

A P H O R I S M E S
OF
JUSTIFICATION,

With their Explication
annexed.

*Wherein also is opened the nature of the
Covenants, Satisfaction, Righteousness,
Faith, Works, &c.*

Published especially for the use of the
Church of *Kedderminster* in *Worcestershire*.

By their unworthy Teacher,
R. I. BAXTER,

Hebr. 9. 15.

And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the Redemption of the transgressions under the first Testament, they which are called light receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

HAGUE,

Printed by *Abraham Brown*,
Anno 1655.

To the Learned, zealous, Faithful
Ministers of Jesus Christ, Mr. *Richard
Vines*, Master of *Pembroke-Hall* in *Cam-
bridge*, and Mr. *Anthony Burges*, Pastor of *Sutton-Cold-
field* in *Warwickshire*, Members of the Reverend As-
sembly of Divines, my very much valued Friends
and Brethren in the work and Patience of the Go-
spel.

Most Dear Brethren,

I Never well understood their mean-
ing, who crave Patronage to their
Writings from the meer great o-
nes of the times. If they need or
desire a borrowed honour? Me-
thinks they quite mistake their way, and go
for water to the top of *Tenerife*, which they
should seek in the valleys or stillflowing
Springs. To give them our Writings to in-
struct them, is agreeable to our Office and
duty: but to submit them to their censures,
or crave the protection of their Greatnesses,
and prefix their names as the Signatures of
Worth, as if Truth did ever the more dwell
within, where this gilded sign is hang'd with-
out: this seemeth to me, to be as needless,
as absur'd. The self-idolizing sin of Pride is
so natural to all men, especially when fur-
thered by dignities and wordly pomp, that
they are apt enough without a tempter, to
take themselves for the *summum genus* in every

Predicament as well as their own. A little help will mount them above their Teachers, and a little more above Ordinances; but the top of the ambition is to be above God; that on them as the *Alpha* all may depend, and to them as the *Omega* all may ascribe. I think it a more needful work (not for our honour, but their own safety) to make them understand, that Princes and Parliaments are Scholars in that School where Christ is the Master, and we his Ushers: and that (at least) in respect of our Nuncupative, Declarative power, we are their Rulers in spirituals, whom they are bound to obey, *Heb.* 13:7, 17. and that all Ministers are Bishops or Overseers in the language of the holy Ghost, *Acts* 20:28, *Phil.* 1: 1. &c. and not the servants or pleasers of men, *Gal.* 11:10.

They leave us the bare name of their Teachers, so that we will teach them nothing but what they have taught us first, and leave out the hard sayings, which they cannot bear. For my part, though I have found as much respect from such as most, yet have I known very few of the most Religious great ones, but if I would deal but half as plainly as my commission and patterns do require, I should quickly turn their respect into indignation. If the old round dealing Prophets and Apostles were among us, I doubt some pious Gentlemen

would take them for sawey, proud, pragmatical fellows; and would think their tongues (though not their revenues) did need a reformation. All this is no blemish to Magistracy, the Ordinance of God, but to human nature, that for the most part can as ill bear a high estate, as a man's brains can endure to stand on the pinnacle of a steeple. Nor is this to blame any due honour to such, but to excuse my self, that I employ not my breath to fill any empty bladder. For you who are low, and full, I suppose the acknowledgement of your worth is less dangerous. As I am more beholden to Reason and Religion, then to Greatness, so do I feel them command my esteem and affections most powerfully. Your names therefore have I chosen to prefix to this paper.

1. As acknowledging you indeed fit censors of my Doctrine; having always valued the judgement of *Aristotle* in Philosophy before *Alexanders*; and thinking your approbation more considerable then all the Lords or Commanders in the Land, if you approve, I shall be the more confirmed (and so will my people for whom I write it, who know and honour you.) If you disallow, (for I cannot conceit that there is nothing to be disallowed) I shall suspect, and search again.

2. I desire also hereby to acquaint the world with the reverend esteem I have of you, and

to shew the contemnners of the ministry some examples for their consutation: That they who think that *England* hath not as learned, holy, experimental, judicious, humble, heart-piercing Preachers, as any other Nation whatsoever, may look upon you and confess their error: That for all the dissensions that have so wasted both Church and State, it may appear in you, we had some that were lovers of peace; and if all had been so minded, our wounds had been healed. That our ignorant yonglings that rush upon the Ministry (who may see themselves in that glass, 1 *Tim.* 3:6. may consider their distance from such as you, and be humbled. That those who wonder at the spreading of errors in our people, may see in you, we had some that taught them better; And *Alexander* did unjustly hang *Ephestions* Physician because he died. And that our Authors or defenders of *Jeroboam's* worship, whose fingers itch to be doing with the Prophets that gain say them, may see what manner of men they have to deal with, whose worth is sufficient to disgrace the proudest persecutors, and make their names hateful to all generations: To whom I commend Sir *Walter Rawleighs* true observation (*Hist. of the world par. l.4. c.3. p.6.*) [If *Antipater* upon his conquest had carried all other actions never so mildly, yet for killing *Demosthenes*, all that

read his eloquent Orations, do condemn him for a bloody Tyrant to this day: Such grace and reputation do the learned Arts find in all civil Nations, that the evil done to a man famous in one of them, is able to blemish any action how good soever otherwise it be, or honorably carried. To such ends as these have I here prefixed your names; and not to interest you in the dishonour of the imperfections of this slender Tractate.

Farewell, Reverend Brethren, and go on to be exemplary in all spiritual excellencies; And that the Lord of the Harvest would send forth more such, and lengthen and succeed your labours to his Church, is the hearty prayer of.

*Your unworthy fellow-
servant,*

Apr. 7.
1649.

R.I. BAXTER.

TO THE READER.

THe flow progress of knowledge, and the small addition that each age doth make to the foregoing, both in common Sciences and Divinity, doth seem a wonder to many. Among many others, these four are no small impediments to this desirable increase.

Every ignorant, empty brain (which usually hath the highest esteem of it self) hath the liberty of the Press, whereby (through the common itch that pride exciteth in men, to seem somebody in the world) the number of books is grown so great, that they begin with many to grow contemptible; and a man may bestow a great many years to find out the Authors weakness, and that his books have nothing in them out common; and so many must be tossed over before we find out those few that are clear and solid, that much of our lives are spent in the discovery: And yet he is thought to scape well that only loseth his time and labour and gets no more hurt by them. Some think the truth will not thrive among us, till every man have leave to speak both in Press and Pulpit that please: God forbid that we should ever see that day! If ten mens voices be louder then one, then would the noise of Error drown the voice of Truth: Ignorance is usually clamorous and loud, but Truth is modest, though jealous: One Orthodox faithful Teacher, would scarce be seen or find room for the crowd of seducers: For the godly, compared with the ungodly, are not near so few as the men of cleer understanding, in comparison of the ignorant: And they are most forward to speak, that know least.

2. Others there are of much like understanding and ends as the former, who yet take the contrary means to obtain those ends. They know no such way to be the only men, as magisterially to silence all contradictors: If it were only for apparent and weighty truths, I should commend their zeal: But the mischief is, that they will be Creed-makers themselves, or put their Commentaries into the Text, or so conjoin them, as the Rhemists, that the Text may not walk in the day-light

alone: And so the Creed of many, who have a quick and easy faith is swelled as big almost as Aquinas Summes. If one of the Primitive Martyrs were alive among us, and professed but what was in his ancient Creed, he would scarce be taken by many for a Christian. I am not all so narrow in my Creed, as Doctor Taylor urgeth: but I have observed more of this sort of men condemn his Arguments, then are able to answer them. These men themselves believe so much (*fide Humana*) that they know but little; and yet, they would have no body know more then they, or no body speak that saith not as they. They would have nothing said but what is said already; and then it is better (in print) say nothing. They think it a reproach to change our opinions, or hold them with reserves: *Pudet hæc opprobria nobis, &c.* But O that these men could tell us how to remedy it! To cry down that ignorance which dwelleth in me, is more to the credit of Knowledge then of me. But these men are like many superficial Scholars, who when they have spent many years in the Universities, have no way to prove themselves proficient, but to extol learning, and to cry down the unlearned, that so they may cast the suspicion from themselves upon others: Even so do these in crying down errors. I know this small Tract will not relish well with these men's palates, neither is it ambitious of their savour, or yet so quarrelsome as purposely to provoke them; though some words may not be cut meet to their conceits. As I abhor the project of Julian to destroy the Christian Faith, by giving all Sects a liberty of contending; so am I loath that any such monster should be produced by nature who should be a professed enemy to the advancement of Reason; or should presume to bound that sea of Knowledge which God hath promised shall cover the earth; and to say, hitherto shalt thou go, and no further; For my part, I must say as Burgersdicius in præfat. as secundam edit. Logic, *δευτεραι φροντιδες σοφωτεραν*. Vis enim humanæ mentis ita circumscripta est, ut omnia non videat omni tempore; & quæ antea probavit, post accuratius examen iterum improbet, rejiciatque. Hoc adeo reipsa competio sæpius in studiis meditationibusque meis, ut

quae olim mihi visa sunt certissima & quasi ex tripode pronunciata, ea melioribus rationibus motus deprehendam, admodum esse a veritate aliena. *And sure Divinity hath as great depths as Philosophy; especially where it is interwoven with it: And to them that will certify me in my mistakes, I must say as Aristotle: to his Physician when he prescribed him the means of his cure* (referente Æliano, lib. 9. de var. Hist.) Ne, inquit, me cures velut bubulcum, velut fossorem, fed prius causam ediffere, sic enim facili persuasione me morigerum reddideris. Crudelissima enim est (inquit Ritschel) & insanissima tyrannis, cum quis alios, ut à se dictis assurgant, cogere vult, nulla dictorum evidentia allata.

3. *But the greatest enemy to knowledge of all, is men's studying only names and words, in stead of things. Both in Sciences and Divinity this hath debased men's understandings. Men get all the terms of Art, and Theological definitions, Distinctions, Axioms, &c. at their fingers end; but to study the nature of the things themselves, they are utterly careless. Their learning tieth more in their memory, than in their reason and judgement: There you may find perhaps a large Nomenclature, or a Farrago Notionum secundarum sed ferè sine primis. They have learned (as Parrots) to speak the same words which their Tutors and Authors have put into their mouths; but put them out of their beaten road, and they are at a stand: These men may with industry make good Linguists or Historians or perhaps be able to muster an Army without their Roles: But for Philosophy and Divinity, they have little more then the Carriers horse when he hath a Library on his back. As learned, Thomas White saith, in Dialog. de mundo, pag. 370. Doctorum duæ sunt Classes, Alii enim eruditi sunt quasi memoria tenus docti; alii veritatum pensitatores: Duo itaque ad auctoritatem petuntur, ut & artis peritus sit, & eorum numero penes quos depositum est scientiæ Tribunal. What I would say to these men, they may read (if they will bestow the labour) in Ritschell's Preface to his late Contemplations Metaphysicæ.*

And (which is the killing effect of this venom) these Preachers usually teach their people a Christianity suitable to their own Theology, which consisteth in repeating certain words, and forms, and using certain ceremonious actions, and then they are as good Christians as they themselves are Divines.

4. *And yet were there no miscarriage in our studies, Knowledge could not make that happy progress which some expect: For it is not in studies as it is in Manufactures, that one man may begin where another left; but every man must fetch it from the very principles himself: Neither can we take the words of those that have studied it before us; for that is neither a sound, nor satisfactory knowledge: whence it comes to pass, (saith Pemble Vind. Grat. p.168.) that while we are busy in examining our forefathers inventions, and posterity employed in trying our examinations, neither we nor they have much time to add any thing for the increase of Learned Knowledge: Whence you may guess at one cause, why many Sciences, for some thousands of years have kept one pitch, and not grown above that dwarfish stature that they had in their infant invention: and also what the reason is that many that read most, prove not the deepest Scholars; for no greater impediment to exalt Learning then to make use of other men's understandings, and neglect our own.*

I speak not this, as if I had overcome these impediments any more then others; but because I have perhaps more been hindered by them, and so take my self bound to warn thee of the pit that I have fallen in: And with all to let thee know, that if godly-men themselves while they lie in these snares shall oppose any truth in this Tract, it is no wonder, but a thing to be expected.

To give thee the History of the conception and nativity of these Aphorismes, & the reason why I trouble the world with more Books, which I blame in others; understand, that this is but an appendix to another Treatise going to the Press on a more excellent Subject: Also, that having occasion therein to touch upon: Matth. 25:35. I was desired to explain in what sense it is, that Christ giveth the reason of his sentence in judgement from men's works: In answer hereto (and to clear some other incident doubts of the like nature) I wrote these Positions or Aphorismes?

which when some had got, they complained of obscure brevity, desired some fuller explication; which when I had done, that which was before but two or three leaves, annexed as an Appendix to the fore-mentioned Treatise, did swell to this bigness, that I was fain to let it go alone. Could I have got Copies enough for my own friends, whom I am bound to instruct, other men had not been like to have been troubled with it; If thou please, thou mayest let it pass without thine observation: if otherwise, it is so small, that it will take up but little of thy time to read it, nor add much to the common burden. Some few passages here are which I am not so clear and confident in my self; As the nature of the Death threatened in the first Covenant; The necessity of the punctual performance or execution of all threatenings; The interest of Christ's Active Obedience to those Laws which did bind men in innocency, in the work of satisfaction, as conjoined with his Passive Obedience to make up the same price. But as these are but few, so I am not utterly at a loss concerning them, but seem to discern a strong probability of what I have written therein,

For you, my Friends, whom Christ hath committed to my Teaching and Oversight, as to an unworthy Usher under him in his School, and Steward in his House, and of his Mysteries; I publish this for your sakes and use:

- 1. Because I have still thought that points controverted are better written than preached, and read than heard; especially, where the greatest part of the Auditory is incapable of understanding them.*

- 2. Yet is this Doctrine of so great concernment, and so near the Foundation, that of all the controversies agitated in the Church, there's few that do better deserve your study, and few that I am so loath you should be ignorant of. It is my exceeding joy, that God hath kept you in his distracted Age, from doting about questions that engender strife, and hath given you to cleave to the most fundamental, undoubted, and practical Truths, and to spend your time in practice, and peace, and promoting the salvation of the igno-*

rant about you, when others are taken up in censuring their brethren, renting the Church, opposing the truth, or wrangling about lesser things; which are quite above their understandings. Hold on this way; and if you have not in it more Communion with Christ, more growth in Grace, and on your Death-beds a more comfortable review of your lives, and at last a better reckoning made thereof, then the other, then say, I have deceived you. Yet, as I would have you neglect no truth, so especially what time you can spare for controversy, let it chiefly be spent upon these that are so weighty. Be ashamed that men should hear you disputing about Circumstantials of Discipline, Baptism, Supper, &c. before you know how to be justified before GOD, or understand the Doctrine of the Covenants, Redemption, Faith, Obedience, &c,

3. The Books that are written of justification are many, and some great, which I knew you had not time to read; and if you did, perhaps would lose much of your labour, as I have done: Therefore I desired to set the most necessary part before you in a narrower compass. I never intended the full handling of the Doctrine of justification, these Aphorisms being but for the Answering of a particular Question; Especially what is in Master Bradshaw I omit, because I expect that you will read and study him, the Book being so small, and of such singular worth, containing as much as the greatest Volumes. In some places I have omitted the proof of my Assertions, partly because they seemed plain, or to be the evident consecutaries of former Positions; partly for brevity, and partly because it is for your use, to whom I am (yet) at hand to clear what you doubt of, and who, I hope, do understand, that to take upon trust from your Teachers what you cannot yet reach to see in its own evidence, is less absurd, and more necessary than many do imagine. Moreover, knowing, that I must shortly put off this Tabernacle, and be taken from you, I thought good to use this endeavour, that you may be able after my departure, to have these things in your understandings and re-

membrance (2 Pet. 1:14, 15.) And while I am in this flesh, I shall not cease to admonish you, and pray on your behalf, that you may beware lest ye also being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness; but may grow in Grace, and in the Knowledge of our LORD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST: Nor shall I desire any greater Honour or advancement on this Earth, than with Abilities Sincerities and Success, to be.

A Servant of Christ, in the
work of your Salvation,

Kedermister.

Novemb. 17.

1648.

R.I. BAXTER.

A P H O R I S M S
O F
J U S T I F I C A T I O N ,
With their Explication
Annexed.

Wherein also is opened the Nature
of the Covenants, Satisfaction,
Righteousness, Faith,
Works, &c.

T H E S I S I.

*G*od hath first a Will of purpose, whereby he determineth of Events: what shall be, and what shall not be, de facto; Secondly, And a Legislative, or Preceptive Will, for the government of the Rational Creature: whereby he determineth what, shall be; and what shall not be, de jure, or in some of duty; and in order thereto, concludeth of Rewards and Punishments.

E X P L I C A T I O N.

*T*his distinction of the Will of God into his Will of Purpose and his Will of Precept, is very commonly used by Divines, and explained by some, especially Doctor

Tivisse frequently, and Doctor *Edward Reignolds*, in his Sermons on the Humiliation days, on *Hos.* 14. Yet is not the exceeding necessity and usefulness of it discerned by many, nor is it improved accordingly by any that I have read: It is near of kin to the common distinction of *Voluntas signi*, & *Beneplaciti*, but not the same: The Term *signi* being more comprehensive, yet (in my judgement) less proper and convenient than this [Legislative Will, or *voluntas Præcepti*.] As the old verse shews, *Præcept ac prohibet, permittit, consulit, implet*. Two of these Acts, to wit, Permission and Operation, fall under the Will of Purpose, as they are the effects and revelation of it; but not under the Legislative Will: And indeed the Schoolmen by their *Voluntas signi*, do intend not other Will, but the same which they call *Beneplaciti*, whose Object is event, as it is uncertainly represented to us by those five signs: And because they are such uncertain signes (the contrary to what they seem to import, being frequently certain;) therefore they tell us that this is but metaphorically called the Will of God; viz., by a speech borrowed from the manner of men, who signify their Will by such kind of Actions; see *Aquin. sum.* 1^a. 1^æ. *Quest.* 19. *Art.* 11, 12. And *Schibler. Metaph.* of this.

But that which I call the Legislative or

Preceptive will, hath another object, *viz.* not event but duty; and is Metonymically rather then Metaphorically called God's Will, it being the effect and revelation of his real unfeigned will. For God doth not seem to Will that this or that shall be our duty, and so speak after the manner of men (according to the sense of their *Voluntas signi*) but he willeth it unfeignedly,

Neither is this Distinction the same with that which differenceth God's revealed Will from his secret. For his revealed Will containeth also part of the Will of his Purpose, and all the will of precept: The mere prophecies, and also the promises and threatenings, so far as they point out future event, are the Revealed part of the Will of God's Purpose. *Tilenus* himself in his conference with *Camero* seems to approve of this Distinction; where he distinguisheth of God's Will according to its Object, *viz.*, *vel quod ipse vult facere, vel quod a nobis vult fieri*: If in this last branch he speak not *de officio* & of this preceptive will, rather then *de eventu* and of the will of purpose, then he can mean it only of a conditional will of purpose.

As we use to distinguish betwixt the legal will of the King publicly manifesting our duty in the Laws, and his personal private will; so must we do here.

The necessity of this distinction is so exceeding great, that but little of the doctrinal part of Scripture can be well understood without it. The verity of it is also unquestionable: for none but the grossly ignorant will deny, that Event and Duty, Purpose and Law, are truly distinct, or that both these last are called in Scripture and common custom of speech, The Will of God.

And therefore it is a senseless Objection, that we hereby make two wills in God, and those contradictory. For first, we only make them two distinct Acts of one & the same will: whereof that of purpose is less revealed, and doth less concern us, yet is most properly called his will as being such as in man we call, the Elicit Act of it: but that of precept is all revealed and doth more concern us; yet as it is in his Law it is only Metonymically called his Will, as being only the discovery of his Will properly so called.

And 2ly Contradiction there is none; for they are not *de eodem*; they have to do with several Objects, To Will that it shall be *Abraham's* duty *pro hoc tempore* to sacrifice his son; and yet that *de eventu* it shall not be executed, are far from contradictory. To Will that it shall be the *Jew's* duty, not to kill Christ, and yet that eventually they shall kill him, is no contradiction. To will that it

shall be *Pharaoh's* duty to let *Israel* go; and yet that in point of event he shall not let them go, is no contradiction. Indeed, if God had willed, that he shall let them go, and he shall not eventually, or that it shall be his duty, and it shall not; either of these had been a contradiction undoubted.

But I have largely explained and more fully improved this Distinction under the Dispute about Universal Redemption, and therefore shall say no more of it now.

THESIS II.

First, Predestination, Election, Reprobation, or Pretention, Secondly, the Covenant betwixt the Father and the Son, Thirdly, the absolute Promises of Regeneration and perseverance. Fourthly, the fulfilling of those Promises by differencing Grace, are all in the series under the Will of God's Purpose.

EXPLICATION.

IT is of very great use to understand which of these Wills every one of God's particular words or works do fall under.

1. That Predestination, Election, and Reprobation are under this Will of Purpose only, is undoubted.

Divines use to mention a Covenanting between the Father and the Son about the work of Redemption: It is called a Cove-

nant but improperly, speaking after the manner of men. Properly it is but the Decree of God concerning Christ's Incarnation, his work, and his sufferings, and the success of these, and what God will further do thereupon. This therefore falls under this Genius, and so doth the Fathers giving the Elect to Christ, which is but part of this.

3. Those promises of taking the hard heart out of us, and giving hearts of flesh, one heart, a new heart, and of putting his fear in us, that we shall not depart from him, &c. are generally taken to be Absolute promises (for here is no Condition expressed or intimated) made to all the Elect and only them, as not yet regenerate; and so not to any either named or qualified persons. These are not therefore fulfilled upon condition of our Faith, or made ours by believing, as other promises are: For Faith is part of the thing promised, and the persons are unregenerate, and consequently unbelievers when these promises are fulfilled to them. Therefore these Absolute promises are but mere gracious predictions what God will do for his Elect, the comfort whereof can be received by no man till the benefit be received, and they be to him fulfilled: Therefore as all mere predictions, so also these promises do fall under the Will of Purpose, and not of Precept.

4. So also doth the fulfilling of these to particular persons: the actual choosing or calling of some while others are passed by; The bestowing of that faith which is the condition of the Covenant: The giving of perseverance: And all the passages of special, effectual, differencing Grace. The knowledge of this is of great use in expediting the Arminian Controversies, as you shall perceive after: Some parts of Scripture do in several respects belong to both these Wills; such are some promises and threatenings conditional, which as they are predictions of what shall come to pass, do belong to the will Purpose, but as they are purposely delivered and annexed to the commands and prohibitions for incitement to Duty, and restraint from Sin, (which was indeed the great end of God in them) so they belong to the Will of Precept: For the promise of Reward, and the threatening of Punishment, are real parts of the Law or Covenant, so of History. All this is only a preparative to the opening more fully the nature of the Legislative Will, and what falls under it: For the Will of Purpose, and what is under it, I have no intention any further to handle.

THESIS III.

First, The Will of God concerning duty is expressed wholly in his written Laws. Secondly Which

Laws are promulgate and established by way of Covenant, wherein the Lord engageth himself to reward those that perform its conditions, and threateneth the penalty to the violaters thereof.

EXPLICATION.

1. NOT but that much of God's Will is also contained in the Law of Nature; or may by the meer use of Reason be learned from Creatures, and Providences: But yet this is nothing against the Scriptures sufficiency and perfection: For besides all the superadded Positives, the Scripture also contains all that which we call the Law of Nature; and it is there to be found more legible and discernable than in the best of our obscure, deceitful, corrupted hearts.

2. All perfect compulsive Laws have their penalty annexed (or else they are but merely directive) but not usually any reward propounded to the obeyers: It is sufficient that the Subject know his Sovereigns pleasure, which he is bound to observe without any reward. Mere Laws are enacted by Sovereignty: Mere Covenants are entered by equals, or persons disengaged to each other in respect of the contents of the Covenants, and therefore they require mutual consent. These therefore made by God, are of a mixed nature; neither mere Laws, nor mere Covenants,

but both. He hath enacted his Laws as our Sovereign Lord, without waiting for the Creatures consent, and will Punish the breakers, whether they consent or no: But as it is a Covenant, there must be a restipulation from the Creature; and God will not perform his conditions there expressed, without the Covenanters consent, engagement, and performance of theirs.

Yet is it called frequently in Scripture (a Covenant,) as it is offered by God, before it be accepted and entered into by the Creature: because the condescension is only on God's part; and in reason there should be no question of the Creatures consent, it being so wholly and only to his advantage. *Gen.* 9:12, 17. *Exod.* 34:28. *Deut.* 29:1. 2 *Kings* 23:3 &c.

There are some general obscure Threatnings annexed to the prohibitions in the Law of Nature, that is, Nature may discern that God will Punish the breakers of his Law, but how, or with what degree of Punishment it cannot discern: Also it may collect that God will be favourable and gracious to the Obedient: but it neither knows truly the conditions, nor the nature or greatness of the Reward, nor God's engagement thereto. Therefore, as it is in Nature, it is a mere Law, and not properly, a Covenant. Yea to *Adam* in his

perfection; the form of the Covenant was known by superadded Revelation, and not written naturally in his heart.

Whether the threatning and Punishment do belong to it only as it is a Law? Or also as it is a Covenant, is of no great moments seeing it is ready mixed of both. It is called in Scripture also, the curse of the Covenant; *Deut. 29:20, 21.*

THESIS. III.

The first Covenant made with Adam did promise life upon condition of perfect obedience, and threaten death upon the least disobedience.

EXPLICATION.

THE promise of life is not expressed, but plainly implied in the threatning of death. That this life promised was only the continuance of that state that Adam was then in in Paradise, is the judgement of most Divines: But what death it was that is there threatned, is a Question of very great difficulty, and some moment. The same damnation that followeth the breach of the New Covenant, it could not be; no more then the life then enjoyed is the same with that which the New Covenant promiseth. And I cannot yet assent to their judgement, who think it was only that death which consisteth in. a

meer separation of soul and body: or also in the annihilation of both. *Adam's* separated soul must have enjoyed happiness, or endured misery: For that our souls when separated are in one of these conditions, and not annihilated or insensible, I have proved by twenty Arguments from Scripture in another book. As *Adam's* life in Paradise was, no doubt incomparably beyond ours in happiness; so the death threatned in that Covenant was a more terrible death then our temporal death. For though his loss by a temporal death would have been greater then ours now; yet he would not have been a Subject capable of privation, if annihilated; nor however capable of the sense of his loss. A great loss troubleth a dead man no more then the smallest. Therefore as the joy of Paradise would have been a perpetual joy, so the sorrow and pain it is like would have been perpetual, and we perpetuated capable Subjects. See *Barlow exercit. utrum melius sit miserum esse quam non esse?* I do not think that all the deliverance that Christ's Death procured, was only from a temporal death or annihilation; or that the death which he suffered was *equivalent* to no more.

THESIS V.

THis Covenant being soon by man violated, the threatning must be fulfilled, and so the penalty suffered.

EXPLICATION

WHether there were any flat necessity of mans suffering after the fall, is doubted by many, and denied by *Socinus*. Whether this necessity ariseth from God's natural Justice, or his Ordinate, *viz.*, his Decree, and the verity of the threatning, is also with many of our own Divines a great dispute: whether God might have pardoned sin, if he had not said, *the sinner shall die*, may be doubted of (though I believe the affirmative, yet I judge it a frivolous presumptuous question. But the word of his threatning being once past, methinks, it should be past question that he cannot absolutely pardon, without the apparent violation of his Truth, or Wisdom. Some think that it proceedeth from his Wisdom rather than his Justice, that man must suffer: see *Mr. Io. Goodwin of justis. part. 2. pag. 34.*) but why should we separate what God hath conjoined? However, whether Wisdome, or justice, or Truth (or rather all these) were the ground of it, yet certain it is, that a necessity there was that the penalty should be inflicted; or else the

Son of God should not have made satisfaction, nor sinners bear so much themselves.

THESIS. VI

THIS penalty the offender himself could not bear, without his everlasting undoing.

EXPLICATION

THat is, not the full penalty: for part of it he did bear, and the Earth for his sake: and (as I think) all mankind doth bear part of it to this day. But the full penalty would have been a greater and everlasting suffering.

THESIS VII.

(1) Jesus Christ at the Will of his Father, (2) and upon his own Will, (3) being perfectly furnished for this Work, (4) with a Divine power, (5) and personal Righteousness, (6) first undertook, (7) and afterward discharged this debts (8) by suffering what the Law did threaten; and the offender himself was unable to bear.

EXPLICATION.

(1) THE Love of God to the World was the first womb where the work of Redemption was conceived, *Joh.* 3. 16. (as it is taken conjunct with his own glory.) The Eternal Wisdom and Love found out and resolved on this way of recovery, when it never entered into the thoughts of man to contrive or desire it.

(2) The Will of the father and the Son are one: The Son was a voluntary undertaker of this task: it was not imposed upon him by constraint: when he is said to come to do his Fathers Will (*Heb.* 10:7, 9.) it doth also include his own Will. And where he is said to do it in obedience to the Father, as it is spoken of a voluntary obedience, so is it spoken of the execution of our Redemption, and in regard to the human nature especially; and not of the undertaking by the divine Nature alone. Not only the consent of Christ did make it lawful that he should be punished being innocent, but also that special power which as he was God he had over his, own life more then any creature hath: *Joh.* 10: 18. I have power (ἐξουσίαν) saith Christ, to lay down my Life.

(3.) No meer creature was qualified for - this work: even the Angels that are righteous do but their duty, and therefore cannot supererrogate or merit for us. Neither were they able to bear and overcome the penalty.

(4.) It must therefore be God that must satisfy God; both for the perfection of the Obedience, for dignifying of the duty and suffering, for to be capable of meriting, for the bearing of the curse, and for the overcoming of it, and doing the rest of the works of the Mediatorship, which were to be done

after the Resurrection. Yet meer God it must not be, but man also: or else it would have been forgiveness without satisfaction, seeing God cannot be said to make satisfaction to himself. Many other reasons are frequently given by Divines to prove the necessity of Christ's Incarnation, *Acts* 20.28. *Heb.* 1:1, 2, 3.

(5.) Had not Christ been perfectly righteous himself he had not been capable of satisfying for others: Yet is it not necessary that he must be in all respects a fulfiller of Righteousness before he begin the work of satisfaction, or that his righteousness and satisfaction be so distinct, as that the same may not be both righteousness and satisfactory.

Though many great Divines do so distinguish between *Iustitiam persoæ*, & *Iustitiam meriti*, as that the former is only a preparatory to the latter; yet I cannot see any reason but the same obedience of Christ to the whole Law may be both personal and meritorious, (of the righteousness of the Divine nature? or the habitual righteousness of the human nature, I do not now dispute.) Therefore I do not mean that all Christ's personal righteousness was only preparatory to his satisfaction and merit, when I speak of his being furnished with a personal Righteousness, though I confess I was long of that judgement. See more after at pag. 45.

(6.) The undertaking of the Son of God to satisfy, was effectual before his actual satisfying: As a man that makes a purchase, may take possession and enjoy the thing purchased upon the meer bargain made, or earns paid, before he have fully paid the sum. To this Purpose most understand that in *Rev. 13:8. whose names were not written in the book of life, of the lamb slain from the foundation of the World:* But I doubt not but *Weemse* his interpretation is the plain truth; that the words [*from the foundation of the World*] have reference to the writing of their names in the book of Life, and not to the slaying of the Lamb, as being thus to be read, *whose names were not written in the. book of life of the slain Lamb, from the foundation ofthe World.* It hath the same sense with *Rev. 17:8.* which doth expound this in leaving out the mention of the slaying of the Lamb.

(7.) I know man's guilt and obligation to suffer, is but Metaphorically called his debt. Therefore when we would search into the nature of these things exactly, we must rather conceive of God as the Lawgiver and Governor of the World, then as a creditor, lest the Metaphor should mislead us. Yet because it is a common & a Scripture phrase, and conveniently expresseth our Obligation to bear the penalty of the violated Law, I use it in that sense.

But here we are cast upon many and weighty and veiy difficult Quertions. Whether Christ did discharge this debt by way of solution or by way of satisfaction? 2. whether in his suffering and our escape the threatning of the Law was executed or dispensed with? 3. And if dispensed with, how it can stand with the truth and justice of God? 4. And whether sinners may thence be encouraged to conceive some hope of a relaxation of the threatnings in the Gospel? 5. And whether the faithful may not fear lest God may relax a promise as well as a threatning? 6. And lastly whether if the Law be relaxable, God might not have released his Son from the suffering, rather then have put him to so great torment, and to have freely pardoned the offenders? I shall briefly answer to all these.

Quest. Meer and proper solution or payment is, when the very same thing is paid which was in the obligation, or suffered which was threatned. This payment the creditor cannot refuse; nor the Ruler refuse this suffering, nor to acquit the person that hath so paved or suffered,

Satisfaction is the paying of somewhat that was not directly in the Obligation, but is given to satisfy the creditor in stead of the debt, which payment the Creditor may choose to accept; and if he do not content to

accept it, though it were paid, yet the debtour should not be acquit. So also in regard of suffering.

Here we take payment and satisfaction in the strict legal sense and not in the large sense wherein they are confounded. And now the Question is, whether Christ's suffering were the payment of the very debt, or of somewhat else in its stead? The resolving of this depends upon the resolving of two other questions both great and difficult.

1. What it was which the Law did threaten
2. What it was that Christ did suffer?

1. Various are the judgements of Divines about the former; and exceeding difficult it is to determine, because it hath pleased the Holy Ghost to speak of it so sparingly: and who can here understand any more then is written? 1. Whether *Adam's* soul and body should immediatly have been annihilated, or destroyed so as to become infallible? 2. Or whether his soul should have been immediatly separated from his body as ours are at death, and so be the only sufferer of the pain?

3. Or if so, whether there should have been any Resurrection of the body after any certain space of time, that so it might suffer as well as the soul? 4. Or whether soul and body without separation should have gone down quick together into Hell? Or into any place

or date of torment short of Hell? 5. Or whether both should have lived acursed life on Earth through everlasting, in exclusion from Paradise, separation from God's favour and gracious presence, loss of his image, &c? 6. Or whether he should have lived such a miserable life for a season, and then be annihilated, or destroyed? 7. And if so, whether his misery on Earth should have been more then men do now endure? And the more important are these Questions of, because of some other that depend upon them. As 1. what death it was that Christ redeemed us from? 2. And what death it is that perishing infants die, or that our guilt in the first transgression doth procure? For it being a sin against the first Covenant only, will be punished with no other death then that which is threatned in that Covenant.

Much is said against each of these expositions of that first threatning.

Against the first I have said somewhat before; And that in 1. *Thess. I: 10.* seems to be much against it: *Jesus that delivered us from the wrath to come:* This wrath was either the execution of the threatning of the Covenant of works, or of the Covenant of grace: not the latter, for Christ saveth none who deserve it, from that: therefore it must needs be the wrath of the first Covenant, and consequently that

Covenant did threaten a future wrath to all sinners, which, if the world or *Adam* himself had been destroyed, or annihilated immediately upon his fall, we had not been capable of.

2. Against the second sense, it seemeth unlikely that the soul should suffer alone, and the body lie quietly in the dust, because the body did sin as well as the soul, and the senses were the souls inticers and betrayers.

Against the third there is no intimation of a Resurrection in the Scripture as part of the penalty of the Covenant of works, or as a preparative to it. That *Adam* should have risen again to be condemned or executed if Christ had not come, no Scripture speaks; but rather on the contrary, Resurrection is ascribed to Christ alone, 1 *Cor.* 15:12, 21, 22.

4. Against the fourth it seemeth evident by the execution, that the reparation of soul and body was, at least, part of the death that was threatned, or else how comes it to be inflicted? and the Apostle saith plainly, that in *Adam* all die, *viz.* this natural death, 1 *Cor.* 15:22.

5. Against the fifth the same Argument will serve.

6. Concerning the sixth & seventh they lie open to the same objection as the second.

It is hard to conclude peremptorily in so,

obscure a case. If we knew certainly what life was the reward of that Covenant, we might the better understand what death was the penalty. *Calvin* and many more Interpreters think that if *Adam* had not fallen, he should after a season have been translated into Heaven without death, as *Enoch* and *Elias*, but I know no Scripture that tells us so much. Whether in Paradise terrestrial or celestial I certainly know not; but that *Adam* should have lived in happiness and not have died, is certain; seeing therefore that Scripture tells us on the one hand, that death is the wages of sin and on the other hand, that Jesus delivered us from the wrath to come; the 2, 6, and 7. Expositions do as yet seem to me the most safe, as containing that Punishment whereby both these Scriptures are fulfilled: Beside that they much correspond to the execution, *viz.*, that man should live here for a season a dying life, separated from God, devoid of his Image, subject to bodily curses and calamities, dead in Law, and at last his soul and body be separated; his body turning to dust; from whence it came, and his soul enduring everlasting sorrows, yet nothing so great as those that are threatned in the new Covenant.

The Objection that lieth against this sense, is easier then those which are against the other. For though the body should not rise to tor-

ment yet its destruction is a very great punishment: And the soul being of a more excellent and durable nature, is likely to have had the greater and more durable suffering: And though the body had a chief hand in the sin, yet the soul had the far greater guilt, because it should have commanded and governed the body; as the fault of a man is far greater then the same in a beast.

Yet I do not positively conclude, that the body should not have risen again; but I find no intimation of it revealed in the Scripture; but that the sentence should have been immediately executed to the full, or that any such thing is concluded in the words of the threat *In the day thou eateth thou shalt die the death*. I do not think; for that would have prevented both the being, the sin, and the suffering of his posterity; and consequently Christ did not say any one in the world from sin or suffering but *Adam* and *Eve*, which seems to me a hard saying (though I know much may be laid for it.)

Thus we see in part the first Question resolved, what death it was that the Law did threaten? Now let us see, whether this were the same that Christ did suffer? And if we take the threatening in its full extent, as it expresseth not only the penalty, but also its proper subject and its circumstances, then it is undeny a-

ble that Christ did not suffer the same that was threatened; For the Law threatened the death of the offender, but Christ was not the offender; *Adam* should have suffered for ever, but so did not Christ; *Adam* did die spiritually, by being forsaken of God, in regard of holiness as well as in regard of comfort, and so deprived at least of the chief part of his Image; so was not Christ.

Yet it is disputable whether these two last were directly contained in the threatening, or not? whether the threatening were not fully executed in *Adam's* death? And the eternity of it were not accidental, even a necessary consequent of *Adam's* disability to overcome death and deliver himself, which God was not bound to do? And whether the loss of God's Image were part of the death threatened, or rather the effect of our sin only, executed by ourselves, and not by God? Many Divines say, that God did not take away his Image, but man thrust it away: So *Capell of Temptations*, pag. 8. &c. Though most judge otherwise, because the same power must annihilate that must create.

I conclude then, that in regard of the proper penalty, Christ did suffer a pain and misery of the same sort, and of equal weight with that threatened; but yet because it was not in all respects the same, it was rather satisf-

faction then the payment of the proper debt, being such a payment as God might have chosen to accept.

The 2. Question was, Whether the threatening was executed, or relaxed and dispensed with?

Answ. The Answer to this is plain in the answer to the former.

In regard of the mere weight of Punishment, considered as abstracted from person; & duration, it was executed & not relaxed, yet taking the threatening entirely as it was given out, and we must say it was dispensed with; for mankind doth not suffer all that is there threatened.

Yet some, who think that the death threatened did consist in out present miseries and temporal death only, do also think that the threatening is fully executed upon the sinners, and that Christ hath only delivered us from the accidental duration of it, but not prevented the execution.

If I could think that the threatening intended no Punishment to the soul further, after it is separated from the body, then I should think as they.

The 3. Question is, How it can stand with, the Truth and justice of God to dispense

with his Threats? Concerning his Justice, the question is not difficult, & I shall say nothing to that; all the question is, how to reconcile this dispensation with God's truth. Here you must distinguish, 1. Betwixt the letter of the Law and the sense. 2. Between the Law and the end of the Law. 3. Between a Threat with exception either expressed or reserved, and that which hath no exception. 4. Between a threatening which only expresth the defert of the sin, and what punishment is due, and so falleth only under the will of precept, and that which also intendeth the certain prediction of event, and so falleth under the will of purpose also. And now I answer:

1. The end of the Law is the Law, and that end being the manifestation of God's Justice. and hatred of sin, &c. was fulfilled, and therefore the Law was fulfilled.

2. Most think that the Threatening had this reserved exception, [*Thou shalt die, i.e. by thyself, or thy surety.*] And though it be; sinful in man to speak with mental reservations when he pretends to reveal his mind, yet not in God, because as he is subject to no Law, so he is not bound to reveale to usual his mind, nor doth he indeed pretend any such; thing.

3. So that the sense of the Law is fulfilled.

4. But the special answer that I give, is this,

When Threatenings are merely parts of the Law, and not also predictions of event and discoveries of God's Purpose thereabouts, then they may be dispensed with without any breach of Truth: For as when God saith, [*Thou shalt not eat of the Tree &c.*] the meaning is only [It is thy duty not to eat] and not that eventually he should not eat: So when he saith (*Thou shalt die the death*) The meaning is, (Death shall be the due reward of thy sin, and so may be inflicted for it at my pleasure) and not that he should certainly suffer it in the event. And I judge, that except there be some note added whereby it is apparent, that God intended also the prediction of event, no mere Threatening is to be understood otherwise but as it is a part of the Law, and so speaks of the dueness of punishment only, as the Precept speaks of the dueness of obeying.

If this be *Grotius* his meaning, I assent, that *Omnes minæ quibus non adest irrevocabilitatis signum, intelligendæ sant ex suapte naturâ dejure comminantis ad relaxandum nihil imminuere, (viz.)* so far as they are no predictions of event; otherwise God's bare prediction is a note of irrevocability: And his two notes, viz. An Oath, and a Promise, are not the only signs of irrevocability: God's Word is as sure as his Oath, and a Threatning as true as a Promise, and when it falls, under *Voluntas propositi*, will

as surely be fulfilled. See *Grotius de satisfactione Christi, cap. 3. & Votivum ejus defenforem.*

The 4. Question is, whether sinners may not hence be encouraged to conceive some hope of a relaxation of the Threatnings in the New Covenant? To this I answer.

1. No: For God hath fully discovered that it is his Purpose and resolution to execute those Threats, and not to relax or reverse them; that he will come in flaming fire to render vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c. 2 *The. 1:7, 8.* That there is no more sacrifice for sin, *Heb. 10:26, 27.* And hath revealed the manner how they shall be condemned, *Mat. 25.*

2. If there were any hope of this, yet were it unexpressable madness to venter ones everlasting state on that, when we see that God did not remit the penalty of the first Covenant wholly, but would have his justice satisfied, though by the suffering of his Son Christ: And yet that it also cost the offenders so dear themselves.

The 5. Question is, May we not fear lest God may dispense with his Promises as well as his Threats? I answer;

1. He did not dispense with his Threatening, but upon a valuable consideration.

2. No; for though the Promise as well as the Threat do belong to the Law, and so discover what is due, rather than what shall come to pass, yet the thing promised being once our due? cannot be taken from us without our consent: and so, as *Grotius* saith? *Ex promissione jus aliquod acquiritur ei cui facta est promissio*; justice bindeth to give all to another that is his, due, but not always and absolutely to inflict upon an offender as much Punishment as he deserveth.

Beside, God hath revealed it to be the will of his Purpose also to confer the things promised in the Gospel upon all Believers.

The 6 and last Question was, If the Law be relaxable, whether God might not have freely remitted the offence, and have spared his Son his satisfactory sufferings? I answer.

It yet remains under dispute whether the Threat speak not *de eventu*, as to the sin, though but *de jure*, as to the sinner? And then the Truth of God would forbid a dispensation as to the sin,

Though the Threatening do not flatly determine of the execution *de eventu*; yet it intimates a strong probability of it, & seems to tell the world, that ordinarily the Law-giver will proceed according thereto, and gives the sinner strong grounds to expect as much.

Therefore if God should relax his Law? much more if he should wholly dispense with it by remission, the Law would seem to lose much of its authority, and the Law-giver be esteemed mutable.

Besides, as no good Laws are lightly to be reversed, so, much less such as are so agreeable to order, and the nature of God and so solemnly enacted as this was.

Though GOD did dispense with his Law as to our impunity, because else mankind would have utterly perished, and because he is abundant in mercy and compassion (*Exo.* 34:7. *Psal.* 103:8. & 111:4, 5. & 145:8. *Isa.* 55:7. *Jer.* 31:20. *Luk.* 6:6. *Rom.* 2:4.) yet he is also holy and just, and a hater of sin; and how would those his Attributes have been manifested or glorified, if he had let so many and great sins go wholly unpunished. (*Prov.* 11:20. *Psal.* 5:5. & 45:8. *Heb.* 11:2. *Rom.* 1:18.

It would have encouraged men to sin and condemn the Law, if the very first breach and all other should be merely remitted; but when men see that God hath Punished his Son when he was our surety, they may easily gather that he will not spare them, if they continue rebels.

6. The very end of the Law else would have been frustrated, which now is fulfilled by

Christ's satisfaction: For *Proxima sunt idem & tantundem*.

7. Besides the exceeding love of God that is manifested in this suffering of his Son, and the great engagements that are laid upon the sinner.

They that will avoid all the supposed inconveniencies of this Doctrine of God's dispensing with his Threatnings, must needs affirm, that the offenders do suffer as much, and the same which was threatened.

(8.) Whether we are justified only by Christ's Passive Righteousness, or also by his Active, is a very great dispute among Divines. By his Passive Righteousness is meant not only his death, hut the whole course of his humiliation, from the Assumption of the human nature to his Resurrection. Yea, even his Obediential Actions so far as there was any suffering in them, and as they are considered under the notion of Suffering, and not of Duty or Obedience. By his Active Righteousness is meant the Righteousness of his Actions, as they were a perfect obedience to the Law. The chief point of difference and difficulty lieth higher, How the Righteousness of Christ is made ours? Most of our ordinary Divines say, that Christ did as properly obey in our room and stead, as he did suffer

in our stead; and that in God's esteem and in point of Law we were in Christ obeying and suffering, and so in him we did both perfectly fulfil the Commands of the Law by Obedience, and the threatenings of it by bearing the penalty; and thus (say they) is Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, *viz.* his Passive Righteousness for the pardon of our sins and delivering us from the penalty; his Active Righteousness for the making of us righteous, and giving us title to the kingdom: And some say, the habitual Righteousness of his human nature instead of our own habitual Righteousness; yea some add the righteousness of the divine nature also.

This opinion (in my judgement) containeth a great many of mistakes.

1. It supposeth us to have been in Christ, at least in legal title, before we did believe, or were born; and that not only in a general and conditional sense as all men, but in a special as the justified; indeed we are elected in Christ before the foundation of the world, but that is a term of diminution, and therefore doth not prove that we were then in him; Neither God's Decree or foreknowledge gives us any legal title.

2. It teacheth imputation of Christ Righteousness in so strict a sense, as will neither stand with reason, nor the Doctrine of Scrip-

ture, much less with the phrase of Scripture which mentioneth no imputation of Christ or his Righteousness to us at all; and hath given great advantage to the Papists against us in this Doctrine of Justification.

3. It seemeth to ascribe to God a mistaking judgement, as to esteem us to have been in Christ when we were not, and to have done and suffered in him, what we did not.

It maketh Christ to have paid the *Idem*, and not the *Tantumdem*; the same that was due, and not the value; and so to justify us by payment of the proper debt, and not by strict satisfaction. And indeed this is the very core of the mistake, to think that we have by delegation paid the proper debt of *Obedience* to the whole Law, or that in Christ we have perfectly obeyed, whereas; 1. It can neither be said, that we did it; 2. And that which Christ did, was to satisfy for our non-payment and disobedience.

So it maketh Christ to have fulfilled the preceptive part of the Law in our stead and room in as strict a sense, as he did in our room bear the Punishment, which will not hold good (though for our sakes he did both.)

It supposeth the Law to require both obedience and suffering in respect of the same time and actions, which it doth not. And whereas they say, that the Law re-

quireth suffering for what is past, and Obedience for the future, this is to deny that Christ hath satisfied for future sins. The time is near when those future sins will be past also; what doth the Law require then? If we do not obey for the future, then we sin; if we sin, the Law requires nothing but suffering for expiation.

