Cor. 3.11; Hebrews 8.13 and 10.9.

Thus have I briefly observed the differences between the two covenants: but it may be some will object and say, what is this to the laying open the main root of Antichrist?

I answer, that in regard the first Covenant did run in the flesh, and did hold out Christ to come in the flesh now to hold out that Covenant, when Christ is come in the flesh is the main Root of Antichrist, and denies Christ to be come in the flesh; As will more evidently appear by the going over these particulars again, and making such use thereof as the Scriptures will direct us to do.

### **THE USE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE OLD AND NEW COVENANT. THE USE OF THE FIRST DIFFERENCE.**

If the first Covenant was made when God took the people of Israel by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt then it takes off that which some suppose, that all actual sins are sins against the first Covenant, and are done away by Christ, and that unbelief is the only sin against the New Covenant;<sup>11</sup> to his end they bring that place, Heb. 9.15, where it is said, for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament that by means of death, for the Redemption of the Transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might retain the promise of eternal inheritance: Now to my understanding, the whole scope of the that place is to show, that notwithstanding there were sacrifices offered for sin according to the Law, yet it was not sufficient to do away sin; for there was an insufficiency

---

<sup>10</sup> Note the terminology employed by the Scriptures to describe Old Covenant worship. Hebrews 7.16 says that the O.T. Worship was "the law of a carnal commandment." Galatians 4.9 describes the elements of O.T. Worship as "weak and beggarly elements" and Hebrews 9.10 "carnal ordinances imposed until the time of reformation."

<sup>11</sup> The view that "all actual sins are sins against the first Covenant, and are done by Christ, and that unbelief is the only sin against the New Covenant is a species of Arminian teaching. Since the Arminian holds to universal atonement it therefore follows that they teach, as in fact they do, that the only sin against the New Covenant is unbelief, i.e. unbelief in Christ and His atoning work.



in them, as appears Hebrews 10.3,4,11 and 9.9. See also the following verses to the 15<sup>th</sup> verse; also 10.1. All which showeth, that that Covenant, and those sacrifices could not make perfect, nor do away sin, as touching the Conscience, but that the blood of Christ must do it, and that they must look beyond all those things to Christ, Heb. 10.9,10,12. chap. 9.14,26,28.

Again, this Covenant being made at that time, declares, that other people were not privileged with that Covenant, as Psalm 147.19,20. It is most evident that God took no people into Covenant before he took the people of Israel, for there was no people in a Religious communion, until God gave Abraham the promises, and the types of the Covenants, as they be found by the Scriptures: therefore to hold that all actual sin, that hath been, or shall be committed by men of all nations, are sins against the first Covenant, and are done away by Christ, makes the first Covenant to be made to all Nations, which is contrary to Psalm 147.19,20. Again, it makes the Covenant to be before it was: Again, it holds it out to be still in being to the end of the world, whereas the Scripture declares it to be done away: as before showed.

### **THE USE OF THE SECOND DIFFERENCE.**

If the first Covenant was made with Israel after the flesh, and the second with Israel after the Spirit; then to affirm that infants are federally holy by virtue of their being born of Believing Parents, HOLDS FORTH STILL A COVENANT IN THE FLESH [emphasis ours], which to do, doth (to my understanding) deny Christ to be come in the flesh; for if the Testator of the New Testament be dead, and the New Testament be in force only to the Spiritual Seed, then to bring in the Natural Seed again, is to look for Christ to come again, for he was to come of the Natural Seed, and when he is come, ALL THE PRIVILGES THAT COME BY DESCENT, ARE VOID; [emphasis ours]. As appears from the Apostle Paul, Phil. 3.3-7 where the apostle renounces all fleshly privilege, and those he strives for, are such as flow from Christ's sufferings, death and resurrection; as also 2 Cor. 5.16. After the Apostle had spoken of the death of Christ, in the 15<sup>th</sup> verse; he infers (vs. 16) that henceforth we know no man after the flesh, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth know we him no more.

*If any ask what holiness that is in 1 Cor. 7.14.*

I answer, that we are to mind the scope of the place; the Apostle is there answering a doubt, which was, whether the believing husband, or wife, might continue to dwell with their husband or wife being an unbeliever? He answers, they might, or else their children would be unclean, as they were under the Law or first Covenant; but that was a thing out of question; it

seems they did not question but they might keep their children. But it appears by the Apostle they might as well question the one, as the other, but neither was to be questioned.<sup>12</sup>

But it may be some may object and say that the people that came of Jacob were not the Seed of the Flesh, but Ishmael was the Seed of the Flesh, as Gal. 4.29.

For answer hereunto, the seed of the Flesh is to be considered in a Two-fold respect: First, Ishmael was the Seed of the Flesh, for he was by a Bond-woman, and was begotten in the strength of Nature; and so Isaac was not the seed of the flesh, but he was of the Free-woman, and born by promise. Gal. 4.23, Again, Ishmael was the Seed of the Flesh, Gen. 18.11,12 as he did the Seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as they were considered the Seed of the first Covenant, and therefore he was before Isaac; for the Bond-woman did type out the first Covenant, and her Seed did type out the Seed of the first Covenant. Gal. 4.23-24. But Isaac as type, did hold forth the Seed of the New Covenant as Sarah did(as a type) hold forth the New Covenant, Gal. 4.26-28 and therefore the mighty power of God was seen, to make good his promise above and beyond the power and strength of nature, that causes the children of the new Covenant to be brought forth, John 2.5, Eph, 2.5-6; Col. 1.12-14; I Pet. 1.3,23; I Cor. 1.23-24. Therefore let us learn to put a difference, where the Scripture puts a difference, lest we deny Christ to be come in the Flesh, and so be antichristian.

