

*THE
OPEN DOOR
For Man's Approach to GOD.
by
John Horne*

Layout © Quinta Press 2026

Occasionally the pagination goes awry. So the original page numbers are in square brackets in the running heads. The biggest error is that pages 139–140 and 277–278 do not exist.

Original text used sourced from EEBO (Early English Books Online).

Unreadable text is marked with {?????}

Greek and Hebrew text that needs careful checking is contained within brackets {}.

ΘΥΡΑ ΑΝΕΩΓΜΕΝΗ
THE
OPEN DOOR

For MANS Approach to GOD.

OR,
A VINDICATION of the *Record* of
GOD Concerning the Extent of the Death
of CHRIST in its Object.

In Answer to a Treatise of Master *Iohn Owen*,
of *Cogshall* in *Essex*, about that Subject.

By *John Horn*, a Servant of God in the Gospel of his Son,
and Preacher thereof at *Lyn* in *Norffolk*.

The Grace of God that bringeth Salvation to All Men, hath appeared, teaching us to deny ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, &c. Tit. 2.11, 12, 13.

God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life. John 3.16. And he is the propitiation for our Sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world's. 1 John 2.2.

Mysticus sol ille justitiæ omnibus ortus est, omnibus venit, omnibus passus est, & omnibus resurrexit, ideo autem passus est ut tolleret peccatum mundi: Si quis autem non credit in Christum, generali beneficio ipse se fraudat. *Ambros.*

Ut si quis clausis fenestris radios solis excludat; non ideo sol non ortus est omnibus, quia colore ejus se ipse fraudavit, nam quod solis est prærogativam suam servat: quod autem imprudentis, communis a se gratiam lucis excludit. *Ambros. in Psal. 118. secund. vulg. Lat. Octon. Octavo Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete.*

London, Printed by *Robert White*, and are to be sold by *Giles Calvert*, at his Shop, at the Sign of the Black-Spred-Eagle at the West End of *Pauls*. 1650.

REader, My necessitated absence from the Press hath occasioned some mistakes both of words and pointings in the printing, which (least envy take occasion by them to traduce me with the simple, and ingenuity it self be at a loss) I have here shewed thee how thou shouldst correct, Viz.

In the Epistle to the Reader.

PAge 14 Line 6 read 2. for 1. p. 18 l. 18 r. them. p.28 l. 15 r. that rule. p.28 l. 29 r. lately. In the Answer. Pa. 12 Lin 22 r. [καταλλάσσω]. p. 15 l. 18r. call. p 23 l. 10 r. too. p.24 marg. r. ver. 18. p.27 l. 11 r. as are then not so. p. 28 l. 1, 2 r. Psal.78. Mat. 18. p.45 l.36 r John 5. p 48 l. 6 r. dawne. p 49. l. 26 r. they would not. p. 54 l.2 put the stop after second. p. 56 l. 25 r. oppose. p. 67 l. 20 r. but as an example. p. 75 l. 38 r. rather without marks. p. 80 l. 35 r. third. p 84 l. 29 r. liked not to have. p. 85 l. 8 r. talents, alike open. p. 87 l. 30 r. not that some. p. 95 l. 1 r. then. p. 118 l. 17 r. Job 5. p. 125 l. 26 r. conferrer. p. 131 l. 21 r. having given. p. 132 l. 29 r. distinguished. p. 141 l. 6, 11 r. if we. p. 142 l. 38 r. had. p. 143 l. 38 r. nor. p. 148 l. 38 r. quia post omnia. p. 156 l. 6 r. yet. p. 161 l. 20 r. pact. p 173 l. 3 r. Grecians. p. 176 l. 29 r. City. l 30 r. 2 Chron. 28. p. 177 l. 39 r. that. p. 178 l. 24 r. that that declares. l. 35 r. Saviour having. p. 182 l. 3 r. them. p. 184 l. 7 r. denies. l. 9 r. I will. p. 185 l. 3 r. is as. l. 25 r. these words. p. 191 l. 8 r. that it doth not. l. 33 r. contain. p. 195 l. 2 r. flung. p. 200 l. 14 r. them or without. p. 203 l. 36 r. nor had they any. p. 204 l. 29 r. halts. p 207 l. 11 r. of. l. 20 r. warn. l. ibid. r. any. p. 223 l.2 r Luc. 19. p. 229 l. 4 r. mistake. p. 235 l. 32 r. its. p 236 l. 35. r. reference. p. 238 l. 22 r. to all which we. p. 255 l. 13 r. delivered from. p. 259 l. 16 blot out we. p. 262 l. 17 r. would. p 263 l. 8 r. to whom they. p. 265 l. 14 put the comma after here. p. 268 l. 18 r. also. p. 271 l. 38 r. as frothy. p. 279 l. 17 r. that. p. 297 l. 17 r. because. l. 28 r. righteousness of the Law. p. 299 l. 21, 26 put a parentheses before (As, and after So) p. 300 l. 22 take away the stop at name, and read name for. p. 305 l. 25 r. mea, p. 306 l. 26 r. something. p. 319 l. 4 r. Reproaches. p.320. l. 35 r. no need.

To the Honorable, Colonel *Valentine*

Walton, One of the Members of the *Supream*
Authority of this *Commonwealth*, and of the *Council*
of *State*, and Governor of the *Garrisons* of *Lyn*,
Yarmouth, *Crowland*, and the *Ile* of *Ely*, &c.

AND ALSO

To the Right Worshipful, Mr. *Thomas Toll*, Bur-
gess for the Town of *Lyn Regis*, and Mr. *Miles Corbet*,
Burgess for the Town of *Yarmouth* in *Norfolk*. Esquires, both
Members of the said *Supream Authority*, &c. Grace,
and Mercy, and Peace in the knowledge of God,
and of Jesus Christ our LORD.

Honorable, and Right Worshipfull,



T was the saying of Socrates, as *Xenophon relates,
[a] That ungrateful persons are to be numbred amongst
the unjust, and that [b] by how much the more and greater
favours any have received, so much the unjuster he is,
if he be unthankeful. Yea, and so hateful was the crime
of Ingratitude to the Persians (as the same Xenophon tells us) that
they used to teach their children to abhor and condemn it, and [c] severely to
punish those that were guilty of it, as conceiving (& that not amiss) That
Ingratitude is that cursed Principle (and a compendium of Vices) that
leads those in whom its planted, and by whom its nourished, to be inju-
rious to, and neglective of both God and man, and to be attended with a
shameless impudency, which is the very Ringleader unto all filthiness
and abomination. And verily Sir, as they guessed not amiss (for the [d]
{ἐς τ} [c] Zenoph. de Cyri paediâ lib. 1. {Ὅν μὲν γινώσκει δυνάμενον μὲν χάριν ἀποδιδόναι μὴ
ἀποδιδόντα δὲ, κολάζουσιν τοῦτον ἰσχυρῶς}, &c. [d] Ingratum si dixeris, omnia dixeris.

* Zenoph.
de dictis &
factis, So-
cratis.
[a] By {ἐν τοῖς
ἀδίκους
καταλογί-
ζεσθε τοὺς
ἀχαρίζους}.
[b] {ὅσω ἂν
τις μείζω
αγαθὰ
παθὼν μὴ
ἀποδιδῶ
κάριν, πσού-
τω ἀδι-
κωτερος}.

e 2 Tim. 3.2, 3. *holy Scriptures couples [e] unthankfulness with unholiness, yea, puts it before it, as the inlet to profaneness, and follows it with want of natural affections, [7] truce breaking, false accusing, &c. and elsewhere speaks of it as the beginning of Apostacy) so are their sayings, especially considerable with reference unto God, the supream fountain and sovereign Author of all good, towards whom unthankfulness is so much the greater injustice, as he exceeds and excels all others in favors towards us. If we should go about to number up his kindnesses, [8] they would arise to such a reckoning as is far beyond us. Great and many are his kindnesses to us in this life, as his giving us life, breath, limbs, strength, health, food and raiment, the shining of the Sun, the falling of the rain, with fruitful Seasons, peace, liberty and gladness, victories over enemies, and good successes, Day to day uttereth speech, and night to night uttereth knowledge, and they all are Evidences and Witnesses of his goodness. But whence all these to sinful unworthy creatures, [9] whose consciences daily accuse us of evils, and tell us death and vengeance is due unto us? Surely as the Scriptures say they are the beamings of his bright goodness, the issues, or out-flowings of the life in Christ, which is the light of men, which life was and is in him through his sufferings for us. [10] For verily Adam forfeited for himself and us, what ever might evidence goodness towards us, even life it self, and all other mercies thereof, so as had God dealt with us after the demerit of his sin, nothing but wrath and misery had been upon us. But verily Christ stepping in, upholds all things, and makes them consist and stand together for our use and service. Yea, there-through also have we in these latter days, that which is yet more precious, the Publishing of the Word and Gospel of God, ordered unto all Nations the end and tendency of all, which too is to lead us to repentance, that repenting of our evils against one so good to us, he might shew us greater things still, even the blessings of a better life, prepared and made ready in Christ Jesus for us, pardon, and peace, and spirit, and eternal happiness. And surely the gift of Christ, and his death and sufferings for us, must needs it self be an inestimable favour, and deserve at our hands unutterable thanks, which is the way and inlet, yea, in a maner, the onely procuring cause under the good Will of God of all these mercies. How then are men in generall bound unto thankfulness, but especially we in this Nation, that enjoy the Scriptures, and publishing of the Gospel therein, which many other Nations have wickedly put away from themselves and their posterities? their supream powers yielding up themselves to the power of darkness, and neither imbracing
 the*

the Word of Truth themselves, nor permitting it to others. Yea, what cause of thanks have we to God, that hath broken yokes of Tyranny and Oppression from off us, that formerly hindered mens receipt, and free confession of his goodness? What salvations hath God wrought for us in the midst of this earth? What plots hath he discovered? What designs of the enemies of Sion hath he defeated? How hath he guided Counsels, and strengthened Armies to deliver us from the Power and Oppressions of those who being ingrateful to God themselves for his goodness, could not indure that others should acknowledge it aright, and be truly thankful? And, O that we also after such an addition of favors above what all have in common, may not run into that horrid sin of unthankfulness, nor reject the tidings of his great goodness, and by observing lying vanities, forsake our own mercies, much less abuse and turn it into wantonness. [II] Surely for these things comes the wrath of God upon the children of unperswasibleness. Yea, not onely destructions, and desolations of Persons, Families, Cities, Countries, and Nations here, but also hereafter eternal vengeance.

{τῆς ἀπει-
θείας}.
Ephes. 5.
3. 4.

Now of the evil of unthankfulness, dear Sirs, how greatly guilty are they, who though they confess men faulty for it, and can aggravate the evil of it above my Rhetorick, yet make it a part of their business and Religion, with zeal and earnestness, to perswade the most of men, that they have cause to doubt whether they have any thing in good will from God, and so by consequence, whether any real ground and cause to be thankful to him, while they hold forth to them, that Christ died but for a few, and the rest are the objects of his hatred from everlasting, and all they have, even the Gospel it self, they have in hatred and displeasure from him; and so onely to this end, that they may work out, and increase their own misery by them? Against which their evil Doctrine I have written this insuing Treatise, in which I have indeavoured to remove that froth of wit, and humane reason, and high thoughts of error, which are with so great noise of Orthodoxness (equivalent to the Romanists cry of Catholike) lifted up against the Apostles Doctrine: and to shew that God is good, really good to All, but especially to those that his goodness makes good, and thankfully through faith to live unto him. And so also that all have real cause of believing, and living thankfully, doing good after his example to All, but especially to the good, and the believing; and that the unbelief of his goodness, and unthankfulness to him for it, is the true cause of multitudes perishing. And now, Dear Sirs, that I might not run into that odious evil of ingratitude toward

you, from whom as instruments in the good hand of God, I acknowledge I have received very much favor and kindness, and under whom I enjoy my Place and Liberty of Gospel-preaching, (and many others with me have received many ingagements of thanks for and to you) having finished this Treatise, I am imboldened to thrust it out into the world, under your Protection and Patronages, under God and the Lord Jesus, to whom supremely I have devoted my self and service. I hope your Honors will not expect it should exceed its Author, in whom you know weakness, but I hope you will take it in good part, as a Testimony of my thankfulness. I expect it will meet with oppositions good store against it, as is always the Lot of Truth in an unthankful world, especially from those it argues guilty of mens unthankfulness; may it but finde with you, that entertainment Truth should have with the Saints, so far as you shall see Truth held forth in it, I shall rejoyce therein concerning you. For whom (with your beloved Consorts, and all yours) My desire is, That God would please so to order, guide, and keep you, that walking righteously in the earth, and serving your generation with faithfulness in the Work of God, you may receive the reward of the righteous in eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord, in whom I remain,

From my House in South-Lyn,

June 20th. 1650.

SIR,

Your Honour, and Worships, faithfully to serve you in the Gospel,

JOHN HORN.

A Brief Revise of some few Passages.

There is a passage, good Reader, in the Epistle to the Reader, *Pag.* 14. *viz.* where I say, That none, till brought into Christ, can make any profitable use of, or rightly understand the Doctrines of Election and Reprobation, of which I desire thy candid and favourable construction, as spoken of (as they are most usually looked upon) as secret Decrees and Counsels of God about the future estates of men, and not as acts or executions of decrees passing upon men in time: for indeed in this latter sense the Scripture (and we answerably may) doth speak of them more intelligibly and profitably. As when it says, *The Lord hath set apart for himself the man that is godly, Psal.* 4.3. Such a chusing, or setting apart for himself as is there spoken of, is, and may be profitably propounded as an inducement unto godliness: Also when its said, That God, for such wilfull refusings of him, and his Word, Truth, and Grace, cast off, reprobated or gave over such and such men, as in *Psal.* 81.9, 10, 11, 14. *Jer.* 6.16, 30. *Rom.* 1.28. Such a propounding of Reprobation may both be apprehended, and good use may be made of it to, and by men yet unrenewed, to deter them from their obstinacy in evill, and warn them to give diligent heed to God, lest they should be so dealt with; but in such a maner of speaking of, and propounding these things, I would not be understood there, but as under those tearms men understand hidden, abstruse acts of the Counsell and Will of God in himself from everlasting.

In *Pag.* 21. of the same Epistle, there is *lapsus memoriae*; a mistake of *Hubberdine* for Dr. *Buckneham*, through the defect of my memory, I not then having the Martyrology by me.

In *Pag.* 74. *lin.* 15, 16, 17, &c. some interlined passages of Mr. *Owens* Inferences were mistaken, and misplaced by the Printer. It should have been printed thus, All that Christ dyed for: 1. He gives (that is, compels) to believe (an inference wholly groundless from that Text, it speaking of actuall believers, and not of faith, as a thing yet to be given them.) 2. All that he dyed for, he justifies, makes righteous, and brings them to glory. 3. All he dyed for, he makes Intercession for, for collating on them all the choise benefits of his death.

In *Pag.* 75. Where I say, The ascribing an antecedent will, Whose fulfilling depends on any free contingent act of ours, fals not upon us; my meaning is, it fals not upon what I said in the beginning of that

that Chapter, about Impetration and Application: That that follows, viz. But I conceive, &c. should have been (*yet I conceive that without injury to God, that may be called an Antecedent will, which respects some Antecedent condition in us, in respect of some will of God, respecting us as its proper object in a consequent condition*) in which I hope the ingenuous Reader will conceive that I speak of the Actings or determinations of Gods will, which are called sometime {Θελήματα}, and not that I assert, that there are in God divers Wills, or *Principia volendi*; for that would be all one, as to assert divers Gods, or divers Essences of the same God.

What I say in *Pag.* 58. About Christs meriting his own exaltation in the humane nature, is so clear, that I hope none will deny it; and yet I find that *Zanchy* was somewhat questioned about it by some in his time; the learned Reader may see his defence of himself, and his confirmation of the Orthodoxness of that assertion, by the Testimony of divers of the Ancient Fathers, as *Augustine*, *Jerome*, *Ambrose*, *Beda*, &c. in *Epist ad Lectorem, tractatui de Fide Christianâ (five Confessioni suâ) præfixâ*; amongst the rest, that of *Augustine* is curt and pithy, in *Phil.* 2.10. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him. *Humilitas claritatis meritum, olaritas humilitireis præmium sed hoc factum est in formâ servi*, &c. And by *Humility* he merited his *glory*, and his *glory* was the reward of his *humility*, but this was not in the form of God, but in the form of a servant, or as he was made man, &c. *Zanchies* Assertion that occasioned that defence is thus. *De Relig. Christ. Cap. 11. Apho. 15. Credimus Christum suâ perfectâ obedientiâ, non solum sibi, sed etiam nobis vitam æternam promeruisse*, &c.

What I say, *Pag.* 125 to that place in *Phil.* 1.29. That the phrase {τὸ {ὕπερ χριστοῦ}} should rather be translated, As pertaining to Christ, is the judgment of divers Learned men as well as mine. *Zanchi* renders it, *Pro Christi*, id est, *In Christi negotio*, vid. *Zanch. in loc.* *Beza: In negotio Christo, ad verbum, in eo quod pro Christo suscipitur, alioqui (inquit) redundaret articulus {τὸ}*. *Bez. Annot. in loc.* *Camerarius in loc.* thus, {τὸ ὑπερ χριστοῦ ἐλλειπτικῶς}, & significat {ἡ ὑπερ περὶ} quod attinet ad Christum, ea vobis contigit gratia, &c.

In *Pag.* 173. That of [every herb] I think (upon further consideration) may be numbered amongst those places which speak of the species or sorts of things, and so the sense is, they took the tenth individual of every species of herbs: but yet that will make nothing to prove the word All to be taken so in the places in question.

To the Reader.

Reader,



Whoever thou art, quædam tecum vellem in limine; I have a word or two to say to thee before thou goest any further. I desire thee to peruse this Treatise thoroughly, for it cannot harm thee, but if thou beest not thine own hindrance it may profit thee. Though it be hostile, its only against that that would hinder thee of good, or obstruct those passages by which thou mightest be led out to do good. It pleads for God and thy good, yea the common good of all that do not wilfully deprive themselves thereof for vanity. It pleads for Love: to defend and maintain that God loves thee, and to let thee see that there is good ground and cause for thy loving him; And its the nature of love to stand enemy to nothing but that that hinders its course, and keeps the parties loved from the good it wishes them. It pleads for a truth, a part of that Doctrine of truth, which the Apostle and Teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth, both instructed our Fathers in, [12] and left upon record for us their posterity; namely, that God wills that men be saved, and come to the knowledg of truth; and that evidenced in this, that as there is but one God, so there is one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus (by whom God dispenses his goodness, and makes known his good will to us, and by whom we may have access to him, and he is ready to accept of and imbrace us) He having given himself a Ransome for all. [13] A truth to be testified to men in due (or proper, or in their own) times. A truth it is though in these dayes covered over with reproachful tearms of error and heresie, and (as from the

B

beginning

[12] 1 Tim.
2.4, 5, 6, 7.

[13] {Μαρτύριον
τοῖς ἰδίοις
καίροις}.

beginning the way of Christ hath been) every where ill spoken of, and exploded as little better then blasphemy. Such force hath Satan, (Gods and mans adversary) in the hearts of many, that they love not, nor believe that that speaks good of God to them, and that which might do them good. But marvel not at that, good Reader, for this beam of truth findes no worse entertainment herein then the body of Truth it self, then the word of God made flesh and manifested in the flesh met with in the dayes of his flesh. Came not He from the bosome of the Father to open his name unto men, and to shew to them the way of their salvation? was not he truly Jesus, the salvation of God, and Saviour of the world? one that came to teach men the knowledg of God, and lead them unto life? But O what course usage did He finde? Did not the world abominate him, as if he had been a Devil incarnate, filled with Satan, the great deceiver of mankind, leading them to Destruction! how often did they cry out against him, and offer to lay violent hands upon him, as if he was unworthy to live amongst them? What evil laws enacted they against him, casting out of their Synagogues (meetings and fellowships) those that would own him? Did they not call a councel about him and condemne him, therein and crave, yea almost force it upon the Secular power, to deliver him up to be crucified by them, till they got their wills in that matter on him? how did they after his condemnation all-to revile, mock and taunt him, yea despitefully intreat and kill him? And as if they would leave no stone unremoved for effecting their designes upon him, they seal him up in his Sepulcher, and set a guard to keep him therein. And who I pray were the persons that thus used him? Were they not the generality of the people, but principally the Priests and Rulers, the zealous and devout, the seeming godly party, that were so strict for tithing mint and rue, for keeping Sabbaths, keeping out errors and blasphemies, as that a man that judged by the outside, would have sworn they were the holiest people and best beloved of God, that the world contained. The wise, the prudent, the powerful, the Scribes, Pharises, and Rulers of the people? But I pray was Christ less the Son of God or the great Truth of truths, because he found so bad entertainment by these prudent zealots? because they condemned him and put him to Death, was he therefore really guilty of that deceit and blasphemy with which they charged him? was it not indeed (as himself told them) because he spake the truth to them, and they could not endure to hear it from him? Because he testified of them that their deeds were evil, and their doctrine viti-
ous

ous which they set so high a price upon? many good deeds have I done (saith He) for which of them do ye stone me? And truly, friend, so have men dealt with this truth in hand, Its cryed out upon as a Doctrine of Satan, as error and blasphemy, as the most pernicious Doctrine that can be taught almost, they sit upon it in council and condemn it, they have reviled it, railed on it, mocked, taunted it, yea have they not crucified it and almost killed it, and all this too hath been acted by the Learned. Prudent, Rabbies, Scribes and Rulers, but what evil hath it done? Why, disturb the Churches peace? so they said Christ and the Gospel did their Synagogues. Deprives believers of their comfort? nay tis but them that believe it not (as Christ did them that believed not in him) not any right believers, as we shall shew, they can prove it guilty of no evil, and therefore let not their charges of it move thee, Veritas magna est & praevalebit: let them bury it, and set a guard upon it, banish it their cities, countries, kingdoms, strike hands with Satan himself, and combine with the gates and powers of hell to under it; out it will and shall, and shall be received. As Moses lift up the Serpent in the wilderness, so shall the son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish but have eternal life. For truth is truth though hated and reproached; its cause is just, their accusations groundless, their opposite positions Antichristian, but it self divine, no nicety or fancy, but of great concernment, it being a truth that glorifies God and brings good news or tidings to men: which with thy patience, I shall a little demonstrate, with the differences of their Anti-position of Christs dying only for an elect number in these following particulars.

1. Its a doctrine that gives glory to God, and magnifies his mercy or goodness and justice toward the sons of men in his dealings with them, whereas the opinion it opposeth detracts from his glory in those particulars. First, I say it commends and magnifies the goodness of God in the exercise of his mercy, while it speaks of him as love it self; one that is good, and therefore doth good, good to All, a lover and Saviour of mankinde, and of the world in general; one that delights not in the death of the wicked, nor would that any should perish and run themselves into destruction, but rather come to repentance and live; to which end it shewes that he hath provided a means for banished mankinde to be brought back by to him again from that estate of misery unto which they were banished, yea that to that end he enlightens, manifests his truth, calls to look to him, lades with benefits, waytes with patience upon sinners, chastens them in mercy, to keep their souls from the pit, and

to enlighten them with the light of the living: and all this not bounded up to a few, the far fewer part of men, but in some degree or other enlarged generally to all. And is not this a commendation of him as good and loving? is it not the nature of love to diffuse it self abroad? to extend it self to all, as well as to burn intensively to any? And

2. Doth not that that speakes of God as so mercifull, illustrate also his justice the more brightly; when it shewes his wrath and vengeance to come upon men for abusing love, undervaluing goodness, and for not accepting his grace? can any thing be thought more just then to punish him that transgresses a command of an Authority, in it self not onely lawful, but also good and Fatherly? that not only by its sovereignty might exact, but also by its clemency and goodness did deserve obedience to its injunctions from all under it? such as this doctrine declares Gods dealings with men by way of justice to be, not only in respect of Adam our first parent, and all in him, but also in respect of us in our particulars: and yet we ascribe his Sovereignty to him in all things too; while we say all these his dispensations are not necessitated to him, but free and voluntary; so as that his giving Christ & the streams of goodness, that come to us through Christ, were all of his good will, not of our works; yea his extending these or those means, longer or shorter time, with less or greater power, are all free dispensations according to his will; the Law he gives to men, and the rewards he propounds, all according to his own will, only we say he acts forth this his Sovereignty towards all in a most equal dispensation, in which he justifies himself to all that plead with him to be good and holy. And yet this doctrine leaves him at liberty too, to do to any one more or less, to make one more exemplary and singular in mercy, and another in severity, as he pleases.

But now the doctrine opposed by us, derogates from God in these things; for it speakes of him in respect of most, as an Abaddon, not a Saviour, an {Ἀνθρωποκτόνος} not, {Φιλάνθρωπος}; not a friend and lover of men, but a hater and destroyer of them; for what else I pray you speakes that language that they preach as a truth concerning the greatest part of men, that God hates them from eternity, and so in hatred made them, and necessitated their sinning and perishing? Is this to represent God lovely and gracious, or dreadful, and one that delights in mans misery and ruine? I know they say his love is but velle bonum creaturis, to will that that is good to creatures, and so that he may be said to love them in that he gives them outward good things; in which I conceive they
either

either give too scant a definition of his love, or call that good in it, that upon second thoughts, if made their own portion, they would scarcely deem so. I conceive his love is rather to be thus defined, *A velle bonum creaturis, quo iis benè esse possit*: a willing good things to creatures for their good, for otherwise the willing of a good thing is not good, if it have in it a destructive intention, as for a man to will another a massy Wedge of Gold that he might cast him into the Sea and drown him with it; and yet such is their doctrine of Gods willing good things to most, for they make his first or eternal thoughts of them as to themselves to be their misery, and so all the bounty, patience, and whatsoever they have from him, to be to that end that they might by them arrive at it, as some have said; Gods dealings with some men are as if one should hang a man in a Goldchain, or tie a wedg of Gold about his neck to sink him. *Quis talia fando temperet à lachrymis?* Now while they thus deny the extent of his mercy and goodness, and give such direful representations of him, they also by consequence obscure his justice; for whereas his justice is illustrated by mercy, they that obscure this must needs obscure the other also. Justice is then seen in acts Retributive, when voluntary unnecessitated transgressions are severely punished, and by how much the more have been the advantages, encouragements, and liberty afforded for doing what is required, so much the cleerer is the equity of punishing the fault committed; How do they then cleer or magnifie Gods justice that make him to punish only necessitated wickedness? Yea that make the Decree of eternal vengeance upon such and such persons to be in order of nature, Antecedaneous to any consideration of sin deserving it? for these to be some of their conceptions and the sum of their expressions too, they well know that are acquainted with any thing in this controversie. Now I propound to any rational understanding, whether of these two most declare and glorifie justice for a master to punish his servant for not doing something that he could not do, or doing what he could not but do, yea what he himself necessitates him to do? or for a master to punish his servant for that he gave him command and ability; yea also incouragement, and promised assistance for doing, and he voluntarily and slothfully neglected or refused to do it? Sure any man that hath his wits about him, will say this latter. But now against this particular I know what they object, and its Mr. Owens in his preface; “They say the earth-
“worms of the world must not prescribe to God, what way to glorifie
“himself in: its rather for us to ascribe that glory to him that he

“makes his own, then devise ways for his glory by our inventions, and “speak lies in his behalf; which things are in themselves rightly spoken, onely they therein intimate that those things which we have said of God, are of our devising and ascribing to him, which he neither ascribes to himself nor owneth at our hands, to take off which we shall come to another particular, viz. That

2. *The perswasion I have defended, is a truth of Gods own revealing, and not of our devising, but on the contrary, theirs a falshood, not revealed by him, but devised by them; in which they as well give God the lye, as deny him to be love. What I here defend is grounded on the Scripture-expressions, in maintaining which I indeavor to keep close to them, and subject reason to faith, theirs have no Scripture expression to maintain it, but leans upon reason, exalting it self against faith. They are the plain Scripture expressions, that God is love, hath loved the world, is good to all, the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe, that he delights in mercy, but delights not that the wicked should die, but rather turn and live, that he is not willing that any should perish, but that all come to Repentance; that his goodness, forbearance and long-suffering, is not to be despised, it leading to repentance, even such, as not repenting, treasure up wrath to themselves against the day of wrath, &c. So also that Christ dyed for all and every one, that he gave himself a ransome for all, and is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; if any hear him and believe not, he doth not judg him, because he came not to judg the world, but to save the world. That those whom he shall judg to death, he will so judge for their not believing in the light he gave them, for not hearing his voice, not receiving the truth, but imprisoning it in unrighteousness, &c. these and many such like are the revelations and expressions of the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures, upon which we ground our perswasion, desiring simply to believe and hold them for true, yea though all things therein held forth, we knew not how by reason to comprehend, judging him true, and his word pure and perfect, but our reasons and wisdom against it, and where it Judges it absurd, to be folly, and bruitishness. We believe and receive also all those places that they produce to us, as that he came to save his people, gave himself for his Church. Sheep, &c. that the Saints and faithful were elected in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world; that God said to Rebecca concerning Jacob and Esau before they were born, or had done good or evil, that the elder of them (with his posterity) should serve the younger (with his) and
that*

that God said by Malachy, that he loved the one and hated the other, and that God chuses not either according to birth or works in us, which is the thing the Apostle brings it to prove, but that he hated either of them from Eternity, and before they had done either good or evil, or that he so hated the greater part of mankind, that God loved only his elect and chosen, that he is only their Saviour; that Christ died only for them, and gave himself a ransom only for his sheep and Church, and did not die for the greatest part of men, nor hath any fitness or sufficiency as a mediator for them to save them; that God did make the greatest part of men with intention to destroy them, and never bare any good will to them, that they perish for ever for the sin of Adam, and that their condemnation is aggravated by their after sins, for their neglecting that that was never for them, and for not repenting and believing on him, though there was neither object meet for them to believe on, nor any power vouchsafed to them from God, by which in attending to God in the meanes propounded, they might have been brought to repent and believe, that all that Christ died for, shall be saved eternally, and none of them shall perish; these and the like positions maintained by them, we finde no Scripture asserting, and so have no divine ground of believing: but to maintain them they rely on their reasons, adding to, and detracting from the Scripture-expressions as they please, yea, plainly contradicting them, making particular affirmative propositions in Scripture equipollent to universal affirmatives, as, *We*, or the Church are sanctified by his Death, ergo *All* that he died for: and particular Affirmatives, to be repugnant and contradictory to universal Affirmatives, as, *He* gave himself for us, ergo, *Not* for all; gave his life as a shepherd for his sheep, ergo, he gave not himself a ransome for all men: and many such inept and unscholarlike inferences their wisdomes make to maintain and strengthen their devised Assertions, drawing conclusions by them openly contradictory to the Scripture-expressions; as ergo *He* died not for all and every one: God would not that all men should be saved, &c. I would Master Owen, and the rest of his minde, would be content that God should be true, and reason be judged absurd and vain where it opposes him; that he may have but that glory of his mercy, goodness, truth and Justice, that he in the Scriptures asserts to himself, we should willingly hold us to that bargain with them. But alas how injurious they are to the truth of God too, and how unbelieving of, and contradictory to the Scriptures, thou mayst see by this litle tast here given, and more fully I hope by the treatise itself here presented to thee as an answer to him; but yet

yet I have not set before thee all the good and usefulness of the truth here defended, nor all the evil of theirs opposed. For

3. This truth is profitable too for men, both in respect of themselves and others, in both which regards too their counter-positions are injurious: First, In respect of mens selves to whom its propounded, & who are to believe and receive it, its profitable for them to hear and receive it, because it presents to them an object for their faith, a motive to repent, believe, serve, and love God, and matter of comfort to them that lye in sadness and distress, for want of seeing ground to hope in him; for this presents God as loving and gracious to them; and what can be a greater motive to a man to listen to God, then that his Doctrine comes in love and good will, and brings good to him? or what so powerful as love to break a man off from evils against him? a loving carriage in David toward Saul, melts him into tears, and brings him from seeking to harm him, to confess his evil and give good language to him; how much more shall the love of God preached to men, and believed by them, work upon them, [14] or else they shall be left the more excuseless, and God shall be the more glorified in their destruction? It is not commands to repent, but love and goodness in him that is offended, that indeed leads and brings in the heart to true repentance. So what will so effectually draw a soul to trust in God, as when it hears and believes the goodness of God? Mansheart is so conscious of its own evil, that neither commands or promises (especially being so uncertain whether they appertain to us or no) will draw us in to betrust our selves with God, [15] except we perceive some real Testimonies of his love first towards us. And what so strong a cord to love and service of him, as to see his love preventing us? Love seen and believed in him, [16] begets love and service in us to him. We love him because he loved us first. Such our contrariety to God in our selves, and such our apprehensions of his contrariety to us, that till our hearts be purged from both by the demonstrations of his love and goodness, we will not love and serve him, not serve him in love, without which our service is not acceptable and delightful to him, so that from this love of God preached and believed, springs true obedience, and the hearty keeping of Gods Comandmmments. Yea herein it is that men see their sins most exactly odious, and are abased in the sight of them. True, the Law saies what is good and evil, righteous and sinful, but the Gospel shews most lively the hainousness of that sin, while it presents it not otherwise to be expiated then by the bloud of Gods own Son, and shews otherway no remission, yea this love and goodness at once both humbles
for

[14] Rom. 2.4, 5.
Psal. 36.7, 8.

[15] 1 John 4.19.

[16] Tit. 3.4, 5.

for sin against God, and leads to hope in, and expect good from God; yea and while it speaks not of an absolute certainty of life and happiness for all, for whom Christ died, but these things to be certainly obtained in submission to him, believing on him, and yielding up to his Spirit, it leads the soul to serve the Lord with an holy fear, and to rejoyce in him with trembling, through which holy fear the heart is preserved from departing from him. So that this doctrine from the very word and Oracle of God, discovers to thee or any man (while yet not sinning that great sin to death) an object meet to look upon and admire, God meet to be turned to, sought after, hoped in, and served; yea, is a motive to, and a ground, foundation and spring of true comfort and godliness, of all which the contrary position deprives a man; No man by that beeing able as from the word of God to see good and right ground of loving, hoping in, and serving God, till he see that he do love, hope in, and serve him; there being nothing that bears witness of God to any particular soul (in their doctrine) that he loves and hath good will towards it, untill it see the discriminating, and distinguishing, electing love of God towards it, which is not to be seen by climbing up into heaven to search into Gods secrets, but by finding in themselves faith and sanctification (they say) and those too, such as are so and so qualified, as may evidence them to be fruits of election, and so men must have the effects before and without their proper cause, which is love discovered to men. Tit. 3.4, 5, 6. they must have all these, Repentance, Faith, Love to God and men, Justification, Sanctification, yea and perhaps too eternal Glory before they shall see any solid ground or motive to repent, believe in him, serve and love him, or that Christ hath done any thing for them, by vertue of which he can justifie and sanctifie them, and bring them to glory with him. And so they are not lead to deny ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godlily, by Gods grace appearing in the Gospel to them, but deny ungodliness, and live godlily (or rather pretend and seem to do so) that so grace might appear to them, and that they might see the gospel declaration to belong to them. The Gospel doctrine is to them but like the law, that is, a doctrine that consists of duties commanded, with promises and threatnings annexed, without Gospel motives of Gods love propounded; the viewing of which things the Spirit of Love breaths in, to lead, and to produce the things required; and so their endeavours after those works and duties are looked upon as the fruits of grace and goodness, yea as the arguments of their Electi-

past, and future happiness, when they may be as far from both as the Pharisee that denied Gods free Grace to Publicans and sinners, and yet judged himself a partaker of Gods Grace by his works of righteousness, magnifying grace against free will, and thanking God as giving such grace in those things which were but the products of his will, neglecting and abiding ignorant of that grace in Christ, which would have truly corrected both his Judgment and will; such the effect of this limiting, restraining doctrine as theirs also was. Men are led hereby to bottom the Gospel it self, with all arguments of love and goodness therein leading to faith and repentance, upon their faith and repentance, which they pretend they may have, before they know whether they have any solid ground for them or no, as if they could winde in themselves into the perception of Gods love by their frames and endeavors, and not first be wrought up to them by the love and goodness of God perceived by them; and as if men should look to themselves and their endeavors, as the glass through which they shall see Gods love as for them; and not rather upon God and Christ as declared in the Gospel to love them, as the glass in which they may see their obligation to God in Christ, and be moved to, and strengthened in their seeking after him & hoping in him. In that their way thou mayst see that God commands thee to repent or change thy minde, to Judg him good and to love him, and that he threatens thee if thou dost not, and promises great things to thee if thou dost, but whether thou beest one of them that he intends any good in his promises to, or that art in a possibility of attaining them, or only hast them propounded to thy hearing, without good will towards thee (but that thou mightest thereby have the greater destruction) that by it thou knowest not; for it presents no act of love from him that (according to it) thou canst say respects thee, or takes thee in as the object of it; only do all those things first, repent, believe, love, serve him, and then it shall be true for thee to believe that he hath good will to thee: a most preposterous way, that doth to men as Pharaoh to the Israelites, takes away their straw, and bids them get it themselves, and yet exacts their number of brick; takes away that declaration of Gods love and good will to men that should properly move them to repent, believe, &c. and sets men upon seeking arguments and demonstrations of these to themselves, and yet not fail to perform those duties required of them. A doctrine it is that presents less love to this or that man, then the Law it self did (whereas the Apostle magnifies the true Gospel as more excellent and more

un-

un veiled) for it set some certain demonstrations of Gods goodness to the Israelites before them, as his bringing them out of Egypt, chusing them in their Fathers to be a peculiar people to him, and many typical sacrifices representing Christs death for them, upon which they were commanded to love and serve him, but for ought this tells thee, thou wert hated by him from all eternity, yea this suggests to thee that all he doth to thee, may be but to bring thee to misery. Nay I might safely say, Gods dealings with the Gentiles represented more goodness as to their particulars, without suggestions of eternal hatred of them, then this kind of Gospell-preaching ascertains any one man of (as yet unregenerate) as truly goodness, and out of good will to him in particular. And O how injurious is that doctrine to men that withholds the most absolute & perfect motive to their duties, and way to meet with consolation. Whence it comes to pass, that first many are led by it into presumption, to lean upon themselves, and their own works, as evidences of that distinguishing love of God, that makes them sure of salvation (as the Pharisee Luke 18.9, 10.) and so of their being pure and righteous, when as yet they have never believed, and through faith received that love of God into their hearts thats preached in the Gospel, to wash and purify them, yea to bring them out of themselves into Christ, that they might be reckoned after him, & conformed to him, to salvation. These are of those that justify themselves, and labour to establish a righteousness of their own, and are ignorant of, and fight against the righteousness of God; despising others, and hindring them of that Gospel of grace that should be opened to them; stumbling as much that the Death of Jesus Christ should be preached to all, to ungodly and sinners not so qualified as they, as ever did the presumptuous proud Pharisees, that Christ should eat and drink with Publicans and sinners, and that his Apostles should preach the Gospel to the uncircumcised Gentiles.

2. Others again are held in bondage all their dayes, and are ever ready to fall into desperation, while not having the Love of God, and his goodness and grace propounded to them, as for them, that should beget faith, hope, fruitfulness, &c. or being hindered from believing it, as so propounded by occasion of this limiting doctrine, and yet being pressed on to believe, repent, be humble and broken, that so they may know that God hath good will to them, and hath given his Son for them, they labor and strive, and finde nothing which they can attain to, sufficient to demonstrate their election, and so that there is any thing in Christs mediation for their wearied souls to rest on; but on the contra-

ry, the more they look into themselves, the worse they finde themselves, and the less ground to think God loves them, and so by consequence, to hope in, believe on, love and serve him. The former throw by the corner stone, the sure foundation, Gods good will in Christ held forth to them in the Gospel, making that but a superstructure built upon their frames, endeavours and conceptions. The latter are Wholly without any foundation, but slote up and down without any setling: yea, and

3. Others go between both these, halting sometimes the one way, and sometimes the other: as they finde good frames (as they conceive) so they grow confident of their righteousness, and like the Pharisee, dare go to God and thank him: and as they finde flaws again in their works and performances, so they sink down again, and are ready to conclude that God never loved them, in the mean time how Hagarish, selfish, pharisaicall, and slavish are all their services to him! So that God is deprived of that service and affection that he should have from them, and themselves of that good, incouragement, and comfort that they might have from him.

And yet this is not all the evil that this doctrine doth to men, for it also in the very bowels of it holds forth an undeniable liberty to men, as yet unregenerate, to reason after this maner. Either they are such as Christ died for, or not: if the first, then they are well enough, for all their sins are satisfied for that they either have done or shall do, they may sin freely, it cannot hurt them, for Christ hath drunk up every drop of wrath due to them, and shall not shed one drop of blood more, or suffer any pain more then he hath for any thing they shall do against him; nor yet can God in Justice damn them, his Son having dyed for them; and therefore they will take no care, but follow their own wayes. If it be said, ah but this will dishonour God, and hurt others. What care unregenerate persons for God or others, if they know not that God cares for them? its themselves they most look at, and they can easily answer, his grace will be commended by forgiving them; and when they know he loves them, and gives them the grace, then they shall glorify him: And for others, if Christ died for them, it cannot hurt them, all is paid for that they shall commit, by occasion of their walking, and they cannot miss of eternal Salvation; otherwise, no matter what becomes of them, God cares not for them, and why should they? If the latter (that Christ died not for them) then they cannot avoid suffering to the utmost what Gods hatred of them will lead him to inflict upon them: he hates them, and what cause have they then

to love and serve Him? Why should they deprive themselves of certain present satisfactions to their mindes, to avoid what they no way can, or get that which no way is possible, or which they must have notwithstanding if Christ hath died for them? So that be I one of these or those (may such a one say) its best for me to take my pleasure here, at least till God make me do otherwise, for if Christ died for me, I shall have the pleasure of such sins here, and happiness hereafter too; if not, then I had better have my pleasure here, then not at all. This kinde of reasoning, I say, that directly tends to looseness and neglect of the means of Salvation, springs from the bowels of this Doctrine; whereas from the truth that I have endeavoured to defend, no such bad consequence follows, but it sets before men sure ground of hoping in, and loving God, and yet cause of watchfulness and diligence to seek him, least by neglecting him they deprive their Souls of that good he set before them. Its true, many in that way perhaps may not yeild up to such reasoning as I have said, but yet the Doctrine gives them ground for it, nor can the defenders of it be able to disprove it. Its true again, some that believe the truth may abuse it, but it gives no fair ground for it, as may easily be seen: we are not to judge of doctrines by mens practices that hold them, because their consciences and practick principles may contradict their erroneous speculations; or their wills and affections cause them to warp from their true principles of judgment. A Pharisaiical Saul may walk more strictly then a Christian Corinth, but by their natural undeniable influences into mens practices we may judg that to be erroneous, that leaves men to, and upholds them in a loose practise, not that that is turned from, into a loose practice, which it doth discountenance.

I know it is sometime objected against what I plead for, that by it a man may be led to take liberty to sin, and do what he pleases, for he may repent when he pleases, its in his own power. But to that I say, its a slander cast falsly upon our doctrine. For we deny that its in a mans power to repent and believe, as, and when he will, but only as, and when God gives it him, when God works upon him, and affords ability to him, and that he gives also in such means as he hath pitcht on, and when he pleases: so that its needful that men neglect no opportunities that he presents to them, nor presume upon their power or Gods patience; for though we affirm that God gives them his help in his seasons, and succors them in the day of salvation, yet if that be neglected or received in vain, God may justly cut it short with them, and therefore

it stands men in hand to take his times and seasons, and lay hold on his strength when he reaches it forth to them, for (as one sayes well) qui promisit poenitenti veniam, non promisit procrastinanti poenitentiam. But to pass from this particular. Of their doctrine its further observable, That

I. *Its injurious also in respect of mens doing good to others, while it takes away those motives of doing good, that the truth propounds unto them; For first as it obscures the apprehensions of Gods goodness in mens selves, which are most effectual motives to do good to others. If he so loved us, we ought also to love one another. So also, Secondly, It takes away Gods example of being good to all, and rather presents him as an example of pretending one thing, and intending another, as if we might hate, and seek to harm some men in our hearts, so we do but speak them kindly, and thats to love and be merciful as God is. Yea, and it puts us upon a straight, whom really to love and pittie, because we cannot be certain whom God loves and pitties, and so that we do not love whom God hateth. And thirdly, It takes away that doctrine that we should hold forth, that word of life by which we should win men, for it makes it uncertain to them that undertake to preach, whom they should hold forth Gospel motives of Repentance and Faith to, I mean, any good will in God toward them to be testified to them, to draw them to repent and believe in him; whence many Ministers are put to it about Gospel preaching, yea in stead thereof become teachers of the Law, and jumble Law and Gospel together, so that they confound them, that they neither preach Law or Gospel, but a mingle mangle of both, not knowing what they say, nor whereof they affirm; talking of duties to them that want principles to perform them rightly, and not declaring to them that doctrine of Gods goodness that should, by declaring his love to them rightly principle them: telling men of believing, and of the fruits and priviledges of faith, but not holding forth Christ to men as one that dyed for them, and so is become a sure foundation for their faith: Yea, telling men that are yet in unregeneracy, of election and reprobation, though none can understand them aright, or make use of them profitably, till brought into Christ, in whom Election is, and for rejecting whom God rejecteth and reprobateth: an unprofitable doctrine to them, and good for little, as many teach it to such, but either to lead men to a careless presumption or drive them into desperation. Nay, in stead of preaching Gospel to every creature, they cannot preach Gospel in a certain sound (so as they or the hearer may say its Gospel to him) to
any*

any creature, except they presume they first see in him some fruits of Election. And so I conceive its a doctrine very serviceable to Satans design of hindering men from seeing that glorious grace of God in Christ, in and by which they should be turned into him, the contrary to all which is evidently affirmable of the Doctrine there pleaded for.