7. This opinion maketh Christ's sufferings (by consequence) to be in vain, both to have been suffered needlessly by him, and to be needless also now to us: For if we did perfectly obey the Law in Christ, (or Christ for us, according to that strict imputation,) then there is no use for buffering for disobedience.

8. It fondly supposeth a *medium* betwixt one that is just, and one that is guilty; and a difference betwixt one that is just, and one that is no sinner; one that hath his sin or guilt taken away, and one that hath his unrighteousness taken away. It is true, in bruits and infensibles, that are nor subjects capable of justice, there is a *medium* betwixt just and unjust, and innocency and justice are not the same. There is a negative injustice which denominateth the subject *non-justum*, but not *injustu*, where Righteousness is not due: But where there is the *debitum habendi*, where Righteousness ought to be, & is not, there is no negative unrighteousness, but primitive: As there is

no middle betwixt strait and crooked, so neither between Conformity to the Law, (which is Righteousness,) and Deviation from it, which is unrighteousness.)

9. It maketh our Righteousness, to consist of two parts, *viz.* The putting away of our guilt, and the Imputation of Righteousness, *i.e.* 1. Removing the crookedness; 2. Making them straight.

It ascribeth these two supposed parts to two distinct supposed causes, the one to Christ's fulfilling the Precept by his actual Righteousness, the latter to his fulfilling the threatening by his passive Righteousness: As if there must be one cause of introducing light, and another of expelling darkness; or one cause to take away the crookedness of a line, and another to make it streight.

The like vain distinction it maketh between delivering from death, and giving title to life, or freeing us from the penalty, and giving us the reward; For as when all sin of omission and commission is absent, there is no unrighteousness; so when all the penalty is taken away, both that of pain, and that of loss, the party is restored to his former happiness. Indeed there is a greater superadded decree of life and glory procured by Christ more then we lost in *Adam*: But as that life is not opposed to the death or penalty of the

Covenant, but to that of the second; so is it the effect of Christ's passive, as well as of his active Righteousness.

So you see the mistakes contained in this first Opinion, about the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us.

The maintainers of it (beside some few able men) are the vulgar sort of unstudied Divines, who having notability or diligence to search deep into so profound a Controversy, do still hold that opinion which is most common and in credit.

If you would see what is said against it, read M^r *Wotton*, *Pareus*, *Piscator*, M^r *Bradshaw* Mr *Gataker*, and M^r *Io: Goodwin*.

The other opinion about our Participation of Christ's Righteousness is this, That God the Father doth accept the sufferings and merits of his Son as a full satisfaction to his violated Law, and as a valuable consideration upon which he will wholly forgive and acquit the offenders themselves, and receive them again into his favour, and give them the addition of a more excellent happiness also, so they will but receive his Son upon the terms expressed in the Gospel.

This Opinion as it is more simple and plain, so it avoideth all the fore-mentioned inconveniences which do accompany the former. But yet this difference is betwixt the main-

tainers of it: Most, of them think, that Christ's Passive Righteousness (in the latitude before expressed) is the whole of this Satisfaction made by Christ, which they therefore call *Iustitia Meriti*, and that his Actual Righteousness it but *Iustitia Personæ*, qualifying him to be a fit Mediator. Of this judgment are many learned and godly Divines, of singular esteem in the Church of God, (the more to blame some of the ignorant sort of their adversaries who so reproach them as Heretics: I have oft wondered when I have read some of them, (as M. *Walker*, &c.) to see how strongly they revile, and how weakly they dispute.) Sure if those two famous men *Paræus* and *Piscator*, beside *Olevian*, *Scultetus*, *Cargius*, learned *Capellus*, and many other beyond Sea, be Heretics, I know not who will shortly be reputed Orthodox; and if they be not mistaken all antiquity is on their side? beside *Calvin*, *Ursine*, and most other modern Divines that writ before this Controversy was agitated; and sure they are neither unlearned nor ungodly that have in our own Country maintained that opinion; witness M^r *Anthony Wotton*, M^r *Gataker*, M^r *John Goodwin*, and (as I am informed) that excellent Disputant and holy, learned, judicious Divine M^r *John Ball*, with many other excellent men that I know now living.

Some others (though few) do think, that though Christ's Righteousness be not imputed, to us in that strict sense as the first; Opinion expresseth? but is ours under the fore-explained notion of Satisfaction only, yet the Active Righteousness considered, as such is part of this Satisfaction also, as well as his Passive, and *Iustitia Meriti*, as as well as *Iustitia Personæ*; and though the Law do not require both obeying and suffering, yet Christ paying not the *Idem*, but the *Tantumdem*, not the strict debt it self, but a valuable Satisfaction, might well put the merit of his works into the payment.

The chief Divines that I know for this Opinion (as it is distinguished from the two former) are judicious and holy M^r Bradshaw, and Grotius, (if I may call a Lawyer a Divine.)

And for my own part I think it is the truth, though I confess I have been ten years of another mind for the sole Passive Righteousness, because of the weakness of those grounds which are usually laid to support the opinion for the Active and Passive; till discerning more clearly the nature of Satisfaction, I perceived, that though the sufferings of Christ have the chief place therein, yet his obedience as such may also be meritorious and satisfactory. The true grounds and proof whereof you may read in Grotius *de Satisfact. cap. 6.* and Bradshaw of Justification in Preface, and *cap. 13.*

The chief Objections against it are these;

1. *Object.* Christ's Passive Righteousness being as much as the Law required on our behalf, as satisfaction for its violation, therefore the Active is needless, except to qualify him to be a fit Mediator. I answer, This objection is grounded upon the forementioned Error, That Christ paid the *Idem*, and not the *Tantundem*: whereas it being not a proper payment of the debt, but satisfaction, therefore even his meritorious works might satisfy. Many an offender against Prince or State hath been pardoned their offence, and escaped punishment, for some deserving acceptable service that they have done, or that some of their predecessors have done before them. And so *Rom. 5.19. By the obedience of one, many are made righteous.*

It is objected, That Christ being once subject to the Law, could do no more but his duty, which if he had not done, he must have suffered for himself; and therefore how could his obedience be satisfactory and meritorious for us? I answer, 1. You must not here in your conceivings abstract the Human Nature, which was created, from the Divine; but consider them as composing one person: 2. Nor must you look upon the Works of Christ, as receiving their valuation and denomination from the Human Nature alone or principally. 3. Nor must you separate in your thoughts the

time of Christ's servitude and subjection, from the time of his freedom before his incarnation and subjection. And so take these Answers. 1. Christ Jesus did perform several works which he was not obliged to perform, as a mere Subject: Such are all the works that are proper to his office of Mediator, his assuming the Human Nature, his making Laws to his Church, his establishing and sealing the Covenant, his working Miracles, his sending his Disciples to convert and save the world, enduing them with the Spirit, his overcoming Death; and rising again, &c. What Law bindeth us, to such works as these? And what Law (to speak properly) did bind him to them? Yet were the works in themselves so excellent, and agreeable to his Father's Will, (which he was well acquainted with) that they were truly meritorious and satisfactory.

2. Some works performed which were our duty indeed, but he was not bound to perform them in regard of himself: Such as are all the observances of the Ceremonial Law, his Circumcision, Offering, and so his Baptism, &c. *Luke* 2:21, 24. *Gal.* 4:4. *Isa.* 53:12. *Joh.* 7:2, 10. *Mat.* 26:17, 18, 19, 20. & 3.13:10. These were the proper duties of sinners, which he was not: These two are admitted by M^r *Gataker*, and most others.

3. Even his obedience to the Moral Law was not his duty, till he voluntarily under-

took it: It being therefore upon his consent and choice, and not due before consent, must needs be meritorious. And though when he was once a servant he is bound to do the work of a servant, yet when he voluntarily put himself in the state of a servant, and under the Law, not for his own sake, but for ours, his work is nevertheless meritorious. Suppose when a Soldier hath deserved death, his Captain should offer himself to the General to do the duty of the private Soldier, and to perform some rare exploit against the Enemy, though he lose his life in the Service, and all this to ransom the Soldier: when he hath undertaken the task, it becomes due, but yet is nevertheless satisfactory. As he (saith *Bradshaw*) who to satisfy for another, becomes a slave to men; doth in and by all those acts, which the Laws bind a slave unto, make satisfaction; yea, though they be such acts, as he, becoming a slave, is bound upon pain of death to undergo: so Christ, &c. and the greater was the bond that he did undergo for the doing of them, the greater was the merit. *Isa.* 42:1. & 53:11. *Phili.* 2:7. *Luk.* 2:20. *Isa.* 53:9, 10. *Gal.* 4:4. 2 *Corinth.* 5:11. *Heb.* 7:26. 1 *Pet.* 2:22, 24. & 3:18. 1 *Joh.* 3:5.

4. Even some works that are due may yet be so excellent for matter and manner, and so I exceeding, pleasing to him that commands them, that they may give him satisfaction for

former injuries, and he may think it his part to encourage the Actor with some reward. So *Jonathan's* delivering *Israel* by that rare exploit did lave him from death: *Abner's* bringing in the Kingdom to *David* would have covered his former service against him: Many of *Joab's* faults were long covered by his good service: Such were the actions of *David* in bringing in the fore-skins of the Philistines; and of his Worthies, in fetching him of the waters of *Bethlehem*. 1 *Sam.* 14:44, 45, 2 *Sam.* 2:3. 1 *Sam.* 18:26, 27. 2 *Sam.* 23:16. It was not only the suffering or hazard in these actions that was meritorious, but also the excellency of the actions themselves.

The interest of the Divine Nature, in all the works of Christ, maketh them to be infinitely meritorious, and so satisfactory.

THESIS VIII.

(I) *Wherefore the Father hath delivered all things into the hands of the Son; and given him all power in heaven and earth, and made him Lord both of the dead and living.* *Joh.* 13:5. *Mat.* 28:18. *Joh.* 5:21, 22, 23, 27. *Rom.* 14:9.

EXPLICATION.

(I) For Explication of this there are several Questions to be debated.

1. Whether the extolling of Christ the Mediator, or the restoring and saving of the offenders, were God's more remote end, and principal intention?

2. Whether this Authority and Dignity of Christ, be by Original Natural Right? or by Donation? or by Purchase?

3. Whether Christ's Lordship overall, do imply or prove his redeeming of all? or of all alike?

4. Whether God hath delivered things out of his own power in any kind, by delivering them into the power of his Son: or whether it be only the substituting him to be Vicegerent to the Father?

To the first, I answer: That the saving of sinners was the end both of the Father and the Son, is plain through the Gospel and that the exalting of Christ to his Dominion was another end, is plain in *Rom.* 14:9. But which of these was the principal end, I think is an unwarrantable question for man to propound: I dare not undertake to assert a natural priority posteriority in any, of God's Decrees? *De mediis ad finem ultimum*; much less to determine which hath the first place, and which the second, *Phil.* 2:9.

To the second question I answer: 1. The Divine Nature of Christ being one with the Godhead of the Father, had an absolute sovereignty over all things from their first being: and so derivatively had the human nature as soon as assumed by virtue of the Hypostatical Union.

2. But there is further a power given him as Mediator to dispose of all at his pleasure, to make new laws to the world, and to deal with them according to the tenor of those laws: This power is partly purchased, and partly given (but not *gratis*;) that is, Though God might have refused the tendered satisfaction, and have made the sinner bear the punishment yet He willingly accepted the merits of his Son as a full ransom, and delivered up all to the Purchaser as his own: And so well was he pleased with the work of Redemption, that he also gave a further power to his Son, to judge his Enemies; and save his people with a far greater Judgment and Salvation. So that this power may be said to

be [given] Christ, as it was the free act of God, without constraint: and yet to be [purchased,] because it was given upon a valuable consideration.

To the third Question, I answer. This Authority of Christ implieth the purchasing of all things under his power or dominion, as is explained in the last: But what redemption or benefit is procured to the party. I shall shew you more, when I come to treat of universal Redemption by it self.

To the fourth Question, I answer. This is more then a substituting of Christ to be the Fathers Vicegerent. It is also a power of prescribing new terms of Life and Death, and judging men according thereto, as is said before. Yet is nothing properly given out of the Father's power or possession: but a power to suspend or dispense with the strict Covenant of Works is given to the Son; and so God having parted with that advantage which his Justice had against the sinning world, and having relaxed that Law, where by he might have judged us, is therefore said to judge no man, but to give all judgement to the Son, *Joh. 5:22, 27.*

THESIS IX.

(1) *IT was not the intent either of the Father or Son, that by this satisfaction the offenders should be immediately delivered from the whole curse of the Law, and freed from the evil which they had brought upon themselves, but some part must be executed on soul and body, and the creatures themselves; and remain upon them at the pleasure of Christ. Rev. 1:18. 1 Cor. 15:26,*

EXPLICATION.

THE Questions that are here to be handled for the Explication of this Position are these.

1. *Quest.* Whether the redeemed are imme-

diately upon the price paid, delivered from any of the curse of the Law? if not from all?

Quest. Whether the sufferings of the Elect before conversion are in execution of any part of the curse of the Law?

Whether the sufferings of Believers are from the curse of the Law? or only afflictions of Love, the curse being taken off by Christ?

Whether it be not a wrong to the Redeemer, that the people whom he hath ransomed are not immediately delivered?

5. Whether it be any wrong to the redeemed themselves?

6. How long will it be till all the curse be taken off the Believers, and Redemption have attained its full effect?

To the first Question I answer:

In this case the undertaking of satisfaction had the same immediate effect upon *Adam*, as the satisfaction it self upon us, or for us: To determine what these are, were an excellent work; it being one of the greatest and noblest questions in our controverted Divinity, *What are the immediate effects of Christ's Death?* He that can rightly answer this, is a Divine indeed; and by the help of this, may expedite most other controversies about Redemption and Justification. In a word, The effects of Redemption undertaken, could not be upon a subject not yet exigent, and so no subject, though it might be for them: None but *Adam* and *Eve* were then existent. Yet as soon as we do exist, we receive benefit from it. The suspending of the rigorous execution of the sentence of the Law, is the most observable immediate effect of Christ's death; which suspension is some kind of deliverance from it. Of the other effects elsewhere.

To the second Question. The Elect before conversion do stand in the same relation to the Law and Curse as other men, though they be differenced in God's Decree, *Eph. 2:3, 12.*

To the third Question. I confess we have here a knotty Question. The common judgment is, That Christ hath taken away the whole curse (though not the suffering) by bearing it himself; and now they are only afflictions of Love, and not Punishments. I do not contradict this doctrine through affectation of Angularity, the Lord knoweth; but through constraint of Judgement: And that upon these grounds following.

1. It is undeniable, that Christ's taking the curse upon himself did not wholly prevent the execution upon the offender, in *Gen.* 3:7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.

It is evident from the event, sceing we feel part of the curse fulfilled on us: We eat in labour and sweat; the earth doth bring forth thorns and briars; women bring forth their children in sorrow; our native pravity is the curse upon our souls; we are sick, and weary, and full of fears, and sorrows, and shame, and at last we die and turn to dust.

The Scripture tells us plainly, that we all die in *Adam*, (even that death from which we must at the Resurrection be raised by Christ,) *1 Cor.* 15:21, 22. And that death is the wages of sin, *Rom.* 6:23. And that the sickness, and weakness, and death of the godly is caused by their sins *1 Cor.* 11:30, 31. And if so, then doubtless they are in execution of the threatening of the Law, though not in full rigor.

It is manifest, that our sufferings are in their own nature evils to us, and the sanctifying of them to us taketh not away their natural evil, but only produceth by it, as by an occasion, a greater good: Doubtless so far as it is the effect of sin, it is evil, and the effect also of the law.

5. They are ascribed to God's anger, as the moderating of them is ascribed to his love, *Psal.* 30:5. and a thousand places more.

They are called Punishments in Scripture, and therefore we may call them so, *Lev.* 26:41, 43. *Lam.* 3:39. & 4:6, 22. *Ezra.* 9:13. *Hosea* 4:9 & 12:2. *Lev.* 26:18, 24.

7. The very nature of affliction is to be a loving punishment, a natural evil sanctified, and so to be mixed of evil and good, as it proceedeth from mixed causes: Therefore to say that Christ hath taken away the curse and evil, but not the suffering, is a contradiction, because so far as it is a suffering it is to us evil, and the execution of the curse. What reason can be given, why God should not do us all that good without our sufferings, which now he doth by them, if there were not sin, and wrath and Law in them ? Sure he could better us by easier means.

8. All those Scriptures and Reasons that are brought to the contrary do prove no more but this, That our afflictions are not the rigorous execution of the threatening of the Law, that they are not wholly or chiefly in wrath; but as the common Love of God to the wicked is mixed with hatred in their sufferings, and the hatred prevaileth above the love, so the sufferings of the godly, proceed from a mixture of love and anger, and so have in them a mixture of good and evil; but the Love overcoming the Anger, therefore the good is greater then the evil, and so death hath lost its sting, *1 Cor.* 15:55, 56. There is no unpardoned sin in it, which shall procure further judgment and so no hatred, though there be anger.

9. The Scripture saith plainly, That death is one of the enemies that is not yet overcome, but shall be last conquered, *1 Cor.* 15:26, and of our corruption the case is plain.

10. The whole stream of Scripture maketh Christ to have now the sole disposing of us and our sufferings, to have prevented the full execution of the curse, and to manage that which lieth on us for our advantage and good; but no where doth it affirm that he suddenly delivereth us.

To the fourth Question: It can be no wrong to Christ, that we are not perfectly freed from all the curse and evil as soon as he had satisfied; 1. Because it was

not the Covenant betwixt him and the Father. 2. It is not his own will, & *volenti non fit injuria*. 3. It is his own doing now to keep us under it, till he see the fittest time to release us. 4. Our sufferings are his means and advantages to bring us to his Will. Mankind having forfeited his life, is cast into prison till the time of full execution: Christ steppeth in, and buyeth the prisoners, with a full purpose, that none of them yet shall scape but those that take him for their Lord. To this Purpose he must treat with them, to know whether they will be his subjects, and yield themselves to him, and his terms. Is it not then a likelier way to procure their consent, to treat with them in prison, then to let them out, and then treat? and to leave some of the curse upon them, to force them to yield, that they may know, what they must expect else, when the whole shall be executed.

To the fifth Question: It is no wrong to the sinner to be thus dealt with; 1. Because he is but in the misery which he brought upon himself. 2. No man can lay claim to the Satisfaction and Redemption upon the mere payment, till they have a word of promise for it. 5. Their sufferings, if they will be ruled, shall turn to their advantage.

To the sixth Question: The last enemy to be overcome is death, 1 Cor. 15:26. This enemy will be overcome perfectly at the Resurrection then also shall we be perfectly acquit from the charge of the Law, and accusation of Satan: Therefore not till the day of Resurrection and Judgment, will all the Effects of Sin and Law, and Wrath be perfectly removed, 1 Cor. 15:24.

THESIS X.

- (1) *MAN having not only broken this first Covenant, but disabled himself to perform its Conditions for the future, and so being out of all hope of attaining Righteousness and Life thereby.*
 (2) *It pleased the Father and the Mediator to pre-*

scribe unto him a new Law, (3) and tender him a new Covenant, (4) the Conditions whereof should be more easy to the Sinner and yet more abasing, (5) and should more clearly manifest, and more highly honour the unconceivable Love of the Father and Redeemer.

EXPLICATION.

(1) WHETHER Man were only the meritorious Cause of this his disability, or also the Efficient, is a great dispute, but of no great moment; as long as we are agreed that Man is the only faulty cause. Whether he call away God's image? or whether God took it from him for sin? whether God only could annihilate it? Or whether Man may annihilate a Quality, though not a Substance? I will not meddle with. But too sure it is, that we are naturally deprived of it, and so disabled to fulfill the Law. If Christ therefore should have pardoned all that was past, and renewed the first violated Covenant again; and set Man in the same estate that he fell from, in point of guilt, yet would he have fallen as desperately the next temptation: yea though he had restored to him his primitive strength and holiness, yet experience hath shewed on how slippery and uncertain a ground his happiness would have stood, and how soon he was likely to play the Prodigal again with his stock.

(2) God the Father and Christ the Mediator, who have one will, did therefore resolve upon a more suitable way of happines.

(3) This way, as the former, is by both a Law and Covenant. As it is a Law, it is by Christ, prescribed, and flatly enjoined; and either obedience; or the penalty shall be exacted. As it is a Covenant, it is only tendered and not enforced. It is called a Covenant as it is in Scripture written and offered (as is said before) improperly, because it containeth the matter of the Covenant, though yet it want the form: Even as a Bond or Obligation before the sealing or agreement is called a Bond: Or as a form of prayer as it is written in a book, is called a prayer, because it containeth the matter that we should pray for: though to speak strictly, it is no prayer, till it be sent up to God, from a desiring Soul.

Though without Grace we can no more believe, then perfectly obey, (as a dead man can no more remove a straw then a mountain) yet the conditions of the Gospel considered in themselves, or in reference to the strength which God will bestow, are far more facile then the old conditions, *Mat.* 11:29, 30. I *Joh.* 5:3. And more abasing they are to the sinner, in that he hath far less to do in the work of his salvation: And also in that they contain the acknowledgement of his lost estate, through his own former self destro-

ying folly.

(5) Such incomprehensible amazing, Love of God the Father, and of Christ, is manifested in this New Covenant, that the glorifying thereof doth seem to be the main end in this design. Oh sweet and blessed End? should not then the searching into it be our main study? and the contemplating of it, and admiring it, be our main employment? *Rom.* 5:8. *Tit.* 3:4. 1 *Joh.* 4:9. *Eph.* 3:18, 19. *Joh.* 15:13. No wonder therefore that God did not prevent the fall of man, though he foresaw it, when he could make it an occasional preparative to such happy ends.

THESIS XI.

NOT that Christ doth absolutely null or repeal the old Covenant hereby, but he super-addeth this as the only possible way of Life. The former still continueth to command, prohibited promise, & threaten. So that the sins even oft be justified are still breaches of that Law, and are either earned and cursed thereby.

EXPLICATION.

I Acknowledge that this Assertion is disputable and difficult: and many places of Scripture are usually produced which seem to contradict it. I know also that it the judgement of learned and godly men, that the Law, as it a Covenant of works, is quite null and repealed in regard of the Sins of believers:

yea, many do believe, that the Covenant of works is repealed to all the world, and only the Covenant of grace in force.

Against both these I maintain this Assertion, by the Arguments which you find under the following Position 13. And I hope, not withstanding that I extol free Grace as much, and preach the Law as little, in a forbidden sense, as though I held the contrary opinion.

THESIS XIX.

Therefore we must not plead the repeal of the Law for our Justification; but must refer it to our Surety, who by the value and efficacy of his once offering and merits doth continually satisfy.

EXPLICATION.

I Shall here explain to you, in what sense, and how far the Law is in force, and how far not: and then prove it in and under the' next head.

You must here distinguish betwixt,

I. The repealing of the Law, and the relaxing of it. 2. Between a dispensation absolute and respective. 3. Between the alteration of the Law, and the alteration of the Subjects relation to it. 4. Between a Discharge conditional, with a suspension of execution, and a Discharge absolute. And

so I resolve the question thus, The Law of Works is not abrogated, or repealed, but dispensed with? or relaxed. A Dispensation is (as *Grotius* defineth it) an act of a Superior, whereby the obligation of a Law in force is taken away, as to certain persons and things.

This Dispensation therefore is not total or absolute, but respective. For, 1. though it dispense with the rigorous execution, yet not with every degree of execution. 2. Though the Law be dispensed with as it containeth the proper subjects of the penalty, *viz.* the parties offending, and also the circumstances of duration, &c. Yet in regard of the mere punishment abstracted from person and circumstances, it is not dispensed with: for to Christ it was not dispensed with: His satisfaction was by paying the full value.

Though by this Dispensation our Freedom may be as full as upon a Repeal, yet the Alteration is not made in the Law, but in our estate and relation to the Law.

So far is the Law dispensed with to all, as to suspend the rigorous execution for a time; and a Liberation or Discharge conditional procured and granted them. But an absolute Discharge is granted to none in this life. For even when we do perform the Condition, yet still the Discharge remains; conditional, till we have quite finished our;

performance. For it is not one instantaneous Act of believing which shall quite discharge us; but a continued Faith. No longer are we discharged, then we are Believers. And where the condition is not performed, the Law is still in force, and shall be executed upon the offender himself.

I speak nothing in all this of the directive use of the Moral Law to Believers: But how far the Law is yet in force, even as it is a Covenant of Works; because an utter Repeal of it in this sense is so commonly, but inconsiderately asserted. That it is no further overthrown, no not to Believers, then is here explained, I now come to prove.

THESIS XIII.

IF this were not so, but that Christ had abrogated the first Covenant, then it would follow, 1. That no sin but that of Adam, and final Unbelief, is so much as threatened with death, or that death is explicitly (that is, by any Law) due to it or deserved by it. For, what the Law in force doth not threaten? that is not explicitly defined, or due by Law. 2. It would follow, That Christ died not to prevent or remove the wrath and curse so defined or due to us for any but Adam's sin, nor to pardon our sins at all: but only to prevent our desert of wrath and curse, and consequently to prevent our need of pardon. 3. It would follow?

low, That against eternal wrath at the day of Judgment, we must not plead the pardon of any sin, but the first, but our own non-desert of that wrath, because of the repeal of that Law before the sin was committed. All which consequences seem to me unsufferable, which cannot be avoided if the Law be repealed.

EXPLICATION.

WHen God the absolute Sovereign of the World shall but command though he expressly threaten no punishment to the disobedient, yet implicitly it may be said to be due; that is, the offence of it self considered, deserveth some punishment in the general: for the Law of Nature containeth some general Threatenings, as well as precepts, (as I showed before;) Whether this Dueness of punishment, which I call implicit, do arise from the nature of the offence only, or also because of this general threat in the Law of Nature, I will not dispute. But God dealeth with his Creature by way of legal government? and keepeth not their deserved punishment from their knowledge no more then their duty; it being almost as necessary to be known for our incitement, as the Precept for our direction. God's laws are perfect laws fitted to

the attainment of all their ends: And by these law's doth he rule the worlds and according to them doth he dispose of his rewards and punishments: So that we need not fear that which is not threatened: And in this sense it is that I say, That what no law in force doth threaten, that sin doth not explicitly deserve: Not so deserve as that we need to fear the suffering of it. And upon this ground the three fore-mentioned consequences must needs follow. For the new Covenant threateneth not Death to any sin but final unbelief, or at least, to no sin without final unbelief: And therefore if the old Covenant be abrogated, then no law threateneth it: And consequently, 1. Our Sin doth not deserve it (in the sense expressed.) Nor Christ prevent the wrath deserved, but only the desert of wrath, 3. And therefore not properly doth he pardon any such sin, (as you will see after when I come to open the nature of pardon.) 4. We may plead our non-deserving of death for our discharge at judgment. 5. And further, then Christ in satisfying did not bear the punishment due to any sin but *Adam's* first. For that which is not threatened to us, was not executed on him. This is a clear, but an intolerable consequence. 6. Scripture plainly teacheth, That all men (even the Elect) are under the Law till they believe & enter into

the Covenant of the Gospel. Therefore it is said, *Joh. 3:18. He that believeth not, it condemned already: And the wrath of God abideth on him,* ver. 16. And we are said to believe for Remission of sins. *Acts 2:38. Mark 1:4. Luk. 24:47. Acts 10:43. & 3:19.* Which shew, that sin is not before remitted, and consequently the Law not repealed, But suspended, and left to the dispose of the Redeemer. Else how could the Redeemed be by nature the children of wrath? *Eph. 2:3.* The circumcised are debtors to the whole Law, *Gal. 5:3, 4.* and Christ is become of none effect to them. But they that are led by the Spirit are not under the law, and against such there is no law. *Gal. 5:18, 23.* The Scripture hath concluded all under Sin (and so far under the Law no doubt) that the promise, by faith in Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe. *Gal. 3:22.* We are under the Law when Christ doth redeem us. *Gal. 4. 5.* See also *Jam. 2:9, 10. 1 Tim. 1:8. 1 Cor. 15:56. Gal. 3:19, 20, 21.* Therefore our deliverance is conditionally from the curse of the Law; *viz.*, if we will obey the Gospel. And this deliverance, together with the abrogation of the Ceremonial Law, is it which is so oft mentioned as a privilege of believers, and an effect of the blood of Christ: which deliverance from the curse, is yet more full when we per-

form the Conditions of our freedom: And then we are said to be dead to the Law. *Rom.* 7:4. And the Obligation to Punishment dead as to us. *ver.* 6. But not the Law void or dead in it self.

7. Lastly, All the Scriptures and Arguments, *pag.* 60, 61. which prove. That afflictions are Punishments, do prove also that the Law is not repealed; For no man can suffer for breaking a repealed Law, nor, by the threats of a repealed Law; yet I know that this Covenant of Works continueth not to the same ends and uses as before, nor is it so to be preached or used. We must neither take that Covenant as a way to life, as if now we must get salvation by our fulfilling its condition, nor must we look on its curse as lying on us remedilessly.

THESIS XIV.

(1) *THE Tenor of the new Covenant is this, That Christ having made sufficient satisfaction to the Law. Whosoever will repent and believe in him to the end, shall be justified through that Satisfaction from all that the Law did charge upon them, and be moreover advanced to far greater Priviledges and Glory then they fell from: But whosoever fulfilleth not these conditions, shall*
 (2) *have no more benefit from the blood of Christ, then what they here received and a-*

bused, but must answer the charge of the Law themselves: and for their neglect of Christ must also suffer a far greater condemnation. Or briefly, Whosoever believeth in Christ shall not perish, but have everlasting life; but he that believeth not shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. Mark 16:16. John 3:15, 16, 17, 18, 36. & 5:24. & 6:35, 40, 47. & 7:38. & 11:25, 26. & 12:46. Acts 10:43. Rom, 3:26. & 4:5. & 5:1. & 10:4, 10. I John 5:10. Mark 1:15. & 6:12. Luke 13:3, 5. & 24:47. Acts 5:31. & 11:18. & 20, 21. & 2:38. & 3:19. & 8:22. & 26:20. Rev. 2:5, 16. Heb. 6:1.2 Pet. 3:9.

EXPLICATION.

(1) CHrist's Satisfaction to the Law goes before the new Covenant, though not in regard of its payment, (which was in the fulness of time,) yet in regard of the undertaking, acceptance and efficacy; There could be no treating on new terms, till the old obligation were satisfied and suspended.

I account them not worth the confuting, who tell us, That Christ: is the only party conditioned with, and that the new Covenant, as to us, hath no conditions; (so *Salt-marsh*, &c.;) The place they alledge for this

assertion in that, *Jer.* 31:31, 32, 33. cited in *Heb.* 8:8, 9, 10. which place containeth not the full Tenor of the whole new Covenant: But either it is called the new Covenant, because it expresseth the nature of the benefits of the new Covenant as they are offered on God's part, without mentioning man's conditions, (that being not pertinent to the business the prophet had in hand; or else it speaketh only of what God will do for his elect in giving them the first Grace, and enabling them to perform the conditions of the new Covenant, and in that sense may be called a new Covenant also, as I have shewed before, *pag.* 7, 8. Though properly it be a prediction, and belong only to God's Will of Purpose, and not to his legislative Will.

But those men erroneously think, that nothing is a condition, but what is to be performed by our own strength. But if they will believe Scripture, the places before alledged will prove, that the new Covenant hath conditions on our part, as well as the old.

(2) Some benefit from Christ the condemned did here receive, as the delay of their condemnation, and many more mercies, though they turn them all into greater judgments: But of this more when we treat of general Redemption.

THESIS XV.

Though Christ hath sufficiently satisfied the Law, yet is it not his Will, or the Will of the Father, that any man should be justified or faved thereby, who hath not some ground in himself of personal and particular right and claim thereto; nor that any should be justified by the blood only as shed or offered except it be also received and applied; so that no man by the mere Satisfaction made, is freed from the Law or curse of the first violated Covenant absolutely, but conditionally only.

EXPLICATION.

I Have shewed before, *p.* 57, 58, &c. That Christ intended not to remove all our misery as soon as he died, nor as soon as we believed. I am now to shew, That he doth not justify by the shedding of his blood immediately, without somewhat of man intervening, to give him a legal title thereto. All the Scriptures alledged *pag.* 79. prove this: We are therefore said to be justified by faith. Let all the Antinomians shew but one Scripture which speaks of Justification from eternity. I know God hath decreed to justify his people from eternity, and so he hath to sanctify them too, but both of them are done in time: Justification being no more an imminent act in God then Sanctification, as I shall shew afterward.

The Blood of Christ then is sufficient in *suo genere* but not in *omni genere* sufficient for its own work, but not for every work. There are several other necessities to justify and save, *quibus positis*, which being supposed. the Blood of Christ will be effectual: Not that it receives its efficacy from these, nor that these do add anything at all to its worth or value, no more then the Cabinet to the Jewel, or the applying hand to the medicine: or the offenders acceptance to the pardon of his Prince; yet without this acceptance and application this blood will not be effectual to justify us. For (as Grotius) *Cum unusquisque actui ex suâ voluntate pendenti legem posit imponere, sicut id quod pure debetur novari potest sub conditione, ita etiam possunt, is qui solvit pro alio, & is qui rei alterius pro alterâ solutionem admittit, pacisci, ut aut statim sequatur remissio, aut in diem, item aut pure, aut sub conditione, Fuit autem & Christi satisfaciens & dei satisfactionem admittentis hic animus ac voluntas, hoc denique pactum & fœdus, non ut Deus statim ipso perpositionis Christi tempore pœnas remitteret, sed ut tum demum id fieret; cum homo, vera in Christum fide ad deum conversus, supplex veniam precaretur, accedente etiam Christi apud deum advocacyne sive intercessionem. Non obstat hic ergo satisfactione quo minus sequi possit remissio satisfactio enim non jam sustulerat debitum, sed hoc egerat, ut propter ipsam debitum aliquando tolleretur, Grot. De satis.*

cap. 6. So that, as *Austin*, he that made us without us, will not save us without us, He never maketh a relative change, where he doth not also make a real. God's Decree gives no man a legal title to the benefit decreed him, seeing purpose and promise are so different: A legal title we must have, before we can be justified; and there must be somewhat in our selves to prove that title, or else all men should have equal right,

THESIS. XVI.

The obeying of a Law, and performing the conditions of a Covenantor satisfying for disobedience, or non-performance, is our Righteousness, in reference to that Law and Covenant.

EXPLICATION.

IF we understand not what Righteousness is, we may dispute long enough about justification to little purpose: you must know therefore that Righteousness is no proper real Being, but a *Modus Entis*, the Modification of a Being, The subject of it is, 1. An Action, 2. Or a Person: An Action is the primary subject, and so the Disposition; and the Person secondary, as being therefore righteous, because his disposition and actions are so.

Righteousness is the conformity of Dispo-

sitions and Actions, and consequently the person to the Rule prescribed.

It is not a being distinct therefore from the Dispositions and Actions, but their just and well-being.

This smition is only of the Creatures Righteousness.

God is the *Primum Iustum*, and so the Rule of Righteousness to the Creature, and hath no Rule but himself, for the measuring of his Actions.

Yet his Essence is too far above us, remote and unknown to be this Rule to the Creature, therefore hath he given us his Laws, which flow from his perfection, and they are the immediate Rule; of our Dispositions and Actions and so of our Righteousness.

Here carefully observe, That this Law hath two parts; The Precept and Prohibition prescribing and requiring Duty: 2. The Promise and Commination determining of the reward of Obedience, the and penalty of Disobedience. As the precept is the principal part, and the Penalty annexed but for the Precept's sake; so the primary intent of the Law-giver is the obeying of this precepts, and our suffering of the Penalty is but a secondary for the attaining of the former.

So is there accordingly a two-fold Righteousness or fulfilling of this Law, (which is

the thing I would have observed on the primary, most excellent and most proper Righteousness lieth in the conformity of our actions to the precept: The secondary, less excellent Righteousness) yet fitly enough so called) (see *Pemle of Justificantat. Pag. 2*) is, when though we have broke the precepts, yet we have satisfied for our breach, either by our own suffering, or some other way.

The first hath reference to the Commands when none can accuse us to have broke the Law: The second hath reference to the Penalty; when though we have broke the law, yet it hath nothing against us for so doing, because it is satisfied. These two kinds of Righteousness cannot stand together in the same person, in regard of the same Law and Action: he that hath one, hath not the other, he that hath the First, need not the Second; There must be a fault, or no satisfaction; this fault must be confessed, and so the first kind of Righteousness disclaimed, before Satisfaction must be pleaded: and Satisfaction must be pleaded, before a Delinquent may be justified. This well understood, would give a clearer insight into the nature of our Righteousness, and Justification then many have yet attained. The great Question is, of which sort is our Righteousness whereby we are justified? I answer, of the second sort, which yet is no derogation from it: for though it be not a righteousness so

honouring ourselves, yet is it as excellent in Christ, and honourable to him. And this first kind of Righteousness as it is in Christ, cannot retaining its own form, be made ours. And to that the Papists arguments will hold good. The Law commanded our own personal obedience, and not anothers for us; We did not so personally obey, we did not really obey in Christ: and God doth not judge us to do, what we did not; If we had, yet it would not; have made us just; for one sin will make us unjust, though we were never so obedient before and after; Therefore if we had obeyed in Christ, and yet sinned in our selves, we are breakers of the Law still. And so our Righteousness cannot be of the first sort. This Breach therefore must be satisfied for, and consequently, our Righteousness must be of the second sort: seeing both cannot stand in one person as beforesaid. Christ indeed had both these kinds of righteousness, *viz.* the righteousness of perfect Obedience; and the righteousness of Satisfaction, for Disobedience. But the former only was his own personal Righteousness, not communicable to another under that notion, and in that form of [a Righteousness by obeying:] The latter, was his righteousness, as he stood in our room, and was by imputation a sinner and so is also our Righteousness in and through him. Yet the former (as I have proved before &c.) is ours

too, and our Righteousness too (though many Divines think otherwise:) but how? Not as retaining its form, in the former sense: but as it is also in a further consideration, a part of the Righteousness by Satisfaction: seeing that Christ's very personal obediential righteousness was also in a further respect satisfactory. I entreat thee Reader, do not pass over this distinct representation of Righteousness, as curious, or needless; for thou canst not tell how thou art righteous or justified without it. Nor do thou through prejudice reject it as unsound, till thou have first well studied the Nature of Righteousness in general, and of Christian Righteousness in special.

THESIS XVII.

Therefore as there are two Covenants, with their distinct Conditions: so is there a twofold Righteousness, and both of them absolutely necessary to Salvation.

EXPLICATION.

AS Sin is defined to be ἀνομία a Trangression of the Law. 1 Joh. 3:4. So Righteousness is a Conformity to the Law. Therefore as there is a twofold Law or Covenants so must there be accordingly a two-fold Righteousness; whether both these be to us necessary is all the doubt. If the first Covenant be totally repealed, then indeed we need

not care for the righteousness of that Covenant, in respect of any of our personal actions: but only in, respect of *Adam's* first, and ours in him, But I have proved before that it is not repealed: otherwise the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, would not be of a very narrow extent; if it were a covering only to our first transgression, I take it for granted therefore, that he must have a twofold Righteousness answerable to the two Covenants, that expecteth to be justified. And the usual confounding of these two distinct Righteousnesss, doth much darken the controversies about Justification.

THESIS XVIII.

OUR Legal Righteousness, or righteousness of the first Covenant is not personal, or consisteth not in any qualifications of our own persons, or actions performed by us, (For we never fulfilled, nor personally satisfied the Law:) but it is wholly without us in Christ. And in this sense it is that the Apostle (and every Christian,) disclaimeth his own Righteousness, or his own Works, as being no true legal Righteousness. Phil. 3:7, 8.

EXPLICATION.

Object. I DOth not the Apostle say, that as touching the Righteousness which is in the Law, he was blameless? *Phil. 3:6.* *Ans.* That is, He

so exactly observed the Ceremonies of the Law, and the external part of the Moral Law, that no man could blame him for the breadth of them. but this is nothing to such a keeping of the whole Covenant, as might render him blameless in the sight of God: otherwise he would not have esteemed it so lightly.

Object. 2. There are degrees of sin. He that is not yet a sinner in the highest degree, is he not so far Righteous by a personal Righteousness? Christ satisfied only for our sin; so far as our actions are not sinful, so far they need no pardon nor satisfaction. And consequently, Christ's righteousness and our own works, do concur to the composing of our perfect Righteousness. *Ans.* Though this objection doth puzzle some, as if there were no escaping this Popish self-exalting Consequence; yet by the help of the fore-going grounds, the vanity of it maybe, easily discovered. And that thus.

1. An Action is not righteous, which is not conformable to the Law; if in some respects it be conformable, and in some not, it cannot be called a conformable, or righteous Action. So that we having no actions, perfectly conformed to the Law, have therefore no one righteous action. 2. If we had; Yet many righteous Actions, if but one were unrighteous, will not serve to denominate the person Righteous, according to the Law of

Works. And that these joined with Christ's Righteousness, do not make up one Righteousness for us, is plain thus; The Righteousness which we have in Christ, is not of the same sort witht his pretended partial Righteousness: For this pretendeth to be a Righteousness (in part) of the first kind mentioned formerly *viz.* Obediential consisting in conformity to the Precept. Now, Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, being only that of the second sort (*viz.* By satisfaction for nonconformity, or for our disobedience,) cannot therefore possible be joined with our imperfect Obedience, to make up one Righteousness for us. I acknowledge, that some actions of ours, may in some respects be good, though that respect cannot denominate it (strictly in the sense of the old Covenant) a good Work. I acknowledge also, that so far it is pleasing to God: yet the Action cannot be said to please, him (much lest the person,) but only that respective Goodness. Also that Christ died only to satisfy for our actions so far as they were sinful, and not in those respects wherein they are good and lawful. Yet that these good works (so commonly called) can be no part of our Righteousness, I think is fully proved by the fore-going Argument, Though I much question, whether they that stand for the imputation of Christ's moral Righteousness in the rigid rejected sense (as if

(as if in him we had paid the primary proper debt of perfect obedience) can so well rid their hands of this objection.

THESIS XIX.

THE Righteousness of the new Covenant, is the only Condition of our interest in and enjoyment of the Righteousness of the old. Or thus: These only shall have part in Christ's satisfaction, and so in him be legally righteous, who do believe, and obey the Gospel, and so are in themselves Evangelically Righteous.

THESIS XX.

OUR Evangelic all Righteousness is not without us in Christ, as our legal Righteousness is: but consisteth in our own actions of Faith and Gospel Obedience. Or thus: Though Christ performed the conditions of the Law, and satisfied for our non-performance; yet it is our selves that must perform the conditions of the Gospel.

EXPLICATION.

THE contents of these two Portions being of so near nature, I shall explain them here together; though they seem to me, so plain and clear that they need not much explication, and less confirmation; yet because some Antinomians do down-right oppose them, and some that are no Antinomians have startled at the expressions, as if they had contined

some self-exalting horrid doctrine; I shall say something hereto. Though for my part, I do so much wonder that any able Divines should deny them: that me thinks they should be Articles of our Creed, and a part of Children's Catechisms, and understood and believed by every man that is a Christian; I mean the matter of them, if not the Phrase; though I think it to be agreeable to the matter also.

That there may be no contention about words, you must take my phrase of [*Legal and Evangelical Righteousness*] in the sense before explained, viz., as they take their name from that Covenant which is their rule, and I know not how any righteousness should be called [Legal or Evangelical in a sense more strict and proper, nor whence the denomination can be better taken then from the formal reason of the thing: Yet I know that the observance of the Law of Ceremonies, and the seeking of life by the works of the Law, are both commonly called Legal Righteousness, but in a very improper sense in a comparison of this. I know also that Christ's Legal Righteousness, imputed to us is commonly called [Evangelical Righteousness,] but that is from a more alien extrinsical respect; to wit, because the Gospel declareth and offereth this Righteousness, and because it is a way to Justification, which only the Gospel revea-

leth. I do not quarrel with any of these forms of speech, only explain my own? which I knew not how to express more properly? that I be not misunderstood. The Righteousness of the new Covenant then being? The performance of its conditions? and its conditions being our obeying the Gospel or believing? it must needs be plain? That on no other terms do we partake of the Legal Righteousness of Christ. To affirm therefore that our Evangelical or new Covenant-Righteousness is in Christ and not in our selves, or performed by Christ and not by our selves is such a monstrous piece of Antinomian doctrine, that no man who knows the nature and difference of the Covenant can possibly entertain, and which every Christian should abhor as unsufferable.

For 1. It implieth blasphemy against Christ, as if he had sin to repent of, or pardon to accept? and a Lord that redeemed him to receive and submit to; for these are the conditions of the new Covenant.

2. It implieth, that Jews, and Pagans, and every man shall be saved. Do not say that I odiously wring out these confluences; they are as plain as can be expected: For if any be damned? it must be either for breaking the first Covenant or the second: If the former be charged upon him, he may escape by pleading the second fulfilled: If the latter, the same plea will serve; so that if Christ have fulfilled

both Covenants for all men, then none can perish. If they say, that he hath performed the new Covenants conditions only for the elect;

3. Then this followeth howsoever, That they are righteous, and justified before they believe, (which what Scripture doth speak?)

4. And that believing is needless, not only as to our Justification, but to any other use: For what need one thing be so twice done? If Christ have fulfilled the new Covenant for us, as well as the old, what need we do it again? Shall we come after him to do the work he hath perfected? Except we would think with the Socinians, and as Sir *Kenelm Digby*, That Christ was but our pattern to follow, and but set us a copy in obeying according to right Reason.

5. That the saved and the damned are alike in themselves, but the difference is only in Election, and Christ's intention. For the saved have broke the old Covenant, as well as the damned; and if it be not they, but Christ, that fulfill their conditions of the new, then the difference is all without them.

6. It confoundeth Law and Gospel, it overthroweth all the Laws & Precepts of Christ, by removing their end, it contradicteth the whole scope of the Scripture; which telleth us, That Christ was made under the Law, (& not under the Gospel,) fulfilled the Law, (but not the Gospel Covenant) bore the curse of the

(but not of the Gospel,) and which imposeth a necessity of fulfilling the conditions of the Gospel themselves upon all that will be justified and saved. To quote the Scriptures that assert this, would be to transcribe almost all the doctrinal part of the New Testament. What unsavoury stuff then, is that of Mr. *Saltmarsh*, of free Grace, *pag.* 83, 84. Who directeth those that doubt of their Gospel sincerity to see it in Christ, because Christ hath believed perfectly, he hath sorrowed for sin perfectly, he hath repented perfectly, he hath obeyed perfectly, he hath mortified sin perfectly, and all is ours, &c. If this be meant of Gospel-believing, repenting, sorrowing, obeying and mortifying, then it is no uncharitable language to say, It is blasphemy in its clear confluence; as if Christ had a Saviour to believe in for pardon and life, or sin to repent of, and sorrow for, and mortify. But if he meant it of legal believing in God, or repenting sorrowing for, mortifying of sin in us, and not in himself; then is it no more to the business he hath in hand than a Harp to a Harrow, as they say, It is not legal believing, which is the evidence doubted of, or enquired after; and sure Christ's repenting and sorrowing for our sin, is no clearing to us, that we repent of our own, nor any acquitting of us for not doing it: And for his mortifying sin in us, that is the doubts whether it be done in the

doubting soul or not? If he mean it of destroying the guilt of sin meritoriously on the Cross, that is but a strange evidence of the death of it in a particular soul: except he think (as divers that I met within *Gloucestershire*, and *Wiltshire*,) That Christ took our natural pravity and corruption together with our flesh. But I let go this sort of men, as being fitter first to learn the grounds of Religion in a Catechism, then to manage those Disputes wherewith they trouble the World.

THESIS XXI.

NOT that we can perform these Conditions without Grace: (for without Christ we can do nothing:) But that he enableth us to perform them our selves; and doth not himself repent, believe, love Christ, obey the Gospel for us, as he did satisfy the Law for us.

EXPLICATION.