If any object and say, May not infants be the children of the New Covenants?

I answer, Not by virtue of being descended of Believing Parents, as is pleaded from I Cor. 7.14 and Acts 2.39.

Again, let this teach all Believers, to love as a Brethren: Be not like those Israelites, Exodus 2.13. What though there be difference in judgment, it is for want of Light that there is any falling short, or going beyond a Rub, for all the people of Christ are a willing people in the day of his power. Psalm 110.3. and that every one that knows God, to be his God, according to the Grace and Power of the New Covenant, is willing to be and do whatever God would have them. Oh, therefore, let there be no strangeness amongst us;<sup>13</sup> God our Father loves us, and bears with us; let us learn to do the like one towards another: It is not the taking, or not taking up of an Ordinance that makes us the children of God, but our being in covenant with God, and there may be as much tenderness of the Glory of God showed, in the forbearing to practice that we are not satisfied in, as in practicing that which we are satisfied in. Let us not

---

<sup>12</sup> The Greek word translated "holy" in the text is hagios and denotes "pure" as opposed to impure, illegitimate. The apostle is simply stating that the fact that the child produced by a physical union of a believer and an unbeliever is pure that is not impure, unclean or illegitimate. The fact that infant sprinklers much abuse this text to bolster their argument is a sure indicator of how desperate they become when forced to conduct the debate on the grounds of the New Covenant Scriptures.

<sup>13</sup> Though we must reject infant sprinkling in all its aspects nevertheless we must be careful to treat infant sprinklers who bear the marks of grace with gentleness and forbearance , instructing them with meekness, cf. 2 Tim. 24-25; I Cor. 13.12.

therefore judge one another anymore. Romans 14.13, but judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock, or an occasion to fall in his brother's way. (vs. 13). And let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another (vs. 19) And judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, Who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the Counsels of the heart: and then shall every man have praise of God. I Cor. 4.5. Love is a great duty, that the people of the New Covenant owe to one another Heb. 10.24, and that which Christ requireth of them, John 13.34 and it is a Note to know Christ's disciples, from the world, vs. 35. This makes us like God; I John 4.7-12.1 might write a whole Book of this particular; But I hope those to whom this is directed, will be active in the discharge of this duty; and truly I observe, that of late the people of God are more for love, and the silencing of differences, than ever I knew them, which I doubt not, but it is a presage of much good: but I say no more of this, lest it should serve to be a digression.

Again, by this it appears, that to hold a Nation (as England, Scotland, Germany, etc) to be the Church of God in Covenant, denies Christ to be come in the flesh<sup>14</sup> and so is Antichristian; For if a Nation be in Covenant, it must needs be in the first Covenant, for the New Covenant take a choice people out of the Nations in whose hearts God writes His Law, Heb. 8.10; 2 Cor. 3.3. and they shall all know him from the least to the greatest, (vs. 11). But so it cannot be said of any Nation; but he will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sin and their iniquities he will remember no more. But to what Nation can this be applied? Surely to none, but to a select people; said to be in Christ, Gal. 1.22; I Thess. 2.14. In which place take notice, that even in Judea where was only one Church; which was the collective body of the Nation, none excepted under the first Covenant; now under the New Covenant, there is several Churches which are in Christ.

### **THE USE OF THE THIRD DIFFERENCE.**

If the Conditions of the First Covenant were, Do this and live, then it shows us the reason why God did deal so sharply with them in outward things when they sinned against him; because it was according to the conditions of his Covenant with them.

Again, it shows the privilege of the people of the New Covenant, that **THEY LIVE TO DO, BUT NOT DO TO LIVE** [emphasis ours]. They do not act to God to be kept in the favour of God; but they are kept in the favour of God, that so they may acknowledge God, and be to the praise of his Grace, for all is of grace in them. First, their Election is of grace. Romans 11.5-6. Secondly, that Christ died for them is grace, Heb. 2.9. Again, they are freely justified by his grace. Titus 3.7. Again, that they are called, is of grace, Gal. 1.6,15. Again, that they believe, it is of grace, Acts 18.27. Again, that they have hope, it is through grace, 2 Thess. 2.16. Again, that they are saved, it is by grace. Eph. 2.8-9 and all is, that they should be to the praise of his Grace, Eph. 2.6. you see here is nothing but grace. Now if there were a Condition of works, then Grace were no more grace. Romans 11.6.

---

<sup>14</sup> An example of this would be Steelite teaching which held that no Presbyterian church was a true church unless that church subscribed to the Scottish Solemn League and Covenant.

If any object and say, then we need not work.  
I answer, We are the more engaged to work.<sup>15</sup>  
If any ask to what end?

It is answered, viz. To glorify God, who hath called us to partake of such Grace; so that to hold forth Works as the Condition of the Covenant, doth (as I conceive) deny Christ to be come in the flesh; for the first Covenant, with the Condition thereof, was ended in Christ, when He came in the flesh.