Upon these, and such like differences (good Reader) as also to stop the clamors of some, and herein give answer to them that deny me liberty thereof otherwise, was I moved to undertake this task of grappling with Mr. Owen in this controversie; not for any hopes I have to finde preferment and advantage in this world, the hopes of which I have thrown behinde me, and desire further so to do for Christ, being well acquainted with the worlds temper in this matter. I know its ever an enemy to the truth of God, and to its own good, through the subtile working of Satan, with the craftiness of the seeming prudent men, high in esteem with it. I know (for I sometimes hear) how supurbous, supercilious men deride the simplicity of the words and Gospel of Christ, how generally they fling against it, and cast dirt upon it; so that we may truly say, the visage and form of Christ is marred more then any form, and the truth of God in this matter rendred more contemptible then any doctrine; they that will not abide an argument or two to their faces, yet if they get into a Pulpit where none may interrupt them, or elsewhere, where there are none to answer them (like the hypocritical mockers at feasts spoken of Psal. 35.16.) then they will gird and argue strenuously against it, or deride and vilifie those that preach it, and more ingenuous men, and confident of their cause appear in print against it. I know the most odious names of Pelagianism, Semipelagianism, and Arminianism are cast upon it, as Samaritanism, and Sathanism too were often cast on Christ to make him odious and fear people from him: on the other side, their device is clothed with the names of sound and Orthodox doctrine, and shews its pedegree as high as Prosper, and Saint Austin. The world deals with these two doctrines, as some would have the Kingdom deal with Presbyterie, and Independency (as they call them) as Tamars Midwise dealt with her two children. It says concerning their doctrine as she of Zarah, this came out first, it is the eldest brother, and they would have a Scarlet thred upon it, establish it by a civil bloody Sanction, and so authorize it to suppress the truth that is opposed by them; of which they say, as she of the supposed yonger, but indeed the Elder (for Christ was in his bowels and he came out first) its
name

name shall be Pharez, its a maker of Schism, upon it and its Preachers be charged our breaches and divisions; and so they vilifie and reproach Christ whose it is, and who is in it, and who for all the others forwardness will give it the dominion. I know the truth of the old adage, Obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit, flattery is befriended, and conformity to mens determinations is esteemed, but the truth is hated. I look for my cleaving in this to the word of God, to be ranked with the worst of Hereticks, and to meet with no better name with this generation then Christ and his former servants have met with in theirs. I look to have my name cast out as odious, and made to stink in the nostrils of men (or else Satan and his instruments will want of their will) while they that oppose the truth of God grow famous: but I much matter not, its but the reward with men that Christ hath appointed for his followers: Its his saying to his servants, ye shall be hated of all men for my names sake; and its properly the name of Christ, viz. That he is {ὁ Σώτηρ τοῦ κόσμου}. The Saviour of the World, that is defended by us, and its his consolation too, that the servant is not greater then his Lord; If they call the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his houshold? and again, Blessed are yee when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their companies (as some have endeavoured) and shall reproach you, and cast out your names as evil for the Son of mans sake; rejoyce yee in that day, and leap for joy, for great is your reward in Heaven, for in the like manner did their Fathers unto the Prophets. We have in our dayes too, them that can {Μυκτηρίζειν},

* Bona conscientia fiduciam mihi dat.

Honesti amore

re illud sine loge &

pœna colo: cæteri parietibus, januis, velis teguntur: ego sub

radio in propatulo ago: omnium oculis

& inquit siti-

oni expositus

Deo me proba.

Epict.

to God, sufferings will follow, as he expresses it. Cum hæc facio, evenit

scoff and deride my weakness in such an undertaking, that will say in their puff-pride (swelling in conceits of their learning and abilities) as sometimes the Athenians did of poor Paul, {καὶ τί ὁ σπρμολόγος οὗτος}; What will this illiterate babler say? Our age will afford those that read and preach the commendations of the Prophets and Apostles, garnishing their writings (though they believe them not) as their fathers did their Sepulchres, but yet will oppose and hate those that follow their footsteps, and cleave close to the word of God that they have published. Non ignota loquor. I have the experience of some things of this nature, and know that truth cannot be sincerely profest at easier rate then such course usage; the glimmerings of it in inferior streams, when stuck to amongst the Heathens, found such usage, and tis nothing better amongst us called Christians; if an * Epictetus approve himself

nit

nit ut malè audiam, imò ut vapulem; at quid mirum à pueris et fatuis, et qui ulcera sua tangi nolunt? *Truth will gall some mens consciences, and then they will kick against it, so he found it, so may I too, idque etiam a prudentibus & populi senioribus qui sibi sapientiæ titulum quasi proprium arrogat. O let the Gospel produce its fruits in me parallel in this matter to his following expressions* (ut affectum nec mutem, nec mittam, ut eos ipsos qui me verberant diligam, tanquam pater omnium, tanquam frater, *that my love may overflow their ignorance or envy, and I may overcome their evil with goodness, as the Apostle counsels, seeking their good as if they were my friends and Lovers; yea though they shall (as some perhaps will) do by my good will as too many do by Gods, render me hatred for it, at least despise and scorn it. As I look not for much better from the most, so shall I not be much troubled if I so finde it. May but God accept and uphold me, and good men approve me, though not for the worth of my performance yet for the readiness of my endeavours, and any be thereby benefited, I shall be contented.*

But stay, I must speak to one or two objections, I know some honest hearts, (for I would not be conceived to think that none such may dissent from me may be snared with the other persuasion, & be filled full of scruples about this doctrine, as conceiving it cross to what the Scripture saies of Election and to go too far in extending it to the Heathen that never heard of him, & as ascribing to man too much in his salvation, establishing his free-will more then gods free grace. Which things though they be spoken to in the Treatise, Yet give me leave to say a word or two about them here too for thy further satisfaction if it may be, premising first, That in the matters of God, we are to exalt faith above reason, admit his word for our sure guide, not our wisdom, [18] knowing that our wisdom in the things of God is but foolishness, his word the truth, and his Gospel, the wisdom of God unto Salvation to them that believe it. Thence if any man seem to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise, let him be so much a fool as to judge God true and wise not making his own blind reason, the measure of Gods unsearchable wisdom, and of the truth of his holy words, as if all we can fathom and conceive ground for, is true and no more, and so all the rest to be cut off that is above our reach, or crosses our reasonings; least that befall us, that befel both Jew and Gentile in the like case, pretending to be wise we become fools thinking to mend Gods words, and carve them into a better fashion for our instruction in the knowledge of

[18] 2 Pet. 1.19.
1 Cor. 3.18.

him by our additions, detractions, limitations, and contradictions, as we think good (as they did his works by their inventions) we (as they) turn the truth of God into a lye, [19] and change the Glory of the incorruptible God, into an Image made to the capacity of corruptible men. I cannot but commend to thee therefore that of Erasmus, Desine disceptare, incipe credere ita citius intelliges; only I would have thee apply it to Gods words (not to mine or any mans else, but as they evidently agree with Gods) and so its one in meaning with what himself says. [20] If thou wilt not believe, thou shalt not understand or be established, thou wilt either mistake or be waved up and down with specious arguments; but in minding his sayings and doing his will, in yielding up to him in the light and power he affords thee, thou shalt understand doctrines, [21] whether they be of God or of men.

Of this also be thou admonished, to prefer Gods sayings before mans traditions, the Apostles expressions before mens glosses and lame deductions: for when men leave Gods word, to lean upon men, and have the fear of God taught them by their Traditions because of their Authority, learning or seeming Sanctity, God justly leaves them, and then they lean on to run into delusion, infatuating their understandings, because they refused to give glory to Him. But to speak a word to those particulars.

I. For the matter of Election, I no whit deny it, nor doth it rightly looked on as the Scripture expresses it, any whit contradict the extent of Christs Death. I confess, that it was made either in Massa pura, or in Massa corrupta simply (as they speak) I finde no where asserted, but in Christ, which I conceive holds forth a view of Christ, as mediator in the act of Election, as in him as mediator we are blessed, and so that the Election of believers was made in him, tanquam in Radice; as in Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob, God chose their seed the Israelites, so in Christ Jesus in choosing him in the manhood into unity with God, and to be the store-house and treasure of all divine blessings, he is said to have chosen to the same priviledges (I mean by way of participation of his fulness) those that after are brought into him, and believe on him. As he is in the humane nature, chosen to be the holy one of Israel (as united to the Divine) so we are chosen in him to be holy, a dedicate people, and select portion for his inhabitation (as the Temple in that sense with the Land and People of Israel were called holy) and to be blameless before him in love, that is, as presented without blame and reproof in Christ, and to be made blameless by Christ, and so those that are believers in Christ,
are

are blessed, and were so chosen to blessing, holiness and blamelessness in him from eternity; (as the present Freemen of Lynn might be said to have been by foregoing Kings, chosen to such priviledges as they have now, in the first chusing it to be a Corporation, and in those that were then made members of it, though many of these present members (perhaps all of them) were then in their progenitors other Country-men) so I say those that are now believers, were in Christ before the Worlds foundation, chosen to the priviledges they have in and by him, being also foreknown of God, both that they should be in Christ, and as owned in Christ, and predestinuted in that his foreknowledge and owning to be made like his Son, whom in order of nature he had fore-ordained as their pattern to dye, rise, and be glorified, in all which he ordained his foreknown ones, even them that believe in him should be conformed to him, and unto which he called them, and in that conformity in sufferings, justifies and maintains them, and (as he hath done, so yet) he doth bring them to glory with him. Yea in his calling men, we deny not his liberty of pulling in more powerfully, preserving from general Apostacies, actuall chusing and ordaining in his Son glorified to their hearts, whom he pleases, and as he pleases: but that either any company of men, as in themselves, & as of the world, uncalled, are ever called (or signified by the word) Elect; much lese that any were chosen to be the object of Christs death, and the others left out (Election being ever coupled with (or respecting) mens calling to Christ, and right to his priviledges, not Christs dying) I can no where finde in Scripture. Besides that which is more secret and mysterious in his decree or dealings, we neither confound with what he hath done in the death of Christ for us and declares in the Gospel to us as the object of our faith, or motive to believe, and that in which he so calls, puls in, and saveth according to his good pleasure. Nor dare we make them to run cross to the Scriptures, that more plainly declare his good will and love to men, acknowledging rather our want of capacity to comprehend those more abstruse things, then daring to call in question the extent of the truth of his other expressions that are more fitted to our understanding, and speak to the more intelligible principles of Christian Religion. Nor finde we warrant for making our narrow conceptions of those more abstruse things of God (which are ever delivered in Scripture without any opposition to, or limitation of the things we treat of) to be the measure of, and to give limits to them: they that so do, both contradicting the Scripture expressions in the things we

speak to, and swarving also from them and their method in propounding and speaking of those things of Election and Reprobation by which they measure them.

2. *For the Heathens that have not had the Gospel opened to them, they put us needlessly upon that, to stumble men about the truth of our doctrine: for we could content our selves with the Scripture expressions of all and every one, and the whole world, unlimitedly, without running into any nice speculations; but when men propound that to us, I know not upon what ground we should say, Christ died not for them, except the Scripture did in some place exclude them from being of that all, for which he dyed: if any man can finde an exception as to them, I shall listen to it, but for my part I have not yet met with it. And to make exceptions without warrant in the word of God about the matters of the Gospels doctrine, I judg very dangerous. I know there are many cavils of reason which have some specious colour for it, but they all amount to no more then those admirations of its ignorance and enmity in other cases, [22] How can this thing be? they are but high imaginations and thoughts, exalting themselves against obedience to the faith of Jesus, [23] which are to be captivated to faith, not faith to them. Reason being a part of that self of ours, which he that will be Christs Disciple must deny, in what it would stop us from receiving the doctrines he propounds to us. So that this is but a trick of Satan, to stir up men to cast such stumbling considerations in their own and others way, that they might not believe and have the benefit of the truth declared to them: to whom its best to say, Get thee behinde me Satan, to leave disputing and inquiring into things more secret, and say either produce me some Scripture that saith, he dyed not for them, or else be silent. Its good in such cases to take what Christ said to Peter, curiously inquisitive after John, for a satisfactory answer. How God deals with them (further then the Scripture says) what is that to thee? they shall be found excuseless when Christ shall Judg them, and therefore follow thou Christ in the receipt of his word and let not any seeming absurdities, to thy reason, prevaile to impede thee. And so we might say to Mr. Owens Cui bono quaesio? about them that perish, what good doth the death of Christ to them? which reasonings are but of the spawn of the Serpents wisdom pretending to teach our reason the knowledg of good and evil from the beginning. Such a question might have been as well made by many Israelites in the wilderness: might not reason thus have led them to argue, either God absolutely willed to possess us all of Canaan,*

naan,

[22] 2 Cor. 10.4.

[23] Math. 16.24.

or only some few of us; if the first, how come so many of us to perish short of it, if the latter, then I pray, Cui bono? to what end, or what good was in the deliverance of the rest from Egypt, seeing they had as good have dyed there, as have been consumed in the Wilderness? Nay if our corrupt and blinde reason shall be umpire, then what Satan and unbelief suggests, is righter then what God himself saith, for did not the Israelites perish in the Wilderness many of them (as their reason and unbelief suggested) and did they attain to Canaan, though that was the promise set before them? but as we said before, Let God be true, and every man in his best wisdom but a blinde fool and liar. We durst not believe our carnal reasonings against Gods word, nor exclude, inlarge, or limit his word by our own hearts dictates, but as we see God in other places instruct us to it. Not but that we can give reasonable answers to their reasons against Christs dying for the Heathen; they being all faln in Adam, and the sentence being executable upon them, and all men in him in the day that he sinned, so that what life and mercies of life, with goodness leading to seek after God, and to repent, they do enjoy, may well and necessarily be conceived to spring from Christs interposing himself as mediator and ransome; But yet if any can shew that Christ died but for all in these latter times, or that the Gospel is preached to, and shew it by Scripture proofs, we will be willing so to interpret those general expressions, till when we cannot admit of that interpretation.

O, but we must not believe Scriptures as they lye in their littoral expressions, for that is dangerous, and will introduce transubstantiation, and to believe Christ to be a door, a vine, &c. there are in the Scriptures many figurative expressions. Object.

To which I answer, that this is another stumbling block cast in our way, much what like to what the Papists used to object against the Scriptures being translated into the English tongue, for fear the Bakers and Plawmen not understanding some passages, should be disheartned from, or miscarry in their callings: things without any great shew of weight, worth other answering, then Mr. Latimer gave to Hubberdine. That in some places we are to take the Scripture as it lies, none that are sober doubt. Now if this objection suit not to the Scriptures in general, but only to some places, then who shall tell us what they are in which it suits not? Sure the Apostles speak plainly in laying the foundation truths that are propounded to bring men to believe, for if the language there be strange, who shall understand what Answ.

it is that is said? if the trumpet there give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to battel? Now this point we speak of, namely the death of Christ, and for whom it is, is fundamental, and the propositions that the Apostle, the Teacher of the Gentiles lays down as the Testimony he Preached in the other parts of them, are very plain and perspicuous; And that this only, that he gave himself a ransom for all, should be obscure, is a groundless evasion of them that do not believe the truth; seeing in their preachings of the Gospel he himself tells us they put no vaile over their faces in their ministration, but manifested the truth to every ones conscience, which sure they did not, if they spake so figuratively, that many might mistake, and few could perceive their meaning, as is pretended. Its true, the Gospel is a mystery, but yet a mystery now revealed; many things hard to be understood, says Peter, speaking of Pauls writings, but thats spoken particularly in the things of Christs second coming, the word is in the Original {ἐν ὧς}, not {ἐν αἷσι}, in which things, not in which writings. Again the speeches that are figurative, are generally conspicuous by the maner of speaking, as plain as Latimers Fox preaching in a Monkes Cowle, and sometimes expresly called parables, but no such thing is conspicuous in those places, except in the allusive words of ransom and propitiation, nor will the places bear such limitations as they speak of, as the following Treatise proveth. As for that inference of transubstantiation, we deny it (or the rest) proveable upon that supposal; No one Scripture saying, that either Christ called the bread his body, or the cup he took in his hand his blood, more then that he said to the Jews, destroy the Temple that he was walking in, John 2. but by this he might mean and indeed point to his present body, and by this Cup his present instant sufferings that he was about to undergo, which the Scripture and himself also calls a Cup, and the Cup that his Father gave him, much less say they that the one or other was turned into his natural body or blood, nor is the parallel fair between the doctrines of the Gospel preached, as the first principles of faith, and these Sacramental and more mysterious speeches. [24] As inept it is almost as to make the Every fowl and beast that entered into the Ark, to be a fit exposition of the Every man that Christ dyed for; whereas the Scripture there expresly limits them to seavens, and to two and two of every kinde, and excludes the rest, and there is no such limitation to any sums, numbers, qualities or conditions about Christs death; they would hiss at men that should produce such places to parallel, and limit the All and Every that shall arise, or give an account

[24] Gen. 17. 14,
15. with ver.
2, 3, 21.

of themselves to God by: which shews them to be {ἄποποι} absurd and foolish men in these their reasonings for want of faith. These and such like rubs are sorry Remoraes to any that are capable of understanding reason, and will Judge impartially in this controversie.

3. For free will, we say that God deales not with men as with stocks and stones, and so much all generally grant us. But what other I pray are men, if their wils have no power or freedom given it of God to act this or that, but as external powers carry them? if they can only go quò fata trahunt, whether they are necessitated, can avoid no evil that they commit, or do no good that they neglect? And yet (good reader) mistake me not, I believe man hath no power but what is given him of God, either in naturalls or in spiritualls: nor any power or liberty to spiritual acts till some spiritual force or power come to him from God. That men are naturally dead in sins and trespasses, and wholly strangers to the life of God, cannot come to Christ except God draw them; and when they are brought to him they cannot of themselves, as of themselves, think any good thought, thats right and approveable, without the grace of God. But I believe that God in naturals hath given men (as more understanding, so also) more liberty of choice then the bruit beasts, & to them more then to insensitive creatures, and in reference to spiritual life, he hath and doth afford means to the natural man suited to his liberty and power, to make choice or refuse to make use of, as to read the Scriptures, hear the word, look upon and view his works, &c. and we conceive, that though those things have no natural ability in them to to save or spirituallize such as use them, nor the acts of men in using them, can do any more thereto, then the blinde mans washing in cold water to open his eyes. Yet in as much as God useth to work in them as mediums: and sends forth his Spirit with them to enlighten and draw men, they are justly guilty of their own destruction that neglect those things when God affords them. Yea further, I understand and believe, that God by his goodness, and with and in those means prevents men, and wroks in them, manifesting his truth in them, and giving them a discerning apprehension of it, with convincing or drawing power; and that he then gives them ability to do what they could not before, as to acknowledg the folly he shews them, confess the truth and goodness he makes evident to them, strive against the ways they see harm them, &c. though yet these are not spiritual acts of divine and Christ like life, they springing from self-love, and desire of their own proper good, not out of love to God. But they, that when they are so prevented, and in
such

such preventions reprov'd, call'd, allur'd to listen further to God in the means afford'd, do stop their ears, close their eyes, harden their hearts, imprison the truth they see, and neglect to use the power given them in these strivings of Gods truth with them, are justly guilty of their own destruction, should God there leave them, and strive no longer with them: and they that turn at such reproofs, and listen yet to the truth, that speaks to them, and do not slothfully neglect the power and liberty therein given them, may meet (yea are in the way to meet) with further operations of the truth to convert and heal them, to give life, yea divine principles of life, hope in God, and faith in God to them; he having said, that such as turn at his reproofs shall have the Spirit poured upon them, and his words made known to them, and they that listen to him (though dead) shall live, &c. and that meerly out of his grace and good will toward them, not out of either merits of Congruity or Condignity found in them. Though that God passes by many rebellions in such cases, and out of more abundant love, where he pleases, draws more prevailingly even those that have more rebelled, & many times passes by those that have less, may be easily proved And wherein this, or any thing in this, either contradicteth or jarreth with the Scriptures, I as yet see not. That men may exercise or use their inatural faculties in the things in which God useth to shine in light to men as well as in others, as to hear the word, as well as to hear other discourses, I see no ground of denying, though they cannot hear with such pleasure and delight as they do other things, till something there heard doth take them, yet hear they may; and mens negligence in such things is call'd slothfulness (which stands not in a mans not doing what he cannot, but in not as-saying to do according to liberty and might) and rebellion, when joyned with wilfulness. Now whereas its said, that should men do to the utmost what they can, by that light and power given, yet that their doing would not save them. To that I answer, that its not material, for first, as to the business in hand, its enough that they have power and liberty from God to do more then they do. 2. Its granted, that no act that God gives any man power to do, can save him by its self. Its not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, [25] but of God that sheweth mercy: but is not he that bids them listen to him, and gives them light to see and discern such truths, and motion to own and follow them, able to save them? or doth he any where give any intimation, that upon their acting forth in these his workings
in,

[25] Rom. 9.6.

in and with them, according to the power and liberty he gives, he will refuse to do any thing more for them, by which they should be brought nearer to him, so as they might be saved? If they have, then indeed they may well be slothful, and say, I had as good stay where I am, and stifle what I see, for yeelding up to it will not save me, nor will God do any thing to that purpose further for me, and so their slothfulness and rebellion may finde some excuse; If not, then it appertaines to them to hear his voice, and (as Caleb said in another case) only not to rebel, nor be slothful, and let God alone with what pertains further to their eternal welfare; which if they refuse to do, they have no excuse, in as much as for ought they know, and that God hath said to the contrary (nay rather by what he says he would have done for others, had they harkened to his voice, they might hopefully conceive that) he would have revealed greater things to them, [26] and put forth greater acts of power about them, and so have saved them. So that they cannot excuse themselves with pleading, as the evil slothful servant (and as many teach men to plead) that God is a hard Master, gathering where he strawed not, and reaping where he sowed not, they cannot say he refused to give them faith, and further grace or knowledg of himself, requisite to save them; seeing they were unfaithful in that talent he gave them, which had they improved as he willed and inabled them, they might have had more for ought they or any know, given them. That such are Gods dealings with men, as are above declared, many Scriptures intimate, as that he manifests his truth in them, and they say to him, Depart from us, &c. His goodness leads men to repentance, they shut their eyes, and close their ears, least they should see, hear, understand, and be converted, and so God should heal them, for which things God also many times in just judgment blindes, deafs and hardens them too, and seals them up to their destruction, but he first strives with men, and reproves them, bids them turn at his reproofs, and he will pour out his spirit upon them, and tells them when he gives them up, it was because they would none of him, would not hear him, would not chuse his fear, liked not to have the knowledg of him, and sayes, had they hearkened to him, their peace had been as the Rivers, and their righteousness as the waves of the sea, and he would have done thus and thus for them with many such like expressions: but that any Scripture says, that as men are naturally dead in sins and trespasses, so he manifests no truth to them, or gives no power with that truth manifested by which they might grope after him,

[26] Psal. 81.
14, 15.
Isa. 48.17, 18.

would not, did they walk out in what he gives them, give any more knowledg of Himself or Son unto them, and would not bring them to believe, &c. We are yet to learn: or that ever any did so, and were there left by him notwithstanding, and were condemned by him. These things I say we neither finde plainly expressed in Scripture, nor dark-lie intimated.

And that this derogates at all from Gods glory, or liberty to shew more mercy, as, and where he pleases, I would fain have any man to demonstrate to me. Yea, I appeale to any equal Judg, whether this clears not the equity of Gods way far more, and suits not better with the Scripture expressions, then to say, he gives them no such power or liberty, and yet condemns them for not doing what they no waies might have done, and doing what was no waies to be avoided by them, requiring of men to act out all that strength that in Adam was given, and punishing them as they fail in that. Surely by the rule Jew and Gentile should both alike be punished (they both equally by nature being destitute of that righteousnes and strength) and not one more then another, according to more or less now vouchsafed to them. So that this Objection about free will is a meer rub cast in thy way too; no such conclusion being provable by Scripture, as that God gives to many men no power or liberty to do any thing that he requiers of them, or that did they constantly act forth according to what he gives them, yet he would do nothing more to them, that would lead them to salvation; or that Christ dyed only for such as he gives liberty to, so as to bring them in actually and effectually to believe on him, and be saved by him, as shall be seen in the ensuing Answers to Master Owen. As for other questions [as whether any be brought to salvation by God, that improve that liberty he gives them? or any that are not more extraordinarily over-powred by him?] as they are matters of curiosity, by which many men detain themselves from doing that that God sets before them, and from striving to enter the strait gate for their particulars, so I shall wave them, and draw to a conclusion.

Only whereas by mentioning the strait gate, I am minded of another stumble that some hit on, viz. That this doctrine makes the way to heaven broader then God hath made it, and the gate wider, and tends to daube up men with untempered mortar, and to heal their hurts slightly; Objections that I hear sometimes urged with that pretence and confidence of strength in them, that a man would judg them to have some weight

weight indeed, though I rather pity, and could lament their mistakes, then admire their acuteness in such charges: I shall briefly say a word or two thereto. Understand therefore I pray thee, that the straitness of a gate stands not in this, that its opened but for a few, nor the wide-ness of it, in that its opened for many; a narrow gate or passage may be exposed to, and open for all, or for any that will go through it, and a wider passage may stand open but for few: besides its not here as in other doors or gates, that the throng of passengers presses men, and makes them finde hard entrance: No, in this spiritual gate the more enterers the easier, the number of believers rather facilitates the passage, then makes it difficult; but the narrowness of the gate stands in this, that this grace exposed to all, hath such operations upon them that enter it, to empty and abase them in themselves, and for denying their wisdom, righteousness, reason, confidence in works; and the enterers of it meet with such calumnies, reproaches, sufferings, &c. that its difficult to be entered, few can finde in their hearts to stoop to such abasement and sufferings as it leads to; Christ is a strait gate, as rubbing so much of man off in their listening to him and walking after him, not in his being given for but a few of men, for if that was the straitness of it, he might be wide enough for them that he died for, and they might finde no difficulty in entering into God by him. As for daubing up souls with untempered mortar, and healing their hurts slightly, there might indeed be some colour of charging us with it, if we taught men as they do, That all that Christ died for, shall certainly be saved, and no sin imputed to them, or if we only told men that Christ died for them all; but we deliver no such doctrine as the first, nor finde just ground for it by any Scripture-expression, and besides the latter, we in preaching the Gospel endeavour to bring men to see their need of having Christ, in that they cannot have life but in having him, and in being emptied of themselves, and found in him, and so we endeavour to bring men to that self-emptiness of wisdom, strength and righteousness of their own, which they who thus object are many of them afraid to be brought to, which is the wounding work of the Gospel, which when they are brought to, we apply no other plaister to them, then Christs sufferings, [27] by those we endeavour both to wound men in discovering the hainousness of their sins thereby, and their emptiness of true righteousness and wisdom, which things are best to be seen in his cross; and again, to heale

[27] Zech. 13.
10. Gal. 2.20,
21. Rom. 3.3.

them, in setting before them the greatness of Gods love therein toward them, and the incouragement it affordeth to wait on him for giving forth his Spirit to them, to unite them to his Son, and so to impart his Sons priviledges to them, which when they are brought to, their sores are truly healed; for if this be to heal them slightly, and the blood and grace of Christ be but untempered mortar, then I know not wherewith truly to heal them; for my part, I desire healing to my soul by no other Medicine: Their daubings that tell souls they may know that Christ loves them by their good desires and indeavours, strifts and labours, from hope in, and by which, souls should rather be taken, my soul abhorreth; they being indeed but untempered mortar that God appointed not for mens rest and healing. They are those dawblings that make many believe that they are in Christ already, who have no more then what the Pharisee (Luke 18. 11.) and the false Apostles (2 Cor. 10.7.) boasted of, who trusted in themselves, that they were Christs, The direct way which) by nursing up souls in self confidence that they are in Christ) keeps many a soul from coming unto Christ, and seeking thoroughly after Christ, for which such daubers shall one day answer.

But I have exceeded the bounds of an Epistle. I shall say no more as to the doctrine, only why I rather answered to Master Owen, then any other, I give thee these reasons. The good report I heard of him for ingenuity and learning, and the high esteemes this his book had with many, the freeness of it from ingaging any one particular, more then some others lightly publisht, and the desire of a worshipful, and loving friend or two, that I would peruse it, made me rather give it these ensuing Answers; the substance of others being also in it, so that in Answering him, little of them can be said to be unanswered. I confess, at first I thought only to overthrow his main pillars upon which his discourse leaneth, and leave his Arguments to fall with them; but finding it his desire, that the answer would not only vellicare, speak but to here and there a passage; to avoid that imputation, I armed my self with a little more patience, and went through with it Chapter by Chapter, as thou seest, only omitting that occasional discourse against some

Socinians

Socinians that in his third book he inserteth, it having nothing in it against me, but rather on my side.

I know that I am no whit worthy to be compared with him in learning, so called, in which both time, opportunities, and his own diligence have given him much superiority and advantage over me. But I hope I am not behinde hand with him in fair dealing with, and pertinent speaking to an argument. What I have done in this Answer, and whether I have refelled his Arguments or not, I must leave to thy judgment.

If thou findest it unsatisfactory (as I hope to intelligent and impartiall men it will not be) judge it rather my weakness in handling the matter, then the causes wrongness; accept my in-deavours, and pass by my infirmities. In fairness of language I conceive I am not short of him, though I may be in elegancy of expression. If upon reading this Treatise, thou beest perswaded of the truth of what it defendeth, rest not in the bare belief of it, as if that was enough for thee, but follow on to inquire and seek after God, that hath such good will toward thee; and walk out in what he discovers of himself to thee, that so he may be pleased to discover himself more to thee, and draw thee by his Spirit into union with, and conformity to his Son, that thou mayest have the utmost healing that the death of Christ brings to the believer, even salvation, with eternal glory. The right use of truth is in being lead from the world and thy own self to God by it, and so attaining the end propounded to thee in it.

If thou, not liking what is writ wilt, reply upon me, I desire thee to do it soberly, and as a seeker of truth rather then of victory, bate pride and passion, which will but darken thine understanding, and nothing advantage thee in thy answering; and take heed lest for fear of losing thine honour, or for desire to get any, thou robbest God of the honour of his truth, and shuttest thine eyes against those flashes of his light that he darts into thee. Better lose thine honour, then ingage against Gods truth for it.

If thou likest the truth pleaded for, but findest defect or wri-ness in any of my expressions in asserting it, I shall be willing to be helpt to see better by thy spectacles, if thou pleasest to lend them me. In a word, I say to thee with the Poet,

——Si quid novisti rectius istis,
Candidus imperti; Si non, his utere mecum.

*And so committing thee, with my self, and this ensuing Treatise
to Gods protection, I remain*

Thy friend and servant in the
Gospel of Christ Jesus,

John Horn.

OR

ΘΥΠΑ ΑΝΕΩΓΕΝΗ,
OR A
VINDICATION
OF THE
RECORD of GOD,
Concerning
The extent of the Death of Christ,
in Answer to Mr. *Iohn Owen* of
Cogshall in *Essex*.
The Preface.



Hereas God (who is love it self) beholding
mankinde faln, and through the subtlety of
the Serpent plunged into death and misery,
was pleased out of pittie towards him, to
finde out a way for his recovery, even to send
forth his own proper Son, his Word and
Wisdom, to take upon him the nature of man
so faln, with the infirmities, weaknesses, death
and misery attending it (yea the whole punishment that the sin of
man had in that fall contracted to it) that so he dying for man, man
might be delivered out of that death; and life and immortality
might be again brought to light; yea, whereas the Son of God
having

having accordingly given himself a ransom for all, it hath pleased the Father (out of the same love he bare to man in sending him) further to provide for his good, in exalting this his Son that suffered, and making him Lord and Christ, a Prince and Saviour, one that should have (and answerably hath) power and authority over all things, and Salvation in him; authority and fitness to save and deliver out of evil, and to bring to life and glory, whoever of the persons of men listen and look to him for Salvation; whoever obey his Word, submit to his Spirit, and give up themselves to be ordered by him; and to that end hath in these last dayes given forth a commission, to certain Elected and chosen persons, appointed for that purpose by him, to be his Witnesses and Embassadors to the whole world in general, to proclaim, publish, and declare this that God hath done, in, and by Christ Jesus for them, and to let them know his good will toward them, that he would not that any of them should perish, but all come to Repentance, and to the knowledg, or acknowledgment of his truth, that they might be saved (to which end he hath also given and constituted his Son to be a witness, and a Leader to conduct them to Salvation) and upon these grounds hath willed them to exhort, command, intreat, and urge all and every man (as they have opportunity to it) to accept this grace, believe the Gospel, repent and turn to God from their dead works, and from their follies, and to Jesus as the only one constituted by him to be his Salvation, even to the ends of the earth. So it is, that since these holy men of God, to whom the tenor of the Gospel and doctrine of truth was first committed, have faln asleep, the vigilant and wicked enemy of mankinde hath not only through his subtlety prevailed with multitudes of those men to whom this proclamation hath been made, to reject, persecute, and put away this Embassy, both from themselves and peoples under them, and posterities succeeding them, and with many others to be slothful, and not to take care to propagate this Doctrine of their Lord and Master, but also by occasion of this wickedness, and slothfulness of men, many that pretend themselves to be understanding men, and servants of God unto their brethren, have come with a counter-doctrine pretending to have better insight into the minde of God, then the letter of the Apostolical preaching doth hold forth (even as at first Satan pretended to the woman to have a more sublime knowledg of the minde of God,

God and to teach her better understanding of it then in the simple belief of Gods words to them, they had attained) telling men that God sent not his Son for all of them, but only for here and there one, they nor any man else not knowing who they be, and that Christ gave himself only for them, and for no others: and this they pretend to have from a more Seraphical understanding of a more secret will of God, by which means they both contradict the tenor of the holy Commission delivered out to his Saints, and left by them upon record for us, by the instinct of his spirit; and take away those certain and more excellent grounds, motives, and inducements to believe, repent, seek after, and love God, which that Commission affordeth, making the Gospel to give such an uncertain sound, that none can by it be induced to prepare himself to battel, as is more largely shewed in the Epistle to the Reader. In which doing they greatly deny, at least disserve the Lord that bought them, in that in stead of making him lovely to all, and an object meet for all to commit themselves to, and forsake all for the worshipping and confessing of, they render it doubtful what one hath cause so to do, and not rather to hate him as a fore (yea eternal) hater of them, that had such desire to their misery, as therefore to create them, yea therefore to do all that he doth about them, that they might at last for ever be more heavily tormented by him. So that they do herein as a company of slaves or persidious Traitors should do to a King, who having made open proclamation of satisfaction received by the hand of some Prince, for the mischief done him by a company of rebels, and of his good will toward them all, that he would have them to lay down their weapons, upon which they should be received into his favour; and that for assurance thereof and incouragement to the submission required, he grants them pardon and an act of oblivion for all past; they should come with an after-pretended proclamation and declaration; pretending that they are of the Kings privy Council, and know his minde, better then in that proclamation, to which he had set his hand and seal, was declared, and telling those Rebels that they know his meaning in those general expressions to be, that only here and there a man of them are included in the Princes satisfaction, and toward them only the King bears good will, the greatest part of them he so hates, that he excluded them the satisfaction and act of oblivion for that thats past, by which

meanes they should strengthen them in their rebellion, it being evident to none of them, who are of the one or of the other, and so who hath cause to rely upon the satisfaction given, and act of oblivion granted. Now for the honour of God and of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, I here defend the Apostical against their counter Commission, accusing their innovation of it as false and fained, and of evil consequence, and all the pretenders in it to be therein guilty of high Treason against the Crown, Royalty, love, goodness and sovereignty of the Son of God; in altering, changing and contradicting his proclamation, putting in another in stead thereof, of their own devising, to the great obscuring and dishonouring of his name, and prejudice to the sons of men, as is before hinted. And whereas one Master Owen amongst the rest hath lately put out a Treatise impleading the true Commission and proclamation of the Gospel, and pleading for this other of mans devising; my intencion is here in this insuing Treatise, to defend and bear witness to the old Apostolical Gospel against him, and to that end to examine and bring to Tryall all his arguments that he pretends against it, and for his opinion, according to the good hand of God with me, refelling and laying open the vanity and falshood of them, and their ground lesness from those Scriptures that he abuseth to countenance them. Now the God and Father of lights, and fountain of spirits, be pleased to shew forth his strength in my weakness, vindicate his truth denyed and darkened, guiding me so to examine and answer his Arguments and Assertions, as glory may be brought to his holy name, and nothing but his truth may be maintained by me. In His name and strength go I forth in this busines, beginning orderly with his First book and Chapter.

ON

On Master Owens first Book.

CHAP. I.

A view of, and answer to his first Chapter, with part of the third Chapter of his second Book.

MASTER Owen in his first Chapter propoundeth a consideration of the end of the Death of Christ (though in his prosecution of it, he takes in the whole business of his coming as well in ministration as in meditation as the Scriptures quoted by him, if duly considered, make it to appear) in which he looks upon it “*generally, both as Intended by the Father and Christ, and also as that which was effectually fulfilled and accomplished by it.*

“*As intended by God and Christ, so he shews out of the Scriptures that it was to save that which was lost; to save sinners, &c.* in which he speaketh the truth, though not the whole truth; that Scripture (in other places also taken in) speaks about this matter, as after we shall see. But to proceed: upon inquiry who these sinners “are, he tells us from *Math. 20.28. that they are many, he came to give his life a ransom for,* which in other places he tells us, are *Cal-“led, Us, Believers, distinguished from the world, Gal. 1.4. His Church. Eph. 5.25.26. &c.* But herein Master Owen dealeth not fairly, in that he tells us not (at least by Scripture proveth not) that those *Many* for whom he gave himself a ransom, be bounded up in those other expressions of *Us, Believers, the Church,* so as that *Many* comprehends no more then in those other expressions are included. Sure I am, the Apostles no where tell us that those their expressions are interpretations of the full latitude of that *Many* spoken of by our Saviour; nor have they any where put a restrictive to those expressions, as *Us* only (I finde the contrary, not for ours only 1 *John* 2.2.) or for *Believers* only (for I finde also that he died for the unjust and ungodly, and bought the false Teachers, *Rom. 5.6. 1 Pet. 3.18. and 2 Pet. 2.1.*) or for his Church only (but also for all men, 1 *Tim. 2.5.6.*) therefore Master Owen hath not delt candidly, in that he hath not given us a full expression of those sinners for whom Christ is said to give himself, or to come to save.

I think Christ himself intimates that he came to save the World both of believers, and not believers: else I see not the clear reason of that in *John* 12.47, *If any man hear my words, and believe not, I Judg him not: for I came not to Judg the world, but to save the world.* How his coming not to Judg the world but save it, if by *World* he mean only believers, should be given as the reason of his not Judging him that believes not, passes my reason to conceive; therefore sure that word *World* there, must be of a larger capacity. He hath not then given a full answer to his query, in that he limits the Many spoken of, to narrower bounds then the Scripture ever limits it to. If he doth not interpret that many by those expressions of *Us* and *Believers*, exclusively, as to others, he saith nothing. But its evident he doth both by his expression *Distinguished from the World* (and yet Christ saith He came to save the *World*, not a part distinct from it only) as also by what he saith to this word *Many*, in *lib. 2. cap. 3. p. 77.* where he tells us that though the “*Word Many is not in it self sufficient to restrain the Object of Christs Death unto some, because its placed absolutely for All, Rom. 5.19. yet those Many being described in other places to be such as its certain All are not, so its a full and evident restriction of it.* But good Sir, where are those places that so describe the *Many*, that Christ gave himself a ransome for, and dyed for? I hope you think not the words unjust, ungodly, sinners, &c. are such restrictive words, and yet these are the most usual descriptions of those for “*whom he dyed. No, but he sayes those Many are the sheep of Christ, the Children of God scattered abroad, the children that God gave him, the sheep whereof he was shepherd, his Elect, his People, his Church, those with whom he made a Covenant, &c.* but as I said before, Doth any Scripture say, that this is the full and adaequate description of those *Many*, or doth Scripture restrain it unto such? I see no one place that proves that. His answer then is still as unsatisfactory, as if to this, who shall rise again? I should answer, they are many that sleep in the dust of the earth, *Dan. 12.3.* and then quote that in *1 Cor. 15.27.* first Christ, then they that are Christs at his coming, and that *Rom. 8.11.* if the spirit of Christ dwell in you, he that raised up Jesus, will also quicken our mortal bodies, and *1 Cor. 6.14.* *He hath raised up the Lord, and will also raise Us up by his power,* and then say, that these are a description of those many that shall rise again: should I be thought substantially to prove that

Many

Many limited only to them? And yet if such an answer would not be fair, then neither is his. If it be *Objected*. That other Scriptures say, that some shall rise to condemnation, I answer that other scriptures suppose a possibility of his perishing for whom Christ died, 1 *Cor.* 8.11. and say that the false Teachers were bought by the Lord, and yet pull upon themselves swift destruction for denying him that bought them, 2 *Pet.* 2.1. so that the arguments are alike; as is evident to any judicious impartial reader. We have nothing but Master *Owens* word, that those forecited epithites and sentences, are the full description of that *Many*, for whom Christ gave himself a ransome; and thats too weak a ground to build our faith upon. That they are included in that *Many*, we grant, that they are all that *Many* that he died for, we deny and he hath not proved.

Now (not to recriminate and fling back upon himself that froth of wit, which in his coming to answer what is objected to his argument from the word *Many*, he casts upon a godly, though less learned writer) I shall view his confirmations of his argument, or evasions from objections made against it. The Objection mainly insisted on, is, that the word *Many* is used for All, and æquivalently to All, as in *Dan.* 12.3. compared with *John* 5.29. and *Rom.* “5.19. *To which he sayes. 1. That if the proof was taken from the “word Many meerly, and not from the description of those Many annexed, with a presupposed distinction of all men into several sorts, by “the purpose of God, that exception would bear some colour.* So that he leans more upon his description then upon the word *Many*; but now that description, being a partial description, and no where in Scripture averred to be the adaequate description of those *Many* for whom Christ dyed, this argument will *ex confesso* fall to nothing, with a following *simile*, which runs not parallel with the argument: for that distinction of men into several sorts, that he mentions here, we shall view it hereafter. 2. To *Dan.* 12.3. he sayes “*that there a distribution of the word to the several parts of it must be “allowed, as thus, the dead shall rise, Many to life, and Many to shame,* which is a meer evasion crossing the text, for the word *Many* is the *Totum congregatum*, and there are distributive particles of that whole following in the Text, {אלה ואלה} these to life, and those to shame, or some to life, and some to shame: besides which “he adds a gross mistake of the Apostle, as if it might be said

“*Many shall rise, because the Apostle sayes, All shall not dye. Where- as the Apostle no where hath such a saying. Its not, all shall not dye, but, all shall not sleep*, which signifies a resting in death, not a dying simply: in that sudden change opposed to sleeping, there is a death and resurrection, though not a sleeping in death, and resurrection from the grave. Besides though that were granted that All dye not, yet I hope the *Many* that sleep in the grave that shall thence rise, [28] are the same with, All that are in their graves shall come forth. All that are in their graves have dyed, and all them are called, *Dan*. “12.2. *Many that sleep in the dust*. 3 To that in *Rom*. 5.19. he sayes “*Many seems there to be all, but not spoken with an intent to denote “all with an amplification, because no comparison there instituted be- “tween the numbers, &c*. But neither is there any strength in that, for 1. though here he mince the matter with (*seems to be All*) yet p. 77. he confesseth the word *Many to be placed absolutely for All*, and instances this place, and thats enough to my purpose. 2. Its plain that a comparison is there instituted between Number and Number, thus far that both numbers are *Many*, yea and verse. 18. the Apostle is as strict in the words of number as in any thing else, As by one offence {ἐἷς πάντας ἀνθρώπους}, so by one obedience {ἐἷς πάντας ἀνθρώπους} *All men to all men*. and so in verse 19. *Many to many*, the comparison is in this that both have their effects upon *Many*, as well as in the effects themselves. Yea, and the word *Many* is clearly a word of amplification of both parts. The All made sinners are truly *Many*, exceeding *Many*, and that *Many All*: for producing other places, in which the word *Many* is *All*, though it be a trivial business, in which only the Author that he bends himself against is challenged, yet because he is confident that there is no other, I shall with the Authors leave and his, propound one or two to consideration; as that in *Numb*. 6.36. Return O Lord to the many thousands in Israel, is to *All* the thousands of Israel, and not to many of those thousands only: so *Mic*. 4.4. *He shall Judg among many Nations*, is among all Nations, for other Scriptures say, The Lord shall be one and his name one in All the earth, and he shall judge the World in Righteousnes, and All Nation shall glorify him: But to return to the first Chapter, in which those expressions of the end of Christs coming, that is, to save sinners, &c. are good and approved by us as the word of God. But how he understands this word *Saved*, or how this phrase of *Com- ing*

[28] Iohn. 5.29.

ing to save, he doth not fully express: to supply which defect I shall consider them a little, And

1. For the word *Save*, its of a large signification in Scripture when its attributed to God and Christ, as,

1. It signifies to preserve or keep life, yea, when it is forfeited by our sin, and God might justly deprive us of it, to keep out of perishing, as in *Luke 9.56. The Son of Man came not to destroy mens lives* (*{τας Ψυχας}*) *but to save them.* Truly I conceive that in the day that *Adam* sinned, he forfeited his soul or life, and in his own ours also, who were virtually in him, and had God strictly taken the forfeiture of him, He, and we all in him, had in that very day forthwith perished: but Christ who was fore ordained to this business, stept in between God and man, and by way of ingagement became the dead Man, the Lamb slain for us, and so preserved his soul and ours also; and so he yet as Mediator between God and us, preserves us from many deaths, being patient toward us, when our follies deserve them to come upon us, [29] in which regard his forbearance is to be accounted Salvation by us. And so when the *Samaritans* brutishly rejecting him, had deserved such a destruction as the Disciples would have called for upon them, Christ tells them No, he came to *Save* mens lives even from such deserved destructions also, not to destory them in them.

[29] 2 Pet. 3.15.

2. To *Save* is sometime further to pull and deliver out of the state of ignorance, blindness, and corruption that men naturally lie in, and so its used in *Tit. 3.5. saved us by the washing of regeneration.*

3. Sometimes to preserve a man in that *Saved estate*, or in that grace of God, to which the soul through the call of God is brought, as in *1 Cor. 15.2, 3. by which ye are saved, if ye keep in minde how I have declared them to you: and so in 1 Tim. 4.16. in continuing in them* (in the words of Christ, thou shalt *Save*, that is, preserve (from falling) thy self and them that hear thee. Again sometimes,

4. To *Save*, is ultimately to deliver from, and out of all dangers, fears and miseries, and to bring to everlasting Glory. And thats the utmost and highest act of saving, the obtaining the Salvation that is in Christ with eternal Glory, *2 Tim. 2.10.*

Now in which of these senses Christ came to save the lost and sinners, or whether he came to save each of them, that he came for,

in

in All of them, he declareth not, but so far as I perceive he takes it as including all together; and intends this proposition for a truth, that whosoever Christ came to dye for, them he came to save in all these acts of saving, but then he neither proves that proposition so universally propounded, but only brings some scriptures which say, he came to save sinners, to wash and purge his Church, *Us*, believers, &c. not proving them to be the whole adaequate object of his Death, as was before noted: nor doth he tell us how we may understand the phrase of *Coming to save*, which in the second place, we shall briefly speak to: for thereby we are to understand,

1. Either that God sent him, and he came forth to bring absolutely and effectually, all and every sinner, for and to whom he came, and for whom he dyed, to Salvation in its highest acts, or to the utmost Salvation.