THIS prevention of an Objection I add, because some think it is a self-ascribing, and derogating from Christ, to affirm our selves to be but the Actors of these duties; though we profess to do it only by the strength of Grace. But that it is Christ that repenteth and believeth, and not we, is language somewhat strange to those ears that have

been used to the language of Scripture or Reason. Though I know there is a sort of sublime Platonic, Plotinian Divines, of late sprung up among us, who think all things be but one; and those branches or beams of God's Essence which had their Being in him before their Creation, and shall at their dissolution return into God again; and so the souls of men are but so many parcels of God given out into so many bodies; or at least but beams streaming from him by a fancied Emanation. These men will say, not only that it is Christ in us that doth believe, but the mere God-head in essence considered. But it sufficeth sober men to believe that Christ dwelleth in us; 1. By his graces or spiritual workings; 2. By our constant love yo him, and thinking of him: as the person or thing that we are still affectionately thinking on, is said to dwell in our minds or hearts (because their *idea* is still there,) or our minds and hearts to dwell upon them. But in regard of the Divine Es-sense, which is every where, as it dwells no otherwise (for ought I know or have seen proved) in the Saints, then in the wicked and devils; so I think; as Sir *Kenelm Digby* thinks of the Soul; That the Body is more properly said to be in the Soul, then the Soul in the Body, so we are more properly said to live, and move & have our Being in God, then God to live, and move, and have his Being in us.

I will not digress from my intended subject so far, as to enter here into a disquisition after the nature or workings of that Grace which doth enable us to perform these Conditions. I refer you to *Parker's Theses de Traductione Peccatoris ad vit.*

THESIS XXII.

IN this fore-explained sense it is, that men in Acripture are said to be personally righteous: And in this sense it is, that the faith and duties of Believers are said to please God, viz. as they are related to the Covenant of Grace, and not as they are measured by the Covenant of Works.

EXPLICATION.

THose that will not acknowledge that the godly are called righteous in the Scripture, by reason of a personal Righteousness, consisting in the rectitude of their own dispositions & actions, as well as in regard of their imputed righteousness, may be convinced from these Scriptures, if they will believe them. *Gen.* 7:2. & 18:23, 24. *Joh.* 17:9. *Psa.* 1:5, 6. & 37:17, 21, & *Eccl.* 9:1, 2. *Ezek.* 18:20, 24. & 33:12, 13, 18. *Mat.* 9:13. & 13:43. & 25:37, 46. *Luk.* 1:6. *Heb.* 11:4. 1 *Pet.* 4:18. 2 *Pet.* 2:8. 1 *Joh.* 3:7, 12. *Rev.* 22:11. *Mat.* 10:41. *Rom.* 5:7. So their ways are called Righteousness. *Psal.* 19:2. & 23:3. & 45:7. &c. *Mat.* 5:20. & 21:32. *Luke* 1:75. *Acts* 10:35.

Rom. 6:13, 16, 19, 20. *I Cor.* 15:34. *I Joh.* 2:29. & 3:10. *Eph.* 4:24. &c.

That men are sometime called righteous, in reference to the Laws and Judgments of men, I acknowledge: Also in regard of some of their particular actions, which are for the substance good: And perhaps sometimes in a comparative sense, as they are compared with the ungodly: As a line less-crooked should be called straight in comparison of one more crooked: But how improper an expression that is, you may easily perceive. The ordinary phrase of Scripture hath more truth and aptitude then so. Therefore it must needs be that men are called Righteous in reference to the new Covenant only; Which is plain thus: Righteousness is but the denomination of our actions or persons, as they relate to some rule. This rule when it is the Law of man, and our actions suit thereto, we are then righteous before men; When this Rule is God's Law, it is either that of Works, or that of Grace: In relation to the former, there is none righteous, no not one: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. Only in Christ, who hath obeyed and satisfied, we are righteous. But if you consider our actions and persons in relation to the rule of the new Covenant, so all the Regenerate are personally righteous, because they all perform, the conditions of this Co-

venant, and are poperly ponounced righteous thereby. Neither can it be conceived how the works of Believers, should either please God, or be called righteousness, as they relate to that old Rule, which doth pronounce them unrighteous, hateful, and accursed.

Two sorts among us therefore do discover intolerable Ignorance in this point. I. Those that commonly use and understand the words [Righteous, and Righteoulness] as they relate to the old Rule: as if the Godly were called righteous (besides their imputed Righteousness, only because their Sanctification and good Works have some imperfect agreement to the Law of Works: As if it were a straight line which is in one place straight and another crooked; much less that which is in every part crooked in some degree, I have been sorry to hear many learned Teachers speak thus; most they say to maintain it, is in this simple objection. If we are called holy, because of an imperfect Holiness: then why not righteous, because of an imperfect Righteousness? *Ans.* Holiness signifieth no more but a Dedication. To God, either by separation only, or by qualifying the subject first, with an aptitude to its Divine employment, and then separating or devoting it: as in our Sanctification. Now a person imperfectly so qualified, is yet truly and

really so qualified; and therefore may truly be called holy so far. But righteousness signifying a Conformity to the Rule; and a Conformity with a *quatenus*, or an imperfect Rectitude, being not a true Conformity or Rectitude at all (because the denomination is of the whole Action or Person, and not of a certain part or respect therefore imperfect Righteousness is not Righteousness, but Unrighteousness; It is a contradiction in *adjecto*. *Object*. But, is our personal Righteousness perfect as it is measured by the New Rule? *Ans*. Yes: as I shall open to you by and by.

I could here heap up a multitude of orthodox Writers, that do call our personal Righteousness by the title of [Evangelical] as signifying from what Rule it doth receive its Name.

The second sort that shew their gross ignorance, of the nature of Righteousness, and the Antinomians, (and some other simple ones whom they have misled) who if they do but hear a man talk of a Righteousness in himself; or in any thing he can do, or making his own duty either his Righteousness, or conducive thereto; they startle at such Doctrine, and even gnash their teeth, as if we preached flat Popery, yea as if we cried down Christ, and set up our selves: The ignorant wretches not understanding, the difference between the two sorts of Righteousness; that of the old

Covenant, which is all out of us in Christ; and that of the New Covenant, which is all out of Christ in ourselves: (though wrought by the power of the Spirit of Christ.)

Quest. But how then is *Ahabs* and *Nineve's* humiliation accepted, and such other works of those that are not in Christ, seeing they are yet under the Law?

Ans. 1. No man is now under the Law as *Adam* was before the new Covenant was made; that is, not so under the Law alone, as to have nothing to do with the Gospel; or so under the old Covenant, as to have no benefit by the new. 2. So that wicked men may now find that tender and merciful dealing from God, that even those works which are less unjust and sinful, and draw nearest to the rectitude required by the Gospel, shall be so far accepted as that for their further encouragement, some kind of reward or suspension or wrath shall be annexed to them, and God will countenance in them that which is good, though it be not so much as may denominate it a good Work. 3. But yet the best of an unregenerate man's works have more matter in them to provoke God then to please him, and he never accepteth them as Evangelically Righteous; for they that are in the flesh, and are without faith, cannot possibly so please God, *Rom.* 8:8. *Heb.* 11:6. As their righteousness is but a less degree of unrighteous-

ness, and therefore is most improperly called righteousness; so their pleasing God is but a lower degree of displeasing him, and therefore bat improperly called pleasing him.

THESIS XXIII.

IN this sense also it is so far from being an error to affirm, that Faith it self is our Righteousness,] that it is a truth necessary for every Christian to know; that is. Faith is our Evangelical Righteousness, (in the sense before explained,) as Christ is our Legal Righteousness.

EXPLICATION.

THIS Assertion, so odious those that understand not its grounds, is yet so clear from what is said before, that I need to add no more to prove it. For 1. I have cleared before, that there must be a personal Righteousness, besides that imputed, in all that are justified. And that 2. The fulfilling of the conditions of each Covenant is our Righteousness, in reference to that Covenant: But Faith is the fulfilling of the conditions of the new Covenant, therefore it is our Righteousness in relation to that Covenant. I do not here take Faith for any one single Act, but as I shall afterward explain it.

Quest. In what sense then is Faith said to be imputed to us for righteousness, if it be our Righteousness it self?

Answ. Plainly thus; Man is become unrighteous by breaking the Law of Righteousness that was given him; Christ fully satisfieth for this transgression, and buyeth the prisoners into his own hands, and maketh with them a new Covenant, That whosoever will accept of him, and believe in him, who hath thus satisfied, it shall be as effectual for their Justification, as if they had fulfilled the Law of Works themselves. A Tenant forfeiteth his Lease to his Landlord, by not paying his rent; he runs deep in debt to him, and is disabled to pay him any more rent for the future, whereupon he is put out of his house, and cast into prison, till he pay the debt; his Landlords son payeth it for him, taketh him out of prison, and putteth him in his house again, as his Tenant, having purchased house and all to himself; he maketh him a new Lease in this Tenor, that paying but a peppercorn yearly to him he shall be acquit both from his debt, and from all other rent for the future, which by his old Lease was to be paid; yet doth he not cancel the old Lease, but keepeth it in his hands to put in suite against the Tenant, if he should be so foolish as to deny the payment of the peppercorn. In this case the payment of the grain of pepper is imputed to the Tenant, as if he had payed the rent of the old Lease: Yet this imputation doth not extol the pepper corn, nor vilify the benefit of his Benefactor,

who redeemed him: Nor can it be said, that the purchase did only serve to advance the value and efficacy of that grain of pepper. But thus; A personal rent must be paid for the testification of his homage; he was never redeemed to be independent as his own. Landlord and Master: the old rent he cannot pay; his new Landlord's clemency is such, that he hath resolved this grain shall serve the turn.

Do I need to apply this in the present case or cannot every man apply it? Even so is our Evangelical Righteousness, or Faith, imputed to us for as read Righteousness, as perfect Obedience. Two things are considerable in this debt of Righteousness The value, and the personal performance or interest: The value of Christ's Satisfaction is imputed to us, instead of the value of a perfect Obedience of our own performing, and the value of our Faith is not so imputed: But because there must be some personal performance of homage, therefore the personal performance of Faith shall be imputed to us for a sufficient personal payment, as if we had paid the full rent, because Christ whom we believe in, hath paid it, & he will take this for satisfactory homage, so it is in point of personal performance, and not of value that Faith is imputed.

THESIS XXIV.

This personal Gospel Righteousness is in its kind, a perfect Righteousness; and so far we may admit the doctrine of personal Perfection.

EXPLICATION.

OUR Righteousness may be considered, either in regard of the matter and the acts denominated righteous, or else in respect of the form which gives them that denomination: Also our Faculties and Actions are considerable, either in regard of their Being, or of their Quality.

1. The perfection of the Being of our Faculties or Acts is nothing to our present purpose, as falling under a physical consideration only.

2. In regard of their Quality they may be called perfect or imperfect in several senses.

1. As Perfection is taken for the transcendental perfection of Being so they are perfect.

2. And as it is taken for the complete number of all parts, it is perfect.

3. But as it is taken for that which is perfect, *Efficienter* or *Participaliter*, that is, for a work that is finished for the Author, so our holiness is still imperfect here.

4. And as it is taken for accidental perfection, (so called in Metaphysics, when it

wants nothing which beyond the Essence, is also requisite to the integrity, ornament and wellbeing of it,) so our holiness is here imperfect.

As perfection is taken, *pro sanitate*, for soundness, so our holiness is imperfect.

6. And as it is taken, *pro maturitate*, for ripeness, so it is imperfect.

7. In respect of the admixture of contrary qualities, our holiness is imperfect.

8. But whether all this imperfection be privative and sinful, or merely negative; and only our misery, whether it be a privation, physical or moral, is a question that will be cleared, when I come to shew the extent of the Commands or Rule.

But not any of these kinds of perfection is that which I mean in the Position: Holiness is a quality, & may be intended and remitted, increased & decreased; but it is the relative consideration of these qualities of our faculties and acts; as they are compared with the Rule of the new Covenant, & so it is not the perfection of our holiness that we enquire after, but of our righteousness; which righteousness is not a quality as holiness is, but the modification of our acts as to the Rule, which is not varied, *secundum majus & minus*: See *Schibl. Metaph. li. 2, c. 9. Tit. 7. Art. 2.* Therefore our Divines usually say, That our Justification is perfect, though our Sanctification be not; and then

I am sure our Righteousness must be perfect.

A two-fold perfection is here implied. 1. A Metaphysical Perfection of Being. 2. A Perfection of Sufficiency in order to its end,

1. The being of our Righteousness formally consisting in our relative conformity to the rule, either it must be perfect, or not at all. He that is not perfectly innocent in the very point that he is accused, is not innocent truly, but guilty. Sincerity is usually said to be our Gospel-Perfection: not as it is accepted in stead of perfection, but as it is truly so; for sincere Faith is our conformity to the Rule of Perfection, *viz.*, the new Covenant as it is a Covenant; yet as it is sincere Faith, it is only materially our Righteousness and Perfection, but formally as it is relatively out conformity to the said Rule.

2. Our Righteousness is perfect as in its Being, so also in order to its end. The end is, to be the condition of our Justification, &c. This end it shall perfectly attain. The Tenor of the new Covenant is not, *Believe in the highest degree, and you shall be justified*; But *believe sincerely, and you shall be justified*; so that our Righteousness 1. formally considered, in relation to the condition of the new Covenant, is perfect or none. 2. But considered materially as it is holiness, either in reference to the degree it should attain, or the degree which it shall attain, or in reference to the

excellent object which it is exercised about, or in reference to the old Covenantor the directive, (and in some sense) the preceptive part of the new Covenant in all these respects it is imperfect.

I speak not all this while of that perfection in Christ's Satisfaction, which is also our perfect Righteousness, because few will question the perfection of that.

THESIS XXV.

YEt is it an improper speech of some Divines, That Christ first justifieth our persons, and then our duties and actions: And except by [justifying] they mean, his esteeming them to be a fulfilling of the Gospel Conditions, and so unjust, it is unsound and dangerous, as well as improper.

EXPLICATION.

1. IT is improper in the best sense: 1. Because it is contrary to the Scripture use of the word *[Justifying]*: which is the acquitting of us from the charge of breaking the Law, and not from the charge of violating the new Covenant, 2. It is against the nature of the thing; seeing Justification (as you shall see anon) implieth Accusation; but the esteeming of a righteous action to be as it is, doth not imply any accusation. 3. This speech, joining Justification of Persons and Actions together, doth seem to intimate the

same kind of justification of both, and so doth tend to seduce the hearers to a dangerous error. 2. For if it be understood in the worst sense, it will overthrow the Righteousness of Christ imputed, and the whole scope of the Gospel, and will let up the doctrine of justification by Works. For if God do justify our Works from any legal Accusation, (as he doth our persons,) then it will follow, That our Works are just and consequently we are to be justified by them. There is no room for Scripture-justification where our own Works are not first acknowledged unjustifiable: because there is no place for Satisfaction and Justification thereby from another, where we plead the Justification of our own Works in respect of the same Law. Justification of Works is a sufficient ground for Justification by Works: seeing the justness of His dispositions and actions is the ground of denominating the person just, and that according to the primary and most proper kind of Righteousness as is expressed in the distinction of it, *pag.* 98, 99.

THESIS XXVI.

(I) *NEither can our performance of the conditions of the Gospel in the most proper and strict sense, be said to merit the reward: seeing there is nothing in the value of it, or any benefit that God receiveth by it, which may so entitle it*

meritorious; neither is there any proportion betwixt it and the reward. (2) But in a larger sense, as Promises an Obligation, and the thing promised is called Debt; so the performers of the Condition are called Worthy, and their performance Merit. Though properly it is all of Grace, and not of Debt. (1) Rom. 4:4, 10, & 5:15, 16, 17. Hose. 14:4. Mat. 10:8. Rom. 3:24. & 8:32. 1 Cor. 2:12. Rev. 21:6. & 22:18. Rom. 11:6. Gal. 5:4. Eph. 2:5, 7, 8. Gen. 32:10. (2) Mat. 10:11, 12, 13, 37. & 22, 8. Luk. 20:35. & 21:36. 2 Thes. 1:5, 11. Rev. 3:4, &c.

EXPLICATION.

IN the strictest sense he is said to Merit, who performeth somewhat of that worth in itself to another, which bindeth that other in strict justice to requite him. This work must not be due, and so the performer not under the absolute sovereignty of another? for else he is not in a capacity of thus Meriting. It is natural Justice which here bindeth to Reward. All that we can merit at the hands of God's natural Justice is but these two things, 1. The escape of punishment in that respect or consideration wherein our actions are not sinful: or the not Punishing of us in a greater degree than sin deserves: (Though indeed it is questionable whether we are capable of suffering more.) 2. Our actions thus deserve the honour of acknowledgment of that good which is in them; yea, though the evil be more than the good. As a merciful Thief that gives a poor man half his money again, when he hath robbed him, as he deserveth a less degree of Punishment, so that good which was in his action deserveth an answerable acknowledgment and praise, though he die for the fact.

But this is a poor kind of meriting, and little to the

honour or benefit of the party: And is more properly called a less desert of punishment, then a desert of reward.

2. The second kind of Merit, is that whereby a Governor, for the promoting of the ends of Government, is obliged to reward the Obedience of the Governed: That when Disobedience is grown common, the Obedience may be encouraged, and a difference made. Among men even Justice bindeth to such reward; at least to afford the obedient the benefit of protection and freedom, though he do no more then his duty; But that is because no man hath an absolute sovereignty *de jure* over his subjects, as God hath; but is indebted to his subjects as well as they are to him. If our obedience were perfect, in respect of the Law of Works, yet all the Obligation that would lie upon God to reward us (any further then the foresaid forbearing to punish us, and acknowledging our obedience) would be but his own wisdom; as he discerneth such a Reward would tend to the well-governing of the World, working morally with Voluntary agents agreeable to their natures. And when we had done all, we must say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done nothing but what was our duty. Therefore this Obligation to reward from the wisdom of God, as it is in his own breast known to himself alone, so is it drawn from himself, and not properly from the worth of our Works, and therefore this is improperly called Merit.

3. The third kind of Meriting is sufficiently explained in the Position: where the Obligation to reward, is God's ordinate Justice, and the truth of his Promise: and the worthiness lieth in our performance of the Conditions on our part. This is improperly called Merit: This kind of Meriting is no diminution to the greatness or freeness of the gift or reward: because it was a free and gracious Act of God to make our performance capable of that title; and to engage himself in the foresaid promise to us; and not for any gain that he expected by

us, or that our performance can bring him.

THESIS XXVII.

1 *AS it was possible for Adam to have fulfilled the Law of Works by that power which he received by nature; (2) So is it possible for us to perform the Conditions of the new Covenant by the (3) Power which we receive from the Grace of Christ.*

EXPLICATION.

(1) *THAT it may be possible which is not future. A thing is termed possible when there is nothing in the nature of the thing it self, which may so hinder its production as to necessitate its non-futurity: Though from extrinsical Reasons, the same non-futurity may be certain, and in some respect necessary; And all things considered, the futurity of it may be termed impossible; & yet the thing it self be possible. So it was possible for Adam to have stood: And so if you should take the word [possible] absolutely, and abstracted from the confederation of the strength of the Actor; even the Commands of the Law are yet possible to be fulfilled. But such a use of the word is here improper: it being ordinarily spoken with relation to the strength of the Agent. (2) But in the relative sense the Conditions of the new Covenant are possible to them that have the assi-*

stance of grace. I intend not here to enter upon an Explication of the nature of that Grace which is necessary to this performance; my Purpose being chiefly to open those things wherein the relative change of our estates doth consist rather than the real. Whether then this Grace be Physical or Moral? Whether there be a Moral Suasion of the Spirit, distinct from the Suasion of the Word, and other outward means? Whether that which is commonly called the Work of Conscience, be also from such an internal suatory work of the Spirit? How far this Grace is resistible? Or whether all have sufficient Grace to believe, either given, or internally offered? with multitudes of such questions, I shall here pass by; Referring you to those many Volumes that have already handled them. All that I shall say of this shall be when I come to open the Nature of Faith. See *Parker's* Theses before mentioned.

THESIS XXVIII.

THE Precepts of the Covenants, as mere Precepts, must be distinguished from the same Precepts considered as Conditions, upon performance whereof we must live, or die for non performance.

THESIS XXIX.

As all Precepts are delivered upon Covenant-terms, or as belonging to one of the Covenants, and not independently; So have the same Precepts, various ends and uses, according to the tenor and ends of the distinct Covenants to which they do belong.

EXPLICATION.

THerefore it is one thing to ask, whether the Covenant of Works be abolished? and another thing, whether the Moral Law be abolished? Yet that no one Precept of either Moral or Ceremonial Law was delivered without reference to one of the Covenants, is very evident. For if the breach of that Command be a sin, and to be Punished, then either according to the rigorous threatening of the old Covenant, or according to the way and justice of the new. For the Law, as it was delivered by *Moses*, may be reduced in several respects to each of these Covenants, and cannot constitute a third Covenant, wholly distinct from both these; and therefore *Camero* doth more fitly call it a subservient Covenant, then a third Covenant. For either God intended in that Covenant to proceed with sinners in strict rigour of Justice, for every sin; and then it is reducible to the first Covenant: Or else to pardon sin upon certain conditions,

and to dispence with the rigour of that first Covenant: And then it must imply satisfaction for those sins; and so be reducible to the second Covenant: (For I cannot yet digest the Doctrine of *Grotius* and *Vossius*, concerning satisfaction by sacrifice for temporal Punishment, without subordination to the satisfaction by Christ;) Or if it seem in several phrases to favour of the language of the several Covenants, (as indeed it doth;) that is because they are yet both in force; and in several respects it is reducible to both. So that when we demand, whether the Moral Law do yet bind, the question is ambiguous, from the ambiguity of the term [Bind.] For it is one thing to ask, whether it bind upon the old Covenant terms? another, whether upon new Covenant terms? and a third, whether as a mere Precept? Here a question or two must be answered.

1. *Quest.* How could the Precepts delivered by *Moses* (when the old Covenant was violated, and the new established) belong to that old Covenant?

2. *Quest.* In what sense doth the Decalogue belong to the new Covenant?

3. *Quest.* Whether the Precepts of the Gospel do belong to the Decalogue?

4. *Quest.* Whether the Precepts of the Gospel belong also to the old Covenant?

But all these will be cleared under the fol-

lowing Positions, where they shall be distinctly answered.

THESIS XXX.

There is no sin prohibited in the Gospel which it not a breach of some Precept in the Decalogue: and which is not threatened by the Covenant of Works, as offending against, and so falling under the Justice thereof. For the threatening of that Covenant extendeth to all sin that then was, or after should be forbidden. God still reserved the prerogative, of adding to his Laws, without altering the Covenant terms; else every new Precept would imply a new Covenant: And so there should be a multitude of Covenants.

Explication.

1. THOUGH the Decalogue doth not mention each particular duty in the Gospel, yet doth it command obedience to all that are or shall be specified; and expresseth the *genus* of every particular duty. And though it were not a duty from the general precept, till it was specified in the Gospel, yet when it once is a duty, the neglect of it is a sin against the Decalogue. For instance; The Law saith, Thou shalt take the Lord for thy God, and consequently believe all that he saith to be true; and obey him in all that he shall particularly command you: The Gospel revealeth (what it is that is to be believed, and

faith, *This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom the Father hath sent, Joh. 6.28, 29.* The affirmative part of the second Commandment is, Thou shalt worship God according to his own institution: The Gospel specifieth some of this instituted Worship, *viz.* Sacraments, &c. So that the neglect of Sacraments is a breach of the second Commandment: And Unbelief is a breach of the first. This may help you to answer that question, Whether the Law without the Gospel be a sufficient Rule of Life? *Answ.* As the Lord's Prayer is a sufficient Rule of Prayer: It is sufficient in its own kind, or to its own Purposes; It is a sufficient general Rule for duty; but it doth not enumerate all the particular, instituted species. Yet here, the Gospel revealing these institutions, is not only the new Covenant it self; but the doctrine of Christ, which is an adjunct of that Covenant also.

2. That every sin against the precepts of the Gospel and decalogue, are also sins against the Covenant of Works, and condemned by it, will appear thus. 1. The threatening of that Covenant is against all sin, as well as one, (though none but eating the forbidden fruit be named:) But these are sins; and therefore threatened by that Covenant. The major appears by the recital afterwards; Cursed is he that doth not all things written. 2. I have proved before, that the old Covenant is not repealed,

but only relaxed to Believers upon Christ's satisfaction; And then it must needs be in force against every sin. The penalty in that Covenant is still executed against such sins. So that every sin against the Gospel is a breach of the Conditions of the Law of Works: But every sin against that Law, is not a breach of the Conditions of the Gospel, And it hinders not this, That the Moral Law by *Moses*, and the Gospel by Christ, were delivered since the Covenant with *Adam*. For though that Covenant did not specify each duty and sin: yet it doth condemn the sin when it is so specified. But the great Objection is this: How can Unbelief be a breach of the Covenant of Works, when the very duty of believing for pardon is inconsistent with the Tenor of that Covenant, which knoweth no pardon? *Ans.* 1. Pardon of sin is not so contradictory to the truth of that Covenant, but that they may consist upon satisfaction made. Though it is true, that the Covenant it self doth give no hopes of it; yet it doth not make it impossible. 2. Unbelief, in reffed of pardon and recovery, is a Sin against the Covenant of Works, not *formaliter*, but *eminenter*. 3. Not also as it is the neglect of a duty, with such and such ends and uses, but as it is the neglect of duty in the general considered; and so as it is a sin in general, and not as it is a sin consisting in such or such an act or omission, The form of

the sin lieth in its pravity or deviation from the Rule: So far Unbelief is condemned by the Law: The substrate ad is but the matter, (improperly so called.)

The review of the comparison before laid down will explain this to you: A Prince bestoweth a Lordship upon a Slave, and maketh him a Lease of it, the tenor where of is, That he shall perform exact obedience to all that is commanded him; and when he fails of this, he shall forfeit his Lease: The Tenant disobeyeth, and maketh the forfeiture; The Son of this Prince interposeth, and buyeth the Lordship, and satisfieth for all the damage that came by the Tenants disobedience: Whereupon the Land, and Tenant and Lease are all delivered up to him, and he becomes Landlord. He findeth the Tenant (upon his forfeiture) disposfessed of the choicest rooms of the house, and chief benefits of the Land, and confined to a ruinous corner; and was to have been deprived of all, had not he thus interposed. Whereupon he maketh him a new Lease in this Tenor, That if in acknowledgment of the favour of his Redemption, he will but pay a peppercorn, he shall be restored to his former possession, and much more.

In this case now the non-payment of the peppercorn, is a breach of both Leases: Of the old, because though he had forfeited his title to the benefits of it, yet he could not

disanul the duty of it, which was obedience during his life: especially when the penalty was not fully executed on him, but he was permitted still to enjoy some of the benefits. So that as it is an act of disobedience in general, his non-payment is a further forfeiture of his old Lease: But as it is the non-payment of a pepper-corn required of him in stead of his former Rent, so it is a breach of his new Lease only. Even so is Unbelief a violation of both Covenants.

THESIS XXXI.

THE Gospel doth establish, and not repeal the Moral Law, and so is perfect obedience commanded, and every sin for bidden, now, as exactly as under the Covenant of Works: to this is but an adjunct of the new Covenant and not a proper part of it: Neither is it on the same terms, or to the same ends, as in the first Covenant.

EXPLICATION.

THat the Moral Law is yet in force, I will not stand to prove, because so many have written of it already. See Mr. *Anthony Burgesses'* Lectures: But to what ends, and in what sense the Gospel continueth that Law, and commandeth perfect obedience thereto, is a Question not very easy.

1. Whether Christ did first repeal that Law, and then re-establish it to other ends? So some think.

2. Or whether he hath at all made the Moral Law to be the preceptive part of the new Covenant? And so whether the new Covenant do at all command us perfect obedience? or only sincere?

3. Or whether the Moral Law be continued only as the precepts of the old Covenant, and so used by the new Covenant, merely for a directive Rule?

To the first I answer; 1. That it is not repealed at all I have proved already, even concerning the Covenant of Works itself; and others enough have proved at large of the Moral Law. 2. Yet that Christ useth it to other ends, & for the advantage of his Kingdom, I grant.

To the other second Question, I answer; 1. That the Moral Law, as it is the perceptive part of the Covenant of works, is but delivered over into the hands of Christ, and so continued in the sense before expressed, seems plain to me.

2. That the same Moral Law doth therefore so continue to command even believers, and that the perfect obeying of it is therefore their duty, and the not obeying their sin, defending the death threatened in that Covenant.

3. That Jesus Christ hath further made use of the same Moral Law, for a direction to his Subjects, whereby they may know his Will. That whereas your sincere subjection and obedience to Christ, is part of the condition of the

new Covenant; that we may know what his Will is, which we must endeavour to obey, and what Rule our actions must be sincerely fitted to, and guided by, he hath therefore left us this Moral Law as part of this direction, having added a more particular enumeration of some duties in his Gospel. That as when the old Covenant said, Thou shalt obey perfectly; the Moral Law did Partly tell them, wherein they should obey: So when the new Covenant saith, Thou shalt obey sincerely; the Moral Law doth tell us, wherein, or what we must endeavour to do.

4. But that the Moral Law, without respect to either Covenant, should command us perfect obedience; or that Christ, as the Mediator of the new Covenant, should command us not only sincere, hut also perfect obedience to the Moral Law, and so hath made it a proper part of his Gospel, not only as a Directory and Instruction, but also as a Command: I am not yet convinced, (though I will not contend with any that think otherwise,) my Reason is, because I know not to what end Christ should command us that obedience which he never doth enable any man in this life to perform, if it were to convince us of our disability and sin, that is the work of the Law, and the continuing or it upon the old terms, as is before explained, is sufficient to that.

But I judge this Question to be of greater difficult then moment

THESIS XXXII.

IF there be any particular sins against the new Covenant, which are not also against the old; or if any sins be considerable in any of their respects, as against the Gospel only, then Christ's death was not to satisfy for any such sins so considered: For where no death is threatened, there none is explicitly due, nor should be executed; and where it is not so due to the sinner, nor should have been executed on him, there it could not be required of Christ, nor executed on him: But the Gospel threateneth not death to any sin, but final unbelief and rebellion, (and for that Christ never died, as I shall show anon,) therefore Christ died not for any sin as against the Gospel, nor suffered that which is no where threatened.

EXPLICATION.

Sin may be said to be against the Gospel, 1. As Christ and his Gospel are the object of it; 2. Or as it breaketh the conditions of the Gospel: In the latter sense only I here take it. To prove the point in hand, there needs no more then the Argument mentioned: For to all that unbelief, and other sins of the godly, which are forgiven, the Gospel doth no where threaten death; and therefore Christ could not bear it, as to satisfy the Gospel-threatening. Though I confess I have been

long in this point of another judgment, while I considered not the Tenor of the Covenants distinctly; some further proof you shall have in the next conclusion. Read *Heb. 9:15*.

THESIS XXXIIX

AS the Active Obedience of Christ was not the Righteousness of the second Covenant, or the performing of it, Conditions, but of the first, properly called a Legal Righteousness; so also his Passive Obedience and Merit was only to satisfy for the violation of the Covenant of Works, but not at all for the violation of the Covenant of Grace for that there is no satisfaction made, and there remaineth no sacrifice.

EXPLICATION.

THat Christ: did not fulfil the conditions of the new Covenant for us: I have proved already: That he hath not satisfied for its violation, I think to the considerate will need no proof: If you think otherwise, consider, 1. Christ is said to be made under the Law, & to have born the curse of the Law, & to have freed us from the curse of it, but no where is this affirmed of him in respect of the Gospel. 2. There be terms by him propounded upon which men must partake of the benefits of his Satisfaction; but these terms are only conditions of the new Covenant, therefore he never satisfied for the non-performance of those

conditions. 3. If he did, upon what conditions is that satisfaction enjoyed by us? 4. But the Question is out of doubt, because that every man that performeth not the Gospel-conditions, doth bear the Punishment himself in eternal fire, and therefore Christ did not bear it: So that as it was not so grievous a death which was threatened in the first Covenant, as that is which is threatened in the second, so it was not so grievous a kind of death which Christ did bear, as that is which final unbelievers shall bear, (except as he accumulation of sins of so many might increase it,) Therefore when we say, That Christ suffered in his Soul the pains of hell, or that which is equall; we must not mean the pain, which is threatened in the Gospel, and the damned unbelievers must endure; but only of that death which the Law of Works did threaten. Wo therefore to the rebellious unbelieving world, that must bear this second death themselves: For of how much soever Punishment shall they be thought worthy, who tread under foot the blood of the Covenant? *Heb.* 10.29.

THESIS XXXIV.

THE Covenant of Grace is not properly said to be violated, or its conditions broken, except they be finally broken: For the violation consisteth in non performance of the conditions, and if they are performed at last, they are truly performed, & if performed,

then the Covenant is not so violated, as that the offender should fall under the threatening thereof.

EXPLICATION.

I Deny not but the new Covenant maybe said to be neglected, and sinned against, and the Command of Christ broken by out long standing out in unbelief, though we come home at last. But the Covenant conditions are not broken, whenever the precept of the Gospel is transgressed, or the Covenant neglected, except it be final. The Condition is, Who ever believeth shall be saved, not limiting it to a particular season. Though both the precept of Christ, & common Reason requireth that we be speedy in the performance, because we have no promise that the day of Grace shall continue, and because our neglect will increase our disability, and our frequent resisting Will grieve the Spirit; So that the new Covenant doth not threaten death to every particular act of disobedience or unbelief, nor to any but what is final, though the precept require that we believe immediately, and every degree of unbelief be forbidden.

THESIS XXXV.

YEt the sins of Believers against the Gospel Precepts have need of pardon, and are properly said to be pardoned, in reference to their deserved pu-

nishment; 1. Both because the punishment, which naturally, and implicitly is due to them, is not so much as threatened in this gentle Covenant, and so becomes not explicitly due, or in point of Law. 2. But especially because the old Covenant condemning all sin, is yet unrepealed, which would be executed on us, even for our sins against GRACE, did not the efficacy of CHRIST'S Satisfaction daily interpose, which makes us therefore have continual need of that Satisfaction.

EXPLICATION.

THIS is laid down to prevent the Objection which might arise from the fore-going Doctrine: For many are ready to ask, If Christ died not for sin as it is against the Gospel-Covenant, then how are such sins pardoned to Believers? I answer, in the fore-expressed way: For certainly the Gospel cannot be said to remit the Punishment which it never threatened, (further then as it is only implicitly due;) And that which it doth threaten it doth never remit.

THESIS XXXVI.

THE pardoning of sin is a gracious act of God, A discharging the Offender by the Gospel-Promise, or grant from the Obligation, to punishment, upon consideration of the satisfaction made by Christ, accepted by the sinner, and pleaded with God.

EXPLICATION.

THE true definition of Pardon, and of Justification doth much conduce to the understanding of this whole mysterious

Doctrine. The former I have here laid down as near as I can. I shall briefly explain the whole Definition,

1. I call it an *Act of God*; for so the Scripture ordinarily doth. *Mat.* 6:12, 14, 15. *Mar.* 11:24, 26. *Luk.* 23:34. *Ephes.* 3:32. Some may object; If all things be delivered into the hands of Christ the Redeemer, and all Judgment committed to the Son, as is shewed before, then the Son should forgive rather than the Father. I answer. 1. So the Son is said to forgive also, *Mar.* 2:7, 10. *Luk.* 5:24. 2. I shewed you before. That the Father giveth not away any power from himself by giving it to the Son; but only doth manage it in another way upon other terms. 3. As the Mediator is a middle person, interposing between God and the world for their reconciliation, so the Acceptance, Pardon and Kingdom of the Mediator, is, as it were a Mean or step towards the Pardon, Acceptance, and Kingdom of God. First Christ doth cleanse men by his Spirit, and Blood, and then offereth them blameless and undefiled, without spot or wrinkle to God, who so accepts them at his hands, and even the Kingdom also will he deliver up to the Father, *Ephes.* 5:27. *Col.* 1:22, 28. *Jude* 24. 1 *Cor.* 15:24. Therefore the Son's pardoning and accepting being first in order of Nature, and so but a mean to God's pardoning and accepting

where the whole work is completely perfected, (when the sinner is fully brought home by Christ to God, from whom he first fell,) the act of pardoning is therefore most usually and fitly ascribed to the Father, (that being the ultimate perfecting pardon,) and we are said to ask it of him through Christ.

2. I call this Pardon, *a gracious Act*; For if it were not in some sort gratuitous, or free, it were no Pardon. Let those think of this, who say, We have perfectly obeyed the Law in Christ, and are therefore righteous. If the proper debt either of obedience or suffering be paid, either by our selves, or by another, then there is no place left for Pardon: For when the Debt is paid, we owe nothing (except obedience *de novo*;) and therefore can have nothing forgiven us. For the Creditor cannot refuse the proper Debt, nor deny an Acquittance upon receipt thereof. But Christ having paid the *Tantundem* and not the *Idem*, the Value and not the strict Debt, this satisfaction the Father might have chosen to accept, or to have discharged us upon Christ's sufferings: which yet because he freely doth, therefore is his gracious Act properly called Pardon.

The ignorant Antinomians think, it cannot be a Free Act of Grace, if there be any Condition on our part for enjoying it. As if in the fore-mentioned companion, *pag.* 153.

the Tenants redemption were the less free, because his new Lease requires the Rent of a pepper corn in token of homage! As if when a pardon is procured for a condemned Malefactor, upon condition that he shall not reject it when it is offered him, but shall take him that procured it for his Lord, that this were therefore no free pardon! Indeed if we paid but a mite in part of the debt itself, so far our pardon were the less free. But I will not further trouble the Reader with these senseless conceits? the confutation whereof is so easy and obvious.

3. I call this Act [*a Discharging*] as being the proper term in Law to express it by. We were before charged by the Law: we are by this Act discharged.

4. I call it a discharge of [*the Offender.*] For an offender is the only capable object or recipient of it. There can be no pardon where there is no offender.

5. I call it a discharging [*from the Obligation to Punishment.*] For. 1. You must look at this whole process as legal, and not as referring chiefly to God's secret judgment or thoughts. Therefore when it is called a freeing man from the wrath of God, you must understand it only of the wrath threatened in the Covenant, and so from [*the obligation to Punishment.*] You must not conceive of the change

in God, but in the sinners relation, and consequently in the sense and sentence of the Law, as to him. 2. The common word by which this *terminus a quo*, or rather the evil which this pardon doth directly free us from, is expressed, is Guilt. But because the word *Guilt* is variously used, sometimes referring only to the Fact, sometimes to the desert of Punishment, and sometime to the dueness of Punishment or the Laws obliging the Offender to bear it; I have therefore here taken it in this last expression, because I think that Guilt is taken away only in this last sense; as I shall further open anon. Therefore many define Guilt only in this last sense, *Reatus est Obligatio ad Pœnam*. This Obligation though expressed only in the Covenant, yet ariseth also from the Fact: For if the Covenant had not been broken, it had nor obliged to suffering; but still to duty nly.

6. I call it a Discharging [by the *Gospel-promise or grant*:] (It is called a Promise in reference to the benefit as future, but more properly a Grant in reference to the benefit as present or past; either in the conferring, or already conferred.) This I do for these Reasons. To clear the nature of this Act. 2. To divert your thoughts from God's secret judgment, where most suppose this Act performed; and to turn them right, and free God from the imputation of change.

A great question it is, Whether Remission and justification be immanent or transient Acts of God? The mistake of this one point was it that led those two most excellent, famous Divines. Dr. *Twisse* and Mr. *Pemble* to that error and pillar of Antinomianism, *viz.* Justification from Eternity. For (saith Dr. *Twisse* often) All Acts immanent in God, are from Eternity: but Justification and remission of sin are immanent Acts: therefore, &c. by [immanent in God] they must needs mean Negatively, not Positively. For Acts have not the respect of an Adjunct to its subject, but an effect to its cause. Now whether all such immanent Acts are any more eternal then tranfient Acts, is much questioned: As for God to know that the world doth now exist; That such a man is sanctified, or just, &c. God's fore-knowledge is not a knowing that such a thing is, which is not; but that such a thing will be, which is not. Yet doth this make no change in God; no more then the Sun is changed by the variety of Creatures which it doth enlighten and warm; or the Glass by the variety of faces which it represents; or the eye by the variety of the colours, which it beholdeth: (For whatsoever some say, I do not think that every variation of the object maketh a real change in the eye, or that the beholding of ten distinct colours at one view, doth make ten distinct acts of the sight, or al-

terations on it: Much less do the objects of God's knowledge make such alterations.) But grant that all God's immanent Acts are Eternal (which I think is quite beyond our understanding to know;) Yet most Divines will deny the Minor; and tell you that Remission and Justification are transient Acts; Which is true: But a Truth which I never had the happiness to see or hear well cleared by any. For to prove it a transient act, they tell us no more, but that it doth *transire in subjectum extraneum*, by making a moral change on our Relation, though not a real upon our persons, as Sanctification doth. But this is only to affirm and not to prove; and that in general only; not telling us what Act it is that maketh this change. Relations are not capable of being the Patients or subjects of any Act: seeing they are but mere *Entia Rationis*, and no real Beings, Neither are they the immediate product or effect of any Act: but in order of Nature are consequential to the direct effects. The proper effect of the Act is to lay the Foundation from whence the Relation doth arise. And the same Act which layeth the Foundation doth cause the Relation, without the intervention of any other. Suppose but the *subjectum fundamentum & terminus*, and the Relation will unavoidably follow, by a mere resultancy. The direct effect

therefore of God's Active Justification must be a real effect, though not upon the sinner, yet upon something else for him; and thence will his Passive Justification follow. Now what transient Act this is, and what its immediate real Effect, who hath unfolded? I dare not be to confident in so dark a point; but it seemeth to me, that this justifying transient Act is the enacting or promulgation of the new Covenant, wherein Justification is conferred upon every Believer. Here, 1. The passing and enacting this Grant is a transient Act. 2. So may the continuance of it (as I think.) 3. This Law or Grant hath a moral improper Action, whereby it may be said to pardon or justify; which properly is but virtual justifying. 4. By this Grant God doth, 1. Give us the Righteousness of Christ, to be ours when we believe: 2. And disableth the Law to oblige us to punishment, or to condemn us: 3. Which real Foundation being thus laid, our Relations of [Justified and Pardoned in title of Law] do necessarily result.

Object. But this Act of God, in granting Pardon to Believers, was performed long ago: But our Justification is not till we believe.

Ans. Though the effects of Causes as Physical do follow them immediately, yet as Moral they do not so; but at what distance the Agent pleases sometimes. A man makes his son a Deed of Gift of certain Lands, to be his

at such an age, or upon the performance of some eminent Action. Here the Deed of gift is the father's instrument by which he giveth these Lands: The passing this Deed is the proper Act and time of Donation: Yet the son hath no possession till the time prefixed, or till the Condition be performed: At which time, the conditional Grant becoming absolute, and giving him right to present possession, it is not unfitly said, that his father doth even then bestow the Lands: though by no new intervening act at all, but only the continuation of the former Deed of gift in force. So here, the conditional grant of Pardon [Justification doth then absolutely pardon and justify us, when we perform the Condition. Hence is the phrase in Scripture of being *Justified by the Law*:] which doth not only signify [by the Law as the Rule to which men did fit their actions;] but also [by the Law, as not condemning, but justifying, the person whose actions are so fitted:] In which sense the Law did justify Christ: or else the Law should not justify as a Law or Covenant, but only as a Direction: which properly is not Justifying, but only a means to discover that we are Justifiable. As the Word of Christ shall judge men at the last day, *Joh. 12:28*. So doth it virtually now. And if it judge, then doth it condemn and justify. So *Rom. 2:12* *Jam. 2:12*. We shall be judged by the Law of Liberty.

Gal. 5:3, 4,23. In the same sense, as the Law is said to convince and curse (*Jam.* 2:9. *Gal.* 3:13.) it may be said that the Gospel or new Law doth acquit, justify and bless. *Rom.* 8:12. *The Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, hath made me from the Law of Sin and Death.* As the Law worketh Wrath, and where is no Law, there is no Transgression, (*Rom.* 4:15.) And as sin is not imputed where there is no Law, (*Rom.* 5:13. and the strength of sin is the law, (*1 Cor.* 15:56. So the new law is the strength of Righteousness and worketh Deliverance from Wrath; and were there no such new Covenant, there would be no Righteousness inherent or imputed: *Joh.* 7:51.

So that I conclude, That this transient Act of God, pardoning and justifying (*constitutive*) is his Grant in the new Covenant; by which as a Moral Instrument? our Justification and Pardon are in time produced, even when we believer the Obligation of the law being then by it made void to us.

And this is the present apprehension I have of the nature of Remission and Justification: *Si quid novisti rectius, &c.* (yet I shall have occasion afterwards to tell you. That all this is but Remission and Justification in Law and Title, which must be distinguished from that which is in Judgment or Sentence, the former being Virtual in respect of the Actuality of the latter).

2. The second kind of God's Acts, which

may be called Justifying, is indeed Immanent; *viz.* His knowing the sinner to be pardoned and just in Law, his Willing and Approving hereof as True and Good: These are Acts in Heaven, yea in God himself; but the former sort are on earth also. I would not have those Acts of God separated which he doth conjoin; as he ever doth these last with the former: But I verily think that it is especially the former transient legal Acts which the Scripture usually means when it speaks of Pardoning and (constitutive) Justifying: and not these Immanent Acts; though these must be looked on as concurrent with the former. Yet most Divines that I meet with, seem to look at Pardon and Justification as being done in heaven only and consisting only in these latter Immanent Acts: And yet they deny Justification to be an Immanent Act too: But how they will ever manifest that these celestial Acts of God, (*viz.* his Willing the sinners Pardon? and so forgiving him in his own breast or his accepting him as just,) are Transient Acts, I am yet unable to understand; And if they be Immanent Acts? most will grant that they are from Eternity: and then fair fall the Antinomians. Indeed if God have a Bar in Heaven before his Angels, where these things are for the present transacted, as some think; and that we are said to be justified only at the bar now; then I confess that

is a transient Act indeed. But of that more hereafter.

7. I add in the definition, That all this is done [*in consideration of the Satisfaction, 1. made by Christ, 2. Accepted, 3. And pleaded with God.*] The satisfaction made is the proper meritorious and impulsive cause: 2. So the Satisfaction as pleaded by Christ the intercessor, is also an impulsive cause. 3. The Satisfactious Acceptance by the Sinner (that is Faith,) and the pleading of it with God by the sinner (that is praying for pardon,) are but the Conditions, or *Causæ sine qua*.

But all these will be fuller opened afterwards.

THESIS XXXVII.

Justification is either 1. An Title and the Sense of the Law; 1. Or in Sentence of Judgment. The first may be called Constitutive; The second Declarative: The first Virtual, the second Actual.

EXPLICATION.

I Will not stand to mention all those other Distinctions of Justification which are common in others, & not so necessary or pertinent to my purposed scope. You may find them in M^r Bradshaw, M^r John Goodwin, and *Alstedius* Distinctions and Definitions, &c.

The difference between Justification in Title of Law, and in Sentence of Judgment, is apparent at the first view: Therefore I need not explain it. It is common, when a man hath a good cause, and the Law on his side, to say, The Law justifieth him, or he is just in Law, or

he is acquit by the Law; and yet he is more fully and completely acquit by the sentence of the Judge afterward: In the former sense we are now justified by faith, as soon as ever we believe: In the latter sense we are justified at the last Judgment. The title of [Declarative] is too narrow for this last: For the sentence of judicial absolution doth more then barely to declarers justified. I call the former [virtual] not as it is in it self considered, but as it standeth in relation to the latter.

All those Scriptures, which speak of Justification as done in this life, I understand of Justification in Title of Law: So *Rom. 5:1. Being justified by faith, we have peace with God. Rom. 4:2. Rom. 5:9. Being now justified by his blood, &c. James 2:21, 25. &c.*

But Justification in Judgment, as it is the completing Act, so is it most fitly called Justification; and I think the word in Scripture hath most commonly reference to the Judgment day; and that Justification in Title is called [Justification] most especially, because of its relation to the Justification at Judgment; because as men are now in point of Law, so shall they most certainly be sentenced in Judgment.

Therefore is it spoken of many times as a future thing, and not yet done: *Rom. 3:30 Mat. 12:37, Rom. 2:13. Both these may be called [Justification by Faith,] for by Faith*

we are justified, both in Law Title, and at Judgment.

THESIS XXXVIII.