### **THE USE OF THE FOURTH DIFFERENCE.**

If the promises of the New Covenant, are only SPIRITUAL; then it may serve to silence them, that speak against those that walk not with them in the public way. Because (say they) they are poor men most of them, and God doth blast them in their estates. For my part, I conceive that such speeches as these flow from a Spirit of ENVIE, or a Spirit of ANTICHRIST, or both. If they speak that which they do not think, it is likely, it is from envie.; But if they think indeed, that because God did promise in the first Covenant to make his people prosper in outward things, and they see not this made good to them now, and therefore they conclude them to be in a way of Error; this is from the Spirit of Antichrist; for this was the privilege of the First Covenant, and God did make good his promise to them;[Joshua 21.45] he gave them indeed a Land flowing with milk, and honey, and made them a rich People, and a terror to their Enemies, so long as they keep close to Him. BUT THE THINGS PROMISED IN THE NEW COVENANT, is ONLY OF SPIRITUAL PRIVILEGES,as is before showed, from Jer. 31.32-34; Heb. 8.9-11 which God hath ever made good to them; only for the measure he doth proportion them accordingly to his Fatherly dispensations; and for outward things, it is enough for them that he that takes care for the Lillies and Sparrows, is their Father;<sup>16</sup> but for abundance, they are not to look for it by virtue of a promise, but rather the contrary, and that by the current of Scripture; see first Christs own words, Matthew 5.10-11. Blessed are they which are persecuted for Righteousness sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven: Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you for my sake, falsely: and truly friends, if ever men were set on work to say all manner of evil against the servants of Christ falsely, then surely now [Pope is speaking in the 17<sup>th</sup> century]. I admire that men dare to write, and preach as they do for first they brand them with the reproachful names of sectaries, and then to lay to their charge such things is ia most false, and then run to the Magistrates in their Dedicatory Epistles, to have them put to death for denying the Authority of the Civil

---

<sup>15</sup> In commenting on Titus 2.12 Elder Durrand said, "The teaching of the Truth causes a living soul to hate and dread sin."

<sup>16</sup> It is evident that Pope had also in his day a species of the false gospel which in our day we have come to call "the health and wealth gospel." The tying of one's temporal estate to his true spiritual state is a pernicious error which much troubles untaught and sensitive children of God. This heresy frequently teaches people that because "they do not have faith" they do not have this or that temporal thing.cf. Eccl. 1.9.

Magistrates, and for striking at the very Root of, the most unjust thing in the world; for they bring large stories of the Anabaptist in Germany, and thence conclude that those they call so here are such. Whether ever there were any such in Germany, or no, I know not. But it is evident those in England that are so called, are as faithful to the Magistrate as any in the Kingdom; for though they do not fight for their religion, yet are there thousands of those sectaries, and Anabaptists, (as they call them) in the Field, with their lives in their hands, to maintain a lawful Magistracy against Tyranny.<sup>17</sup>

Add to this, the Confession of Faith, published in the name of seven Churches in London.<sup>18</sup>

Sometimes they say they are an unclean people, and then to prove it, they bring a great many stories of Out-landish men, and of a great many of their beastly Predecessors ; the Popes who tolerated Jews, and instance in but one man in all England one Farnham, that pretended he was one of the Prophets of Rev. 11. this Farnham, if he be a man of any Religion, is that of the Church of England, for since he was in prison he was very hot for common prayer; therefore Dr. Featly<sup>19</sup> should have framed his argument thus; if the Popes tolerate Jews, or any old stories can be related of some beyond the Sea that have been called Anabaptists, that have had many wives, or any one giddy-brained fellow in England, although of no religion, then are the Anabaptists an impure Sect; but the former is true, therefore the latter. Another slander as bad as this is cast upon the Anabaptists, which is, that they are a bloody Sect, and to make this good, Dr. Featley tells us; First, that some under colour of Religion, sacrificed their Parents, some their children, in the Valley of Hinnon, the Indians their Kings and Priests, to which they were stirred up by the Devil, and sometimes to wars, then tells us persecution against the Church; but because this reaches not the Anabaptist, he tells us what the Anabaptist did in Suevia, and Francoma, of Thomas Munzer, John Mathias, and John of Leyden;<sup>20</sup> and because this is little to Anabaptist in England, he says, it is not good to suffer

---

<sup>17</sup> It is past interesting that in the 17th century Particular Baptists were labeled as "Anabaptists." What is significant in Popes refutation is that he nowhere distances The Particular Baptists from the Anabaptists. It is evident that Pope did not see Anabaptism as essentially different from the the Particular Baptist faith of his own age. He only distances the Particular Baptist faith from the fanatical elements of Anabaptism, most of whom confined their activities to Germany. This approach is markedly different from modern Baptist "scholars" (particularly in the Reformed Baptist churches) who take great pains to ignore or deny any connection between the Anabaptists and the English Particular Baptists.

<sup>18</sup> A reference to the 1st London Confession of 1646, chapter 48 which reads in part, "A Civil Magistracy is an ordinance of God, set up by Him for the punishment of evil doers and for the praise of them that do well; and that in all lawful things commanded by them, subjection ought to given by us in the Lord..."

<sup>19</sup> Dr. Featley was an Anglican "scholar" who incessantly attacked Particular Baptist teachings. His chief work was "The Dipper Dipt." He was in character much the same as the Jews who followed the apostle Paul from city to city to harass him and stop him, as much as possible, from preaching the Gospel.