2. Or else that he came from God with the authority and Office of a Saviour, to reveal that to men, and do that in dying for men, by which they listening to him should be saved, but rejecting him they may miss of that exercise of his office, and work of saving, which they otherwise might have from him. Indeed in the first sense, the series and drift of his discourse argues that he takes it; but the latter sense seemes to be as agreeable to Scripture, which saith that he would have gathered them, and they would not. They would not come unto him, that they might have life, that he is the bread of God, that came down from heaven, and gives life to the world, the true bread that God gave to the murmuring *Jews*, who yet not eating him, have not life in them. All which expressions argue an authority and office given to Christ, to save and give life to men, and his readiness to give it; though they also shew that the execution of that office, or rather its fulfilling in men is suspended, and takes not its effect towards those that refuse to come to him and submit to his order, prescribed for executing it on them. Such a phrase we have in *Exod. 3.8. I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of the land into a good land and a large, &c.* in which his meaning cannot be, that he came with an absolute intent and purpose to bring all that his people certainly and effectually out of *Ægypt* into *Canaan*; but there was an implicit condition couched in it, of their hearkning to him and following him, otherwise though he came down to bring them into *Canaan*, many might never come into
it

as the event also proved it. Now if thus we take those Scriptures of his coming to save sinners, and that that was lost; then though we understand the word *Save*, to comprehend all those forementioned acts, it will be little to the Authors advantage. But I pass from this part of his consideration to the next, viz.

“2 *The effect and actual product of the work it self, the thing effected and accomplished by the Death, Oblation and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ, which he expresses more distinctly to be Reconciliati-on, Justification, Sanctification, Adoption, Glory and Immortality;* for which he produces divers Scriptures, some pertinent, some not. Now to this part we shall grant, that by the death of Jesus Christ some men attain to all these things, which is as much as those Scriptures produced by him prove. But I shall briefly declare how they are by his Death.

1. His Death and bloodshedding was that way through which God went to effect these things, and so {διὰ τοῦ θανάτου} may be translated [through his Death] as Gods dividing the red sea was part of that way by which he brought *Israel* into *Canaan*, and the ordering *Joseph* to prison, was the way through which God brought him to his preferment in Pharaohs Court, and made provision for the people of those countries in the 7 years of famine. *Davids* fight with *Goliah*, was the way through which the Israelites were victorious over the Philistins, &c. Had not Christ died we had not been reconciled, justified, sanctified, received the adoption of sons, and so not glorified: by that our sin was expiated the way between God and us cleared and made open, Redemption obtained: salvation is in Christ for us, so as that by believing in his Name any may be saved. *Acts* 4.11, 12.

2. By his Death we are Reconciled, Justified, Sanctified, made Sons, &c. as its the way through which discovered to us, and believed in by us, we are brought to union with Christ, and to receive that salvation and redemption that is in him: not that Christ in the act of his dying, made us at one with God, and so reconciled us to God in our selves, or justified, or sanctified us, made us sons and glorified us in our persons. But this death of his made known to us in the Gospel, is that by which God draws us to his Son, and to himself, and so its it by which he reconciles us. Thence the *Colossians* are said Now to be reconciled, since the enmity in their minds was slain by him: and so, reconciled by his death, is a

[30] Rom. 3.25.
and 5.1.

phrase like those in 1 *Pet.* 1.3. and 3.20. begotten to a lively hope by the resurrection of Christ, from the dead, and so the conscience gives a good answer by his resurrection, that is, by it as not only acted in Christ, but as discovered to us in the word, and as its that *medium* by which we behold Gods goodness toward us. And so the blood of Christ Justifies us by faith in it, as by vertue of the satisfaction made by it Christ presents us righteous, being brought into him through the faith of it: and so for sanctification, it's by his blood sprinkled on us, and through the power of the spirit working powerfully in us. That place in *Heb.* 9.14. quoted by him p. 64. to prove sanctification to be an immediate product of his death, is horribly mistake; for it speaks not of his Death simply assuffered, or his blood as presented by him to God, but as sprinkled upon the conscience, and therefore its brought to answer the type of the red heifer *Numb.* 19. which not by its death and oblation immediately sanctified the people, but the ashes of it being reserved, and after mixed with clean water, and sprinkled on the unclean, then Sanctified, to the purifying of the flesh; and not otherwise: so also he hath misapplied, 2 *Cor.* 5.19. in his first chapter, p. 2. bringing it to prove Reconciliation accomplished in the Death of Christ. When the Apostle speaks but of it in *fieri* not in *facto*, its {ἀπαλλασσόμενος}, Reconciling, to the accomplishment of which in them, he exhorts them in ver. 20. Be ye reconciled unto God: so in pag. 3. he hath to wrong purpose quoted *Heb.* 9.12. and 1 *Pet.* 2.24. as speaking of redemption or justification as accomplished upon men, when they (so far as he quotes them) speak but of Christs finding or obtaining it of the father in himself or into his hand, nor is it there expressed for whom, or for how many he obtained it, the words, for us, being not in the Text. Again he there misquotes *Rom.* 3.25. rendring it We have all sinned, and are justified, as if it were {πάντες ἡμαρτήκαμεν}, whereas it is indeed {πάντες ἡμαρτον}, All have sinned, being justified, &c. But I pass from these things. His drift in all this he afterward in pag. 4. and more “plainly chap. 3. lib. 2. discovers to us: Its to beat down a *spread-ing perswasion (as he calls it) of Christs giving himself a ransome for all, and every one*; a perswasion which the Teacher of the Gentiles in truth and verity broached in those very expressions. 1. *Tim.* 2.5, 6, 7. *Heb.* 2.9. a sad time when men of parts study to oppose his doctrine *totidem verbis* in the very *tearms* that he delivered it in.

in. But *Hic labor, hoc opus est*. To this purpose the aforesaid considerations were laid down, to be the foundation and Basis of an argument or two; as to that purpose he hath enlarged them also, *lib. 2, cap. 3.* producing more scriptures tending to the same thing, to which those above mentioned were produced; as That he shall save his people from their sins, shall see his seed, and carry on the pleasure of the Lord: Sanctified himself, that they may be Sanctified through the truth, gave himself for us that he might deliver us from this present evil world, was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (most or all of which we shall after meet with, and speak more particularly to) from all which he draws this argument.

“*That which the Father and Son intend to accomplish, in and towards all those for whom Christ died, by his death that is most certainly effected. But the Father and Son intended by the Death of Christ to redeem, purge, sanctifie, purifie, deliver from Death, Satan, the curse of the Law, to quit of all sin, to make righteousness in Christ all those for whom he dyed. Therefore He dyed for all, and only those in and towards whom, all those things recounted are effected, and so not for All.* This is a main pillar of his edifice: let us by Gods assistance assay to shake and evert it.

And first (not to speak to the form, how the conclusion should have been inferred) for the *major*, if taken in this sense, What the Father and Son did intend, purpose, and wholly take upon themselves, absolutely to do by his death, that was and shall be thereby effected, His determinate purpose shall not fail; so its granted. But if by *intended*, we understand what he propoundeth as an end intended in which there may be something suspended in the proposition upon some condition, in that way I say what ever is propounded as his intent, may not be fulfilled and accomplished in All for whom he dyed. But I know he intends it in the former sense: and therefore (2. I shall deny the Minor, and desire his proof for it, namely that the Father and Son intended, that is, absolutely purposed, and wholly took upon themselves, without condition, to redeem, purge, sanctify &c. all for whom Christ died. For

1. This is beside the scripture, that saith, He dyed for all, but never that he so intended to purge, sanctifie, set free, and save All.

2. Its against that intimation in *Rom. 14.15.* and *2 Cor. 8.11.* that one for whom Christ dyed may possibly perish, and makes a

meer scare-Crow of the Apostles reasoning, as if he would deter them from evils, by propounding impossible consequences of it, and suppositions quite contrary to the faith: to say nothing that it thwarteth that too in 2 *Pet.* 2.1.

3. None of all the Places quoted, prove what is affirmed: for either they say not that the object named is all that Christ died for, but some specially distinguished from others, by the intervention of faith either, in the eye of God, or in real existence in them, as his people, them that believe on him, the Church, that is, a people called out of the world, *Us*, who were then actually believers; them that were given him out of the World, had received his words, believed, were sent into the *World* by him to preach the Gospel (to say nothing of his begging the question, that by sanctifying himself he meanes his dying, or setting himself apart to dye, in *Joh.* 17.19.) so that that *Minor* is peccant in that it wants proof, none of those Scriptures saying, that those things he aynded at in all he dyed for. To illustrate the business, the proof is like this. It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe; and he called you by the Gospel to the obtaining of the Glory of the Lord Jesus; *Ergo* All to whom it pleased God that the Gospel should be preached, shall be saved and obtain eternal Glory. To propound as a truth that God intended to redeem, purge, and save All for whom Christ dyed, and then to prove it by telling us he intended to do so to *Us* that believe, to his Church and people; is as lame a proof as if I should propound for truth, that God intended to bring into *Canaan* all that he brought out of *Ægypt*, and then prove it by shewing that he so intended to all that believed and followed him. Or else

2. Those places show not that those things so mentioned, were the absolute intentions of God and Christ, taken upon themselves to be effected by them, without suspending them upon condition in us, and if the *Minor* take not the word *intended* in that sense, it suits not with the *Major*, but contains a *quartus terminus*: and the *major* not so taken is untrue. If it be said the words are, I came to save that that's lost, he gave himself that he might purge *Us*, and suffered for the unjust, to bring us to God, &c. and where things are so spoken of, as the ends and aimes of God in acting; there, though we have not the expressions, He intended this and that; yet we are to understand that God, absolutely intended to accomplish
and

[31] 1 *Pet.* 2.10.

and bring about those things, and so that all those that are the object of those acts which were acted to such an end, obtained or shall obtain that end. Then I deny it and will prove it, that in such speeches where two acts are mentioned as end and means, and God the agent in the act directed to such an end, it is not safe to say, that alwayes that act propounded as the end, in his acting, was absolutely intended to be, and answerably is brought about by him, in all those upon whom or for whom he acted that act thats mentioned as the means: as to instance. *Act. 17, 26, 27. He made of one bloud all the kinde of men to inhabit all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times appointed, and the bounds of their habitation, that they might seek the Lord, &c.* Here is end and means propounded, the making all of one bloud, bounding their times & habitations, the means directed to this end, that they might seek the Lord. Will any man hence say, that God absolutely intended that he would cause all that he made, and whose times and habitations he bounded, to seek him, and who ever seek him not, and so call those in *Rom. 3.11.* were not made by him? So *John 1.6, 7. John was sent to bear witness to the light, that all through him might believe.* Doth it follow that because that was the end propounded, therefore God absolutely purposed to make all believe, to whom he bare witness, and so its true that he bare witness to none else? is not that contrary to *Mat. 11.16, 17, 18.* and *21.32.* So *John 5.34.* Christ tels the cavilling *Jews* that he spake those things to them that they might be saved; will it follow that it was his absolute intent that they should all be saved, hear him or not? or to make all hear him and be saved, even those that would not come to him that they might live? vers. 40. Christ came to save that which was lost: Doth it follow that he absolutely determined to bring all them to eternal life to whom he came? even those also to whom he came, and they received him not? *John 1.11.* So *Psal. 105.33, 34.* He brought his chosen into *Canaan*, that they might observe his Statutes and keep his Laws. Therefore he intended to make them all do so, and all that he brought into that land did so, contrary to *Psal. 106.34, 35, 36.* And to say no more, God came down to bring *Israel* out of *Ægypt*, to bring them into *Canaan.* *Exod. 3.7. and he brought them out thence that he might bring them into, and give them that land. Deut. 6.23.* Ergo he absolutely purposed it concerning all that came out of *Egypt*

Egypt, and no more were brought out thence, then were brought into *Canaan*. Such his Argument.

Like to which he hath another taken from the effects of Christs “Death, [32] the Minor of which Affirms that his Death sanctifies and “and purges all them for whom he dyed, redeems them from Law, Curse, Death, &c. none of all which he proves, none of all those Scriptures alledged for proof, [33] having such a clause in it, as, *All, for whomsoever he dyed*, or any thing sounding that way, they being but applicative speeches not universal assertions. Its such an argument as this. *The Lord brought us out of Egypt, and brought us into this place viz. Canaan, Deut. 26.8, 9. And the Lord made you to go up out of Egypt, and hath brought you into this Land. Judg. 2.1.* Therefore all that God brought out of *Egypt*, he brought into *Canaan*. Besides he hath for the bottom of this Argument this proposition in p. 4 line. 71. and again in page 66. *that the things before recounted are the immediate fruits and products of Christs Death, namely Reconciliation, Justification, Sanctification, Adoption, Glorification*: which is as true as that the dispossessioning the *Canaanites*, and the giving their Land to the *Israelites*, was the immediate fruit and product of their bringing out of *Egypt* over the red Sea; as may be seen by what we sayed to them p. 10. No one of those things as accomplished in men, is the *immediate fruit* and product of his Death. Not Reconciliation, though that be by the Death of Christ, yet not *immediately*, there is requisite to it beside Christs death the word of Reconciliation to declare it, and that heard and submitted to, as is plain, 2 *Cor. 5.19, 20.* We beseech you be ye reconciled to God; yea and all these things come between the death of Christ and Reconciliation, and are mediums of it. Justification is not the immediate fruit and product of his death, but *mediante fide*, We are justified by faith, *Rom. 5.1.* thence, we have believed that we might be Justified. *Gal. 2.16.* and that presupposes the word and spirit opening the death of Christ, and shedding abroad the love of God; and sprinkling the bloud of Christ upon the soul, as in *Tit. 3.5, 6, 7.* He shed on us the Spirit abundantly, that being justified by his Grace we might be made heires, &c so 1 *Cor. 6.11.* ye are Justified by the Name of the Lord, and by the Spirit of our God. Sanctification is not the immediate fruit and product of Christs Death but *mediante fide* too; Sanctified by faith that is in Christ Jesus, *Acts. 26.18.* and so there intervenes the being called out of the world and

[32] *Lib. 2. cap. 3.*
pag. 66.

[33] This argument he hath again in *lib. 3. cap. 4* where we shall speak further to it.

and Church't, *Ephes.* 5.26, 27. Adoption is not the immediate fruit and product of Christs death, but hath Faith and Justification intervening, *John* 1.12. To them that received him, he gave this priviledge to be the sonnes of God, to them that believed on his Name, *Gal.* 3.26, 27. *Ye are all the Sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ.* *Tit.* 3.7. *That being Justified by his grace, ye might be made heirs, &c.* And I am sure glory and immortality follows all these, except we will have the inheritance go before the heirship, and right to it. But of this enough, and to this Chapter.

CHAP. II.

Animadversions upon some passages in the second and third Chapters of his First Book.

THE second Chapter being only speculation about the nature of end and means, [34] and not at all applied there to the question, I shall pass over; only noting a mistake in that expression about the nature of Moral means, which he hath pag. 6. line 15, 16. "*that in a moral sense, when the action and the end are to be considered in reference to a Moral rule or law prescribed to the agent, then the means are the Deserving or Meritorious cause of the end.*" Which I conceive to be false, looking upon Moral as contradistinct to Physical or natural, as there he doth, for it would then follow that Faith as a means considered in reference to the Law of Faith, should be the Meritorious cause of its end, that is, Justification and Salvation, and so good works: which I think All Orthodox and Protestant Divines do utterly disclaim. Though Faith be the way to justification and eternall life, yet its no wayes the meritorious cause; otherwise we should be justified not only *per fidem*, but *propter fidem* too, not *ex gratiâ* but *ex debito & merito*; and so that distinction of the Apostle in *Rom.* 4.2, 3, 4. is quite overthrown, but no more to that, it being but by the by.

[34] To Chap. 2.

His third chapter is spent about the consideration of God as the agent in the work of Redemption; [35] about which there is no express difference between us as to the main, only a few expressions drop by the by, that are considerable, as That 1 *Tim.* 4.10. "[*who is the Saviour of all men, chiefly of them that believe*] calls not God a Saviour with reference to his Redeeming us by Christ, but his saving and preserving all by his providence: A strange conceit,

[35] To his 3. Chap.

in which *opponit non opponenda*; for though its true he saves Us by his providence, yet that that providence of his is saving to sinners, yea so much as in this life, without respect had to the mediation of Christ, much less that its so saving, specially to believers, as that it becomes the motive and ground to them, of such trust in God, [36] as carries them out to suffer and labour in his Gospel (as there its affirmed to be) is unreasonable to conceive; and it disagrees with what he says to this business in other places, where he tells us, it was eying God as one that had prepared things not seen, eternal in the heavens for them, and eying Christs death for All that they might live to him, and glorifying his love therein, to his and his brethrens hearts; expecting a saviour from heaven to change their vile bodies, that made them despise their lives and liberties, preach the Gospel through sufferings, reproaches, crosses, how ever little esteemed as beside themselves. Now here to think the Apostle cuts off all that consideration of his saving, and only pitches upon him as a providential Saviour in a salvation out of Christ, or without the consideration of Christ intervening, as the lovely object of Trust and Confidence in all their labor and afflictions, is too jejune and erroneous: but we shall meet with this again in his eighth chapter.

Again in considering the obligation and Covenant between God and Christ, he promises something that will utterly overthrow the Universal Redemption, but defers it to another after-place in *lib. 3. chap. 1.* where we shall meet with, it and give it its answer: only whereas he tells us p. 16. *that the promise in Isa. 53.11. is "inconsistent with their persuasion who in termes have affirmed, That "the Death of Christ might have had its full and utmost effect, and "yet none be saved.* To that I shall say how I conceive that may be affirmed and how not (not standing here upon it that that in *Isa. 53.11.* is a prophesie of, but not a promise uttered to Christ)

1. It might have been so, *supposito quod Deus eam aliter ordinasset*; as it might have been undertaken and indured, and as God might have decreed, it might have been so.

2. To look upon it as it was indured, and take it by it self, simply as Death; though to such and such ends without Resurrection from which it is distinct, then also it might have been so: had he not risen too, all its effect would not have saved any man: So the Apostle intimates, *1 Cor. 15.14, 16, 17.*

3. It

3. It might have had its full effect as only offered to God without application to men, and none saved; had it been its end intended, it had been contrary to that in Isai. 53.11. but the effect and end of a thing differs much; The Carpenter builds a house, the effect of his work is the house it self, the end of its building, habitation: the end of Christs Death is, that men might be saved by him, the effect of it as a thing simply done by him, between God and him, is not the salvation of any one without application of it, or dispensation of spirit to men through it; so that had Christ died, and rose too, and done no more, none had been saved to the utmost, except the business of his Priesthood be in vain, and a thing that might have been spared; so that its effect it might have had as a thing endured by him, and none saved, as they take saving in that highest act.

4. But to say the thing that God aimed at, and that was covenanted to be granted to Christ upon, or as a reward of his Death, might have been effected or performed, and yet none saved; is indeed cleerly false, nor did the speech opposed affirm so much; but thats as much, I suppose, as upon (second thoughts) he aimed at.

“Whereas he saies, pag. 17. *That the pleasure of the Lord that was “to prosper in the hand of Christ, was the bringing of many sons to glory;* thats a truth but whether it be all the truth or no he tells us not, and so deals not so fully and plainly as he should; whether the glorifying of God in the convincing, and just and righteous judging of the rest be not the pleasure of the Lord too, he saith nothing, much less disproves it, and yet I think he shall do that, and the pleasure of the Lord too in that matter shall prosper in his hand.

“In the same *pag.* he tells us the request of our Saviour, *John 17.* “was neither for more nor less then God had ingaged himself to “him for, and that was for a full confluence of the love of God, and “the fruits of that love upon all his Elect, in Faith, Sanctification and “Glory: But of that he gives us no proof, neither that there he asked no less (for as for more I will not question) nor that he requested Faith for all his Elect, or any of them. To the first. I propound to him, Whether the salvation of *Abraham* and *Isaac*, &c. was not in the Covenant made between God and Christ? if not, then some more are saved then were included in that Covenant: If yes, then I demand, what passage in that Prayer requests that they might believe and be sanctified? if none, then he asked less in that

Prayer then God had ingaged himself to him for. To the second, I desire him to shew in what passage he prayes for the faith of the Elect in all that Prayer: not from the sixth to the twentieth, for he tells his Father they had it already, and I suppose he will not be able to prove that he prayed to his Father there to give them that which they had before that prayer, at least in that degree in which they had it; nor in *ver.* 20. for them he supposeth as future believers, as he makes them the *suppositum* of his prayer; his prayer is not, that they might believe, but that believing, which he supposeth they should, they might be one, viz in body, priviledg, and injoyment of the grace of God in Christ; except he will say Faith is prayed for in *ver.* 21. and 23. when he saith, *that the world might believe*; but first, that's for the world, not for the Elect; secondly, that he himself denies to be the faith of the Elect, and so the fruit of that love "here said to appertain to the Elect, but only a conviction, not for "any good of the world, but onely for the vindication of his people, *cha* 7. *pag.* 47. therefore I desire him to shew me in what place of that prayer, that Faith he here speaks of, as a fruit of Gods electing love, is prayed for.

"In *pag.* 19. He tels us, *That it seems strange to him that Christ should "undergo the pains of hell in their stead, who lay in the pains of hell before he underwent those pains, and shall continue in them to eternity*: To which I need not say (with many of the Antients) that he emptied hell by his death, [37] and descent into those pains, as Bishop *Vsher* relates: nor will I put him to prove that any were as then, or yet are undergoing those pains before the judgment of the great Day, when they shall be sentenced thither, which will be somewhat hard for him to do, except he take that in *Luke* 16. to be a Narration, or History of things really done, and think that the rich man see *Lazarus* in *Abrahams* bosome, and could call from hell to heaven to him; but I say, it will not follow from our saying, That Christ gave himself a ransom for All, that he must undergo those torments for All, which were properly inflicted upon men for their abuse of that liberty which he virtually gave them to injoy by his after-death. His enduring the sentence of the death he found them under, as in *Adam*, was enough to pay for that dispensation of life, liberty, grace & mercy to them, which they in their several times injoyed upon the ingagement of his future dying, [38] without induring those torments for them, to which they stood by the word adjudged for their not receiving him, who was the Author of such liberty and mercy to them in those hints
of

[37] Bishop
Usher in
his Answer
to the *Irish*
Jesuit up-
on *Limbus*
Patrum,
&c.

[38] See more
to this in
cha. 3. *li.* 3.

of truth, and reproofs, and counsels, in his Spirits strivings despised by them. Hence we may fall into an Answer of a Dilemma there propounded to us, and again repeated chap. 3. lib. 3. viz. “*That God imposed his wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men, or all the sins of some men, or some sins of all men: If the last, then all have some sins to answer for, and so no man shall be saved; if the second, then that is it he affirms; if the first, then all should be saved, or why not?*” This may seem at the first view such a three-headed Monster as that there is no conquering it; but through Gods assistance we shall grapple with it. About his suffering the pains of hell, I shall not question with him; its an ambiguous word, and variously used; And as no Scripture uses his expressions, perhaps in his intention, so as the Scripture uses the word hell, I have no ground from Scripture to deny the expression: therefore to the thing it self,

I may say, that in severall respects, all those three branches of the Dilemma are true, and yet his consequences will not follow. As,

1. He underwent the wrath of God for some fins of all men, [39] else he could not give himself a ransom for them all, nor his righteousness come to All men to justification of life, nor any favor of God be extended to them, except he interposed between God and that sin that in its desert, and by Gods sentence of death, stopt the passage of all good flowing upon them, unless hindred by mediation. But then he says, All have some sins to answer for, *Nego consequentiam*, that follows not for he that bears some sins of all, may yet bear also all of some, those two are not inconsistent: had he said, But some sins of any, that had excluded All of any; but some of All doth not: those that may be but some of one mans sins may be All of another; as suppose he bare all sins *in genere*, but the sin against the Holy Ghost, he then bare all some mens sins, [40] for some men are not guilty of that, but are kept from it: but yet in respect of their sins that run into that, he bare but some of their sins, not all as so considered.

2. He underwent the wrath of God for all the sins of some, that is, gave such satisfaction to his justice, that no sin they have shall be their condemnation, namely of those that believe and walk in the light with him, as it is 1 *John* 1.7. *Rom.* 8.1. otherwise the phrase as he expresses it, the Scripture hath not: But then thats it he faith. No sure, for he says he bare only All the sins of some men, and dyed for

[39] 1 Tim. 2.
6.
Rom. 5.
18.

[40] Heb. 10.
26.

none else but those some, but so neither the Scriptures nor we say: He might bear the punishment of all the sins of some men, and yet not them only.

3. He underwent the wrath of God for all the sins of All men in some sense considered, That is, as they were sinners in his first stepping in to undertake for men, as sin was upon them through the fall of *Adam*, and bound them to curse and death, and so they needed a mediator, or else they must presently be cut off and perish; and so in a consideration and view of them as previous to his stepping in to mediate. And his bearing all of them was enough to ransom them all from that first condemning sentence: and yet neither follows it so that all must then be eternally saved, because there are other sins against his mediation, and the fruits of it extended to them, as considered in a condition consequent thereto: as refusing the light, and abusing the power and liberty given them in the strivings and operations of his grace and spirit, a turning away from him that did so much for them, a denying him that bought them, not believing on his name, &c. But then he says further, “*If this unbelief be a sin, then Christ underwent the punishment of it or not, if he did, then why must that hinder more then other sins? &c.*” To which I answer, that though properly and most directly those sins and evils came upon him, into which the fall of *Adam* plunged us, sins not against him as Mediator, or God as giving a Mediator and dealing with us there-through, which was consequent to the fall and to mans sinning: yet inasmuch as God knew that which they would do against his Mediating for them, he not only laid upon him that sin previous to it with its proper operations in that way, but also provided in that his Death against other sins that would follow, so as that he might be perfectly able to save to the utmost any that should come to God by him. And so he did so much in that one Death and offering, as by virtue thereof, patience and forbearance might be afforded for some space to the Rebellious, while God is striving with them by his Spirit, and leading them to Repentance. [41] And its said, *there is forgiveness with the Lord, that he might be feared, and with him is plenteous Redemption*, Psal. 130.4, 6. with him before it be with us, or before we have it made ours; before we fear him, for its provided with him, and he exercises patience answerably with Declarations of it, that he might be feared, and this held forth to such, as yet are supposed, may despise and perish

[41] { עטר
הסליחה }

rish *Acts* 13.37. 40.41. And thence in urging the wicked to Repentance, its added as the motive, *for he is gracious, and will multiply pardon*. He hath received so much satisfaction for any wicked man whoever, short of that unpardonable sin, that he hath power and readiness of forgiveness for them with him, [42] and desires not their ruine, but that they might turn and live: such a Caution hath Christ put in with his Father for them, and not onely so, but also he so far fore-provided, that upon submission of any of them to him, all their sins against his light, goodness and Mediation, during the time of Gods calling, findes Remission from him: [43] and the after-follies to that his own Called-Ones run into are provided against; [44] remission is in him for them, and upon their confession and returning they have it dispensed to them; and for them he hath provided, that they shall not fail of seasonable operations of Spirit, with due chastisements, [45] whereby they may be sanctified and made pure in his sight; and for the sanctified, he hath provided for their utmost perfection, and all this in one sacrifice. But all this power of pardoning, obtained by his Death, is deposited in his hand, and the pardon not immediately passed over from God to us, or any he died for; as if Christ bare all the Curse and Death, and then for his sake we have Remission, blessing and life presently confer'd upon us: but as Christ bare all our evil God-ward, so he hath received, and is the treasury of Gods fulness of blessing Man-ward, and men receive it from him and with him, it being Gods Ordinance that he and life go together: so as that we have not life till we have him, nor Redemption till translated into his Kingdom; who then sets us free by revealing his Truth to and in us, *Iohn* 8.32, 36. *Col.* 1. 13, 14. *1 Corinth.* 1.30. But the persisting in obstinacy and Rebellion till the space of Grace be expired, deprives men of that Mercy and Salvation they might have found in submission to him, *Jon.* 2.8. *Psalms* 81.10, 11, 12. *Luke* 19.41, 42, &c. And so unbelief Condemns, not onely as it deserves Condemnation, for in that regard he hath power to forgive it, but as its necessary operation is the keeping a soul at a distance from him, in whom is all Salvation and Remission, and without whom we cannot have whatever of that nature is given to us, all being intailed upon and bound up in him, *1 Joh.* 5.11.

[42] *Matth.* 22.
3, 4, 7.

[43] *Isa.* 55.7.

[44] *1 Joh* 1.9.

[45] *Ephes* 5.
26, 27.

So

So that in a word, he hath born all the sins of all men, as in their first transgression, and as considered precedaneous to his mediation; and hath obtained such power against all other sins of all, or any man, that he hath made them all pardonable, except that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; that upon repentance he can and will pardon any of them; though yet we say not that he bare upon himself all the sins of all men as considered sinning against his mediation.

CHAP. III.

A View of his fourth Chapter, with Answer thereto.

“IN his fourth Chapter he tels us how Christ was Agent in the “work of Redemption by voluntary susception of the office imposed on him, and so was incarnate, and offered up himself a sacrifice to God, which we affirme also; only some of the Scriptures that he quotes for this (though they intimate his suffering and offering) yet speak to a further business, as the washing us in his blood, *Rev.* 1.5. is in the sprinkling his blood upon our consciences, compare it with *Heb.* 10.22. *1 Cor.* 6.11. *Ephes.* 5.26. so the sanctifying himself, *Joh.* 17.19. is not his yeelding up himself to death sure (or not that only) that they might be yeelded up to death by his death: but the devoting himself to God, to receive and make known the knowledg of God to them, that they might be sanctified, and set apart through the truth to that ministration to which he sent them; for neither speaks he there of all the Elect (except Mr. Owen think that all the Elect are sent to minister to the world, [46] as Christ was) but of those actual believers whom he sent into the world; [47] for he makes this prayer, as one that had finished the work that God gave him to do on earth, and as one committing the business of the Father toward the world, in point of ministration unto others fitted for it; even as Paul prayed for the Elders of *Ephesus*, when he was leaving them and the flock of God to them, *Asts.* 20. but to passe that: Besides those other two acts of his undertaking, *Incarnation* and *Oblation*, he mentions also a third, viz. *Intercession*, which we grant also; but whereas he says, “Its for all and “every one of those for whom he gave himself as an oblation, he did “not

[46] Psal. 18.

[47] verse 4.

“not suffer, and then refuse to intercede for them, do the greater, “and omit the less; that position, though I will not peremptorily deny it, yet as Mr. *Owen* by Intercession means and takes in his Intercession as the {παράκλητος} or Advocate in this assertion, so I believe he will not prove it by Scripture. And yet no need of saying he refused to do it for them, it will be difficult I suppose for him to prove, that the wisdom of God did see it meet to impose that upon him, so to intercede for all that he dyed for. And if it was not propounded to him, though he do it not, yet may he not be said either to refuse or omit it. It becomes us to believe what God hath declared, not to deliver for truths or impositions of God, what our fancies conceive he must have imposed, where he hath declared no such imposition: he hath said Christ dyed for all; but where he saith, he makes intercession for all, or for all he dyed for, I leave to Mr. *Owen* to finde, and I would he would remember his own language in the Preface. “*To honor God and Christ in his own language, or “else be for ever silent, and that our inventions, be they never so “splendid (and I add rational too) in our eyes, yet to him they are abominations.* God doth not act alwayes according to our rules, do the lesser where he hath done the greater, but may suspend the lesser upon condition, if it so please him; as he doth not alway supply with bread, and keep from perishing by famine him that he hath given life to, though the life be more then food; and a man that believes and walks in Gods ways, may reason affirmatively, as our Saviour instructs us, *Math. 6.25.* but let us view his pretended proofes of it from Scripture.

“The first is *Psal. 2.8. Ask of me, and I will give thee the Heathen “for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession, &c.* But doth that say, That Christ should make intercession for all he died for? no such matter; nor is there a word about interceding for any, but that they should be given him as his inheritance and possession; and if that be his intercession there, then its extended to all elect and others, the Nations and the utmost parts of the earth; not an elect people onely, but even those that he should rule with an iron rod, and break in pieces as a Potters vessel. I hope Mr. *Owen* thinks not (at least will not prove) that God rules his Church, *Tam duro imperio*, so as to break them in pieces as a Potters vessel, & make them unprofitable, or that he rules them onely so; nor I suppose upon second thoughts, will he say, that the next place that
he

“he quotes, *viz. Joh. 14.2. I go to prepare a place for you*, is either a good exposition of that in *Psal. 2.8* as if his going to prepare a place for his Disciples, was asking them for his inheritance, to rule them with an iron rod, or proves that he went to entercede for all he “died for: nor doth *Heb. 9.7.* say any thing to that purpose, but that the high Priest went into the second Tabernacle once a year with the blood that he offered for the ignorances of the people; nor saies, “*ver. 24.* That Christ appears in the presence of God, to intercede for All that he died for, much less as an Advocate, and as the Apostles speak of his intercession with reference to believers. “The *1 Joh. 2.1, 2.* (which he nextly quotes) extends his Propitiation beyond his Advocation, and doth not speak of the one as largely as the other; Minde the words, *We have an advocate, and he is the propitiation for our sins*; I hope the Our there is as large as the *We*, of whom he had said, *We have an advocate*, that [*Our*] being a repetition of, and so the same with the former [*We*] but now see his Propitiation expresly extended further, *And not for our sins onely, but also for the whole worlds*: so that that makes more against his Assertion then for it. Its true, that his Advocation (as he saies) is founded upon his propitiation, and may be found in exercise for the same persons as there is proved, *We have an Advocate* who is the propitiation for our sins; but that the Advocation must therefore extend to all the same persons that the propitiation reaches to, is a fond inference, like this, A Prince by his favor with a King, and by his own great cost and charge, mediating for twenty men condemned forfelony, gets a pardon for them all; therefore when afterwards ten of them love and honor him, yet have their failings, and the other ten openly rebell against him still, and reject his love; he must keep them all still in the Kings special favor if he keep any of them therein. The roof of the house and every particular Chamber of it, is built upon and upheld by the foundation, therefore every Chamber must be every way as large as it, so that hitherto this Assertion wants proof of Scripture.

“That of *John 17.9.* proves it not neither, for that saies, *I pray not for the world*, but the Scripture saies, *God was in him reconciling the world*, and that he came to save the world; and indeed good reason, for his not praying as there for the world, whether the Elect in purpose and fore-knowledg or not, for his requests there are onely for things consequent to faith, as Union, Preservation in Faith, Sanctification,

ctification, and Glorification, and therefore meet to be put up for none but men called out, or viewed as called out, of the state and fellowship of the world; that in *ver.* 20. though its for persons as then of the world, yet as such they are not there the object of his prayer, but as supposed in an after-believing state; even as when a King grants to the Mayor of a Corporation the honor of having a Sword or the like born before him, and saies, neither give I this honor to thee onely, but to all succeeding Mayors of this Corporation also, and to none else; the subject of that Grant, is a Mayor as a Mayor of that Corporation; though in saying such as shall be Mayors, its plain the Grant reaches to persons as are then that not so, perhaps then not born, and yet the expression is true, that its given to none but the Mayor of that Corporation, for they that after shall be Mayors, and now are not, are not the subject of that Grant, as now unborn or unfree, but as after they come to be made Mayors; so here, they that are of the world now, may come to be such persons as there are prayed for, and yet the world, as, and while the world, wholly excluded from being the subject to whom those “*postulatae* are desired to be given. And to Mr. *Owens* saying, that the “world there is opposite to the Elect (except by Elect he mean, men {ἐκλεκτοι}, that is, gathered out of the world, as the words {ἐν} & {λέγω} signifie) is yet to prove, and his Assertion too looses by the bargain: Though yet neither is that true that after follows in “him, *That if he should intercede for All, All should undoubtedly be saved*, meaning eternally, for he may intercede for some for other things, & not for eternal salvation, as in *Luke.* 13.7, 8. *Lord let it alone this year till I dig about it, & dung it, and if it bring forth fruit, well, if not, then afterward thou maist cut it down*; sure he was the prime Vine-dresser, and thats likely to be his intercession for the barren Nation of the *Jews*; or if it was of subordinate Officers, yet sure their intercessions prevail not for patience and continuance of the means of Grace (as that Parable compared with what went before, *v.* 1.5. intimate they do) where he intercedes not, and carries not up their prayers for that particular; so that how he should be there excluded, I know not, and so he may pray, as *Luke* 23.34. *Father forgive them, they know not what they do*, and yet they not be saved, for thats not, Father justifie them, and bring them to life eternal; there is forgiveness mentioned in the Scripture short of what is attended with that, as, *Lord lay not this sin to their charge, Acts* 7.61. and such as are men-

tioned in *Numb.* 14.19. *Psal.* 73.37, 38. *Amos* 7.2.3, 5, 6. *Math.* 13.27, 34, 35. So that neither of these is proved. Either that he intercedes for All he dyed for, or that if he do, they are all saved eternally. Its true indeed (as he after saith) He is able to save to the utmost all that come to God by him, because he ever liveth to to make intercession for them; but neither proves that he makes intercession for all that he dyed for, nor that whosoever he makes Intercession for, he makes it for them for ever, and they shalbe saved to the utmost. The Fig-tree notwithstanding that intercession made for patience and means of grace, yet not coming to God by him, might be cut down. It says not all that he goeth to God for any thing, for shall be saved to the utmost: but he is able to save to the utmost all that come to God by him, because he ever lives to make intercession for them. He is able to save them to the utmost by virtue of that powerful office, but if men come not to God by him, or withdraw from him, he says not that he lives for ever to execute his office for them, and to save them to the utmost. Indeed from this his office and intercession founded on his oblation, believers (men that come to God by him) have notable confidence as is expressed, *Rom.* 8.33, 34, (another place quoted by him) even as *Caleb* and *Joshuah* whose spirits were right with God, had notable confidence (from the great things God had done for them and his presence amongst them) to possess the Land of Canaan and subdue their enemies, *Numb.* 14.9. and yet it was not therefore a truth that all that God had done those mighty things for, and was walking amongst, either had that confidence, or their success; which being considered keeps alive the *General Ransom* from that *break neck* with which Mr. *Owen* threatneth it; for though its true that those for whom he dyed, hearing and believing his love to them, have no cause but to trust in him, and seek and hope for great things from him, as all the Israelites that came over the red Sea and see Gods mighty works for for them, had no cause but to have believed in God as well as the rest, *Numb.* 14.11. yet as there all that shared in those great things did not so believe as some, nor had the like issue, but many through their unbelief sell short of *Canaan*; so here many not believing the goodness of God to them (for which in part many may thank their Ministers that leave them to seek whether they have a mediator appointed of God for them or not) do not believe in Christ, and so for not believing and by not believing, perish; for the Apostle saith
not

not that All that Christ dyed and rose for, he intercedes for; nor that all that he intercedes for shall be saved and have no condemnation; no more then *Caleb* said All that God brought out of *Egypt*, and that he at that present was with, should enter into *Canaan*: but as he, so the Apostle believingly feeding upon the goodness of God, joyes in it, and is raised up to exceeding confidence by it; and shews that they who are in Christ and walk after the spirit (as they did) have no condemnation, but are kept from it by the Death, Resurrection and Intercession of Christ believed on by them; but he affirms not that, of all that he dyed, rose and intercedes for.

Whereas a little after he saith, That God only promised to “Christ that he should be Captain of all Salvation to all that believe, “and effectually bring many sons to glory; he saith not truely: for he promised him also, *Psa.* 2.8, 9. That he should rule the Nations with an Iron rod, and break them in pieces as a potters vessel, as he tels us he hath also received, *Rev.* 2.26, 27. And therefore that Christ looked only and alone (as *Mr. Owen* also saith) for the accomplishment of those things that he there mentioned, is false also; He looked for, and doth and shall see the other made good to him too. But so much to his deviations in this Chapter. The fifth only shewing that the Holy Ghost hath his concurrence, and had his operation in the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and no Argument being thence drawn to his purpose, I shall pass it over and proceed to the following Chapters.

CHAP. IIII.

*A further view of what he affirms of the equal
latitude and extent of the Oblation and Intercession
of Christ in his sixth Chapter, and seventh.*

His sixth Chapter goes over the same things again spoken of in the fourth, only here they are considered as means conducing to an end; namely the *Incarnation*, *Oblation*, and *Intercession* of Christ; the last of which [*Intercession*] he says contains every act of his exaltation, even his Resurrection; for which he brings no proof at all, nor any reason wherewith to back it, only quotes *Rom.* 4.25. which saith no such thing, but that he rose again for our

justification: no nor appears it (as he saith) that by his Resurrection all his following dispensation and perpetual intercession is there intended. Its but his conception without proof, it may rather be conceived that in saying, *For our justification*; he means that he might do all those acts conducing to our justification, and so include his Intercession there, then that in the word *Resurrection* those acts are intended. Nor saith *Acts* 3.26. any such thing; and her falsifies it doubly in his quotation of it. For first, he renders it thus, that God raised up his Son Jesus to bless us: Whereas the Text is, having raised him up he hath sent him to bless. I conceive he means it of his sending him in the Gospel, which is a preaching of Christ and offering him to men. And then, to bless us; as if he spake of the believers, whereas he saith to bless you, in turning every one of you from your iniquities. Which place duly weighed, shews the vanity of his arguing from such speeches that mention the end of Christs sending. For though there he is said to be sent to bless them in turning every one of them there spoken to, from their iniquities, by which he presses his exhortation to them for Repenting; yet it no where appeareth nor can he prove it, that all them people were ever so blessed and turned away from their iniquities; onely there Christ was held forth to them as authorised of God and ready to do it in their listening to him: the perception of which perhaps made him so cleverly to change the words {ὅμῖν} and {ὅμῶν}, into *us* and *us*. But I leave that to his better consideration.

But the chief thing considerable in this Chapter, is what he propounds about the Oblation and Intercession of Christ, [48] to the same purpose, as before in his fourth; “as, *That they are not in any respect to be separated or divided, as if the one should have any respect to any persons or any thing, that the other doth not in its kinde equally respect also; they being* 1. both alike intended, for the obtaining the [Reas. 1] “same end proposed, the effectual bringing of many sons to glory; [Reas. 2] “and 2. what persons soever the one respecteth in the good things it [Reas. 3] “obtaineth, the same and none else doth the other respect in applying “the good things so obtained, and 3. The oblation being the foundation “of the Intercession, &c. Which things are before spoken to in the precedent Chapter: and being here again only propounded, not proved, especially the main proposition with the first and second reasons of it (that place *Rom.* 4.25. which he brings for proof, neither shewing what or how many persons were the adaequate object of

of his Death, nor expressing any thing of his Intercession, much less saying that it hath the same extent to persons and things as his Death, and that other place of *Joh. 17.19.* being but a begging the question, and impertinent as hath been shewed, in that it extends but to those that Christ says he sent into the world) as also the main proofs of it being reserved to the following Chapters, we shall procede to view them, only premising this; that,

1. Should we grant these things, they would not prejudice our Cause, as hath in part been shewed on chapter fourth: He might offer himself to ransom men, and to provide for means of grace and patience to be extended to them, in attention to which they might meet with his power to Save them, [49] and Intercede for those things too for them, and yet many abusing the grace procured by both (as is supposed in the parable of the barren fig-tree) they might not be eternally saved. So that his after-conclusion in this Chapter would not thence follow, viz. *“That every one for whom he died, must actually have applyed to him all the good things purchased by his Death: except he can first prove, that whoever Christ Intercedes for, he Intercedes for all those good things for them which he procured by his Death: Which I am confident he cannot prove. For to speak in his own Dialect, He saith, “that the Death of Christ purchased the “Spirit, and the whole confluence of the grace of God. I would ask him then, if it purchased not Apostleship and the gift of prophecy, &c. If no, then are some good things conferred upon some that were not purchased by his Death, contrary to his Assertion, pag. 33. line 5. If yea, then I demand, whether every one for whom he dyed have the gift of Apostleship and prophecy conferred upon them; if he say yes, then he contradicts the Apostle, 1 Cor. 12.28. if no, then his Conclusion is proved false. If it be replied, that he means but of things essentially necessary to every one for eternall life, then yet*

[49] Luk. 13.
7, 8.

2. We desire his proof for this, That whoever Christ dyed for, or that he intercedes for, them he intercedes for eternall life, or makes such intercession for them, as the Apostle tels us he makes for them that come unto God by him; which because he promises (in effect) in the next Chapter, I now thither follow him to view his Arguments or Reasons which are as followeth.

“His first Argument is taken from a powerful Union that the “Scripture makes of both those, [50] almost alwayes joyning them “together, and so manifesting those things to be inseparable “which

[50] On Chap.
7. Arg.

“*which are looked upon as the distinct fruits and effects of them.*”

Before I answer to his Arguments, I shall repeat again the main proposition undertaken by him, which is this, that the Oblation and Intercession of Christ have not only the same persons for their Object, but that they have also all the same good things for each person, and all and only the same. Which I oppose but as in the word *Intercession* he aims at the prime exercise of it; for that he intercedes for the most special favors for persons for whom he dyed, I deny not; but that he doth it for all those for whom he dyed, that I desire to have proved. His first Argument for which, put into a form runs thus.

What things the Scripture almost always couples together, they have the same adequate objects, and their distinct fruits and effects are inseparable, and extend to all the same persons joyntly; but the Scripture almost always couples Christs Oblation, and Intercession together, *Ergo*, &c.

The major proposition here is false, as may be seen in many instances, as the bringing the Israelites out of *Egypt* and possessing them of *Canaan*, are very frequently joyned together, as often at least as Christs Death and Intercession, and yet had not the same adequate object, though both means of performing Gods Covenant and promise to *Abraham* and his seed. See for the proof of this, *Deut.* 4.37, 38. *Exod.* 3.8, & 6.68. *Deut.* 6.33, & 26.7, 8. *Psal.* 105.43, 44. *cum multis aliis*. Again the Scripture frequently mentions, Christs preaching to the people and healing their diseases together, as *Math.* 4, 27. & 9.35. *Acts* 10.36, 38. *Luk.* 5. 15. & 6.17. and both tended to glorifie his Father and make known his name. But I suppose that none will say therefore that both had the same adequate object, and that he preached to no more then were healed by him. The like I might say for teaching or preaching and baptising, both ordained to the same saving end, and often mentioned together, and yet not both of equal latitude: the latter not done to All, for and to whom the other was vouchsafed.