Justification, in Title of Law, is a gracious Act of God, by the Promise or Grant of the new Covenant, acquitting the Offender from the Accusation and Condemnation of the old Covenant, upon consideration of the Satisfaction made by Christ, and accepted by the sinner.

EXPLICATION.

HERE you may see 1. That pardon of sin, and this Justification in Law, are not punctually and precisely alone: 2. And yet the difference is very small. The chief difference lieth in this, That the *Terminus a quo* of Remission, is the obligation to Punishment; but the *Terminus* of Justification, (or the evil that it formally and directly doth free us from,) is the Laws Accusation and Condemnation: Now though the difference between these two be very narrow, and rather respective then real, yet a plain difference there is: For though it be one and the same Commination of the Law, by which men are both obliged to Punishment, accused as guilty, and condemned for that guilt, yet these are not all one, though it is also true, that they all stand or fall together.

That pardon is most properly the removing of the Obligation, and that Justification is the removing of Accusation and Condemnation in the Law, will be evident to those that have read what Divines have written at large concerning the signification of the words, especially such that have skill in Law, which is a great advantage in this doctrine of Justification: Therefore as Mr. *Wotten*, and Mr. *Goodwin* do a little mistake in making pardon of sin to be the formal cause of Justification,

(though they are far nearer the mark than their opposers.) So Mr. *Bradshaw* doth a little too much straighten the form of it, making it to lie only in Apology or Plea. It consisteth in both these Acts; 1. Apology, in opposition to Accusation; thus Christ our Advocate doth principally justify us: 2. In Sentence, (virtual or actual,) & so it is opposed both to Accusation and Condemnation; so Christ the Mediator as Judge, and the Father as one with him, and as the supreme judge, doth justify: But this latter is the chief Act. The rest of the Definition is sufficiently opened under the foregoing Definition of Pardon, and will be more after.

THESIS XXXIX.

Justification in Sentence of Judgement is [a gracious Act of God by Christ, according to the Gospel, by Sentence at his public Bar, acquitting the sinner from the Accusation and Condemnation of the Law, pleaded against him by Satan] upon the consideration of the Satisfaction made by Christ, accepted by the sinner, and pleaded for him.

EXPLICATION.

There is also a two fold Pardon, as well as a two-fold Justification: One in Law, the other in Sentence of Judgement. So *Acts 3:19. Repent, that your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing comes, &c.* But pardon of sin is usually mentioned in respect to this life present, as being bestowed here; because a man may more fitly be said to be fully quit from the Obligation of the Punishment, commonly called the guilt in this life, then from the Accusation of that guilt which will be managed against him by Satan hereafter, or from the Condemnation, which he must then most especially be delivered from.

The difference betwixt this Justification and the former, may easily be discerned by the Definition without any further Explication.

THESIS XL.

WHen Scripture seaketh of Justification by Faith, it is to be understood primarily and directly of Justification in Law title, and at the bar of God's public Judgment; and but secondarily and consequentially of Justification at the bar of God's secret judgment, or at the bar of Conscience, or of the-World.

EXPLICATION.

1. WHat justification by Faith is *in foro Dei*, and not *in foro conscientiae* primarily, see Dr Downam's Appendix to Covenant of Grace against M^r Pemble. Conscience is but an inferior, petty, improper Judge: The work must be transacted chiefly at a higher Tribunal. View all the Scriptures that mention Justification by Faith, and you shall find by the Text and Context that they relate to the bar of God, but not one directly to the bar of Conscience. It is one thing to be justified, and another thing to have it manifested to our Consciences that we are so.

2. That it is not directly at the bar of the World, all will acknowledge.

3. That it is not directly at the bar of God's secret Judgment, in his own breast, may appear thus: 1. That is not a bar at which God dealeth with sinners, for Justification or Condemnation in any known or visible way; No Scrip-

ture intimateth it. 2. We could not then judge of our Justification. 3. They are immanent Acts; but Justification is a transient Act: Therefore Dr *Downname* in the place before mentioned hath proved against Mr *Pemle*, that Justification is not from Eternity. And (as I judge by his following Tract of Justification) Mr *Pemle* himself came afterwards to a sounder Judgment in the nature of Justification. 4. God dealeth with man in an open way of Law, and upon Covenant terms, and so will try him at a public judgment according to the Tenor of his Covenants. The secrets of his breast are too high for us. By the word will he judge us: That must justify or condemn us. Therefore when you hear talk of the Bar of God, you must not understand it of the immanent Acts of God's Knowledge or Will, but of his Bar of public Judgment, and in the sense of the Word, Some think that Justification by Faith is properly and directly none of all these yet, but that it is a public Act of God in heaven before his Angels. I think this opinion, better then any of the three former, which would have it at the Bar of God's secret Judgment, or of Conscience, or of the World; and I know no very ill consequence that followeth it; But that God doth condemn or justify at any such Bar, I find no Scripture fully to satisfy or persuade me. Those places, *Rom.* 2: 13. *Heb.* 9:14. *Luke* 12:8, 9. & 15:10. which

are alledged to that purpose, seem not to conclude any such thing, as that to be the Bar where Faith doth most properly justify: Yet I acknowledge that in a more remote sense we may be said to be justified by Faith at all the four other Bars, *viz.*: God's Immanent Judgment, and before the Angels, and before Confidence, and the World; For God and Angels do judge according to Truth, and take those to be just, who are so in Law and in deed: and so do our Consciences, and Men when they judge rightly; and when they do not, we cannot well be said to be justified at their Bar. Therefore I think they mistake, who would have Works, rather than Faith, to justify us at the Bar of the World, as I shall shew afterward, when I come to open the conditions of Justification.

THESIS XLI.

THat saying of our Divines [That Justification is perfected at first, and admits of no degrees] must be understood thus, That each of those Acts which we call Justification, are in their own kind perfect ad once; and that our Righteousness is per feä and admits not of degrees. But yet as the former Acts, called Justification, do not fully, and in all respects, procure our freedom, so they may be said to be imperfect, and but degrees toward our full and perfect Justification at the last Judgment.

THESIS XLII.

There are many such steps toward our final and full Justification; As 1. God's eternal Love and Decree of justifying us. 2. Christ's undertaking for satisfying and justifying. His actual satisfying by paying the price. 4. His own Justification, as the public Person, at his Resurrection. 5. That change which is made in our Relation upon our Regeneration, or receiving the vital seed of Grace, where, among others, that is contained, which is called the habit of Faith: these infants are capable of. 6. The change of our Relation upon our actual Faith. 7. The pacifying our own hearts is by the evidence of Faith, and assurance thereupon, and witness of Confidence, and Testimony, and Seal of the Spirit. 8. The Angels judging us righteous, and rejoicing therein. 9. Our Justification before Men, 10. And our final Justification at the great Judgment.

But it is only the sixth and tenth of these which is directly and properly the Justification by Faith, as is before expressed.

THESIS XLIII.

The Justification which we have in Christ's own Justification is but conditional as to the particular offenders, and none can lay claim to it till he have performed the conditions; nor shall any be personally justified till then: Even the elect remain personally unjust and unjustified, for all their conditional Justification in Christ, till they do believe.

THis needs not explication, and for Confirmation there is enough said under the 15, 18, 19, 20, Positions before.

THESIS XLIV.

*M*En that are but thus conditionally pardoned and justified, may be unpardoned and unjustified again for their non-performance of the conditions, and all the debt so forgiven be required at their hands; and all this without any change in God, or in his Laws. See Ball of the Covenant, pag. 240.

THis is all plain; only for so much of it as seems to intimate an universal conditional Justification, and consequently universal Redemption, I intreat the Reader to suspend his Judgment, till I come to the point of Universal Redemption, where I shall fully and Purposely explain my meaning.

And for that which intimates in the following Position, the falling away of the justified, understand, that I speak only upon supposition, and of a possibility in the thing, and of the Tenor of the Gospel: But in regard of God's Will of Purpose, which determineth eventually, whether they shall fall quite away or not, I do believe, that the justified by Faith never do, or shall fall away.

THESIS XLV.

YEa, in case the justified by Faith should cease believing, the Scripture would pronounce them unjust again, and yet without any change in God, or Scripture, but only in themselves. Because their Justification doth continue conditional, as long as they live here; the Scripture doth justify no man by name, but all believers as such; therefore if they should cease to be believers, they would cease to be justified.

THESIS XLVI.

Justification implieth Accusation, either Virtual or Actual.

EXPLICATION.

AS there is a justification in Law or in Sentence, so is there the Accusation of the Law, as it stands in force, which may be called a virtual Accusation, in reference to that at Judgment, which will be Actual from Satan's pleading the violated Law against us. Mr Bradshaw doth fully shew you the reason of this Position.

THESIS XLVII.

THe new Covenant accuseth no man, as deserving its penalty, but only those that perform not its conditions; that is, the finally unbelieving and impenitent rebels against Christ, and their rightful Lord.

EXPLICATION.

That the Gospel doth not condemn men, or threaten them with damnation for any sins but unbelief, I dare not speak or think. But that the Gospel threateneth no man with damnation but unbelievers, is out of all question: And consequently the proper sin threatened in the new Covenant as such, is unbelief, the rest are but left and settled on the sinner by this.

THESIS XLVIII.

Where the Gospel-Covenant doth thus accuse, or where any one is truly thus charged, there is no Justification for that person.

EXPLICATION.

IMean, not where any man is accused of a temporary neglect, or delay of performing the conditions: For the Gospel threateneth not death to such, is at last they do perform them: But where there is a final nonperformance which is the proper violation, there is no hope of Justification. See for this the 32, 33, 34, 35, Positions.

THESIS XLIX.

IT being the Laws Accusation and Condemnation only, & not the Gospels, which weave justified against; therefore the Righteousness which must be

pleaded for our Justification directly must be a legal Righteousness, which is only Christ's Satisfaction.

THESIS L.

OVr Faith therefore cannot be the least part of that Righteousness so to be pleaded, it being not the Righteousness of that Covenant which doth accuse us; so that though we are justified by Faith, yet is it not any of the Righteousness to be pleaded against the accuser.

THESIS LI.

YEt if Satan, or any other, should falsly accuse us of not performing the conditions of the new Covenant, and so having no part in Christ's Satisfaction, here we must be justified only by our Faith, or person all Gospel-Righteousness, and not by any thing that Christ hath done or suffered: For in all false accusations we must defend our innocency and plead not guilty.

EXPLICATION.

BUt because there is no danger to us from false accusation before the all-knowing God, therefore Scripture saith nothing of any such Justification, Yet at the bar of men it is frequently useful, where false accusations may be heard, & therefore *David, Job, &c.* do plead their Innocency against their accusers. Also at the bar of our own erroneous Consciencs; this kind of Justification is frequently;

full; for there Satan hath more hope that his false accusations may take place, then at the Bar of God; Wherefore he more usually accuseth Christians to themselves of being graceless, and unbelievers, and impenitent, and of having no part in Christ, then of breaking the Law by their sins. And in such cases, when the accusation is false, we have no way to answer it, but by pleading not guilty, & calling back the accusation as a lying slander, and producing our Faith and Gospel-Obedience, or what ever grace we are accused to want: And so it is that our own graces and duties may be properly our comfort: It will be but a senseless shift in such an accusation to shew Christ's Legal Righteousness in stead of our own Evangelical Righteousness. To tell Satan, that Christ hath fulfilled the Law for us, when he is accusing us of not fulfilling the Gospel; silly women are made believe by Antinomian Teachers, that this is a solid way of comforting: But Satan is a better Logician then to take *quid pro quo*, and to be baffled with such arguing. And as silly, and more false a shift it will be, to tell him, that Christ hath believed, repented and fulfilled the Gospel-Conditions for us, as I have shewed before. The best is, these Teachers do but spoil the comforts of believers, and not their safety; for in the case in hand, we suppose the accusation to be false: But yet by such grounds they may very

easily overthrow the safety also of unbelievers, while they teach them how to comfort themselves without Faith, or to look at all out of themselves in Christ, and so to silence the accusation of both Covenants, by producing only the Righteousness of one.

THESIS LII.

WE must not plead for our Justification, that Christ hath made us free from the very fact; nor, (2) from the sinfulness of the fact; nor, (3) from its desert of punishment; if Christ had done any of this for us, he must verify Contradictories. But we must plead, that the penalty is not due to our persons notwithstanding the fact, and its sinfulness and demerit, because Christ hath satisfied for all this.

EXPLICATION.

SO M^r Anthony Burgess in his book of *Justif. pag. 19.* affirmeth as much, though some take it for heinous doctrine. 1. That the fact should be done, and not done, is a contradiction. 2. So is it, That the fact should be sinful, and not sinful. 3. Or that it should deserve death, and not deserve it: Or that it should be a sin against that threatening Law, and yet not deserve the penalty threatened. Besides, if any of these three could have been taken off, what need Christ have died? But that which Remission and Justification freeth us from, is the dueness of Punishment to our persons, notwithstanding the dueness of it to the sin; because what is due to the sin, is inflicted on the person of another already, even Christ. So that you see in what sense Christ taketh away sin and guilt, which you must observe, lest

you run into the Antinomian conceit? That God seeth not sin in his justified ones. When we say therefore that God looketh on our sins as if they had never been committed, the meaning is, that, in regard to punishment, they shall have no more power to condemn us, then if they had never been committed.

THESIS LIII.

The offending of God, and the desert and procuring of punishment, are not two distinct effects of sin, as some make them; nor is the removal of the curse and punishment, and the obtaining of God's favour, two distinct parts of our Justification.

EXPLICATION.

THIS is plain, because God's displeasure against our persons (for his dislike of the sin is never taken off) is a chief part of our punishment, and therefore not to be distinguished from it, but as the Species from its *Genus*. And so when all the punishment is removed, then God's displeasure, or the loss of his favour, must needs be removed: Therefore that Justification in this differs from Remission of sin, I cannot yet think, (as that godly and learned Servant of Christ, whom I honour and reverence, Mr *Burgess* of *Justificat. pag. 259.* doth,) That Justification, besides the pardon of sin, doth connote a state that the subject is put into, *viz.* a state of favour, being reconciled with God. Because even Remission it self doth connote that state of favour: For if the loss of God's favour be part of the punishment, and all the punishment be remitted, then the flavour which we lost must needs be thereby restored. Indeed there is a two-fold Favour of God. 1. That which we lost in the fall; 2. More super-added by Christ, besides the former restored: Of these in the following Position.

THESIS LIV.

*R*emission, Justification and Reconciliation do but restore the offender into the same state of freedom and favour that he fell from; But Adoption and Marriage-Union with Christ do advance him far higher.

EXPLICATION.

THe three former are all concomitant consequents of one and the same Act of God by his Gospel: The freedom from obligation to Punishment is called Remission: the freedom from Accusation and Condemnation is called Justification; and the freedom from enmity and displeasure is called Reconciliation which are all at once, & do all denote but our Restauration to our former state. Adoption and Marriage-Union do add the rest.

Some may blame me for putting Union among the relative Graces, and not rather among those that make a real physical change upon us, as Sanctification and Glorification. But I do herein, according to my judgment, whereof to give the full reasons here would be too large a digression. I know that *Caspar Streso*, and divers others, do place it in an unconceivable, unexpressable *medium* between these two, which yet must be called a Real Union, more than a Relative, though not Physical: I will not now stand on his fore-

knowledge a Real Foundation of a Relative Union, and a Real Communion following thereupon: But am very fearful of coming so near, as to make Christ and sinners one real Person, (as the late elevated Sect among us do,) lest blasphemously I should deify man, and debase Christ to be actually a sinner. And if we are not one real Person with Christ, than one what? It sufficeth me to know as above said, and that we are one with Christ in as strict a bond of relation as the wise with the husband, and far stricter; and that we are his body mystical, but not natural. That we shall be one with him, as he is one with the Father, is true: But that [*as*] doth not extend the similitude to all respects, but to a truth in some.

THESIS LV.

BEfore it be committed it is no sin; and where there is no sin, the penalty is not due; and where it is not due, it cannot properly be forgiven; therefore sin is not forgiven before it be committed, though the grounds of certain Remission be laid before.

EXPLICATION.

FOR proof of this I refer you to Master Burgess of *Justificati. Lect.* 28.

THESIS LVI.

B*Y what hath been said, it is apparent, That Justification in Title may be ascribed to several Causes. 1. The principal efficient Cause is God. 2. The Instrumental is the Promise or Grant off the new Covenant. 3. The Procatactick Cause, (so far as God may be said to be moved by any thing out of himself, speaking after the manner of men,) is four-fold. 1. And chiefly the Satisfaction of Christ. 2. The Intercession of Christ, and supplication of the sinner. 3. The necessity of the sinner. 4. The opportunity and advantage for the glorifying his Justice and Mercy. The first of these is the Meritorious Cause; the second the moral persuading Cause; the third is the Objective, and the fourth is the Occasion. 2. Material Cause properly it hath none: If you will improperly call Christ's Satisfaction the remote matter, I contend not. 3. The formal Cause is the acquitting of the sinner from Accusation and Condemnation of the law, or the disabling the Law to accuse or condemn him. 4. The final Cause is the Glory of God's and of the Mediator, and the deliverance of the sinner. 5. The Causa sine quâ non; is both Christ's Satisfaction, and the Faith of the justified.*

EXPLICATION.

H*ere it will be expected, that I answer to these Questions. 1. Why I call the Gospel the Instrumental Cause? 2. Why I call Christ's Satisfaction the meritorious Cause,*

and the *Causa sine quâ non*? 3. Why I make not Christ's Righteousness the material Cause? 4. Why I make not the Imputation of it the formal Cause? 5. Why I make not Faith the Instrumental Cause? 6. Why I make it only the *Causa sine quâ non*?

To the first Question: As a Lease or Deed of Gift is properly a man's Instrument in conveying the thing leased or given; and as the King's Pardon under his Hand and Seal is his proper Instrument of pardoning & justifying the Malefactor, so is the new Covenant God's Instrument in this case, or, as it were, his Mouth, by which he pronounceth a believer justified.

To the second Question: Christ's Satisfaction hath several ways of causing our Justification. 1. That it is the Meritorious Cause, I know few but Socinians that will deny. 2. That it is besides properly a *Causa sine qua non*, cannot be denied by any that consider, that it removeth those great Impediments that hindered our Justification. And what if a man should say, that because impulsive and procaccartical Causes have properly no place with God, that therefore the greatest part of the work of Christ's Satisfaction is to be the *Causa sine qua non principalis*? But because my assigning no more to Christ's Satisfaction but merit, and this improper causality, doth seem to some to be very injurious thereto; I desire them so long

to lay by their prejudice & passion while they consider of this one thing, That we are not in this business considering which cause hath the preheminance, in regard of physical production, but which in moral respect deserveth the highest commendation. In point of Morality the greatest praise is seldom due to the greatest natural strength, or to the strongest natural causation. In Physics the efficient hath the greatest part of the glory; but in Morals the Meritorious Cause hath a singular share: As *Diogenes* said, *Quare me non laudas qui dignus sum ut accipiam? Plus enim est meruisse quam dedisse beneficium.* The like may be said of some Causes *sine qua non*: That they deserve far greater praise in moral respect, then some that have a proper causality do. It is agreed, that *removens impedimentum quâ talis, is Causa sine quâ non*: And doth not the greatest part of a Phisicians skill lie there? That which taketh away the offending humor, and cleanseth out the corruption, and removeth all hinderances, shall have the greatest share in the glory of the cure, of any artificial cause. Suppose a man be condemned by Law for Treason, one payeth one thousand pound for his Pardon, and thereby procured it under the broad Seal; hereby he suspendeth, and afterward disableth the Law, as to the offender; This man is the efficient of those happy effects from which the justification of the Traitor

will follow: But as to his justification it self, he is but the *Causa removens impedimenta*, taking away the force of the Law? and the offense of Majesty? and whatsoever else did hinder the justification of the offender. And yet I think he deserveth more thanks then either the Lawyer that justifieth him by Plea, or the Judge that justifies him by Sentence. So here, if you had rather: you may call it a necessary Antecedent. Or if any man think fitter to call these Causes by another name, I much care not, so we agree concerning the nature of the thing.

To the third question. Christ's Righteousness cannot be the material cause, of an Act which hath no matter. If any will call Christ's Righteousness the matter of our Righteousness, though yet they speak improperly, yet far nearer the truth, then to call it the Matter of our Justification.

To the fourth Quest. That Imputation is not the Form, is undeniable. The form gives the name: especially to Actions, that have no matter. Imputation and Justification denote distinct Acts: And how then can Imputing be the Form of justifying. Though I mention not Imputation in the Definition, nor among the Causes here, yet it is implied in the mention of Satisfaction, which must be made ours, or else we cannot be Justified by it. Though therefore, the Scripture do not

speak of imputing Christ's Righteousness or Satisfaction to us; yet if by Imputing, they mean no more but, [Bestowing it on us, so that we shall have the Justice, and other benefits of it as truly as if we had satisfied our selves,] in this sense I acknowledge Imputation of Christ's satisfactory Righteousness. But I believe that this Imputing, doth in order of nature, go before Justifying: And that the Righteousness so Imputed, is the proper ground whence we are denominated Legally righteous, and consequently why the Law cannot condemn us. It is a vain thing to quarrel about the Logical names of the Causes of Justification, if we agree in the matter.

To the fifth Question. Perhaps I shall be blamed, as singular from all men, in denying Faith to be the Instrument of our Justification: But affectation of singularity leads me not to it. 1. If Faith be an Instrument it is the Instrument of God or man: Not of man: For man is not the principal efficient; he doth not justify himself. 2. Not of God's For 1. It is not God that believeth; though its true, he is the first Cause of all Actions. Man is the *Causa secunda*, between God and the Action and so still man should be said to justify himself. 3. For (as *Aquinas*) The Action of the principal Cause and of the Instrument is one Action: and who dare

say, that Faith is so God's Instrument? 4. The Instrument must have influx to the producing of the effect of the Principal cause by a proper Causality. And who dare say, that Faith hath such an influx into our Justification?

Object. But some would evade thus: It is (say they) a Passive Instrument not an Active.

To which I Answer. 1. Even Passive Instruments are said to help the Action of the principal Agent, (*Keckerm. Logick pag. 131.*) He that saith, Faith doth so, in my judgement, gives too much to it. 2. It is past my capacity to conceive of a Passive Moral Instrument. 3. How can the Act of Believing (which hath no other being, but to be an Act) be possibly a Passive Instrument? Doth this Act effect by suffering? Or can wise men have a grosser conceit of this. 4. I believe with *Schibler*, that there is no such thing at all as a passive Instrument. The examples that some produce (as *Burgersdicius* his *Cultor et gladius*) belong to Active Instrument. And the Examples that others bring, (as *Keckermans Iurus instrumentum fabricationis, mensa & scamnum accubitus, terra ambulationis*) are no Instruments: except you will call every Patient or Object, the Instrument of the Agent. The Instrument is an Efficient Cause. All efficiency is by action; and that which doth not Act, doth not effect. Indeed, as some extend the use of

the word instrument, you may call, almost, any thing an Instrument, which is anyway conducive to the production of the Effect under the chief Cause; And so you may call Faith an Instrument.

Quest. But though Faith be not the Instrument of Justification; may it not be called the Instrument of receiving Christ who Justifieth us?

Answ. I do not so much stick at this speech as at the former: yet is it no proper or fit expression neither. For 1. The Act of Faith, (which is it that justifieth) is our Actual receiving of Christ, and therefore cannot be I the Instrument of Receiving. To say our Receiving is the Instrument of our Receiving, is a hard saying. 2. And the seed or habit of Faith cannot fitly be called an Instrument, For, 1. The sanctified faculty it self cannot be the souls Instrument; it being the soul it self and not any thing really distinct from the soul: (nor really distinct from each other, as *Scotus*, *D'Orbellis* *Scaliger*, &c. *D. Jackson*, *Mr. Pemble*, think: and *Mr. Ball* questions.) 2. The holiness of the Faculties is not their Instrument. For, 1. It is nothing but themselves rectified: and not a Being so distinct as may be called their Instrument. 2. Who ever called Habits, or Dispositions, the souls Instruments? The aptitude of a Cause to produce its effect, cannot

be called the Instrument of it: you may as well call a man's Life his Instrument of Acting or the sharpness of a knife, the knives Instrument, as to call our holiness, or habitual faith, the Instrument of receiving Christ.

To the sixth and last Question, I Answ. Faith is plainly and undeniably the condition of our Justification. The whole Tenor of the Gospel shews that. And a condition is but a *Causa sine quâ non*; or a *medium*, or a necessary Antecedent. Here by the way take notice, that the same men that blame the advancing of Faith so high, as to be our true Gospel Righteousness. *Posit.* 17. 20. and to be imputed in a proper sense, *Posit.* 23. do yet, when it comes to the trial ascribe far more to Faith, then those they blame: making it God's Instrument in justifying. 1. And so to have part of the honour of God's own Act; 2. And that from a reason intrinsical to faith it self; 3. And from a Reason that will make other Graces to be Instruments as well as Faith. For Love doth truly receive Christ also. 4. And worst of all, from a Reason that will make man to be the *Causa proxima* of his own Justification. For man is the *Causa proxima* of believing and receiving Christ, and therefore not God but man is said to believe. And yet these very men do send a *Hue and Cry* after the *Tò credere*, for robbing Christ of the

glory of Justification, when we make it but a poor improper *Causæ sine qua non*, (And yet I say as before, that in Morality, yea, and in Naturality, some *Causæ sine qua non*, do deserve much of the honour; but that Faith doth not so, I have shewed in the 23. Position.) Some think that Faith may be some small low Impulsive Cause: but I will not give it so much: though if it be made a Procatactick Objective Cause, I shall not contend.

Thesis LVII.

IT is the Act of Faith which justifieth men at age, and not the habit: yet not as it is a good work, or as it hath in it's self any excellency in it above other Graces: But 1. In the nearest sense, directly and properly as it is, [The fulfilling of the Condition of the New Covenant:] 2. In the remote and more improper sense, as it is [The receiving of Christ and his satisfactory Righteousness.]

EXPLICATION.

1. THAT the habit of Faith doth not directly and properly justify, appears from the tenor of the Covenant: which is not [He that disposed to believe shall be saved] But [he that believeth.]

2. That Faith doth not properly justify through any excellency that it hath above other Graces, or any more useful property,

may appear thus: 1. Then the praise would be due to Faith. 2. Then love would contend for a share, if not a priority. 3. Then Faith would justify, though it had not been made the Condition of the Covenant.

Let those therefore take heed, that make Faith to justify, merely because it apprehendeth Christ; which is its natural, essential property.

3. That it is Faith in a proper sense that is said to justify, and not Christ's Righteousness only which it receiveth, may appear thus, 1. From the necessity of two-fold righteousness, which I have before proved, in reference to the two-fold Covenant. 2. From the plain and constant Phrase of Scripture, which saith, He that believeth shall be justified: and that we are justified by Faith: and that faith is imputed for righteousness. It had been as easy for the Holy Ghost to have said, that Christ only is imputed, or his righteousness only, or Christ only justifieth, &c. if he had so meant. He is the most excusable in an error, that is lead into it by the constant express phrase of Scripture. From the nature of the thing: For the effect is ascribed, to the several Causes (though not alike) and in some sort to the Conditions. Especially, me-thinks they that would have Faith to be the Instrument of Justification, should not deny

that we are properly justified by Faith as by an Instrument: For it is as proper a speech to say [our hand and our teeth feed us,] as to say, [our meet feedeth us.]

That Faith doth most directly and properly justify [as its the fulfilling of the Condition of the New Covenant] appeareth thus.

1. The new Covenant only doth put the stamp of God's. Authority upon it, in making it the Condition. A two-fold stamp is necessary to make it a current medium of our Justification. 1. Command. 2. Promise. Because God hath neither commanded any other means, 2. Nor promised Justification to any other, therefore it is, that this is the only condition; and so only thus Justifieth. When I read this to be the tenor of the New Covenant [Whosoever believeth shall be justified:] doth it not tell me plainly why Faith Justifieth; even because it plealeth the Law-giver and Covenant-maker to put Faith into the Covenant, as its condition. 2. What have we else to shew at God's bar for our Justification, but the New Covenant? The Authority and Legality of it must bear us out. It is upon point of Law that we are condemned; and it must be by Law, that we must be Justified. Therefore we were condemned, because the Law which we break did threaten death to our sin: If we had

committed the same Act, and not under a Law that had threatened it with death, we might not have died. So therefore are we Justified, because the New Law doth promise Justification to our faith. If we had performed the same Act under the first Covenant, it would not have Justified. As the formal Reason, why sin condemneth is, because the Law hath concluded it in its threatening: so the formal Reason, why Faith justifieth, is, because the New Law of Covenant hath concluded it, in its Promise. And as where there is no Law, there is no Transgression nor Condemnation: because sin is formally a transgression of the Law, and Condemnation is but the execution of its Threatening: so where there is no fulfilling the new Law, there is no Righteousness nor Justification: because Righteousness is formally a conformity to the Law of Righteousness, and Justification is but the performing of part of its Promise.

5. That Faith's receiving Christ and his righteousness, is the remote or secondary, and not the formal Reason, why it doth Justify, appeareth thus. 1. I would ask any dissenter this Question. Suppose that Christ had done all that he did for sinners, and they had believed in him, thereupon, without any Covenant promising Justification to this faith: Would this faith have justified them? By what Law? Or whence will they plead their Justifi-

cation at the bar of God? Well: but suppose that Christ having done what he did for us, that he should in framing the New Covenant have put in any other Condition; and said [whosoever loveth God shall by virtue of my satisfaction be Justified.] Would not this love have Justified? No doubt of it. I conclude then thus: The receiving of Christ, is as the silver of this coin: the Gospel-promise is as the King's stamp which maketh it currant for justifying. If God had seen meet to have stamped any thing else, it would have passed currently. Yet take this. Faith is, even to our own apprehension, the most apt and suitable condition that God could have chosen: (for as far as we can reach to know;) There cannot be a more Rational & apt condition of delivering a redeemed Malefactor from Torment, then that he thankfully accept the pardon, and favour of redemption, and hereafter take his Redeemer for his Lord.

So that if you ask me [what is the formal Reason, why Faith Justifieth?]

I answer. Because Christ hath made it the condition of the New Covenant, and promised Justification upon that Condition.

But, 2. If you ask me further, Why did Christ choose this rather then any thing else for the Condition?

I. Answer, 1. To ask a Reason of Christ's

choice and commands is not alway wise or safe. 2. But here the reason is so apparent, that *a posteriore*, we may safely adventure to say: That this is the most self-denying, and Christ advancing work: Nothing could be more proportionable to our poverty, who have nothing to buy with, then thus freely to receive: Nothing could be more reasonable, then to acknowledge him who hath redeemed us, and to take him for our Redeemer and Lord: many more such Reasons might be given. In a word, then Faith Justifieth primarily and properly, as it is the Condition of the New Covenant, (that is the formal reason.) And secondarily, remotely, as it is the receiving of Christ and his righteousness: (that is the aptitude of it to this use to which it hath pleased God to destinate it.)

I stand the more on this, because it is the foundation of that which followeth.

THESIS LVIII.

THE ground of this is; because Christ's Righteousness doth not justify us properly and formerly, because we Believe or receive it; but because it is ours in Law, by Divine Donation, or Imputation.

THIS is plain in it self, and in that which is said before.

THESIS LIX.

Justification is not a momentaneous Act, begun and ended immediately upon our Believing: but a continued Act which though it be in its kind complete at from the first, yet is it still in doing, till the final Justification at the Judgement day.

EXPLICATION.

THIS is evident from the nature of the Act: it being as I shewed before, an Act of God by his Gospel: Now 1. God still continueth that Gospel-Covenant in force. 2. That Covenant still continueth Justifying Believers. 3. God himself doth continue to esteem them accordingly, and to Will their Absolution. 1. This sheweth you therefore with what limitation to receive the Assertion of our Divines, that Remission and Justification are, *simul & semel*, performed. 2. And that the Justified & pardoned may pray for the continuance of their pardon and Justification. 3. That of Christ's satisfaction and our Faith are of continual use, and not to be laid by, when we are once Justified, as if the work were done. See Dr. Downname of *Justific.* of this point.

THESIS. LX.

The bare Act of believing is not the only Condition of the New Covenant: but several other duties also are part of that Condition.

EXPLICATION.

I Desire no more of those that deny this, but that Scripture may be Judge: and that they will put by no one Text to that end produced, till they can give some other commodious, and not forced Interpretation.

1. Then that pardon of sin and salvation are promised upon condition of Repenting, as well as believing, is undeniably asserted from these Scriptures. *Prov.* 1:23. & 28:13. *Mar.* 1:15. & 6:12. *Luke* 13:3, 5. *Acts* 2:38. & 3:19. & 8:22. & 17:30. & 26:20. & 5:31. & 11:18. *Luke.* 24:47. *Heb.* 6:1. 2 *Pet.* 3:9. *Ezek.* 18:27, 28. & 33:12. *Hose* 14:2. *Joel* 2:14, 15. *Deut.* 4:30. & 30:10.

2. That praying for Pardon, and forgiving others, are Conditions of Pardon, is plain, 1 *Kings* 8:30, 39. *Mat.* 6:12, 14, 15. & 18:35. *Mar.* 11:25, 26. *Luke* 6:37. & 11:4. 1 *Joh.* 1:9. *Jam.* 5:15. *Io.* 14:13, 14. 1 *Joh.* 5:15. *Acts* 8:22.

3. That Love, and sincere Obedience, and Works of Love, are also parts of the Condition, appeareth in these Scriptures, *Luke* 7:47. (though I know in Mr *Pink's* Interpretation of that) *Mat.* 5:44. *Luke* 6:27, 35. *Io.* 11:12, 17. 1 *Cor.* 2:9. *Rom.* 8:28. *Ephes.* 6:24. 1 *Cor.* 16:22. *Jam.* 1:12. & 2:5. *Joh.* 14:21. *Pro.* 8:17, 21. *Joh.* 16:27. *Mat.* 10:37. *Luk.* 13:24. *Phil.* 2:12. *Rom.* 2:7, 10. 1 *Corinth.* 24:9. 2 *Tim.* 2:5, 12. 1 *Tim.* 6:18, 19. *Rev.* 22:14.

Luke. 11:28. Mat. 25:41, 42. Jam. 2:2, 22, 23, 24, 26.

THESIS LXI.

Therefore though the non-performance of any one of these be threatened with certain death; yet there must be a Concurrence of them all, to make up the Conditions which have the promise of life.

EXPLICATION.

Therefore we oftener read, death threatened to those that repent not, then Life promised to them that Repent: And when you do read of Life promised of any one of these, you must understand it *cæteris partibus*, or in *sensu composito*, as it stands conjunct with the rest, and not as it is divided. Though I think that in regard of their existence, they never are divided (For where God giveth one, he giveth all,) yet in case they were separated, the Gospel would not so own them as its entire Conditions.

THESIS LXII.

Yet Faith may be called the only Condition of the new Covenant 1. Because it is the principal Condition, and the other but the less principal: And so as a whole Country hath of its name from the chief City; so may the Conditions of this Covenant from Faith: 2. Because all the rest are reducible

to it; either being presupposed, as necessary Antecedents or means, or contained in it as its parts, properties, or modifications; or else implied as its immediate product, or necessary subservient means or consequents.

EXPLICATION.

Subservient Addons are in common speech silently implied in the principal. If the besieged be bound by Articles to surrender a Town to the besiegers at such a time; it need not be expressed in the Articles, that they shall withdraw their Guards, and cease resistance, and open the gates, and yield up this house, or that street, &c. All this is implied clearly in the Article of surrender.

If a redeemed gally-slave be freed, upon condition that he take him for his Redeemer and Master that did deliver him; it need not be expressed, that he shall leave the gallies, and his company, and employment there, and go with him that bought him, and do what he bids him do: All this is plainly implied in the foresaid words, of his Conditions.

So here, the great condition of Believing doth include or imply all the rest.

I confess it is a work of some worth and difficulty, to shew how each other part of the Condition is reducible to Believing; and in what respect they stand towards it. I dare not

determine too peremptorily here, but I think they stand thus. 1. Hearing the Word, consideration, conviction, godly sorrow, repentance from dead works, are implied as necessary means antecedents. 2. Knowledge of Christ, and Assent to the Truth of the Gospel are at least integral parts of flat necessity, if not essential parts of Faith. 3. Subjection, Acceptance, Consent, cordial covenanting, self-resigning, are the very proper essential, formal Acts of Faith.

Esteeming Christ above all in Judgement, preferring him before all in the Will, loving him above all; I say this preferring of Christ above all in Judgement, Will, and Affection, is (in my Judgement (the very *Differentia fidei maxime propria quæ de ea essentialiter prædicatur, & sic pars ejus essentialis*; the very essential property of true Faith differing it from all false Faith, and so an essential part of it. I know this is like to seem strange; but I shall give my reasons of it anon.

5. Sincerity and perseverance are the necessary Modifications of Faith: and not any thing really distinct from its Being.

6. Affiance and sincere obedience, and works of Love, are the necessary immediate, inseparable products of Faith; as heat and light are of fire; or rather as Reasoning is the product of Reason: or yet rather as

actions most properly conjugal, are the effects of Conjugal contract. And as Faith is in some sort more excellent then Affiance & Obedience, as the cause is better then the effect: so in some sort they may be more excellent then Faith; as the effect may be preferred before its Cause; the Act before the habit; as being that which is the end of the habit, for whose sake it is; and to which it tendeth as to its perfection.

The praying for forgiveness, the forgiving of others, the pleading of Christ's satisfaction, are both parts of this obedience, and necessary consequents of Faith, and Acts subservient to it for the attaining of its Ends.

8. The denying and humbling of the flesh, the serious, painful, constant use of God's Ordinances, Hearing, Praying, Meditating, &c. are both parts of the foresaid obedience, and also the necessary means of continuing and exercising our Faith.

9. Strength of Grace; Assurance of Pardon and Salvation; Persuasion of God's favour; settled peace of Confidence; Joy in this Assurance and Peace; the understanding of Truths not fundamental, or necessary in practice; All these are no properties of the Condition of the Covenant; but separable adjuncts of Faith; tending to the Well-being of it; but neither tending to, nor necessary, proofs of the Being

of it; which a Believer should have, but may possibly want,

I shall give you some reason of several of these Assertions? when I have first made way by the Definition of Faith.

So then, as when you invite a man to your House, it is not necessary that you bid him come in at the door, or bring his head, or his legs, or arms, or his clothes with him; (though these are necessary) because all these are necessarily implied: even so when we are said to be justified by Faith only; or when it is promised, that he that believeth shall be laved, all those forementioned duties, are implied or included.

THESIS LXIII.

As it is God's excellent method in giving the Moral Law, first to require the acknowledgment of his sovereign authority, and to bring men to take him only for their God, (which is therefore called the first and great Commandment,) and then to prescribe the particular subsequent duties; so is it the excellent method of Christ in the Gospel, first to establish with men his Office and Authority, and require an acknowledgment of them, and consent and subjection to them; and then to prescribe to them their particular duties in subordination.

THESIS LXIV.

*F*Aith therefore is the summary and chief of the conditions of the Gospel, and not formally and strictly the whole: But as Love is the fulfilling of the Law, so Faith is the fulfilling of the new Law; or as taking the Lord for our only God, is the sum of the Decalogue, implying or inferring all the rest, and so is the great Commandment; so taking Christ for our only Redeemer and Lord, is the sum of the conditions of the new Covenant, including, implying or inferring all other parts of its conditions, and so is the great Command of the Gospel.

EXPLICATION.

THe Observation in the 63 Position, is commended to you by Mr *White* of *Dorchester* in his Directions for reading Scripture, p. 307.

The full subjection to the Authority commanding, doth imply and infer subjection to the particular Commands: therefore God doth still make this the sum of the conditions of the Law, that they take him only for their God, or that they have no other God's but him: And when he contracteth his Covenant into an Epitome, it runs thus, *I will be thy God, and thou shalt be my people*, *Exod.* 20:3. & 23:13. *Deut.* 7:4. & 8:19. & 13:2, 3. &c. *Jos.* 24:2, 16. &c. *Judg.* 2:12, 17, 19. & 10:13. *1 Sam.* 8:8. *2 Kings* 5:17. & 17:7. *Jer.* 21:

9. & 7:23. & 11:4. & 30:22. *Ezek.* 36:28. *Deut.* 26:16, 17, &c. And as God's promise of taking us for his people doth imply his bestowing upon us all the priviledges and blessings of his people, and so is the sum of all the conditions of the Covenant on his part. Even so our taking the Lord for our God, and Christ for our Redeemer and Lord, doth imply our sincere obedience to him; and is the sum of the Conditions on our part. And so as Idolatry is that violation of the law of Nature, which doth *eminentér*, contain all the rest in it; So is Unbelief in respect of the Law of Grace. And as the formal Nature of Idolatry lieth in disclaiming God, from being God, or from being our God, or from being our alone God: Even so the formal nature of Unbelief lieth in disclaiming Christ, either from being a Redeemer and Lord, or from being Our Redeemer and Lord, or from being Our only Redeemer and Lord. This being well considered, will direct you truly and punctually, whereto find the very formal being and nature of Faith? Not in believing the pardon of sin, or the favour of God, or our salvation; nor in Affiance or recumbency, (though that be a most immediate product of it,) Nor in Assurance, (as Divines were wont to teach 80. years ago.) Nor in Obedience or following or Christ as a guide to

Heaven, or as a Captain, or mere Pattern and Law-giver (as the wretched *Socinians* teach.) But in the three Acts above mentioned, 1. Taking Christ for a Redeemer and Lord; which is by Assent. 2. Taking him for our Redeemer, Saviour and Lord; which is by consent. 3. Taking him for our only Redeemer, Saviour and Lord; which is the Moral sincerity of the former: And the essential differencing property of it: Not whereby Faith is differenced from Love or joy, &c. But whereby that faith in Christ, which is the Gospel condition, is differenced from all other Faith in Christ. So that as *Corpus & Anima, & Rationale*, do speak the whole essence of man: Even so this Assent Consent, and Preference of Christ before all others; do speak the whole Essence of Faith.

For the common opinion, that justifying Faith, as justifying, doth consist in any one single Act, is a wretched mistake, as I shall shew you further anon.

THESIS LXV.

Scripture doth not take the word [Faith] as strictly as a Philosopher would do, for any one single Act of the soul; nor yet for various Acts of one only Faculty: But for a complete entire Motion of the whole Soul, to Christ its Object.

THESIS LXVI.

Neither is Christ, in respect of any one part or work of his office alone, the Object of Justifying Faith, as such: But Christ in his entire, office considered, is this Object: viz. as he is Redeemer, Lord and Saviour.

THESIS LXVII.

Much less are any Promises or benefits of Christ, the proper Object of justifying Faith, as many Divines do, mistakingly conceive.

THESIS LXVIII.

Nor is Christ's person considered as such, or for itself, the object of this Faith. But the person of Christ as clothed with his Office and Authority is this Object.

EXPLICATION.

IPut all these together, as aiming at one scope: & I shall now, explain them distinctly,

(To the 65.) First, that Faith is not taken for any one single Act, I prove thus. 1. If it were but one single Act (I mean specifically, not numerically.) then it could not (according to the common opinion, of *Philosophers*) be the Act. Of the whole Soul: But Faith must be the Act of the whole Soul: or else part of the Soul would receive Christ, and part would not; and part of it would entertain

him, and part not. Some think the soul is as the body, which hath a hand to receive things in the name, and for the use of the whole. But it is not so, Christ is not only taken into the hand: But as the blood and spirits, which are received into every living part. (Though I intend not the comparison should reach to the manner of receiving.) Neither is the soul so divisible into parts, as the body is; and therefore hath not several parts for several offices. 2. The most of our accurate studious Divines of late, do take Faith to be seated in both faculties, Understanding and Will: But if so; according to the common Philosophy, it cannot be any one single Act.

Neither Secondly, is it in various Acts of one single faculty: For, 1. It will (in my judgement) never be proved, that the soul hath faculties which are really distinct from it self, or from each other. These Faculties are but the soul it self, able to do thus and thus from its natural being. *Vide Scaliger Exercit. 107. Sect. 3.* Understanding and Willing are its immediate Acts: And perhaps those very Acts, are more diversified or distinct in their objects, then in themselves. The soul's apprehension of an object as true, we call Understanding; in regard of its Metaphysical Truth, it is a simple apprehension; as we receive this Truth upon the word of another, it is Assent and Belief; as this Object is considered as Good, our mo-

tion toward it, is called, Willing; if absent, Desiring, Hoping; if present, Complacency, Joying; when we Will a thing as Good, anything strongly, and apprehend its Goodness any thing clearly, this we call Love, &c. But whether all these be really distinct kinds of Acts of the Soul, is very doubtful: Much more, whether they proceed from distinct Faculties. As I am not of my Lord *Brooks* mind concerning the Unity of all things: So neither would I unnecessarily admit of any division: especially in so spiritual and perfect a piece as the Sould; knowing how much of Perfection lieth in Unity; and remembering the *Pythagorean* curse of the Number Two, because it was the first that durst depart from Unity; & *frustra sit per plura* &c.

2. But if it were proved that the Soul's Faculties are really distinct; yet both these Faculties are capable of receiving Christ; and Christ is an Object suited to both: and then what doubt is it whether Faith be in both?

1. For the Will no man will question it that it is capable of receiving Christ; and Christ a suitable Object for it.

2. And for the Understanding, it doth as much incline to Truth, as the Will to Goodness; and as truly receive its Object under the notion of True, as the Will doth receive its Object as Good. If you would see it proved fully. That Assent is an Essential part

of justifying Faith, read Dr. *Downane* of *Justification*, on that Subject: and his *Appendix* to the *Covenant of Grace*, in Answer to Mr. *Pemle*: Where though his Argument will not reach their intended scope, to prove that Assent is the only proper Act of justifying Faith, yet they do conclude, that it is a real part. And he well confuteth his opposer, though he do not well confirm that his own opinion.

2. Consider further, that Christ doth not treat of Faith, *in sensu Physico sed morali I Politico*, not as a Natural Philosopher, but as a Law-giver to his Church. Now in Politics, we do not take the names of Actions in so narrow and strict a sense, as in *Physics* and *Logic*. If a Town do agree to take or receive such a man for their Mayor; or a Kingdom take or receive such a one as their King: The Words [*Take*, or *Receive*] here do not note anyone single Act of soul or body alone; but a compound, as it were, of Actions; which yet do all take their name from the Principal, which is [*Consent*.]

To the 66. That Christ as a Saviour only, or in respect of his Priestly Office only, is not the Object of justifying Faith; but that Faith doth as really and immediatly Receive him as King; and in so doing, Justify: this I prove thus,

1. The Gospel doth not reveal Christ's Offices as separated: But as they are revealed, so they must be believed.

2. Neither doth it Offer Christ in his Priestly Office only, as separated from his Kingly: though it may sometime press our Acceptance of him in one respect, and sometime in another: Bnt as he is offered, so must he be received.

3. Scripture no where tieth justification to the receipt of him as our Priest only, therefore we must not do so.

4. How commonly doth Scripture join his Offices together? calling him usually, *Our Lord and Saviour Jesus, Christ?*

5. If we receive him not as King, we receive him not as an entire Saviour: For he saveth us, not only by dying for us, but also by reducing us really into communion with God, and guiding us by his Laws, and protecting and perfecting us by his Government, and subduing our enemies.

6. His Kingly Office is a true part of his entire Office of Mediatorship: Now the sincerity of Acts in Moral respects, lieth in their true suitableness to the nature of their Objects: As God is not truely loved, except he be loved entirely: so neither is Christ truly received, if you receive him not entirely. It is a lame, partial Faith, and no true Faith, that taketh Christ only in the Notion of a de-

liverer from guilt and Punishment, without any accepting of him, as our Lord and Governor. Though I believe that the hope of being pardoned & saved is the first thing that moveth men to receive Christ, yet do they, being so moved, receive him as their Lord also, or else they do not receive him sincerely.

7. The exalting of his Kingly Office, is as principal an end of his dying, & of his becoming Mediator, as is the saving of us, and the exalting of his Priestly Office. See the second *Psal.* and *Rom.* 14:9. To this end he both died, rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead, and the living. And therefore the receiving of him as Priest alone, is not like to be the Condition of our Justification.