<sup>20</sup> These were the chief scoundrels whose fanciful teachings and extreme actions cast all of the Anabaptists under the dark cloud of being immoral anarchists. It was common for all shades of Protestantism to frequently cite these cases as justifying the most extreme measures to suppress Anabaptist teaching and practice.

the Eggs of the Cockatrice to remain among us, for when they be hatched, there will break out of them most whether the Anabaptists, or Dr. Featly and those of his Sectaries- Mr. Paget who applies himself to the Lord Mayor [of London] to take a course with the Anabaptists , and Mr. Pryn who applies himself to Parliament, to cut off the sectaries, or Dr. Featly himself, who would have them dealt with as one would do with a Cockatrice Egg, and if the Dr. and his Sect be the bloody Sect, then whereas he says the Anabaptists are a lying Sect, page 168, this will fall upon him also, and his followers whose Books are almost as full of untruths as an Egg is full of meat: But pardon this digression, it is only to show how that Scripture is fulfilled, Matthew 5.11<sup>21</sup>

I will now proceed to show that the people of the New Covenant ARE NOT TO LOOK TO BE THE MORE PROSPEROUS IN THE THINGS OF THIS LIFE, BECAUSE THEY WALK CLOSE WITH GOD. [emphasis ours], as it was with the people of the first Covenant. Matthew 10.16-18. Christ tells those he sends out what hard things they must suffer for His Names sake; He doth not tell them, that their Enemies that come out against them one way, shall fly before them seven ways; but they must go forth as Sheep among Wolves and be brought before Councils, and before Kings, and Magistrates for His Names sake so also, vs.21,12,36,37,38. And therefore he gives them many encouragements against their troubles, as vs. 19,20,24,25,28,29,30,31,32,39. [Acts 14.22] And what Christ foretold his servants in these and many more Scriptures, they found to be fulfilled; see an abstract of their sufferings, 2 Cor. 1.8-10 and 11.23-28; 4.8-11. See how it befell the Churches; 1 Thess. 2.14; Acts 8.1; Heb. 10:32-34; Rev. 2.9-10;11.3;12.4.6.13.14.16.17. Thus you see how it went with them, in regard of persecution: I will give you some Scriptures, that speak of their poverty; the Churches of Macedonia had a great trial of afflictions and were in deep poverty. 2 Cor. 8.2. So the Church of Smyrna. Rev. 2.9. Christ told those that would be his Disciples, that they must deny themselves, and take up their cross daily and follow him. Matthew 16.24; Mark 8.34. Christ himself had not whereon to lay his head. Matthew 8.10 and the disciple is not above his Lord. Matthew 20. The prophets prophesy in sackcloth. Rev. 11. God hath chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith. James 2.5; I Cor. 1.26-28. Thus you see by the current of Scripture, what is the condition of the Churches, and people of the New Covenant.

Now if God had promised them the same privileges in outward things, as he did the people of the first Covenant, he would have made good His promises: But he had promised BETTER THINGS [emphasis ours] in the this Covenant, to the people that belong to it; and hath also made it good to them, as he did make good the promises of the first Covenant, to the people of it: This may cause us to suspect that Church, in which we see worldly glory, to be none of Christs; especially, seeing the Scripture hath set out the Whorish, Antichristian Church in her bravery. Rev. 17.4 having the Kings of the Earth to be her companions, in her fornication, or Whorish Worships; as also the multitudes of the Nations vs. 2,15;chap. 18.3,9. See her costliness further, v.7,12-19. But by what means are people deceived, to think this glorious

---

<sup>21</sup> The true Church of Christ is always "the sect" "everywhere spoken against." Acts 28.22. Note Luke 6.26.

Whore to be the Church of Christ? Only by this, that God did put a great deal of outward Glory upon the Church of the first Covenant, and it had in it the King of Israel to rule in matters of God; and from this they ground, that the Churches of the Nations, are the Churches of Christ; and from hence it is, that their Ministers must be Gentlemen, have the Tithe of all mens charge, and labour, which they bestow on their Land, as well as the increase: and from hence it is, that there must be dedicated places for Worship, built large, and high with great stones, like the Temple: But we have seen the contrary in the Church of Christ under the New Testament all along; therefore this worldly glory did only belong to the first Covenant, which now to hold forth, denies Christ to be come in the flesh and is Antichristian.

In the next place, it may be of singular comfort to the people of this Covenant that the promises thereof are better promises, then the promises of the first Covenant; for they are Spiritual, and perpetual good things that are promised: it may be a strong ground against falling away. If God have writ His Law in our hearts, who shall take it out? If God hath pardoned our sins, who shall them to our charge? If God will not remember them, who shall call them to mind? Rom.8.35.

#### **THE USE OF THE SIXTH DIFFERENCE.**

If the Covenant into which we are taken, be that better covenant, and Christ (not Moses) is the Mediator of it; then to have any Mediators beside Christ denies Christ to be come in the flesh, and is Antichristian.<sup>22</sup>

Again, it shows us the happy estate of the Saints, they have such a Mediator; It is their duty not to sin, but when they do sin, there is a Mediator between God and Man, who continually makes up the breach. Hebrews 9.24; I John 2.1-2. I confess if it were not so they might fall out of the favour of God; but seeing he is gone into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us, Hebrews 4.29, I believe so long as he appears a Risen Christ for us, and continueth His Mediatorship, those that are in Covenant with God shall so continue; otherwise we shall make the Mediatorship of Christ, less successful than that of Moses, who did prevail with God to pass by the peoples sin, Exodus 32.21; Psalm 106.23. Oh let us take heed that we do not so dishonor Christ in His Mediatorship; for to prefer Moses before Christ, is Antichristian.