So that that Proposition hath no truth and it, and therefore the Argument is invalid. Nor doth he prove the Minor, that Oblation and Intercession are *almost always* joyned together in the Scriptures. He hath scarce any pertinent proofs that they are so joyned at all,
not

not above one or two at most. He alledges first, *Isa. 53.11.* “By his *“knowledg shall my righteous servant justifie many, for he shall bear “their iniquities.* Which proves, that many whose sins he bare, shall by his knowledg be justified, and that those many that by his knowledg he shall justifie, had their sins born by him, and he having born their sins could and should by his knowledge justifie them; but that neither saith he should justifie all whose sins he bare, nor should make Intercession to that purpose; nor makes any mention of his Intercession. “And whereas he sayes they are so put “together in the next verse, that surely none ought to separate them. Let us consider how they are put together. The words are, *He hath born the sins of many, and shall make intercession for the transgressors.* Which proves, that both Oblation and Intercession are the Works of Christ; which we deny not, nor is that the thing to be proved, but that his Intercession is for all the same persons for whom he died, and that too for all the good things that his Death procured, that place sayes not: There are different words used to express the objects; He shall bear the sins of *multitudes* or *manies*, there is his oblation, but now he adds not, and he shall make Intercession for all them, no nor saith he for them, but (using another word) He shall intercede for Transgressors; how many or who they be, or whether he intercede for all good things procured by his Death for any or not, that saith nothing. It mentions Oblation and Intercession both, its true, but that’s but once yet, and the Argument concludes not from it, as is before shewed. He quotes also *Rom. 4.25.* which mentions not his Intercession, but his Resurrection for our Justification, so that thats impertinent as to the Minor.

Rom. 8.33, 34. Mentions both, its true, but that is spoken to in *chap. 4.* and the vanity of his collection from there shewed. His inferen-
 “ces, That *He died onely for the Elect, and that none shall be con-
 “demned for whom Christ died, and that there is proved there an equal
 “extent of his Oblation and Intercession,* are not the Apostles but his own, as we before noted on *Chap. 4.* The first of them being contrary also to *1 Tim. 2.5 6.* and *2 Pet. 2.1.* The second of them contrary to those suppositions of the Apostle in *1 Cor. 8.11. Rom. 14.15. Heb. 2.3.* and that affirmation in *2 Pet. 2.1.* For the third, Its there asserted that the Elect and Believers in Christ have his Death, Resurrection, and Intercession, all for them, and that they are in a safe condi-

condition thereby, but saith not that all he died for had them all; as hath been noted. For his giving all things with Christ, we shall finde it elsewhere, where we also shall answer it. Now these two places, of *Isai.* 53.12. and *Rom.* 8.33, 34. being the onely two places wherein Oblation and Intercession are coupled together, and they scarce the tithe of the places where his Death is mentioned; his *Minor* is also false, and so the whole Argument ineffectual. And the second is like it, *viz.*

[Arg. 2] 2. Because they are *Acts of the same Office of Priesthood*. The Argument from thence runs thus.

The Acts that pertain essentially to the same Office, must be performed upon, or for all the same persons, and the one for All things for which the other. But Oblation and Intercession are acts of the same Office. *Ergo*, &c. The *Major* of this too is denied: and proved false, thus. To Preach and to Baptize were both acts of the Office of the *Baptist*, and of the Ministers of the Gospel sent by Christ into the world, *Matt.* 28.19. and yet it follows not that whoever they preached to, them also they baptized: nor can it be proved that the Priests used to pray for whomsoever they offered up a Sacrifice for. That of 1 *Joh.* 2, 1, 2. we have before scanned, That he is appointed to intercede for All that come to God by him, and so an high Priest for that purpose over Gods House, he proves well out of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, but that all that Christ died for, do go to God by Christ, or that he is appointed to make intercession for all that he died for, that he proves not, nor doth any Text in that Epistle or elsewhere speak it.

His conclusion then, “*That if he perform either of the acts of his Priesthood for any, he must of necessity also perform the other for them*,” flowes neither from the strength of his premises in his Argument, nor from any of his proofs, but is the issue fo his own misguided reason. His *absurd*, that else we make him but an half Priest or unfaithful, is an absurdity it self: For was not *John Baptist* a full Minister of the Gospel, and so the twelve Apostles, or shall they be taxed with unfaithfulness in their Office if they baptized not all that they preached to, because Baptizing and Preaching were both enjoyned them in their Commission, and pertained to them as Christs Ministers? but no more to that.

[Arg. 3] 3. “His third Argument is taken from the *Nature of his Intercession*, which, he saith, is only a presentation of himself, sprinkled with

“with the blood of the Covenant, before the throne of grace in our behalf, an appearing in the presence of God for us, *Heb.* 9.24. “and so is nothing else but an Oblation continued in postulating those things which by it were procured. Thence he argues, How “can he be said to offer for them for whom he doth not intercede, “when his Intercession is nothing else but a presenting his Oblation “in behalf of them for whom he suffered, and for the bestowing the “the good things thereby purchased?

To which I answer, that first, This seemeth to swallow up his Intercession into his Oblation, and so to confound those things that he before distinguished, having no Scripture to back it that his Intercession is but a continuance of his Oblation; nay rather the Scripture goes against it; for it speaks of his offering as a thing done and perfected, not continually doing, *Heb.* 10.13. This man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down at the right hand of God: he first offered that before he sate down. And were it not so, the difference between him and the Priests of the Law should not be so cleer. The Apostle opposes his offering and sitting down, to their standing daily to minister and offering oftentimes the same sacrifice. Now if his intercession be a presenting or a continuation of his oblation, then he should stand to minister and offer daily too, for his intercession is a work in doing and continually to be done, He ever lives to be make Intercession, *Heb.* 7.25. Again, though its true, He appears (or is manifested) in the presence of God for us, yet whether that appearing there onely to present his oblation for the bestowing the good things thereby purchased, be all the matter of his intercession, or all the matter there aimed at, is doubtful; as also whether he so appear for all he dyed for, as is there expressed. For I suppose he so appeared as Mr. Owen mentions, in his first enterance thither; so soon as he entred & offered he appeared, and his continuance in his Fathers sight is contained in his sitting down or being at the Fathers right hand; but the Interceding is spoken of as a thing beyond that *Rom.* 8.33, 34. He is at the right hand of God and also maketh intercession for us; that {&v} [and also] puts the business of his intercession a little further, every single expression of some act of Christ in heaven may not hold forth all his business there, as every single expression of his returning acts holds not forth all he shall do at his return as in, *Heb.* 9.29. He shall appear without sin to salvation, doth not argue that his very appearing without any

other act shall estate the Saints into the full possession of salvation: sure he shall raise them and do other acts also. Surely his Intercession hath in it also a presentation of his will to the Father concerning such or such particulars as indeed are founded upon his offering; or he hath liberty and privilege thereby to will or ask (for the word {θέλω}, *John* 17.24. may signifie a willing by desire, as it is elsewhere used, as *1 Cor.* 7.7. *Mark* 12.38.) and sure it shall be granted to him whatever he so wils of God. But suppose that thats also included in that phrase of the Apostle, and that Mr. *Owen* means as much in saying he postulates those things which by his oblation were procured; yet then that he doth appear to will or ask all those good things to be dispensed to All for whom he dyed, which his Death for any procured (as his phrase with the whole tenor of his arguing intimates that he means) or that Intercession and Advocation spoke of in *Heb.* 7.25. & *1 John* 2.2. (which are there said to be for such as are actually believers) is for any but believers, at least for all he dyed for, that I deny. That Advocation or Intercession being a presentation of his will, for the believers consolation; so as that he is Comforter therein, {ὁ παράκλητος}, he doth {παρακαλεῖν}, intreat for comfort, and procure {τὸν παράκλητον} a comforter to be sent unto them. Now to argue thus, He presents his sacrifice (yea and his will) for some good things which he hath procured or obtained right to demand for all he dyed for: Ergo he doth as a {παρακλήτον} make good the case of all he dyed for: thats the thing I say denied, and for which the argument is invalid; though that indeed is the thing (as is before said, and as his expressions in the next argument do declare) he chiefly aimes at, the whole consideration otherwise making nothing against us, or to his chief intended purpose.

4. [Argu. 4] “His fourth argument is from the identity of the end; that if “the Death of Christ procured and obtained that every good thing “should be bestowed which is actually conferred by the intervening “of his Intercession, then they have both of them the same end and “aim: his Minor should be, that the Death of Christ procured “and obtained that every good thing should be bestowed which is actually conferred by his Intercession, &c. which he neither proveth, nor (did he) doth it conclude the *Concludendum*, that is the same Object in all the things his Death procured. So that his after inference, *viz*, That the promises upon which his Intercession is founded, were an engagement to bestow and actually collate upon them “for

“for whom he suffered, all those good things which his Death and “oblation did merit and purchase (if by them for whom he suffered, he mean All them, which he must, or else he saith nothing) neither springs from his premises, nor is true in it self. For,

1. There is no such ingagement on Gods part in Scripture, as that All whom Christ should suffer for, should have all things collated on them which by his suffering he obtained, that in *Psal.* 2.8. mentioned by Mr. *Owen*, doth but say what should be collated on himself, not what should be collated upon All the Nations there mentioned; that he should be the Anoynted, the Christ, and King, and all given him for a possession; not that All he dyed for should be Christ and Lord. Nor do those places of *Isa.* 49. & 53. (forementioned in *chap.* 3.) say any such thing, as that All he dyed or suffered for, should have collated upon them all the good things procured by him; they ingage that a people should be glorified, but not all for whom he suffered.

2. The speech in strict sense is evidently false in matters of act; for then All of them should be Apostles and Prophets: except we shall say that those graces were not procured by his Death and sufferings.

3. The way of God in rewarding his Son, is in giving him All things into his hands, glorifying him, and thereby drawing souls to him to stay upon him, and then granting him all his desires in them of all the fulness of his glory as he sees good to measure out amongst them; Not that he would make them all glorious that he dyed for, but only all of them that in the day of grace are brought into him to believe on him: So that neither will this Argument serve him up to his intention.

5. His fifth proof is from Christs putting them together in *Joh.* 17. [Argu. 5] which only proves that Christ doth as well intercede, as he did offer up himself: not that he intercedes for all them for whom he dyed, much less for those speciall things accompanying salvation there prayed for, which was the thing to be proved. We have shewed the Impertinency of that in *John.* 17. before in answer to his fourth Chapter; his other proofes also of *1 Cor.* 15.17. & *Heb.* 9.12. are impertinent too, neither of them speaking a word of Intercession, much less for whom or how many.

“6. His last Argument is, [Argu. 6] That the seperating and dividing the

“Death and Intercession of Christ in regard of the objects, cuts off
 “all that consolation which any soul might hope to attain by
 “an Assurance that Christ dyed for him. But thats false; for
 this doctrine of Christs dying for All men, though joyned with
 this, that he makes Intercession but for All that come to God by
 him, gives both ground and incouragement for every man upon
 hearsay of it, to look to God and go to him by Christ, as one that
 hath testified such great love to him as to open such a way of accesse
 for him through the blood of his Son; and also assures him of strong
 consolation upon his going to him, and thats the Apostles phrase,
Heb. 6.18. we might have strong consolation that have fled for re-
 fuge to lay hold on the hope set before us. So that here’s never
 a whit the less censolation for them that do believe then in their
 way; and there is more ground and incouragement for any man
 to believe, then in their way; this doctrine shewing more evidently
 testimonies of Gods love to any man then the other doth; That can
 assure none of Christs Intercession but upon believing, this doctrine
 assures such as believe of it too. So that that Affirmation that the
 “Doctrine of the General Ransom cuts in pieces all the nerves and
 “sinews of that strong consolation that God is so abundantly willing
 we should receive, is a very gross mistake, as I hope by this is evident
 and may afterward more appear. Mean while I would have Mr.
Owen minde, that his doctrine leaves men at an uncertain whether
 there be any mediator for them or no till they can finde fruits of E-
 lection in them; which how any should do till he first know love in
 God towards him & the mediation of Christ for him, so as that by the
 knowledg thereof he be brought to trust in God by him, I would
 faine have any man to prove. Yea that doctrine layes open men
 horribly to desperate courses, while the very proper result of it is, that
 All men are under one of these two decrees, either Elect or Repro-
 bate, either he hath a mediator or not: so that any man may say, Ei-
 ther Christ dyed for me or not, If he did, I am sure enough what
 ever sin I commit Christ will follow me into every Court, & I shall
 be safe enough in the issue; yea I am already safe enough by his
 Death and Intercession though I know it not; therefore why should
 I take care for any thing? If God will have me know it, he will re-
 veal it to me, bring me to the means, or the means to me, and I can-
 not perish, the proper fountain of that *Ergo agite juvenes* menti-
 oned by Mr. *Owen* in his preface. If not, I shall perish let me do
 what

what I can; and I had as good save the labor of afflicting my self in hearing and praying, &c. as to tire my self out about needless businesses, to get that, which if I be excluded the Death of Christ, can never be obtained, and which shall be thrust upon me and I cannot miss what course soever I take if I be not. See, sir, if these do not inevitably flow from your principles. As for our doctrine it lies not open to these loose consequences, for if I know and believe that Christ dyed for me, I know and believe also that he is ready and able to save me, and looking to him and going to God by him he will assuredly save, being found in him and yeelding up to his spirit, this doctrine tels me that not any sin acted through infirmity and temptation shall appear against me to condemne me; His Death, Resurrection and Intercession shall have their fruit in me to eternal life; but if I neglect so great salvation, or deny him that bought me, turn away from him that speaks from heaven and hath the blood of sprinkling to sprinkle upon me, &c. then how shall I escape? then how shall not his love rise up into jealousie and the greater condemnation fall upon me? and are not these agreeable to the Apostles reasonings in his Doctrine? *Rom.* 8.1.13.33, 34. *Heb.* 2.1, 2, 3, & 10. 25, 26, 29. & 12.24, 25. 2 *Pet.* 2.1. But I have done with that Chapter also.

CHAP. V.

A reply to his Answers of Objections made against his former doctrine in Answer to his eight chapter.

IN his next Chapter he assays to remove Objections as a man removeth dung till it be all gone. I shall follow him in that too, and see if he remove not pearls in stead of dung, and cast not dung upon that that is pretious truth. I fear he plucks up Wheat in stead of Tares.

He tels us some have undertaken to Answer an Argument like this proposed in these words. [Object.] The Ransome and Mediation of Christ is no larger then his offices of Priest, Prophet and King; But these offices pertain to his Church and chosen: Therefore his Ransom pertaines to them only. I confess they that propounded the Objection so (as I believe the An-

K k

swerer

had it so delivered to him in writing) propounded it foolishly, the conclusion containing a *quartus terminus*, and having more in it then follows from the premises. Indeed I have heard it thus propounded. The Offices of Christ are of equal extent: But his Kingly and prophetical Offices pertain but to his Church: *Ergo*, his Priestly pertains to them onely. The *Minor* of which I deny, and would invert it thus. His Offices are of equal extent in regard of their Object, But his Kingly and Prophetical Offices extend to All; Therefore also his Priestly. The *Minor* I prove thus. He is King of all the earth, *Psal.* 47.7. which speaks of God ascended who is the same that first descended, as the Apostle speaks upon a like Scripture. So he is King upon the holy hill of Sion, and all Nations given him, and the utmost parts of the earth, *Psal.* 2.7, 8. King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and therefore sure of all under them, Kings and Lords too. And so he is a Prophet for them that hear him, and them that refuse to hear him too, *Acts* 3.22, 23. and indeed if he was not a Prophet sent of God to any but the Elect, then none but they should be in danger for not hearing him; for God useth not to punish men for not attending to Ordinances that were not for them; or not hearing a Prophet that prophecieth nothing to them; so that there he is clearly held forth to be a Prophet to more then his Church and chosen. Yea as it pertains to his Prophetical Office to reveal the Truth of God, so (as the Wisdom of God) he cries in the streets to the sons of men, and to those that are without, *Pro.* 1.20. and is the light that lightneth every man that cometh into the world. *Joh.* 1.9. and therefore so far also his mediation must extend, for its the life in him is the light of men, even that life that he hath for men. ver. 4, 5, 6.

But let us see what he saith to the Answerer of the Objection. First, He in stead of removing dung, casts dung upon him, as if he was "guilty of making a distinction or division between the death of "Christ and the ransom, as if he might die for All, and not be the ransom of All. Whereas indeed the Answer intimated that to be the Objectors conception. Its clear that he is every where in his Book contrary to it, making the death of Christ as for All, to be "the ransom. And whereas he thinks there is no man in his right wit will propose it; I know not what wit they are in, but I believe men that have as good conceits of their wit, as Mr. *Owen* hath, have hinted, if not expressed such a distinction: I can shew him one (by name, Mr. *How*, who lately put out an Answer to the

the *Universalist*, as he stiles him) who in a writing to my self, grants that all men had interest in the Act of Christs Death, as buying or purchasing men into his dispose, and yet stiffly denies him to be the ransom for all. Well, [Answ.] but what was the Answer to the Objection? It was this. “The mediation of Christ is more general, or “more special. More general as he mediates between God and “men, 1 *Tim.* 2.5. More special as Mediator of the New Testament, *Heb.* 9.15. Which Answer, first, he *Turkases*, as if he had said, [Repl.] a general Mediator and a special, and then digresses into a little Rhetorical passion against the barbarousness of the expression; whenas indeed the sense is plain enough, and the proofs pat to the purpose. For though he be but one Mediator, and the Office one intire Office in it self; yet in regard of his mediation or exercise of that Office, he may exercise it in some way, and for some things for more, then in some other way, and for some other things. Even as God is but one, and his Government one in him, yet in regard of the exercise of it, it in some things and way comprehends more then in some others; and so his saving acts in some expressions and exercises are towards more then in others, as in 1 *Tim.* 4.10. is plain. Now to me this is plain, that the mediation of Christ as spoken of in 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. is of other and larger extent in respect of reference to its Object, then as its spoken of in *Heb.* 9.15. In the former place its spoken of as a demonstration of Gods good will to, and in some sense a ground for our praying for All men, not for the Church and chosen onely, but for All men, for Kings and all in authority, which never any man yet affirmed to be all members of Christ, and heirs of life. Now, that that demonstrates Gods good will to all men, and is a ground of our Mediating, or Interceding for All (*ver.* 1.) must it self be something extending to All, or else the building should be greater then may be supported by its foundation. So that there surely he is spoken of as a Mediator, so appointed of God, and so acting as a Mediator, that thereupon All, or (as *Beza* renders it) any one may be the Object of our prayers, and hath encouragement to seek to God to be saved by him, and so as a general Mediator, or a Mediator that is set up for All men, and hath accordingly given himself a ransome for All men. But in *Heb.* 9.15. his Mediation is spoken of as exercised about a peculiar Object, in a more special maner, for specal things, the performance of the Legacies given to Sion, for the called of God, that they might receive that to which they are called,

called, and of which they are made heirs, even the eternal inheritance. As a Prince may mediate between his Father offended and rebellious subjects in general for many things: and in a special maner for those that lay down Arms and come over to him; he may demand or urge his Father to shew more favor to them then to all the rest, and yet ask favor for them too. But this is admired that Christ should be Mediator and not of a New Testament. Whereas we affirm him Mediator of the New Testament, and deny it not But that he mediates that for All, or that his mediation for men as spoken of in 1 *Tim.* 2.5 6. is, that the New Testament, might be performed to them all whose Mediator he is, will require some time for him to prove. He saies a Mediator is not of one (which we “grant) and all mediation respects an agreement of several parties, “and every Mediator is the Mediator of a Covenant. All which may be granted with reference to Christ; if by Covenant we understand the Covenant made between God and Christ; but as otherwise its not always true (*Joab* may mediate for *Absolom*, and yet no Covenant made between *David* and *Absolom*; and the Vine-Dresser for the barren Fig-tree, and yet not mediate any Covenant made with the Fig-tree, nor for any Legacies fore-given to the Fig-tree) so neither follows it thence, that Christ mediates the New Testament for all he mediates for. The word there in *Heb.* 9. 15. {διαθήκη}, signifies a Testament or Will, made and confirmed by Death, as *ver.* 16. shews; and the New Testament is the promises of God, bequeathed to the believer, the called, the chosen. Now though Christ mediates not the giving these to them that are uncalled, yet he may notwithstanding mediate for Gods forbearance, patience, dispensation of means, such as in which they may be invited, and have opportunities to look to him for mercy to be afforded. I think not the Assertor, so much as the Opposer of that passage needs further Consideration, I will not say Catechising, in this business, and I am perswaded the Assertor is pretty able to answer for himself, were Mr. *Owen* his Catechiser. Nay, were Mr. *Owen* asked this question, how he can prove that Jesus Christ mediates nothing but the New Testament, nor for any but those that are made heirs of it, it would put him to it to finde proofs for it. I am confident he could produce no better proofes then what he doth produce here to disprove this general extent of his mediation, *viz.* “That it was his “Church that he redeemed, loved, and gave himself for, his sheep
“he

“he laid down his life for, appears in heaven for us. &c. And what then? who denies that? or how doth that disprove the other? It was *Israel* that God created, *Ergo* none else? they that have the Spirit of Christ in them shall be raised, *Ergo* none else? God will raise us up by his power, 1 *Cor.* 6.14. *Ergo* none else or not all? Again he says, “Because the children partooke of flesh “and blood, therefore he also took part with them, *Heb.* 2.14. Therefore he took part with none else in them; or mediated for none but them. Like this, Because many undertook to write the Gospel of Christ, therefore Luke wrote also, *Luk.* 1.1. therefore he wrote for no mans cause but theirs, as if the word Because always intimates or refers to the whole cause or reason of a thing. “So, “for their sakes (*viz.* whom I have sent into the world as thou hast “sent me) I sanctifie my self, *John* 17.18, 19. *Ergo* I mediate for none but them. But then, I pray, to what purpose sent he them into the world, if none in and of the world to which they were sent had and Oblation offered up for them? So he rose for our Justification; on; but how far that *us* extends, he tells us not, whether it reach to all the Object of his Death and Resurrection, and if so, whether that be not as large an *us* as that in *Act.* 17.27. not far from any one of *us*, for in him we live; or as that [*our*] in those expressions Jesus Christ our Lord. “*Again I go to my father to prepare a place for you.* *Ergo* to mediate for nothing for any but you only. “So “he ever lives to make Intercession for all that come to God by “him, therefore he mediates for nothing for any else. [51] He excluded the world from his prayers for conferring such and such privileges on believers, not desiring His Father to confer them on the world, or any of it, while such, Therefore he never prayed for any of the world, while, and considered as such, contrary to *Luk.* 23.34. These are Mr. *Owens* reasonings, which whether they be inconsequent yea or no, and whether the ★ Answerer that he opposes, or himself that pretends to far more learning, be more to be admired for their strange inferences, I leave to the impartial Reader soberly to judge.

[51] Contrary
to Isa. 53.
12.

★ *T. Moore.*

“He Objects against his in consequent reasoning upon 1 *Tim.* 2 5. Between God and man, Therefore for All men: Are not the Elect men? &c. But in this he mistakes: we reason it not meerly from that as barely so expressed; but from that as laid down for a demonstration of Gods good will to All; his willing all men to be

L

saved,

saved, and as the foundation of our praying for All; and from that (that the Apostle addes) he gave himself a Ransom for All, which I conceive to be an act of mediation. Our reasoning then runs thus, That which argues the good will of God to All, pertains to All: But Christs being a Mediator between God and men is an argument of his love and good will to All: Therefore it pertains to all. The major leans upon this proposition, That which holds forth love but to some, cannot be an Argument of love to All; That that argues love to All must concern all. The minor is the coherence of the fourth and fifth verses. Again thus, That which Christ hath acted in for All, pertains to All, but Christ hath acted in his mediation for All, &c. This arises from the fifth coupled with the sixth verse. Again thus, If the mediation of Christ be a good foundation for our praying for All or any men, then it self must concern All: But so it is, as its laid down by the Apostle in that place, compared with *vers.* 1, 2, 3. Our prayers are groundless for any that he is not appointed as mediator for, therefore to incourage us to pray for all, he shews us a mediator that hath acted for All.

“His conceit on 1 *Tim.* 4.10. we have seen and spoken to before, in *Chap.* 3. and shewed it to be a vain conceit, that God as the object of the Apostles trust, in all his labor and sufferings should be considered but as a Saviour out of Christ: for the word Saviour is but once used there, and if it signifie at all a Saviour without Christs mediation, then it doth so to both branches, besides that neither he nor any of them can prove God a Saviour to sinners (as all men are) without the interposition of a mediator. I would ask how he deals with men in that saving them? whether according to the Covenant of works which curseth according to deserts? If so, then no room for saving them from the death deserved by them, no not for a moment. If not, then I ask according to what he saves? and what it is that procures that he deals not with them in that severe way of their deserts? The case of beasts instanced in *Psal.* 36. admits of a twofold exception.

1. That they have not sinned, nor is there a law imposed upon them, the transgression of which needs a mediator for their saving, as the case of man is.

2. That as they partook of vanity for mans sins sake, so why may not their preservation for and to men be looked upon as a mercy vouch-

safed to man by vertue of Christs mediation for the sin of man, which laid them open to destruction for the punishment of man: “as far wide is his instancing 2 *Cor.* 1.9, 10. the Apostles trusting in God that raises the dead; as if he would tels that God as he acts in raising the dead, acts not through Christs mediation, or through Jesus Christ; and so thats false, that *As by man came Death, so also by man came the resurrection of the Dead*; for he intimates that he raises the Dead, without eyeing the interposition or mediation of man, the man Christ. As vain is that, that the place fore-quoted speakes of God the Father; as if Christ was excluded from being the object of the Apostles faith for preservation, and as if God the Father wrought without Christ, contrary to *John* 5.20. and were a Saviour to sinners in any way out of Christ, and not through him; all which are postulata’s no way proveable. For his wonder, that Christ should be a Saviour of them that are not saved, its no greater then that God should purge some that yet were not purged, and yet the Scripture plainly affirms that, *Ezek.* 24.13. or made a Feast for them that never eat of it, *Mat.* 22.4. *Luk.* 14.24. to say nothing that in some acts of saving they are saved, and might in more, did they not by observing lying vanities forsake their own mercies. But we shall say more to this in *Chap.* 2. *Lib.* 2, where it is further urged. O but he never gives grace to some to believe. I believe he gives to All more then they improve or well like of, and would give them more did they not smother what he gives them, and thats all I shall say to it here, for we shall meet with it in fitter place, as also with that other absurdity (as he thinks) that he should be a Saviour to them that never hear one word of saving. If they have the thing in any sense, its not material that they never hear of its name. God did gird *Cyrus* though *Cyrus* knew him not, *Isa.* 45.5. and many may have real good by that whose right name they never heard of. I hope *Mr. Owen* is so charitable, that if one of his children should dy in infancy, he would think it might be saved by Christ, though it never heard or understood a syllable of Christ or of a Saviour. He things it absurd too, that Christ should be a Saviour in a twofold sense, *for all, and for believers*. But I hope he doth what the Father doth, *Josh.* 5.19. but the Father is the Saviour of All and especially of believers, as himself grants, and Christ saith he came to save the lives of men, [53] whether he do no more to believers then is there spoken of I leave to his consideration; He is the Savi-

[53] *Luk* 9.56.

of the World, 1 *John* 4.14. and the Saviour of his body the Church, *Ephes.* 5.25, 26. whether the world be his Church and body, I leave to him also to shew. Whether the condition of believing be procured by him for All or for any, I leave to its place, and in the mean time desire him to prove by Scripture his perswasion, “that to whom Christ is in any sense a Saviour in the work of Redemption, them he saves to the uttermost from all their sins of infidelity and disobedience, with the saving of grace here and glory hereafter; and in particular that he so saved those, to whom in the knowledge of himself as a Saviour he gave an escape from the pollutions in the world who afterward backslid from him, 2 *Pet.* 2. 20, 21.

[54] *T. M.* “Whereas answer was further made to his Objection, [54] that he “in some sort intercedes for transgressors, the sons of men yet in “and of the world, that they through Gods blessings on their ministration may be convinced and be brought to acknowledge that Jesus is the Lord, &c. but more especially for the called, believers &c. Here Mr. *Owen* first mistakes his Answer, [55] as if he had said he prayed for them that they might be brought to faith in God through Christ effectually saving to life eternal; and then opposes him in that conception. Whereas he only said to believe the report of the Gospel (according to that in I. 17.21, 23.) and to come to some perceptions of light therein, whereto attending they might be brought further, or which refusing they may be hardened for it. Then he asks,

1. “In what sort Christ intercedes for that for such, *John* 17? I answer for him: in that sort as Christ expresses himself in *John* 17. 21, 23. obliquely, as we pray for the good of a Kingdom when we pray for a spirit of wisdom, and government, on Kings and men in authority. Its true believers are the direct Object of his intercession for those things conducing to this convincement and to this knowledge and faith, even as Kings and Magistrates are in those prayers instanced, 1 *Tim.* 2.2. though in other instances they may be the direct object as the Fig-tree of that Intercession, *Luk.* 13.7. and the persecutors of that in *Luk.* 23.34. But then he asks whether it be intended to be accomplished. I suppose it is and shall be in due time according to the tenor of our Saviours praying for it; but to me he seemes to wrangle with our Saviour himself about his expressions, because he gives no fuller account of his petitions. Its likely he would make

the same query about our Saviours praying for believers unity, and say, Did Christ absolutely intend it or no? and if so, then why is it not better effected but that there are so many divisions even amongst them? Christs prayers have I conceive in part their Answer here, but not fully till the perfect day, when all the world shall see and say, *This is Sion, the City of the Lord*, and this is the truth of God, &c.

2. "He demands if it be by vertue of his blood shed for them? I answer, I conceive it is: had he not offered up himself a ransom, and removed their death and condemnation, he had had no ground to ask any further favor for them; had he not come with blood for sin that cryed for vengeance, no hearing I conceive of any supplication for them. But then he saith, it follows that by his death he procured faith for all. But thats a mistake. For first, Neither is this asserted for All, though for others then the Elect only. Nor secondly, Follows it that his death (if he mean simply and *per se*) procured it, nay rather the contrary, for then what need of any further Mediation, or petition for it? frustra fit per plura, &c. A man may with boldness go to request a new lone of another for a man that plaid the bankrupt & had run far into his debt, bringing pay with him for the former debt, that perhaps might have had no admittance for his suit in that kinde without that payment made, and yet that payment meerly procured not the second lone. That may be *causa partialis & sine quâ non* of a thing, that is not *causa propriè & plenè effectiva* of it, Its not the payment of the old debt that either obliges him that pays to borrow anew, or him that lends to lend anew, but grace in both, from the ★ lender to the borrower, and from both to him for whom he borrows it. Christ hath such grace in his Fathers eyes, that he having paid our old score may ask a new stock and obtain it, though his meer payment without that asking did not oblige the Father to it.

★ Or giver.

3. "He asks if he interceded for them with an intention and desire that they should believe or not. I answer, Yes sure, for I suppose else he would not so have prayed; and so they do and shall, though not so far as his question here supposes. That which he desires to be granted conducing to that end, shalbe granted, but the end that he would have men attain to by those means afforded, may by them not be so far obtained as he desires them to press to. He would have them being convinced of the truth, cleave to it, follow after it,

acknowledg it, &c. but many do not grant him his desires, even as he would have gathered *Jerusalems* children, and yet they would not; and as he rather pleases that men would turn and live, and yet many do not, *Matth.* 23.27. *Ezek.* 33.11. Yet that that he asks of his Father to that purpose as conducing to that end, *viz.* a blessing with his means afforded so far as that they have light drawn to them to attend on that they have, and shall acknowledg when their mouths shall be stopt for abusing it. And in this is answered his two following Queries: As first, Whether it be for all and every man in the world? That neither was affirmed, nor in that place (*Joh.* 17.21.) held forth; but men of the world, others then the Church. Secondly, Whether absolutely or conditionally? so that; absolutely, that his Disciples might be made fit means for such an end: but for the worlds further believing and making good use of what they have, thats left to them upon the means, and those convincements whether to chuse the good, and refuse the evil, or persist in evil, and not chuse the good, and yet not without divers exhortations, motions, end counsels, to chuse that thats good; and therefore for not chusing ahe fear of the Lord they are after charged, *Pro.* 1.29. Whereas he t^e demands Whether Christ prayes that they may use well the means 'of grace or not? I Answer, I finde no such prayer, and yet it follows not, but that he prayed that they may believe those things there mentioned, or rather that the Believers may walk so well as that the world (did they not wilfully shut their eyes) might see and believe those truths, *viz.* both that that Doctrine concerning Christ is the truth, and that they are Gods people, God in them of a truth, which also will they nill they, they shall at length see and confess: and these acts of believing are not (as he saith) the using well the means of grace, but rather the effects of the means of grace well used by others, and the preventing operations of God, putting men into a fit capacity of obeying those means. For when men are so far convinced, then must they either yeeld to follow God in the way they are convinced of (which indeed Christ by his servants prayes them to do, 2 *Cor.* 5.20. no where prayes his Father to make them do that I know of) or else wilfully and inexcusably turn their backs of those means to their own after-misery. So that all this reasoning hath not shaken the truth of the Answer.

“He comes then to consider the other proofs, as *Isa.* 53.12. he
 “made intercession for transgressors, which he saies, are either all
 “he

“he suffered for, or those he suffered by. It may be both, and yet he gains nothing, those by whom he suffered being also persons for whom he suffered, *Isai.* 53.3, 4. We esteemed him not, we hid our faces from him, and yet he bare our sins, thence also he prays, *Luke* 23.34. *Father forgive them.* From which Mr. *Owen* (nextly considering it) first lays down a wrong inference as the Answerers, *viz.* therefore there is a general intercession for All that they might believe; which is far beyond what he affirmed; his words being but these, for transgressors, the sons of men, yet in and of the world—and that those amongst whom believers converse and dwell, might be convinced and brought in to believe the report, as *Luk.* 23.34. *M. Moore* said not, that there he prayed for all in and of the world, but for them there persecuting him, thence his after reasonings against him fall to the ground; the extent of his mediation by way of Intercession for All, we rather conceive proveable from *1 Tim.* 2.5, 6. fore-spoken to, and from the actual dispensation of goodness and bounty to all, then from those other places: onely we produce those places against that position, that he intercedes in no wise for any but his Church and chosen ones, such as are described, *John.* 17.6.9, 10, 20. Whereas he says, “It appears not that he prayed for them all, “but them that did it out of ignorance, nor for all that they should “believe, not for the chief Priests, they were not there, &c.

I answer first, That they none of them knew what they did, *Act.* 3.17. with *1 Cor.* 2.7. no not the Rulers, and whereas he says, “Its certain some did it ignorantly, but not all; thats his own, “the Apostles except none, yea he says, Had they known, they would have crucified the Lord of glory. Its true they knew more then they walked after, knew so much as might have perswaded them otherwise in reason; but yet they knew not *what they did*, they knew not what and how glorious a *one* they put to death. Besides our Saviour saith not, Father forgive those of them that do it ignorantly or know not what they do, as if he prayed but for some of them; or as if some of them knew what they did, and others not, but indefinitely, *Father forgive them, they know not what they do*, {πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς οὐ γὰρ ὅτι ἔιδωσι τί ποιοῦσιν}.

2. We say he interceded for them, we say not he interceded there for them or All men that they should believe, but that God forgiving them that their act of crucifying him, might yet spare them and continue with them yet the means of believing.

3. Whether

3. Whether the chief Priests were there or no, its not material. He says not Father forgive them that are here, and therefore that yet wants proof, that he prayed only for those crucifiers that were there, he prayed for them that crucified him using this argument, They know not what they do; and even those there present were not his Church, believers, comers to God by him, given him out of the world, such as had received his name, &c. as those in *John 17*.

Whereas he says, "It cannot be supposed that Christ should "pray for all and every one of them supposing them to be finally "impenitent, seeing he knew what was in man, and its contrary to "to the rule we have, to pray for them whom we know to be finally impenitent.

I answer, first, That Christ doth not use to condemn or withhold his goodness from a man before he be actually guilty of final impenitency upon foresight that he will be so: as God did not deny *Adam* communion with himself because he foresaw he would sin, till he had actually sinned: so Christ doth not withhold his offices of love from men because he sees they will abuse them, for he knows how to glorifie himself and Father from his acts of love to them, though abused by them, he doth that that he sees may be for their welfare, though he knows beforehand that they will turn it into a trap. He did not actually deny them the vertue of his death, till they actually upon tenders of it did obstinately and persistingly reject and slieght it, *Luk. 14.24*. otherwise there should be no difference between the time when he is risen up and hath shut to the doors, and the time of his keeping open house and exercise of his patience and bounty towards them. Nay if he did not procure for them and afford unto them such grace, they could not be guilty of abusing it and turning it into wantonness, nor God so clearly and brightly glorious in his just condemning them. If he say that by finally impenitent he means, them that then had persisted in impenitency to the end even till the door of grace was shut upon them, then it remains for him to prove, that any of them as then were in that condition: surely this very prayer argues it was not then so shut against them. If he can prove it of any of them (his crucifiers) them we might indeed exclude from the patience and forgiveness here prayed for, and yet even so he gets nothing, it being evident that there were men yet in and of the world for whom

whom yet Christ prayed, and that was the thing that was asserted; “whereas he endeavors to prove that those had faith and forgiveness given them, and his prayer was effectual. For forgiveness in the sense I have opened it before on *Chap. 4.* I believe it was vouchsafed to them, and I do not judge his prayer ineffectual, they had a forgiveness, and letting them escape deserved punishment then for that sin, patience extended, which is to be accounted salvation. The not falling upon them, and taking speedy vengeance on them, but on the contrary, preaching peace and mercy really to them was {ἄφεσις}, a relaxation of that bond, and that was the forgiveness, as I conceive, directly prayed for, such as God often vouchsafed them in former ages, and like that in *Matth. 18.27. 34.35.* as was before noted, and they had it; but that they were all after converted and saved, that he proves not. Many of them were, that he proves, but not all. He cannot prove one Ruler of them converted. He brings *Acts 6.7.* to prove it, but that sayes but the Priests, not the chief, or high Priests, much less Rulers, and yet much less that those Priests were of the number of his Crucifiers. Priests and Rulers in the Scriptures are spoken of as distinct parties. *Luke 23.13. and 24.20.* Besides, were any of the Priests Rulers, Its probable they were then called the chief Priests, but its not said many, or any of them believed. However, this yet concludes that Christ there interceded for men in, and of the world, *ut supra.* But he hath besides all these Objections, a pretty conceit, not worth the answering, such a one as we might as well put upon the 17. of *John (viz. “of praying as a private man, not as Mediator)* and so we might say, he prayed there as a private man for his friends, not as the Saviour of the world, for he supposes, That Christ as a private man “might intercede for things that were never granted, but not as “Mediator, as if as a private man subject to the Law, he would act contrary to his Acts of Mediation, take in whom that rejected, and that in an act of Mediation too. For its evident there he put himself between God, and the people for forgiveness. Was it ever before heard, that acts of Mediation were excluded the Office of Mediatorship, and looked upon in a Mediator as no acts of his Office? Or can it be supposed that Christ in any thing he (though but as subject to the Law) requested of God was not heard of him? Did ever a righteous man, guided by the Spirit ask according to the will of God and he denied him? and did Christ ask otherwise there? Or

was he denied what was so asked by him? I might use his own words, *Apaga has nugas*.

He goes on to the instance of *John* 17.21, 23. In which he saies “nothing but what we have spoken to before, except this, That a “conviction of men, that Christ is not what they formerly thought “him, (and so that his people are a people in whom God is, and “whom God loves) is not for any good of the world. Which is a very false saying. For its to the end that they might submit to him, and love his, that they might chuse the right way, that they might see their light and glorifie God. And is that no good to have the right way evidenced and put into their reach? and to have means of glorifying of God afforded to them? Yea, Suppose none but the compelled chuse aright upon this discovery (which yet cannot be proved) shall we say it was not for the others good, because they abuse it to their harm? Shall Gods goodness and Christs love be blasphemed, or despised and vilified because men abuse it? Is not this it the Apostle faults, *Rom.* 2.4, 5. *Despisest thou the riches of Gods goodness, forbearance, and long-suffering, not knowing that his goodness leads thee to repentance?* because men are not led by it, but sin against it, hardening their hearts, and treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath, shall we despise it too, and make a tush of it, and say it was not afforded for any good to them? Is it not a good to lead men to Repentance? O let not those that undertake to call men to Repentance, so lightly speak of, nay, speak so evilly of that they should commend to them; as if themselves too, and their calling them were not for their good! speaking the very language of ungracious hearts, that say, if God would have given me grace I would have done better, when they willingly despised and smothered that which God gave them. Might not the *Israelites* by this be justified in their saying, that God did little or nothing for them, nay, he brought them out to destroy them, because that did actually befall them for their refusing to follow him? The Lord set it home to mens consideration, that they believe not Satan, nor nurse up in their hearts slighty esteems of that goodness, that heeded by them would do infinite great good to them. Whereas the Answerer also alledged, *Matth.* 5.15, 16. and *Joh.* 1.9. as I conceive, onely to prove that Christ would have his people useful to the world for convincement, (intimated in this expression, *Ye are the salt of the earth*) and for drawing in convinced men (intimated in that experssion, *Ye*

Ye are the light of the world) agreeable to the end of Christs prayer for his called ones in *Joh.* 17.21, 23. and to shew that he doth so intercede and put in for others then Believers, that he doth in some measure inlighten every man, &c. Mr. Owen not perceiving his drift in the former proof, speaks impertinently about it, and on the latter blusters a little too high and too causlesly, asking in *what measure? how far? into what degree? by whom, and by what means?* &c, as if he would be angry with the expression of Scripture; for that he inlightneth every man that comes into the world is the Scripture saying (a more certain and full expression then that which he suborns in the room of it, viz. He inlightneth every man that is inlightned, which gives an uncertain sound, and may signifie All or Some or almost None) only *T. Moore* put in the words, in some sort, to signifie that all are not in the same measure inlightned by him, nor in the same manner, which the Scripture also fully proveth, *Psal.* 147.19, 20. Now to ask a man in what measure, degree, &c? is to put a man to search into the secrets of God and of every mans heart, to see how far the word insinuates it self into men; I mean Christ the word who was in the world, and it knew him not, and came to his own (even before his being made flesh actually) and they received him not. What understanding of God with motions to seek him in & by his works and oracles, this word or divine light gave or gives to every man who can disclose, but he whose all seeing eye knows all things, and he will discover that it beamed in so much light by one means or other, as that all men when they come to be judged by him shall be left without excuse; and they that have submitted to him shall glorifie his goodness toward them in the day of the Lord Jesus.

The sum of what the Answerer further said to the fore-propounded Objection, amounts to this, That as Priest, he offered up himself to death, and through death as a sacrifice to God, in which he respected diverse things, & had several nearer ends subordinate to the ultimate, [57] the glory of God, as he did it to ransom men faln into Death from the power of that sentence upon them, and to be the propitiation that God might deal in a way of mercy with them: And he eyed further the Testament of promises made to his called ones, that God would bring in to believe in him, & layd down his life for confirmation of their faith in those promises, and also for confirmation and ratification of the truth of his doctrine to those to whom he preached it. Now in the first consideration he says, he took in All

[57] Heb 9.9,
26.
Joh. 1.29.
& 1 Joh 2.
2.
Heb. 9.14
15. Matt. 26.
28.

men; though not all, but his called ones, and such as he should have for his seed. In the second, against which Mr. Owen saith, nothing worth the Answer, but faults the things that he seems not well to understand, and quarrels with want of smoothness in the expressions and unaptness of quotations, not rightly taking them to the Authors meaning as I conceive. For I suppose *Heb.* 9.9, 26. He only quoted to shew that as a Priest he offered sacrifice, *Joh.* 1.29. & 1 *Joh.* 2.2. to shew that he was as a propitiation, and that extended to All, *Heb.* 9.14, 15. & *Matt.* 26.26. he quotes to prove his Death to be for Ratification of his Testament; and so the Apostle made use of it in *Rom.* 5.10. & 8.32. none of them expressing his utmost end, that being known sufficiently and granted on every hand. Now whereas Mr. *Owen* saith, that his proofes for the sealing the Testament hold out but the first end of the death of Christ; he speaks not rightly, for neither of those places (viz. *Mat.* 26.26. & *Heb.* 9.15.) speaks only of procuring of remission of sins, or power and prerogative of forgiving, but of sealing the Testament also, which bequeaths (not to all he dyed for, but) to all that heartily believe in him (and such the Apostles were) the receipt and injoyment of forgiveness, and of the inheritance it self, which remission the believers indeed confess that they experimentally receive from him in his blood believed on by them (*Rom.* 3.25.) as in *Eph.* 1.7. & *Col.* 1.14. which Scriptures speak not of procuring Redemption (though that must needs be supposed as a thing fore-done) but of the receipt and injoyment of it, that they being brought out of darkness into Christs Government, met with, and partook of, as the word {ἔχομεν} declares too.

“Whereas he calls his distinction of these ends mentioned his {πρωτον ψεύδεις}, that only his want of discerning, and so till he see better, may be forgiven him, as all the rest of that following froth he hath, not worth repeating or answering; for whereas he saith that “he may this way answer any thing, by saying its otherwise in his opinion, it seemes strange to me that he cannot see the places above recited cleerly proving what was affirmed by him. Doth not his being a Lamb to take away the sin of the world, and the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, shew that the work of his Priest-hood had something in it extending beyond the bounds and limits of the Church and chosen? except he can first shew that the world, the whole world, is the Church of God, and all of them
the

the chosen of God; and so confound the distinction so cleerly held forth in Scripture between the Church and the world, *John* 14.17, 22. & 15.18, 19. & 16.20. & 17.9. 1 *Cor.* 6.2. & 11.32, &c. And doth not *Heb.* 9.15. with *Mat.* 26.26. plainly say that Christ also intended to confirm the faith of his called ones, in expectation of the eternal inheritance, and to make that sure to them? Is there not a plain difference between these two, the breaking in peices the bond of Death man was faln into, and so delivering him out of that; and the making a Covenant of promises with some of them so ransomed? Is it all one for a Prince to ransom a thousand men out of prison, in which they were to perish, and save them from hanging when the rope was about their necks, And his entring into a bond and Covenant to prefer so many of them being ransomed as will submit to, and serve him? Did not Christ undertake for both in his death? both to ransom man faln, and to confirm his Church in faith? But who can give eyes? or who shall perswade wise men to be willing to be fools in themselves that God may give them eyes? I shall leave the Reader to God, intreating sobriety from him, and that he will not wink with his eye willfully when light is propounded to him. And so having through Gods assistance finished my answer to his first book, In expectation and confidence of the same assistance, I shall follow him to the second.

The Second Book.

CHAP. I.

A further view of his consideration of the ends of the death of Christ, as further handled in his first and second Chapters of his second book.



Considering further the end of the Death of Christ, He tels us it was either,

1. "Ultimate and supream, *viz.* the glory of God "the Father, Or,
2. "Subservient to that, *viz.* The bringing men to God, and in that, both
1. "That men might have means of coming to

God, And

2. "The end it self, coming to God, or Salvation.