So that if Christ put both into the Condition, we must not separate what he hath joined. But the main ground of their Error, who think otherwise, is this: They think Acceptance of the mercy offered, doth make it ours immediately in a natural way, as the accepting of a thing from men; And so as if he that accepted pardon, should have it, and he that accepted sanctity should have it, &c. But Christ (as I have shewed) establisheth his Offices and Authority, before he bestow his mercies; and though Accepting be the proper condition, yet doth it not confer the title to us, as it is an accepting primarily, but as it is the Covenants Condition: If we should

take possession when we have no title in Law, God would quickly challenge us for our bold usurpation, and deal with us, as with him that intruded without the Wedding garments; There is more ado then come in: and sit down, and take what we have a mind to: God hath put all his Son's Offices into the Condition, to be received and submitted to: either all or none, must be accepted: And if All be in the Condition, then the receiving of all must needs Justify upon the grounds that I have laid down before.

To the 67. That the promises or benefits are not the immediate proper objectt of Justifying Faith, is evident from the grounds already layd down: As also from the confiant language of the Gospel, which maketh Faith to lie in receiving, believing in him, and in his name; &c. ffill making Christ himself the immediate object. Therefore if Mr *Cotton* say as the Lord *Brook* represents him, That Faith can be nothing but a laying hold of that promise which God hath made; (in his *Tract. of Truth and Uni. pag. 152.*) it is a foul error in so weighty a point; as is also his other, of Faith justifying and saving only declaratively. Indeed that first less principal Act of Faith, which we call Assent, hath the truth of the Gospel revelation for its nearest and most immediate object; but (I think, by the leave of those who contradict) not its only nor chief

object: The truth of the proposition is but a means to the apprehending of the truth of the thing proposed; nor the truth of the History, but a glass to shew us the truth of the Acts which it relateth. So that even the Understanding it self doth apprehend the person and offices of Christ in their Metaphysical Verity, by means of its apprehension of the Logical and Moral verity of the Relation: and though the truth of the Word be the nearest object of Assent, yet the truth of Christ's person, nature and offices is the more principal: Or if about these, it may not have the name of Assent, yet shall it have the same nature still.

To the 68. I think none will contradict it, and therefore there need nothing be said.

THESIS LXIX.

Justifying Faith is the hearty accepting of Christ for our only Lord and Saviour.

EXPLICATION.

IN this brief definition, you have nothing but what is essential to it.

1. The *genus* I need not mention; when it is the Act of Faith which I define, you know the *genus* already,

2. The Understandings apprehension of Christ as a true Redeemer and Saviour, which in several respects is called Knowledge or Be-

lief, I do imply this, and not express it; because though I take it for a real part of Faith, yet not the most principal and formal part. And as we use to imply *Corpus*, and not express it when we design man to be *Animal rationale*; because the form, or principal essential part giveth the name: So here (though I know Assent is not properly a material cause) yet being the less principal Act, it giveth not the denomination.

3. That Christ, as Lord and Saviour is the proper object, I have proved before. His Prophetical Office whereby he is the Teacher of his Church, I imply in both these, because it may in several respects be reduced to these: For he teacheth by his Laws and Commandments, and his spirits teaching and governing are scarce distinguishable, and he saveth by teaching. Also his Office of Husband, and Head, are in these implied; they signifying more the future benefits and priviledges of a believer, which he shall receive from Christ believed in, then the primary offices which he is to acknowledge in believing.

4. The proper formal act of justifying Faith, which is most principally essential to it of all other is [accepting:] If I must needs place it in one only, it should be this.

My Reasons are, 1. Because the Scripture

makcrh unbelief, and not receiving Christ, all one, *Joh. 1:11.* and believing and receiving Christ, all one, *Joh. 1:12.* So it proclaims this as the great work of the Gospel, to Take, Eat, Drink, &c.

2. The Gospel is the offer of Christ (and his benefits to them that first accept himself;) Therefore Faith maile: be the accepting of the thing offered. Both these are plain in *Rev. 22: 17. Whosoever will let him take of the water of life freely:* There is the free offer, upon condition of coming and taking, or accepting.

3. The will is the commanding faculty of the soul, therefore its act is the principal act, and that is accepting.

4. Christ is presented to us in the Gospel, as a Suitor, beseeching us by his Spirit and Ambassadors, and wooing us to himself, and the enjoying of him, which this driveth at, is called our Marriage to him, and we his Spouse, and he our Husband: Now you know that which tieth the knot of Marriage is Acceptance or Consent.

5. Yea the very nature of a Covenant requireth this. Consent maketh it a complete Covenant. Therefore I said before *pag. 219.* That *Acceptance, Consent, Heart-Covenanting, and Self-resigning,* are the proper essential Acts of this Faith. For all these are the Wills acts to this their object, which are of flat necessity to the very tying of the Covenant or Marriage

knot. *Rom. 10:10. With the heart man believeth unto Righteousness.*

And here let me mind you of one useful observation more.

The Covenanting on our part, is a principal part of the Conditions of the Covenant. Though this may seem strange, that a Covenanting and performing Conditions, should be all most all one. But that is the free nature of the Grace of the Covenant. As if you marry a poor woman that hath nothing, you will, give her yourself, and all you have, merely upon Condition that she will Consent to have you; And that Consent is all the Condition on her part, for obtaining present possession (I say, *Acceptance, Consent, Covenanting, Self-resigning*; which are in a manner all one thing;) But because the end of the marriage is the faithful performance of Marriage duties, though mere Consent were the only Condition of the first possession, and the continuance of her Consent is the chief Condition, of continuing her possession; yet the performance of those Marriage duties, and not going into others, is part of the Condition also of that continuance: So it is in the present case of Justification.

5. Let me here also tell you, that I take love

to Christ as our Saviour and Lord, to be essential to this Acceptance: and so some degree of Love to be part of Justifying Faith, and not properly a fruit of it, as it is commonly taken. My reasons are,

1. The Wills serious apprehension of a thing Good, which we call at earnest Willing it, and Accepting it, is (in my judgement the same thing as Love, in an other name. Love is nothing but such an earnest Willing, choosing and Accepting it as it is Good.

It is generally acknowledged, that the Affections are but the Motions or Acts of the Will. And if Love be an Act of the same Will, and have the same Object with Consent, Election, Acceptance, &c. Why should it not then be the same Act? Only Acceptance considereth its Object as offered; Election considereth it, as propounded with some other competitor; Consent considereth it, as we are persuaded and invited to it: But all these are extrinsical considerations: They all consider their Object as Good, and so doth Love.

You may object, 1. Then Desire and Hope may be essential to Faith.

I Answ. That Love which they imply in them is: but Desire and Hope, as such, do properly consider their object as absent, which this Justifying Faith doth not.

2. *Object.* Scripture oft distinguisheth Faith and Love,

Answ. 1. Sometime Faith is taken for Historical faith, or Faith of Miracles, and then it may be distinguished. 2. Sometime true Faith is taken in the strictest sense, and sometime larglier, as I shall shew anon. 3. But especially; so do I distinguish of Love, as it is considered by it self, and as it is an essential part of this Acceptance. Love respecteth its Object merely as Good, in it self and to the Lover. But Consent and Acceptance have several other respects, as is expressed: And yet there may be Love in all such Acceptance; though not properly Acceptance in all Love,

Object. 3. Then Love Justifieth as well as Faith.

I Answ. When it is thus considered in Faith's Acceptance, it is not called by the name of Love, but loseth its name, as a lesser River that falleth into a greater; therefore it is not said that Love Justifieth; but Faith that worketh (even in its essential work of Accepting) by Love.

Object. But Love is the greater Grace, and shall out-live Faith, and Faith should rather then be swallowed up in Love.

Answ. Love considering its object only as Good, shall continue for ever, because the Goodness of its object shall so continue: But Acceptance, Consent, &c. have other additional considerations in their Objects which will vanish. But which is the chiefest Grace in it

self, is not the question, but which is the chiefest in the present work. Now seeing Consent, Acceptance &c. are the chief as to Justification, that Love which is essentially in them may well lose its name here: seeing in the business of justifying it is considered but as an essential part of the main duty.

My next Reason is, because Christ doth propound it in the Gospel, as of the same necessity, with the same promises annexed to it, *Jo. 16:27. For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and believed, &c. Joh. 14:21. He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and shew my self to him. Jam. 1:12. & 2:5. The Crown and Kingdom is prepared for them that love him, 1 Cor. 16:22. If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha, Ephes. 6:24.* In a word, Faith is a comprehensive duty, containing divers Acts, whereof this seemeth to me to be part: Neither can I yet conceive, how there can be a cordial Acceptance of Christ as our only Saviour, and Love not to be an essential part of that Acceptance: but if a finer wit can apprehend the difference better; yet as (I said) Faith being considered here in Moral and Politic respect is, and not in its strict natural quiddity, may essentially be an Affectionate Acceptance, for all that.

If any think fitter to make a wider difference between the nature of Faith and Love

to Christ, I will not contend; for the matter is not great: that both are necessary to Justification is doubtless: and that they are concurrent in apprehending Christ: And that Love is a part of the Condition of the Covenant, is also undoubted and therefore will have some hand in the business of Justification, as I shall further clear.

6. I put in the word *only* in the Definition; because (as is said before) I take the preferring of Christ before all others, and taking him for our Only Lord and Saviour, to be the essential difference of true Faith. There is a two-fold Verity or Sincerity in our duties requisite. 1. The verity of their natural Being, which is called their Metaphysical Truth. 2. The verity or sincerity of them as Duties or Graces, which is their Moral sincerity: This last consisteth in the true suiting of the Act to its Object. For example, one man pretendeth to love his wife, and doth not: There is neither Natural nor Moral Truth. Another doth love her, but not half so well as other women: There is the Metaphysical Truth, but not the Moral. A third loveth her as a wife above others: There is both Metaphysical Truth and Moral.

So it is in our Love to God: To Love him

as the chief Good, is to love him as he is: And, he that loveth him never so much, and yet, loveth any thing else, as much or more; though his Love have a Metaphysical Truth of Being, yet it hath no Moral sincerity at all: So that the Preferring God before all, or taking him for our Only God, is the very point of sincerity of Love. Why, just so it is about our Faith: The taking him unfeignedly for our only Lord and Saviour, is the very point of the sincerity of our Faith in Christ. As Adultery is the most proper violation of the Marriage Covenant, except actual renouncing. and deferring: So the taking of any other Lord or Saviour besides Christ, or conjunct with him, is the most apparent violation of the bond of our Covenant, and most contradictory to the nature and Essence of Justifying Faith: except only the Actual renouncing Christ, and the Covenant it self, by full Apostacy; which is an unpardonable sin, *Hebr.* 6:4, 5,6. & 10:26. Yet in subordination to Christ, we may have other Lords and Saviours, but not in competition and co-ordination. Some of his Government he exerciseth by Ministers, and some by Magistrates under him (for I cannot consent to them that say, the Magistrate is only the Officer of God as Creator, and not of Christ the Mediator; because all things are delivered into his hands, and he is made head overall.) Some, also of his saving works, he

performeth by instruments and means: And what they so perform under him, may be acknowledged without any derogation from him at all.

But perhaps some may think that the Scripture Phrase seemeth rather to intimate, that Faith is an Assent, and not such an Acceptance and Consent, as is before mentioned; because it oft times requireth but this, To believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; he that should come into the world, &c.

To which I answer, 1. This proveth only, that this Knowledge or Assent is part of Faith: but not that it is the whole. 2. It is the use of Scripture to drive at that duty which is most unknown, neglected, or resisted; and to speak little of others, where there was then less need to speak, though perhaps the duty be in it self more weighty: Therefore Christ and the Apostles did spend most of their pains to persuade the Jews to this Assent: That the Messiah should come, be their deliverer, they all knew: Even the poor woman of *Samaria* could tell that, *Joh.* 4:25. And so ready were they to Receive him, if they had known him, that it was the general expectation, and desire of the people, *Mal.* 3:1. But to persuade them that Jesus was the Christ, here lay the difficulty. Therefore as Dr. *Ames Medull. cap. 3. §.20.* though sometime Assent to the Truth concerning God and Christ, *Joh.* 1:50. be taken

for true Faith; yet the special Election or Apprehension (for that he means by *Fiducia* §.13.) is still included; and those words do but determine and apply that *Fiducia* to Christ, which is presupposed to be already toward the Messiah.

And let me conclude this with one more practically useful observation. From this definition of faith, now men may see what to enquire after in their searching of their estates. As faith, being the Gospel-condition, is the main thin it to be looked for; So here you see what that faith is. The ignorance of this deceiveth and troubleth multitudes. Some think it lieth in Assurance: Some, in a quieting their hearts in confidence on Christ: Some think, as M. *Saltmarsh*, That it is nothing else but a persuasion more or less of God's love: And then when poor troubled souls do feel neither assurance, confidence, nor persuasion of that love, they conclude that they have no Faith. And how will these mistaken Teachers help them to comfort? Why, as Mr. *Saltmarsh* doth: sometime to tell them, Christ hath believed for them; and sometime to tell them plainly, that he can but commend them to the Lord, who is the Author and finisher of Faith: and sometime to tell them, that they should not question their faith, any more then Christ himself. Thus

their first way of comfort is to tell them, they do ill to question their faith: If that would serve, all the world might have comfort, and there needs no more. If that will not do, then Christ hath believed for them: Yet if that will serve, there is as much comfort for one as another. But what if they say still, I cannot believe, (that is, as you expound Belief;) why, then he confesseth plainly, he is at a loss; he can drive on the work of comforting no further; he can do no more but pray for them, *pag.* 31. Is it not a wonder that this lamentable Comforter should be so valued by the troubled spirits? I was many years my self under perplexing doubts: If I had heard such comforting words as these, they would sooner have driven me to despair then to comfort. He that hath not so much wit as to discern so gross fallacies, may as soon be comforted by a false and impertinent argument, as by a sound one. *Quest.* But how would you comfort such a one, that saith he cannot believe? *Ans.* Why, I would first make him know, that the very essential form of faith lieth in the Wills acceptance of an offered Christ: Then would I know of him, whether he be willing thus to have Christ both for Lord and Saviour, or not? If he say, He is willing: I shall answer, That then he doth believe; and then he is justified: for his Willingness is his very

Consent or Acceptance (and that Consent is true Faith: Christ expecteth no more to make up the match. If the match break, it must be either, because Christ is unwilling, or because he is unwilling: not Christ; for he is the Suitor, and Intreater, and Offerer: Not himself; for he confesseth that he is willing. If he say, I am not willing: I should ask; Why then do you look after it, or regard it? Do men enquire after that, and lament the want of it, which they are not willing to have? either temptation or melancholy maketh you not know your own mind or else you do but dissemble in pretending trouble and sad complaints. If you be indeed unwilling; I have no comfort for you, till you are willing; but must turn to persuasions to make you willing: I should answer, The Condition of the Covenant is not the Perfection, but the sincerity of Faith or Consent; which way goes the prevailing bent or choice of your will. If Christ were before you, would you accept him, or reject him? If you would heartily accept him for your only Lord and Saviour, I dare say, you are a true Believer.

Thus you see the comfortable use of right understanding, what justifying faith is; and the great danger and inconvenience that followeth the common mistakes in this point.

THESIS LXX.

*F*Aith in the largest sense, as it comprehendeth all the Condition of the new Covenant, may be thus defined: It is when a sinner by the Word and Spirit of Christ being thoroughly convinced of the Righteousness of the Law, the truth of its threatening, the evil of his own sin, and the greatness of his misery hereupon, and withal of the Nature and Offices, Sufficiency and Excellency of Jesus Christ, the Satisfaction he hath made, his willingness to save, and his free offer to all that will accept him for their Lord and Saviour; doth hereupon believe the truth of this Gospel, and accept of Christ as his only Lord and Saviour, to bring them to God their chiefest good, and to present them pardoned and just before him, and to bestow upon them a more glorious inheritance, and do accordingly rest on him as their Saviour, and sincerely (though imperfectly) obey him as their Lord, forgiving others, loving his people, bearing what sufferings are imposed, diligently using his means and Ordinances, and confessing and bewailing their sins against him, and praying for pardon; and all this sincerely, and to the end.

EXPLICATION.

THis is the Condition of the new Covenant at large, That all this is sometime called faith, as taking its name from the primary, principal, vital part, is plain hence.

1. In that Faith is oft called *the Obeying of the Gospel* but the Gospel commandeth all this, *Rom.* 10:16. 1 *Pet.* 1:22. & 4:17. 2 *Thes.* 1:8. *Gal.* 3:1. & 5:7. *Heb.* 5:9.

The fulfilling of the Conditions of the new Covenant is oft called by the name of Faith, & so opposed to the fulfilling the Conditions of the old Covenant, called works; But these forementioned are parts of the Condition of the new Covenant, and therefore implied or included in Faith, *Gal.* 3:12, 23, 25. Not that Faith is properly taken for its fruits, or confounded with them, but (as I told you before) it is named in the head of the whole Condition, all the rest being implied as reducible to it, in some of the respects mentioned under the 62 Position.

It may be here demanded, 1. Why I do make affiance or recombency an immediate product of Faith, when it is commonly taken to be, the very justifying Act?

I answer: 1. I have proved already, that Consent or acceptance is the principal Act, and Affiance doth necessarily follow that. 2. For the most of my Reasons; that Affiance is a following Act, and not the principal, they are the same with those of Dr *Downname* against Mr *Pemble*, and in his Treatise of Justification, whither therefore I refer you for Satisfaction.

2. *Quest.* Why do I make sincerity and per-

severance to be so near kin to Faith, as to be, in some sense, the same, and not rather distinct: Graces?

Answ. It is apparent, that they are no real distinct things, but the *Modi* of Faith. 1. Sincerity is the verity of it, which is convertible with its Being, as it is Metaphysical Verity, and with its Vertuous or Gracious Being, as it is Moral or Theological Sincerity. 2. Perseverance or duration of a Being, is nothing really distinct from the Being it self; *Suarez*, thinks, not so much as a *Modus*.

THESIS LXXI.

(1) *THE sincere Performance of the summary, great Command of the Law, To have the Lord only for our God, and so to love, obey, believe and trust him above all, is still naturally implied in the Conditions of the Gospel, as of absolute indispensable necessity, (2) and in order of nature, and of excellency before Faith it self: (3) But it is not commanded in the sense, and upon the terms, ns under the first Covenant.*

EXPLICATION.

(1) *THIS Command need not be expressed in the Gospel Conditions, it is so naturally necessary, & implied in all: As the ultimate End need not be expressed in directions & precepts so as the means, because*

it is still supposed; & *consultatio est tantum de mediis.*

Love to God's and taking him for our God and chief Good? is both in excellency and order of nature, before Faith in Christ the Mediator; 1. Because the End is thus before the means in excellency and intention: But God is the ultimate End; and Christ as Mediator is but the means? *Joh. 14.* tf. Christ is tke way by which men come to the Father. 2. The Son as God-man or Mediator, is less then the Father; and therefore the duties that respect him as their Object, needs be thelelfe excellent duties, *Joh. 14:13.* The glory of the Son, is but a means for the glory of the Father, *Joh. 14:28.* *My Father is greater then I:* therefore the Love of the Father is greater then the Love to the Son, &c. So also in point of necessity it hath the natural precedency: as the End hath before the means: for the denying of the End doth immediately cashier and evacuate all means, as such. He that maketh not God his chief Good, can never desire or Accept of Christ, as the way and means to recover that chief Good. The Apostle therefore knew more reason, then merely for its perpetuity, why the chiefest Grace is Love, 1. *Cor. 13:15.* Though yet the work of Justification is laid chiefly upon faith.

(3) That this Love of God, is not commanded in the sense, and on the terms as under

the Law, is evident. For, 1. The old Covenant would have condemned us, for the very imperfection of the due degree of Love: But the Gospel accepteth of Sincerity, which lieth in loving God above all; or as the chief Good. 2. The old Covenant would have destroyed us, for one omission of a due Act of Love; But the Covenant of Grace accepteth of it, if a man that never knew God all his life time, do come in at last.

Yet the sincere performance of it is as necessary now as then.

THESIS LXXII.

As the accepting of Christ for Lord, (which is the hearts subjection) is as Essential a part of Justifying Faith, as the Accepting of him for our Saviour: So consequently, sincere obedience, (which is the effect of the former,) hath as much to do in justifying us before God, as Affiance, (which is the fruit of the later.)

EXPLICATION.

I Know this will hardly down with many. But I know nothing can be said against it, but by denying the Antecedent, *viz.* That Faith as it Accepteth Christ for Lord and King doth Justify. But that I have proved before. If it be one Faith, and have the Object entirely propounded as one, and be one entire

principal part of the Covenant's Condition; then sure it cannot be divided in the work of *justifying*. This may be easily apprehended, if men will but understand these three things, 1. That Faith is no Physical or natural proper Receiving of Christ at all: But merely a moral *Receiving* though performed by a Physical Act of *Accepting*: For thy Will doth not naturally touch and take in the person of Christ; That is an impossible thing, whatsoever the Transubstantiation, men may say: (Though the Essence of the Godhead is every where.) 2. That this accepting which is a Moral Receiving doth not, nor possibly can, make Christ ours immediately and properly, as it is a Receiving; But mediately and improperly only: The formal cause of our interest, being God's Donation by the Gospel Covenant. 3. That this Covenant maketh a whole entire Faith its Condition: A Receiving of whole Christ with the whole soul: It is, as *Amesius*, *Actio totius hominis*; And if the Covenant do make Christ as King, the object of that Faith which is its Condition, as well as Christ, as a Deliverer or Priest; Then may it be as fit a *Medium* for our Justification, as the other.

That Obedience is as neree a fruit of Faith, as Affiance, is evident; if you take it for the Obedience of the Soul, in Acts that are no more remote from the heart then Affiance is: And

so is the Obedience of our Actions external in its formal respect (as Obedience): though not in its material, because the imperate Acts are not all so near the fountain as the Elicite. I take it here for granted, that Dr Downname's arguments in the place fore-cited, have proved Affiance to be but a fruit of the principal justifying Act of Faith.

THESIS LXXIII.

From what hath been said, it appeareth in what sense Faith only justifieth; and in what sense Works also justify: viz. 1. Faith only justifieth, as it implieth and includeth all other parts of the condition of the new Covenant: and is so put in opposition to the Works of the Law, or the personal Righteousness of the old Covenant. 2. Faith only justifieth as the great principal master duty of the Gospel or chief part of its Condition, to which all the rest are some way reducible. Faith only doth not justify in opposition to the Works of the Gospel; but those Works do also justify, as the secondary, less principal parts of the Condition of the Covenant.

THESIS LXXIV.

SO that they both justify in the same kind of Causality, viz. as Causa sine quibus non, or mediums and improper Causes; or as Dr Twisse) Causæ dispositivæ: but with this difference: Faith as the principal part; Obedience as the

less principal. The like may be said of Love, which at least is a secondary part of the Condition: and of others in the same station.

EXPLICATION.

I Know this is the doctrine that will have the loudest out-cries railed against it: and will make some cry out, *Heresy, Popery, Socinianism!* and what not? For my own part the Searcher of hearts knoweth, that not singularity, affectation of novelty, nor any good will to Popery, provoketh me to entertain it; But that I have earnestly sought the Lord's direction upon my knees, before I durst adventure on it: And that I resisted the light of this Conclusion as long as I was able. But a man cannot force his own understanding, if the evidence of truth force it not; though he may force his pen, or tongue, to silence or dissembling.

That which I shall do further, is, to give you some proofs of what I say, and to answer some Objections, Though, if the foregoing grounds do stand, there needs no more proof of these assertions.

1. If Faith justify as it is the fulfilling of the Condition of the new Covenant, and Obedience be also part of that Condition, then obedience must justify in the same way as Faith: But both parts of the Antecedent are before proved.

The other proofs follow in the ensuing Positions, and their Explications and Confirmations.

THESIS LXXV,

The plain expressions of Saint James should terrify us from an interpretation contradictory to the Text; and except apparent violence be used with his Chap. 2. 21, 24, 25, &c. it cannot be doubted, but that a man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only.

THESIS LXXVI.

Either is there the least appearance of a contradiction betwixt this and Paul's doctrine, Rom. 3:28. if men did not through prejudice, negligence, or wilfulness overlook this; That in that and all other the like places, the Apostle doth professedly exclude the Works of the Law only from Justification; but never at all the Works of the Gospel as they are the Condition of the new Covenant.

EXPLICATION.

IN opening this I shall thus proceed: 1. I will shew the clearness of that in *James* for the point in question. 2. That *Paul* is to be understood in the sense expressed. 3. How this differeth from the Papist's Exposition of these places: and from their doctrine of Justification by Works. 4. And how from the Socinian doctrine.

1. The ordinary Expositions of St. *James* are these two: 1. That he speaks of Justification before men, and not before God. 2. That he speaks of Works, as justifying our Faith, and not as justifying our persons: or (as Mr. *Pemle's* phrase is) the Apostle when he saith Works justify, must be understood by a *Metonymy*, that a working Faith justifieth. That the former Exposition is false may appear thus.

1. The worlds Justification freeth us but from the World's Accusation, to which it is opposed: And therefore it is but either a Justifying from the Accusation of human Laws; Or else a particular Justification of us in respect of some particular facts; or else an usurped Judgement and Justification: For they are not constituted our Judges by God: And therefore, we may say with *Paul*, *It is a small thing with me to be judged of you, or of man's Judgement*: And so a small thing to be Justified by men from the Accusations of the Law of God.

But the Justification in *James* is of greater moment: as appears in the Text. For, 1. It is such as salvation dependeth on *vers.* 14. 2. It is such as followeth only a living Faith: but the world may as well Justify us when we have no Faith at all.

I therefore affirm, 1. The World is no lawful Judge of our Righteousness before

God, or in reference to the Law of God. 2. Neither are they competent or capable Judges. They cannot possibly pass any certain true sentence of our Righteousness or unrighteousness. 3. If they could, yet Works are no certain *medium*, or evidence, whereby the world can know us to be Righteous: For there is no outward work which an Hypocrite may not perform: and inward works they cannot discern: nor yet the principles from which, nor the ends to which our works proceed and are intended. There is as much need of a divine heart-searching knowledge, to discern the sincerity of Works, as of Faith it self. So that if it be not certain, that the Text speaks of Justification before God, I scarce know what to be certain of.

Once more: 1. Was *Abraham* justified before men for a secret Action! 2. Or for such an Action as the killing of his only Son would have been? 3. Was not he the justifier here, who was the imputer of Righteousness? But God was the imputer of Righteousness, *vers.* 23. therefore God was the Justifier, So I leave that interpretation to sleep.

2. That it is the Person and not his Faith only, which is here said to be justified by Works, is as plain in the Text almost as can be spoken, *vers.* 21. *Abraham* (not his faith) is said to be justified by works. *Vers.* 24.

By Works, *a man* is justified: If by a man were meant, *a man's Faith*, then it would run thus senselessly: By Works a man's Faith is justified, and not by Faith only, so *Vers. 25*,

3. For Mr. *Pemle's* interpretation, That by *Works* is meant a *Working Faith*.

I Answer, I dare not teach the holy Ghost to speak; nor force the Scripture; nor raise an exposition so far from the plain importance of the words without apparent necessity: But here is not the least necessity: There being not the least inconvenience, that I Know of, in affirming Justification by Works, in the fore-explained sense. Men seldom are bold with Scripture, in forcing it; But they are first bold with Conscience enforcing it. If it were but some one Phrase dissonant from the ordinary language of Scripture, I should not doubt but it must be reduced to the rest. But when it is the very scope of a Chapter, in plain and frequent expressions, no whit dissonant from any other Scripture; I think he that may so wrest it, as to make it unsay what it saith, may as well make him a Creed of his own let the Scripture say what it will to the contrary: what is this but with the Papist to make the Scripture a Nose of wax? If Saint *James* speak it so oft over and over; that Justification is by works, and not by Faith only, I will see more cause before I deny it; or say, he means a Working Faith.

If he so understand a *Working Faith* as that it justifieth principally as Faith, and less principally as working? then I should not differ from him, only I should think the Scripture Phrase is more safe and more proper; But he understandeth it according to that common assertion and exposition, that *Fides solum justificat, non autem fides sola*: Faith alone justifieth, but not that faith which is alone. The question therefore is, Whether Works do concur with Faith (as part of the Condition) in the very business of Justifying? or whether they are only Concomitants to that Faith which effecteth the business without their assistance? The ground of the mistake lieth here; They first ascribe too much to Faith; and then because that *nimum* which they give to Faith is not found agreeable to Works, therefore they conclude, that we are not justified by works at all. They think that Faith is an Instrumental efficient cause of justification (which that properly it is not, I have proved before:) when if they understood that it justifieth but as a *Causa sine qua non*, or condition, they would easily yield, that Works do so too. I will not say therefore that Works do effectually produce our Justification (For faith doth not so: Nor that they justify as equal parts of the condition: For faith is the principal. But that they justify as the secondary less-principal part of

the Condition, (not only proving our Faith to be sound, but themselves being in the Obligation as well as Faith, and justifying in the same kind of causality or procurement as Faith, though not in equality with it) I prove thus: 1. When it is said that we are *Justified by Works* the word *By*, implieth more then an Idle concomitancy: If they only stood by, while Faith doth all, it could not be said, that we are Justified by Works.

2. When the Apostle saith, *By Works, and not By Faith only*, he plainly makes them concomitant in procurement, or in that kind of causality which they have: Especially, seeing he saith not, as he is commonly interpreted, not *By Faith which is alone*; but not, *by Faith only*, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον.

3. Therefore he saith that *Faith is dead being alone*, Because it is dead as to the use and purpose of Justifying: for in it self it hath a life according to its quality still. This appears from his comparison in the former verse 16. that this is the death he speaks of. And so Works make Faith alive, as to the attainment of its end of Justification.

4. The Analysis which *Piscator* and *Pemble* give, contradicteth not this Assertion. If in stead of *a Working Faith*, they will but keep the Apostles own words, I shall agree to most of their Analysis. (Though conclusions drawn from the Analysis are often weak, it is so easy

for every man to feign an Analysis suited ta his ends) only the explication of the 22. vers. they seem to fail in. For when the Apostle saith, that Faith did, *συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ*, work in and with his works, it cleary aimeth at such a working in, and with, as maketh them conjunct in the work of Justifying: And when he saith that *Faith was made perfect with Works*, it is not (as they and others interpret) only a manifesting to be perfect. But as the habit is perfected in its Acts, because they are the end to which it tendeth; And as Marriage is perfected *per congressum & pocreationem*: or any Covenant when its conditions are performed. Faith alone is not the entire perfect Condition of the New Covenant: but Faith with Repentance and sincere Obedience, is; A condemned Galley-slave being Redeemed, is to have his deliverance upon condition that he take his Redeemer for his Master: This doth so directly imply, that he must obey him, that his conditions are not perfectly fulfilled, except he do obey him as his Master: And so taking him for his Redeemer and Master, and obeying him as his Master, do in the same kind procure his continued freedom. Indeed his mere promise and consent doth procure his first deliverance, but not the continuance of it. So I ac-

knowledge, that the very first point of Justification is by Faith alone, without either the concomitancy or co-operation of Works; for they cannot be performed in an instant; But the continuance and accomplishment of justification is not without the joint procurement of obedience. As a woman is made a man's wife, and instated in all that he hath, upon mere acceptance, consent, and contracts; because conjugal actions, affection, the forsaking of others, &c. are implied in the Covenant, & expressed as the necessary for future; therefore if there be no conjugal actions, affections or fidelity follow, the Covenant is not-performed, nor shall the woman enjoy the benefits expected. It is so here, especially seeing Christ may dis-estate the violaters of his Covenant at pleasure.

This sheweth us how to answer the Objections of some: 1. Say they, *Abraham's* Faith was perfect long before. *Answ.* Not as it is a fulfilling of the Covenant's Condition, which also requireth its acting by Obedience.

2. *Abraham* (say they) was justified long before *Isaac* was offered, therefore that could be but a manifesting of it. *Answ.* Justification is a continued Act. God is still justifying, and the Gospel still justifying. *Abraham's* Justification was not ended before.

Mr *Pemle* thinks, that as a man cannot

be said, [*to live by Reason*] though he may be said, *to live by a reasonable soul*, and as a plant liveth not *per augmentationem*, & *si per animam auctricem*: So we may be said to be justified by a working Faith, but not by Works.

I Answ. Both Speeches are proper. And his simile doth not square or suit with the Case in hand: For Justifying is an extrin-sical consequent, or product of Faith, and no proper effect at all: Much less an effect flow-ing from its own formal essence, as the life of a man doth from a Reasonable soul, and the life of a Plant from a Vegetative. I hope it may be said properly enough, that a Servant doth his work, and pleaseth his Master, by Reason, as well as by a reasonable soul: And a Plant doth please the Gardiner by augmen-tation, as well as *per animam auctricem*. So that a man pleaseth God, and is Justified by sin-cere Obedience, as well as by a working Faith.

3. How this differeth from the Papist's Doctrine, I need not tell any Scholar who hath read their writings.

1. They take Justifying for Sanctifying: so do not I. 2. They quite overthrow and deny the most real difference betwixt the Old Covenant and the New: and make them in a manner all one: But I build this Exposi-tion and Doctrine, chiefly upon the clear diffe-rencing and opening of the Covenants,

3. When they say. We are Justified by Works of the Gospel; they mean only, that we are sanctified by Works that follow Faith, and are bestowed by Grace, they meriting our inherent justice at God's hands. In a word, there is scarce any one Doctrine, wherein even their most learned Schoolmen are more sottishly ignorant then in this of Justification: so that when you have read them with profit and delight on some other subjects; when they come to this, you would pity them, and admire their ignorance.

They take our Works to be part of our Legal Righteousness: I take them not to be the smallest portion of it; But only a part of our Evangelical Righteousness; or of the Condition upon which Christ's Righteousness shall be ours.

But what difference is there betwixt it and the *Socinian* Doctrine of Justification? *Answ.* In some men's mouths, *Socinianism* is but a word of reproach, or a stone to throw at the head of any man that saith not as they. Mr. *Wotton* is a *Socinian*, and Mr. *Bradshaw*, and Mr. *Gataker*, and Mr. *Goodwin*, and why not *Piscator*, *Parens*, &c. if some zealous Divines know what *Socinianism* is. But I had rather study what is Scripture-truth, then what is *Socinianism*: I do not think that *Faustus* was so *Infustus*, as to hold nothing true: That which he held according to Scripture is not So-

mianism. For my part, I have read little of their writings; but that little gave me enough, and made me cast them away, with abhorrence. In a word: The *Socinians* acknowledge not that Christ had satisfied the Law for us; and consequently is none of our Legal Righteousness: but only hath set us a copy to write after, and is become our pattern, and that we are Justified by following him as a Captain and guide to heaven: And so all our proper Righteousness is in this obedience. Most accursed Doctrine! So far am I from this, that I say, The Righteousness which we must plead against the Law's accusations, is not one grain of it in our Faith of Works; but all out of us in Christ's satisfaction. Only our Faith, Repentance, and sincere Obedience, are the Conditions upon which we must partake of the former. And yet such Conditions as Christ worketh in us freely by his Spirit.

Lastly, let us see whether St. *Paul*, or any other Scripture do contract this. And, for my part, I know not one word in the Bible, that hath any strong appearance of Contradiction to it. The usual places quoted are these, *Rom.* 3:28. & 4:2, 3, 14, 15, 16. *Gal.* 2:16. & 3:21, 22. *Ephes.* 2:8, 9. *Phil.* 3:8, 9. In all which, and all other the like places, you shall easily perceive. 1. That the Apostle's dispute

is upon the question, What is the Righteousness which we must plead against the Accusation of the Law? or by which we are justified as the proper Righteousness of that Law? And this he well concludeth, is neither Works nor Faith. But the Righteousness which is by Faith; that is, Christ's Righteousness.

But now St. *James* his question is, What is the Condition of our Justification by this Righteousness of Christ? Whether Faith only? or Works also?

2. *Paul* doth either in express words, or in the sense and scope of his speech, exclude only the works of the Law, that is the fulfilling of the Conditions of the Law our selves. But never the fulfilling of the Gospel-Conditions that we may have part in Christ. Indeed, if a man should obey the Commands of the Gospel, with a Legal intent, that it might be a Righteousness conform to the Law of Works; this Obedience is not Evangelical, but Legal obedience: For the form giveth the name.

3. *Paul* doth by the word, *Faith*, especially direct your thoughts to Christ believed in; For to be justified by Christ; and to be justified by receiving Christ is with him all one.

4. And when he doth mention Faith as the Condition, he always implieth obedience to Christ. Therefore *Believing* and *obeying* the

Gospel, are put for the two Summaries of the whole Conditions. The next will clear this.

THESIS LXXVII.

That we are justified by sincere obedience to Christ, as, the secondary part of the Condition of our Justification; is evident also from these following Scriptures. Mat. 12:37. Mar. 11:25, 26. Luk. 6:37. Mat. 6:12, 14, 15. I Joh. 1:9. Acts 8:22. Acts 3:19. I Pet. 4:18. Rom. 6:16. I Pet. 1:2, 22.

THESIS LXXVIII.

Our full Justification, and our everlasting Salvation have the same Conditions on our part. But sincere Obedience is without all doubt, a Condition of our Salvation: therefore also of our Justification.

EXPLICATION.

The Antecedent is manifest, in that Scripture maketh Faith a Condition of both Justification and Salvation: and so it doth Obedience also, as is before explained. Therefore we are justified, that we may be saved. It would be as derogatory to Christ's Righteousness, if we be saved by works, as if we be justified by them. Neither is there any way to the former but by the latter. That which a man is justified by, he is saved by. Though Glorification be an adding of a greater happiness then we lost, so justification is not enough thereto: Yet on our part, they have the same Conditions.

Yet here I say still, *Our full Jusification* because, as I have shewed our first possession of it is upon our meet

Faith or Contrat with Christ. But I think our Glorification will be acknowledged to have the same Conditions with our final Justification at the bar of Christ. And why not to our entire continued justification on earth? You may Object. Perseverance is a condition of our Glorification; but not of our Justification here, I Answer, 1. Perseverance is nothing but the same Conditions persevering. 2. As the sincerity of Faith is requisite to our first possession of Justification; so the perseverance of Faith, is the Condition of persevering Justification. See *Hebr.* 1:14.

2. That Obedience is a Condition of our Salvation is undoubted, *Hebr.* 5:9. Christ is the Author of eternal Salvation to all them that obey him; so fully, *Rom.* 2:7, 8,9, 10. *Revel.* 22:14. *Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have Right to the tree of Life, and may enter by the Gates into the City.* And hath that no hand in their Justification, which giveth them right to the tree of Life? *Jam.* 1:22, 23, 24, 25. *Mat.* 5. from the 1. to the 13. especially the 19:20. *Mat.* 7:13, 21, 23, 24, with the multitude the like. Besides all those under *Posit.* 22. which prove a personal Righteousness, so called from the conformity to the Gospel. See *Rom.* 8:4, 13.

THESIS LXXIX.

THis Doctrine is no whit derogatory to Christ and his Righteousness: For he that ascribeth to Faith or Obedience no part of that work which belongeth to Christ's satisfactory Righteousness, doth not derogate in that, from that Righteousness. But he that maketh Faith and Obedience to Christ, to be only the fulfilling of the Conditions of the New Covenant, and so to be only Conditions of justification by him, doth give them no part of the work of his Righteousness; Seeing he came not to fulfil the Gospel, but the Law.

EXPLICATION.

I Have proved this before, *Posit.* 20. I shall here only Answer some objections. *Object.* 1. Christ was baptized because he must fulfil all Righteousness: But that was no part of the Legal Righteousness. *Answ.* The Priests were to be washed when they entered upon their office: There were many Ceremonious washings then in force: Either Christ's Baptism was Legal; or else by [*fulfilling Righteousness*] must needs he meant, The fulfilling all the works of his own office: whereof one was, the instituting of Church Ordinances: and he thought meet to institute this by Example as well as Doctrine. He that will affirm, that Christ hath fulfilled Evangelical Righteousness for us, as well as Legal, shall overthrow the office of Christ, and the nature of Christianity; *Object.* 2. Mr. *Bradshaw*, and most others say, That he received the Sacrament of his Supper, *Answ.* Wholly without book—I believe not that ever he did it: for the Scripture nowhere speaks it: And many absurd consequences would hardly be avoided: All the probability for it is in those words, *I will drink no more of the fruit of, &c,* *Answ.* 1. That may be a Reason why he would not drink now; and doth not necessarily imply that he did. 2. But clearly, *Luke* who speaketh distinct-

ly of the two Cups (which the other do not) doth apply, and subjoin these words to the first Cup, which was before the Sacramental.

If it were granted that Christ did receive the Sacrament; yet he never did as an obediential Act to his own Gospel precepts? Did he obey a Law not yet made? or his own Law, and so obey himself? Much less did he perform it as a part of the New Covenant Condition on our part. But as a Law-giver and not an Obeyer thereof: It was a Law-making Action, (if any such had been.)

Object. If sincere obedience be a part of the Condition, then what perplexities will it cast us into to find out, when our obedience is sincere? *Answ.* 1. This difficulty ariseth also, if we make it but the Condition of our Salvation: & yet few, but *Antinomians*, will deny that. 2. Why is it not as hard to discern the sincerity of faith as of Obedience. 3. Obedience is then sincere, when Christ is cordially taken for our only Lord; and when his Word is our Law, and the main desire and endeavour is to please him; and though through prevalency of the flesh we slip into sin, yet the prevailing part of our will is against it, and we would not change our Lord for all the world,

Mr. *Salmarsh* thinketh, that because we have so much sin with our Obedience, all Be-

lievers have cause to suspect it; and so cannot conclude Justification from it. As if sincerity might not stand with infirmity! Or could not be discerned where there is any remaining imperfection! Might not *Paul* conclude of the sincerity of his Willingness to obey Christ, because he did the evil which he would not? And might he not conclude his Justification from that Willingness to obey? Read *Ball* of the Covenant chap. 11.

THESIS LXXX.

TO conclude: It is most clear in the Scripture, and beyond all dispute, that our Actual, most proper, compte at Justification, at the great Judgement, will be according to our Works, and to what we have done in flesh, whether Good or Evil: which can be no otherwise then as it was the Condition of that Justification. And so Christ, at that great Assize, will not give his bare Will of Purpose, as the Reason of his proceedings: but as he governed by a Law; so he will judge by a Law: and will then give the Reason of his Public Sentence from men's keeping or breaking the Conditions of his Covenant; that so the mouths of all may be stopped, and the equity of his Judgment may be manifest to all; and that he may there shew forth his hatred to the sins, and not only to the persons of the Condemned; and his Love to the Obedience and not only to the persons of the Justified.

EXPLICATION.

Here I have these things to prove: 1. That the Justifying Sentence shall pass according to Works, as well as Faith. 2. That the Reason is, because they are parts of the Condition.

For the first, see *Mat.* 25:21, 23. *Well done, good and faithful servant! Thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things: Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.* And most plain is that from the mouth of the Judge himself, describing the order of the process at that day, *Mat.* 25:34, 35. *Come ye Blessed! inherit the Kingdom, &c. [For] I was hungry, &c.* So *1 Pet.* 1:17. *Who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work.* So *2 Cor.* 5:10. *We must all appear before the Judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad.* So *Rev.* 20:12, 13. *They were judged every man according to his Works.* *Heb.* 13:17. *Phil.* 4:17. *Mat.* 12:36, &c. But this is evident already.

2. As it is beyond doubt that Christ will then justify men according to their Works: So that this is not only to discover the sincerity of their Faith, is as evident; but that it is also, as they are parts of that Evangelical Righteousness which is the Condition of their Justification. 1. The very phrases of the Text import as much, *Mat.* 25:21, 23. *Well done good &*

faithful servant, &c. Mat. 25:34, 35. [For] *I was hungry*, &c. And in the rest [*According*] *to their Works*. Can any more be said of Faith, then that we are justified or judged to Life, both [for] it, and [according to] it?

2. If Works be not then considered as part of the Condition; how then? 1. Not as the Righteousness which the Law requireth: For so shall no man living be justified in the sight of God, *Rom.* 3:20. *Psa.* 143:2. 2. Not as a mere sign whereby God doth discern men's faith: For he seeth it immediately and needeth no sign, Not as a mere sign to satisfy the justified person himself: For 1. There is no such intimation in the Text. 2. Then it should be no further useful then men remain doubtful of their sincerity. 3. The godly then know the sincerity of their Faith. 4. Neither is the business of that Day, to satisfy the doubting about the sincerity of their Faith, by Arguments drawn from their former works: But to judge and justify them, and so put them out of doubt by the Sentence, and by their Glory.

4. But the common opinion is, That it is to satisfy the condemned World of the sincerity of the Faith of the godly. But this cannot stand with the Truth: For 1. It is clearly expressed a ground or reason of the Sentence. 2. And to the Consolation & Justification of the justified: and not to the satisfaction or conviction of others only or chiefly,

3. The poor world will have somewhat else to take up their thoughts? as the Text sheweth: to Wit, the excusing of the sin for which they are condemned themselves. *Mat.* 5:44

It seemeth that Christ doth in the Text call them *Righteous* in reference to this personal Evangelical Righteousness mentioned in their Justifying Sentence, *vers.* 46. *The Righteous into life Eternal.*

5. If God's Justice engage him, not to forget their work and labour of Love? *Heb.* 6:10, 11, 12. If the dead in Christ are blessed, because their Works follow them, *Rev.* 14:13. If in every Nation, he that feareth God and worketh Righteousnes be Accepted of him, *Acts* 10:35. If men shall reap the fruit of well-doing in due time, *Gal.* 6:7, 8,9. If Ministers save themselves in taking heed to themselves and to doctrine, 1 *Tim.* 4:16. If he that doth Righteousness is righteous, 1 *Joh.* 3:7. If whatsoever good thing any man doth, the same he shall receive of the Lord, *Ephes.* 6:8 If hearing and doing be building on a Rock, *Mat.* 7:24. If the doers of God's Will be the mothers, sisters and brothers of Christ, *Mat.* 12:50, &c. Then the mention of these works at judgment, is more then to signify their sincerity to the condemned world.

If Christ mentioned these works to convince the world, 1. Either it must be his own Testimony of these works, that they are sin-

cere evidences of a sincere Faith. 2. Or else, by the discovery which the works do make themselves. But 1. Christ may testify of their faith immediately as well. 2. Works are no certain signs of Faith to any stander-by, who knoweth not whether Works themselves are-sincere, or not. See more under the 76, Position.

If any say, that it is to silence the Accusation of Satan, that these works are mentioned at judgement; The same Answer will serve, as to the last. Besides, Scripture giveth us no intimation of any such accusation; but only the managing the Law's Accusation. But if he should Accuse us falsely of Hypocrisy, as he did *Job*; It must be only God's heart-fearthing knowledge of our sincerity that can clear us.

Yet do I not deny in all this, but that Works are effects of Faith, and to the person himself, who knoweth their sincerity, they may be some Argument of the sincerity of Faith, and God will vindicate his people's Righteousness before all, and be admired in them. But his justificatipn primarily respeceth the Law, and his own Justice, and the Righteousness and Salvation of the Justified, and but remotely the beholders.

Let me conclude with two or three cautionary Quæries concerning the inconvenience

of the contrary doctrine.

1. *Qu.* Doth it not needlessly constrain men to wrest most plain and frequent expressions of Scripture?

2. *Qu.* Doth it not uphold that dangerous pillar of the Antinomian Doctrine? that we must not work or perform our duties for Life and Salvation; but only from Life and Salvation: That we must not make the attaining of Justification or Salvation an end of our Endeavours, but obey in thankfulness only? because we are saved and justified? A doctrine which I have elsewhere confuted; and if it were reduced to practise by all that hold it, (as I hope it is not,) would undoubtedly damn them: For he that seeks not, and that striveth not to enter? shall never enter. Now if good Works or sincere Obedience to Christ our Lord? be no part of the Condition of our full Justification and Salvation, Who will use them to that end? For how it can procure Justification as a means, and not by way of Condition, I cannot conceive.

3. *Qu.* Whether this doctrine doth not tend to drive Obedience out of the world? For if men do once believe, that it is not so much as a part of the Condition of their Justification? will it not much tend to relax their diligence? I know mere love and thankfulness should be enough: And so it will, when all our ends are attained in our Ultimate End; then

we shall act for these ends no more: we shall have nothing to do but to love, and joy, and praise, and be thankful; but that it is not yet. Sure, as God hath given us the affections of Fear, and Desire, and Hope, and so Care, so he would have us use them for the attainment of our great Ends. Therefore he that taketh down but one of all our Motives to Obedience, he helps to destroy Obedience it self? seeing we have need of every Motive that God hath left us.