#### **THE USE OF THE SIXTH DIFFERENCE.**

If the blood of Christ (and not the blood of Beasts) is the blood of the New Testament, then here is the great privilege of Saints, the blood of the first Covenant. Matthew 26.28. And this blood purges the conscience from dead Works, to follow the living God, Hebrews 9.14. By this blood we have Remission of Sins, and a way made into the holiest through the veil, which is his flesh; and that with boldness, by that new and living way, and have a high Priest

---

<sup>22</sup> Such as the Popish church and her blasphemy asserting Mary to be a "co-Mediatrix with Christ."

over the house of God, Heb. 10.18,19,20,21. Nay, it is not only our privilege that we enter boldly, but it is our duty, we ought to draw near in full assurance of faith, vs. 22. So that which is our privilege, is our duty; and duty is our privilege: In this, we may take notice of the unspeakable freeness of the Grace of God, and magnify it; as also, the wonderful happiness of the Saints, that are made to partake of such grace; When the blood of the first Covenant was to be offered, none could go into the holiest, but the High Priest, but now the veil that did keep the people from the holiest is done away, or rather the substance of that shadow is consecrated to be our new and living way of entrance by the blood of Jesus, into the holiest; and this blessed way unto the Father is open to all the people of the Covenant, that they go as freely before the Mercy Seat, as the High Priest who is already entered. Hebrews 9.24. But the way was not made manifest while the first Tabernacle was standing, Heb. 9.8. This shows us us, that for men to teach, that the people of God ought to mourn for sin<sup>23</sup>, NOT DECLARING IN WHAT SENSE, IS ANTICHRISTIAN [emphasis ours] because there is no need to offer this blood, year by year, nor a remembrance of sin every year, as under the Old Covenant, Hebrews 10.1-3. but by one offering Christ has perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Hebrews 10.12,14. So that now for the people of God to mourn for sins as under sin, is sinful; since it undervalues the blood of the Covenant, as if it needed to offered yearly, as the blood of the first Covenant was. Again, it is sinful ,because it opposes duty; for it is the duty of Saints to draw near in full assurance of Faith, but to apprehend ourselves to lay under the guilt of sin, keeps us off of this duty; so that those who are truly humbled for sin(I mean those that are in the Covenant) are not humbled FROM SENSE OF GUILT, AND FEAR OF WRATH; [emphasis ours] but because they by sin to dishonour God, who is their loving Father, who also hath pardoned their sin.

### **THE USE OF THE SEVENTH DIFFERENCE.**

If the law of the first Covenant was written in Tables of Stone, and the Law of the New Covenant in Fleshly Tables of the heart; then it informs us, that we are not to reckon a Nation to be in covenant with God, and so to be the Church of God; for that sets up the first covenant again, and so is Antichristian, denying Christ to be come in the flesh; for God did take a Nation into covenant by the first covenant;but by the second he takes only those meet to himself by covenant, in whose hearts he writes his Law; and therefore there were Churches in Judea, where there was but one National Church, under the first Covenant (as I have formerly showed) and those Churches were in Christ. I Thess. 2.14; Gal. 1.22. The Church of Corinth were Saints by calling, I Cor. 1.2. The Church to whom Peter wrote, were

---

<sup>23</sup> Bro. Pope does not mean to deny that in a real sense N.T. Believers are to mourn for their sin. cf. James 4.9. Rather he makes a critical point here. Namely that the New Covenant believer does not mourn over his sin from the sense of guilt and fear of God's wrath. He mourns because he has grieved the Holy Spirit and offended the one he loves-the Lord Jesus Christ. Notice John 14,15; 15.9-13 and the central part love plays in the New Covenant ethic.



lively stones, I Peter 2.5. Such as did believe, vs. 7. A holy Nation, a peculiar people, such as were called out of darkness into His marvelous light, vs.9. Such holy Nations, and none else, the New Covenant doth allow of, to be churches of Christ; all other Nations, viz all collective bodies of the Nations, affirming to themselves the title, and practice of Churches, having no rule but from the first Covenant, are Antichristian.

Objection. It may be some will object and say that in the invincible Church, there is none but such as have God's Law written in their hearts; but in the visible Church under the New Covenant, there have been as bad as was among the Jews under the first Covenant.

Answer. I answer, that into the visible Churches of Saints, some may creep in unawares; as Jude speaks Jude 4. [2 Peter 2.1; Acts 20.29-31] But if they once be discovered to be wicked, the Church will be leavened with them, if they do not cast them out, I Cor. 5.1,6,7,11. Rev. 2.20. And so my ground holds good for Saints in the Nations to be the people of God's covenant, and for the Nations that call themselves Gods Churches, they are (as I conceive) The waters that carry the whore. Rev. 17.15. For the Whore being a spiritual thing, must necessarily sit upon people that are accounted religious, and not the Nations of Turks and Pagans, as some think.