Which I suppose not as so indefinitely propounded, though I think the ends of it may be more fully and cleerly assigned thus, *viz.*

1. Gods Glory, *Phil.* 2.11.

2. Nextly the glory of the Son of God, that he might have the pre-heminence, and God be glorified in him, *John.* 17.1, 4. *Phil.* 2.9, 10. *Rom.* 14.9. To this end he both dyed, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of quick and dead. So *John* 5.22. The Father hath given to the Son to have life in himself (which I understand of the life communicable to men, for that is said to be in him, 1 *John* 5.11. and so life in him through his death for men) that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father; for thats the life indeed for which he is so worthy to be honored of all men, in their looking to him, and believing on him as on the Father; and

and thats the honoring him as the Father, to give him all the honor of believing and staying on him, resting and glorying in him, acknowledging his Lordship, &c, as to the Father.

3. To these purposes that all might be set free and ransomed from the sentence of death under which they were fallen, that so God and Christ might be glorified in them all, and an object of hope and faith be provided for them to look to and believe in for salvation, and for God to glorifie the riches of his mercy in drawing men to according to his good pleasure, *Matth.* 20.28. & *1 Tim.* 2.6. *2 Cor.* 5.14, 15.

4. That those that believe in him might have eternal life. So in *Iohn* 3.16. be brought to God, *1 Pet.* 3.18. and to glory, *Heb.* 2.10 having Christ for a witness and Covenant, ratifying and sealing an everlasting Covenant with them, and being an example, and pattern, yea a Captain and leader to them, *Isa.* 49.6. & 55.4. *Heb.* 9.15. *Matth.* 26.26. *1 Pet.* 2.21, 22.

But that that was his end that Mr. Owen propounds towards the conclusion of his 1. *Chap* (*viz.* That All and every one of them for whom Christ dyed, should have All those things conferred upon him, that he procured for any; or that they All should certainly be brought to God and to eternal glory) I deny, and leave for him to prove, which there he doth not. But let us see if he disprove none of the ends laid down by me.

He tels us (*Chap.* 2.) that it was not meerly his own Good he aimed at in his death. That it was not meerly his own is without doubt, but that it was also his own glory to be manifested is as evident, and therefore also he prays the Father for that, *Iohn* 17.4, 5. but he says further, "While he was in the way he merited nothing for himself. Whereas the holy ones of God have deemed him worthy to receive honor and glory, power and riches, [58] wisdom and strength for that his sufferinging &c. and I think God judged him so too, for as a reward of his sufferings he hath given it him; and that Christ had no eye at that in regard of his humanity (as he insinuates) is not to be believed, seeing the Apostle expresses he had, *Rom.* 14 9. *Heb.* 12.2. he procured the exaltation of his humane nature (and the manifestation of his glory as the word of God more brightly) by his sufferings, and that God predestinated it to that glory otherwise then by sufferings, I no where finde, nor I think he neither. Its true, that was not the onely thing, nor perhaps the main thing in his eye,

He

[58] Rev. 5.9.

He aimed more at the glorifying of his Father, and that the world through him might be saved; but that “That was not in his eye, “nor procured meritoriously by him, and so no end aimed at by him in making satisfaction for sin, seem strange positions, and yet these are Mr. *Owens* Conceptions and Conclusions, quite cross to that of *Rom.* 14.9. before mentioned.

Sure if he procured any thing meritoriously of the Father, he procured his own exaltation in the humane nature, especially that glory of it to be the habitation and storehouse of that fulness that he hath for us, which to me is more plain then that it may be denied in that *Psal.* 68.18. *He led captivity captive, and received gifts in the man;* and in *Rev.* 5. its (*{ἐνίκησε}*) he prevailed to open the Book, and unloose the seals (which was his honor as well as our commodity) *ver.* 4, 5. whence that after-confession (*{ἄξιός ἐστι}*) thou art worthy to take “the Book, and open the seals, &c. *ver.* 7, 8. He errs again, when he “saith, The Dominion he hath over All, is not founded on his Death, for the Scripture saith expresly to this end he died (*{ἵνα}* *{κυριεύσῃ}*) that he might have Dominion, and for this cause God highly exalted him, because he humbled himself, and bare the sins of many, *Isai.* 53.12. *Phil.* 2.10, 11. But Mr. *Owen* seems here to leap over hedge and ditch to his own purposes, not considering how full the Scriptures are against him. And indeed how can we expect a concurrence of Scripture to disprove a Scripture Assertion? But let us “see how he confirms his opinion. He endeavors it from *Heb.* 1.3. He was appointed heir of all things. But what then? In what nature was he so appointed? Sure he needed no appointment or constitution for his Divine Nature, seeing Dominion over all was essential to that. If in the Humane Nature united to the Divine, then through what way was he appointed to become heir? was it not the same in which he was begotten to be his Son? and is it not said of him upon his Resurrection in that regard, *Thou art my Son, “this day have I begotten thee?* then he was begotten in the Humane Nature, to possession of the Divine Glory. Besides, may it not as well follow, that therefore he purchased no glory for his Elect, for they were appointed, & preordained to it too, before the foundation of the world. So that this is proofless to that particular. “His next is, *Heb.* 2.7, 8. *God hath put all things under his feet.* But doth he not speak of that as a consequent to his abasement; *Thou madest him little lower then the Angels, thou crownedst him with glory and honor, &c?*
And

And expresly in *ver. 9.* We see Jesus for the suffering of Death crowned with glory and honor. I marvel what could make him quote this place of all the rest, it being rather full against him.

“He asks if Christ died for all those things that are subject to him? *Sed quid hoc ad Rhombum?* Its enough that he died that he might have such dominion over them, which he hath partly by dying for them (as in men) and partly by conquest over them (as in the devils) and partly by gift, as a reward of his service performed by him to his Father, as in all things, *Phil. 2.10, 11.* “Again, He asks if he have not dominion over the Angels? (Yes, and what then?) “But he died not for them. True, but what then? Did he not die, that through death his Humane nature might be taken up into glory, transcending theirs? But he says, All things “are rather given him out of the Immediate love of the Father? What he means here by Immediate I well know not, if that without consideration of his death and sufferings, the forecited Scriptures say enough against him. If he mean onely that that was the bottom-fountain of his giving all to him: Then doth he not see how by that manner of reasoning, he also overthrows the effect of Christs death that he pleads for, in procuring grace and glory for his chosen, for by the same reason he purchased not that neither, nor eyed it, they flowing from the {ἐὐδοξία}, the good pleasure and love of God, as is declared at large, *Ephes. 1.4, 5, 6, 7. and 2.4, 5. &c.* Certainly in all this Argument he hath horribly mistaken.

“But yet at length he says. Suppose this be true, What proof “follows from thence of the general Ransom, seeing this Domin- “on is a power of condemning as well as saving? and its not rea- “sonable to assert, that Christ died to Redeem them, that he might “have power to condemn them; nay, if he died to Redeem them, “then he aimed not at any such power to condemn them. To this I onely say. 1. We ground not our Assertion of the generality of the Ransom upon this bottom meerly, but upon plainer testimonies also; onely we assert this end. 2. We say, at the power of saving or condemning them he aimed, though not at their condemnation. And that *Rom. 14.9.* proves. He had not power over them to save them, nor were there any just ground for their looking to him for salvation (as the case stood) he not dying to ransom them from the power of that condemnation that was already passed upon them, therefore that he might be able to save them, and he, and God in

him be a fit object for them to look to for it, to that end he died for them, *John* 3.17. though tis true, that by the same he is able also to judge and condemn them for neglecting and rejecting him and his salvation, which he could not reasonably be thought to have had, if there had been no salvation in him, or way to salvation opened to them by him, and so his power to condemn, yea his actual condemning of them had not been with so much subserviency to the highest end of all, Gods glory manifested: Gods glory had been less gloriously manifested in condemning men for their sin in another meerly, the sin of the publike man, then for their personal abuses, neglects, refusals, and wilful rebellions against grace afforded personally to them, which they had no way to obtain but through his sufferings to ransom them from destruction in their former sentence of condemnation.

2. Another end rejected by him is this. “That Gods Justice being satisfied he might save sinners. In which, in effect, He either denies that Christ died to make satisfaction to Gods Justice (contrary to his after discourse against the *Socinians*, and his Chapter about Satisfaction) or that that satisfaction was any means of the salvation of sinners, [59] or at best a needless means, for God might otherwise have saved them. None of which he proveth. “Now “whereas he adds that the *Arminians* say, that after the satisfaction “made by Christ, *Deo integrum fuit*, it was freely in Gods dispose “whether to save any or no: I shall pass it, as wholly impertinent, either to what I have laid down as the ends of Christs death, *Chap.* 1. or to the Position here rejected by him, *viz.* That Christ died, that Gods Justice being satisfied he might save sinners. For this adds also, he might, or might not save any one sinner. Which that Position said not. But he further lays down this Position. “That it was not to “procure any thing to God, but to obtain all good things to us. But how agrees this with those Scriptures, that say. He bought us by his blood to God, [60] and God purchased a Church by it to himself? Will M. *Owen* exclude these acts from being in Gods intention in giving Christ to die; or doth he think [*Us*] the Church to be nothing? Besides, what need, I pray, of obtaining any good to us, if God was equally at liberty to dispense those good things to us without his dying, as through it, notwithstanding his sentence of condemnation forepassed, and that the supream end aimed at was to be accomplished? (for we speak not of satisfying Justice, or opening a way for Gods goodness to flow forth without consideration, either of the sentence requiring

[9] *Lib.* 3. c. 7.
8, 9.

[60] *Rev.* 5.9.
Act. 20.28

requiring satisfaction, or the end of God in glorifying his Justice, for how then should we make it a subordinate end thereto?) in which his first argument is answered. We say, if that sentence being passed, He could otherwise have saved man, and given him all good things, then is the Death of Christ evacuated, no need of him to have obtained any thing of God, God from eternity loving them, and being free to give them all good things, and his justice as well dispensing with sin unsatisfied for, as requiring satisfaction; but this he declines the asserting of.

His second Argument being only against that clause, That God might save none notwithstanding that satisfaction, I pass over, as nothing against our Assertions. In his third, He says that then “Christ should be said rather to redeem a liberty to God than to us “from evil, to enlarge God, &c. To that I say, He hath in a manner confessed himself, that he dyed supremely to make way for the breaking out of Gods glory, for what else is it to manifest his glory, as if otherwise it would have lain more hid, and could not have so appeared, had not Christ dyed? and then doth not this absurdity lie as much upon himself as us? We say, but (*Posito Decreto*) God having decreed to have no fellowship with sinners, nor to dispense favor to their persons but through satisfaction for their sins, he could not act forth the manifestations of his glorious grace but through satisfaction; and he says the same, otherwise he will make it but a needless means to the supream end, the manifestation of his glory. And yet from neither his saying nor ours, is it meet to say that Christ dyed to redeem a liberty to God rather than to redeem us, for he was in no real bondage in himself, nor ever a whit the less glorious in himself had he bound up himself for ever from doing us good: but ours would have been the bondage and misery, that thereby should have been debarred from experimenting his goodness upon us to eternity, his love to us led him to think it as a strait (as it did to *Ephraim*, *Hos.* 11.8.) but that was because his love made ours his. What he saith about the merit of Christ, we shall have occasion to speak to more fully afterward, in answer to *Chap.* 10. *lib.* 3. and *Chap.* 1. *lib.* 4.

His next argument also (being against the assigning that as All the end of the death of Christ, so as that being accomplished none might be saved) intrenches not upon us, as is manifest by what I laid down in the beginning of this Chapter.

“That Christ is given for a Covenant (as is afterward affirmed by him) I believe, and that also as a Covenant, is propounded (in respect of future benefit) conditionally to men upon submission and obedience, is as true. See this latter in *Isa.* 55.3, 4, 5. Hear, and your souls shall live, and I will make an everlasting Covenant with you: here is the promise of making that Covenant (even the sure mercies of *David*, which is Christ dead and risen, &c.) but its upon this condition; hear and then your souls shall live, and I will make it with you; thence men that take hold on Christ by faith, take hold on the Covenant, *Isa.* 56.6. the former is propounded, *Isa.* 49.6. I will give thee for a Covenant to the people, &c. that is (as I understand) one through whom believed on, the people shall be in Covenant with me; they accepting him (as I accept him) we shall be agreed and made at one; but of this subject we shall have occasion to speak more afterward.

“His after-denying that Christs death effected a liberty to God of doing that, which otherwise his justice by vertue of his sentence of punishing the sinner, would have hindred him from doing, is as much as if he should say, That Christ dyed in vain, and without any need, for he might have manifested his justice and his mercy as much in his dealings with the sons of men, if Christ had never dyed in stead of them; which if it be not to make the Death of Christ an unnecessary, supervacaneous thing, I know not what is.

CHAP. II.

On the latter part of his third Chapter, lib. 2. in which he urges the phrases For many, and for the sheep; and pretends to answer what T. Moore hath observed about them.

HE proceeds in the next place to application, and to demonstrate this Assertion, “That Jesus Christ according to the “Counsel and will of his Father, did offer himself on the cross, to “the procurement of eternal salvation, with all the branches and “means of it, and makes continual Intercession with this intent “and purpose, that all the good things so procured by his death “might be actually and infallibly bestowed on, and applyed to All “and every one for whom he dyed, according to the will and counsel of God. A position manifestly false, for then we must all be Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers, nay have a
name

name above every name, &c. for these things Christ procured by his death. But to pass that: He endeavors to make good this by a three-fold consideration.

1. "From Scriptures holding out the intention and counsel of "God.

2. "From Scriptures laying down the actual accomplishment, "or effect of his oblation.

3. "From those that point out the persons for whom Christ dyed. His prevarications and weakness in the pointing out and arguing from each of which, we sufficiently shewed in our answer to the first Chapter of his first Book, and therefore here shall add only this, That his arguments run but to this purpose. [1] Some one subordinate end of Christs death only agrees to some, therefore he dyed only for those, and with no respect to the supream end dyed for any other; and so by consequence God hath no glory brought to him by the death of Jesus Christ, but only in and from the Elect; and Christ hath got no glory from any other but them, he leaving them as he found them, and doing nothing in his mediation for them. Truly God and Christ are not beholding to Mr. *Owen* for his arguing. So again, [2] Believers have had such and such effects in and by the death of Christ believed in by them, therefore he dyed only for them; like this, such as go to a feast are well refreshed by eating it, therefore it was made for no more then them that go to it: or this, Such prisoners being ransomed and following the Prince that ransomed them, met with such bounty from him, Therefore he ransomed none but them. And again, Many were ransomed, *Ergo*, not All. [3] God made *Israel*, Therefore he made no body else, &c. but no more to them arguments, only there are diverse passages in the latter part of this *Chapter* from *p.* 79. that we have not spoken to, and therefore shall take them in here, As,

"He denies that the death of Christ in any place of Scripture is said to be for all men. For Answer to which, I desire the Reader to turn to 1 *Tim.* 2.5, 6. *Heb.* 2.9. *Rom.* 5.18. I know his objection is elsewhere, that the word Men is not in the original. To which I answer first, That by the same reason he may say that in *Rom.* 5.12. Its not affirmed that All men sinned seeing its but {πάντες}, the word Men is not expressed; and the like in 1 *Cor.* 15.22. that All men dyed not in *Adam*. But, 2. The word Men is expresly in *Rom.* 5.18. And 3. The word Men is the substantive clearly to be sup-

plied, because the whole precedent speech was about men, All men to be prayed for, 1 *Tim.* 2.1. and expresly, *verse* 4. that God would have All men to be saved {πάντας ἀνθρώπους}, &c. and that demonstrated by this, that there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for All. For All what? must it not needs be men, between whom and God he is a Mediator, and whom he tels us God would have to be saved, All men; and so in *Heb.* 2.9. was not the Apostle admiring Gods goodness to man? Lord what is man, and the Son of man? exalting man above all his works, which is now verified in one Man Jesus that dyed for every one; What can it be referred to as before spoken about, but man, or the sons of men? But of this we shall have cause to speak further hereafter.

That there are more ends of the death of Jesus Christ then what is the immediate fruit of it by way of ransome and propitiation before faith in it, we have shewed in the conclusion of the first Book, and upon his first Chapter of the second. Some fruits there are of it from God towards men before faith, and while in state of unbelief, as the opening the door for entrance, and for exhortations to strive to enter, a feast prepared in Christ, and a way of participating of it made, and invitations vouchsafed, as in *Matth.* 22.4. *Prov.* 9.3, 4, 5. *Luk.* 13.24. and those for and to more then enter and eat: other fruits there are of it that flow in upon faith, as satisfaction, justification, sanctification, the contents of the new Testament, &c. And he that cannot see these to be distinct fruits, and produced for or upon diverse objects, and objects diversly considered, is blinde and cannot see afar off, nor into the things evidently held forth in the Gospel; And what the ransome either immediately with God and for men, or mediately upon and in men produceth, were subordinate ends and aimes that Christ had in his eye upon his death, as Mr. *Owen* himself also implies, when he makes the ends of Christs death to be coincident with its effects; His following observation objected against that, that where the word *many* is used, there are more ends of Christs death mentioned; I shall pass it, being not material, and in some passages at least doubtful.

But in *page* 80. To this exception of ours, Christs death is not limited to many, and to his sheep, &c. as the ransome and propitiation, as if he dyed for them only; he tels us,

1. "That Christ saying he dyed for his sheep and Church, and
"Scripture

“Scripture witnessing that all are not his sheep, they conclude and “argue by undeniable consequence, that he dyed not for those that are not so. At which assertion I can but wonder; when first I heard of Mr. *Owens* Book, he was so commended to me for a disputant, that I could not expect any such lame arguments from him: If we must take his saying of a thing to be an infallible proof, that its so, then we have done with him; but sure no Logick rule or good reason that I have ever met with can prove this assertion. Had he said, Christ saying he dyed for his sheep, and the Scripture saying all are not his sheep, it argues that in that saying he extended not the speech there about his Death to All, he had spoken reason; but to argue, that because he mentions no more there as the object of his Death, therefore he had no greater object of his death, is as great an inconsequence as any can be. Let it be considered by this like reasoning, God stiles himself the Creator of *Israel*, and their King, [61] *Isa.* 43.15. but many places of Scripture witness that All are not *Israel*, therefore he did not Create all men, nor is King of all the earth, contrary to *Acts* 17.24, 25, 26. & *Psal.* 47.7. So again in *Jer.* 14.7. God is stiled the Saviour of *Israel* in the time of trouble, but All are not *Israel*, Therefore he is not the Saviour of All men, contrary to 1 *Tim.* 4.10. Or like this, God Created the Smith that blows in the fire, and that brings forth the instrument for his work, and the waster to destroy: but all are not such, *Ergo* God created not All *Isa.* 45.16. What rational man, much less a Scholar would call these undeniable consequences? but let us observe what strong proofs he brings to back it. He tels us that in that very place Christ presently adds, that some are not of his sheep, which if it be not equivalent to his sheep only, he knows not what is. Now that [*presently*] is in *ver.* 26. and the other *ver.* 15. so that there are eleven *verses* distance between them, and in the interim there is a Chafma, a breaking off that discourse in *vers.* 15. and the following verses, See *ver.* 19, 20, 21. and a new occasion of the following discourse mentioned in *ver.* 22, 23, 24. so that the latter in *vers.* 26. might be spoken at another time, many hours or dayes after the former: but however, suppose them spoken within two or three verses distance, what doth that prove? that he dyed for his sheep only? just as much as Gods mentioning the *Babylonians* and *Caldeans* in *Isa.* 43.14. the verse next before his saying (I am the Creator of *Israel*) proves that he created not the *Babylonians*; What wilde reasoning is this? It shews indeed that (which we deny not) there

[61] *Isa.* 43.11.

there he speaks of no more then his sheep, not that therefore he dyed for no more then his sheep, especially as the propitiation, there he saith not he died for all, not there he denies that he dyed for All. As when *Paul* saith, *He loved me, and gave himself for me*, he speaks but of himself there, but it follows not from thence, that he denied his loving any but him, &c. I might retort here his own language, in *lin. 24.25. of pag. 81.* but I have enough to do beside, I pray God help him to see that the beam is in his own eye while he cries out of the mote in his brothers. Let any but rationally compare what is objected against him, *pag. 81.* and his answers to it, *pag. 82.* and he may well admire the answers.

For whereas its objected, That our Saviour did not in *John 10.* set forth any difference between such as he died for, and such as he died not for. He answers, that there is there an evident distinction, and that he called them he died for, his Sheep (just as God calls them he created, *Israel*) those that he would give eternal life to, &c. Now I would Mr. *Owen* would shew us the other part of the distinction, where Christ in any part of the Chapter saies, But some there are that I will not die for, and they are such and such. There Mr. *Owen* fails. In the first discourse Christ onely tells us how he loved his sheep more then other Shepherds that are hirelings, and who are his sheep, but not a word that he died onely for them sheep, by way of ransom and propitiation. Nor indeed speaks he there of dying (at least not meerly) in that consideration, but as a shepherd opposed to other shepherds that are hirelings, who will not lay down their lives for the flocks committed to them, but flee. Were they hired think we to ransom, or be a propitiation for the sheep, and are any faulted for running away, and not doing that? Surely God never required that of any but Christ, nor faulted any for declining it. But they were hired to teach, lead, stand by, support and go before their flocks, in witnessing the truth against ravenous Wolves, and Persecutors, not to run away in times of danger, and leave their flocks to shift for themselves; for not dying for the sheep in this sense he faults the hirelings, and in that properly he there opposes himself to them in laying down his life for witnessing the Truth preached, and strengthening them for sufferings. So that he not onely limits not the ransom here to his sheep, but speaks of his laying down his life also, to a quite other purpose then Mr. *Owen* produceth it to prove. What follows in him, is not pertinent to prove, that
either

either he speaks there of dying for them by way of propitiation, or (much less) that he so died onely for them. "Indeed he tells us intimately, that all those for whom he died, he died for them in the "same manner, and to the same end, and that he died for none but "those that shall be brought in by the Ministration of the Gospel. But these are things often spoken, but never proved, and often disproved. He tells us also that the "Primary difference there, is not "between believers, and not believers, but between sheep and not "sheep; in which he also mistaketh. For though in his after discourse he puts a difference between sheep and not sheep, believers and not believers; yet in that former discourse in which he speaks of laying down his life, there is no difference aimed at between sheep and not sheep, but between shepherd and shepherds, the good shepherd and the hireling, in their entrance to the care of the flock, and deportment toward them. Let that be but warily considered, and it will give further light to our understanding of the place, and clearly cut off that exception. He sayes again, That "the question is not at all to what end Christ mentions his Death. But there he is out too; for it pertains much to the question; for if he mentions it as an example to other shepherds under him, then he mentions it not as the propitiation, for in that we are not to follow him, nor can we. But he saith, "His intention is to declare his "giving his life a ransom, *ver.* 18. but that saith not any such thing, but onely that he laid down his life, and took it up again. And though he should include the business of Ransom and propitiation in that 18 *verse*, yet taking in the other thing too, *viz.* the Testimony-bearing to his Doctrine, and so the preservation of his sheep in the faith, it makes the thing impertinent to our purpose. For our controversy is not, whom he died to establish in the faith, but whom he died for, to ransom them from the sentence upon them in *Adam*. Again, Though he say not that he laid down his life to give us example, yet speaking of it as done by him, as a shepherd over the flock, with opposition to hirelings that leave the flock, he tacitely instructs us, what he would have other good shepherds do, and so tacitely propounds himself as an example to us, To which may be added this, That the sheep of another fold (whether people seeking after God in other Nations not yet gathered into unity with these believing *Jews*, or others yet to be called, its disputable) seem to be spoken of as a distinct people from those for whom he sayes he laid

down his life, as not pertaining to his ministration as on the earth, and so not so concerned in his Death, as a shepherd for confirmation and strengthning of them by the view of his constancy in the faith believed, as these sheep were. The phrase is remarkable, That so soon as he had said, *I laid down my life for the sheep*, he adds, *And other sheep also I have that are not of this Fold*. Others, from what? but those he had been speaking of that the Father had immediatly put under his charge, in point of his vocal and personal Ministration. For whose incouragement also in the first place, he laid down his life, witnessing a good confession before *Pontius Pilate*. But I leave that to judicious considerations. Again, If by sheep not of this fold, be meant such *Gentiles* as God had drawn to seek after him, by those meanes of his goodness spread abroad amongst them, though not yet led so far as to know and acknowledge, or walk with Christ and his Disciples of the *Jews* (such as *Cornelius* and some of his family were, and others such might be) as I see nothing to disprove it, Then Mr. *Owens* Allegation of that afterward to prove, That the word sheep contains others, then those that are in some degree believers or fearers of God, falls to the ground. But however, take it one way or other, it nothing disproves the main controverted point. *viz.* That Christ died not for his sheep onely.

I pass other following contentions, not directly pertinent; onely “note, That where (in *pag.* 85.) He saies he knows not where its “said, For All men, but is sure that Christ is said to give his life a “ransom, and that onely mentioned, when it is not said for All, as “*Matt.* 20.28. and 10.45. (I suppose it should be, and *Mark* 10.45.) his words are ambiguous, for either he means that its only mentioned as a ransom, where the word [All] is not joyned with it, or where its not extended to All: and if so, then speaks he evidently false, for in 1 *Tim.* 2.6. its in express tearms, *He gave himself a ransom for All*; or else that Christ is said to give himself a ransom, and nothing mentioned, but that in some places where its not said for All. But then he trifles too. For if it be said but in one place [*for All*] its enough for our faith to close in with, there being no one place that denies it of any; and many being neither a limitation of, nor contradiction to All, as is evident. To say nothing that there his Mediation and Ministration are joyned together. To Minister and give his life a ransom for many.

“Whereas in the conclusion of that Chapter, he charges M. *Moore*,
“with

“with framing an objection like a man of clouts, to which none of
“his Adversaries did ever contribute a penful of Ink. I shall say no
“more but this, That to my remembrance, I saw a writing sent him,
containing four Objections, the same in matter and form as are
there laid down in his book, in the beginnings of his 14, 15, 16, and
17. Chapters. And as I remember they were sent him by one *Ed-
mund Scottin* of *Emmith* neer to *Wisbitch*. So that therein Mr. *Owen*
doth falsely asperse him, being guilty himself of as weak Argu-
ments as any one of them, As may appear by this of dying for his
sheep: to which I have been lastly speaking.

CHAP. III.

*Concerning Impetration and Application, with a view of, and answer
to what Mr. Owen saies to them in his fourth Chapter.*

HIS next Chapter is about Impetration and Application. About
which I shall first propound my understanding, and then consi-
der what is said by him, Thus then I conceive the Scripture to
hold forth.

1. That Jesus Christ by his Death and Sacrifice impetrated,
procured, and obtained a release of all men from being dealt with
according to that sentence of condemnation that passed upon them for
the transgression of *Adam*, so as that they should not be cut off
and destroyed properly for that: (As *Moses* by his mediation
for *Israel* procured a repeal, or reversion of that sentence
pronounced against them in *Numb.* 14.11, 12. of smiting them
by Pestilence, and disinheriting them, *ver.* 19, 20.) This I gather
from *Rom.* 5.18. 1 *Tim.* 2.6.

2. That Jesus Christ by his death and Sacrifice impetrated, procured,
or obtained power and Lordship to himself in the man, over them
all, and all things concerning them, Angels, Devils, and all creatures
made for them, that he should have power over them, to rule or
order them, and make them, useful and serviceable to all, or any
man, or for chastisement and correction to them, as he pleases. This
I ground upon *Rom.* 14.9. *Acts* 10.36. 1 *Pet.* 3.21.

3. That he procured and obtained thereby to have in himself in
the Humane Nature all fulness of gifts and grace, life and salvation,

so as that it might be dispensed unto all or any man in that way God and he should propound for participation thereof, which (in regard of the eternal life and salvation) is only by receipt of himself, so as that it should not pass from him dividedly from himself, but men must come in to him, and receive him, to receive and injoy that fulness in him. And this I ground upon those Scriptures, *Psal.* 68.18. Ascending up on high, and leading captivity captive, he received gifts in the Man, 1 *John* 5.11. God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son (whence also as thus filled, he is the Bread and Tree of life) He that hath him, hath this life, and he that hath not him, hath not life, *vers.* 12. He may impart and give other gifts to men that are apart from him and not in him, but the main gift, the life in him, he gives injoyment of only to men in him, so that if men would have it, they must go to him for it; though the servants are sent abroad, and he comes forth with them to call men to the feast, yet men must go into him by Faith, and receive him into their hearts, else they have not the efficacy of the feast prepared for them in him; but he hath impetrated to have life in himself and fulness fit for All or any to look to him for, and communicable by him to all or any in looking to him.

4. He hath also impetrated and obtained, that the ingagement of God to him should be fulfilled, he having performed his Fathers will, he hath obliged God (as we may so say) upon his promise to give him a seed, and to that end so to glorifie him with himself and to men, and so to exercise his power and goodness amongst them, that Nations and people should run in to him, and so come to injoy the life thats in him, and glory with him, leaving that (so far as I finde) to his Fathers goodwill, whom and how many so to cause to run unto him, not doubting but he will make good his word to his satisfaction. Thus for his Impetration.

Now accordingly by way of Application (if we may so call it) He and God in him,

1. Deals with all men in a way of mercy, bounty, and goodness, and not according to the Tenor of the first obligation, or the curse deserved by their sin in *Adam*.

2. Hath invested him with supream Authority over All Creatures, giving all things into his hands, and he rules the Nations with a rod of Iron, &c. and dispenses to them as seems good to him. And,

3. Hath life in himself, free for, and communicable to All or any,
which

which he makes over to his people brought into him, forgiving their sins, sanctifying their souls, putting into them his spirit, laws, fear, &c. changing them into his likeness, till he bring them into the full possession of all his glory. And,

4. The Father glorifies him amongst men, and so works in his word and providences by his Spirit, that he hath a Church and Spouse, a seed given him, to whom he doth impart that fulness that is in him; and executes his Lordly office amongst the rest according to his and the Fathers will, so as that he brings about the main end of his sufferings, the glory of God, in all his dispensations even toward them also. And these are my thoughts about this distinction.

Some make use of a Distinction of a Reconciliation wrought in Christ for men, and in men by Christ; the first for all men, the second in all cordial and through-believers. Which I make out and approve thus.

1. The nature of man was fully and perfectly reconciled to God in the person of Christ by his death, for All men, or in the behalf of, and for the benefit of all men. The nature of man (though the Word descended into it and was made Flesh, yet) as it was given in the behalf of other mens persons (yea he in it as the publike sinner) to ransom all, so between it in Christ and God there was a controversy, and that so great, that God fell upon it, wounded, bruised, afflicted, yea cursed it, as I may say, or made it accursed, and his Son as in it, pouring upon it the punishment of the sin of man before he took it up into his glory: but having done so, to the utmost of his will not sparing him, he then raised it, [62] took it up into Sonship with the Word, and filled it with all his fulness, being at perfect unity with it, and it with him, never more to be at odds again; here is a full, compleat, and perfect reconciliation of the nature of man in Christs person, and this for All, as the punishment was suffered in stead of the whole nature in its several individuals, and so as that God now lets go all other from executing the fierceness of his wrath upon them for that sin in which they formerly stood condemned, and calls for satisfaction to his justice in that point from none of them, [63] but extends such means and goodness to them as leadeth to Repentance. Yet in their persons they are not reconciled, they all (except the man Christ) remain in enmity against him, and the nature of man in all our persons is such, that with no one of mankind can so holy a God have fellowship, till something be done to them,

[62] Acts 13.
33.

[63] Rom. 2.4,
5.

that is (*De adultis loquor*) till there be wrought in them a renouncing of themselves and sins, and a willingness to walk with God through his love and goodness, which none have in them meerly by Christs dying for them, and ascending to God, till something be wrought in them from heaven by his Spirit: [64] Till when, men are like *Absolom*, when *David* at *Joabs* mediation took of the sentence of his banishment, but yet would not let him see his face. All yet in that regard children of wrath, worthy of wrath, though God deal not with them according to desert, nor goes about to execute the fierceness of wrath upon them, but on the contrary affords them means of seeking him, &c. to some more, to some less, as he pleases. But,

[64] 2 Sam. 14.
24, 28.

2. When the goodness of God, [65] and the operations of his Word and Spirit, the insinuations of divine light and love into the hearts of any is so received and yielded to, that they are brought to Repentence and faith in God and Christ, and submission to his Spirit, then they come in their own persons to be reconciled, to receive the reconciliation and atonement; then God begins to own and walk with them, [66] and take them up into unity and fellowship with his Son: and this is the reconciliation wrought in men by Christ, to which the Apostle exhorts in 2 *Cor.* 5.20.

[65] Psa. 36.7, 8.
Eph. 1.13.

[66] Rom. 5.11.

How much my sense of these distinctions differ from the *Arminians*, *Camero's*, *Testardus* and others (who as *M. Owen* tells us, all speak of an Impetration of Reconciliation, Remission, Redemption, conditionally if they believe) I leave to their Judgments that compare us. *M. Owens* arguments against that first distinction, as used by them, make nothing against me, I affirming an application or donation from the Father to be made to Christ, and through Christ to men, according to the purpose of his Impetration: only some passages in his arguments would be spoken to; as whereas in his second Argument p. 89. he affirms, that whatsoever is obtained for any, is theirs by right for whom it is obtained. I think that is not every way true. I may purchase a picee of land intentionally for my childe, and yet keep the right and title in my own hand so that he may not have right in it, or title to it, till I actually instate him in it. Whatever the thoughts of Christ were to any in dying for them, yet we are not made heirs till brought into him; till then we have no right either to claim, or to receive the promises, *Ye are all the sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ*, and if Christs, then *Abrahams* seed, and heirs according to promise,

promise, *Gal.* 3.29. So *Tit.* 3.6. being justified by grace, we are made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. Whether the condition of faith be purchased or no, we shall view elsewhere,

Again, in his third Argument, he tels us that these two, Impetration and Application, are alwayes joyned together in the Scriptures: in which he saith not truly, for I demand where is the Application in *1 Tim.* 2.6. He gave himself a ransom for All, or in *Heb.* 2.9. by the grace of God he might tast death for every one? and where is the impetration in that, *By him whosoever believes shall receive the remission of sins?* *Acts* 10.43. He hath also diverse indirect and vitious inferences, as when from *Isa.* 53.11. [*“He shall justify many for he shall bear their iniquities”*] he infers, All whose sins he bare, he also justifieth, whenas such a conclusion cannot fairly be drawn from those premises, no more then if a man should say from that in *1 Cor.* 6.19, 20. [The Holy Ghost is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price] that all that are bought with a price have the Holy Ghost in them, and so those false Teachers in *2 Pet.* 2.1. which bring upon themselves swift destruction. That clause, *For he bare their iniquities*, shews the ground upon which by his knowledg he might (and (so) did) justify them, that he proceeded legally, not the adequate object of his act of bearing sins. Thence also he adds by his knowledg, that is, by making known his truth, or doctrine, or himself in it, he shall justify many; how comes that about, that he by his knowledg should produce such an effect? the reason is rendred, for he bare their iniquities. He shall make known himself to them, as one able to save them, and so draw them in to him, and then by vertue of his sufferings for them he shall justify them, for that was it by which he was perfected for conferring such a favor on them that obey him, as in *Heb.* 5.9. He saith not, he justifies many by bearing their sins, as if that alone did it, but by his knowledg, which knowledg, whoso regard not, nor receive, they go without that justification, or accounting righteous, there spoken of, yea though he dyed for them (and had they received that knowledg of him, both could and would have justified them) men stumbling at him, and not believing on him, may perish, though Christ have dyed for them, *1 Cor.* 8.11.

Again, his inference from that in *Isa.* 53.5. [*By his stripes we are healed, Therefore All that he dyed for*] hath no more force, then if some *Israelites* that were healed by looking to the brazen Serpent

Serpent should say, By the brazen Serpent we are healed, Therefore All that it was set up for were healed by it. Of no more force are those other inferences from *Rom.* 8.32, 33. He that spared not his Son, but gave him up to the Death for us All, how shall he not with him give us all things? *Us*, that are in Christ Jesus, that walk after the spirit, that have received the first fruits of it, that are called, justified, &c. Its like the confident reasoning of the believing *Israelites*, *Exod.* 13.13, 14, 16, 17. God that brought us out of Egypt by so mighty a hand, redeeming us, and bringing us forth in his mercy. will guide us by his strength to his holy habitation, [67] bring us in, and plant us, &c. that is, such as in this confidence follow his conduct, and rebel not against him. Now as if one from thence should infer, *Ergo* all that he brought out of Egypt he surely brought into Canaan: just such are those three inferences of Mr. *Owens* from that *Rom.* 8. *viz.* That all he gave Christ for, 1. He gives to believe in him, (that is compels them to believe) And 2. Brings them to glory, (an inference wholly groundless from that Text, that speaking of actual believers, and not of faith, as a thing yet to be given them) and All that he dyed for. 3. He makes intercession for (for the collating all the choise benefits of his Death upon) (for thats the meaning of his third inference, though not so *in terminis* expressed, otherwise I should not deny it) but I have said enough before to these kinde of inferences, and I shall speak fullier to that place where he more fully urges it, *lib.* 3. *chap.* 11.

That which follows in him hath something in it worthy the noting, *viz.* those Assertions repeated and spoken to by him. As,

1. "In that he denies Gods inclination to do us good to be natural and necessary, he crosses that common maxime, *Quicquid in Deo est, Deus est*, every thing in God, is God: and if that be true, then its necessary and natural to God, for that which is God cannot but be, and so whatever love is in him to us, must be necessary, it being something in him. Besides the Scripture defines him by love. God is love, which sure hath in it an inclination to do good, and what he is, is natural to him, and as necessary as he; though what object to act forth his love toward, and in what way, is not necessary but meerly free to him; and therefore when he says that every thing acted by him towards us is an act of his free-will, *opponit non opponenda*, seeing though his actings be voluntary, yet his nature is essentiall and necessary, and these two cross not each other.

2 "Whereas

[67] Numb. 14.
9, 10.

“Whereas he saith, the ascribing an Antecedent will to God, “whose fulfilling depends on any free contingent act of ours, is injurious to God. This falls not upon us. But I conceive that that may be called an Antecedent VWill of God, which respects some Antecedent condition in us, in respect of some VWill of God, respecting us as its proper object in a consequent condition. As (to explain my meaning.) God viewing *Adam* as innocent, willed him Paradise, and fellowship with himself (yet the injoyment of this to be according to his standing in that created condition) but viewing him as voluntarily faln, he willed to expel him from Paradise, &c. the former of these in respect of the latter, may be called Antecedent, as it was a Will respecting an Antecedent, or former condition of *Adam*, and the latter a consequent will to that fall from his former condition beheld by him. So a Will to provide a Saviour for men as helpless and faln, and to extend goodness to them through him, compared with his Will to exclude them his Kingdom, and seal them up under wrath, as obstinately, after light and power vouchsafed, rebelling against his Son, and abusing his goodness, may be called an Antecedent will, and the latter a Consequent, though that denomination of Antecedent and Consequent arises rather from the priority and posteriority in the objects, then the will it self. For that place, *Who hath resisted his will?* as it makes nothing against what I have here said, so I shall say nothing to it here, but refer what I have to say about it to my Answer to *cap. 4. lib. 4.* where he urges it again, as also his third Assertion, *viz.*

3. That a meer common Affection and Inclination to do good to all, sets not out the freedom, fulness, and dimensions of the Love of God asserted in Scripture, as the cause of sending Christ. To my Answer to his fourth Book, and second Chapter, where he further urges it again.

“4. Whereas he denies, that all mankind was the object of that “love of God that moved him to send Christ. We believe he denies it; but how doth he disprove it? why thus. He made some for the day of wrath, *Prov. 16.4.* but he should have told us whom. The Scripture saith, *The wicked*, such as persist in wickedness (if by evil day, we mean a day of destruction to themselves;) for otherwise in turning they shall live, and God swears he had rather they should turn and live, then go on in sin and die, [68] which [*rather*] argues a Mediator for them to turn to God by, and such as refuse to

[68] Ezek 33.
11.

turn to God by him, God works them (as the word {פעל} signifies) to an evil day, [69] like that in *Rom.* 2.4, 5. If Mr. *Owen* think that them that are now wicked, God made them at first for the day of destruction, and therefore left them to be wicked, (for I hope he thinks not that God made any wicked) then he must say his creating work was to most an act of hatred, and that God hated men, while innocent and righteous, and while his own meer workmanship, for in that instant he intimates that he made them unto wrath, which suits not with the Nature of God, which is Love, nor with the Truth of God, that saith, That God loves the righteous, as all were when God created them. The truth is, the word [*Made*] signifies also to order and frame providentially, and so the word {פעל} more properly signifies, being never that I finde applied to his creating things, and so his disposing *Israel* to Mercy or Judgment in his providential government of them, is compared to a Potter making a Vessel,[70] or making it another Vessel when marred, *Jer.* 18.4, 5, 6.

[70] *Jer.* 18.4,
5, 6. {לטענה}

The meaning of the sentence then is this. That the Lord wrought as all things for himself (or for its cause, as *Drusus* notes) so the wicked, those that are so, and persist to be so, against the goodness and grace of God leading them to Repentance, them he works (or by an *Ellipsis* they are) for the evil day, That is, to be his rods, to afflict and exercise men withall, to make a day of affliction, and try-all, which in Scripture is called [a] an evil day, as the word is here*. As its said, *Wickedness proceeds from the wicked, and Ashur the rod of my wrath.* And so its said, That ungodly men, turners of the grace of God into wantonness, were [b] fore-written to this condemnation, or judgment, *viz.* to be exercises to the Saints of God, and put them to trial about their faith, *Jude* 4. (another place quoted by him) but surely they had that grace vouchsafed to them which they abused, or else how did they abuse it? [c] These are the same men, with those in 2 *Pet.* 2.1. that are said to be bought by the Lord, and that buying them, and his goodness toward them being bought, was the grace they turned into wantonness: And surely, he that says that God fore-ordained, that those that being bought by him, and having grace and favor extended to them through Christ, leading them to Repentance, should deny the Lord, and turn his grace into wantonness, and so persist in wickedness, should be for exercises and rods to the Church (for so the words (to this judgment or condemnation) seem to import) or (if ye will) that they should be condemned; He

say

[a] *Eph.* 6.13
{יִסְרֵעָה}
1 *Sam.* 24.
13.

Isa. 10.5.

[b] {προγε-
γραμμέ-
νοι}.

[c] Compare
2 *Pet.* 2.
with this
Epistle of
Jude.

say, that so saith, doth intimately say, that God ordained them first to be bought by Christ, and to have such grace extended to them; and I think grace is love and favor; and then he saies nothing to deny that even those also, though not looked upon as such (persisting in ungodliness and wickedness) but in an Antecedent condition (as we noted before) were also the objects of Gods love in sending his Son: no more then he that saies, that God intended to throw faln *Adam* out of *Paradise*, and deny him communion with himself, denies that God made *Adam* righteous, and shewed him much favor in *Paradise*.

“But he saith again, That some were hated before they were born, pointing to *Rom. 9.12*. But there is no such passage there. Onely that before the children were born, or had done good or evil, it was said to *Rebecca*, *The elder shall serve the younger*. And that we shal finde indeed spoken before they were born; *Gen. 25.22, 23*. but the other, [*Esau have I hated*] was spoken in *Malachies* time, long after they were dead, and was spoken inclusively of *Esaus* posterity too, as the other part of the speech of *Jacobs*, and its produced by the Apostle to shew the standing of Gods purpose for exalting the younger above the elder; for this proves Gods purpose to stand, that *Esau* not submitting to serve *Jacob* according to the Oracle (in which he might have met with blessing) God hated, rejected, and cast him out, and destroyed his mountains. You may as well say, that God laid his mountains wast before he was born too, and so before he had any, as that he hated him before he was born. For they are put together, *Mal. 1.2*. yet I hated *Esau*, and made his mountains wast. But again,

From *Rom. 9.22*. He tells us that some were fitted for destruction, but thats impertinent. For its not He (that is, God) fitted them to destruction, much less in his first creating them. But they being fitted for destruction, yet (he says) God to shew his power and wrath, to make known his Name for the good of others, spares them. As when *Pharoah* (to whom he seems there to allude) was fitted and ripened for destruction, and might have been justly cut off. Yet that he might make him more exemplary, he treated with him a long time before he destroyed him; and what doth this hinder but that he might send his Son to dye for such, as considered in a precedent condition. A man for whom Christ died, by stumbling and turning from Christ, may be fitted for destruction. So the Apostle intimates *1 Cor. 8.11. 2 Pet. 2.1*. Except a man may perish, and not be fit for it, which I think none shall.

He produces also 2 *Pet.* 2.12. like bruit beasts made to be taken, &c. which being spoken of such as deny the Lord that bought them, *vers.* 1. it cannot be in reason conceived that Christ dyed not for them, except he bought them by some other price then his death, which I finde not affirmed. Beside, Mr. *Owen* may abuse his reader, making him believe that the Apostle says that those men were made to be taken and destroyed, when indeed the words are these, Like bruit beasts made to be taken and destroyed, the words Made to be taken and destroyed, agree with the word Beasts, not with the word Men, but the men being as brutish as such creatures, speak evil of things they understand not; He compares them to the beasts that are made for such ends, in regard of their absurd irrationall carriages, as by the parallel place in *Jude* 10. appears, and Master *Owen* would make men believe contrary to the originall (which is οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἀλογαζῶα φυσικὰ γεγεννημένα εἰς ἄλωσιν, . & c . not γεγεννημένοι) That the Apostle applies those words, Made to be taken and destroyed, to the men compared to them.

He tels us also that some are appointed to wrath, 1 *Thess.* 5.9. the Apostle says not some, as faln in *Adam*, or muchless as created, were appointed to condemnation, and that Christ should not dy for them. We deny not that believers are not appointed to wrath (and thats all the Apostle there says) nor that unbelievers are appointed to condemnation, as they remain unbelievers, not believing in him whom they had so good ground to have believed in, he having done so much for them, and having such a name of salvation as is reported to them, *John* 3.18. but this comes not up to Mr. *Owens* intention.

His last quotation is *Act.* 1.25. To go to his own place, which I conceive is rather applicable to the Apostle to be chosen, and so the words to be read thus, That he may take the lot of this ministration and Apostleship, [74] to go to his own place, and the words [*From which Judas fell*] are only put in by a *parenthesis*: but take it as its usually understood, yet then it shews but that such as requite Christ hatred for his love, and betray him after the knowledg of the truth received, loose whatever honor in the Gospel they had before attained, and have for their own place hell and destruction: and what doth this make against Christs having loved and come forth to ransom him as faln in *Adam*, that he so highly abusing that love, had a place fell to him amongst the Divil and his Angels?

[74] Compare
Acts
1.20. with
Psal. 109.
4, 5, 8.