4. *Qu.* Doth it not much confirm the world in their soul-cozening Faith? Sure that Faith which is by many thought to justify, is it that our people do all most easily embrace? that is, the receiving of Christ for their Saviour, and expecting Pardon and Salvation by him, but not withal receiving him for their Lord and King, nor delivering up themselves to be ruled by him. I meet not with one, but is resolved in such a Faith, till it be overthrown by teaching them better. They would all trust Christ for the saving of their souls, and that without dissembling, for ought any man can discern: Are all these men justified? You will say, They do it not sincerely.

There is evident as incincerity opposite to dissimulation: But a Moral or Theological sincerity there is not; Why is that? but because they take but half of Christ. Let any Minister but try his ungodly people, whether they

will not all be persuaded very easily to believe that Christ will pardon them and save them, and to expect Justification from him alone? But whether it be not the hardest thing in the world, to persuade them really to take him for their Lord, and his Word for their Law, and to endeavour faithful obedience accordingly? Surely the easiness of the former, and the difficulty of the latter, seemeth to tell us that it is a spiritual, excellent, necessary part of justifying Faith, to accept unfeignedly of Christ for our Governour, and that part which the world among us will most hardly yield to, and therefore hath more need to be preached than the other. (Though some think that nothing is preaching Christ, but preaching him as a pardoning, justifying Saviour.) Indeed among the Turks or Indians, that entertain not the Gospel it is as necessary to preach his pardoning Office, yea and the verity of his Natures and Commission: therefore the Apostles when they preached to Jews or Pagans, did first & chiefly teach them the Person and Offices of Christ, & the great benefits which they might receive by him but when they preach (as *James*) to Professors of the Christian Faith, they chiefly urge them, to strive to enter, to fight, that they may conquer, so to run that they may obtain to lay violent hands upon the Kingdom, and take it by force, and to be unwearied in laborious obedience to Christ their

Lord; to be steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the Work of the Lord, forasmuch as they know their labour is not in vain in the Lord.

Lastly, Is not this excluding of sincere Obedience from Justification, the great Bumbling block of Papists? & that which hath had a great hand in turning many learned men from the Protestant Religion to Popery? When they see the language of Scripture in the forecited places so plain to the contrary: When *Illyricus*, *Gallus*, *Amsdorfius*, &c. shall account it a heresy in *George major*, to say, That good Works are necessary to Salvation: And when (if *Melchior Adamus* say true) *eo dementia & impietatis ventum erat, ut non dubitarent quidam hæc axiomata propugnare; Bona opera non sunt necessaria ad salutem: Bona opera efficiunt saluti: Nova obedientia non est necessaria.* When even *Melancthon's* credit is blasted, for being too great a friend to good Works, though he ascribe not to them the least part of the Work or Office of Christ: And when to this day many Antinomian Teachers, who are magnified as the only Preachers of Free Grace, do assert & proclaim. That there is no more required to the perfect irrevocable justification of the vilest Murderer or Whoremaster, but to believe that he is justified, or to be persuaded that God loveth him. And when, such a Book as that, styled the *Marrow of Modern Divinity*, have so many applauding Epist-

les of such Divines; when the Doctrine of it is, That we must not Act for justification or salvation; but only in thankfulness for it: contrary to the main drift of the Scripture, which so presseth men to pray for pardon, & to pardon others, that they may receive pardon themselves: and to strive to enter, & run that they may obtain, & do Christ Commandments that they may have right to the Tree of life, & enter in by the gate into the City, *Revel*, 22: 14. Do these men think that we are perfectly justified and saved already? before the absolving sentence at the great Tribunal; or the possession of the Kingdom, for which we wait in Hope? Indeed when we have that perfect salvation, we shall not need to seek it, or labour to attain it; but must everlastingly be thankful to him that hath purchased if, and to him that hath bestowed it. But in the mean time, he that seeketh not, shall not find, & he that runs not shall not obtain: No, nor all that seek and run neither, *Luk.* 13:24. *Luk.* 12: 31. 2 *Tim.* 2:5.

This Doctrine was one that helped to turn off Grotius to *Cassandrian* Popery; See *Grotii votu*, *Pag.* 21, 22, 23, 115. And was offensive to *Melancthon*, *Bucer*, & other Moderate Divines of our own, And all ariseth hence. That men understand not the difference betwixt Christ's part of the work, which he performeth himself, & that which he requireth and enableth us to

perform: nor know they, that true justifying Faith doth at once receive Christ, both as Lord and Saviour; and that sincere Obedience to Christ, is part of the Condition of the New Covenant. Works (or a Purpose to walk with God) (saith Mr. *Ball* on the Covenant pag. 73.) do justify as the Passive qualification of the subject capable of Justification. See *Calvin* on *Luke* 1:6. The common assertion then *That good Works do follow Justification, but not go before it* must be thus understood, or it is false, viz. Actual obedience goeth not before the first moment of Justification, But yet it is as true, 1. That the taking of Christ for our Lord, and so delivering up our selves to his Government (which is the subjection of the heart, & resolution for further obedience, & indeed an essential part of Faith) doth in order of nature go before our first justification. 2. That Actual Obedience (as part of the Condition) doth in order of Nature go before our Justification as continued and confirmed. For though our Marriage contract with Christ do give us the first possession, yet it is the Marriage faithfulness and duties, which must continue that possession. 3. That perseverance in faithful obedience doth both in nature & time go before our full, complete and final Justification; and that as part of the Condition of obtaining it. *If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another; and the blood of Jesus*

Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin, 1 Joh. 1:7. So Isai. 1:16, 17, 18, 19. Wash you; make you clean; put away the evil of your doings; cease to do evil; learn to do well, &c. Come now, &c. though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; and though they be red like crimson, they shall be like wool, So Ezek. 33:14, 15, 16. & 18, 21, 22. Neither let any object that this is the Law of works: For certainly that hath no promises of forgiveness: And though the discoveries of the way of justification be delivered in the old Testament, in a more dark and Legal language than in the New; yet not in terms contradictory to the truth in the New Testament. Thus you may see in what sense it is that Christ will judge men according to their Works: & will say, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom, &c. For I was hungry, & ye fed me, &c. Well done, good & faithful Servant, thou hast been faithful in few things; I will make thee Ruler over many things: Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord, Matth. 25.

For being made perfect, he became the Author of Eternal salvation to all them that obey him, Heb. 5:9. Of whom it shall be said, when they are glorified with him: These are they that come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb, and made them white: Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple; and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them, Revel. 7:14, 15. To whom be Glory for ever, Amen.

REader, because an exact Index would contain a great part of the Book, I shall omit it: and instead of it, I here lay thee down some of the chief Distinctions, upon which this Discourse dependeth; desiring thee to understand them, and keep them in memory.

You must distinguish,

1. *BETwixt God's Decretive or Purposing Will: And his Legislative or Preceptive Will. The 1. is his Determining of Events. The 2. of Duty and Reward.*

2. *Betwixt 1. the Covenant or Law of Works, which saith, Obey perfectly, and Live, or sin, and Die. 2. And the Covenant or Law of Grace, which saith, Believe, and be saved, &c.*

3. *Betwixt the two parts of each Covenant: viz. 1. The Primary, discovering the duty in Precepts, and prohibiting the Sin. 1. The secondary discovering the Rewards and Penalties, in Promises and Threatnings.*

4. *Betwixt a twofold Righteousness of one and the same Covenant. 1. Of perfect Obedience, or performance of the Condition. 2. Of suffering, or satisfaction for disobedience, or non-performance which maketh the Law, to have nothing against us, though we disobeyed. See Pemble of Justification, pag. 2. Our Legal Righteousness is of this last sort, & not of*

the first. Both these sorts of Righteousness are not possible to be found in any one person, except Christ, who had the former Righteousness at his own, (incommunicable to us in that form) The second he had for us, as he was by imputation a sinner: And so we have it in, or by him. Mark this.

5. Betwixt two kinds of Righteousness, suitable to the two Covenants and their Conditions. 1. Legal Righteousness, which is our Conformity, or satisfaction to the Law. 2. And Evangelical Righteousness, which is our Conformity to the new Covenant. Note, that 1. Every Christian must have both these. 2. That our Legal righteousness is only that of Satisfaction: but our Evangelical is only that of obedience, or performance of the Condition. 3. That our Legal Righteousness is all without us in Christ, the other in ourselves.

6. Betwixt Evangelical Righteousness, improperly so called, viz. because the Gospel doth reveain and offer it. This is our Legal righteousness of Christ. 2. And Evangelical righteousness properly so called viz. Because the new Covenant is the Rule to which it is conformed. This is our performance of the new Covenant's Conditions.

7. Betwixt the Life or Reward in the first Covenant: viz. Adam's paradise happiness. 2. And the Life of the second Covenant; which is, Eternal glory in heaven.

8. Betwixt the death or curse of the old Covenant, which is opposite to its reward: This only

was laid on Christ, and is due to Infants by nature. 2. And the death of the second Covenant, opposite to its life, called the second death, and far forer punishment. This final unbelievers suffer.

9. Betwixt sins against the first Covenant: For these Christ died. 2. And sins against the second Covenant: For these he died not.

10. Betwixt sinning against Christ and the Gospel, as the object of our sin only: So Christ died for them. 2. And sinning against the new Covenant as such, or as a threatening Law: So Christ died not for them.

11. Betwixt delaying to perform the conditions of the new Covenant. This is not threatened with death. 2. And final non-performance. This is proper violation of the Covenant, and a sin that leaveth no hope of recovery.

12. Betwixt paying the proper debt of obedience (as Christ did himself) or of suffering (as this damned do.) 2. And satisfying for non-payments as Christ did for us.

13. Betwixt repealing the Law or Covenant (which is not done) 2. And relaxing it or dispensing with it (which is done.)

14. Betwixt relaxation or dispensation in the proper subject and circumstances of the Penalty. This is done in removing it from us to Christ. 2. And dispensing with the Penalty it self. This is not done; for Christ did bear it.

15. *Betwixt the change of the Law: 2. And of the sinners relation to the Law.*

16. *Betwixt the Law ss forbidding and condemning the sin: (so it doth still.) 2. And its condemning the sinner: (So it doth not to the justified because Christ hath born the curse.)*

17. *Betwixt the Precepts as abstracted from the Covenant terms, (which really they are not at all) 2. And as belonging to the several Covenants.*

18. *Betwixt perfection of Holiness (which is a quality.) This is not in this life. 2. And Perfection of Righteousness, (which is a Relation:) This is perfect, or none at all.*

19. *Betwixt recalling the Fact, or the evil of the Fact, or its desert of punishment. These are never done, nor are possible. 2. And removing the due-ness of Punishment from the Offender. This is done,*

20. *Betwixt Pardon and Justification Conditional, which is an immediate effect of Christ's Death and Resurrection, or rather of the making of the new Covenant. 2. And Pardon & Justification Absolute, when we have performed all the Conditions.*

21. *Betwixt Conditional Pardon and Justification, which is only Potential. (Such is that which immediately followeth the enacting of the new Covenant to men before Faith, or before they have sinned.) 2. And Conditional Justification, which is actual, & of which the person hath true possession, such is our Justification after Faith, till the last Judgement, which is ours actually, but yet upon con-*

dition of perseverance in Faith and sincere Obedience.

22. *Betwixt Pardon and Justification, as they are Immanent Acts in God, (improperly, and without Scripture, called Pardon or Justification.)* 2. *And Pardon and Justification, as they are Transient Acts, performed by the Gospel-Promise as God's Instrument. This is the true Scripture Justification.*

25. *Betwixt Justification in Title and Sense of law, (which is in this Life.)* 2. *And Justification in sentence of the Judge, (which is at the last Judgement.)*

24. *Betwixt justifying us against a true Accusation, (as of breaking the Law.) Thus Christ justifieth us; and here it is that we must plead his Satisfaction.* 2. *And justifying us against a false Accusation, (as of not performing the Conditions of the Gospel.) Here we must plead not guilty, and not plead the Satisfaction of Christ.*

25. *Betwixt the Accusation of the Law, (from Christ doth justify believers.)* 2. *And the Accusation of the Gospel or new Covenant, for not performing its Conditions at all, (from which no man can be justified, and for which there is no sacrifice.)*

26. *Betwixt those Acts which recover us to the state of Relation which we fell from; that is, Pardon, Reconciliation and Justification.* 2. *And those which advance us to afar higher state, that is, Adoption and Union with Christ.*

27. *Betwixt our first Possession of Justification,*

which is upon our contract with Christ or mere Faith.) 2. And the Confirmation, Continuation and Accomplishment of it, (whose Condition is also sincere obedience and Perseverance.)

28. Betwixt the great summary duty of the Gospel to which the rest are reducible: which is Faith. 2. And the Condition fully expressed in all its parts, where of Faith is the Epitome.

29. Betwixt the word, Faith, as it is taken Physically, and for some one single Act: 2. And as it is taken Morally, Politically and Theologically here; for the receiving of Christ with the whole soul.

30. Betwixt the accepting of Christ as a Saviour only, (which is no true Faith, nor can justify.) 2. And Accepting him for Lord also (which is true Justifying Faith.)

31. Betwixt the foresaid Receiving of Christ himself in his offices (which is the Act that Justifieth:) 2. And Receiving his Promises and Benefits, (a consequent of the former:) Or betwixt accepting him for iustificatio; 2. And believing that we are justified.

32. Betwixt the Metaphysical Truth of our Faith: 2. And the Moral Truth.

33. Betwixt the Nature of the Act of Faith, which justifieth, or its Aptitude for its office (which is, its receiving Christ: 2. And the proper formal Reason of its Justifying power, (which is, because it is the Condition upon which God will give us Christ's Righteousness.)

34. Betwixt Works of the Law (which is

perfect Obedience: 2. And Works of the Gospel Covenant (which is Faith and sincere Obedience to Christ that bought us.)

35. Betwixt Works of the Gospel used as Works of the Gospel, i.e. in subordination to Christ, as Conditions of our full Justification and Salvation by him. 2. And Works commanded in the Gospel used a-Works of the Law, or to legal ends, viz. to make up in whole or in part our proper legal Righteousness; and so in opposition to Christ's Righteousness, or in co-ordination with it. In the first sense they are necessary to Salvation: In the second, Damnable.

36. Betwixt receiving Christ and loving him as Redeemer (which is the Condition it self:) 2. And taking the Lord for our God and chief Good, and loving him accordingly; Which is still implied in the Covenant as its End and Perfection; And so as more excellent then the proper Conditions of the Covenant.

Glory to God in the highest, and on Earth Peace; Good-will towards men, Luk. 2:14.

Postscript.

WHEREAS there is in this Book an intimation of something which I have written of *Universal Redemption*, Understand, that I am writing indeed a few pages on that subject only by way of Explication, as an Essay for the Reconciling of the great differences in the Church thereabouts: But being hindered by continual sickness, and also observing how many lately are set a work on the same subject, (as *Whitfield*, *Stalham*, *Howe*, *Owen*, and some men of note that I hear are now upon it,) I shall a while forbear, to see if something may come forth, which may make my endeavour in this kind useless, and save me the labour: Which if it come not to pass, you shall shortly have it, if God will enable me.

Farewell.

AN
APPENDIX
to the fore-going
TREATISE;

BEING
An Answer to the Ob-
jections of a Friend concerning some
Points therein contained.

And at his own Desire annexed for the
sake of others that may have the
same thoughts.

Zanchius in Philip. 3:13.

*What can be more pernicious to a Student yea to a
Teacher, then to think that he knoweth all
things, and no knowledge can be wanting in him;
For being once puffed up with this false opinion, he
will profit no more. The same is much truer in
Christian Religion, and in the Knowledge of
Christ.*

Rom. 3:25.

*Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation,
through Faith in his blood, for Remission of sins
that are past, through the forbearance of God.*

THe disorder of the Interrogations and Objections, which extorted from me this whole Tractate by pieces one after another, hath caused me (an unfeigned lover of method) to give thee such a disorderly, immethodical Miscellany. Also the quality of these Objections hath occasioned me to answer many things trivial, whilst I know more difficult and weighty points are overlooked: these things need no excuse; but this information; That I was to follow and not to lead: and that I write only for those who know less than my self; if thou know more, thank God, and join with me

for the instruction of the ignorant, whose information, reformation, and salvation, and thereby God's glory, is the top of my ambition. *R.B.*

AN
ANSWER
to some
Objections and Questions
OF
One that perused this small TRAC-
TATE before it went
to the Press.

The sum of the Objections is as followeth.

IT seemeth strange to me, that you make the death which the first Covenant did threaten to be only in the everlasting suffering of soul, seperated from the body and that the body should be turned to earth, and suffer no more but the pains of death; and consequently not whole man, but only part of him should be damned?

2. Though you seem to take in the Active Righteousness of Christ with the Passive into the work of Justification, yet it is on such grounds, as that you do in the main agree with them who are for the Passive Righteousness alone, against the stream of Orthodox Divines?

3. I pray you clear to me a little more fully in what sense you mean, that no sin but final unbelief is a breach or violation of the new Covenant, and how you can make it good, that temporary unbelief, and gross sin is no violation of it, seeing We Covenant against these?

4. Whether it will not follow from this doctrine of

yours that the new covenant is never violated by any; for the regenerate do never finally and totally renounce Christ, and so they violate it not; & the unregenerate were never truly in covenant, and therefore cannot be said to violate the Covenant which they never made?

5. How you will make it appear, that the new Covenant is not made with Christ only?

6. How make you faith and Repentance to be conditions of the Covenant on our part, seeing the bestowing of them is part of the condition on God's part: Can they be our conditions and God's too?

7. Seeing God hath promised us these which you call conditions, is not the Covenant therefore rather absolute, and more properly a promise?

8. In making a general Covenant to all, you bring wicked men under promise, whereas all the promises are Yea and Amen in Christ, and so belong only to those in Christ: I find no promise in Scripture made to a wicked man.

9. May you not else as well give the seals to wicked men as the Covenant? Except you will evade as Mr *Blake*. and say the Sacrament seals but conditionally; and then let all come that will.

10. How can you make it appear, that *Do this and live* is not the proper voice of the Covenant of Works? Or that according to the new Covenant we must act for life, and not only from life; or that a man may make his attaining of life the end of his work, and not rather obey only out of thankfulness and love?

11. Why do you single out the book called, *The marrow of modern Divinity*, to oppose in this point?

12. Seeing you make faith and covenanting with Christ to be the same thing; do you not make him to be no real Christian that never so covenanted? and consequently him to be no visible Christian who never professed such a Covenant? and so you bring in a greater necessity of public covenanting, then those who are for Church-making Covenants?

13. Do you not go against the stream of all Divines, in denying the proper act of Faith as it justifieth, to be either Recumbency, Affiance, Persuasion, or Assurance? but placing it in Consent or Acceptance?

14. Do you not go against the stream of all Divines, in making the Acceptance of Christ for Lord, to be as properly a justifying act as the accepting him for Saviour, and all that you may lay a ground work for Justification by Gospel obedience or Works; so do you also in making the Acceptance of Christ's Person and Offices to be the justifying act, and not the receiving of his Righteousness and of pardon?

16. How can you reconcile your Justification by Works with that of *Rom.* 3:24, & 4:4, 5, 6?

17. I desire some satisfaction in that which *Macovious*, and Mr *Owen* oppose in the places which I mentioned.

THE ANSWER.

TO the first Objection about the death threatened in the first Covenant, I answer: 1. I told you I was not peremptory in my opinion, but inclined to it, for want of a better. 2. I told you, that the Objections seem more strong which are against all the rest, and therefore I was constrained to make choice of this, to avoid greater absurdities, then that which you object. For, 1. If you say that Adam should have gone quick to Hell, you contradict many Scriptures, which make our temporal death to be the wages of sin. 2. If you say that He should have died, and rose again to torment: 1. What Scripture saith so? 2. When should He have risen? 3. You contradict many Scriptures, which make Christ the Mediator, the only procurer of the Resurrection. 3. If you say He should have lived in perpetual misery on earth, then you dash on the same Rock with the first opinion. 4. If you say, He should have died only a temporal death, and his soul be annihilated, then 1. you make Christ to have redeemed us only from

the grave, and not from hell, contrary to 1 *Thes.* 1:10. *Who hath delivered us from the wrath to come.* 2. You make not hell, but only temporal death, to be due too, or deserved by the sins of believers, seeing the Gospel only (according to this opinion) should threaten eternal death, and not the Law; but the Gospel threatenneth it to none but unbelievers. You might easily have spared me this labour, and gathered all this Answer from the place in the book where I handled it; but because other Readers may need as many words as you, I grudge not my pains.

TO your second Objection about Christ's active and passive Righteousness; You should have overthrown my grounds, and not only urge my going against the stream of Divines: As I take it for no honour to be the first inventing a new opinion in Religion, so neither to be the last in embracing the truth: I never thought that my faith must follow the major vote; I value Divines also by weight, and not by number; perhaps I may think that one Pareus, Piscator, Scultetus, Alsledius, Capellus, Gataker, or Bradshaw, is of more authority then many Writers and Readers: View their Writings, and answer their Arguments, and then judge.

TO your third, about the violation of the Covenant, I shall willingly clear my meaning to you as well as I can, though I thought what is said had cleared it. The 34 Aphorism (which is it you object against) doth thus far explain it, 1. That I speak of God's Covenant of Grace only, or his new Law, containing the terms on which men live or die. 2. That by *Violation* I mean the breaking or non-performance of its conditions, or such a violation as bringeth the offender under the threatening of it, and so maketh the penalty of that Covenant breaking due to him. 3. I there tell you, that the new Covenant may be neplected long, and sinned against objectively, and Christ's Commands may

be broken, when yet the Covenant is not so violated. The Tenor of the Covenant me-think should put you quite out of doubt of all this, which is *He that believeth shall he saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned*. The unbelief and rebellion against Christ, which the godly were guilty of before believing, is a neglect or refusal of the Covenant; and I acknowledge that all that while they were in a damnable state, that is, in a state wherein they should have been damned, if they had so died; for then their unbelief had been final.

But your doubt may be, whether they did not deserve damnation while they were in their unbelief for resisting Grace?

I answer you as before: 1. I look upon no Punishment as deserved, *in sensu forensi*, in the sense of the Law, but what is threatened by that Law: Now you may easily resolve the Question your self, Whether the new Covenant do threaten damnation to that their unbelief? If they believe not at all before death, it pronounceth them condemned, other wise not. 2. Yet might they in this following sense be said to deserve the great condemnation before they obeyed the Gospel, *viz.* as their unbelief is that sin for which the Gospel condemneth men, wanting nothing but the circumstance of finality or continuance to have made them the proper subjects of the curse; and it was no thanks to them that it proved not final; for God did make them no promise of one hour of time and patience, and therefore it was merely his mercy in not cutting them off, which made their unbelief not to be final and damning: Many a man that lived not half so long in rebellion, did yet prove a final condemned rebel; so that they did deserve, that God in the time of their infidelity should have cut off their lives, and so have let their infidelity be their destruction. But supposing that God would not so cut them off, and so their unbelief should not be final, (which is the case,) and so they are condemned or threatened by none but the first Law or Co-

venant which Christ did satisfy: But as for the second Law or Covenant it condemneth them not, so that Christ need not bear the condemnation of that Covenant for them; for He doth not fetch any man from under the condemning sentence of it, but only in rich mercy to his chosen: He doth prevent their running into that condemnation, partly by bearing with them in patience, and continuing their lives, (for into the hands of the purchaser are they wholly committed,) and partly by prevailing with them to come in to him by the efficacy of his Word and Spirit; so that considering them as unbelievers who were to be converted, and so they were neither the proper subjects of the Promise of the new Covenant, not of the threatening and condemnation of it: Promise they had none, but conditional, such as they had not received, and so were never the better for; and so they were without the covenant, and without hope, and without God, and strangers to all the priviledges of the Saints: But yet not those to whom the Law or Covenant saith, You shall surely die, except they had been such as should never have believed: And for that wrath (*Eph. 2:3.*) which they were children of by nature, it must needs be only the wrath or curse of the first violated Covenant, and not the wrath or curse of the second; for no man is by nature a child of that.

But I perceive you think it a strange saying, That a man by the greatest, grossest actual sin may not be said to violate this Covenant, so as to incur its curse, but only for final unbelief: Do not the godly sometimes break Covenant with Christ?

Ans. I have two things to say to the helping of your right understanding in this, *viz.* a two-fold distinction to mind you of, which you seem to forget. I. Either the gross sins, which you speak of, are such as may stand with sincerity of heart, or such as cannot: If

they be sins of really godly men, then certainly they violate not the Covenant, so as to make them the subjects of its curse; For the Covenant saith not. He that sinneth shall be damned; nor he that committeth this, or that great sin, shall be damned; But, he that beleeveth not shall be damned.

Object. But is not this Antinomianism, which you so detest? Is it not said, that no whoremonger, or unclean person, or covetous person, &c. shall enter, into the Kingdom of Christ, or of God? *Rev.* 21: 8. & 22:15. and *Eph.* 5:5. that for these things sake cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience?

Answ. I pray you remember that I have already proved, that Taith is the consenting to Christ's Dominion and Government over us; or the accepting of him for our Lord, that we may obey him, as well as for our Saviour, that we may have affiance in him: And consequently Unbelief (in this large sense in which the Gospel useth it in opposition to that faith which is the condition of the Covenant) containeth in it all Rebellion against Christ's Government: I could prove this to you out of many plain Scriptures, but the plainness of it may spare me that labour: Even in the Text objected, the word translated [*Children of disobedience*] doth signify both *Unbelief* and *Disobedience*; or obstinate, unpersuadablemen, that will not be persuaded to believe and obey: 2 *Thess.* 1:8. Christ shall come in flaming fire to render vengeance to them that obey not his Gospel: Certainly those are unbelievers. Or if you will have it plainly in Christ's own words, what is the damning sin opposed to faith, see it in *Luk.* 19:27. *But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring them hither, & fitly them before me.* It is not then for every act of those fore-mentioned sins that the everlasting wrath of God doth come upon men; for then what should

become of *David, Noah, Lot, Mary Magdalen*, and all of us? But it is for such sins as do prove and proceed from a confederate wilful refusal of Christ's Government, or an unwillingness that he should reign over us: and that not every degree of unwillingness, but a prevailing degree, from whence a man may be said to be one that would not have Christ reign, &c. Because this is real unbelief it self, as opposite to that Faith which is the condition of Life, which is the receiving of Christ for Lord as well as Saviour.

Yet it is true, that temporal judgements may befall us for particular sins; as also, that each particular sin doth deserve the eternal wrath which the first Covenant doth denounce; but not (in a Law-sense) that which is denounced in the second Covenant. Every great fault which a subject committeth against his Prince, is not capitals or high Treason. Every fault or disobedient act of a Wife against her Husband doth not break the Marriage Covenant, nor loose the bond: but only the sin of Adultery (which is the taking of another to the marriage bed, or the choosing of another husband (and actual forsaking the Husband, or renouncing him.

And you need not to fear lest this doctrine be guilty of Antinomianism: For their Error (which many of their adversaries also are guilty of) lieth here; That not understanding, that

receiving Christ as Lord is an essential act of justifying Faith, nor that the refusal of his Government is an essential part of damning unbelief, they do thereupon acknowledge no condition of Life, but bare Belief in the narrowest senses that is, either Belief of Pardon, and Justification, and Reconciliation, or Affiance in Christ for it: so also they acknowledge no proper damning sin, but unbelief in that strict sense as is opposite to this faith; that is the not believing in Christ as a Saviour.

And upon the common grounds who can choose but say as they, that neither drunkenness, nor murther, nor any sin, but that unbelief doth damn men, except he will say that every sin doth; and so set up the Covenant of Works, and deny his very Christianity, by making Christ to die in vain; so great are the inconveniences that follow the ignorance of this one point, That justifying faith is the accepting of Christ for Lord and Saviour, and that sincere obedience to him that bought us, is part of the Condition of the new Covenant.

I have been sorry to hear some able Divines, in their confessions of sin, acknowledging their frequent violation of this Covenant; yea, that in every sinful thought, word or deed they break the Covenant which they made in Baptism. Did ever any sober man make such a Covenant with Christ, as to

promise him never to sin against him? Or doth Christ call us to such a Covenant? Doth his Law threaten, or did we in our Covenant consent, that we should be condemned if ever we committed a gross sin? I conclude therefore, that those sins which do consist with true faith, can be no breaches of the Covenant of Grace; For else (Faith being the condition) we should both keep it, and break it, at the same time.

2. But all the doubt is about the sins which are inconsistent with Faith. Those are either, 1. Disobedience to the Law of Works; (but that cannot violate the Covenant of Grace as such.) 2. Or else Refusal of Christ by Rebellion and Unbelief privative,) for of negative unbelief I will not speak:) And that Refusal is either, 1. Temporary, (of that I have spoken already:) Or, 2. Final (and that I acknowledge is the violation of the Covenant.)

Perhaps you will object, That the sin against the Holy Ghost also is a damning sin? and so a breach of the Covenant. To which I answer, Final Unbelief is the *Genus*, and hath under it these three sorts, 1. Ordinary final Unbelief, *viz.* against Ordinary means. 2. The sin against the Holy Ghost. 3. Total Apostacy: All these are unpardonable sins.

I have in another Treatise adventured to tell you my judgment concerning the sin

against the Holy Ghost *viz.* That it is when a man will not believe in Christ notwithstanding all the testimonial miracles of the Holy Ghost, which he is convinced *de facto* were wrought, but yet denieth the validity of their Testimony. This is the unpardonable unbelief, because uncureable: for it is the last or greatest Testimony which Christ will afford to convince the unbelieving world; and therefore he that deliberately refuseth this and will not be convinced by it, is left by God as a hopeless wretch. So that the sin against the Holy Ghost is but a sort of final unbelief. Lay by your prejudice against the singularity of this interpretation, and exactly consider what the occasion of Christ's mentioning this sin was, and what was the sin which those Pharisees did commit? and then judge.

Lastly, For the sin of total Apostacy, I confess it is the most proper violation of the Covenant, not only as it is a Law and Covenant offered, but also as it is a Covenant entered and accepted. But it is unbelief which Apostates do fall to; for it is only an explicit or implicit renouncing of Christ either as Lord or Saviour, or both, which is the unpardonable sin of Apostacy, which is called *falling away* (that is, from Christ and the Covenant,) and *crucifying the Son of God afresh, and putting him to open shame*, Heb. 6:6. And which is called Heb. 10:

26, 29, *sinning wilfully*, that is, considerate, resolved rejecting Christ, or refusing his Government,) and so called? *treading underfoot the Son of God, and counting the blood of the Covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and doing despite to the Spirit of Grace.* As the nature of this Apostacy lieth in returning to infidelity, so being Total it is always also Final; God having in his just Judgement resolved to withhold from all such the grace that should recover them; and so this is a sort of final unbelief.

A second distinction, which I must here mind you of, is, betwixt 1. the main Covenant of Grace: and 2. Particular, subordinate, inferior Covenants, which may be made between God and a believer. The former is not violated, but as I have shewed before: The latter is ordinarily broken by us. If any man make a vow like *Saul's* or *Jephtha's*, he may break it possibly, and not be damned, but recover by repentance. If in your sickness, or other affliction, or at Sacrament, or on days of Humiliation, or Thanksgiving, you should Covenant with God to for sake such sin, or to perform such a duty, to mend your lives, to be more holy and heavenly, &c. this Covenant you may perhaps break, and yet recover. And of such Covenants it is that I mean, when in confession I do bewail my Covenant-breaking with Christ) and not of the main Covenant

of Grace; for then I should confess my self a total irrecoverable Apostate. The Covenant which ought to be made with Christ in Baptism, and which Baptim is the professing sign and seal of, is the main Covenant of Grace; Therefore is there no use for re-baptizing, because such Apostacy is an unrecoverable sin.

So you see what Covenant it is that the godly break, and what breach it is that they use to confess.

To the fourth Objection.

YOur fourth Objection [that from this doctrine it will follow, that the Covenant is never broken] is easily answered.

I. I think it is true, that the regenerate do never break the Covenant: But yet the breach in it self, and in respect of our strength is more then possible; and the controversy *de eventu* will hold much dispute. *Austin* seemeth to me to be of this opinion, That there are some effectually called that yet may fall away, but the elect cannot; so that he distinguisheth of calling according to Purpose or election, (and that he thinketh cannot be lost.) and calling not following election, (which he thinketh may be lost,) so that he placeth not the difference in the calling, but in the decree. I do not recite this as assenting to it; nor yet can I assent to them, who make the very nature of Grace to be immortal, and

from thence do argue the certainty of perseverance. I think to be naturally Immortal is God's Prerogative, and properly incommunicable to any creature: Even Angels, and souls of men are Immortal only from the will and continued sustentation of God; and if God did withdraw his hand, and not continually uphold it, the whole Creation would fall to nothing, much more the quality of holiness in the soul: To subsist of himself without continual influx from another, is proper to God, the first, natural, necessary, absolute, Independent Being: Yet I acknowledge, that when God will perpetuate any Being, he sitteth the nature of it accordingly, and maketh it more simple, pure, spiritual and less subject to corruption. But yet to say, that therefore it is a Nature Immortal, or that cannot die, I think improper: But I know Philosophers and Divines do think otherwise, and therefore I do dissent, *quæsi coactus & petitâ veniâ*. 2. But whether the Regenerate may break the Covenant or not, certain I am the unregenerate may and do: And whereas you object, [*That they were never in Covenant, and therefore cannot be said to break it:*] I must desire you, besides the former distinctions, to remember these two more. 1. Betwixt the Covenant as promulgate, and only offered on God's part. 2. And the Covenant as accepted and entered by the sinner. The former is most properly called; The Law

of Christ, or new Law, as containing the conditions of our salvation or damnation; yet it is properly also and frequently in Scripture called a Covenant, (though not in so full a sense as the latter,) because it containeth the substance or matter of the Covenant, and expresseth God's consent, so we deny not ours; and also because the great prevailing part in it is Mercy and promise, and the Duty so small and light in companion of the said Mercy, that in Reason there should be no Question of our performance: And so Mercy obscuring or prevailing against Judgment, it is more frequently called a Covenant and Gospel than a Law; yet a Law also most properly it is, and oft so called. Now then that the Covenant in this sense may be broken, is no question: God hath said, *He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned*. Doth not he that never believeth break this Law or Covenant, and incur the penalty? So that men that never accept the Covenant, do thus break it by their refusal, and so perish.

2. You must distinguish betwixt 1. The Covenant accepted heartily and sincerely, 2. Or nor heartily and sincerely: And so I answer you, Though unregenerate men did never sincerely covenant with Christ, and so are not in Covenant with him as the Saints are, yet they do usually Covenant with him, both with their mouths, by solemn profession, ac-

knowledging and owning him as their Lord and Saviour? and also by their external submitting to his Worship and Ordinances, and taking the seals of the Covenant, and also in some kind they do it from their hearts, (though not in sincerity.) Either they do it 1. Rashly, and not Deliberately; Or 2. They do it out of fear, as a man that is in the hands of a conquering enemy, that must yield to his will to prevent a worse inconvenience, though he accounteth it an evil which he is forced to, and had rather be free if he might, and doth covenant, but with a forced will, partly willing (to avoid greater misery) and partly unwilling. 3. Or else they keep secret reservations in their hearts, intending (as a man that as, aforesaid covenanteth with the conquerour,) to break away as soon as they can, or at least to go no further in their obedience then will stand with their wordly happiness or hopes (though these reservations be not expressed by them in their Covenant.) 4. Or else they mistake Christ, and the nature of his Covenant, thinking he is a Master that will let them please the flesh, and enjoy the world and sin, and understand not what that Faith and Holiness is which his Covenant doth require, and so they are baptized into they know not what, and subscribe to they know not what, and give up their names to they know not who; and then when at last they find their mistake? they

repent of the bargain and break the Covenant or else never discerning their mistake, they break the Covenant while they think that they keep it; or if they keep their own, they break Christ's. All these ways men may enter Covenant with Christ, but not sincerely; for sincere covenanting must be 1. Upon knowledge of the nature, ends and conditions of the Covenant, though they may possibly be ignorant of several Accidentals about the Covenant, yet not of these Essentials, if they do it sincerely. 2. They must Covenant deliberately, and not in a fit of passion, or rashly.

They must do it seriously, and not dissemblingly or slightly. 4. They must do it freely and heartily, and not through mere constraint and fear. 5. They must do it intirely, and with resolution to perform the Covenant which they make and not with Reservations, giving themselves to Christ by the halves, or reserving a Purpose to maintain their fleshly interests. 6. And they must especially take Christ alone, and not join others in office with him, but renounce all happiness save what is by him, and all Government and Salvation from any which is not in direct subordination to him. Thus you see that there is a great difference betwixt covenanting sincerely, and covenanting in hypocrisy and formality; and so betwixt Faith and Faith. Which I have opened to you the more

largely, because I forgot to do it when I explained the Definition of Faith in that Aphorism, whereto you may annex it.

I conclude then, that multitudes of unregenerate men are yet in Covenant with Christ, though not as the Saints in sincere Covenanting, which I farther prove to you thus: Those that are in Christ, are also in Covenant with Christ: But the unregenerate are in Christ; therefore, &c. That they are in Christ is plain, in *Joh. 15:2, 6*. There are branches in Christ not bearing fruit, which are cut off, and call away. So *Heb. 10:29, 30*. They are sanctified by the blood of the Covenant, and therefore they were in covenant in some sort. I suppose it would be but lost labour to recite all those Scriptures which expressly mention wicked men's entering into Covenant with God, and God with them, and their Covenant-breaking charged on them: you cannot be ignorant of these. Wherefore you see, that it is a common sin to violate the Gospel-Covenant.

To the fifth objection.

YOur fifth is a mere demand of my proof, That Christ is not the only person with whom God the Father entereth Covenant. Which Question I confess I am ashamed to answer: Nor can I tell what to say to you, but [*Read the Scripture*] Doth not the whole scope of it mention God's Covenants with

man? Turn over your whole Bible, & see whether it speak more of covenanting with Christ, or with us? Nor can I imagine what should make you question this, except it be because Mr *Saltmarsh* (or some such other) doth deny it. How could Christ be the Mediator of the Covenant, if it were to himself and not to us, that the Covenant were made? I know Dr *Preston* and other orthodox Divines do affirm, That the Covenant is made primarily with Christ, & then with us: But I confess I scarce relish that form of speech: For it seemeth to speak of one & the same Covenant; & then I cannot understand how it can be true. For is this Covenant made with Christ? [*Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved: and if thou believe not, thou shalt be damned?*] This is the Covenant that is made with us: and who dare say, that this is made with Christ; Or is this Covenant made to Christ? [*I will take the hard hearts our of their bodies, and give them hearts of flesh, &c. I will be merciful to their transgressions, & their sins and iniquities will I remember no more?*] Had Christ, think you, a hard heart to cure? I know some think the latter, clause belongeth to him first, and so to us; *viz.* as he was a sinner by imputation, and so had our transgressions upon him: but very ignorantly: For was God merciful to him concerning the debt? Did he not deal with him in rigorous justice? & upon the terms of the first severer Covenant? and make

him pay the uttermost farthing? Sure the Covenant, whose curse Christ did bear, did know no mercy to transgressors.

Again, the Covenant is also a Law, and Christ himself is styled the Law-giver; therefore can he not be under the Law, or under the Covenant: He is not King and Subject too. Moreover (as I said before) he is the Mediator, and therefore not he to whom the Covenant is made. Perhaps you will say, was not *Moses* both? To which I answer?: 1. *Moses* was but a Typical improper Mediator. 2. *Moses* was in another respect a Subject to the Law whereof he himself was the Mediator; as he was one that had a soul and body to save, or lose, upon the same terms with the rest of the people: But it was not so with our Lord Jesus; He was only a Mediator, as being a middle Person betwixt the offended Majesty, and the offending Subjects: But *Moses* was one of the offending Subjects, chosen out to supply the place of a true Mediator, as his Type. So that though *Moses* was both Mediator, and also a Subject to that Law and Covenant; yet it is not so with Christ. But the words, and tenor of the Covenant it self, are so plain an Argument? that I need to say no more. Yet do I acknowledge that there are several Promises in the Scriptures made only to Christ: As *That he shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied: and by his knowledge justify many, Isai. 53:10, 11. That the Heathen shall*

it given for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession, &c. Psa. 2.

But 1. These not be the Covenant made with us. 2. And for my part, I take it not to be any part of God's Legislative Will, as it referreth to Christ, but only as it belongeth to us, as a prophecy what God would do in the advancing of Christ and his Kingdom, and so of us; and so hath partly the nature of a promise to us also. For that which is commonly called the Covenant betwixt the Father and the Son, is part of God's Purpose or decree, rather than of his Law. The Covenant betwixt the Father and Son was from Eternity: So is not the Law, or Covenant written. The Divine Nature, which undertook the Mediatorship, could not be subject to Laws, or proper Covenants; Christ had no need of engagement from the Father by word or writing for his encouragement or confirmation. So that all the Promises to Christ in Scripture, are either mere Prophecies or do also intimate some Promise to the Church; and so are written for our sakes, and also for the spreading of the Mediator's Glory; but not for proper Covenant ends betwixt the Father and him. And this interpretation Christ himself hath taught me, *John 12: 28, 30.* Christ prayeth to the Father to glorify his Name viz. in the Son's Death and Resurrection; He is answered by a voice from

Heaven, *I have glorified it, and will glorify it:* Christ telleth the people that flood by? *That this voice came not because of him, but for their sakes.*

I conclude therefore, That the Gospel-Covenant, properly and usually, so called, is made betwixt God and man by the means of a Mediator, and so delivered to us in the hands of a Mediator; and may also fitly be said to be betwixt Christ and us: But not properly that it is betwixt the Father and the Son: Much less is the Son the only person covenanted with. God doth indeed give up the World to Christ; and more especially the Elect to be saved by him: But these are not the work of a written or temporary Covenant, but of an eternal Decree.

To the sixth and seventh Objections.

THe same Answer will serve to your sixth and seventh Questions; *viz.* How Faith and Repentance are both promised of God? and required of us; Can they be his conditions and ours too? And then whether the new Covenant be not absolute?

I told you before that the Scripture mentioneth two sorts of Covenants, absolute and conditional. The Absolute Covenant is found in *Ezek.* 11:17, 18. *Jer.* 31:31, 32, 33, 34. *Jer.* 32, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42. & mentioned by the Apostle in *Heb.* 8:10. Concerning this Cove-

nant you must understand, that as in the first promise of it here by the Prophets, it seemeth to be made to the particular Nation of the Jews, and is joined with the promise of their temporal Restoration; so some do question, whether it be yet to them fulfilled? or whether it be not a promise of some extraordinary permanent happiness which they shall receive at their last and great deliverance by the Messiah? (whether by coming personally to reign among them, or not, I now dispute not.) Yet as the Apostle in *Heb.* 8:8, 9. doth extend it further then to the Jews, so must we; but whether the Apostle mention it as an absolute promise, is a great doubt; or whether he only respect the spirituality of the benefits, and so oppose the writing of the Law in our hearts, (which the new Covenant promiseth) to the writing of it in stone, and revealing mercy in the dark way of Ceremonies? But yet, for my part I think you may call it an absolute Promise: But then understand, that this is not the new Law or Covenant made with mankind, revealing to them their duties, and the terms on which they must live or die: This is made to the elect only; this speaketh nothing of duty: No man can have any comfort by this Covenant, till it be performed to him, and till he have received the promised benefits; for no man till then can tell whether it be made for him, or not; It is made to

the elect only; and no man can know himself to be elect, till he be sanctified, and when He is sanctified this promise is fulfilled; therefore the benefits of this promise are not to be received by Faith: for Faith is part of the promised Good, as it is contained in a new & a soft heart seminally, and therefore to receive this promise by Faith, were to believe, that we may receive grace and power to believe, then which what can be more absurd: No man therefore can say before-hand, that he shall have a new and soft heart, because God hath promised it; for he cannot know that it is promised to him: So that I conclude, that this is most properly but a prophecy what God will do, *de eventu* as it hath reference to the parties on whom it shall be fulfilled, and so is the revealed part of God's purposing Will, and belonged not at all to his Preceptive or Legislative Will, by which he doth govern, and will judge the world: But as it is revealed to the Church visible in general, and so in regard of the subject is indefinite, intended only to reveal the quality and spiritual excellency of the Mercy of the New Covenant procured by Christ that so Christ may be honoured, and men drawn to seek after, and entertain this precious Covenant, and not to stick to the old imperfect Dispensation; In this sense it belonged to God's Legislative Will: And in this sense I think

241 [really 251, numbering jumps back]

it is that the Apostle to the *Hebrews* doth recite it; and not in the former sense, as it doth respect the particular persons that shall have it fulfilled, and so is an absolute Covenant to the unknown Elect.

But now the Covenant which is mentioned through the whole Gospel is of another kind, *He that believeth, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned.* This is frequently and plainly expressed, and not so darkly as the former: This is made to all the world, at least, who hear the Gospel: This is the proper new Law and Covenant? by which men must be judged, to justification or condemnation. This properly succeedeth in the place of the first Covenant, which saith *Do this and live:* And this is it which I still mean, when I speak of the new Law or Covenant.

So that now I hope you can hence answer to both your own demands. To the 7. you see there is a Covenant absolute, and a Covenant conditional; but the last is the proper Gospel-Covenant. To the 6. you see, that in the absolute Covenant, or Prophecy, he promiseth faith and repentance (in promising his Spirit, and a new heart) to the elect, who are we know not who. And in the conditional proper Covenant he requireth the same Faith and Repentance of us, if we will be justified and saved. So that they are God's part which he hath dis-

covered that he will perform in one Covenant; and they are made our conditions in another.

Neither is there the least shew of a contradiction betwixt these: For in the absolute Covenant he doth not promise to make us Believe and and Repent against our wills: Much less, that He, or Christ, shall Repent and Believe for us; and so free us from the duty: But that he will give us new and soft hearts, that we may do it our selves, and do it readily and willingly: which that we may do, he commandeth and persuadeth us to it in the conditional Covenant: not bidding us do it without his help; but directing us to the Father to draw us to the Son; and to the Son, as without whom we can do nothing; and to the Spirit, as the sanctifier of our hearts, and exciter of our Graces.

To the eighth Objection.

IN your eighth Question I observe several mistakes. I. You observe not how ill it agreeth with the two former. For if the Covenant were only absolute, then it can be made to none but wicked men: and indeed the absolute Covenant is made to none other. Sure those that God doth promise to bestow new hearts upon, and soft hearts, have yet their old and hard hearts: (except it were meant of a further degree, and not of the

first saving Grace.) 2. And as the absolute, so the great conditional Promise, *Believe and be saved* is also made to ungodly men. Is not this spoken to Unbelievers? Will you speak it to none but those who believe already? Were none of those Jews ungodly, to whom *Peter* saith *Acts* 2:39. *The Promise it made to you and to your children?* But I have proved a little before, that not only as it is a Covenant offered of God, but also as it is a Covenant entered by them, even wicked men are within the Covenant.

2. Yet you say, that [*you no where find any promise to a wicked man.*] Why then you have found but a few of the Scripture promises. I have shewed you, that the absolute promise of a new and soft heart is made to wicked men, and the great conditional promise of the Gospel: Would you have particular examples? In *Gen.* 4:7. there is to *Cain* a conditional promise of acceptance, and the donation of Superiority and Government. *Gen.* 9:11, 12. There is a Covenant betwixt God and every living Creature. *Gen.* 27:39, 40. *Isaac* is God's mouth in blessing *Esau*: Were all the Israelites godly, to whom the Land of *Canaan* was promised and given? *1 Sam.* 10:4, 5, 6, 7. There the Spirit of God and other favours are promised to *Saul*. *1 Kings* 11:31, 32, 33, 38, 39. There are promises to *Jeroboam*. How many score places in the Psalms and

Prophet, do mention promises and Covenants of God to ungodly Israelites? If I should instance in all the promises made to *Ahab*, *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Cyrus*, *Darius*, &c. it would be tedious.

Object. But all these are rather Prophecies then promises. *Answ.* If that which expresseth the engaging of the word and Truth of God to bestow good upon a man be not a Promise, I would you would tell me what is.