#### **THE USE OF THE EIGHTH DIFFERENCE.**

If the New Covenant be so plain, and full of light; then let the people of it labour to walk as children of light, and of the day; putting on the breastplate of faith, and love, and for an Helmet the hope of salvation, I Thess. 5.8. Oh let us endeavour so to walk, as those that watch for our halting, may have nothing against us, unless it be in the matter of our God; Let us labour to show forth the praises of him, that hath called us out of darkness into His marvelous light. I Peter 2.9. And the note the Scriptures give us to know if we are in the light is, if we love the Brethren, I John 1.7;3.9-11. So that (I conceive) to desire to have any of them hanged, imprisoned, or banished, IS FROM THE DARK SPIRIT OF ANTICHRIST; [emphasis ours] and not from the Spirit of Love, and Light, which is from Jesus Christ: For when the Disciples would call for fire from Heaven, as Elijah did, Christ tells them, they did not know what Spirit, they were of. cf. Luke 9.55. It is like, they thought it had been the Spirit of God that moved them to be so zealous for their Master, when it seems it was nothing so; For the Spirit of the Lord doth produce other fruits, Gal. 5.22-23, as Love, Peace, Long-Suffering, etc. [James 3.13-18]. So by this (I suppose) we may judge what spirit men are guided by, if we see them exercising love, joy, peace, long-suffering, goodness, gentleness, etc. then we may conclude they are led on by the Spirit of Christ.

But if we hear them cry out thus, Let us fill all presses and make all Pulpits ring, and so possess Parliament, City, and whole Kingdoms against Sects, etc.<sup>24</sup> And when such counsel as this, is so generally practiced by the Ministers of the Presbyterian way, crying continually to God, and the Magistrate, for fire from heaven, or that which is equivalent to it, to devour

---

<sup>24</sup> As modern day Reconstructionism and "Christian Right" movements.

them. We may also conclude as safely that this is from the dark spirit of Antichrist, the veil being still upon their hearts, when we look to the Old Testament to be a Rule in this; that because God appointed under that Testament, that men should be cut off by death for divers sins; as breaches of the Sabbath, Num. 15.36 and for many other offences; as Lev. 20.2.27; 24.24,23; Deut. 13.10 and 17.5 and 21.21 and 22.21,22,24. Now Christ hath appointed in the New Testament, that they be cut off by Excommunication, for that which was death under the Old Testament, Deut. 22.22 compared with I Cor. 5 etc. But they would not have them cut off for the same things, as they were under the first Testament, but for Heresy; and that not proved by two or three witnesses, without which none could be put to death under the first Testament.

### **Objection**

But it will be objected, that it is proved to be Heresy, for which the Presbyterians would have the Sectaries cut off;<sup>25</sup> by more than two or three witnesses; for the whole Synod (some few excepted) prove it.

### **Answer**

For answer hereunto they say so; but unless they be infallible in their says they cannot prove it.

### **Objection**

But it will be objected, that it is like that so many learned men, after long debating know more than some few, and those for the most part unlearned.

### **Answer**

I answer, there were the more ground to think so, if their own interest did not so much blind their eyes; but seeing why lies at stake (as they conceive) and they having the whole business in their own hands, they being parties, and witness, and judges, it is not likely they should acknowledge that to be truth, which their supposed adversaries the Sectaries (as they call them) hold; but condemn it for heresy, though it be the very truth of Christ: for if it were not so, why did they formerly seek to the Magistrates for liberty themselves, when the same would make out their own interest, and now are so earnest against it, crying daily to the Magistrate to refrain it in others, who do as well deserve it as themselves: But they be in

---

<sup>25</sup> At the time when Bro. Pope wrote this the Presbyterian Party had, for a brief time, assumed control of the British Parliament.. The Westminster Assembly (termed Synod by Pope) was sitting and the vision of a National Church that would be wholly Presbyterian was being pursued zealously. Pope astutely observes that the goals and methodology employed by the Presbyterian Party was no different in sum and substance from that employed by its predecessor, the National Anglican Church. Sadly, in less than a generation from Pope's day the next generation of Particular Baptists would begin to make common cause with the Presbyterian Party, letting the Trojan horse inside the walls of Zion.

honour, and live like Princes, yet this availeth them nothing, so long as they see any honest Mordecays (that are faithful to make discoveries of whatever is against the welfare of the State, whom they have reproached with the name of Sectaries) to fit in the Kings Gate, under the Parliaments protection; but should they prevail to have them cut off, I am sure these adversaries could not repair the States loss; for I am persuaded that this design to cut off the Sectaries, is of as dangerous consequence, as any one thing that hath been plotted by the Kings party.<sup>26</sup> But blessed be God that the faithfulness, and valiant achievements of these Mordecayes, are daily read in the ears of the Parliament, so that I doubt not but they will keep them still under their protection, although their adversaries have set up Gallows in their own thoughts; and purposes to hang them all upon, as appears by their daily preaching and printing, following the Parliament with their Dedicatory Epistles, Sermons, and Petitions for power to suppress them; and because they have it not to their minds, they charge the Parliament with Covenant-breaking, etc. But I wonder what these men think of the 25 of Matthew. Do they think that Jesus Christ was in earnest, when he said, that those which did not visit His brethren in their affliction must be sent away with Go ye cursed: Oh then, what will be the condition of those that labour by all possible means to have them imprisoned, banished, etc.