What follows in his p. 93.94, 95. is party impertinent, and partly spoken to. He tels of several ways that men go in to make out their conceptions in this point, and I could also shew such differences amongst those that oppose the extent of Christs death; some more fully opposing it then others, some denying that there is any Gospel sent to any but to the Elect, as Doct. *Laighton*, Mr. *How*, &c. some that the Gospel is sent indeed to All, and to be preached to All: so the most of them. Some that Christ dyed to purchase all into his dispose, but yet bare not any sin of theirs, nor did ransom them from any foregoing sentence upon them. Some that he hath not bought them or dyed for them at all, onely seemed to buy them; others that he dyed to buy many good things for them, but not to buy them, &c. but to what purpose doth he repeat (or I recriminate) such things, which shew but that we have not attained to unity of faith in perfection, or that there are imperfections in our apprehensions of truth? not that this, or that is the truth. I doubt not but *Veritas magna est, & prævalebit*: As truth shines forth more brightly, so the many oppositions against it by them, and the many swarvings from it in some conceptions that may be amongst us, will all vanish and be scattered, nor shall its abettors need such distinctions as are not founded in the Scriptures, nor such expressions as there finde no footing, as many of Mr. *Owens* are, as we shall see; as what he gives us as the summ of the truth in this matter, viz. “*That god out of his infinite love to his Elect sent his dear Son in the fulness of time, to dy and pay a ransome of infinite value and dignity for the purchasing eternal redemption, and bringing unto himself all and every one of those whom he had before ordained to eternal life for the praise of his grace.*” Not that we deny that God sent his Son to dy and pay such a ransom, or that he purchased eternal Redemption, or will bring to himself all those that he fore-ordained to eternal life, &c. But that the Elect was the sole object of Gods love, or that it was love to them only, and none but them, as he after concludes, that moved God to send his Son. Our Saviour himself expressed not himself so. He saith not, God so loved his Elect that he gave his only begotten Son, that every one that believes should not perish, &c. but God so loved the World: Mr. *Owen* confounds the Elect and the World together, and makes as if Christ had said, that every one of the Elect that believes should not perish. Besides, I would have Mr. *Owen* shew me that any persons were considered as

Elect before the consideration of Christs dying for men, and how they are said then to be Elect in Christ, and not in *Adam* rather; if men looked upon either as in *Massâ purâ*, or as in *Massâ corruptâ*, were the object of Election, and not rather as Christ was eyed intervening between God and them.

What he says about the value and dignity of the ransom, and price which Christ paid, *viz.* “That it was infinite and fit for the accomplishing of any end, and procuring any good for all and every one “for whom it was intended, had they been millions of men more then ever were created, we shall meet with it again in *li. 4. ca. 1.* and therefore I shal onely say this to it here, That it fairly intimates, that Christ hath merited more by it then ever shalbe applyed, the desert or merit of it being immeasurable for extent, but the application of it bounded, and so if strictly looked into, he grants such difference between the meriting of it and its application, as he faults his adversaries for; nay and makes a great, yea an infinite part of its merit to be to no purpose.

His following Assertions are things again and again affirmed, but never as yet proved by Scripture, *viz.* Either that the whole adæquate intention of God in giving Christ, was the bringing many “sons to glory, or, that all the things procured by Christs death are to be bestowed on All that Christ dyed for. I conceive my expressions laid down in the beginning of this Chapter, are cleerer, and less cloudy, yea and more consonant to the Scripture expressions, then what he hath given us as the Sum of the Truth in this business.

CHAP. IIII.

A view of what is further said by Mr. Owen to this matter, in his fifth Chapter.

HIS next Chapter is spent in Arguments against that Distinction of Impetration and Application, as he had expressed it in the *Arminian* sense; which differing from mine I might pass over, yet I shall speak to diverse passages in it, which somewhat intrench upon what I have laid down in my second observation about Impetration. As,

In the entrance he hath an Assertion without proof, *viz.* “That “for whomsoever Christ obtained good to them, it must be applyed. To which I oppose this, That Christ procured good things into himself

himself in the humane nature, for those that refusing him, go without them. He received gifts for the rebellious, as *Psal.* 68.18. there are favors held forth by God to them, and in a sort given them (as Christ tels the unbelieving Jews that his Father gave them the true bread) but that all they for whom such gifts are received by Christ, must also necessarily receive them, is as void of proof, as that all the unbelieving, murmuring Jews received Christ as the bread of life, and fed upon him: sure the Holy Ghost says, [75] That some deprive themselves of their own mercies, miss what in obeying they should have had, know not (and so miss of) the things pertaining to their peace: Nor is it rational to think, or Christian so say, that God calls people to Christ, that hath received nothing into himself for them, and so hath nothing to dispense to them that will do them good; is so earnest to draw them to that that cannot satisfie them, and condemns them for refusing that that had nothing for them in it; as he hath not any thing of what he calls them to as communicable to men, but by his sufferings.

“Whereas he saith, That the blood of Christ in the vertue of it “cannot be looked upon as a Medicine in a Box, laid up for all that “shall come to have any of it, and so applied now to one, and then “to another. That speech so far is false, as to the good things pertaining to eternal life, and the vertue of that blood for the in-joyment of them, for it is resembled to the ashes of an heifer laid up in a clean place, and from thence to be sprinkled upon men, [76] and so his name is compared to ointment poured forth, *Cant.* 1.3. whats his name but his love, grace, vertues and excellencies declared and made known? the pouring forth of which, intimates that they were all first included in him as ointment in a Box. Now though the declaration of these be as ointment poured forth, yet the things themselves, Remission, Sanctification, Spirit of Joy, Glory, &c. are all contained in him, and passe not from him to any soul, till it be first brought in to him; yea the whole tenor of Scriptures speak of these things as laid up in him for men, one and other: thence those phrases, The salvation that is in *Jesus Christ*, 2 *Tim.* 2.10. Neither is there Salvation in any other, *Act.* 4.11, 12. All fulness in him, *Col.* 1.19. All the fulness of God dwels in him bodily, and in him we are compleat, *Col.* 2.9, 10. In him we have Redemption, *Col.* 1.14. the life that is given us in the Son, 1 *John* 5.11, 12. in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledg, *Col.* 2.3. Be strong in the
grace

[75] Joh. 6.32.
Jon. 2.8.
Psa. 81.13,
14.
Luk. 19.4,
42, &c.
Isa. 55.2, 3 Prov.
1.21.
22, 23, 24.

[76] Num. 19.
9. Heb. 9.
13, 14.

grace that is in Christ Jesus, 1 *Tim.* 2.1. yea this grace is compared to a feast made in a house, whitherto men are to come, &c. *Matth.* 22.2, 3, &c. [77] Yea thence Christ himself is said to be made to the believer wisdom, righteousness, &c. and we are said in believing to receive remission, to receive the atonement, &c. because in believing we go to and receive him; yea we are said to come to the blood of sprinkling, *Heb.* 12.24. Now that this also is laid up in him for all that shall come to have any of it, and so applyed now to one, and then to another, as they come (or rather laid up for All that upon his call they might come to him for it) is also the tenor of Scripture Doctrine; thence Look to me and be ye saved all ye ends of the earth. [78] Whoever will, let him come and take of the water of life freely. He says not the Elect, or any shall have it given out from him without coming, or they only have right to come for it, its only for them; but whoever will may, thence it is a feast made for all people, *Isa.* 25 6. and all are invited in the Gospel, even whomsoever we meet with we may call, *Matt.* 22.8, 9. though all obey not the call to come, yea and the blood is sprinkled upon, and the grace applyed now to one, then to another, as they come. Thence some obtain mercy and grace before others, as an example and incouragement to others, 1 *Tim.* 1.15, 16. some are in Christ before others (as *Andronicus* and *Junia* were in Christ before *Paul*, *Rom.* 16.7.) and so have fellowship with God and Christ before them, yea before others be called to it, or born. And this also is given to All comers, without difference, as is clear in Scriptures, to Jew and Gentile, bond and free, for there is no difference, *Rom.* 3.23, 24. *Gal.* 3.27, 28. its open to All, and intended no more for one comer then another, as to the essentials of it, though more to those that come, then others that come not; Yea though Christ hath purchased All good things into his humane nature, and they free for all, and prohibited to none, till they be wickedly put away; yet its uncertain to any before coming, whether it shall be theirs or no: and as to Scripture Revelation, for them its left indifferent, the Scripture expressing them no more then others, nor others, yet unbelievers, more then them.

His arguments to the contrary touch not to any purpose what hath been said: they are these. 1. Its against common sense that such a thing should be obtained for one, and yet that not be his. To which we have given some answer before, besides which, we say further, that its here inconcludent, for it should have been [That a thing should

should be obtained for one, and yet he never enjoy it] not [that it should not be his] The application answers not to right and title, but to enjoyment of right. Men may have right to that in Christ, which they refusing to accept or look after, have not the enjoyment of, so *Jon.* 2.8. they that observe lying vanities, forsake their own mercies: its {חרפם} their own mercy, and yet they deprive themselves of it. So *Esau* had a birthright, the first portion was his by right, and yet he never had it applyed to him, he lost it or sold it willingly, and so went without it, and there are too many prophane, as *Esau*. Corn may be treasured up with *Joseph* for All *Egypt*, yet with this Proviso, that men must go to *Joseph* before they can have it, [79] so that any *Egyptian* hath right to go to him and receive it, yea good ground to go to him too, and yet if any man refused to go to him and to take it at his hand, he might perish for want, but (as I have propounded that distinction) Christ is not wanting to apply what is impetrated, according to the will of God for application, or compact made in Impetration; and therefore his second Argument is vain too, *viz.* That

[79] Heb. 12.15

2. "Its contrary to reason that the Death of Christ in Gods intention should be applyed to any one that shall have no share in the merits of that Death. None of all his adversaries produced by him say any such thing, they rather deny the application of it to many, then say that some to whom its *to be* applyed, have no share in his merits. "Whereas he says many know not of it; we have shewed before that a man may have a fruit of love from another that he knows not. *Cyrus* was girded and strengthned by God, though he knew him not. So men have a release from the dealing of God with them according to the merit of *Adams* sin, which should else unavoidably have come upon them, and this by Christ though many know not him; And all receive some fruits of *Adams* sin, though many knew not that there was such a one, or what his sin was. "Whereas he saith, its against reason, that a ransom should be paid "for captives upon compact of deliverance, and yet upon payment "those captives not be made free and set at liberty; that Christ "should be a ransom upon compact of deliverance of captives, and "yet the greatest number of them never be released. That is falsly bottomed, for God released All from that deadly destroying sentence, which hath God taken the forfeit of *Adams* sin in that very day, had ruined *Adam* and his whole posterity. Justification of life

is to all, so that they All have life here, and shall (however) be released and brought out of the death that is ordered to them by occasion of *Adams* sin, in the resurrection, so far are all acquitted that if any perish its not in that but in a second Death. Yea all are released also in this regard, that whereas all were cast out of Gods presence, and might not approach to him, now through Christ all have free leave to approach to him, all are commanded to repent and turn to him, to look to him and be saved, whoever will may come and welcome; yea God is so far from keeping them away, that he faults men for not coming to him, *John* 5.40. Now if a ransom be paid for captives, and the prison doors opened, and means afforded for leading them out, and prisoners willingly and stubbornly refuse, but will stay in prison still (as in this later respect many do) shall that be imputed as a defect of justice in him to whom the ransom was paid for them? Surely no, except it could be proved that that was the compact, that he should in that regard compel, and forcibly cause to come out of prison, all that the ransom was paid for; which I am sure Mr. *Owen* will not be able to prove in this matter. Christ no where says to any, God would not have you come to him, you are not included in the ransom, nor that all that he dyed for shall be brought in to him; but he often tels us, God would have them seek him and come to him, and faults them that they will not.

“For that after-shift (as he cals it) of conditional and absolute obtaining of things; it fals not upon me. I affirm that liberty from that first sentence’s execution upon us was absolutely obtained, Justification of life to All. And that liberty is opened in the Gospel to All and men exhorted to enter, and for not striving to enter now, the door comes to be shut upon many (that which they have shall be taken from them, because they liked to have it) and then they cannot enter. Also that all life, remission, and fulness, are absolutely put into Christs hands, only I say the will of God for his dispensation, and so to his proposition of the things to be dispensed (not his obtaining them into his dispose, nor the freeness, and openness of them for men to look after and come to him for them) hath a condition annexed. God wils Christ to dispense them to men upon coming to him, and Christ holds them forth upon that condition to any, Whoever will, let him come, &c. we deny that Christ is bound to make known to all for whom he dyed, the fulness that is in him like evidently, or himself or the way of salvation to all alike expresly,

or

or expresly at all. That all are bound to minde and imbrace what he revealeth to them, is clear, but that he is bound to make known this or that to all he dyed for, I deny that Mr. Owen can any where prove. He may bring infants to himself, and dispense his salvation to them, and yet never give them capacity to hear the condition of salvation; and yet we believe what the Scripture saith, [80] that he is the true light that inlightens every man coming into the world. He is not bound to give every man ten talents alike, open and plain declaration of himself and Father (no not for saving them) but every man is bound to improve and submit to God in what he gives them, be it more or less; and if they do so, he is able and ready to give more (being liberal and free) and can tell how to save them: if not, he is just to take away what they have, and not bound to save them, He being Lord of them. Nor yet say we that men have power of themselves to improve what is given them, but he who gives them the talents, gives them the power too, in which he requires them to improve them, and its not inability, but slothfulness and obstinacy for which they are faulted and condemned by him, because they rather chuse to live idly in themselves, and dy, then stir abroad to seek God, [81] or yeeld to what he brings home to them, and live. Christ, as he is the Truth of God, is the great Physitian of souls, and by revelations of truth both calts to himself for healing, and by further revelations of it to those that come to him, doth heal. [82] The truth shall make you free, and this because He hath given himself a ransom for them in the first place (without which neither ground of calling, nor fitness to heal them) Now this Great Truth of God doth send abroad his beams of divine light, and so some sparklings of himself as the Word of God and God, by vertue of his relation to the humane nature (first virtually and then actually united to him) to men in generall; [83] though not so clearly nor so many beams at all times as in some, nor to All men as to some. Yet to the generality some Beams of truth, [84] & those beams have their force in their leading them to know something of God, & so to seek him groping after him if happily they may finde him; yea such power as that men are fain to suppress and keep them under, and bid them be gone, and shut their eyes against them, lest they work too much upon them. Now though they see not what a one, or who he it whence these beams come, and those operations in their hearts, yet they knowing in their consciences that they ought to obey them, and that it would be better for them so to do

[80] John 1.9.

[81] John 8.31,
32, 34, 36.

[82] John 14.6.

[83] John 1 4,
5, 9,

[84] Rom. 1.
18, 19, 21.
28.

Acts 17
27, & 28.
27.
Job 21.14

(though what that betterness is, they comprehend not) and contrary to that knowledg they have, willfully rebelling; they cannot plead ignorance, total ignorance of this great physitian, but for not obeying what they know, shall be excuse less before him. So that “Mr. Owens “comparison of Christ to a physitian tendring cure, & he wholly unknown, [85] is a mistake also, nor shall men be able to make good that plea when he comes to judge them; though many shall say in respect of his person and fuller appearances, when saw we thee thus and thus? as if they would plead ignorance of him, yet he shall take away that plea from them, making it appear that in such and such *mediums* (as his poor people), [86] he was evidencing himself to them, and presenting himself before them, and there they would not know him. Nor is “he as one tendring a thousand pound to a blinde man on conditi- “on he will see, and yet giving no ability to see: but he in tendring gives forth such light that men see some glimmerings, and bids them look though but with their blinde holes that they may see; which did they, the light would make them see and see more clearly, yea it would turn them, [87] and he would heal them, *Act.* 28.27. but many wilfully (loving their own ease and wils) will not see, lest they should be turned and be healed by him; they see they should listen to him, yea many see that in looking to him they might have healing and yet refuse to look to him, they desire not his healing. Whereas he “saith the condition of faith is procured for us by the death of Christ or not, I shall here say but this, *viz.*

1. That Christ is become an object fit for us to believe on and hope in through his death, which else he had not been for us sinners.

2. That God in Christ hath done so much for All men, and doth so much for them through him, that he deserves highly at their hands to be trusted in by them; I know this agrees not with Mr. Owens principles, yet I shall stand to it against him, that all men have good cause and ground to believe in him, or to betrust themselves to him; and so much we are in preaching Gospel to demonstrate to them (not having sinned to death or blasphemed against the Holy Ghost) Its but a righteous thing for any man to believe in God and in Christ; and its unrighteousness and hainous sin not to believe in him being declared to them, that is, not to commit souls and bodies to him, as to one ready to save them.

3. All the ways and means, with all the power that comes in and with them to inable men to believe, are vouchsafed to men through the

[85] Rom. 1.20.
28.

[86] Matth. 25.
42, 43, 44,
55.

[87] Isa. 42.18.

the Death of Christ: none of them had been afforded to us, had not Christ dyed for us.

4. Its the promise of God to Christ, so to exalt and glorifie him, that some should be brought in to him and be given him to believe, and be his seed.

5. Yea its by the discovery of Gods good-will in the death and resurrection of Christ, that God useth to overcome men to believe, and so his blood and death, as so discovered and set home, redeems men out of their bondage to Sathan, and world, and corruption, *Rev.* 5.9, 10, & 14.4.

But that Christ obliged the Father to make all those men that he dyed for, to walk out in the exercise of such power and liberty of acting, as he should in his gracious dispensations afford them, for attendance to means, receipt of light given, looking up to him in that light, yea to believe in him and rely on him for salvation, this I desire him to prove. Its not proveable by Scripture so far as I can finde, nay I may use this argument against it (bottomed upon Mr. *Owens* own maxime) *viz.* Whatever Christ procured or merited by his oblation, that he intercedes to have collated or bestowed on men: But Scripture no where shews that Christ intercedes for faith (saving faith) to be given to one or other, *Ergo* Scripture no where proves that he procured that by his oblation. The major is Mr. *Owens* own in *cap.* 4.6. & 7. *lib.* 1. The minor is easily proved by Induction, no one place speaking of Christs Intercession mentions his interceding for saving faith; not that platform (as some say) of his Intercession, in *John* 17. as we shewed *lib.* 1. *chap.* 2. if not there, no where else, for in *Rom.* 8.33. he mentions his interceding for Us, men in Christ, believers, but says not for what, much less for faith, that they had already. In *Heb.* 7.25. Its for those that come unto God by him, that some might come to God by him. I leave it for him to finde any one place in which Christ prays that God would make any to believe. Nor will this diminish at all the honor and love due to him, for as “Mr. *Owen* says, We are not to invent ways of honoring “him, but give him that that in the Scripture God gives to him. He produces *Tit.* 3.5, 6, & 2 *Cor.* 5.21. but neither of them say that Christ procured faith for us, as obliging God to give it us; the former shews but how God wrought it in discovering his love, and the latter, that Christ became sin for us; that we might in him (that is in believing in him) be made the righteousness of God; and so that he

opened the way for our believing and making righteous, not that he obliged God to make us, or all that he dyed for, righteously to believe; no more then in *vers.* 15. where He says he dyed for all, that they that live might not henceforth live to themselves, he shews that therefore he obliged God to make all cease from thenceforth to live to themselves, and God performs not his obligation to him, in that so many, even after believing, live so much to themselves, and minde their own things, as *Paul* complaineth. That he shall bring in a seed to him, I grant, but that he is obliged to bring in this or that Individual to be of that seed, muchless all that he dyed for, I no where finde. That in *Eph.* 1.3. & *Phil.* 1.29. We shall meet with afterward, and with the point it self also more fully urged, *viz.* in *lib.* 3. *cap.* 4. where we shall speak to them; only this I shall say to them here, that neither of them say, that Christ by his death obliged the Father to give to this or that, muchless to all he dyed for, effectually to believe in him and to be saved, not a word to that purpose. So that that piece of doctrine, *viz.* That for whom Christ dyed, them he procured faith for, is none of those Scripture-truths that will scatter the supposed clouds and mists. Nor yet follows it, that the whole impetration of Redemption is made unprofitable. For,

1. God hath ingaged himself so to glorifie his Son, that some shall be brought in, though he no were say All he dyed for, nor (that I know of) any particular persons, so as that this or that individuall must, or else he should be unjust.

2. He shall have much glory from his good, bounteous, and merciful dispensations to men through the Death of Christ, that yet he compels not to believe on Christ; [88] yea in the just and righteous condemnation of those that sin'd against that mercy, and refused to submit to him. For that condition upon which he supposes we will "say Christ is to bestow salvation, *viz.* so they do not refuse or resist "the means of grace; Its a mistake, we know no such imposition put upon him, for men may receive the means, and yet rebel against the grace it self that comes in them, have a form and deny the power of godliness, and for that perish; "Though that all Pagans and "infidels are left destitute of all means leading them to seek after "God, or that any that have no outward means from Christ, nor "ever resist Gods workings in them, shall be condemned, as Mr. *Owen* would perswade us, I leave for him to prove. Christ says to the Jews

[88] Matt. 22.
2, 3, 4, 5.
with Rom.
11.36.

Jews, that if he had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin; and for ought I know, If Christ neither come in Word, [89] nor in any spiritual way (as he preached to the old world by his Spirit) if any such he can finde, they may not have sin charged on them to condemnation, and destruction. Yet if Mr. *Owen* can shew me otherwise, I will believe it. For making Christ but a half Mediator, its frivolous, yet we shall speak to it, *lib.* 3. *c.* 3. where it occurs again. That Christ did not dye for any on condition of their believing, I believe; nor that he dyed only for the Elect of God, that they should believe, nor finde I any Scripture calling any man while yet in and of the world, an Elect person. He dyed for All, that being Lord of them, and presenting his light to them according to the good pleasure of the Father, whosoever believes might not perish, but have eternal life. And here ends this Second Book, and my Answers to it.

The

The Third Book.

His third Book contains Arguments (grounded for the most part upon his former premises) against the universality of the Death of Christ, we shall (Favente Deo) orderly view them.

CHAP. I.

An answer to his two first Arguments contained in his first Chapter of this Book.

The first Chapter contains two Arguments, As

[Argu. 1]



From the nature of the Covenant of Grace, established, ratified, and confirmed in and by the Death of Christ. His Argument runs thus.

“The effects of the death of Christ cannot be extended beyond the compass of the new Covenant (or Christ died only for those that are within the New Covenant) But this Covenant was not made universally with all, but particularly onely with some. Therefore those alone were intended in the benefits of the death of Christ. A very vitious Argument, whereof the Conclusion contains a *quartus terminus*, for instead of any *effects*, the term propounded in the *Major*, He says the *benefits* therein (as is clear by what follows in him) comprehending the choice benefits of the death of Christ applied. The *Major* also is ambiguous

ambiguous and uncertain. For either it is universal, as No effect of the death of Christ, &c. or else particular, as Some do not, &c. If the latter, its impertinent, and concludes not against the death of Christ for All, but onely its having some effects in All, which is besides the thing in question; if the former, as I suppose he intends it, then I deny it. I deny, I say, that Christ died for none (or that none have any effect of his death extended to them) but onely such as with whom the New Testament is made. He brings no other proof for it (which he perhaps therefore lisped in, because he saw himself weak in the proof of it) but onely from that title given to his blood, that its called *The blood of the New Testament*. So that his Argument to prove that, runs thus. *Its called the blood of the New Testament*, Therefore shed onely for them, that are heirs of the New Testament. Which is like this, The Spirit is called the *Spirit of Comfort, and the Comforter*, Therefore whoever it works upon, it comforts them; and so when it convinces the world of sin, its their comforter too, and when it kindles the fire of *Tophet*, *Isai.* 30.33. it comforts them that are tormented with it. A wilde Argument! and yet such is his. The truth is, As its an office of the Spirit to comfort, and he is a Comforter to all that obey him; so is it an office of the blood of Christ, or rather one end of its shedding, to ratifie the new Covenant, which it also doth to all that believe in it: But as that is not all the work, or business of the Spirit, to comfort, so neither was that all the work or end of the blood of Christ to establish the new Covenant; but first of all to ransom from the death that was passed upon men; and then to confirm a Covenant to the house of *Israel* and *Judah*, This blood where ever its tendered, the Covenant is tendred with it; *Hear and your souls shall live, and I will make an everlasting Covenant with you, the sure mercies of David*, and he that obeys this, is entred into Covenant by it; but not All for whom it was shed, are in Covenant by its shedding; no more then all for whom the water of Purification was made, were therefore purified, because it was made for them, and called the water of Purification, *Numb.* 19 9.20.

Mr. *Owen* also mistakes the parties with whom the Covenant is made. For he understands them to be a certain number of persons yet lying in the world, and that its one clause of the Covenant to give them faith, or make them to believe; whereas indeed (especially as pertaining to the Gentiles) the proper object with whom

the Covenant is made, is the called of God, believers in Christ Jesus, into those mens hearts God will put his fear (not to bring them to him, but) to keep them from departing from him (which argues their being brought to him before) these shall have the Law written in their hearts; an allusion to the old Testament written in Tables of Stone, not before they were brought out of *Egypt*, but after they were Baptized into *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and were come to Mount *Sinai*. The Apostle alluding to that, tells the believing *Hebrews*, partakers of the heavenly Call (*Heb.* 3.1.) that they were not come to Mount *Sinai*, to have a Law of works and death put upon them, but to Mount *Sion* ★ to hear him that speaks from heaven (and so intimately to have the Law writ in their hearts) *Heb.* 12.18, 22, 24, 25. in which they came also to the blood of sprinkling. He doth not say, they were come to Mount *Sion* while they were yet uncalled, but in obeying the Call, they came thither to meet with, and receive the new Covenant opposed to the Covenant made with their Fathers at Mount *Sinai*. That that confirms me in this belief, is this, that it is by faith that we are made of one body with the *Israel* of God, and are no where called the seed of *Promise*, or *Israel of God*, till brought to Christ: but then we are all one with the believing *Jews*, *Jews* in the inner man, the Circumcision, the seed of *Abraham*, and heirs according to *Promise*, *Gal.* 3.26. 29. Now the Covenant spoken of, is made with the house of *Israel* and *Judah*. If Mr. *Owen* think men to be fæderates in that Covenant before faith, let him shew me that any unbelieving *Gentiles* or uncalled, are called by the name of *Israel* and *Judah*.

Besides, That the promises of God are made with Christ, *Gal.* 3. 16. and are in him, *yea, and Amen*, 2 *Cor.* 1.20. But if any yet out of Christ, should be fæderates while out of him, then they should have a larger object then Christ, and a larger performance then in Christ Jesus. But I say this, *ex abundanti*, to the *Minor*, it being sufficient to the overthrow of the Argument, that the *Major* is proofless. Whereas Mr. *Owen* makes the difference between the Old and New Testament to be, That this Covenants the giving of Faith, and that not, I deny it, and say, The difference between them is in this, That was carnal, weak, and afforded not such operation of Spirit; This spiritual, powerful, and full of life, writing Gods teachings in the heart, whereas that writ them but without in Books or Tables
of

★ Whence
the Law of
Grace go-
eth forth.
Isai. 2.3.

of Stones. That propounded Precepts and Promises, but gave not the performance; This in Teaching conforms the heart to Gods VVill, and gives in the enjoymment, and accomplishment of the promises; whence, as the Apostle saith, *The righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in us that walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, Rom. 8.* 4. That this Covenant is propounded conditionally too, to those that are not yet believers, we have shewed before in *Isai. 55.3.* So that no man short of believing can say (as Mr. Owens Objection supposeth;) The Lord hath promised *To write his Law in our hearts*, but if we listen to Christ, he will write them in our hearts; but to the believer in Christ, to him that is Christs, the Covenant is free, he being the proper heir of it, as is before shewed. He repeats his Argument again in the winding up of the Argument. “That the “blood of Jesus Christ, was the blood of the Covenant, and his Oblation was intended onely for procuring the things intended and “promised thereby, and therefore it cannot have respect to All, &c. That it procured the good things contained in the Covenant, or rather that he ingages the performance of them to the called (for I think the word (*{ἐγγυς}* *sponsor*) hath rather that signification then of a *procurer*) we grant, and to that the Quotation of *Heb. 7.22.* is pertinent, but his inference from thence is yet unproved, as we have shewed. And so we have seen the fallacy and weakness of this Argument.

2. His second Argument is thus. “*That if the Lord intended, [Argu. 2] that “he should (and so Christ by his death did) procure pardon of sin, and “reconciliation with God, for all and every one, to be actually enjoyed “upon condition that they do believe, then ought this good will and intention of God, with this purchase in their behalf by Jesus Christ be made “known to them by the Word, that they might believe, for faith comes “by hearing, &c. otherwise men may be saved without faith in, and “the knowledg of Christ, or else the purchase is plainly in vain; “but all men have not those things declared to them, in and by the “Word, &c.*

To this Argument many things may be answered, [*Answ.*] As

1. That it concludes not against the Assertion that he undertook to oppose, in *lib. 1. cap. 1. pag. 4. viz.* That Christ gave himself a ransom for all, and every one. But against his intention of purchasing pardon and reconciliation for All, to be enjoyed upon condition of believing, which is a fallacy that we call *Ignoratio elenchi.*

2. Again, The Antecedent of the *Major* contains, and crowds together divers questions, which is another fallacy in arguing. As with this, Of Christs dying for All, it jumbles Gods intention of his procuring Reconciliation and Pardon, and the intention of bestowing it, and upon what condition. Now these are three distinct questions, *viz.* First, Whether Christ died for All? The thing he set himself to oppose. Secondly, Whether in dying for them he procured Reconciliation, and forgiveness for all? And Thirdly, Whether he procured it for All, with intention that they all should enjoy it upon condition of believing? The first of these, I absolutely affirm, and Mr. *Owen* denies. The second, I thus affirm, That for the offence of *Adam*, and the condemnation that came upon All therefore, he hath procured justification or pardon for All; so as that God dealeth with All after another manner, then according to its Merit, and the Obligation to Death that came thereby. And for their other sins, there is with him a treasury of Forgiveness and Redemption, full and free for All. So as that (in answer to the third) All may have forgiveness of all their sins, and Reconciliation upon believing in him; and it was his intention, that whosoever of All (yea, were it All) believe in him, should have forgiveness of sins, and be reconciled to God by him. Whence its propounded to men in general upon that condition in the Gospel. But yet, neither is that condition upon which God propounds it, to be confounded (as Mr. *Owen* here doth) with the act of purchasing it, and Gods intention therein; nor may we binde up God to that condition in his dispensing it, nor his intention of forgiving and saving men, in his giving Christ to dye for them: as if because All, or Any may have it (according to the Gospel-tender) upon believing, therefore he intended that none should have it that have not that believing condition. For I dare not say, That God intended not that any Infant dying in its Cradle, or deaf man that never heard any word at all, should have forgiveness or salvation by vertue of Christs purchase, because they have not that act of believing that comes by hearing; whence also,

3. I deny the consequence of the major proposition, if by [*ought to made known*] he means (as I suppose he doth) that God ought or is bound so to have done (for that word [*ought*] may be otherwise applyed as we shall see anon) for though its true that whosoever by hearing the word believes, shall have remission, yet God nor tying himself

himself in his dispensation thereof to that condition (for them to dy in infancy, and to be born and continue deaf to death, should be necessary evidences of reprobation, which I think none is so hardy as to affirm) it will follow that God is not bound to that making known to every one the purchase and intention spoken of, lest he should be frustrate of his intention. Besides that a man may possibly be brought to believe and receive forgiveness, that never heard of that purchase and intention, and yet their Faith may come by hearing too, a man may be brought to believe that God is, & is a rewarder of them that seek him (which is as much as the Apostle says is of necessity for coming to him, *Heb.* 11.6.) yea many have believed so much that have not known of Christs death, or that he should dy, muchless of the purchase and intention of God in his death. As the Disciples had faith, and so had *Cornelius* too, such as in which they were accepted of God before they understood that Christ should dye, and by dying purchase them forgiveness and reconciliation, and doubtless many of the Ancients heard less then they of him, as *Rahab*, *Ruth*, *Naaman*. and many others, so that at least a making known to all (for so he intends) so much as he speaks of, would not necessarily appertain to God, though the Antecedent were granted in the very form in which he puts it. Indeed God binds us to preach and declare in these last dayes since the ascension of Christ, this his purchase and intention, and men are bound to give credit to it when preached, that so they might the better be brought to him, and they that keep back that doctrine from men, if they perish, are guilty of their blood: but God hath not by any thing he hath done, or by his intention therein, bound himself to make known to every, one for whom he hath so done, that his intention & doing. A Prince may ransom from destruction a Nation appointed thereto for some default against their Sovereign, with intention that every one that obeys his counsels shall enjoy the priviledges of free subjects, and so that they all shall have such priviledges so obeying, & yet that may put no ingagement upon him, to cause every particular of them to know what he hath done for them, & what was his intention therein, especially too they never knowing distinctly how they came to be lyable to their ruine from which he ransomed them; only he may propound (though at a distance from them, and as to persons unknown to them) some advices and counsels, in obeying which he may do to them as he intended, and in disobeying them frustrate them of the otherwise intend-

ed benefits; yea and order punishment also to them without any absurdity or crosness to his intention.

4. The words [*ought to be made known*] may signifie, It ought to be made known by men, such as are the messengers of Christ and preachers of the word, and then indeed we grant it to be a truth, that All ought to have it made known to them by us to the utmost of our opportunities and abilities; and so it reproves Mr. *Owen*, and many other Ministers for their faultiness herein, because they not only make not known to All without restrictions this good will and purchase of Christ for them, but they on the contrary make it uncertain to men whether Christ dyed for them or not, yea hinder and oppose the making known this good will to All men; I would they would cease to do what they ought not, and do as they ought.

5. But then, The minor of this Argument is faulty and contains a *Quartus terminus*, for whereas he should have assumed thus, But this purchase, good will and intention, ought not to be made known to All, he hath assumed thus, All have not these things made known to them in and by the word: But who sees not that between what men have, and what they ought to have, there is a great difference? God may have done what appertains to him, not only in giving to *Adam* and *Noah* the knowledg of his truth, though less clearly, that it might be propagated by one to another sucessively in all their generations, but also and that more clearly, in giving it forth to his servants to be made known to All Nations for the obedience of faith, willing all to come to the knowledg of it, as indeed he hath done *Rom.* 16.25, 26. 1 *Tim.* 2.4. and yet those to whom this charge of divulging it appertains, being slothful and negligent herein, and others not coming to it, when, and as held forth to them, as in many divulgers and others is too true, they may not have what they ought to have, and might have had, had the will of God afore-said been obeyed by them. So that this argument the further we look into it, the less hurt it doth us; But I shall say no more to it, lest I be too tedious: many passages he hath about it, are but the same with what we had *lib.* 2. *cap. ult.* where I have answered them, and shall not need here again further to repeat. Only whereas he saith, "*The Spirit forbad the Apostles to go to sundry places with the word,*" as if God would not have some hear of his word, though they might have had it: the places he aims at are, *Acts* 16.6, 7. where

Paul

Paul assaying to go to *Asia* and *Bithinia*, were forbidden; this is to be noted, that that was not because he would not have the Gospel preached to them, but because the Apostle not being able to go two ways at once, and there being others whom God pleased to prefer, sent them elsewhere first, ordering others to preach at those places, or the same to preach there when the other work was over: therefore the Holy Ghost as if he would give us an account of this action, to prevent our rash misprisions particularly names these places to have been peculiarly preached to; As concerning *Asia* we have a fuller testimony then of any other place, *Acts* 19.10. All that dwelt in *Asia* heard the word of the Lord; and for *Bithinia*, there were many believing people scattered abroad in it, as appears in 1 *Pet.* 1.1. who were to shine as lights, and shew forth the praises of him that called them in the places where they lived.

Again, whereas in the conclusion of this Argument he saith, “*That Paul tels us that by the works of creation they might be led to know his eternal power and Godhead: but that they should know any thing of a Redemption and a Redeemer, was utterly impossible.*”

I answer, first, That its not material. If Christ interposing himself between them and the blow of justice, preserved and rescued them from that, and then gave them no other hints of light and knowledge of God, but in his works, then he required the less of them again, for where less is given less is looked for again; he looked but that they should feel after him so discovered, and glorifie him with thankfulness as they came to know him, as in *Act.* 17.27. *Rom.* 1.19, 21. come to him as believing that he is, and is a rewarder of them that seek him. And its for not answering that little that he faults & condemns them; he not judging them according to that they had not, nor according to the sin of *Adam* that I can finde, but according to their imprisoning, abusing and not liking to retain and yield to what they had, as is plain, *Rom.* 1.18, 19, 20, 21, 28. And its all one to give less and look for less, as to give a great deal more, and look for more in point of Retributive justice: and then,

2. It was not impossible for them to come know a Redemption and a Redeemer, because that God that was evidenced to them in the works of Creation and Providence, being glorified according to those hints given, was able and sufficient to have revealed the Mediator, as he did reveal him to *Job* and *Abraham* and to many others. All the Scriptures cannot bring a soul to Sonship in Christ

or

or cause it to apprehend the glory of Gods Grace, so as to transform it into his Image, by all a mans reading and searching into them, without God add his Spirit: is that a good excuse for a man to slight the Scriptures? No, let men attend to God in his means afforded, and do what he wills them, and inables them to, and leave the success to God; if he cannot shew men by his Spirit, that that the means cannot without it, then the case is altered; but being he can do what he will, they are guilty of depriving themselves of greater mercies, that bury their talent in the earth, and improve not what they have given them in mercy. He that is unfaithful in a little, would be so in greater things, and he cannot plead against God for the insufficiency of those means to reveal Christ, who yielded not to obey God in the means, who had all sufficiency in himself beyond the means to do him good, and bring him to Christ.

CHAP. II.

An Answer to three other Arguments in his second Chapter.

His third Argument is thus. [*Argu. 3*] “*If Christ died for All that is purchased and procured eternal redemption for All, then he either “did it absolutely or conditionally: but he did it neither absolutely nor “conditionally.* To which I Answer, That he again jumbles together the purchase of Christ with his intention of bestowing, and puts all this into the act of his dying for men, which is fallacious. We say, That Christ died as a ransom for All, from what was upon them, as binding them over to destruction (previous to his coming) and obtained eternal Redemption in himself of the Humane Nature from all those miseries that it was plunged into, with power of dispensing thereof to All or Any; and this purchase of it into himself was absolutely, but the dispensing it is conditional, *viz*, upon their coming to him for it. There is no condition in his purchasing any thing on our part, but there is condition in the propounding the things purchased. Now Mr. Owen confounds these together, and therein is fallacious, as in the former Chapter we have noted. As for Christs purchasing faith, (that is, ingaging God to give it to this or that particular) as we have said something to it, in *cap. 4. lib. 2.* So the fuller speaking to it, we reserve to its proper place in *lib. 3. cap 4.* The necessity

necessity of making known the condition upon which he is to dispense life, we spake to in the former Chapter, as also of mens power in themselves to perform it, we have formerly spoken to. I shall onely add this here, That if God gives men means of faith, and evidences to them that there they ought to seek him, and they put away those means, they justly deprive themselves of that divine supernatural power for working faith on God and Christ, which, had they yieled to the means, and to the light in them, he might probably have wrought. If *Naaman* refuse to wash in *Jordan*, which God gave him power to do, God may justly deny to heal him, nay, he deprives himself of that Almighty power that God was ready to give forth in those waters to heal him. And so, If the *Israelites* refused to look to the *Brasen Serpent*, &c. Such is the case here, Faith comes by hearing, and that is of the Word of God. Now if God give men his VVord, and opportunities of hearing it, and they either refuse to hear, or when God gives them to discern something in hearing, shut their eyes, and refuse to look upon it, they are justly deprived of that faith, conversion, and healing, which would have followed. And that by such doings men do often deprive themselves of such further favors that God would have bestowed on them, is evident in *Psal.* 81.11, 12, 13, 14, 15. *Isai.* 48.17, 18. *If they had hearkened to his voice, then he would have subdued their enemies, and their peace should been as the rivers, and their righteousness as the waves of the sea, &c.* If men refuse to do that that God gives them power to do, its just with God to withhold that that is the proper work of his power to do. So that the case here is not with men, as in such comparisons as *Mr. Owen* makes of conditions impossible in themselves, and in which they with whom they are possible will not help. For in this matter God both prevents with grace, and makes things possible, and requires obedience to that possibility, and is also ready to help, and promises to help in the day of that his grace, and therefore exhorts not to receive his grace in vain; onely he deals not with all in a compulsize or like powerful way. But as with *Israel* in the VVilderness, He was with them, and went before them, and would have led them safely to Rest, and they followed Him, but refusing to follow Him, as they might have done, He gave them over; So God, in his preventing Operations, doth give men power and liberty to means propounded, and is at hand to make those impossibilities possible, and attainable; but men (as the *Israelites*

of old) say, the walls are high, and we cannot enter, and will not walk out in what God gives them, nor go in that way where they might experiment him, making rough ways plain, and hard things easie, and so they miss of the experiments of his Divine Power that are needful for them, and then they fault Him for it. As the Proverb saith, *The foolishness of a man perverts his way, and then his heart frets against the Lord*, Prov. 19.2. And a sluggard refuses to put forth his strength God gives him, and then saith, to colour over the matter, *A Lyon is in the way*. Just so is it here, men stifle, and refuse to walk in what they have power and freedom from God to, and then they put it off with this, The business is too hard for them, and God gave them not grace to it. And truly Mr. Owen, and many other such Preachers do frame such excuses to their mouths, telling them, “*That either God purposed to work faith in them or not, If not, its in vain for them to wait, nay, he would that they should not believe: his not willing it, is a willing it should not be. His calling upon them to believe, is but as if the King should bid the Captives at Algiers free themselves from their enemies, that they can in no wise do, and then he will pay a ransom for them. If he did, then they must have it, they shall not need to take any care about it, &c.*” which passages as they contain notable falsities and dissimilitudes, as may appear by what is already said; so they serve to justifie the wicked in what ever they do, putting this plea into their mouths, even as high as the sin of *Adam* it self, God willed not that it should be otherwise, Therefore he would have it thus, and, God afforded no Grace for that he called for, &c. contrary to his own sayings, *I would have gathered, and ye would not, yea I purged you, and ye were not purged, &c.* But I pass it.

To that Position of some, *That God bestows faith on some, and not on others*, He asks, *Did Christ purchase that distinguishing love or not?* To which I say, That if by love he means the Will of God, that some should be effectually brought in rather than others (as he, with others, defines it to be *Velle bonum creaturis*) I do not see any such thing held forth in Scriptures. I finde that Christ came to do Gods VVill towards men, not to purchase him to will more to these than those men. If by Love he means the actings forth of his good-will upon men according to Gods purpose, then I say, by satisfying for, and removing the sin that obstructed, and stood between us and good things, he opened a way for God, according to his good will,

to

to bestow things on men, and so may be said to purchase their bestowing. Nor yet follows it (as Mr. Owen objects) “*That those that are saved, have no more to thank Christ for, then those that are damned, contrary to Rev. 1.5.* For those that God peculiarly brings in to him, those he taking as a special gift of him, washes in his blood (as in that Scripture mentioned) and so sets them free, and actually brings them, or buyes them off from their pollutions, idols, bondages, and makes them clean, and so presents them to his Father, as meet for his Fellowship and Delight, to them he gives his Spirit, imparts his Minde, gives them the priviledges and inheritance of sons with himself, &c. And is this nothing worth the believers thanking Christ for, more then they have that perish? Though for the bringing to Christ, the Apostles manner is in especial to give thanks to the Father, *Giving thanks to the Father, who hath made us meet to partake of the inheritance of the Saints in light, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son,* Col. 1.13, 14. For Christs purchasing faith, which Mr. Owen repeates over and over, in almost every Chapter, VVe shall meet with it more fully in *Chap. 4.* to which I refer it. And to conclude the Answer to the Argument, Christs dying conditionally, I disclaim. His death was absolutely undertaken, and undergone for All, but the life in him is on condition propounded in the Gospel unto All.

His fourth Argument is this. “*If God by his eternal purpose distinguished All men into two sorts, and Christ is peculiarly affirmed to die for one of those sorts, and no where for them of the other, then he did not die for All. But God hath so distinguished All men into two sorts, Loved and Hated, Elect and Reprobate, Church and World, &c. and saith, he died for the one, but never for the other, Ergo. &c.*” [Argu. 4]

Both these Propositions are weak and erronious, therefore the Conclusion is necessarily erronious too. For first, He is not able to prove the Consequence of the Major; for its possible that God making such a distinction of men, might yet give his Son to die for both sorts, especially if that distinction, though made in his purpose, be made upon man as fore-considered, [91] in a condition consequent to Christs Death for them, as that of Election and Reprobation is. Election beging in Christ, and Predestination to conformity to him in his Death, &c. which presupposes him as interposing and dying, as the Prototype, to which they are to be conformed; [Answ.]

[91] Ephes. 1 4.
Rom. 8.
29.30.
Jer 6 30.
2 Thes. 2.
10.11.

and Reprobation (though according to Gods free VVill) yet for rejecting Christ, or the mercies afforded through him; for of no other to damnation do I read in Scripture. Its just such another Argument as this. If God have distinguished All men into two sorts, good and bad, godly and wicked, righteous and unrighteous, and says peculiarly of one sort; He preserves and keeps them, and never says so of the other, then he doth not afford preservation to All; But he hath so distinguished men; And he saith, The Lord preserves the righteous, and preserves all that put their trust in him, &c. But never says, He preserves them that hate him, the unrighteous and wicked, &c. Therefore he doth not preserve any of them.

2. His *Minor* is false, That he no where saies, He died for the other sort. For first, He that says he died for All, and the whole world, includes both sorts, and if he express his death in words, including both sorts, then its equivalent to his distinct mentioning of both. As he that saith, God made of one blood all Nations that dwell on the earth, and that he is the Saviour of All men, says as much, as if he had said, He made, and is the Saviour of good and bad, righteous and sinners, godly and ungodly, elect and reprobate, &c. and yet the Scripture never uses those expressions. Now the Scriptures use as general expressions about Christs death, as it doth about the Creation, All, every one, the benefit to All men, the propitiation for the whole world; and therefore having these general expressions, comprehensive of both, it is as much as both distinctly.

2. This distinction is in part thus, The Church and the world, believers and the unjust, godly and ungodly: now the Scripture useth these expressions that are in the worsen part of this distinction, as *The ungodly*, Rom. 5.6, 8. *The unjust*, 1 Pet. 3.18. The world, 2 Cor. 5, 19. 1 Joh. 2.2. *False teachers that bring upon themselves swift destruction*, 2 Pet. 2.1. So that his *Minor* is evidently false.