These predictions do only declare what God will do, but give no title to the mercy as a Promise doth.

Answ. Did not God give *Cain* a title to his Superiority and Government, and the Israelites Title to the Land of Promise? and so the rest.

Promises do give Title to the thing promised; 1. Either full and absolute: 2. Or imperfect and conditional. In the first sense we have title both by an absolute promise, and by a Conditional Promise, when we have performed the condition, In the latter sense it giveth title to men that have not yet performed the condition.

Object. But these things which are given to wicked men, are not good to them, but evil, therefore it is not properly a promise, *Answ.* It is good in it self and would be to them, but for their wilful abuse. Shall man's sins make God's promises and mercies of

less value? God promised that Christ should come to his own, the Jews (*Isa.* 53. *Mal.* 3: 1, 2, 3.) and yet his own received him not. *Joh.* 1:11. Shall we say therefore, that God threatened them with a Christ, rather then promised him? He promised and gave them both Prophets and Apostles; was it no promise or mercy, because they killed and perfected them?

To conclude this, the Scripture expressly contradicteth your opinion, *Rom.* 9:4. To the Israelites was the Adoption and Glory and Covenants, and the service, and the Promises: And even to them for whom *Paul* would have been accursed: So *Acts* 2:39. And *Heb.* 4:1. Take heed lest a promise being made of entering into his Rest, any of you seem to come short of it. *Prov.* 1:23, 24. 25. Christ promiseth the foolish and the scorers, that he will pour out his Spirit to them, if they will turn at his reproof. *Amos* 4:5, 6. *Seek the Lord, and your soul shall live.* *Isa.* 55:6, 7. *Seek the Lord while he may be found; Call upon him while he is near: Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy on him; and to our God, and he will abundantly pardon.*

Are not all these promises to wicked men?

Object. But when they return and repent, they are not wicked.

Answ. But is not this conditional promise made to them before they return?

Object. the Promise is only to Believers, therefore not to all.

Answ. Either you speak of the making, or of the fulfilling of it: It is fulfilled only to Believers, but it is made and offered to all that hear it, on condition of Believing, as is proved. *Object.* Believing is not the condition of the promise, but only the qualification of the persons to whom it is made.

Answ. This Objection hath more subtilty then sense: Is not Believing (in plain English) a Duty required in the Promise by the free Promiser and Law-giver, of him to whom the Promise is made and sent, and that upon these terms, that if he perform it, the thing promised shall be his, otherwise it shall not? And is not this properly a condition required of the party if he will enjoy the thing promised? When you say [It is a qualification of the person to whom the Promise is made] you speak in the darkness of ambiguity: For 1. Do you mean it is a qualification which he hath before the Promise is made to him? If so, I have proved the contrary already. Or is it his qualification afterwards, so it is indeed: But not of all to whom it is made, but of all to whom it shall be fulfilled. Again, do you mean an habitual qualification or an Actual? I

doubt not, but you know it is the act of Faith which we dispute of: And what is the difference betwixt such an active qualification, required on the terms before mentioned, and a proper condition?

But I perceive that which you stick at, is, that the Promises are all Yea and Amen in Christ, and therefore are made to none but those in Christ.

Answ. It will be long before you will prove the Consequence. They are made only on the ground of Christ's undertaking, and he is the Mediator of them, and in him they are sure. But doth it therefore follow, that Christ dispengeth then to none but those that are in him? Wicked men have benefits by Christ, even those that are not in him so much as by a visible profession: And why then may they not have some promises? Yet I know that believers are oft called in Scripture, the Children, and Heirs of the Promise. But to understand this, you must know, 1. That the Holy Ghost hath chiefly the respect to the Thing promised, and of that Believers are the only Heirs: If you also consider, that he speaks chiefly of the great Promises of Reconciliation, Remission, Sanctification, Adoption, glorification. 2. I told you before, that the promise before we perform the Condition doth give a remote, imper-

fect, loosable title to the good promised: And so the wicked are children of promise. But the Promise when we have performed the Condition, (as also the absolute promises) doth give an immediate, proper, certain Title to the good promised, so that a man may say, it is mine: And thus only the faithful are the heirs of the Promise: They only have a propriety in the spiritual and special Mercies there promised. But a wicked Israelite may have propriety in his Inheritance by virtue of Divine Promise and Donation. For Christ hath led captivity captive, and received gifts for men, even for the Rebellious, that the Lord might dwell among them, *Psal.* 68:18.

To the 9. Objection.

YOur 9. Objection is, That if I make the Covenant to belong to wicked men, I may as well give them the seals.

To which I answer you, 1. You must mean only the main Covenant of grace, and not inferior promises and Covenants: For the Sacraments are only to seal to the main Covenant, 2. As you must remember I distinguished betwixt the Covenant offered and the Covenant entered by mutual consent; so must you distinguish accordingly betwixt two sorts of wicked men: 1. Open

Infidels, who never accepted and consented to the offered Covenant. 2. Those who have consented and entered the Covenant, and listed their names in the roll of Christ: but yet not sincerely unreservedly, entirely, as is necessary to salvation. To the former of these you may not give the seals: For they are not willing of them as such: And they are not to be forced upon any: Neither are the seals useful till the accepting and entering of the Covenant.

But to the latter the seals are most properly to be given by the Minister, except they do again renounce Christ by word or deed, or by some gross sin do constrain us to suspend their enjoyment of such priviledges while they are under trial, and till they discover their repentance.

Quest. What do you take for such announcing of their Covenant?

Ans. 1. When they shall in plain terms renounce it, as Christians do that turn Turks.

2. When they renounce or deny any fundamental Article of the Faith.

3. When they do (not through weakness, but) wilfully and obstinately refuse to yield obedience to Christ, for this is a renouncing of their subjection to him, which is an essential part of their Covenant and Faith; and it is a renouncing of his kingly

Office? And so a renouncing of Christ, whew they say, He shall not reign over us. And though such may acknowledge him in words, yet in works they do deny him, being disobedient, and to every good work, reprobate, *Tit.* 1:16. If therefore you shall deny, the seals to any man that is thus in Covenant with Christ before he do thus disclaim his Covenant, you must do it at your peril. Therefore you must not undertake to be the Judge of his sincerity in the Covenant, except he plainly discover that he is not serious. Dare not you to assume God's Prerogative of searching the heart, nor to dispence God's seals upon your conjectures of the probability or improbability of men's sincerity. Neither must you deny the seals to them, for any smaller sin then as aforesaid: For as every, sin is not a breach of Covenant, so every sin must not deny them, the seals.

Object. Then we must not deny it to them for every gross sin neither; seeing you affirm, that every gross sin breaketh not Covenant.

Answ. Yet because, he that, liveth in known gross sin, cannot consent to the Kingly Office or Government of Christ over him, therefore we have just cause to suspend the giving of the seals, and also of fellowship with him, while we try whether he did

it through weakness or wilfulness.

Ob. But how shall we know that?

Answ. Christ hath lined us out the way: We must reprove him, and see whether he will hear and reform; if he do not we must tell the Church, and so admonish and shame him publicly: If he hear not the Church we are to account him as a man without the Covenant? and so unfit for seals or communion.

Quest. But when shall I take him for one that will not hear the Church?

Answ. When he will not be persuaded to confess and bewail his sin, nor to give over the practice of it.

So that I do considerably advise you (after long study of this point, and as cautelous a proceeding as most have used) for you know my former Judgement, and that I never administered the Sacrament, till within this year, and that I was then invited to it by an eminent wonder of providence) I say, I advise you to beware how you deny to men the seals, till you have tried with them this way prescribed by Christ: Christ is free in entertaining, and so must we; Christ putteth away none, but them that put away themselves; and then doth he call after them as long as there is hope of hearing, as one that is grieved at their destruction, and not

delighted in the death of sinners, but had rather they would return and live: And even thus must we do too. Laziness is the common cause of separation; when we should go with words of piety and love, and with tears beseech sinners to return to their duty, and shew them their danger; we neglect all this, to save us the labour and the suffering that sometime follows this duty; we will plead that they are no Church-Members, and so not the Brethren that we are bound to admonish, and so lazily separate from them, and say as *Cain*, Am I my Brothers keeper? or as the man to Christ, who is my Neighbour? And thus when we have made his sin our own by our silence, and not reproving him then we excommunicate him for it out of our society and from the Ordinances, and so judge our selves out of our own mouths. Or we separate from him for the neglect of some duty, when we our selves have neglected both to him and others, this, great and excellent duty of faithful admonition. It is more comfortable to recover one soul then to call off many by separation. Though I know that the avoiding communion with wilful offenders, who by this due admonition will not be reclaimed, is a most necessary & useful duty too. But do not execute a man before he is judged; nor judge him before you have heard him speak, & fully proved that

obstinacy is added to his sin; (except it be to suspend him while he is under this legal trial,) But perhaps you will object, that we have no discipline established, & so no Authority to do thus and the means are vain which cannot attain their end. To which I answer: 1. You have divine authority: 2. And may do as much as I press without a Presbytry, First, you may admonish privately: Secondly, before witness: Thirdly, you may bring your Congregation to this, that the parties offended, may accuse them openly: (The Presbyterians deny not to the Congregation the audience and cognizance of the Fact, but only the power of judicial sentencing.) And here you may admonish them before all: Fourthly, if yet they prove obstinate, you may by your Ministerial Authority; 1. Pronounce against him by name what the Scripture pronounceth against such sinners: particularly, that he is unfit to be a Church-Member, as openly denying obedience to the known Laws of Christ, 2. You may charge the people from Scripture to avoid familiarity with him. 3. You may also acquaint the Magistrate with his duty, to thrust him out, if he violently intrude into Communion, or disturb the Ordinances. 4. You may forbear to deliver the Sacrament particularly to his hands. 5. You may enter and publish your

dissent and dislike, if he intrude, and take it himself. All this I could most easily and beyond doubt prove your duty as you are a Christian and a Minister. And if there be any more that a Classis may do, yet do you do this in the mean time: only be sure you try all means in private (if the fault be not in public) before you bring a man in public: And be sure you do it in tenderness and love, and rather with wary than passionate reproaches; And be sure that you do it only in case of undeniable sins, and not in doubtful disputable Cases: And be sure that the matter of Fact be undoubtedly proved: And that no man be suffered to traduce another publicly in a wrong way: Or if he do, that he be brought to acknowledgement. The word Excommunication comprizeth several Acts: Those before mentioned belong to you as a Minister, and are part of your proper Preaching declarative power, which you may perform by your Nuntiative authority. The power of Classes and Synods (I think) doth differ only gradually, and not specifically from that of every minister. I am ashamed that I have contrary to my first Purpose, said so much of this unpleasing controversy. But when you are next at leisure privately, I shall undertake to prove all this to you from Scripture; and that the Keys are put by Christ into the hands of every Minister

singly: and that with sobriety and wisdom you may thus name the offenders publicly, as all Scripture Ministers have been used to do. And if you question whether our ordinary Congregations are true real Churches, where such works may be managed. I shall prove that they are, by giving you a better definition of a Church, then that which you gave me, and then trying our Churches by it: In the mean time this is not matter to intermix here.

BUt you cannot, it seems digest Mr. *Blake's* assertion, that the Sacraments do seal but conditionally. Answer, I have not Mr. *Blake's* book by me, and therefore how he explaineth himself I cannot tell; But I remember he hath oft said so in conference with me. But let me tell you two or three things. 1. That I question, whether you well understand him. 2. Or whether you be able to confute it, as thus to except against it, 3. That Mr. *Blake* is as truly conscientious whom he admitteth as you.

But for the Controversy, you must consider it a little more distinctly before you are like, to understand it rightly. It is in vain to enquire, whether the Sacraments do seal absolutely or conditionally, till you first know well what it is that they seal.

Let us first therefore resolve that Question, what they seal? and then enquire how they seal? You know a Christian doth gather the assurance of his Justification and Salvation by way of Argumentation, thus: He that believeth is justified, and shall be saved: But, I believe; therefore I am justified and shall be saved. Now the Question is which of the parts of this Argument the Sacrament doth seal to? Whether to the Major, the Minor, or the Conclusion? To which I answer: 1. That it sealeth to the Truth of God's promise (which is the Major proportion,) is unquestionable. But whether to this alone, is all the doubt? 2. That it sealeth not to the truth of the Minor Proportion, (that is, to the truth of our Believing) I take also for to be beyond dispute, For, first it should else seal to that which is now here written: For no Scripture saith, that I do believe. 2. And then it should be used to strengthen my Faith, in that which is no object of Faith: For, [that I do believe] is not matter of Faith, or to be believed, but matter of internal sense, or to be known by the reflex act of the understanding. 3. Also God should else set his seal, to my part or condition of the Covenant, as well as his own, and seal to the truth of my word, as well as to the truth of his own; for a justifying and having us, is God's condition, which he un-

dertaketh to perform; so believing or accepting Christ is our condition, which we there profess to perform. So that it is doubtless, that a Sacrament as it is God's engaging sign or seal, doth not seal to the truth of my faith, or sincerity of my heart in Covenanting: It were a most gross conceit to imagine this.

But withal you must understand, that as there is in the Sacrament reciprocal actions, God's giving, and our receiving; so is the Sacrament accordingly a mutual engaging sign or seal. As it is given, it is God's seal; so that as in this full Covenant there is a mutual engaging; so there is a mutual sealing. God saith to us, *here is my Son who hath bought thee, take him for thy Lord and Saviour, and I will be thy reconciled God, and pardon and glorify thee:* And to this he sets his seal. The sinner saith, *I am willing Lord, I here take Christ for my King, and Saviour, and Husband; and deliver up my self accordingly to him:* And hereto by receiving the offered elements, he setteth his engaging sign or seal; so that the Sacrament is the seal of the whole Covenant.

But yet you must remember, that in the present controversy, we meddle not with it as it is man's seal, but only as it is God's.

So then it is clear, that as it is God's seal, it sealeth the major proposition, and as it is ours, to the minor.

But yet here you must further distinguish betwixt sealing up the promise as true in it self, and sealing it with application as true to me. And it is the latter that the Sacrament doth, the delivery being God's act of application, & the receiving ours; so that the Proposition which God sealeth to, runs thus, *If thou believe, I do pardon thee, and will save thee.*

3. But the great Question is, Whether the Sacrament do seal to the conclusion also, *That I am justified, and shall he saved?* To which I answer, No, directly and properly it doth not; and that is evident from the arguments before laid down, whereby I proved that the Sacraments seal not to the minor.

For 1. this conclusion is now here written in Scripture.

2. And therefore is not properly the object of Faith: whereas the seals are for confirmation of Faith.

3. Otherwise every man rightly receiving the seals, must needs be certainly justified & saved.

4. And no Minister can groundedly administer the Sacraments to any man but himself, because he can be certain of no man's justification and salvation, being not certain of the sincerity of their Faith. And if he should adventure to administer it upon probabilities and charitable conjectures, then should he be guilty of prophaning the ordinance, and every time he mistaketh,

he should set the seal of God to a lie: And who then durst ever administer a Sacrament, being never certain: but that he shall thus abuse it? I confess ingenueously to you, that it was the ignorance of this one point which chiefly caused me to abstain from administering the Lord's Supper so many years: I did not understand, that it was neither the *minor*, nor conclusion, but only the major proposition of the foresaid Argument, which God thus sealeth. And I am sorry to see what advantage many of our most learned Divines have given the Papists here. As one error draws on many, and leadeth a man into a labyrinth of absurdities; so our Divines being first mistaken in the nature of justifying faith thinking that it consisteth in *A Belief of the pardon of my own sins*, (which is this conclusion) have therefore thought that this is it which the Sacrament sealeth. And when the Papists allege, that it is no where written *that such or such a man is justified* we answer them that it being written *That he that believeth is justified* this is equivalent: A gross mistake: As if the major proposition alone were equivalent to the conclusion; or as if the conclusion must, or can be merely *Credenda*, a proper object of Faith, when but one of the promises is

matter of faith, & the other of sense or knowledge, The truth is the major, *He that believeth shall be saved* is received by Faith: The minor *that I do sincerely believe* is known by inward sense and self-reflexion: And the conclusion therefore I shall be saved is neither properly to be believed nor felt, but known by reason, deducing it from the two former; so that faith, sense, and reason are all necessary to the producing our assurance,

So you see, what it is that is sealed to.

2. Now let us consider, how it sealeth? Whether absolutely or conditionally? And I answer, It sealeth absolutely. For the promise of God which it sealeth is not conditionally, but absolutely true.

So that the sum of all I have said is this (which answereth the several questions.)

The Sacrament sealeth not the absolute Covenant or Promise, but the conditional *Believe and live*.

It sealeth not the truth of my Covenant, as it is God's seal; or it sealeth not to the truth of my faith.

It sealeth not to the certainty of my justification and salvation.

But it sealeth to God's part of the conditional Covenant.

And sealeth this conditional promise, not conditionally, but absolutely, as of undoubted truth.

6. And not only as true in it self, but true with application to me.

So that by this time you may discern what is their meaning, who say, that the Sacraments do seal but conditionally, that is, as it sealeth to the truth of the major (which is the promise) so thereby it may be said to seal conditionally to the conclusion; for the conclusion is, as it were, therein contained, upon condition or supposition of the minor proposition. He that saith, *All Believers shall be saved*, saith as much as that *I shall be saved*, it being supposed that I am a Believer: And so you must understand our Divines in this, Yet this speech is less proper: For to speak properly, it doth not seal to the conclusion at all; yet it is very useful to help us in raising that conclusion, and to be persuaded, that we are justified, because it so confirmeth our belief of that promise, which is one of the grounds of the Conclusion.

For your inference in the last words of your objection *then let all come that will; If you mean All that will, though they come to mock or abuse the ordinance*, then it will no way follow from the doctrine which I have new opened. But if you mean, *Let all come that will seriously, really, or apparently, enter or renew their Covenant with Christ*. I think that to be no dangerous or absurd consequence. If Christ when he offereth himself, and the thing signified, do say, *Let him that is athirst, come; and whoever will, let him take*

the water of life freely, Rev. 22:17. Why may not I say so of the sign and seal, to those that seriously profess their thirst. Sure I shall speak but as Christ hath taught me, and that according to the very scope of the Gospel, and the nature of the Covenant of free grace. And I wonder that those men who cry up the nature of free grace so much, should yet so oppose this free offer of it, and the sealing the free Covenant to them that lay claim to it upon Christ's invitation.

To the tenth and eleventh Objections.

YOUR 10. and 11. objections you raise upon my exceptions against the book, called, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*: And first you mention the Doctrine, and then the Book.

1. You think, that *Do this and live* is the voice of the Law of works only, and not of the Law or Covenant of Grace, and that we may not make the obtaining of life & salvation the end of duty, but must obey in mere love, and from thankfulness for the life we have received.

To all which I answer. 1. By way of explication; and 2. of probation of my assertions.

1. *Do this and live*, in several senses, is the language of both Law and Gospel. 1. When the Law speaketh it, the sense is this; *If thou perfectly keep the Laws that I have given thee or shall give thee, so long thou shalt continue this life in*

the earthly Paradise which I have given thee: But if once thou sin, thou shalt die.

I. When the Gospel speaketh it, the sense is thus: Though thou hast incurred the penalty of the Law by thy sin, yet Christ hath made satisfaction: Do but accept him for Lord and Saviour, and renouncing all other, deliver up thy self unreservedly to him, and love him above all, and obey him sincerely, both in doing and suffering, and overcome & persevere herein to the end; and thou shalt be justified from all that the Law can accuse of, and restored to the favour and blessings which thou hast lost, and to a far greater.

Thus the Gospel saith, *Do this and live.* That the Gospel commandeth all this, I know you will not question; and that this is doing, you must needs acknowledge. But all the question is, whether we may do it that we may live? I have fully explained to you in this Treatise already in what sense our doing is required, and to what ends: *viz.* not to be any part of a legal Righteousness nor any part of satisfaction for our unrighteousness, but to be our Gospel righteousness, or the condition of our participation in Christ, who is our legal Righteousness, and so of all the benefits that come with him.

In these several respects and senses following the Gospel commandeth us to act for life.

A wicked man, or unbeliever, may, and must hear the Word, pray, enquire of others, &c. that so he may obtain the first life of grace and faith. This I now prove, *Isa.* 55:3, 6, 7. *Jonas* 3:8, 9, 10. *Pro.* 1:23, 24, 25. *Amos* 5:4. *Acts* 2:37. *Isa.* 1:16. *Mat.* 11:15. & 13:43. *Luk.* 16:29:31. *Joh.* 5:25. *Acts* 10:1, 2, 22, 23. *Rom.* 10:13, 14. *1 Tim.* 4:16. *Heb.* 3:7. *Rev.* 3:20.

Yet do not I affirm, that God never preventeth men's endeavours; he is sometime found of them that sought him not. Nor do I say, that God hath promised the life of Grace to the endeavours of nature; But their duty is to seek life; and half promises, and many encouragements God hath given them; such as that in *Joel* 2:12, 13, 14. Who knoweth but God will, &c, So *Zeph.* 2:3. *Exod.* 32:30. And that in *Acts* 8:7. 2. *Pray therefore if perhaps the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven thee.*

That a man may act for the increase of this spiritual life when he hath it, methinks you should not doubt if you do see, *1 Pet.* 2:1, 2. & 1:22. &c *2 Pet.* 1:5, 6, 7, 8. & 3:18. And the Parable of the Talents *Mat.* 25:26, 27, 28, 30.

3. That we may and must act for the life of Reconciliation;, and Justification, and Adoption, is beyond dispute: How oft doth Scripture call on men, to Repent, to Believe, to Pray, to forgive others, and to reform, that their sins may be forgiven them? I have quoted the Scriptures before, when I opened the conditions of justification, *Isa.* 1:16, 17, 18. *Isa.* 55:6, 7. *Acts* 8:22. *Jam.* 5:15. And we are still said to be justified by faith, which is an act of ours.

4. That we may act for to obtain assurance both of our justification and sanctification is undeniable, *2 Pet.* 1:10. *2 Cor.* 13:5. &c.

5. That we may act for eternal life and salvation; methinks, he that beareth the face of a Christian, should not deny: and that both for, 1. Title to it, 2. Assurance of our enjoying it: & 3. for possession it self. I shall but quote the Scriptures for brevity sake, desiring you to read them, and save me the labour of transcribing them, *Rev.* 22:14.

John 5:39, 40. *Mat.* 11:12. and 7:13. *Luke* 13:24. *Phil.* 2:17. *Rom.* 2:7, 10. *1 Cor.* 9:24. *2 Tim.* 2:5, 12. *1 Tim.* 6:12, 18, 19. *Phil.* 3:14. *Mat.* 25. *1 Cor.* 15. last. *2 Cor.* 4:17. and 5:10, 11. *2 Pet.* 1:10, 11. *Luke* 11:28, *Heb.* 4:1. *Luke* 12:5. *1 Cor.* 9:17. These last places shew, that the escaping hell, and damnation, is a necessary end of our actings and duties, as well as the obtaining of heaven.

If when you have read and weighed these Scriptures, you be not convinced, that we may act or do for life and salvation, (and so that *Do this and live* is in some sense the language of the Gospel) I shall question, whether you make the Scripture the Rule of your faith, or be not rather one of them that can force upon themselves a faith of one or others making.

Object. But it is not the most excellent and Gospel-like frame of spirit, to do all out of mere love to God, and from Thankfulness for life obtained by Christ, and given us.

Answ. 1. If it come not from love to God, it is not sincere.

2. Yet doth not the Gospel any where set our love to God, and to our own souls, in opposition; nor teach us to love God, and not our selves: but contrarily joineth them both together, and commandeth us both. The love of our selves, and desire of our preservation, would never have been planted so deeply in our natures by the God of nature, if it had been unlawful.

I conclude therefore, that to love God, and not our selves, and so to do all without respect to our own good, is no Gospel frame of spirit.

2. Thankfulness for what we have received, either in possession, title, or promise, must be a singular spur to put us on duty. But I pray you tell me, Have you received all the life and mercy you do expect? Are you in Heaven already? Have you all the grace that you need or desire in degree? if not, why may you not labour for that you have not, as well as be thankful for that you have? Or have you as full a certainty of it hereafter, as you do desire? If not, why may you not labour for it.

AND to shew you the vanity, and Intolerable, Admnable wickedness of this doctrine, let me put to you a few more considerations.

1. Do you think you may act for your natural life, to preserve it, or recover and repair any decayings in it? it not, why will you labour, and eat, and drink, and sleep? why will you seek to the Physician when you are sick? Do you all this in mere love, or thankfulness, or from obedience which hath no further end? Or if you do, why may you not do as much for your soul, as for your body? Is it less worth, or doth not God require it, or will he not give you leave? Hath not Christ redeemed your body also? and is it not his purchase, and charge, and work to provide for it? And yet you know well

enough, that this excuseth not you from your duty; and why then should it excuse you from using means for your soul?

Nay, hath not God put you upon far more for your soul, then for your body? For this life, he hath bid you be careful for nothing; cast all your care on him, for he careth for you; Care not for to morrow: *Why are ye careful O ye of little faith? Labour not for the food that perisheth: Lay not up for your selves a treasure on earthy &c.* But hath he said so concerning the life of your souls in immortality, Care not, labour not, lay not up a treasure in heaven? Or rather hath he not commanded you the clean contrary, to care, to fear, to labour, to strive, to fight, to run, and this withal your might and strength? And yet do you think you may not all or work for life and salvation?

3. I pray you tell me. Do you ever use to pray or no? Do you think it necessary or lawful to pray (pardon me for putting such gross interrogatories to you; for the main question which you raise, is far more gross:) If you do pray, what do you pray for? Is it only for your body, or also for your soul? And is not earned praying for life, pardon, and salvation, some proper kind of doing? it may be you will say, you pray only for God's glory, and for the Church: But hath not God as much care of his Church and his glory, as of your soul? or may you pray for other men's souls, and not your own, when you are bound to love them but as your self? Sure,

if you may not make the obtaining of life, the end of your labour and duty, you may not make it the end of your Prayers, which are part of your labour and duty.

And indeed according to the opinion which I oppose, it must needs follow, that Petition is to be laid aside, and no part of prayer lawful, but praise and thanksgiving.

4. Do you not forget to make a difference betwixt earth and Heaven? I assure you, if you do, it will prove a foul mistake; if you once begin to think you are in Heaven, and as you would be, and all the work is done, and you have nothing to do but return thanks, you shall ere long, I warrant you, be convinced roundly of your error. And I pray you, what do you less by this opinion, then say, Soul, take thy rest, I am well, I have enough: For if you must not labour for life, and salvation, but only in thankfulness obey him that hath saved you: What is this, but the work of Heaven? Indeed there, and only there we shall have nothing to do, but to love, and joy, and, praise, and be thankful.

5. Methinks, if you do but consider what Heaven and Hell, reward and the punishment are, you should easily come to your self and the truth. Heaven and reward is nothing else but the enjoyment of God eternally in perfection: Hell or the punishment is most in the loss of this enjoyment, and the self-tormentings that will eternally follow the considerati-

on thereof, and of the folly that procured it.

Now is it such a legal slavish mercenary thing for a Christian to seek after the fruition of God? Or to be careful that he may not be everlastingly deprived of it? is it possible that any sober considering man can think so?

6. Do you not think that you may and must seek after the enjoyment of God in those beginnings and fore-tastes which are here to be expected? May not that be the end of your duties, care, fear, labour, watchfulness? May you not groan after him, and enquire, and turn the stream of your endeavours this way? And may you not be jealous, and careful, and watchful, lest you should loose what of God you do enjoy; and lest any strangeness or displeasure should arise? I dare not question, but that this is the very business which you mind, and the usual frame of your spirit.

And is it possible, that you can think it our duty, to seek the fore-tastes, and the first fruits of Heaven? and yet think it unlawful to labour for the full everlasting possession? How can these hang together.

Consider seriously, I pray you? to what end God implanted such affections and powers in your soul. Why did he create in you a power and propensity to intend the ultimate end in all your endeavours, to value that end, to love it, desire it, study and care how to obtain it; to fear the loss of it, and to loath all that resisteth your frui-

tion, to seek and labour after its enjoyment? Why is the love of our selves, and desire of our preservation so natural? Surely it is lawful for you to care and desire, and labour for God in Heaven, or for nothing: And its our duty to fear the loss of this, or to fear no evil at al: and I can hardly think that God would create such powers in the soul which should be utterly useless. Then let us no more cry down the abuse of our affections and powers, but the life of them; and so turn worse then Stoics: this is such a making God the Author of sin, as few men durst ever before be guilty of. And certainly, if the escaping of Hell and the obtaining of Heaven may not be the end and work of all these affections, then much less may any inferior thing.

Nay, consider whether you do not make the soul and life of man to be useless as to the obtaining of any future happiness: And so you take down the blessed order which God hath established in nature by Creation, and maintained in the constant course of providence; and this you undeniably do in taking down from us the ultimate end: Take down that, and all inferior ends are nothing, and all means do lose their nature, and become useless: and so the soul of the most gracious man shall be no fitter to attain and prosecute its end, and do no more thereto then a beast or a stone; This consequence is undeniable.

9. Nay, consider whether you do not make all the graces of the Spirit (except love, joy, and

thankfulness) to be almost vain, and the blessed supernatural work of the spirit upon us, to be a useless labour? doth not God only create in nature, but also new create by grace in us such things as Desire, Care, Fear, Zeal, Courage, Diligence, Watchfulness, &c. and may we not use them? Surely, if we may not use them for Heaven, then for nothing. And I cannot believe that God will at so dear a rate plant in us a heavenly nature, and these heavenly Graces, and then make it our sin to use them for Heaven, and that while we are here in the way where we have such need of them.

But especially, I would have you thoroughly consider to what end God did fill his word so with Precepts, Prohibitions. Promises conditional, and Threats? Doth not almost all the Scripture for the doctrinal part consist of these? And are not Precepts to put us on to duty? And hath not every duty its end even for our selves? And can it be any other then the obtaining of the fruition of God in Heaven? so what end have the prohibition else? And what are the conditional promises for, but to stir us up to believe and to perform the conditions, that so we may enjoy the promised good? And why are the Threatenings but with the fear of the evil threatened to deter us from the sin, and to the duty? What think you is the reason that God doth so commonly Promise Heaven, and threaten Hell, if it be unlawful for us to labour for Heaven, and

to escape Hell? Do you not hereby insinuate an accusation of vanity at least against God and his Laws? Nay, the very essence of the Covenants doth consist in all these parts conjunct: And will you also overthrow the very essential parts of the Law of Covenant, by making it unlawful for us to admit their proper use? To quote the particular places for this, would be needless and endless.

II. Methinks you should be so far from questioning the lawfulness of labouring for Heaven, that you should rather think you have almost nothing else to labour for. God's glory and your salvation, not disjunct, but conjunct, are all the business you have to look after: What do you live for? Why have you all the mercies of your life? Is it only that you may be thankful for life and mercy? Or that you might also improve them to some further advantage? I hope (for all your question) that you make it the greatest labour of your life to seek for assurance and obtainment of your eternal happiness in God.

And once more let me entreat you to consider, whether there be any hope of that man's salvation, who shall reduce this your doctrine into his practice? I abhor censoriousness, but I desire it may be considered, because it is a matter of such unspeakable importance: For surely, if this Doctrine practised will not stand with salvation, it is time for you and all men to abhor it: And

indeed, this is it that maketh me say so much against it, because it hath a holy pretence, and is very plausible to the inconsiderate, but yet is no better then damnable if it be practised: I say, if practised, because the opinion as such is not so; for I believe many a godly man doth err as souly as this. But it is possible for a man by reading and argument, to be drawn to entertain some opinions in his brain, (not only consequently, but) directly contrary to the practice of his heart and life, and yet himself to continue that practice: Even as a wicked man may entertain those truths into his brain in speculation, which directly to contradict his continued practice. Now it being the practice here that is of absolute necessity to salvation, and not the opinion, I doubt not but such that err only in this opinion, not reducing, it into practice, may be saved.

But if practised, I cannot see but it will certainly damn.

For search the Scriptures impartially and, consider, whether seeking Heaven be not necessary to the obtaining of it? And whether those that seek not, and labour not for it, be not shut out? View over the places which I quoted you before, and then judge. Must not all that will have life, come to Christ, that they may have it? *John* 5: 39, 40, And must not they strive to enter in at the straight gate, and lay violent hands on the Kingdom of Heaven? And lay up for themselves a treasure in heaven, and seek the Kingdom of

God and his Righteousness in the first place, *Matth.* 6:33. And press on that we may attain the Resurrection, *Philip.* 3:14. And lay up a good foundation against the time to come, doing good works, and lay hold on eternal life, 1 *Timoth.* 6:12, 18, 19. And work out our salvation with fear and trembling, *Phil.* 2:12. And do his commandments, that we may have right to the Tree of Life, and enter in by the gates into the City, *Rev.* 22:14. And make friends of the unrighteous Mammon, that they may receive us into everlasting habitations; See also *Rev.* 2:7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19. 23:26, 27, 28, 29. and 3:2, 3,4, 5, 8:10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22. See also *Mat.* 18:8, 9. *John* 5:29. *Acts* 2:28, 1 *Tim.* 4:8. *Jam.* 1:12. 1 *Pet.* 3:10. *Rom.* 2:7. 1 *Tim.* 1:2. 2 *Tim.* 4:18. *Mat.* 5:12. & 6:1. & 19:21. *Luk.* 10:20. *Phil.* 1:19. 1 *Pet.* 1:9. *Heb.* 2:3. 2 *Tim.* 2:10. 1 *Thes.* 5:8, 9. *Acts* 16:17.

Yea, we are commanded to fear him that is able to destroy both soul and body in Hell: even under that consideration to fear him, *Luke* 12:5. And to fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into rest, we should come short of it, *Heb.* 4:1. And what is that but to fear the loss of Heaven, or to fear Hell? *Prov.* 15:24. *Mar.* 3:29, & 10:16, *Mat.* 5:25. *Rom.* 11:21, 44. 1 *Cor.* 10:12. *Heb.* 12:15, 16. *James* 5:9, 12.

But I must stop; for if I should quote all Scriptures that prove this, I should transcribe a great part of the Bible.

Consider then, if even many that seek to enter shall not be able, whether they are like to enter that never seek? And if the righteous be scarcely saved, what shall become of them that thought it unlawful to labour for salvation?

15. Lastly, how is it that you do not see, that by this Doctrine you condemn not all the Saints only, but even the Lord himself? Did not *Paul* therefore keep under his body, and bring it into subjection, lest when he had preached to others, himself should be a cast-away? *1 Cor. 9:27.* what can be plainer? Did not *Abraham* obey because he looked for a City which had foundations? *Heb. 11:10.* And *Moses*, because he had respect to the recompence at Reward? 26. And all that cloud of witnesses obey and suffer, that they might attain a better Resurrection? 35. and did they not seek a better Country, that is, an heavenly; and therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: *for he hath prepared for them a City,* ver. 16. Do not all that confess themselves strangers on earth, plainly declare that they seek another Country? ver. 13, 14. Whosoever therefore shall hereafter tell you, that you must not do good to attain salvation or escape damnation, as being too mercenary and slavish for a Son of God; abhorre his Doctrine, though he were an Angel from heaven: And if this satisfy you not, look to Jesus the Author and Finisher of your Faith, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set

down at the right hand of God; *Heb.* 12:12. *Rom.* 14:9. And as *Adam* fell to be liker the Devil when he needs would be as God: so take heed whither you are falling when you will be better than Jesus Christ,

And do I after all this need to answer the Common objections, that it is mercenary and slavish, to labour for salvation? Must I be put to prove that; the Apostles and Christ himself were not mercenary slaves? or that God's Word hath not prescribed us a slavish task? Indeed if we did all for a reward distant from God, and for that alone, without any conjunction of Filial love, and expected this Reward for the worth of our work, then it might be well called Mercenary and slavish. But who among us plead for such a working.

FRom all this you may gather part of the Answer to your next Question: why I except against the book called, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*? Because it is guilty of this heinous Doctrine. Yet further let me tell you, that I much value the greatest part of that Book, and commend the industry of the Author, and judge him a man of godliness and Moderation by his writing: And had I thought as meanly of it, as I do of *Colyer Sprigs*, *Hobsons*, and many such abominable Pamphlets that now fly abroad I should not have thought it worthy the taking so much notice of. But because it is otherwise useful, I thought meet to give you warning, that you drink not in the evil

with the good. And especially because the names that so applaud it, may be a probable snare to entangle you herein. And I conjecture the Author's ingenuity to be such, that he will be glad to know his own mistakes, and to correct them: Otherwise I am unfeignedly tender of depraving or carping at any man's labours. Some of these mistaking passages I will shew you briefly. As page 174. *Quest.* Would you not have believers to eschew evil and do good for fear of Hell, or for hope of Heaven? *Ans.* No indeed, I would not have any beleiver do the one or the other: for so far as they do so, their obedience is but slavish, &c. To which end he allegeth, *Luke* 1:74, 75. But that speaks of Freedom from fear of our Enemies, such as Christ forbids in *Luke* 12:5. where yet he commandeth the fearing of God: And consequently, even that fear of enemies is forbidden, as they stand in opposition to God, and not as his instruments in subordination. Or if it be even a fear of God that is there meant; yet it cannot be all fear of him or his displeasure: so far as we are in danger of sin or suffering, we must fear it: and so far as our assurance is still imperfect: a jealousy of our own hearts, and a dreadful reverence of God also are necessary. But not the Legal terrors of our former bondage, such as arise from the apprehension of sin unpardoned, and of God as being our Enemy.

In the 180 Page, he denieth the plain sense of the Text. *Mat.* 10:28.

In the 155 page, he makes this the difference between the two Covenants: One saith, Do this and Live: the other saith, Live and do this, The one saith, Do this, for life. The other saith, Do this from life.

But I have proved fully, that the Gospel also saith, Do this for life.

So in his second part, page 190. His great note to know the voice of the Law by, is this, [that when in Scripture there is any moral work commanded to be done either for the eschewing of punishment, or upon promise of any reward temporal or eternal; or else when any promise is made with the condition of any work to be done, which is commanded in the Law; there is to be understood the voice of the Law.

A notorious and dangerous mistake, which would make almost all the New Testament, and the very Sermons of Christ himself to be nothing but the Law of works, I have fully proved before, that moral duties as part of our sincere obedience to Christ, are part of the condition of our Salvation; and for it to be performed. And even Faith is a moral duty. It is piety that any Christian should no better know the Law from the Gospel: especially one that pretendeth to discover it to others.

So in the next page 191, he intolerably abuseth the Scripture, in affirming that of 2 *Thes.* 2:12. 10. to be the voice of the Law, and so making Paul a Legal Preacher.

And as shamefully doth he abuse 1 Cor. 6:9, 10, As if the Apostle when he biddeth them, not to be deceived, were deceiving them himself in telling them, that no unrighteous person, fornicators adulterers, &c. *shall inherit the Kingdom of God*. Is this Law? Then let me be a Preacher of the Law. If *Paul* be a Legalist, I will be one too. But these men know not, that the Apostle speaketh of those that die such; and that these sins exclude men the Kingdom, as they are Rebellion against Christ their Lord, and so a violation of the New Covenant.

So in part first page 189. He mentioneth a Preacher, that said, he durst not exhort nor persuade sinners to believe their sins were pardoned, before he saw their lives reformed, for fear they should take more liberty to sin. And he censureth that Preacher to be ignorant in the Mystery of faith. I confess I am such an ignorant Preacher my self; and therefore shall desire this knowing man to resolve me in a few doubts. 1. Where he learned, or how he can prove, that Justifying Faith is a believing that our sins are pardoned? when Scripture so often telleth us, that we are justified by Faith: and sure the Object must go before the Act: and therefore that which followeth the Act is not the Object,

If we must believe that we are pardoned, that so we may be pardoned; then we must believe a lie to make it a truth. Also doth not the Scripture bid us *Repent, believe, and be baptised for the re-*

mission of sins; but not first to believe the Remission of our sins? I have proved already that justifying Faith is another matter: and this which he calleth Faith is properly no Faith at all; but the knowledge of a conclusion, one of whose premises is afforded by Faith, and the other by Sense.

If therefore the Preacher had said, that he would not have men accept Child, and so believe for Remission, before their lives be reformed, then I should have subscribed to this man's censure of him. 2. I desire him to tell me, whether he can prove that any man's sins are pardoned before they have accepted Christ for their Lord? that is, before Faith, if not, 3. Whether this be not the subjection of the soul to Christ to be governed by him; and so a heart-reformation? 4. Whether the reformation of the life doth not immediately even the same moment follow the heart's reformation? And if all this be so, (as I know it is) then the ignorant Preachers doctrine must stand good, that Reformation of life must go before the belief or knowledge of pardon, though not before justifying Faith.

Many other intolerable errors I could shew you in that Book: as his making the New Covenant to threaten nothing but present Afflictions, and loss of our present communion with God, page, 208. and that we may pray for no other kind of pardon, pag. 206, 210. contrary to *Mar.* 16:16. *Heb.* 10:26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31.

Heb. 1, 3. *Joh.* 15:2, 6, and many other places: so his affirming that we sin not against the Covenant of works; which I have confuted in the Aphorismes.

So his making the Law of Christ and the Law of Faith to be two Laws or Covenants: when that which he calleth the Law of Christ is but part of the matter of the New Covenant.

But this is not my business; only because you urged me, I have given you a grain of salt wherewith to season some passages in your reading that and such like Books.

And that passage in *M. Shepherd's Select cases* page 96, 102. that no unregenerate man is within the compass of any conditional promise had need of a grain too.

To the twelfth Objection.

WHat you object concerning my making a necessity of public covenanting, I wholly acknowledge: And I heartily wish, that instead of our large mixed National Covenant; and instead of the Independant's Political Church-making Covenant, we had the Gospel or New Covenant conditions formally in public rendered to all the people of this Land; &c that the same being opened to them, they might knowingly and seriously profess their consent, &c if they subscribed their names, it would be more solemnly engaging: and this before they receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

This, 1. would take off most Arguments which are brought for a necessity of Re-baptizing: 2. And would tend much to engage men to their obedience to Christ, when they have so solemnly promised it under their hands. 3. And I think that as an unfeigned heart covenanting with Christ is true faith, and of the Essence of our Christianity; so is this public covenanting of our visible Christianity.

Though other men's promises on our behalf may be of use to infants; yet when we come to age, we are bound of absolute necessity to a personal Faith and covenanting.

This also would answer the ends of the ancient custom of Confirmation: And to this end is it, that the Church hath still used to rehearse the Creed, or Articles of Faith, and to require the people to stand up to signify their Assent and Consent; which, for my part, I think not only a laudable custom, but for the substance of it, a matter of necessity; so we do but carefully keep away that Customariness, ceremoniousness and formality, which spoileth the most necessary and weighty duties.

I could wish therefore that this practice were established by Authority. And, for my self, I do administer the Sacrament to none, that do not solemnly profess their assent to every fundamental Article of Faith expressly mentioned to them, and their content that Christ shall be their Lord and Saviour and that they will

faithfully and sincerely obey his Scripture Laws.

To the thirteenth and fourteenth Objections.

YOur 13. and 14. Objections, which charge me not with error, but only with Angularity, I will answer together. And I am the less careful to answer you in this matter, because I resolve to stand or fall to the Judgement of Scripture only. And to tell you the truth, while I busily read, what other men say in these controversies, my mind was so prepossessed with their notions, that I could not possibly see the truth, in its own nature and naked evidence: and when I entered into public deputations concerning it, though I was truly willing to know the truth, yet my mind was so forestalled with borrowed notions, that I chiefly studied how to make good the opinion which I had received, and ran further still from the truth: yea when I read the truth in Doctor *Preston* and other men's writings, I did not consider and understand it: and when I heard it from them, whom I opposed in wrangling disputations, or read it in books of controversy, I discerned it least of all, but only was sharpened the more against it: till at last, being in my sickness cast far from home, where I had no book but my Bible, I set to study the truth from thence, and from the nature of the things, and naked evidence; and so by the blessing of God, discovered more in one week, then I had done before in seventeen

year's reading, heaving and wrangling. Not that I therefore repent of reading other men's writings: for without that I had not been capable of those latter studies.

So that as I fetched not this doctrine from man, So you must bear with me if I give you the less of man to attest it.

Yet that you may see I am not singular, as you conceive, I will shew you the concurrent judgements of one or two.

Mr. *Wallis* (a man of singular worth, I am confident, by his own writing, though I know him not) in his answer to the Lord *Brook*, pag. 94; saith, That Faith is an accepting of Christ offered, rather than a believing of a Proposition affirmed.

But because I will not fill my pages with other men's words, I will allege but one more; and that one who is beyond all exception for piety. Orthodoxy, and Learning, even Dr. *Preston*.

1. That Faith containeth several acts.
2. That it is both in the understanding and will.
3. That the principal act is accepting or consent.
4. That it is the accepting of Christ for Lord as well as Saviour.
5. That the object is Christ himself, and not his benefits but in a remote sense and secondarily.
6. That Faith consisteth in Covenanting or Marriage contract. All these he is so plain and full in, that I find him speaking my own thoughts in my own words; and begun to think when I read

him, that men would think I borrowed all from Dr. *Preston*. Read him in his *Treatise of Faith*. pag. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 89, 97. Also *Of Effectual Faith*, pag. 40, 41, 87, And *Treatise of Faith*, pag. 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 56, 57, 58.

7. But especially, the chief point that I stand upon, & am like to be opposed most in, he handleth so fully and asserteth so frequently, as if it were the choicest notion which he desired to divulge, *viz.* That justifying faith, as such, is a taking of Christ for Lord as well as for Saviour. Of so many places I will transcribe two or three.

And first his definition of the active part of faith, is the very same with mine. *Of Faith*, pag. 44. It is to Believe, not only that Christ is offered to us, but also to take and receive him as a Lord and Saviour, that is, both to be saved by him, and to obey him. Mark it (saith he) I put them together, to take him as a Lord and Saviour; for you shall find that in the ordinary phrase of Scripture, they are put together, Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour; therefore we must take heed of disjoining those that God hath joined together: We must take Christ as well for a Lord as a Saviour; let a man do this, and he may be assured that his faith is a justifying faith; therefore mark it diligently; if a man will take Christ for a Saviour only, that will not serve the turn; Christ giveth not himself to any upon that condition only to save him, but we must take him as a Lord too, to be

subject to him, and obey him, and to square our actions according to his will. &c. pag. 45.

So of *Effectual Faith*, pag. 92. Now faith is nothing but this: We come and tell you that Christ is offered; if you will be content to let all these things go, and to turn your hearts to him, then the whole bent of a man's mind is turned the contrary way and set upon Christ; this is such Faith indeed, &c. Now if we were not mistaken in it, there would be no question of this: We think that faith is nothing but a persuasion that our sins are forgiven a persuasion that the promises are true, and the Scripture true, a persuasion that Christ died for my sins: And thence it is, that men are apt to be deceived in it. If they took Faith, as it is in its self (a Marriage of our selves to Christ, with all our heart and affections, when he hath given himself to us as in Marriage; and we are given to him.) in doing this, we should never be deceived.

So in his *Treatise of the New Covenant*, pag. 458. you must know that the Covenant is then dissolved, when that is dissolved that did make the Covenant: Look what it is that puts a man into the Covenant of Grace at the first; when that is taken away, then the Covenant is disannulled between God and us; but till then the Covenant remains sure. Now what is it that makes the Covenant? Mark it: This is that which makes the Covenant; when Jesus Christ offereth himself to us, and makes known his consent, &c. when we

again come and take him, and give our consent to make him our Lord, and we subject our selves to him to be his; when we say to the promised seed. He shall be my God and my Governor, and I will be among his people, and be subject to him; I say, when the heart gives a full content to this, &c. now the Covenant and contract is made between them. Now as long as this union continues between Christ and us, the Covenant is not disannulled; So that in a word, the Covenant is never nullified till thou hast chosen to thy self another husband, till thou hast taken to thy self another Lord, &c. pag. 459.

So that here you see 8^{ly}. that every infirmity breaks not the Covenant. See also *Treatise of Love*, Pag. 147.

9. That there is a Gospel curse following the breach of the Gospel Law, and that it is unrepalable and more terrible then that of the Law pag. 19, 20.