### **THE USE OF THE NINTH DIFFERENCE.**

If the worship of the first Covenant did hold out Christ to come, and the worship of the New-covenant declares Christ to be already come; Then it teaches us, that to hold out any part of that worship now, is to deny Christ to be come, and so is Antichristian.<sup>27</sup>

Now the worships of the two Covenants, did differ in many regards; As first, the worship of the first Covenant was tied to ONE NATION, Psalm 147.19-20. Also, it was tied to ONE PLACE, Deut. 25.5-7; 14.26-27. But the worship of the New-covenant is to be performed in ANY NATION, and in ANY PLACE of that Nation, Acts 10.34-35, the whole of Ephesians 2; John 4.21-23. Answerable to this was the Saints practice, Acts 2.46; I Cor. 14.23. When the Whole Church is come together into some place (saith the Apostle) making no difference of places. The worship of the first Covenant was carnal, and performed in a worldly sanctuary, Col. 2.10,20. Hebrews 9.1. But the worship of the New-covenant is Spiritual, and performed in a Spiritual sanctuary, Phil. 3.3; I Peter 2.5; Ephesians 2.20-22.

These things premised, it will easily appear what is the reason that many of the people of God, do question many things in point of worship: As first of all, that the people in a Nation

---

<sup>26</sup> The reference by Pope is to the Presbyterian charge, in all like hood true, that Charles I and his inner circle were actively plotting to return the National English Church started in the previous century by Henry the 8th to being part of the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>27</sup> That infant sprinkling is based largely upon the practice of the old covenant which its most learned and candid practitioners admit; that its origin was in the corrupted early churches and that it spread by reason of the force employed by the 2nd Beast proves this practice be one of the chief tenets of Antichristian religion.

should be compelled to worship; for though God did require under the first covenant that the Whole Nation of Israel should worship him, it was because they were His people in covenant; but he hath not taken any other nation into covenant; therefore to force any Nation to worship, must have a ground from the first covenant. But in the New-covenant God only requires such to worship him, as can worship him in spirit and truth. John 4.23-24. This makes many think, that if it would please the Magistrates to set men free in point of worship, there would be more sincerity and less hypocrisy in the worship of God; As to instance in the public Fasts, the whole Nation is forced to worship, as the Nation of Israel was. [Matthew 6.16-18]. But now under the New-covenant God requiring only SPIRITUAL WORSHIP, it is conceived, that if all those who have NO HEART, nor NO SPIRITUAL ABILITY to perform worship, were left to follow their business in the world, which they can do, and the work were commended only to those that would freely offer themselves, It would be more pleasing to God, being more suitable to the New-covenant, and less suitable to the Old; for it is not the number, but the sincerity in answering a Rule of the New-covenant that is well-pleasing to God; Three horses that can, and will draw, will do more when the Cart stands, then they can with twenty more added to them that draw backward: the like may be said of other National worship.

Again, inasmuch as God did bind all the people of the first covenant to come to one place to worship, and to bring thither their gift, which place he made holy by dedication and consecration; and now a ground being taken from thence to set apart special places of worship, consecrated and dedicated, and all men bound unto it under penalties, as in the first covenant; that therefore it is, that many of the people of the New-are afraid to come to worship there, lest they should approve (at least) of that which (as they do conceive) doth deny Christ to be come in the flesh; and upon this ground it is (and no other, as I truly believe) that many people of God do think, that the power of Christ alone is to be administered among the Churches, in things appertaining to God; and that in matters of Civil Government, the Magistrate is to rule all men alike, both Churches, and others; for the Scepter was not to depart from Judah; nor a Law-giver from between his feet till Shilo come, Gen. 49.10.

### **OBJECTION**

But if you say, sometime they had none to rule by that Scepter? As appears, Judges 17.16; 18.1; 21.25

### **ANSWER**

I answer, though they had none to rule, yet there did remain the Scepter, and the right of ruling; and that in matters of worship, God informing them by his Prophets what to do, they being to rule for him, in that Nation which he had chosen, which was Church and State individual; and this to continue till Shilo came; therefore when this people would have a King like other Nations (God having divorced them from all other Nations) God tells the Prophet, they have not cast of him, but God: I Samuel 8.7. And though God did grant them a

King, yet would he not make them altogether like other Nations; for he would chose their King for them, I Sam. 10.24. And he appointed the manner of their kingdom, vs. 25. Thus did God rule over the people of His Covenant, in a more special way then over other Nations; therefore it is conceived, that he doth so now over the people of the New covenant; But now Shilo is come, he is conceived to have the Scepter, and to be the Law-giver to the people of the New-covenant; in all those things that appertain to his own kingdom; and for those things that appertain to this life, he hath set the ordinance of Magistracy to be obeyed, by all his own people, as well as others, and he that refuseth refuseth the Ordinance of God, and therefore they must obey, or submit to every human ordinance, or ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, and for conscience sake. cf. John 1.49, Rev. 1.5;15.3;Matthew 2.2; 21.5; Romans 13.1,2,5; I Peter 2.13,14

### **OBJECTION**

If any one object, that if this be so, then every one will do that which is right in his own eyes?