If it be Objected, That its never said, He died for the Reprobate. I answer, No more have we this expression, He died for the Elect. If that its never said For the vessels of Wrath, so it is never said For the vessels of Mercy, &c. I say these expressions are not in the Scriptures. And indeed there is good reason it should not be said for Reprobates, Goats, vessels of Wrath, &c. because God gave not Christ for them as such; no more then its said, He created Reprobates, Devils, ungodly Men, because they were not such as created by him, but they after declined from him, and were rejected by

by him. So we say Christ dyed not for men as Reprobates, Goats, appointed to wrath, for they were the objects of these Decrees as viewed in an after-condition, as neglecting, refusing and rejecting, the goodness of God and grace afforded through Christs mediation; for that he says in answer to our exception, that its no where us only, sheep only, &c. we have taken it off before. Creation and preservation and resurrection and judgment, are also spoken of and applyed to *Israel* and believers, when they are spoken of with some distinction from, & opposition to others, and yet in none of them are those expressions sufficient to prove that they are applicable to them only. One instance for Creation we gave in, *Isa.* 43.14, 15. there is another like it in *Isa.* 64.8. We are the clay & thou art the potter, and yet the whole precedent part of the Chap. with the latter end of the former, speaks in a distinguishing way between the people of God & their adversaries. So for preservation, The Lord preserveth the faithful *Psal.* 31.23. and the Lord preserveth all them that love him, and yet there are oppositions between them and others, so for judgement, *Deut.* 32.36. The Lord shall judg his people, and they distinguished from their enemies. So for Resurrection, *Rom.* 8.9, 11. there is an opposition of them that have not the Spirit of Christ in them, and them that have; and its said, If the Spirit of Christ dwell in you he shall quicken your mortal bodies: Whether from those and the like expressions its safe to say, God created and preserveth none but his people *Israel*, the righteous, &c. will quicken the bodies of and judg none but his people, and such as have Christs spirit dwelling in them, I leave to any rational man to judg. And whereas he says, “*By the same reason in other places when its said Christ is the “the way, the life, the resurrection, It pleased God that in him should “all fulness dwell, We might except too, and say, its not said, Its he only “and in him only.*” I answer the case is unlike, For if the Scriptures say so in other places, or extend it not in any other place to others, its boldness to extend it; but if the Scripture in other places affirms it of others, we may then well speak against the putting in an *only*, to limit other Scriptures. The first is the case of those places, the latter of this in controversie, so that this exception is very answer-able; as for his confidence, that It may be further urged: when and where it is so, I hope I shall further answer it. In the mean time I have said enough to shew the vanity of this Argument.

5. His fifth Argument is, [*Argu.* 5] *That the Scripture no where says Christ*

died for all men, which is vain and evidently false, as was shewed *lib. 2. chap. 3.* The expression is plain, the righteousness of one (which I think all must grant to be his obedience to the Death) to All men to justification of life, {ἕως πάντας ἀνθρώπους}. So he is the propitiation for the whole Worlds sins, *Joh. 2.2.* So the expression in *1 Tim. 2.6.* & *Heb. 2.9.* & *2 Cor. 5.14, 15.* are equivalent to an expresse mention of All men, as hath been shewed; And its against reason to say (as Mr. *Owen* intimates) that the Apostle there means all his Elect, his Church, children; seeing in those places where those expressions are, there is no mention of Election or Elect, Church, or Believers, to which the words may rationally be joyned, and its against reason to think that the Apostle in his writing should more respect other writings, other Books or Chapters to refer his Adjectives to some words in them, or to some following verses in the same Chapters, then to such substantives as he in the scope & drift of those Scriptures in which those Adjectives are, and in the preceding verses of it was manifestly speaking about, which in those places, its manifest are Men. Besides we might retort (and let Mr. *Owen* minde it) that no Scripture says in *terminis*, Christ died for his Church, Children, Elect, no one such expression: that in *John 11.52.* (which he points to) is not, He died for the children of God, but that he might gather into one the children of God. In *Eph. 5.26, 27.* (his other proof) its, He gave himself for his Church, which might be in exchange, thus, He gave himself to her to be hers, that she might be his, holy to him. So *Acts 20.28.* He purchased the Church by his blood, that is by the preaching and presentation of his blood, (foreshed) with the benefits thereby ratified to all that believe, and so gathered in or acquired and obtained (as the word {περιποιέομαι} signifies properly) them to be his Church. So that we might as colourably deny those sayings, as he That Christ died for All men, to be the Scriptures expressions. But enough hath been said to this fore-answered vain and false Argument.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

An Answer to his third Chapter containing two other Arguments.

HIS sixth Argument is, “*That for whom Christ dyed, he dyed as a Sponsor in their stead: But he dyed not so for all, &c.*” How much he puts into the word *Sponsor*, I know not well, but in their stead he dyed I grant; though his proofs might be questioned whether they will evince it. A man may dy for another, that is, for his sake to do him good, when the other man perhaps should not have dyed had not he dyed, and so not in a way of commutation: and if he might in any way dye for all, and not so for all, then his *major* is invalid; but yet I say I will grant that and deny his *minor*, but then he saith it will follow. That, 1. “*He freed them all from the anger and wrath of God, and guilt of death which he underwent for them.*” To which I say that will not follow, It will follow then, that he freed them from the death they should have dyed, but not from all the anger or displeasure that occasioned him to sentence to that death as in this case. A malefactor of an evil disposition is condemned to dye for some evil fact; the day determined, and way prescribed; another steps in and intreats for his life, to see if clemency may win him, or however that he may be more excuseless if he persist after this mercy shewed in his wickedness to a new condemnation, and whereas the sentence is to be executed, he tenders satisfaction, perhaps to dy for him: upon this the others life is given him, but that the other being ill disposed must needs be now made a favourite, or all the Kings anger wholly turned from him, it follows not; he may testifie yet such displeasure against him, as ill-conditioned: as to let him live at a distance from him, & not put all his anger or displeasure with him apart, so as to bring him into his favor & fellowship, till this his accepting another for him, and giving him conveniences for life though at a distance, with other means for winning him to a better disposition, work upon him and make him better. So when *Joab* had mediated for *Absalom*, and the King had reversed his sentence of Banishment, yet he was not well pleased with him. Suppose *Joab* had done it by exchange, become a banished man that *Absalom* might be called home, it would not follow that therefore *David* must receive him into his Court and make him a favorite, not being changed in his disposition,

disposition: Indeed he could not justly banish him and the other too, accepting that change for him, but he might justly yet shew displeasure toward him, and only receive him into favor as he submits to him. So is the case here, Reconciliation (and Justification with admission into favor) suppose more then only satisfaction by way of commutation of punishment. It presupposes also the parties submission to, and compliance with him that he is Re-conciled to. Reconciliation is when two parties agree, not when one accepts the punishment of a third for a seconds fault, he still retaining his evil disposition. And when men are Reconciled, that is, brought to Gods terms and into Gods favor, then he justifies them, so as to pronounce them and accept them as righteous. Therefore let this be minded that I lay down as a positive truth. That though Christ suffered by way of commutation of penalty (and therein sustained acts of displeasure from God against the sin of man) yet he did not suffer by way of commutation of affection; that is, God was better pleased with his Son in all his suffering, when his humane nature was under all its punishment, then with any man unconverted, while unconverted, though Christ hath dyed for him, and he be exempted from that punishment. He was wel-pleased in his Son, in that he bare all our sufferings, and he is angry with those for whom he suffered while not submitted to him. And indeed if Mr. *Owen* thinks that Christ suffering for mens sins, takes off all wrath and anger from those for whom he suffers, then I would have him tell me, whether Christ suffered not for all the sins of the Elect? I know he says Yes: Then I demand whether any anger of God comes or lies upon any of them at any time? If he say No, then he speaks contrary to many Scriptures, and to his own contests with the *Socinians* in chap. 8. & 9. If Yes, then he overthrows his own inferences here, and shews that he goes too far, when from the *minor* granted he infers, “*Then they reconciled, justified, and imputed righteous, &c.* And in this also is answered that objection from *Joh. 3.36. The wrath of God abides on him.* That is, God never comes to be at one with and welpleased with him, nor he ever comes to see life. As if *Joab* changing sentence of banishment with *Absalom*, and *Absalom* when called home refusing by all loving Arguments to submit himself to *David*, *Davids* displeasedness with him abides, and some testimonies of it (as keeping him at a distance) abide on him, he never admits him to see his face; yea for persisting in Rebellion after this favor shewed him

him, He takes away his life from him. In which also his second inference with the several branches of it are answered, as also they are before, lib. 1. chap. 2. for whereas he infers that 2. “*Then Christ made satisfaction for the sin of all and every man*; Its granted, as to that or those sins that brought that sentence of death upon men, which occasioned, and (as it were in the order revealed) required Christs coming to satisfy for them, that lire might be afforded to men and goodness extended to their persons. See *chap. 3. lib. 1.* But his Assumption here (viz. “*That he hath not satisfied for all the sin of All*, contains a quartus terminus, as I appeal to learned judgment. *Joab* might by commutation have satisfied to the penalty upon *Ab-salom*, imposed for all his evil past, and yet it follows not from thence, that in that commutation (supposed) he satisfied for whatever should follow his return from banishment; and so his after-rebellion. His three following reasons then brought to prove that Christ satisfied not for all the sins of every man, fall as so many prevarications with his Assumption. As for Christs satisfying justice for them that were in hell before, we have answered it in *chap. 2. lib. 1.* we might a little alter his *simile* and illustrate it thus. A company of malefactors being condemned to dy, one promises such a sum of money for their lives and freedoms from that sentence, obtains it, the sentence is reversed, they are provided for and preserved, and greater favor is profered to them upon terms of compliance with him against whom they had sinned; many of them rebell a second time, and are taken and condemned anew and executed, others of them are won and become obedient subjects, and all this before the promised payment is performed. I ask now; seeing he that bought their lives had his bargain for that he compacted for, shall it be thought injustice for him who upon that promise spared their lives, to demand his Covenants, because they being then spared, afterward rebelled, and were anew condemned and executed? the case is like here: If God gave such and such favors to men upon Christs promise of payment, shall not he pay for it upon whose score he gave them, what ere in the after estate become of them? His *Dilemma* is the same *verbatim* which we had in *Chap. 3. Lib. 1.* Where we gave it its answer.

His seventh Argument is, “*For whom Christ dyed, for them he is a Mediator.* I conceive thats true, for I think his dying for them [Argu. 7] was an high act of Mediation or coming between God and them.

T

“But

“*But* (says he) *He is not Mediator for All*, because then he must be Priest too for them, which he brings no proof for. *Joab* mediated for *Absalom*, yet was no Priest for him; neither proves he that he is not Priest for All, not that he applies not that deliverance from the death that they should have dyed, which by his dying he procured for them, to All. So that here we have a groundless, profoeless Argument: though he saith it needs no proof, yet I think it needs more proof then he can bring for it in every particular. Object. “*But this makes but Christ at most an half Mediator*. Ans. But why so? If a man undertake to mediate for another to have his life spared, and obtains what he undertakes, shall that be imputed an injury in him, because in so doing he did not also undertake he should never sustain any anger for any after-folly? If Christ do his work he undertook in Mediation, and that to satisfaction to the justice and will of God, who shall dare to call him but a half-Mediator; because many a man refusing to make use of his Mediation in higher things, that is, to come to God by him, deprive themselves of the further acts of it, which he tels them they shall have if they will be ruled by him. A King and some Subjects are at difference, they are attached, condemned, and must dy. A third between them comes and procures that the sentence shall be reversed, and favor shewed them from the King, and then goes to them and tels them, if they will follow his counsel and be ruled by him, as he hath procured their release from that sentence, so he will also bring them to be favorites and familiars, some listen to him and are ruled by him, and he performs his word to them to the utmost; others reject all his counsels, will not be beholden either to him or the King; being spared break out into new insolencies against them both, and for that are again condemned and executed. Shall their wickedness be cast as an imputation upon him, and make him be stiled but an half-Mediator, because they refuse the better half of the benefit they might have had by him?

If this be rational, let rational men Judge. I might illustrate it by the case of *Moses* mediating for the *Israelites*, and yet refusing to pray for, nay praying against the Rebels in *Numb.* 16. But I leave it, the matter being so evident.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

An Answer to his eighth Argument, in which is considered whether Christ purchased faith for those he dyed for.

HIs eight Argument is thus. “If Christs blood doth wash, purge, [Argu. 8]
 “cleanse and sanctifie them for whom it was shed, then certainly
 “he shed his blood only for them that in the event are purged, cleansed,
 “and sanctified. But All are not in the event washed, purged, cleansed
 “and sanctified. Ergo He dyed not for All.

The consequence of the *major* that he conceives undeniable, is undeniably vitious, nor is it any way proved by him. The proposition being reduced is thus. They whom Christ dyed for, are or shall be sanctified and purged by his blood. And so it being indefinite, its to be construed Particularly or Vniversally: if Particular, its *peccant* in this, that the *major* in the second figure (in which this syllogisme thus reduced, is) ought all to be Vniversal. If construed Vniversally, as he must needs intend it (or else he says nothing) then I deny it, and he no where proves it, that All that Christ dyed for, are or shall be purged by his blood. The consequence is like this. If they that came out of *Egypt*, entred into *Canaan* by the river *Jordan*, Then they only came out of *Egypt* that passed over the river *Jordan*. But let us view the proofs of his *major*, as Vniversally taken. “*He assays to do it, first by viewing the types, and then secondly by plain expressions:* but first he halts in laying down his *probandum*, for in stead of this, That all that Christ dyed for are or shall be so purged, he propounds to prove, that “*The blood of Christ is effectual for all those things, washing purging, sanctifying;* which I will grant him, where it is received by faith, but I say that comes no more up to the thing to be proved, then if a man should affirm, That all that God brought out of *Egypt* were preserved and kept till they injoyed *Canaan*, and then for proof produce some Scriptures that shew that those that followed God in his leadings of them, and believed in him, were so preserved, &c. But let us see his proofes. And first, From the types he says, “*That the Apostle says that the expiation-sacrifice legally sanctified the unclean, as is exprest Heb. 9.13.* But by his leave the Apostle saith not, It sanctified them all for whom it was a sacrifice, but them whom it sprinkled, the words are, sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth

to the purifying of the flesh; not, Being offered for the unclean, sanctifies, &c. But Mr. Owen says, "*These are never divided though distinguished*: but I see no word to disprove their being divided, though he says he was about it. Let us see if we can find any thing for proof of it; we will then appeal to the Law of the expiation-offering in *Numb.* 19. There we first finde a Commandment to take a red heifer and offer her up, and then gather the ashes and keep them, and its said, they shall be for *The Congregation of the children Israel* for a water of purification; the sacrifice then was for a preparation of a purifying water for the Congregation; here is no exception or exclusion of any in that: That pertained to the Congregation, and then he tels them how they should purifie themselves with it, and in what cases; but now mark what he says in *vers.* 20. *The man that shall be unclean, and shall not purifie himself with it, that sould shall be cut off from the Congregation.* It seems then God supposed the application divisibile from the preparation of it, and appoints a punishment for those that refuse its application; *Cutting off from the Congregation.* It seems he was of it before, and ought to have been sprinkled and sanctified with it, the refusal of which and presuming to approach to God without it, was to be punished with cutting off from the Congregation. To which the Apostle I conceive alludes in *Heb.* 12.24, 25. Ye are come to the blood of sprinkling, take heed that ye refuse not him that speaketh; [92] as in another place the believers are said to be chosen to the obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus. Now unbelievers are disobedient, and in what but in not yielding up themselves to God and Christ to be sanctified and cleansed by his blood? So that Mr. Owen hath got nothing by that legal typicall expiation: his after exception about the Antitype to this, we shall speak to in its due place. Let us now see the express sayings. His first is that in *Rom.* 6.5, 6. "*If we have been planted together with him into the similitude of his Death, we shall be also in the similitude of his resurrection, knowing that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.* But *quorsum hæc?* how doth this prove that all that Christ dyed for, are, and shall be sanctified by his blood? Why he tels us, That the fifth verse says, "*That a participation in the death of Christ, shall be accompanied with a conformity to him in his Resurrection.* But what mean you, Sir, by a participation in it? an having part in it, or being a part of the object of it? If so, which word

[92] 2 Pet. 1.2.

word in ver. 5. says so? That says, He thats planted into the likeness of it, not, he that Christ died for. Surely if Mr. *Owen* had dealt fairly, he should have kept the same tearms in both branches of his Assertion, as the Apostle doth, thus, Conformity to Christ in his death shall be followed with a conformity to him in his Resurrection. Sure if planting into the likeness of him, signify conformity to him in the latter branch (as it doth) it signifies so in the former too, it being the very same maner of expression. But Mr. *Owen* hath a little too much “art of making *quidlibet de quolibet*. But what follows? *The words “of the later verse yield a reason of the former Assertion. Because our “old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, “&c. [What gathers he from that? why this] That our sinful corruption and depravation of Nature, are by his Death and crucifying, “meritoriously slain and disabled from such a rule and dominion over us, “as that we should be servants to them.* But suppose this was the Apostles sense, That Christ merited, that such as are planted into the likeness of his Death by Baptism, or conformed to him in his Death, should have their sins subdued in them: will it therefore follow, That he says all that he died for shall be so conformed to him, or shall have their sins subdued in them? Let Reason judge of that Consequence. But which word in the Text signifies a *Meritorius slaying*? I suppose he means the word {συνεσταυρώθη}. If so, I deny it. That signifies there a real crucifying in us, according to that in *Gal 5.24 They that are Christs have crucified the flesh*, &c. That is, have nailed it upon the Cross, (that is, the Grace and Spirit of God, which is cross to it, and lusts against it, they have given it up to be mortified by the Spirit) that so the body of *Sin might be destroyed*; It is not destroyed yet, nor doth the Apostle say so, as well he might, if he had spoken of a meritorious slaying; for what concerns the matter of Merit, that is already accomplished, though the thing merited be not. But when was this crucifying? I answer, when the soul was brought to give up it self to Christ, and not before, [93] when it was Baptized into his Death (not in the outward onely, but chiefly in the inward spiritual Baptism, 1 *Pet. 3.21.*) and so begun to be planted into the likeness of it. But perhaps he will say, The word is, *Crucified with Christ*, and therefore must be referred to what was done in his crucifying. I answer no, It signifies but a companionship in being crucified as he was, or after his similitude, not a thing done when he was crucified, as *Col. 2.12.* we are said to be buried

[93] Rom. 6.
4. 5.

with him; but when was that? He says not, in his being buried, but in Baptism, which is a thing not inwardly accomplished, no, nor begun before believing. And so, *You that were dead in sins and trespasses hath he quickned with him*; the quickning men up to hope in God, and bringing them from their dead condition, in which before believing they lay without hope, is said to be with Christ. Yea, when we suffer for Christ, and dye for his Name, we are said to suffer and dye with him, 2 *Tim.* 2.11, 12. *Rom.* 8.17. which are not to be referred to the time of his suffering and dying, as if we then suffered and died meritoriously with him. So that first express saying, is pressed too injuriously to speak for Mr. Owen besides its proper intention. Again, He brings 2 *Cor.* 1.20. *All the Promises of God are in Christ Yea, and in him Amen.* Which says nothing that God hath promised that All that Christ died for, should be sanctified and cleansed from all their sins, but that in him all the promises are surely to be met with. The Covenant we have spoken to before. Thats made, or rather promised to be made with the House of *Israel*, and the House of *Judah*, of which houshold, men are not accounted, till brought to Christ to believe, as is plain, *Ephe.* 2.12, 17, 18, 19. After Christ hath preached peace to us, and given us access to the Father, then we are of the houshold of God, and fellow Citizens with the “Saints. The promise of circumcising the heart (which he mentions as most famous in the New Covenant) follows after obeying the voice of God in listning to his Son. *Deut.* 30.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. & so the Apostle intimates, 2 *Cor.* 3.16. When the heart turns to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away, which I conceive, answers to Circumcising the heart. As impertinent to his purpose is that in *Heb.* 9.23. of purging the heavenly things, (except he prove, that All that Christ died for, are heavenly men, even before believing, and before their calling to God with a heavenly call) And that in *Col.* 1.14. of the believer brought to Christ, receiving, and having the Redemption in him: with which agrees the 1 *Cor.* 1.30. which says not all that he died for are made wise, redeemed, righteous, &c. by him, but they that are in him (by faith, as see *Rom.* 16 7.) have him in the vertue of his blood, and by his Spirit, for wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. As impertinent is his allegation of *Heb.* 2.14. To destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, that he might free those that by reason of death (or through the fear of death rather) were all their life time subject to bondage.

No

No more is his *Probandum* proved by that, then that all that Christ spake to are saved, can be proved by that in *Joh. 5.34. These things speak I to you* (you that had neither heard the voice of God, nor seen his face, *And who will not come unto me that ye might have life*, ver. 38.40.) *that ye might be saved.* Or from this, That he brought us into Egypt that he might bring us into *Canaan*, that all that came out of the one entred into the other. Nor is there any more consequence from the other places, mentioned in *Ephes. 5.25, 26.* and *Tit. 2.14. He gave himself for his Church that he might sanctifie it*, provided in his death for the perfecting those that should believe in him; *Ergo* All he died for shall be sanctified and saved. So that the contrary to his Conclusion is true, that he hath in no one place proved what was by him undertaken.

But to take off this that we say, Many are not sanctified and purified by it, because they believe not, and thats the reason why his death hath not such effects in them, not that Christ died not for them, therefore he undertakes to prove, “*That Faith it self is a pro-per immediate fruit and procurement of the death of Christ for all those for whom he died.*”

Quod si perficiat, fiet mihi magnus Apollo. But I fear it, for we see great undertakings hitherto, but little performances; *Parturientes montes, erepentis verò mures.* Before he come to perform his promise, He premises some things which we must grant him, and shall as far as truth appears in them. He premises,

“1. *That what ever is freely bestowed upon us, in and through Christ, that is wholly the procurement and merit of the death of Christ?* But how proves he this? why he saith (but his sayings “are no proofs) *that nothing is bestowed through him on those that are his which he hath not purchased, the price whereby he made his purchase being his blood.* If this saying were as firm as Scripture, and somewhat firmer, yet it would not reach his Assertion: for he limits it to those that are his; now by those that are his, is sometime meant his peculiarly, owned by him as his, so *Rom. 8.9.* And so I conceive Mr. Owen means it, and then he denies not here but that something granted to others (not yet so his, that yet have not his Spirit in them) though through him may not be his purchase. But because his words are no proof, and as to the main matter, its but *Idem per idem*, a repetition of his first saying, Let us carry it to his Scripture proofs, which are, (1.) “1 *Cor. 6.* I suppose he means ver. 19, 20. *Your bodies*

“bodies are the Temple of the holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own, for you are bought with a price, Here is mention made of buying them with a price, but no mention made of his buying the holy Ghost, and their glorifying of God; and yet the holy Ghost was a gift freely given them through Christ, much less of all things given them freely in him; so that that proof reaches not. But then he adds out of *Isai. 53. “That the Covenant made between his Father and him, of making out all spiritual blessings to them that were given him, was expressly founded on this condition, that He should make his soul an offering for Sin.* But in viewing the place, I finde no such expressions. It appears but a tradition that that is a Covenant made between the Father and Christ. For its not the Fathers speech to Christ, or Christs to Him; but the Prophets of Christ to the Father, or of both Father or Son. When thou shalt make his soul [or when his soul shall make] an offering for sin, he shall see a seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He says not, My pleasure, as speaking in the person of the Father. Nor doth he say, because his soul shall put a guilt-offering, or make an offering for sin, therefore he shall see a seed, &c. But if his soul shall be so, or when it is so, then that shall follow. Much less saith he, that there was before that a people given him, that should for that have all spiritual blessings made out to them. Indeed, in the twelfth *verse*, there is a promise, and that grounded upon his intercession and sufferings, but then the contents of it are not all good things to be given to men, but a glorious portion to be given to Christ. So that he is deficient here too in his proofs.

And yet I will tell him how I will grant him this, though he prove it not; *viz.* that we had had none of those things, had not Christ suffered (I speak according to what is revealed, for secret things appertain not to us.) He opened the way and passage for all good things to come unto us, by removing the sin that did obstruct, and hinder us of them. The earth, and we all in it were dissolved, he bare up the pillars of it, and in him all things now stand together. (I know not whether *M. Owen* will except, or will also include Election, and Predestination to Sonship, for they are said also to be in, and by Christ, *Ephes. 1.4, 5.* I shall leave that to his consideration) but if, by procuring and meriting, he means that he ingaged God, and procured his good will, that such things should be bestowed on

us,

us (especially if by *us* he mean (as he must) all that he died for) so as that what ever God bestows on any by Christ, he bestows it out of debt to Christ, and should be unjust to him, should he bestow less on (or deal any otherwise with) any particular in point of favour then he doth: that I cannot but question till I see it better proved.

2. He propounds, “*That faith in men of understanding is of such absolute indispensable necessity to salvation, that what ever God or Christ hath done in his oblation and intercession for all or some, without this in us, is (in regard of the event to us) of no value, worth, or profit, but serveth onely to increase, and aggravate condemnation, it being certainly true, That he that believes not shall be damned* (all which I conceive true, and what may be granted him with those limitations specified of [men of understanding] & (in regard of the event to us) especially where the Gospel is plainly preached, that being evidently the meaning of our Saviour in that last clause, *viz* that the Gospel being preached by them, *He that believeth not* (the Gospel so preached and thereby in himself) *shall be damned*; and yet I deny not but both in former times, and other cases, he that by the light afforded, was or is not prevailed with to believe on God, and seek after him, and glorifie him as power was, or is vouchsafed thereto, shall be condemned also. But what infers he hence? It follows) “*So that if there be in our selves a power of believing, and the act of it proceed from that power, then certainly it is in our power to make the Love of God and death of Christ effectual towards us or not*; To that I say, that no man doth at any time believe but he hath power to believe first in himself, and in that power he acteth; for the act of believing being an intrinsecal act of the soul, the power in which the souls acts in it, must needs be inward too, but I suppose he means so in our selves, as to be {ἐξ ἑαυτῶν}, of our selves too; but so I say not that we have power in our selves, as meerly natural, without Grace preventing, and inabling us: And yet were it so, it would not follow that then its in our power to make Christs Death effectual to our selves but as its the preventing assisting Grace of God that impowers the soul to believe. So the soul acting in that power, it still remains in Gods Power onely to give it the promised efficacy, the soul

in believing onely puts it self into such a posture, as in which it becomes the object of Gods Promise, to make the death of Christ effectual to it. As suppose I promise an alms to a poor man if he will come to my house for it, though it be in his power to come, yet its not in his power to make my promise effectual, that appertains to me, and is onely in my power still. From this thats said, his following conclusion (viz. *“That this being the absolute necessity of faith, the cause of that must needs be the prime and principal cause of salvation, as being the cause of that, without which the whole would not be, and by which the whole is, and is effectual”*) nothing harms us, we making God the prime Cause our faith, and the Will be its freedom what it will, but instumental, and no instrumental subordinate cause (as the Will of man however considered, must needs be the whole man, and his Will being the Workmanship of God) though a *causa sine quâ non & per quam totum*, can be said to be the prime cause. As to instance that in Acts 27.31. *Except the Shipmen abide in the ship, the passengers could not have been preserved.* Their abiding in the ship was a cause of their preservation, such a one as without which they could not have been preserved, and upon which they were preserved, and yet, I hope, no man will be so graceless, as to conclude that they or the souldiers that caused them to stay, were the prime and principal cause of their preservation. So a poor mans asking an alms may be a cause of his receiving an alms, and yet when anothers bounty propounding an alms to him upon that condition, encourageth him to ask, and gives him when he asks, though his Will be never so free in asking, yet it cannot be looked upon as the prime cause of his receiving. So that this premise too as it tends to conclude the act of the Will (from the former premises) to be the principal cause of our salvation, though specious, is but fallacious and erronius.

3. After both these {προλεγόμενα} (as one that forgot what he undertook to prove, instead of performing his task) *“He puts it to our option, to chuse whether we will answer directly and Categorically, whether Christ by his Death and Intercession merited and procured faith for us or no.* To this I say, as before, that except Christ had died for us, there had neither been a fit object for

us sinners to believe on, nor an instrument fit to beget it by, nor a power to work with that instrument to inable us thereunto. So that in that sense he did by his death procure it for us, that is, removed that which hindred us from having any of those; yet there too that he obliged God to give *Us* individually faith, that is, to make us act faith in that object according to the power given us in the *medium* or instrument, so as that if God had not given *Us* that in *our individual persons*, he must have dealt injuriously with Christ, that I leave for him to prove. In the Interim, That he obliged him to give it to All he dyed for, that is, to cause them All to believe unto life eternall, I Categorically deny; and expect his proof of it; before which he seems to me to contradict his first premise, while he denies, “*That the granting a way of salvation (by bringing life and “immortality to light by the Gospel) in Christ* (which passage he ascribes to *T. More p. 35.*) was procured for us by Christ. (To say nothing that I finde no such passage in the place pointed to) why may we not say, this way was procured for us by Christ? Did not he procure the bringing life and immortality to light by the Gospel? Sure then not all benefits bestowed upon us (for that is one and none of the least, which the Apostle also ascribes to him in 2 Tim. 2. 10.) and then neither did he procure faith for us; for he that procures a thing must procure all requisites to the working of that thing, or else he doth not procure that thing. Now if he procure not the bringing life and immortality to light, then he procured not that we should have that by which faith is effected, for thats it that begets faith, the appearing of light and immortality in the Gospel; faith I say according to the present plainness of the Gospel: and so he hath overthrown the thing he fights for. Ah, but “*its a strange “Contradictory Assertion that he should procure a way to life in him-“self. [But why so?] because he is the chiefest part of this way, and “sure procured not himself by his own Death, &c.* But by that reason, he procured few things freely bestowed on us in and by Christ, for then neither did he procure us Wisdom, Righteousness, Holiness, nor Redemption; for all these he is called himself as much as he is called the Way. See 1 Cor. 1.30. then he procured not our peace, for he is our peace, Ephes. 2.14. He procured not our life, for he is our life, Col 3.4. But is it such a strange thing to say, such a man got or procured himself to be made protector to such a people, or to have the favor of admitting to or keeping out any from the Kings ear, by such

[94] Heb. 5.9.

and such services and carriages? Surely no, And why then is it so to say that Christ procured himself to be the Way to life for sinners by suffering for them? Was he the way to life to us without his sufferings and death? I suppose not: and if not, then he obtained that power and title by his sufferings, [94] through that way he became our way to life, by sufferings he was perfected, and so became the Author of salvation eternall to all that obey him. And is this such a strange Assertion? Sure I cannot but think it a just hand of God upon men (as is prophesied *Zech.* 11.13. *Isa.* 29.9, 10, 13, 14. *Jer.* 8.8, 9.) that because they slight Gods Word, the plain testimonies of Scripture, God smites their eye that they cannot see reason. But to return to our purpose. I deny, I say, that Christ procured (that is, engaged or obliged God) that all should be brought to believe on him for whom he dyed, though we deny not that he opened a passage for the grace of God to display and glorifie it self; so that He presents himself to men as good and powerful an object meet to be looked to, and stayed on, as in *John* 5.8, 9, 10, 11. especially in the Gospel as now published since the Appearance of Christ in the Flesh, which presentation of himself to men as good, grations, powerful, &c. is the medium and instrument for begetting faith according to the degree and measure of the Revelation (as *Rahab* believed to justification by a lesser revelation of God then *Paul* had, *Josh.* 2.10, 11, 12. with *Heb.* 11.31. and so *Cornelius* before *Peters* coming to him believed in a lower act by less light then *Peter* brought to him, and the *Ninivites* by far lesser then the *Jews* rebelled against) now that power accompanies these mediums too in their lesser or greater dispensations, is evident, in that the Spirit is said to have preached to & striven with men, even those that yet obeyed it not, *Gen.* 6 3. 1 *Pet.* 3 19. the hand of the Lord was stretched out with his reproofs and counsels *Prov* 1.24. and in the effects it produceth, as that they attain to some knowledg of God, convincements, illuminations, &c. against which they often willfully rebel and close their eyes, and I say further, that God doth in many by these means effect faith, and bring them actually to believe, and I conceive many more might have faith, did they not wilfully turn away from God, for I conceive a fore going act propounded or enjoined to men (you may call it a condition if you please) upon which they might be brought to believe. Whereas Mr. *Owen* asks what that is? I answer, it is to listen to the voice of God, not hardning the heart. So *Isa.* 55.3. *hearken diligent-*

diligently and your souls shall live: by diligent attendance to the voice of God the soul is quickned up to a life of faith and hope in God, so *Isa. 49.1. Listen O Isles unto me, and hearken ye people from far,* and in *Psal 95. To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.* Lift not up your reasons and understandings against the authority of God, be swift to hear, hear him out and make not haste to speak and cavil against him. As also to minde those demonstrations of his Divine Power and Goodness that he affords, not winking with the eye, and wilfully turning from the light when he makes it appear, or from the means of light, which beheld, would give us to see what he holds forth to us, according to that Call, *Hear ye deaf, and look ye blinde, that ye may see,* *Isai. 42.18.* So, *Behold my servant whom I have chosen.* ver 1. *And look to me, and be ye saved,* *Isai. 45.22.* *And consider the works of God,* *Job 37.14.* *That that is to be known of God, is in them manifested,* &c. *Rom. 1.19.20.* But then, “*Is not this same hearing and listening, believing?*” I answer, No, Its but a mean to it. We are to attend that we may believe; by this hearing, Faith and the spirit of it are given unto us. But it will be objected, “*Its obeying, and obeying is believing.*” So M. Owen. But there is a fallacy in that; for neither is every Act of hearing, obeying; nor every Act of obeying, the believing spoken of. As obeying in some acts follows believing, so in some it may be but a tendency to the meeting with that which will cause us to believe, & so believingly to obey. Take this *Simile.* Two men are at controversie, suppose a Master and a Servant, the Master would have him do such things as the servant doth not, nor will, The Master begins to expostulate with him, and to shew him reasons for his demands, the servant hears what he says, this is not yet an act of obedience to his Master, for perhaps he may yet prove refractory, and more obstinate then before, and perhaps in hearing he may be perswaded, and become obedient to him, being convinced and changed in minde by what he hears, till which change his act of hearing will not denominate him obedient, or pass for an act of obedience. Mr. Owen saith, “*If we can propound a condition for Faith that is not Faith, he will hear it,* And yet I suppose he will not think his hearing us propound it, an act of obedience to us at all. But then he says, “*This is procured by Christ or not.* In the sense before explained, we grant it procured; otherwise not: and that to the power of exercising it is absolute, but as to the act of exercising of it, its voluntary, and to the most,

uncompelled, or unnecessitated. Many have absolute power and ability given them of hearing and seeing the hints of Light and Truth that come from God, that yet have it in their choise, whether they will act so or so; and therefore are faulted for not acting as they might, for not chusing the fear of the Lord, *Prov.* 1.29.30. For shutting their eyes against his Light, and stopping their ears, *Matth.* 13.15. *Acts* 28.27. And yet the cause of Faith is not resolved into our selves, but into him that gives the power to hear, and that speaks such words when we do listen, as overcomes our reason and our hearts. Our faith is justly still ascribed to him. For if he spake not we could not hear, yea, if he gave us not power to hear; yea, if when we hear, he spake not suitable words, and exercised not power with his words, we should not yet believe in him. So that Inference is as absurd as these, That because the blind man went and washed in the Pool of *Siloam*, Therefore he was the cause of his own healing, or Not Christ so much as he; and The ten Lepers were the cause of their own cleansing, because they went on their own legs to shew themselves to the Priests at his Commandment. VVe avoid also all his following Consequences. If by procuring Faith, he means his meriting and obliging God to cause all to believe in him for whom He died. For denying that, it follows not either,

“1. *That Faith is an act of our own wills, and so our own as not to be wrought by Grace, and that its wholly sited in our own power to perform that spiritual act.* No such thing follows upon that Proposition denied. (1.) That Faith is an act of the VWill, no man can deny, for in it the Will closes with an Object propounded as good to be relied on, but that its not wrought by Grace is clearly false, from what is said above. Its our act to hear, and yet not that without the VVord of God, but tis Gods Act, even the act of his Grace, to perswade us by what he speaks to lean upon him, and believe in him. Besides, (2.) God might freely work it in some without being obliged to it by the Death of Christ, the same love that led him to give Christ, may (sin being removed, and the enmity being slain by Christ) work as much as it pleases, without being obliged and tied to work it. Besides, (3.) Christ might oblige him to work it in some, and yet not in all He died for. So that every way this is inconsistent. And we neither,

“1. *Contradict any Scripture, Nor 2. Speak contrary to the nature of*

“*of the new Covenant of Grace*, which indeed is sealed by Christs Death to believers, but says not, that Christs Death obliged God to make this and that man, much less all he died for, to believe. Nor is it

“3. *Destructive to free Grace*, but leaves it still as free to some, as if the Death of Christ obliged him to bestow such grace upon them. Grace bestowed without an obligation to it, is as free as grace bestowed upon obligation. Nor “*set we up the power of Free will to the sleighting or undervaluing of Free-grace*. For we say that its grace that gives men that freedom to good they have, and its mens abusing the freedom given by grace, and turning grace into wantonness, and not improving it, but receiving it in vain, that brings destruction upon many. Therefore we exhort men so to magnifie grace, as to believe and receive it, and that not in vain, and fault men because they will abuse the liberty that God gives them of his goodness and grace, chusing their own ways and not his, refusing to come to Christ, &c. And I think in such language the Scripture speaketh. Nor do we

4. *Contradict the received doctrine of our natural depravedness and inability to good*. We say, that what power men have to good, they have it in and by Gods striving with them, light manifested in them, and grace preventing them, and that otherwise they are wholly unable to any thing that is good. Nor say we

“5. *That a natural faculty is able to produce of it self without some spiritual elevation an act purely spiritual*, no more then the blinde mans natural act of washing, was able to produce a supernatural gift of sight to him, and so neither are we *guilty of contradicting right reason*, Nor

“2. *Must we resolve almost the sole cause of our salvation ultimately into our selves, as being able to make all that God and Christ do to that end, effectuall or ineffectuall*. This we have before disproved, And here say again, That we leave it in the Power and Will of God to use what means he pleases to any man, and how long, and compell whom he will to come in and believe. And yet it follows not, that either Christ obliged God to do it to this and that man, or much less to All for whom he died, the thing he should have proved; which he further endeavors (after these premises) by the following Arguments, viz. [Argu. 1] “*The death of Jesus Christ purchased holiness and sanctification for us (as was proved at large,*

Arguments

Argument 8.) But faith is a part of our sanctification and holiness. Ergo, he procured faith for us. If this Argument should be wholly granted, yet his Assertion goes unproved, viz. *That he hath purchased faith for All for whom he died.* The word *Us* being applicative may be diversly expounded, as *Us* that are of this Nation, *Us* that are of this minde, *Us* that believe, &c. and so its ambiguous. But if by *Us* he means All for whom he died, then the *Major* with the eight Argument brought to uphold it, is already disproved. Beside the *Minor* is questionable, whether Faith be a part of our sanctification. VVe are sanctified by Faith, its true, thats the instrument that receives it, but that no more proves it a part thereof, then that the *Israelites* were healed by looking to the brazen Serpent, proves their looking to it a part of their healing. The Church, *Ephes.* 5.26. 27. as a Church, are a people called and believing, and them he is to sanctifie, and will sanctifie, but that rather proves Sanctification a consequent of Faith, then Faith a part of that sanctification.

[*Argu.* 2] *All the fruits of Election are purchased by Christ, But Faith is a fruit of Election, &c.* The *Major* is proof-less, and deficient too, for it should have been general as to the object of his Death, thus, All the fruits of Election were purchased by Christ for All he died for, or it concludes not: if he mean it so, then I deny it, as he takes the word *purchase*, and desire his proof for it. Nor yet is the *Minor* without exception. [95] For faith is scarce a fruit of Election in all that believe, except such as believe for a time were elected for a time too. His proofs as they reach not that, so neither are they all pertinent to what he brings them. In *Eph.* 1.4. the *Us* is the Saints and faithful, ver. 1. if not of a narrower signification, as distinct from the persons spoken to, as the 12, & 13. verses seem to import, as first speaking of their own experiences and priviledges, and then of theirs. At furthest the Text extends it but to *Saints, and faithful in Christ, blest with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in him.* And so it shews that it was according to the eternal purpose and counsel of God, that men in Christ should be holy in him, and that in chusing Christ before the world was, they also were by consequent chosen. He chose not either in *Adam*, or in the Law, or in mens selves, but in ★ Christ a holy people for himself, which holiness is a consequent of mens faith and being in Christ as was said before, and as is proved, 1. *Cor.* 1.30. I question too, whether *Rom.* 8.29. says, that unbelievers, as so eyed

★ See further about this place in the Epistle to the Reader.

eyed was the object of predestination, and not men fore-known as future believers, to which in time they are called. So that though that Scripture in a manner couples them, yet it says not Faith (at least in all that believe) is the fruit of Predestination or Election. Much more is that in 1 Cor. 4.7. impertinent to that its brought for, for (as *Beza* also expounds it, and as any man that seriously mindes the Apostles duft in the three foregoing Chapters, and in the verse before may see) the Apostle is not speaking of men differenced from the world by believing, in comparison with the world, but of believers differing from one another in gifts, and crying up one above another, according to that difference, or lifting up themselves for that one above another. Nor is the difference he speaks of in the act of believing, as if one had believed, and another not, (as if he had said, Who made thee to receive) but in the matter of their receits, who had all received something. *What hast thou that thou hast not received?* The meaning is, Believers are not to lift up themselves, or one another, one above another, for their gifts, in that one hath more, or better gifts then another, and so not to fault and disown them that have less, and dote on them that have more. But they may fault and disown them that believe not, and commend them that do, and they have good warrant so to do, which they might not, if the want of Faith in men was because there was none for them. A company of poor beggers receiving alms, some six pence, some a shilling, have no cause to brag one over another, and fault one another, when the gift was free to each, and not out of desert to any more then other, yet they may fault other beggers, and glory over them that were slothful, and refused to go where they went for the alms. So that thats impertinent. That in *Acts* 13.48. seems to have the greatest force for proof, that Faith is in some the fruit of Election. The words are, *And they believed, so many as were ordained to life eternal.* The word that we Translate *Ordained*, is {τεταγμένοι ἦσαν, ἃ τάσσω τάσσομαι}, which is properly to rank, and order; and often in the Writings of the Apostles is used to signifie an actual appointing or ordering to a thing, as *Rom.* 13.1. *The Powers or Authorities that are, are ordained* [{τεταγμένοι}] *ordered, or ranked, of or under God,* {ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ}. Some expound it by {προχειρίζομαι} from *Acts* 22.10.14. as if it were *foreappointed* or *ordained*. But the word is not {προτεταγμένοι}, *foreappointed*, as if it spake of an act of Gods purpose and counsel in himself only, But {τεταγμένοι}. Besides

that word {προχειρίσασθαι}, signifies too an actual setting apart, or separating in time unto a thing, a transient act of God upon a creature, as is plain Acts 26.16. {ἐἰς τοῦτο ὥφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαι σε} {ὑπερέτην}, &c. I have appeared to thee to ordain, or foreappoint thee a Minister, and Witness of those things that thou hast seen. Where {προχειρίσασθαι}, to foreordain, is a thing not precedent but consequent to Gods appearing to him; for he appeared to him, he saith not, because I had fore-appointed thee, but to fore-appoint thee; which was an actual ordering him into such a place or office, before he should or could act in it, and so * *Chrysostom* interprets {τεταγμένοι} by {ἀφωρισμένοι τῷ θεῷ}, separated to God, and the Syriack interpreter by [*Positi*,] put into such an order. The sense then is, So many as in the call of God, and by the coming of his Word unto them were separated from the world unto, and disposed, ordered, or set for eternal life, believed. And then its further to be considered, That the word *Believed*, signifies here, as sometimes else, a *continuing* or *abiding in believing*, as in *Joh. 2.11. His Disciples believed on him*; They were Disciples and had faith before, but now they believed, that is, went on believing in him, they were furthered in their faith, confirmed in it, and so in *verse 22. They believed the Scripture after the Resurrection*. They did so in part before, but They believed there, is all one with, they were fastened, or confirmed in believing them, they believed them stronglier. So *Joh. 17.8. They have known and believed*, in opposition to those that believed for a time, and then fell away; these continued believing. And so in *Acts 17.34. Some clave to Paul and believed*, that is, abid constant in the Doctrine, and went on in it. Such, I conceive, may be the meaning of it here too. The *Gentiles* glorified God, they were generally affected and taken with it [*Many were called.*] *And they believed, so many as was ordered or ordained to life eternal*, that is, they abode constant in the Doctrine, they were not for a flash onely as the others were; others thought the Word true and rejoyced in it, and glorified it; but none abid in it but them that God more especially pull'd in to himself. These things we have noted on the *Minor*, though the faultiness of the *Major* is sufficient to overthrow the Argument in the thing that should have been concluded, *viz. That Faith is the immediate fruit and effect of Christs death, which God is obliged by it to give to All that Christ died for.*

[*Argu. 3.*]“All the fruits of the New Covenant are procured and purchased by
“him:

“him: [Argu. 3] but Faith is one of them. But neither doth this conclude. And we have shewed before, *cap. 1. lib. 3.* that he neither hath proved Faith to be a fruit of the New Covenant, but a thing presupposed: Nor that that Covenant is made with all them that Christ died for.

That without which its impossible that we should be saved, [Argu. 4] must “be procured by him by whom we are fully and effectually saved. This may be granted in the sense we have taken the word *Procuring*. And yet it concludes not neither, except he could infer, But all that Christ died for are fully and effectually saved: which he doth not, nor can any where prove. Besides, his proofs prove neither the Major nor the Minor, *Matth. 1.21. His people, Heb. 7.25. All that come to God by him.* And intimately, *Heb. 5.9. He is the Author of eternal salvation.* But to whom saith the Apostle? *To all that obey him.* None of which Scriptures takes in Faith as one of those things, which he is the Author, Procurer, or Confirmer of. For the very *Suppositum* in them all is Believers, his people, men called, and of no people made a people of God, as *1 Pet. 2.10. They have faith.* Them that come to him, and obey him, they have faith. So that Christ may be affirmed to be the Author of their eternal and perfect salvation there mentioned, and yet not the procurer of their faith. As David was a protector of all that fled to him, and stood by them to the utmost, and yet it follows not, that he purchased it of any to make them come to him. So that this also is impertinent.

The last Argument is that of *Phil. 1.29. [Argu. 5]* “*Its given to you to believe, {ὁπὲρ χριστοῦ}*. He leaves out the Article *{τὸ, τὸ ὁπὲρ χριστοῦ}*, which may be read thus, *Its given to you* (as pertaining to Christ) *not onely to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.* This is given of grace. As if he should say, I speak not now of all sufferings and faith, but of what pertains to Christ, and what is in his Cause. As pertaining to Christ its given by Grace, *{ἐχαρίσθη}*, not onely to believe, *Ec.* Or thus, *{ὁμὴν ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὁπὲρ ξριστοῦ}*, *Ec.* *To you that which pertains to Christ was given freely, not onely to believe on him, but also to suffer for him.* But let the words be read as they are (though, I conceive, not so rightly, because of the Article (τὸ) omitted) yet it follows not, either that it was given them as his purchase. I may give a man a thing for my childs sake, because I love him, and would have him esteemed and loved, which yet is not by him bought of me for that man. Or if so, yet it follows not that Christ did so for all that he died for.