10. What near conjunction love hath with Faith in justifying. See *Treatise of Effectual Faith*. 41, 42.

11. That the promise and offer of Christ is general, see *Treatise of Faith*, pag. 9, 10. I will transcribe but one more, *Treatise of the New Covenant*, pag. 317, 318. You must know there is a two-fold Covenant, one of works, another of grace, &c., The Covenant of grace runs in these terms [Thou shalt believe; thou shalt take my Son for thy Lord and thy Saviour, and thou

shalt likewise receive the gift of Righteousness, which was wrought by him, for an absolution for thy sins, for a reconciliation with me, and thereupon thou shalt grow up in love & obedience, towards me, *Then I will be thy God, and thou shalt be my people.*] This is the Covenant of grace, &c.

In this you see also, 12ly. That love and sincere obedience are parts of the condition of the New Covenant.

Thus you see I am not in these 12. points singular; and in more could I also prove his context; though in some things I confess he differeth; as in making Faith an instrument in our justification, pag. 74. *Of Faith.* But as I take that to be a small difference; so it is apparent by the forecited places, that he took Faith to justify, as the condition of the Covenant; and so the difference is but verbal; yet speaking in the common phrase put him upon that absurdity, pag. 56. *Treatise of Faith, viz.* to say. That reconciling and justifying are acts of Faith: If he had said, but that they are effects of Faith, it had been more then (in proper strict sense taken) can be proved.

To the fifteenth Objections.

TO your fifteenth Objection I answer, 1. The Apostle in those places dealeth with the Jews, who trusted to works without and against Christ: This is nothing against them that set not up works in opposition nor coordination but only in subordination to Christ.

2. If I affirmed that works are the least part of that Righteousness which the Law requireth, and which must be so pleaded to our justification, then I should offend against the freeness of grace: But when I affirm, that all our legal Righteousness is only in Christ, then do I not make the reward to be of debt, or less free.

3. The Apostle in the same verse *Rom.* 4. saith, that his Faith is counted for Righteousness; and I have proved before that subjection is a part of Faith.

4. The Apostle plainly speaketh of that Righteousness whereby we are formally righteous, and which we must plead that we may be justified from the accusation of the Law, and this is neither in Faith nor works, but in Christ: But he nowhere speaketh against that which is only the condition of our participation of that, and whereby we must escape the condemnation of the Gospel, which is Faith, as I have opened before.

If the Apostle should mean otherwise, it were as much against your Doctrine as mine. For is not Faith a work or act of ours? But you will say, That though Faith which is a work do justify, yet not as a work, but as an instrument. I answer.

To be an actual apprehension of Christ (which you call its instrumentality) is to be a work; Therefore, if it justify as it is such an

apprehension, it justifieth as a work.

So also say I, that subjection and obedience justify, 1. Not as works simply considered; 2. Nor as legal works; 3. Nor as meritorious works; 4. Nor as Good works which God is pleased with; 5. But as the conditions to which the free Law-giver hath promised justification and life.

Nay, your Doctrine ascribeth far more. of the work to man than mine; for you make justification an effect of your own Faith, and your Faith the instrumental cause of it, and so make your self your own justifier. And you say your Faith justifieth as it apprehendeth Christ, which is the most intrinsical; essential consideration of Faith, and so Faith hath much of the honour. But while I affirm that it justifieth only as a condition, which is an extrinsical consideration, and alien from its essence or nature, I give the glory to him that freely giveth me life, and that made so sweet a condition to his Covenant, and that enableth me to perform the said condition.

And thus I have according to my measure of understanding answered your Objections, as fully as necessitated brevity would permit.

And for that question which you propounded about Relaxation, Abrogation, &c. of

the Law, which you confess you do not well understand; I refer you to *Vossius Defens. Grotii de Satis. cap. 27.* where (among other things) he telleth you that *Apud Romanos seu ferenda esset Lex, populus rogabatur an ferri vellet? seu tollendæ, rogabatur, an tolli eam placeret? Hinc rogari lex dicebatur, quæ ferrebat, ut dicit Vlp. Tit. 1. Regal. Eâdemque de causâ abrogari dicebatur, cum antiquaretur, &c.* And then he expianeth all those phrases to you out of *Vlpian. Lexrogatur, id est, fertur; vel abrogatur, id est, prior lex tollitur; vel Derogatur, id est, pars primæ tollitur: aut subrogatur, id est adjicitur aliquid primæ legi: aut Obrogatur, id est, mutatur aliquid ex primâ lege.* And so concludeth, that the first Law was not abrogated, but relaxed, dispensed with, and obrogate.

How far it was executed, I have shewed you in the Treatise.

But the last task you set me, is of all the rest most ungrateful, endless, and (in my judgement) unnecessary, *viz.* [To answer what other men have written against some doctrines which I have here asserted.]

1. It is a work ungrateful to search into other men's weakness and mistakes; to handle the truth in a way of contention or to speak in way of derogation of the labours of the learned and godly.

2. And should I fall upon a confutation of every man that hath written contrary to any

thing in my Book, the task would be endless, and I might stuff a great deal of paper with words against words, and perhaps add little matter to what is already written; which is a work unfit me for to undertake who have so much better work to do, and am like to have so short a time to do it in.

3. And it seems to me a needless task; partly because from the clearing and confirmation of the positive truth? you may be enabled to answer opposers your self.

2. The Authors which you mention do so easily and effectually assault the doctrines mentioned, that I should think no judicious man can thereby be staggered.

But at your request I will briefly consider them particularly.

The Authors which you refer me to, are two, D. *Maccovius*, and Mr. *Owen*. The points which they contradict are three.

1. That our legal Righteousness which we have in Christ, consisteth not formally in obedience to the Precept of the first Covenant, but only in satisfaction for our Disobedience. This *Maccovius* opposeth in *Colleg. Theol. par. 1 Disp. 10. & par. 4. Disp. 9.*

2. [That Christ paid not the same debt which was in the first obligation, but the value; and so the Law was not properly and fully executed, but relaxed.] This, you say, Mr. *Owen* confuteth in *Grotius*, in his late Treatise

of *Universal Redemption*, lib. 3 cap. 7. p. 140.

3. [That no man is actually and absolutely justified (no not so much as in point of Right) either from eternity, or upon the mere payment of the debt by Christ, till themselves do believe.] This, you say, is confuted by both of them, *Maccov. par. 3. Disp. 16. & par. Disp. 17. Et Owen ubi supra.*

If men's names did not more take with you then their Arguments, you might have spared me this labour. But briefly to the first of these answer.

1. Most passages in *Maccovius* do affirm but that Christ obeyed for us, as well as suffered for us; and who denyeth that?

2. Of those passages which yet go further, there is few of them that say any more then this, that Christ's active Righteousness did merit for us that life and glory which is given by the New Covenant, more then we lost by breaking the Old: But this is nothing to our Question which is only about justification. For I have cleared to you before, that Justification is (properly and strictly taken) one of those acts whereby we are recovered from the condemnation of the Law, and set in *statu quo prius*; and not one of those acts which give us that additional glory which is Adoption Union, Glorification.

3. Those few Arguments which yet do drive higher then this, are so fully answered

already by Mr. *Gataker* against *Lucius*, *Gomarus*, &c. and Mr. *Goodwin* (notwithstanding Mr. *Roborough's* Answer) and divers others, that I am resolved not to lose so much time and labour, as to do that which is better done already, then can be expected from me.

Only one argument more then usual I find in part 1 *Disput.* 10. And which I confess deserveth a special consideration, And that is this. [If Christ only suffered for us, then the righteousness of *Adam*, had he continued in innocency, would have been more excellent then the righteousness of Christ; For the law requireth obedience principally and suffering but *per accidens*. But the consequence is false, because else Christ hath not set us in as good a state as we fell from.]

To this I answer. 1. This righteousness may be termed excellent in several respects. 1. In reference to its Rule: 2. Or in reference to its Ends. The 1. denominateth it Good in itself: The second denominateth it good to us. Now the Rules to measure it by, are two; 1. The nearest inferior Rule; which is the Law: 2. The remote superior Rule; which is the good pleasure and will of the Law-maker.

2. The ends which may denominate our righteousness more excellent, are: 1. The glory of God's justice and mercy; 2. The glory of the Mediator's love, and the setting up of

his kingdom: 3. And the good of the creatures
Or rather all these in one.

Now these things thus standing, I answer
thus. 1. I acknowledge that the Law made for
mankind doth primarily require obedience,
and but secondarily suffering, and upon sup-
position of disobedience.

2. But you must distinguish betwixt what
the law requireth of us, and what of the Me-
diator: the law to the creature, and the law
to the Mediator, are in several things diffe-
rent: The will of his Father which he came to
do, consisted in many things which were ne-
ver required of us: such are all the works pro-
per to the office of Mediatorship. Now
though the Law required of us meet creatures
primarily Obedience active; Yet that which
was principally imposed upon the Mediator
and undertaken by him, was to satisfy for our
disobedience: And so the principal part of
his works was passive obedience, and that in
him was as excellent or more then Active obe-
dience; though in us it would not have been
so; because the law did not require it of us
in the first place, as it did of Christ.

3. If you call that most excellent which is
best pleasing to God the Law-maker; then cer-
tainly the satisfaction of Christ did please him
better, then *Adam's* perseverancc in innocen-
cy would have done. This needeth no proof
but the consideration of the event.

4. And for the ends of righteousness, let I us consider them distinctly; and see whether Christ's satisfaction do not attain them all more eminently and fully than *Adam's* perseverance would have done.

1. The glory of God's justice would not have been manifested so, if *Adam* had stood, as it was by Christ's sufferings: 2. Nor the glory of his mercy and free grace. 3. Nor the Mediators love: 4. Nor would the Kingdom of the Mediator have been set up, nor his honour so advanced. 5. Nor the saints advanced to so high a dignity and happiness, as now they are and shall be by Christ.

So that in what respect is our righteousness less excellent? or who is the looser? Not the Father; Not the Mediator: All the question is of our selves: But that is only in point of our honour: It is acknowledged, that to the creature it would have been more honourable to have kept his innocency, then to have his disobedience satisfied for by another. But here consider these things, 1. God's honour is to be preferred to ours. 2. And the Mediators advancement before our advancement. 3. It was the very design of God in the Gospel way of our salvation to take down our honour, that the creature might not glory in itself, but all might be acknowledged to free grace: And shall we

think it a wrong, if we have not a righteousness as honourable to our selves as that which we lost? 4. Our happiness will be greater though our honour will be less: For we shall have a far greater glory. And that is better then mere honour. 5. Yea we shall have more honour then we lost: A real honour of being the sons of God, and members of Christ, and heirs of glory: And this is greater then the honour of our perseverance would have been. Only this being all freely given redoundeth to the giver: but still the real honour and happiness we enjoy therefore is it the everlasting work of Saints, to praise the Lamb who hath redeemed them out of all nations, and made them Kings and Priests to God; which implieth an acknowledgement of their former disobedience and misery, (and so taking dishonour to themselves) and yet the greater glory to Christ, and happiness to them.

6. Moreover we have now besides the righteousness of Christ's satisfaction a personal evangelical righteousness, consisting in the fulfilling of the conditions of the law of grace.

So that our little loss of the honour of self-performance you see is in these 6. respects abundantly recompensed.

So that to our selves a righteousness of sa-

tisfaction, is better then a righteousness of personal obedience. And as it is found in Christ, it is also in it self more excellent.

Yet further; that it is not derogatory to Christ, doth thus appear, 1. He had in himself both sorts of righteousness; *viz.* Of obedience to the Precept, and of satisfaction to the threatening. Though both could not be ours, retaining their forms as such: because the law requireth but one sort of righteousness of one person for himself: so that we derogate nothing from Christ's righteousness or perfection.

Both these sorts in Christ, *viz.* his active and passive (as I conceive) do concur to make up that one sort of righteousness necessary for us, *viz.* Or satisfaction to the threatening: and so both conjunct are our righteousness, though not as two sorts of righteousness, but as one. Yet I know that this is somewhat dark and doubtful, because Obedience is a thing commanded and not threatened: But yet seeing Christ paid not the *Idem*, but the *Tantundem*; not the very same debt mentioned in the threatening, but the value. I think therefore that his obedience as such may go in to his satisfaction.

3. I also freely acknowledge, that the additional happiness which we have by Christ, more then we lost in *Adam*, contained in our Adoption, Union with Christ and Glorifica-

cation, are procured by Christ's active obedience as such, as well as by his satisfaction in suffering.

If yet besides all this, any will maintain that we fulfilled the precepts of the law in Christ; or that his fulfilling of them as such, is our righteousness, let them shew me solidly what need we have of Christ's sufferings, and let them answer what is said to the contrary by the formentioned Authors; and I shall quickly yield.

To conclude, that God accepteth this righteousness of satisfaction as being equivalent to that of obedience (though obedience be first in the law, and the precept the principal part) and so that he is as well pleased with us as if we had obeyed: may appear from the end & nature of satisfactory Punishment. For the penalty of a perfect just law is supposed to be such, that it will make a perfect compensation or satisfaction for all the wrong we have done, to the law-maker or the public: so that being paid or suffered, we must needs in point of innocency be *in statu quo-prius*. I know some object thus, If a thief be burnt in the hand and so the law satisfied; yet he hath lost his credit, and will not be taken or trusted for an honest man.

Answ. You must distinguish 1. betwixt his breach of man's law, and his breach of God's law.

2. Betwixt his actual fault, and his habi-

tual pravity. And then you will see, that his burning in the hand was for the breach of man's law; but the perpetual infamy is apart of the penalty inflicted by God for the breach of his law, by the same fact. 2 That his suffering was only for his actual fault: But our distrust and contempt of him is also for the pravity of his heart by that fact discovered, of which mans Law taketh not notice.

But if you instance in the breach of a mere penal law (as for keeping Artillery, for forbearing to eat flesh in Lent, &c.) You will see that the mere suffering or payment, doth put the offender in as good a condition as he was before.

But the Disputant in *Maccovius* thinketh to strike all dead, with this casr. In 1 *Sam.* 11:7. the penalty for them that would not go out with *Saul* to battle, was, that their oxen should be hewed in pieces; yet (saith he) they should besides this have lost their part in the prey or spoils. To which I answer.

Then the loss of the spoil was implied as part of the penalty. 2. He all along runneth upon a false supposition; *viz.*, That *Adam* besides the continuance of the happiness which at first was freely given him, should moreover by his obedience have merited or procured some further reward: Now (saith he) this reward must be procured us by Christ's active righteousness, though his satis-

faction put us into the state we fell from. But all this is a mere fiction. For where doth the scripture talk of *Adam's* meriting any more, or where doth it promise him any more than the continuance of that happiness which he then had?

So I have done with the first Question.

Your 2. is [whether Christ paid the same debt which was in the first obligation?] And here you send me to Mr. *Owen*.

Answ. 1. I had far rather you had obeyed your self. For I cannot well understand Mr. *Owen's* mind. in pag. 137. He distinguisheth betwixt paying the very thing that is in the obligation; and paying of so much in another kind. Now this is not our question, nor any thing to it; for we affirm that Christ's suffering was of the same kind of punishment, (at least in the main;) but yet not the very same in the obligation.

In pag. 140. He states the question far otherwise, (and yet supposeth it the same) *viz.*, whether Christ paid the *Idem*, or the *Tantumdem*? which he interpreteth thus; *that which is not the same, nor equivalent to it, but only in the gracious acceptance of the Creditor.* Now what he means by *not equivalent* I cannot tell.

1. If he mean not of equal value, then he fighteth with a shadow, he wrongeth *Grotius*, (for ought I can find in him (who teacheth no such doctrine; How-ever, I do not so use to

English *solutio Tantidem*. But if he mean that it is f not equivalent in procuring its ends, *ipso facto*, delivering the debtor, without the interven- tion of a new confession or contract of the cre- ditor, (as *solutio ejusdem* doth,) then I con- fess *Grotius* is against him; and so am I.

So also [God's Gracious acceptance] is either his accepting less in value then was due, and so remitting the rest without payment: (this I plead not for,) or else it is his accepting of a refusable payment, which though equal in value yet he may chase to accept according to the tenor of the Obligation. This is gracious acceptance, which *Grotius* maintaineth? And so do I; and so distinguish betwixt *solutio* & *satisfactio*, payment: and sa- tisfaction.

Yet here Mr. *Owen* entereth the lists with *Grotius*; And.

1. He overlooketh his greatest Arguments.
2. He slightly answereth only two.

And 3. when he hath done, he saith as *Gro- tius* doth, and yieldeth the whole cause.

These three things I will make appear in order.

1. The chief Argument of *Grotius* and *Vos- sius* is drawn from the tenor of the Obliga- tion, and from the event: The Obligation chargeth Punishment on the offender him- self. It saith *In the day thou eatest, thou shalt die. And Cursed is every one that continueth not in*

all things, &c. Now if the same in the Obligation be paid then the Law is executed, and not relaxed; and then every linner must dye himself, for that is the *Idem*, and very thing threatened: So that here, *Dum alius solvit, simul aliud solvitur*. The Law threatened not Christ, but us. (Besides, that Christ suffered not the loss of God's love, nor his image and graces, nor eternity of torment, of which I have spoke in the Treatise.) What saith Mr. Owen to any of this?

2. The two Arguments he dealeth with, are these.

1. The payment of the very debt, doth *ipso facto*, free the debtor To which he answereth, that Christ's death do actually or *ipso facto*, free us. This Answer I shall consider under your last question whereto it belongeth.

To the second Argument that the payment of the same thing in the Obligation, leaveth no room for pardon he answereth thus:

1. God's pardoning comprizeth the whole dispensation of Grace in Christ: As 1. The laying of our sin on Christ. 2. The imputation of his Righteousness to us; which is no less of grace and mercy: However, God pardoneth all to us, but nothing to Christ: So that the freedom of pardon hath its foundation.

1. In God's will freely appointing this satisfaction of Christ.

2. In a gracious acceptation of that decreed satisfaction in our stead.

3. *In a free application of the death of Christ to us &c.* so far Mr. Owen.

To which I answer: 1. Pardon implieth Christ's death as a cause; but I would he had shewed the Scripture, that maketh pardon so large a thing, as to comprize the whole dispensation of Grace; or that maketh Christ's death to be part of it, or comprized in it.

2. If such a word were in Scripture, will he not confess it to be figurative, and not proper, and so not fit for this Dispute?

3. Else when he saith, that Christ's death procured our pardon, he meaneth that it procured it self.

2. Neither is imputation of Righteousness any part of pardon but a necessary antecedent; so that here is no part of pardon yet in all this.

3. The same may be said of God's Acceptation.

4. Its Application is a large phrase, and may be meant of several acts; but of which here, I know not.

How can he call it, *A gracious Acceptation, a gracious imputation, a free Application*, if it were the same thing which the Law required that was paid? To pay all according to the full exaction of the Obligation, needeth no favour to procure acceptance, imputation, or application. Can Justice refuse to accept of such a payment? Or can it require any more?

Object. But it is of grace to us, though not to Christ.

Answ. Doth not that clearly intimate, that Christ was not in the Obligation? that the Law doth threaten every man personally; Or else it had been no favour to accept it from another.

3. That Mr. *Owen* giveth up the cause at last, and saith as *Grotius* (having it seemeth not understood *Grotius* his meaning) appeareth p. 141, 142, 143.

For 1. he acknowledgeth that the payment is not made by the party to whom remission is granted, (and so saith every man that is a Christian.)

2. He saith, It was a full valuable compensation, (therefore not of the same.)

3. That by reason of the Obligation upon us, we our selves were bound to undergo the Punishment, (therefore Christ's Punishment was not in the Obligation, but only ours, & so the Law was not fully executed, but relaxed.)

4. He saith he meaneth not that Christ bore the same Punishment due to us, in all accidents, of duration and the like; but the same in weight and pressure, (therefore not the same in the Obligation, because not fully the same: Not the same numerically; nor perhaps specifically in all respects, if the loss of God's Love and Image, and incurring his hatred, the corruption of the body, the loss of right to, and

use of all the creatures and the loss of all comforts corporal or spiritual, &c. were any part of the curse.) yet that it was in the greatest respects of the same kind, I doubt not.

5. *He saith, God had power so far to relax his own Law, as to have the name of a surety put into the Obligation, which before was not there; and then to require the whole debt of that surety.*

And what saith *Grotius* more then this? If the same thing in the Obligation be paid, then the Law is executed, and if executed (properly and fully) then not relaxed. Here he confesseth that the sureties name was not in the Obligation; and that God relaxed the Law to put it in. Now the main business that *Grotius* there drives at, is but to prove this relaxation of the Law, and the non-execution of it on the offenders threatened.

I Judge that Mr. *Owen* hath no better success in his next assault of *Grotius*, on that question, [whether God manage this work of relaxing the Law, punishing Christ for us, &c. as a Creditor, or as an absolute Master, or as a Judge under Laws, or as the supreme Rector? The laft of which *Grotius* maintaineth? He that readeth *Grotius* and *Vossius* own words, doth need no further defensative against the force of Mr. *Owen's* Answers.

But this is nothing to me.

Only I would not have any truth to fare the worse for *Grotius* his defection. It was him-

self that deserved the discredit, and not the Truth of God.

The third and last contradicted Article is, *That no man is actually and absolutely justified upon the mere payment of the debt by Christ, till they become Believers.*

Against this, you send me to both the fore-mentioned Authors.

Answ. 1. When I first cast my eye upon the two fore-cited Disputations in *Maccowski*, I had thought he had spoke only of the universal conditional Justification of men, when he faith, *that active Justification was at the beginning of the first promise*; But my charitable thoughts I soon saw were mistaken.

But I find, as his Doctrine is very strange, so are his proofs as slender, as any mans you. could have sent me to.

Is it not strange that Active justification should be perfected 5000. years before Passive justification is in being? I thought Passive justification had been the mediate effect of the Active; And that God had justified no man, who is not thereby justified.

2. And as strange and abhorred to me, is the other part of his doctrine, *viz.* That Faith only taketh knowledge of justification formerly wrought.

And his Arguments are as weak as the doctrine erroneous.

1. The first is *Because the Object must needs go before the Act.*

Answ. But is it not pity that so excellent a Doctor should think that justification (& that not only in offer, but in actual being) should be the object of justifying Faith? I am ashamed to confute so senseless an assertion. Sure it is Christ, and not actual justification that is the object. When the Scripture saith, that *Whosoever believeth shall be justified* is it a learned Exposition which thus interpreteth it? [You that are elect, are already justified, and if you will believe it, you shall know it;]

2. He citeth *Paræus*, saying, that Faith doth not effect justification, but accept it.

Answ. 1. They that say, Faith is the instrumental cause of justification, must needs say, that Faith effecteth it.

2. Faith accepteth Christ for justification.

3. It accepteth not justification as being actually and absolutely our own before the acceptance: But it accepteth a conditional justification offered to me, that by the acceptance it may become absolutely mine.

His citing of *Tossanus* words is nothing for him; For when he saith, that *All the Elect are justified in Christ, in respect of the merit thereof* it is no more then to say that *Christ hath merited their justification*: which who denieth?

But the great Argument which he and all of his judgement do trust to, is this: *If the surety*

so undertake or discharge the debt, that the creditor rest satisfied with that undertaking or discharge; then is the debtor free from the debt. But Christ hath so undertaken and discharged the particular debts of the Elect; therefore the Elect are freed.

Answ. 1. Payment is refusable, or not refusable: That payment which is of the same thing in the Obligation, either by our selves or our Delegate, is not by the Creditor refusable; so that if we had paid it, or Christ had been our Delegate, appointed by us to pay the same that was due, then God could not have refused to take that payment: But Christ being appointed to this by the Father, and not by us; and also paying not the very same, but the value, God might have refused the payment.

2. Where the payment is not refusable, there the discharge of the debtor is not refusable, but doth follow *ipso facto*: But where the payment is refusable, (as here it was) the Creditor may accept it upon what terms he pleases, and choose to give the Debtor an absolute discharge; so that it being the full agreement and pleasure both of the Creditor and the Surety, the father and the son, that the Debtor should have no discharge by the payment but upon a certain condition by him to be performed, no doubt he shall have none till he have performed it.

3. So that God's accepting the payment

and being satisfied with it, may be understood.

1. In respect to the Surety, and the value of his payment; and so God was well pleased and fully satisfied in Christ's payment, as being the full value that his justice did require, and beyond which he expected no more at his hands.

2. Or it may be spoken in reference to the debtor, the sinner, and the effecting of his freedom; And so God was not immediately upon Christ's payment, so satisfied or well pleased with the particular offenders, as to deliver and discharge them without requiring any thing at their hands.

1. For he will first have them perform the imposed condition of taking Christ who hath bought them, for their only Saviour, Husband, and Lord.

To these of *Maccorius*, Mr. *Owen* in the place (against *Grotius*) which you refer me to, addeth some more.

As 1. *By death be deliver us from death:*

Answ. Not immediately nor absolutely, nor by his Death alone; but by that as the price, supposing other causes on his part, and conditions on ours to concur before the actual deliverance.

2. He saith *The Elect are said to die and rise with him.*

Answ. Not in respect of time, as if we died & rose at the same time, either really or in God's

esteem: Nor that we dyed in his dying, & rose in his rising. But it is spoken of the distant mediate effects of his death, & the immediate effects of his Spirit on us, rising by regeneration to union and Communion with Christ.

3. He saith, *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse, being made a curse for us*, Gal. 3:13.

Answ. I explained before how far we are freed by Redemption; He hath redeemed us, that is, paid the price; but with no intent that we should by that Redemption be immediately or absolutely freed.

Yet when we are freed, it is to be ascribed to his death as the meritorious cause; but not as the only cause.

4. He saith *The hand-writing that was against us, even the whole obligation is taken out of the way and nailed to his Cross*.

Answ. I. By the hand-writing of Ordinances, is especially meant the Law of Ceremonies.

2. If it be meant also of the curse of the Old Covenant, then it cannot be so understood, as if the Covenant itself were abrogate for the reasons I have before given in the Treatise.

3. Nor yet that any are absolutely discharged from the curse, till they perform the condition required for their discharge.

4. But thus far the Law is taken down, that our Redeemer hath bought us from that

necessity of perishing that lay upon us for our transgressing that Law; so that no man is now condemned for the mere violation of that first Covenant; and so he hath taken the Law into his own hands, to charge only upon those that break the conditions of the New Covenant.

5. And so he hath taken down the condemning power of the Law as it standeth by it self, and not as it is under the Covenant of grace; And he hath freed us from the curse conditionally, and the condition is easy and reasonable.

6. So that *quoad meritum*, the work is done. All the satisfaction is made, and price paid; and therefore in *Heb.* 1:3. it is said to be done. If a man where a 1000l. in debt, and had tried all means, and had no hope left to procure his discharge: And if a stranger to him go to the Creditor, and buy the Debtor who is in prison into his own hands, by paying all the debt, yet resolving, that if he refuse his kindness, he shall have no benefit by it, but lie and rot there; May it not be fitly said, that the debtor is delivered? because the great difficulty which hindered, is removed; and the condition of his freedom is so reasonable, that common reason supposeth he will not stick at it; and if he do, it is utterly against reason and humanity, for he may be freed if he will.

Therefore it is no unfit phrase, to say the man is freed as soon as his debt is paid: But yet he is not absolutely freed, nor actually neither in point of personal right, nor of possession. And for his humane refusal of the kindness of his Redeemer, may lie and perish there, and be never the better, but the worse for all this.

Yet it being the absolute Purpose both of the Father and Mediator, to cause all the Elect to perform this condition of their discharge; therefore Redemption is a cause of their certain future discharge, and a link in the inviolable chain of the causes of their salvation; But to the rest of the world it is not so.

But I do not well understand the meaning of the Author you refer me to: For he saith, [That Christ did actually and *ipso facto*, deliver us from the curse and obligation; yet we do not instantly apprehend and perceive it, nor yet possess it; but only we have actual right to all the fruits of his death: As a prisoner in a far Countrey who is ransomed, but knoweth it not, nor can enjoy liberty till a Warrant be produced, &c.

But 1. Whether a man may fitly be said actually, and *ipso facto*, to be delivered and discharged, who is not at all delivered, but only hath right to deliverance, I doubt.

2. Knowledge and possession of a deliverance

are far different things: A man may have possession and no knowledge in some cases; or if he have both, yet the procuring of knowledge is a small matter, in comparison of possession.

3. Our knowledge therefore doth not give us possession; so that the similitude fails, for it is the Creditor's knowledge and satisfaction that is requisite to deliverance. And our Creditor was not in a far and strange country, but knew immediately, and could either have made us quickly know, or turned us free before we had known the cause.

4. Nor can it easily be understood, how God can so long deny us the possession of Heaven, if we had such absolute actual Right (as he speaketh) so long ago; which seemeth to express a *jus ad rem & in re*.

If it be said, we are yet in our minority, and not fit for present possession.

I answer, That this fitness and our maturity is part of the deliverance, or benefit (which he saith, *de facto*, we had right to:) And so we should have had that also in present possession.

4. But if he do mean only a right to future possession (for such there is,) yet I confess it is beyond my conceiving, how in regard of the relative part of our deliverance, that right and the possession should stand at so many years distance. To have right to God's favour and acceptance, and to have possession

of that favour; to have right to the remission of sin, and adoption, & to have possession of these, do seem to me to be of nearer kin. Except he should think that possession of favour is nothing but the knowledge or feeling of it; and that possession of pardon is the like; & that Faith justifieth us but *in soro conscientiae*: But I will not censure so hardly till I know it.

Indeed there is a justification by public declaration at the great judgement, which much differeth from a mere Right. But our justification by faith here is but a justifying in the sense of the Law, or giving us right to that full justification: So that *To have right to it, and to have possession of it in point of Law or Right*; is to me all one: For what doth Faith give us possession of in its justifying Act, but this legal right?

5. And indeed, it seemeth to me a full definition of all pardon and justification which is here to be expected, which he layeth down; He saith, *Christ did deliver us from the curse, and take away the Obligation which was against us ipso facto*. And I think to be justified, is but to be freed from the curse or condemnation; and to be pardoned, is nothing else but to be freed from the obligation to punishment. And is remission and justification the immediate effect of Christ's death?

Whatever this Writer thinketh in this, is nothing to us: But because I would not have you so palpably and dangerously err, let me lay a little more against this mistake. You may remember I have oft told you, of how great moment it is in Divinity, to be able soundly to distinguish betwixt immediate & Mediate Effects of Christ's Death. (I think *Tho. Moore* meant the Immediate and Mediate Effects, which he calleth *Ends* which hath caused a great many pages about the Ends of Christ's Death, to be written by his Antagonists to little Purpose.) Now I would have you know, that this actual Remission and Justification, are no Immediate, but Mediate effects of Christ's Death; no, nor a personal right thereto if there be any such thing distinct from actual freedom.

And to this end I pray you weigh these Arguments.

I. What Right soever God giveth to men to things supernatural such as justification, remission, adoption) he giveth by his written Laws. But by these Laws he hath given no such thing to any Believer, (such as are the Elect before conversion, (therefore, &c.

The major is evident: God's Decree giveth no man a personal right to the mercy intended him. And for the minor, no man can produce any Scripture giving to unbelievers such a right.

2. If God hate all the workers of iniquity, and we are all by nature the children of wrath, and without faith it is impossible to please God, and he that believeth not is condemned already; then certainly the Elect while they are unbelievers are not actually, *de facto*, no nor in personal Right, delivered from this hatred, wrath, displeasure and condemnation. But the major is the very words of Scripture, therefore, &c.

3. If we are justified only by Faith, then certainly not before Faith: But we are justified only by Faith; therefore, &c.

I do in charity suppose that you will not answer so grossly, as to lay, we are justified *in foro Dei*, before Faith, and only *in foro conscientiae*, by Faith, till you can find one word in Scripture which saith, that an unbeliever is justified, If I thought you were of this opinion, I should think it an easy task to manifest its falsehood.

And if you say that we are justified in God's Decree before Faith;

I answer, 1. It is no justification; shew me the Scripture that calleth it so.

2. Nay, it clearly, implieth the contrary. For Decreeing is a term of Diminution, as to justifying. He that faith he is purposed to free you from prison, &c. implieth that as yet it is not done. To be justified or saved in Decree, is no more but that God decreeth to justify

and save us; and therefore sure it is yet undone.

4. If we are exhorted while we are unbelievers, to be reconciled to God, and to believe for remissions of sins; then sure we are not yet reconciled nor remitted; But the former is evident in Scripture; therefore, &c.

5. No man dare affirm, that we are immediately upon Christ's death, delivered actually, and *ipso facto*, from the power or presense of sin, nor from afflictions and death, which are the fruits of it; nor yet that we are freed from the distance and reparation from God which sin procured. And why then should we think that we were immediately delivered from the guilt and condemnation?

I know the common answer is, that justification is an immanent act, and therefore from eternity; but Sanctification is a transient act. But I have disproved this in the Treatise, and cleared to you, that justification is also a transient Act: Otherwise Sociniansm were the soundest doctrine, that Christ never needed to satisfy, if we were justified from eternity. Yet (to confess the truth) I was long deceived with this Argument my self, taking it upon trust from Dr. *Twisse* and Mr. *Pemle*, (whom I valued above most other men; and so continued of that same judgement with these Authors you allege, and remained long

in the borders of *Antinomianism*, which I very narrowly escaped: And it grieveth me to see many of our Divines to fight against Jesuits and *Arminians* with the *Antinomian* weapons, as if our cause afforded no better; and so they run into the far worse extreme.

I undertake to manifest to you, that this Doctrine of Christ's immediate Actual delivering us from guilt, wrath, and condemnation,] is the very pillar and foundation of the whole frame and fabric of *Antinomianism*.

But these things which you draw out of me here unseasonably; I am handling in a fitter place, (in a small Tract of *Universal Redemption*;) But the last week I have received *Amyraldus* against *Spanhemius* exertations, who hath opened my very heart, almost in my own words; and hath so fully said the very same things which I intended, for the greater part, that I am now unresolved whether to hold my hand, or to proceed.

The Lord give you to search after the truth in love, with a humble, unbiassed, submissive soul; neither losing it through negligence and undervaluing, nor yet diverted from it by inferior controversies, nor preverted by self-confidence, nor forestalled by prejudice, nor blinded by passion, nor lost in contentions, nor subverted by the now-ruling spirit of giddiness and levity, nor yet obscured by the

confounding of things that differ; that so by the conduct of the Word and Spirit, you may attain the sight of amiable naked truth, and your undemanding may be enlightened, and your soul beautified by the reflection and participation of her light and beauty, that your heart being ravished with the sense of her goodness, and awed by her Authority, you may live here in the constant embracements of her, and cordial obedience to her, till you are taken up to the prime eternal Truth and Goodness.

Rom. 14:9.

For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.

Ephes. 1:22.

And (God) hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church.

Heb. 5:9.

And being made perfect, he became the Author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him.

Revel. 20:14.

Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in by the gate into the City.

Sayings of excellent Divines;

added to satisfy you who charge
me with Singularity.

*D. Twisse his Discovery of Dr. Jackson's
vanity, p. 5 28.*

What one of our Church will maintain, that any one obtains actual Redemption by Christ without Faith? Especially considering that Redemption by the Blood of Christ, and forgiveness of sins are all one, *Eph. 1:17. Col. 1:14.*

Bishop Hooper cited by Doctor Jackson.

(Christ] only received our infirmities and Original Disease, and not the contempt of him and his Law.

*Expounded by Dr. Twisse against Dr.
Jackson, pag. 584.*

His meaning in my judgement is only this, that Christ hath made satisfaction for the imperfections of our Faith and holiness, although we continue therein until death: But he hath not made satisfaction for the contempt and hatred of his Word, &c. in case men do continue therein unto death.

Alstedius Distinct. Theol. c.17. pag. 73

The condition of the Covenant of Grace, is partly Faith, and partly Evangelical obedience or holiness of life proceeding from Faith in Christ.

Idem ibid. cap. 23.

Christ is our Righteousness in a causal sense, but not in a formal sense.

Sadeel. advers. human. satisfact. pag. 213.

Christ's satisfaction is to them profitable to whom it is truly applied. The way of application is this, that the merits of Christ: be imputed to us: This imputation is done when the Holy Ghost begetteth in us a true faith, which receiving the benefit of Christ, doth at once also produce in us the true fruits of our Regeneration.

Rivetius in Disput. de Satisfactione.

God was not bound to accept the satisfaction performed by another, although sufficient; unless (which he could not) man had satisfied himself, and had born the Punishment due to his sin; therefore there was a necessity that a Covenant should intercede, and God himself propound a Mediator.

That there must an agreement intercede on his part who was satisfied, I have proved, without which the satisfaction had been in vain, *Ibidem*.

Ibidem. ibid. Thes. 4:5, 6.

The Act which in satisfaction God performeth, it is of a supreme Judge, freely relaxing his own Law, and transferring the penalty on another: So that in this relaxation God's supreme dominion may be observed: For how could God have relaxed his Law, if he had not been the supreme Rector, or had been under a Law himself? And by the transferring the penalty from the sinner, & exacting it of the surety, the relation of a party offended, as such, is removed from God, &c. *Jam. 4:12*,

So he proceedeth to prove, that God could and did relax his Law, as being positive, and so relaxable; that it is abrogate, not expounded *κατα ἐπιείκείε*. And what of it was relaxable, and what not, &c.

Bellamine confesseth (*l. de just. cap. 7.*) that our opinion is right, if we mean, that Christ merits are imputed us, because they are given us, and we may offer them to God the Father for our sins, because Christ undertook the burden of satisfying for us, and re-

conciling us to God. Which *Rivet* approveth,
Disp. de justific.

Dr. Twisse Vindic. Grat. l. 2. par.
2. crim. 3. §.6.

I confess salvation, and so pardon and adoption, are offered to all and singular men on condition they believe &c. And so I deny not, that Redemption is so far obtained for all and every man.

Dr. Twisse against Cotton, pag. 74.

Still you prove that which no man denieth, *viz.* That God Purposed life to the world upon condition of obedience and repentance; provided that you understand it right, *viz.* that obedience and repentance is ordained of God, as a condition of life, not of God's Purpose.

Dr. Twisse Consid. of Tilenus Synod dort &
Arles reduced to prac. pag. 61.

Ger. Voßius interpreted the will of God touching the salvation of all of a conditional will, thus; God will have all to be saved, to wit, in case they believe; which conditional will in this sense, neither *Austin* did, nor do we deny.

Idem pag. 143, 144,

I willingly profess that Christ died for

all in respect of procuring the benefit (of pardon and salvation) Conditionally, on condition of their faith.

So also, pag. 154, 161, 164, 165, 170, 194. And *Discovery of Doctor Jackson's vanity*, p. 527, 551.

Junius Parallel, l. 3. Heb. 5:9.

For the promise of salvation is made to obedience, and be queathed to it in the Testament of Christ himself dying.

Paræus in Hebr. 5:9.

To obey Christ is not only to profess his Name, but to acknowledge him the only perfect Redeemer, to cleave to him in true affiance, and to live worthy the Gospel. This condition in the whole Gospel is required in those that shall be saved. Universal Grace belongeth only to the obedient.

Piscator in Heb. 5:9.

Christ is not the Author of salvation to all men, but only to those that obey him, that is, who believe his Promises, and obey his Precepts.

Aretius in Heb. 5:9.

The benefit of Redemption is universal, and indeed belongs to all in general, so be it we obey him.

Calvin in Luke 1:6.

We must so expound whatsoever the Scripture speaks of the Righteousness of men, that it overthrow not the forgiveness of sins, whereon it resteth as a building on its foundation. They who simply expound it, that *Zachary* and *Elizabeth* were righteous by Faith, because they were freely accepted of God for the Mediators sake, do wrest the words of *Luke* to a strange sense: And as to the matter it self, they say something, but not the whole. I confess indeed, that the righteousness which is ascribed to them, ought to be acknowledged as received from the Grace of Christ, and not to the merit of works; yet the Lord, because he imputed not to them their sins, doth dignify their holy life, with the title of Righteousness. The folly of the Papists is easily refelled, who oppose this Righteousness to the Righteousness of Faith; when as it flows from it, so it ought to be placed in subordination to it, that so there be no disagreement between them.

Perkins Vol. 1. p. 662. The true Gain.

And lest any should imagine, that the very act of Faith in apprehending Christ, justifieth, we are to understand, that Faith doth not apprehend by power from it self, but by vertue of the Covenant. If a man believe the Kingdom of *France* to be his, it is not therefore

his; yet if he believe Christ and the Kingdom of Heaven by Christ, to be his, it is his indeed; Not simply, because he believes, but because he believes upon commandment and promise; For in the tenor of the Covenant, God promiseth to impute the obedience of Christ to us, For our righteousness, if we believe.

Perkins Vol. 1. p. 476. on Hab. 2:4.

Justice mentioned in the word is two-fold, the justice of the Law, and the justice of the Gospel: The justice of the Law hath in it all points and parts of justice, and all the perfection of all parts; and it was never found in any upon earth except *Adam* and Christ. The justice of the Gospel hath all the parts of true justice, but it wants the full perfection of parts. And this kind of justice is nothing else but the conversion of a sinner, with a Purpose, will, and endeavour to please God, according to all the Commandments of the Law. Thus was *Noah* just, *Job*, *Zachary*, *Elizabeth*; and thus must the just man be taken in this place, *Hab. 2:4.*

Sop. 649. in the true Gain.

God doth as it were keep a double Court, one of justice, the other of Mercy. In the Court of justice he gives judgment by the Law, & accuseth every man that continueth not in all things, &c. In this Court nothing can stand but the Passion and Righteousness of Christ; and for the best works that we can do,

we may not look for any acceptation or reward, but use the plea of *David, Enter not into judgement with thy servant, O Lord, for no flesh shall be justified in thy sight.* Now in the Court of Grace and Mercy God hath to deal with his own children, that stand before him justified and reconciled by Christ, and the obedience of such he accepteth in this Court, and mercifully regardeth, though imperfect—for Christ.

Perkins, Vol. i. pag. 124. On the Creed.

Christ as he is fet forth in Word and Sacraments is the object of Faith.—Faith apprehendeth whole Christ.—pag. 125. First, it apprehendeth the very body and blood of Christ; and then in the second place the virtue and benefits. Whereas some are of an opinion that faith is an affiance or confidence, that seems to be otherwise, for it is a fruit of Faith.

That Faith is so large as to contain very many acts, see *Zanchy* on *Eph. i. in loco communum de fide.*

That Word and Sacraments are the instruments of Justification on God's part, *Zanchy* affirms on *Ephes. i. loco communi de justificatione,*

That the form of Righteousness is conformity to the Law, he teacheth on *Phil. i:11.*

That there is a necessity of a two-fold Righ-

teousness, one imputed, the other inherent,
Zanchy ibid, & freq.

Dr. Willet on Rom. 2. contr. 3.7.

Good works are required as a condition in those which are to be saved, not as a meritorious cause of their salvation.

The meaning of this sentence *the doers of the law shall be justified*, is the same: God will *approve, justify, reward* them that do the works of the Law, whether Jew or Gentile: Yet it followeth not that a man is therefore justified by the works of the Law; But God approveth and rewardeth the workers, not the hearers and professors: So here the Apostle treateth not of the cause of justification, which is faith without the works of the law; But of the difference between such as shall be justified, and such as are not. *Faius*. They only which have a lively Faith, which worketh and keepeth the Law in part, and supplieth the rest which is wanting in themselves by the perfect obedience of Christ, *they shall be justified*; not those which only profess the Law, and keep it not. The Apostle then here sheweth who shall be justified, not for what.

By these words it is evident that Dr. *Willet* and *Faius* acknowledge sincere obedience to be a condition of justification, or of those that shall be justified, though not a cause, as they say (I think mistakingly) Faith is.

*Dr. Davenant Animadversions on God's love to
mankind, p.385, 386.*

The Doctrine of Predestination permitteth no man to persuade himself that his salvation is certain? before he find that he is truly converted, truly faithfull, truly sanctified.

Because you will perhaps hear Mr. *Owen* before *Grotius*, see Mr. *Ball* on *Covenant*. p. 290.

There is a two-fold payment of debt, one of the thing altogether the same which was in the Obligation; and this *ipso facto* freeth from punishment, whether it be paid by the debtor himself, or by his surety. Another of a thing not altogether the same which is in the Obligation, so that some act of the Creditor or Governor must come unto it, which is called remission; in which case deliverance doth not follow *ipso facto* upon the satisfaction; and of this kind is the satisfadion of Christ.—Thus this great learned, holy Divine as almost *England* ever bred, doth go on (even in *Grotius* his own words translated) betwixt whom (had he been living) and Mr. *Owen* would have been but *impar congressus*.

Ball on Covenant, p.240.

As these false Teachers 2 *Pet.* 2:I. were called into the Covenant, accepted the condition, believed in Christ, for a time rejoiced in him, and brought forth some fruit? so we

confess they were bought by the blood of Christ, because all these were fruits of Christ's Death, whereof they were made partakers.

As in the Parable, *Mat.* 18:25. the Lord is said to remit to his servant a 1000, talents when he desired him, *viz.*, *Inchoately, or upon condition, which was not confirmed, because he did not forgive his fellow-servant*: So the false Prophets are bought by the blood of Christ, in a sort, as they believed in Christ. We read of Apostates who had been enlightned, &c. *Heb.* 6. and did revolt from the Faith; To these men their sins were remitted in a sort in this world, and in a sort they were bought with the blood of Christ, but inchoately only, and as they tasted the word of life. Had they eaten the word of life, had they soundly and truly believed in Christ, they had received perfect and consummate remission of sins, both in this world, and in the world to come; they had been perfectly redeemed and reconciled to God; But because they did not eat, but tasted only, they received not perfect Remission, they were not perfectly redeemed.

Idem. pag. 225.

There is this mutual respect betwixt the promise and stipulation; that the promise is as an argument which God useth, that he might

obtain of man what he requireth; and the performance of the thing required, *is a condition without which man cannot obtain the promise of God.*

Idem. pag. 43.

Of this Covenant be two parts, 1. a Promise: 2. a stipulation, The Promise is, that God will pardon the sins of them that repent unfeignedly, and believe in his mercy.

2. The Stipulation is, that they believe in him that justifieth the ungodly, and walk before him in all well-pleasing.

See him also delivering the most of *Amiraldus* doctrine, p.244, 245.

Molinæus de elect. ex fide, p.. 316.

We know remission is not obtained before Prayers (for it.) But I say that it was decreed, before Prayers, and that it is sought by Prayers, although it be decreed.

Scarpus symphonia. p. 93.

The substance of the Covenant lieth in the promise of grace made in Christ, and the Restipulation of Faith and Gratitude.

Paræus in Genes. 17. p. 1130.

The substance of the Covenant lieth in the promise of free Reconciliation, Righteousness, and life eternal, by and for Christ freely to be given, and in the restipulation of our Moral Obedience and Gratitude.

Bullinger. Decad. 1. Serm. 6. pag. 44.

We say, Faith justifieth for it self, not as it is a quality in our mind, or our own work: but as Faith is a gift of God's grace having the promise of Righteousness and life, &c. Therefore Faith justifieth for Christ, and from the grace and Covenant of God.

*Mr. Ant. Burgess of Justic. Lect. 14,
p. 117.*

Scripture maketh no pardon of sin to be but where the subject hath such qualifications as this of forgiving others. It is not indeed put as a cause, or merit, but yet it is as a qualification of the subject; therefore our Saviour repeateth, *Except ye forgive others, &c.* So *Acts 10:43. Rom. 3:15. So 1 Joh. 1:9. If we confess, &c.* By these and the like Scriptures it is plain, *That remission of sin is given us only in the use of these Graces.*

*Mr. Burges of Iustis. Lect. 18. pag. 148,
149.*

Prop. 2. Although the Scripture attributes pardon of sin to many qualifications in a man, yet repentance is the most express and proper duty.—If we speak of the express formal qualification, it is repentance of our sins, &c.

Prop. 3. None may believe, or conclude that their sins are pardoned before they have repented, *Mat. 3:2. Luk. 13:3.*

Prop. 4. There is a necessity of repentance if we would have pardon, both by necessity of Precept, and of means. The Spirit of God worketh this in a man to qualify him for this pardon, pag. 150.

You see then that Faith is not the only condition of remission, and consequently nor of justification.

Not as an appeal to men, but to fill up the vacant pages, and satisfy you who charge me with singularity, have I added these promiscuous Testimonies, supposing you can apply them to their intended uses.

FINIS.