### **ANSWER**

I answer, seeing God by his own Ordinance hath appointed Magistrates to order the affairs of the Nations, and Jesus Christ to order the affairs of his Kingdom, this objection is fully resolved: Neither need any fear that any of those that have learned to give the Lord his due, will deny Caesar his, seeing the Lord hath made both a duty; and both former, and latter, experience doth confirm it; and if any men in the Kingdom be disloyal to the Magistrates, it is those that would so fain have those that are faithful and true hearted to the State cut off, imprisoned, or banished, in a time where there is so great need of them: But the Lord forgive them.<sup>28</sup>

### **THE USE OF THE TENTH DIFFERENCE.**

If the Lord have taken away the first, that he might establish the second, Heb. 10.9. Then it should teach all people to take heed that they do not go about to establish again that which God hath taken away, nor take away that which God hath established: all do which endeavour to bring into the worship of God the rites of the first Covenant; and it is indeed to give the Spirit of God the lie, for it is in effect to say the first Covenant is best, when the Spirit of God says the second is the best, being established upon better promises. I am persuaded, that each godly heart doth long for the utter ruin of Antichrist, which will be completed so soon as this is generally seen, that the upholding the first Covenant is the

---

<sup>28</sup> This objection fails to realize that true religion is a matter of the heart. The Civil Magistrate can never form true religion in the hearts of his subjects. This can only be formed in a nation by the preaching of the Truth. If a nation is irreligious it only shows what is in the heart of the nation and cannot be remedied by any measures of the Civil Magistrate.

upholding of Antichrist;<sup>29</sup> what was that with which the Churches were deceived, and bewitched presently upon their first planting? Was it not the bringing in something of the first Covenant? As appears, Gal. 3.1,2,3. and almost the whole Epistle declares it, O foolish Galatians

(saith the Apostle) who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? The Apostle seems to admire that inasmuch as a crucified Christ had been so clearly held forth among them, which did put an end to the Rites of the first Covenant, that they should be so bewitched as to bring them in again.

Are you so foolish (saith he) having begun in the Spirit are you now made perfect by the flesh? vs. 3. By flesh he means the rites and privileges of the first Covenant, and by Spirit the privileges of the second, as appears by what follows all along, to the 12<sup>th</sup> verse of the 5<sup>th</sup> chapter; compared with Phil. 3.3-4. If the Galatians were bewitched, and if it were foolishness in them to return to the first covenant; is it not so now in those that do the same thing, as they did?

Would it make the Apostle a transgressor to build again the things which he had destroyed? Gal. 2.18. And must not they needs be transgressors, which build again the things which God himself hath made void, Hebrews 10.9. We see there was no small deceit in this, that the Apostle is fain to use so many Arguments to prevent it; He tells them It was to be in bondage to weak and beggarly elements; Gal. 4.9, as he should say, what folly is it for those that are set in a glorious liberty, to desire to be in bondage to things that are beggarly? Therefore he warns them to stand fast in this liberty, against that bondage. Gal. 5.1.<sup>30</sup> You see he holds out the distance and difference between the Liberty of the New-covenant, and the bondage of the Old, in the two Mothers, and their two Seeds, as before is showed. Gal. 4.22,-26. Again, he tells them, if they were circumcised Christ should profit them nothing.

---

<sup>29</sup> This error is often subtle. In our age it is very common to teach the people of God that the rule of their conduct is the Ten Commandments. But it is manifest from Scripture that the Ten Commandments were given to ISRAEL as a rule for the FIRST Covenant. As J.C. Philpot put it, "We rightly discard and reject the law as a rule of life to a believer. What then, is our rule?...We have a rule of life as far exceeding the law as the new covenant of grace and truth in the glorious Person of the Son of God exceeds and outshines the old covenant of works, and as much as the ministration of the Spirit, of life, and of righteousness excels in glory the ministration of the letter, of death, and of condemnation. (2 Cor. 3.6-11) In a word, THE PRECEPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, in all their fulness, minuteness, and comprehensiveness, ARE OUR RULE OF LIFE."- Gospel Precepts by J.C. Philpot, pages 34 & 35. The reader is urged as a necessary corrective to this Antichristian error to read the entirety of "Gospel Precepts."

<sup>30</sup> The walking by the rule of circumcision is not dead in our day. The infant sprinklers maintain that "Baptism has TAKEN THE PLACE of circumcision." To maintain that any element of the New Covenant is a replication of an element of the Old Covenant is to be "entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. 5.1. The New Covenant view of circumcision is laid out in clear terms by the apostle when he says, "For I testify to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law, Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace." Gal. 5.3&4.

Gal. 5.2. That Christ was become of none effect to them, that were debtors to keep the whole Law, that they were fallen from grace. Gal. 5.3-4.

It seems that Circumcision was that particular of the first Covenant, whereby they were most easily deceived at that time, being so lately in use: But now this will not take with people, the Spirit of Antichrist hath put men upon the observing of other particulars of the first Covenant, which are as dangerous (as I conceive) as that of Circumcision: Oh therefore let us take heed how we act in any of the parts of the first Covenant, in the worship of God; for this persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you. Gal. 5.8. Religion is not a thing to be jested with; if we would therefore honour God, and be honoured of God in the enjoyment of Gospel freedom, and pursue Antichrist to utter ruin; Let us cleave close the rules which Christ, and his Apostles have left us to walk by, which when all religious people are brought unto, Antichrist is down.

**FINISH**