Christ might procure that God should absolutely make some believe in him, and yet leave him to glorifie his Mercy or Justice on others as he pleases, leave them to such grace as whereby they might have been brought to believe in walking out in the means according to power given; yea, leave it wholly to the meer VVill of God, whom to cause to believe, both as to persons and their number. So that no wayes doth this Argument conclude. Nor doth *Ephes.* 1.3. (another place urged by him) speak of Faith, they being believers that were spoken of in that Speech, as the *Suppositum* in it. And how it should be meant when he says, *My Dinner is prepared, and all things are ready, come ye to the Wedding*, That the peoples coming was one of the dishes prepared, I know not, or that God hath put faith into Christ for us. Yet suppose it mean that through him God hath blessed us with faith (which I grant he hath, such as do believe) yet how either he obliged God to bless such particulars so, or (much more) all that he died for, I am sure no man can shew me from that proof. So that Jesus is the Author and Finisher of our faith, the beginning and the end of what we believe for, or (as the word is) the {ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος}, the prime Captain and Perfecter of our faith, or ★ the way of our faith, and so greater then any of the cloud of witnesses I believe; and so I desire to eye and look to him also, yea, as him without whose sufferings I could neither have had object of faith for me, nor VVord, or Spirit to inable me to it, and as he that is the prime leader in it, and finisher of it, bringing about to me the whole end of it, the salvation of my soul: But yet, that therefore he so obliged God to make men look to him, as that had God passed me by, and fastened upon some other, he should have been unjust to him, or that he hath procured that All he died for shall be brought to believe to eternal life, that place shews not. And now to review his whole Argument, it runs thus.

“If the fruit and effect procured by the death of Christ absolutely, “not depending on any condition in man to be fulfilled, be not common “to All, then did not Christ die for All. But the supposal is true, as is seen “in the Grace of Faith, which was procured by the death of Christ to be “absolutely bestowed on them for whom he died is, but yet not common “to All; Therefore Christ died not for All. The whole Syllogism is in clouds, for either Proposition being indefinite, may admit of truth or falshood, as they may be interpreted. If the *Major* be universal thus. That if no fruit or effect procured or wrought absolutely by
the

★ The word
Faith there
signifies
rather the
profession,
or matter
of Faith
believed,
then the
act of
Faith inus.

the death of Christ for All for whom he died be common to All, then he died not for All: Then its granted; but then the *Minor* is too scanty: for it should be universal too, taking in the whole *Medius terminus*, or else the Argument concludes not negatively. If the *Major* be not so universal, then we deny the Consequence. For we suppose Christ might procure some things not for All, as the grace of Apostleship for *Paul*, and thats not common to all the Church, yet it follows not from that that he died not for all the Church. Again, The terms for whom he died are equivocal, for its either to be interpreted, All for whom he died had the grace of *Faith* procured for them, to be absolutely bestowed on them or not. If not, then it comes not up to the intent of the *Major*, nor takes in the whole middle Term of it as it ought to run. If so, we have seen no proof for it, and therefore (to say no more, that the whole *Minor* remains unproved) the main thing opposed by him yet stands firm, viz. *That Christ died for All*.

Having done with this long labyrinthed Argument, [*Argu.* 9] he comes to a new one, Thus. “*Those onely are spiritually redeemed by Christ, who were typed out by the people of Israel in their carnal typical Redemption: But by the people of the Jews, in their deliverance out of Egypt, bringing into Canaan with all their Ordinances, and Institutions, onely the Church of God, the Elect, were typed out* (which he sayes was proved before, but I never yet saw it proved from the beginning of the Book hitherto, and I am confident never shall) *Ergo*, &c. Truly this is a very sorry Argument, and I had thought such a man as Mr. *Owen* would not have mentioned such a one; but sure he so much over-reasoned himself in the former, that he forgot himself here. For first, to the *Major*, He hath no proof for it at all, and this reason may be given to deny it, that he can no where prove, that that was a type of Christs dying for us meerly. But out of courtesie we will grant it him, and fall upon his *Minor*, in which he both adds a *Quartus terminus*, in mentioning the bringing them into *Canaan*, and all their Ordinances, &c. not mentioned in the *Major*, and in saying, Onely the Elect and Church of God was typed out by them, saith falsely, and so its denied by me upon these grounds. 1 The beasts were all brought out to a hoof, of which some were clean and some were unclean for Sacrifice, were all these types of the Elect and Church onely? 2. The Murmurers and Rebels that fell in the Wilderness were brought out of *Egypt*, were

they also types of the Elect? Sure then if *Canaan* be a type of heaven, and heavenly Rest, and *Egypt* a type of the Kingdom of Death and Darkness, then it will follow, That few of the Elect, scarce two of six hundred thousand shall enter into Rest, and that many that Christ died for, and ransomed from death and misery through unbelief, shal never come into heavenly glory. Was not *Corah* and his company some of that people that was redeemed out of *Egypt*? Sure they were. See *Numb.* 16. and yet the Apostle tells us they were types of them that perish for rebellion against Christ. *Jude* 11. Were they, think you, the Elect of God? And so the Apostle propounds those Murmurers and Fornicators, and Idolators amongst them, as types of them that now murmur against Christ, and commit Fornication and Idolatry against him, *1 Cor.* 10.5, 11. So that this Argument is notoriously erroneous. Let us turn it thus rather. All that were typed out in the Redemption from *Egypt*, are ransomed spiritually by Jesus Christ. But all men, good and bad, were typed out by them. *Ergo*, All so ransomed, To make good the *Minor* (for the *Major* is Mr. *Owens* own.) The clean beasts typified those of the *Gentiles* that are fit for sacrifices to God, being sanctified by the holy Ghost, *Rom.* 15.16. The unclean, those that remain in unbelief, and so are not fit to be so offered up, *Tit.* 1.16. Likewise the good and faithful people, and such as were chosen into Office, types of the Elect, and faithful in Christ Jesus, *1 Pet.* 2.5. And the Murmurers, Complainers, and Unbelievers, types of the disobedient to, and backsliders from Christ. Therefore all such people, though they come not all to heaven, yet Christ gave himself a ransom for them. But enough to this most incongruous Argument.

CHAP. V.

An Answer to his fifth Chapter: In which is considered, How Christ gave himself a ransom for All.

HAVING done with those Arguments, we follow him now to Arguments taken from words used in this matter, which he saith, “Disagree in their genuine signification from the Opinion that extends “to all the matter spoken of in them. [Arg. 10] And first, He lays down his Argument generally thus. “That Doctrine that will not by any means suit
“with,

“which, and be conformable to the thing signified by it, but contradicts
 “the expressions literal and deductive, whereby in Scripture its held
 “out to us, cannot possibly be sound and sincere. But such is the persuasion
 “of Universal Redemption, or General Ransom. Ergo, Its unsound. And
 this strange Argument (that grants the Doctrine held forth in Scrip-
 ture expressions, [99] and yet contradicts those Scriptures) he labors to
 prove by Induction, and first from the word {Ἀντίλυτρον}, *Aransom or*
price of Redemption; He argues thus. “That the thing signified in it
 “agrees not to all, therefore the word is not to be so applied. Which is in
 substance, Paul spake unadvisedly when he made so general an
 expression: this is not to believe the Scripture, but to judge and de-
 ny it to be right. VVell, let us see what the word signifies. It
 signifies a price for Redemption. Now (saith Mr. Owen,) “If
 “Christ pay a price for Redemption, his aim is their deliverance for
 “whom its paid, to that end he satisfies the Judge, and conquers the
 “Jaylor, but this agrees not to All, All are not ransomed. Shall we be-
 lieve Mr. Owen, or the Apostle here? who also tells us in Rom. 5.
 18. *That by one mans Righteousness to all men to Justification of life.*
 And again, in 1 Cor. 15 22. *As in Adam All die, so in Christ all shall*
be made alive. But Mr. Owen says, *Why are not all saved then?* I
 might say, *Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God?*
 But I have answered before. From the first death they are, from the
 second they are not, because many are disobedient against their Sa-
 viour. As all *Israel* were saved out of *Egypt*, [100] (Its the Apostle *Judes*
expression) But why then not all preserved into *Canaan*? He tells
 us, He afterwards destroyed them that believed not. So here, he af-
 terward in a second death destroys all those that know (like, or ap-
 prove) not God, and all that disobey the Gospel of Christ, 2 *The*s.
 1.7, 8. All were in thrall to the sentence of death, and so to the exe-
 cution of vengeance from God upon them all in *Adam* in an utter
 ruine; and again, for slighting and sinning against Light and Good-
 ness afforded, deserve destruction to come suddenly upon them, in
 plagues, famines, &c. The bond that held them in the former was
 their sin in *Adam*, and to the latter many sins against Gods good-
 ness now exposes them. VVhat price pays Christ? Himself, to bear
 that blow for them, and be the propitiation for their sin. Now in
 that the sentence passed not (or rather lyes not) upon men. Men
 are not debarred reaccess to God, for that folly the sentence of ba-
 nishment is reversed, and the banished called home again, here is a
 Redemption

[99] Instance.
I.

[100] Jude 5.

Redemption made from that thralldom. And whereas many times they are liable to destruction again in their persons, Christ Mediating, and Interposing himself as the Propitiation, preserves them. And on this ground we are to pray for All, and make Intercession with thanksgiving for All, as in 2 *Tim.* 1.2, 6. But, I suppose, he thinks All not ransomed, because many remain thrall'd in their corruption. To which I might say but as *Prosper, Ad capit. Gallor. Sanguis Christi est totius mundi pretium, pro omnium redemptione verè persolutum*, (and thats as much as 1 *Tim.* 2.6. says) *sed illi homines ab eo pretio extranei sunt, qui aut captivitate delectati redimi noluerunt, aut post redemptionem ad eandem servitutem sunt reversi*; and again, *Omnes rectè dicantur redempti, sed non omnes a captivitate eruti*. But to clear it, I shall propound these following considerations.

1. That men in sinning fell under a double bondage. 1. To death to be inflicted from God, according to his sentence, *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die the death, and death came on all, in that all sinned*. 2. To corruption, or sinfulness of Nature in themselves, and the delusions of Satan, *Ephe.* 2.1. *Dead in sins and trespasses, conceived in sin, and born in iniquity*.

2. The latter of these thralldoms, was not the curse, or death inflicted as the punishment of the fall, but the proper consequence of it. That it was not its punishment, nor any essential part of it, appears in this, that every essential part of the punishment of it Christ was to bear by way of satisfaction, and so he bare anguish in body and soul, death of body, and separation from Gods presence: but he bare not the inherency of sin for us, nor inability for serving his Father, nor was he subject to the deceits of Satan, as if it had been an essential part of that punishment he must have done, for it appertains to, and spreads over the whole nature. But the first was the punishment to which we were subjected, and which, had we abid never so pure in our natures, must have been executed for the fault committed, because the word was not, *If thou becomest so polluted, but In the day thou eatest thou shalt die*, and therefore Christ also suffered that, becoming a ransom for us though innocent.

3. In the latter the Justice of God did not detain us (but as man being debarred from any new grace, without that could not do what he should) but we ought (that notwithstanding) to do our best to serve him, we had his permission to it; if such a thing might be supposed, that we might have lived under that sentence unsuffered

for us. He neither put sin into us, nor kept it in us. But the former came directly from God upon us, and his Justice detained us in our Mediator, in it, till his sentence was satisfied.

4. That first was the death of which Satan had power, and the fear of which (though but now a carcass) detains men in their spirits in bondage, *Heb. 2.14*. Men fear not, but love the other, their corruptions; now Christ conquered Satan, when he brake his snare, and got victory over that death, that should else have swallowed us up for ever. So that Satan could not, as else he would have done, play the Executioner upon us.

5. God neither putting men into corruption, nor corruption into them, nor his Justice standing against our doing better (he would that they should come out of it, if they could) the price was not given to God properly as the price of Redemption from that, but onely as the ransoming them from the death inflicted, makes a passage for means also to be afforded to them for their recovery and setting free from that bondage too. Were it not for this Ransom, he would not afford him any means to help him out of this, but his Justice required not any positive influence upon him to hold him in, and hinder him from getting out of it till he was satisfied in the other. Thence Christ given himself to bear the blow, and deliver men from that proper punishment inflicted by God, and men being thereby delivered out of that sentence, they may be said properly to be ransomed, though still they are not brought out of the bondage to their corruption; especially the prison door being opened, with help afforded for their coming out of that too. To clear it by a *Simile*. A King makes a Law, That he that shall eat such a fruit (suppose as in the eating of it, hath a property to make men leprous) should for so doing be forthwith adjudged to death, and executed. A certain company of men notwithstanding, being overcome by some evil inticement, transgress the Law and immediately become leprous. The Executioners seize upon them, and are drawing them to punishment, in the interim one gives a sum of money for their ransom. The intention of it is to ransom them from the sentence to the execution of which they are going; the ingagement or performance of the paiment being accepted, he that gave the price receives power to rescue them from the Tormentors, and doth it: still they remain leprous, and lye exposed to the subtilty of former inticers: shal we say now, these men are not ransomed, or that

he that payed the price, ransomed them not, because they remain leprous? Nay, we will go further, suppose the Ransomer obtaining by the same price the best Surgeons, and skilful Physitians for their healing too, and by all loving Arguments intreating them to be healed, and no longer to hearken to the contrary suggestions of their inticers, some of them trust him and are healed, others peremptorily listening to their inticers like their leprous condition better, because they like not the Ransomers society, and think they shall not be troubled with it so long as they are leprous, having great suspition also perhaps that the things he prescribes for them will poyson them, and so refuse to be healed, and abide lepers all their dayes, yea, perhaps also for disobedience to their Ransomer and the King again, come to be again condemned and executed; shall we say now that this man did not give a price of Redemption for them all, because they through their folly, were never freed and redeemed, as it were, from the power of their leprosie? Such is the case in hand, I need not to apply it, the case is so clear. If it be objected, That Similitudes prove nothing. I Answer, There is no need of proving a Scripture saying, that's to be believed, and Similitudes may be apt to illustrate how we may conceive the thing expressed sutably to the expression in Scripture used. Let me this say further, that the word Redemption is sometime applied to the effect of the believing application of the blood of Christ, for healing men, in regard of their corruptions, and setting their mindes free to serve God, as in 1 *Pet.* 1.18. *Rev.* 5.9. and 14.3, 4. being the same in substance with *Heb* 9.14. As also sometimes for a powerful freeing the body from mortality, weakness, and death, *Rom.* 8.23. In which further significations, it is not to be confounded with the use of it here, but distinguishing from it.

CHAP. VI.

Concerning Reconciliation, in answer to his sixth Chapter.

[101] *Instan.* 2. **H**IS next Instance and Argument from thence is about Reconciliation. [101] “Which he (rightly) makes to be in the mutuall joynt “turning of affections to each other, and coming into amity, accord “and friendship. His Argument from that runs thus. All are re-
“conciled

“*conciled to God for whom Christ died, But all are not so, &c.* We are to minde that he speaks here of reconciliation of men in their own persons. For otherwise the *definition*, and the thing *defined* would disagree, and he should prevaricate in his arguing. Now reconciliation so considered, I deny his *Major*, viz. *That all for whom Christ died are reconciled to God.* His proof for it is this; “*That Reconciliation is the immediate effect and product of the death of Christ*, which (though he is *confident none can deny*) I have before disproved. [102] Yea, that mens affections are not turned unto God immediately upon Christs death for them, as before the Call of God hath overcome them, I appeal to Mr. Owens own Doctrine against the Socinians, Chap. 8. But he thinks to help it by distinguishing “*Reconciliation into meritorious and accomplished*, and so through *all are not yet actually reconciled to God*, yet he says, *That Christ hath merited that they shall be, and so they all shall and must be.* Which distinction so applied I deny. Indeed that God hath done so much for all in dying for them (and God in giving him to die for them) that he hath highly deserved at their hands, that they should all love and live to him, I freely grant, yea, and if we take Reconciliation for a making their peace so with God for them, as to * change their condition into a far better then what it was before, so as that whereas they were by sin debarred the Presence and Kingdom of God, now God is ready to receive them, hath opened the way for them, yea, calls and commands them to come back again to him, in such a sense I will grant his Assertion; but that Christ hath obliged (or made it due debt to himself from) the Father, to make all for whom he died affect and live to him, I deny, nor can he prove it. He endeavors it from sundry Scriptures, which I shall view, and discover his mistakes in.

[102] Lib. I. ca. I.

* {ἀπαλλαγὴ κατὰ λαγῇ} are of the Greek words ἀλλάσσω, & {ἀλλάσσομαι} to change.

His first is, 2 Cor 5.19. *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, &c.* Which we may understand in the sense even now yielded; or else also taking the word *World* for the *Gentiles*, it holds forth, that God in Christ brake down the partition wall, and slew the enmity, the Law of Commandments in Ordinances that kept them at a distance from fellowship with the *Jews*, and so made way for their coming in to him to be at one with him; not imputing their trespasses (or contrary walkings to his Ordinances) to them, but so remitting them as no longer to count them, or any of them common or unclean in that respect; but all, or any of them may be

welcome to his Church or Kingdom, notwithstanding their uncircumcision, according to that Acts 10.22. *God hath shewed me that I should call {μεδένα ἄνθρωπον}*, *no one man common or unclean*. But whether we take it onely in the former, or this sense also (as I think it comprehends both) yet it comes far short of Mr. *Owens* Assertion. viz. That God was obliged by the death of Christ to make them all affect him. It reaches but to a way-making and foundation laying unto that. And indeed its to be minded, that Reconciliation is neither there spoken of as the act of Christ toward God (as had it signified an ingagement, putting upon him, it should rather have been) but as the act of God in Christ; *God was in Christ reconciling*: nor as of a thing accomplished and done (as had it been of a meritorious reconciling, it might have been with respect to the act of Merit so spoken of, the act of Meriting being a thing already done) but onely as of a thing then ★ *in fieri*, in the doing; and (as the following vers. (*ver.* 20.) argues) not as yet done, while that exhortation to be reconciled, is but yet a pressing. Its as if he should have said, God hath been doing that in Christ for the world, that tends to, and makes for its reconciling, or being reconciled to him, he hath taken that out of the mid-way that stood against the shewing himself gracious to them, and receiving them into favor; nothing is wanting on his part to their being at one with him, nay, he hath done that in Christ that may induce them thereto, as in *Matth.* 22.4. *His Oxen and Fatlings are killed, and he hath prepared a dinner, and all is ready for receiving them*, upon which ground also, as there the servants were sent out to the guests with that good tidings, and thereupon to invite them *to come to the wedding*, so here the Apostles were sent out former hints of his goodness in the Wisdom of God afforded, [105] being not in the wisdom of the World understood or discerned) plainly to declare this that *God* had done in *Christ* for them, and to intreat them to be at one with him, which as it intimates (as I said before) that they were not yet in their hearts reconciled to him, for why then needed any further beseeching of them thereto? So doth it no more prove, that they must be all so reconciled, and that Christ had obliged God thereto, [106] then that phrase, *All things are ready, come ye to the Wedding*, argues that Christ had obliged God to make all those bidden guests to feast with him, and the following Caveat in *Chap.* 6.1. warning them *not to receive the Grace of God in vain*, both argues, that there is such a receiving it, and that there is danger

★ Its but
[ἦν ἐν χρί-
στῳ, κατὰ
λάσσω],
not [κατὰ
λαξέ].

[105] Joh. 1 4, 5.
1 Cor. 1
21.

[106] Mat. 22.4.

danger that some such as this grace is affirmed to concern, may so receive it, and so by consequence not be reconciled in their hearts at all to him. So that this place duly weighed, rather overthrows Mr. Owens Assertion, then contributes any the least mite to its confirmation. He produces also *Rom. 11.15. The casting off of the Jews is the reconciling of the world*, which neither speaks a title of Christs death; nor can be understood to make any thing for a *meritorious* reconciling, Reconciliation there signifying only the occasional way and means of reconciling; As Salvation, *Acts 28.28.* is the means of saving. He quotes also *Rom. 5.10. If being enemies we were reconciled to God by the Death of his Son*, &c. and *Col. 1.21. Now are ye reconciled in the body of his flesh through death*. But neither will they serve him up to his purpose. For neither of them, either speak in that latitude as All for whom Christ died, nor of a meritorious reconciling onely; but of Reconciliation at least *inchoative* accomplished in mens persons. In *Rom. 5.* The Apostle having said, [107] That the believer being justified by faith in Christ, is at peace with God (which is all one with, [108] is reconciled) and is lead to rejoyce in the hope of the glory of God even in afflictions, shews how Faith nourishes and acts the soul in that hope, from what principle, and by what considerations, *viz.* By minding the great love of God in giving his Son to the Death for it, when in a miserable condition, [109] and the great love of Christ in so dying for it, and the state to which God hath there-through already brought it, *viz.* [110] A justified and reconciled estate. VVhence it leads the soul thus hopefully to judge and reason. Hath God shed his Sons blood for me, that I might have good ground of believing in him, and overcoming me to believe therein: hath he justified me there-through? (Compare *ver. 1.9.* with *Chap. 3.25.*) how shall he not much more now save me (me, or us that are thus justified) from wrath to come? And again, Hath God made me of an enemy his friend by such a way, & at such cost as the death of his Son? how much more wil he now that I am no more his enemy but his friend, reconciled to him, save (preserve me in, and bring me safely out of all afflictions and trials unto glory) by his life, seeing he shall not need to die again to do that for me? Yea, not only so says he, but it leads too to Glory in God himself through Jesus Christ, through (or by) whom it hath now (now that it believes and is justified,) received the atonement, {καταλλαγήν}, by a Metonymy, the Grace of God that effected this reconciliation, and

[107] Verse 1.

[108] Ver. 2, 3, 4, 5.

[109] Ver. 6, 7, 8.

[110] Ver. 9, 10.

brought it in to be the reconciled of God, as he had before (*ver.* 10.) affirmed. He says not, we were reconciled in the time of Christs dying, that would have been rather {ἐν τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν αὐτόν}. But the reconciliation which we now have received (in receiving him, to wit) and in which we are reconciled, we have it by his Death. That phrase, *By his Death* that men so stumble at, I have explained before, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 1. This then says nothing of Christ meriting of, or obliging God to reconcile, that is, turn the affections of all to himself for whom he died: nor says that in *Col.* 1.21, 22. any thing more for it, but that the believing *Colossians* were of enemies to God become now his friends reconciled to him, onely the Apostle there tell us what was the bond or *medium* of their agreement, viz. The body of Christs flesh, through, or by means of death, that is, he having in that his body suffered for our sins, and offered up himself to God, God there takes up his delightful dwelling, and is propitious towards us; now we also by Faith, closing with, and feeding on that his body as it hath (or he therein) died for us, God and we are at one, But what is this to his meriting of God that he actually reconcile all for whom he died?

His last proof is *Ephes.* 2.15, 16, where the Apostle having said that the *Ephesians* sometimes strangers to God and his Church, were now made neer by the blood of Christ; which we may either understand of that cleansing of the state of the *Gentiles* in general, and opening a free access into his Kingdom to them, of which we spake above, or else more especially of the believing *Gentiles*, such as the *Ephesians* written to, made of one body with the believing *Jews*, he shews how that nighness was effected, viz. in Christ our peace, and how he is our peace, viz. in that he hath broken down the partition wall, and so slain the enmity, the Law of Commandments in Ordinances in his cross or sufferings. Which work of his he amplifies by his ends in it. viz. 1. That he might create of two peoples, one new man in himself, which is done in their believing on him. 2. That he might reconcile them in one body unto God, that is, in his own body fed on by both, or in one mystical body consisting of both, by the Cross, that is, the vertue of his sufferings, having slain the enmity there, as above, *ver.* 15. Now note that he says not, he reconciled them to God in dying, (no more then that he had new created them therein) but he slew the enmity there, that is, the power of the

the Law upon us, which was the bond of enmity and difference between us, that by it he might reconcile us, that's spoken of as a further and future thing to his dying and slaying the enmities. Unto which also it follows that he came and preached peace to them. So that this proves not Reconciliation of man to God, an immediate fruit of his death, but through the interposition of the Word and Spirit, and Faith, (as *ver.* 18.) bringing us to feed on that one body of Christ, and into one body with the Saints of God. Much less is there is any Scripture saith, That Christ merited, that all for whom he died, should be effectually brought in to be friends to God. He is indeed worthy to be believed on by us, as I said before, but hath no where obliged God to cause us in so doing to become at one with him. So that that Argument also is a gross mistake. And this takes off all the following Queries in that Chapter, which need no other Answer. Onely there is a touch in it needs a little clearing. Its said, 2 *Cor.* 5.19. *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, [Object.] not imputing their trespasses unto them;* And I acknowledg he hath done so much for the world. But then, are not the world blessed and made righteous? seeing its said, *The man is blessed to whom God imputes not sin,* Rom. 4.5, 6, 7. To that I say, No, not in themselves, [Answ.] though in the promised seed. And onely here propound this difference to be considered between the places. In this its onely in the time past, and hitherto, *Not imputing,* there it is, *He will not impute.* He is not a blessed man, (in the prime sense of the word *Blessed*) to whom God hath not been imputing sins, but preaching peace and forgiveness, and diverting his Wrath (in regard of the Testimonies of it against the sins that brought condemnation on us) to his Son: But he that is so far brought into favor, as that he will not Impute sin. As he is blessed that shall not come into condemnation, but not every one whom Christ now judgeth not, or condemns not; Except the man that believes not is also blessed. For in *Joh.* 12.47. Its said, *If any man hear my words and believe not, I judg him not.* [III] So he that considers the poor, is blessed in this, *That the Lord will deliver him in the time of trouble.* He is a blessed man whom God will deliver in all times future, but its not true, that he is blessed, that God hath in times past, and perhaps hitherto doth deliver in times of trouble, he being not yet by all those deliverances brought to believe in him. Except we should take blessedness in a lower sense then there, as its taken in *Psal.* 144. the former part of the last

Verse

[III] *Psal* 41.1.

Verse. [Object.] If any object, That if God was reconciling the world, and they all never come to be reconciled, Then God doth his work imperfectly. [Answ.] Let him consider, that as much might be said against his bringing *Israel* into *Canaan*, that he was bringing them unto *Canaan*, and yet many thousands not following him fell short of it, and yet that of *Moses* is true, *As for God his work is perfect, All his wayes are Judgment, Deut. 32.4.* And let that suffice to that Chapter and Argument.

CHAP. VII.

About Satisfaction.

[112] *Instan. 3.* **H**Is next Chapter treats of Satisfaction, [112] containing the same Argument in substance that we have answered before in *lib. 1. cap. 3.* and *lib. 3. cap. 3.* The main thing in it is, “*That for whom Christ died, All their sins he satisfied for: And therefore being just he ought to discharge them, &c.* But first he fails in the proof of both. He proves not that Christ undertook to satisfy for all the sins of All he died for, as well Consectaneous as Antecedaneous to his Mediation, for such a proof would be to some purpose, and make the Apostles caution, as well as our perswasion ridiculous: it would be out of fear that any man should occasion one to perish for whom Christ died, seeing whatever sin such a one can commit, is paid for and discharged beforehand. So that I say, Those passages in *Rom. 14.15.* and *1 Cor. 8.11.* would be as vain, as if he had said, Take heed lest ye annihilate Christ, or swallow him up through sorrow, in the mids of all his glory. Such kinde of vain intimations, are not to be fixed on the Apostles Doctrine. But if it be true indeed, that there the Apostle supposes, *viz.* That a man for whom Christ died, may by stumbling at Christ, and departing from him, perish: then is it not true that Mr. *Owen* propoundeth, that for such sins as any do so commit, Christ hath so fully satisfied, that the forgiveness of them is due debt, and God unjust in case they for them perish. We grant he hath satisfied to the utmost of that Obligation that he undertook, and so removed the sentence of death from off all that the benefit of his righteousness is to All to justification of life; but not that he hath made the remission of all sins past, present, and to come

fot

for all for whom he died due debt, so as that its unjust that any perish for them. The onely place he brings to prove it, is 1 Joh. 1.7. which he seems not to understand; for that neither saith The blood of Christ hath cleansed All them for whom he dyed, from all their sins, that they have or shall commit; nor that it cleanseth all us (absolutely) from all our sins: but it saith, *If he walk in the light, as he is in the light*, (that is (in other Scripture phrase) If we walk in the Spirit, and continue rooted and grounded in the Faith, and be not moved from it) *then have we fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all our sins*. He forgot that [*If he walk in the light, &c.*] Its the same in meaning with that in Rom. 8.1. *There is no condemnation to those that are in Christ Jesus, that walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit*. He saith not There is no condemnation to any that Christ hath died for, nor to all in Christ Jesus; for some such may be unfruitful branches, and grieve and rebel against the Spirit, and so be cut off. [113] Its like that too in Col. 1.23. *To present you blameless, and unreprieveable in his sight, if ye continue stedfast, &c.* The meaning, in a word, is this, That such is the force of the blood or sufferings of Jesus Christ with God, and such Gods wel-pleasedness in that his obedience, and such the mutual consent of God and Christ upon his sufferings, That whoever receiveth the light that comes from God, & walks therein, as God is in it affording power and strength to him there-through, with him God hath fellowship, and him God admitteth into communion with himself (or such have joynt participation one with another) & are presented spotless in the sight of God. So as that though they have sin in them that hinders them from doing as they would, from attaining to walk in that heighth & perfection that they desire, yet they not yielding to that sin but siding with the light and Spirit of God against it, God imputes it not to them. All such mens sins, being sins of weakness to which they are meerly drawn, are so covered, that there comes no condemnation upon them for any of them, no rebuke from God, nor * self condemnation to burthen the conscience. The blood of Jesus Christ believed in, presenting the soul spotless to God, and speaking peace unto the conscience. But now its neither so with all that Christ died for, nor with all that are in Christ. Such as walk after the flesh, and sow to it (though believers) do and shall of the flesh reap corruption. Its not the agreement between God and Christ, that his blood or sufferings, should present men in that

[113] Joh. 15.4.

* So {κατα-ΓΡΕΕΚ} is used in Rom. 14. 23. Gal. 6.7.

condition unblameable before him, his blood speaks no such protection to sin, or to men as walking after sin, but such, notwithstanding Christs Death for them, God rebukes and punishes. There are {κρίματα} that come upon them, as appears 1 Cor. 11.29.30. Revel. 3. 19. Its true, those judgments are not to destruction, but that they might be brought to see, and confess their follies, and turn to the Spirit and Light of God again, which if they do, they shall finde the blood of Christ then effectual for them to remission again, as it follows in 1 Joh. 1.9 Otherwise they shall perish also. 1 Cor. 8.11. And this is the plain meaning and scope of that place; which by what is said, appears to be notably misapplied by Mr. Owen. And indeed the not discerning of this, is the ground of their error, whom they call *Antinomians*, who deny that God is angry, or punishes any believer (or any Elect man though an unbeliever) for his sin. Its grounded upon, and undeniably flows from this very conclusion of Mr. Owens, That for whom Christ died, all their sins are satisfied for, past present, and to come, and God ought not further to molest or trouble them for them. Nor can Mr. Owen Maintain, what he says in Chap. 8. against the *Socinians*, viz. “*That the state of those that Christ died for during their unregeneracy, is all one with such as he died not for, that they are unacceptable in all their services, in bondage to Death, yea, under the curse and condemning power of the Law, obnoxious to judgment, and guilty of eternal Death.*” I say, these things cannot be true of any of them, if Christ hath made for all their sin, such satisfaction, as that they ought to be discharged of all suits, charges, and molestations, as here he saith they ought. How can it be conceived, That a man whose debts are all paid, that he hath or shall contract, is liable to the Law, and obnoxious to perpetual imprisonment still for them. But we say, a man whose debt is paid, & he discharged, may run into a new debt and become obnoxious again to Law, And that the case is so here, appears, as by that intimation before noted, 1 Cor. 8.11. So also by many other Scriptures. So the *Israelites* that were pardoned all their rebellions and murmurings from *Egypt*, till they sent Spies to *Canaan*, and that rebellion too that ensued. *Numb.* 14.19, 20. yet were many of them cut off and consumed without pardon for the Rebellion of *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, that soon after hapned, *Numb.* 16. Nor would *Moses* intercede for them in that, though he hath for all the rest formerly. *ver.* 15. And accordingly those who are said to have had their

their old sins cleansed, yet growing purblind, and Apostatizing (for so its clearly intimated by way of Antithesis, that they may fall, yea, are in the way to it, 2 *Pet.* 1.9, 10.) yea, denying the Lord that bought them, and turning his grace into wantonness, are said to perish in the gainsayings of *Korah*, no pardon for so high rebellion, *Jude* 11. Again, as God is “*That Creditor to whom* (as Mr. *Owen* saith) *we owe a thousand talents*, *Matth.* 18. So our Saviour there tells us, That they who receive forgiveness of those talents from him, and yet afterward walk not in the Spirit of God, in love and Christlike dispositions, but forgetting their own purging from their old sins; are destitute of Vertue, Knowledge, Temperance, Charity, &c. God will so deal with them, as he that having forgiven his servant a thousand talents, afterwards for his cruelty to his fellow-servant, threw him into Prison till he should pay the utmost farthing. So says our Saviour himself in that very place instanced by Mr. *Owen*, *Matth.* 18.32, 35. So that all Mr. *Owens* Inferences and Queries in that Chapter built upon the former premise, are meer fallacies, and amount to just nothing. The needs no *Oedipus* to resolve his Riddles, the Spirit of God in the Scriptures hath plainly enough resolved them to any that have understanding.

CHAP. VIII.

An Answer to his Arguments from the Word Merits, and the Phrases,
 {ὕπερ πάντων} & {ἅντι πόλλων}.

HIs two following Chapters, *scil.* the eighth and ninth, being a digression, and in some points (as is shewed) a contradiction to his inferences of Gods being bound to surcease all actions and molestations against those for whom Christ died; and not concerning the Question debated, but opposing the Socinians, I pass them, [115] and come to his Chapter of Merit, in which he confesses, “*That no* [115] *Instan.* 4.
word is found in the Scripture that may justly be so translated.

From which concession I might take advantage to tell him, That then he can prove nothing against a plain saying of Scripture by any Argument drawn from this Word which is not found in Scripture; but I pass it. Now will I say much to these places quoted by him to hold forth the thing meant by the word *Merit*, viz. *Isai.* 53.5.

Heb. 9.12. Acts 20.28. save that they prove not any obligation put upon God to do those things there mentioned to all that he died for, but onely that God was pleased to do such things upon such considerations, or by such mediums. Onely the latter place, of *Acts 20.28.* seems least to the business, for it speaks not of Christs meriting of God, but Gods procuring, acquiring, or obtaining (as the word most usually signifies) a people to be a Church, by that way of his blood, the sufferings of Christ. But to pass those things. Let this be observed (which himself grants, *lib 4. cap. 1.*) “*That however pretious and valuable the sufferings of Christ be, yet they oblige and binde God to nothing, but according to his own appointment and free ingagement.*” Having noted that, we come to his Argument, which is this. “*That Christ did merit and purchase by his death for all those for whom he died, all those things which in the Scriptures are assigned to be the fruits and effects of his death. But all have not all those effects and fruits, Ergo, he died not for All.*” *Ans.* If by his *Major* he means, He procured them into himself, as into Gods Treasury to be free for them all, to look after, and come to him for, and to be dispensed to all that do look after him and come to him; Then it nothing hurts us: But then his *Minor* assumes not rightly (as it doth not however) for it should be thus, That Christ hath not purchased all those things for All, and not as it is, That all have them not. But if in his *Major* he means (as he seems to do) that he obliged the Father to bestow upon All for whom he died, and bring them to enjoy all those things which his Death (either as presented to God, or as believed by us) is said to effect (as his after-enumeration of its effects argue him to mean) then I deny it, and desire his proof of it, which because he brings not, his Argument falls to the ground, and needs no further answering. Onely I shall minde the Reader, that the effects enumerated by him, are such (for the most part) as it produceth in us by believing on it, such as the “*Delivering us from the hand & power of all our enemies* [which we are not till called, nay, till raised from the dead] “*from wrath to come,* [which we are not, till justified by faith, as is evident by his own confession against the “*Socinians*] *The works of the Devil* [which are overcome and destroyed by him in being believed on, *Ephes. 6.13.16.*] “*the curse of the Law* [which he says we are subject to till believers, *Cap. 8. Sect. 6.*] *from our vain conversation, the present evil world, the earth, and from men,* all which he doth by his blood and sufferings, as being
accepted

accepted of God they are made known to us, and (withall the Covenant ratified by it) held forth to us. By letting us see such love in God towards us, and such good-will in Christ with such perfection to save us, and so great promises ratified to believers, he moves and persuades us to let go our vain conversations, renounce the world, its fellowships, vanities and wickedness, to cease cleaving to the earth and earthy men, and having our confidence in them, and reliance on them, for teaching, worship, satisfaction, delight, &c. Thus God is said to have bought *Israel* to himself, *Deut.* 32.6. in that he by so great things done for them, purchased or gained them in to own and follow him. And so in *Hos.* 3.2. Gods buying *Israel* to be a people for himself, is compared to *Hoseahs* buying an harlot off from other lovers to be his wife for a certain consideration or Sum given her. So Christ buys men unto God from other things, by setting before us his great sufferings for us, and profering to us the great glory he will thereby bring vs to if we will renounce all for him. But this note is over and above what was needful for shewing the invalidity of the Argument. All his other quotations too are impertinent, and none of them prove, either that God is obliged by the Death of Christ, and ought to grant to, and possess all for whom he died of those good things that he mentions: or that he was, or is bound thereby (otherwise then as he freely ingaged himself) to do them to any. They say, That *by his Death we are reconciled*, as we may say By *Joabs* Mediation *Absolom* was recalled from banishment and brought into *Davids* favor. Which speech proves not that the inward worth of his Mediation bound *David* to that. So, He is our Propitiatory through Faith in his blood, and God hath set him forth to be so, that proves not that he obliged God to forgive the sins of All he died for. The like I might say for Peace-making and salvation. *Believing on him we are at peace with God, and shall be saved by him*; but no place sayes, All that he died for shall be saved, or that God ought to make them all believe, and so save them, as was before shewed.

“For his next Instance from the Phrases, { ὑπερ πάντων }, & { ἅντι πολλῶν }. [116]
 “For All, and for Many, and Interrogatory, “Whether Christ died in the stead of All? Its answered in those Chapters that speak about Satisfaction, with all the Queries he propounds upon it. Onely I shall spake to one of them. viz. “Whether Christ hung upon the Cross for Reprobates? I say, I conceive, as they were men faln in

[116] Inst. 6.

[117] 1 Pet. 4.6.

Adam he did, but not as besides that Reprobated also. Its like that, *The Gospel was preached to the dead*, [117] *and the Spirits in prison*. Was the Gospel preached to dead men, and men in hell? Yes, To them that are now dead and in hell, But not when, and as dead, and in hell. Men were not Reprobates as they were the Objects of Christs Death, but as they are considered, and actually found guilty of sinning wilfully and pertinaciously against the truth discovered, and benefits afforded to them through his Death. If we will speak of things according to the Scripture. If otherwise, *Eâdem facilitate rejicitur quâ asseritur*. The Scriptures say, men that corrupt themselves, and notwithstanding the means of purging used to them (which sure are all consequent in order of Nature to the death of Christ for men, there being nothing affordable to men towards purging, according to the demerit of *Adams* sin, but All were forthwith to have perished) stand out, and remain in their corruptions, are the reprobate silver, men rejected of God, *Jer.* 6.30. And for such obstinacy against God in lower or higher means, the Scripture often tells us, that God reprobates or rejects men, as is to be seen in *Rom.* 1.19, 20, 21, 28. *Gen.* 6.3. *Psa.* 81.9, 10, 11, 12. *Pro.* 1.22, 23, 24, 25. *Matth.* 13.15, 16. *Acts* 28.27. 2 *Thess.* 2.10, 11, 12. And no other ways do I finde Reprobation befalling any one. Now that that is done for the sinning against a mercy afforded, and the fruits of it, presupposes that mercy to have extended to them, and not the contrary.

CHAP. IX.

An Answer to his last General Argument drawn from sundry Texts of Scripture.

[Argu. 11]

HIs last general Argument is from divers Texts of Scripture, which he pretends to hold out, That Christ died onely for the Elect, but never a one of them concludes it. I wonder how quick-sighted men are to spie out conceptions, where no such Phrase or Expression, as they conceive, is held forth; and yet cannot see plain expressions. [118] But let us view those Scriptures.

[118] *Scrip.* 1.

The first is, *Gen.* 3.15. *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between her seed and thy seed; He shall break thy head*

head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. I will not call this, as he doth a better one, *Argumentum a baculo ad Angulum*; but sure this place says not whom, and how many Christ died for, or that he should die at all. It says, but that the seed of the woman, and them that are born of Satan (granting that by the Serpent Satan is meant) shall have enmity between themselves, and the womans seed shall conquer Satan. How the Elect should be the seed of the woman more then others, I finde no reason, much less proof for it, And how it follows, That if Christ brake the head of Satan, then he died not for All, I see as little. Again, I finde not that any man, as he is born into the world, is called a childe of Satan, one of the Serpents seed. And we have shewed, That Christ might die for All, as faln in *Adam*, and yet destroy all such as after that, and the goodness extended to them thereby, should rebel against him, though the Verse speak not of destroying any but the Serpent himself, *He shall break thy head*. So that this Argument concludeth nothing. He neither proving the Serpent to be the Devil (and so that the Devil goes upon his belly and eats dust) nor the seed of the woman to be the Elect onely, nor that any till they rebel against Christ are the seed of the Serpent, nor that Christ was promised to the seed of the woman, there is no such passage in it, That I will give the womans seed one to die for them. At the most, it amounts but to this, That Christ in himself, and those that believe in him, shall get the better of Satan, and all that do oppose them. Which we grant.

“His second place is, *Matth. 7.23.* [119] *I profess unto you I never knew you. But Christ (says he) saith expresly, he knows his own whom he died for. Joh. 10.14, 17. Surely he knows whom, and what he hath bought, &c.* This is fallacious reasoning, To shew the vanity of which, we are to minde, That to know in Scripture, is sometime to apprehend, understand, or discern a thing, what it is, and of what nature. So Christ knew what was in man, and knows all things. But oftentimes to know, is to own, approve, and acquaint ones self with: so God is said to know the way of the righteous. And in both these senses Christ (is in some measure known of his, and he) knows his sheep. But in the latter sense we say, He knows not (that is, approves not of) all he died for. Though buying them they are his own, yet he skills not of many of them in their states and ways, so as to own them for his friends, and acquaint himself with them, as the

[119] *Scrip. 2.*

the word here signifies. Its as much as, You went without my Mission, however, without my liking in all your ways. His Argument that He hints thus [*Christ knows them He died for. But he knows not All, Ergo, Died not for All*] is fallacious, The *Minor* is Negative in the third Figure; and the *Major* a particular Affirmative or a falsity. For we deny (take knowing for owning, approving and countenancing, as there it signifies) that Christ so knows all that he died for, though he doth his sheep. Its like this. *Israel* that came out of *Egypt* was planted by God in *Canaan*, But all *Israel* that passed over the red Sea was not so planted, *Ergo*, they all came not out of *Egypt*. We grant that Christ knew, whom, and what he bought, even all of them, *Simplici cognitione*, as knowledg signifies, in the former of the senses above mentioned: But that he owns them all in their way and frame, we deny. Its like this. A Prince ransoms an hundred slaves, some of them under pretence of honoring him, do wicked acts to his dishonor, and then being brought to an account, they plead what they have done to honor him, how they have spoken for him, &c. He bids them be gone, for he approved none of their

actions, never owned them in what they say they did for him, they secretly carrying on a Trayterous design against him: And as such people pleading his ransoming of them, and the cost he was at for them, and the pains he took to do them good, would but plead

against themselves, and he could easily answer them, that they were the more ingaged to have loved him, sought his glory, and served his designs, and not to have counterfeited with him, secretly seeking to

betray him, under pretences of love: So will Christ * say to those, that their Destruction shal be the greater, and the less excuse there is for their wickedness, for that he having been at such cost to buy them, and being so gracious a Lord to them, yet they would deny him, and work iniquity against him. Nor will that advantage them,

to say (as Mr. Owen suggests) “*Is it not because thou dyedst it for thine*

“*Elect that none can lay any thing to their charge? and why should we be*

charged if thou dyedst for us? he can easily say to them, My Death in-

deed was efficacious to them to salvation from all such charges, for

mine. Elect were such as loved and served me, and walked in my

spirit

quam illa, quam tui
misertus mortem tuam
occisurus ascendi.
Impassibilis cum essem,
pro te pati
dignatus sum; sed tu
despexisti in homine
Deum, in infirmo
salutem, in viâ reditum,
in iudice
veniam, in cruce vitam,
in suppliciis medicinam:

spirit, and if at any time they stept away, [121] yet they returned again at my reproofes unto me, and I improved the vertue of my blood with my Father to the utmost for their good and protection. But so hath not your way been before me, you have sinned against my blood, and troden me under foot, and therefore it now requires vengeance on you. Mark by the way, that its not said, Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect, because Christ dyed for them? but, God justifies them, & who is he that condemns them? Not, who shal condemn them? but who is he (that is in comparison of God that justifies them) that here reproaches and condemns them? Its Christ that dyed, one who hath infinite favor with God dyed for them being enemies and shall not such a one (being now at his right hand) prevaile for more strength for God to uphold them (they being his choise ones, men in him, and believers on him) then is in all their adversaries to overthrow them? But as for those that neglect his salvation, he saith, How shall they escape? *Heb. 2 3.* not, how shall they but be own-
ed and protected in their way by him?

[121] *Matth. 25.*
35, 36.
Heb. 10.
29.
2 Pet. 2.1.

His next Scripture-proof is *Matth. 11.25, 26.* [122] “*Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, &c. thence he gathers. That from whom the Lord in his Sovereignty hides the Gospel, either in regard of its outward preaching, or inward revelation in their hearts, Them Christ dyed not for.* But our Saviour here affirms there are such, &c. Both these propositions I deny. The first, for he reveales it not to children dying in infancy by the outward preaching, yet we dare believe they are not all heirs of hell, and he may justly hide the inward revelation from those that stop their ears against, or attend not to the outward preaching, and yet Christ might dy for them to ransom them from the Death that they were adjudged to in *Adam*, that so he might further glorify the Father in his dispensations towards them, and dispose of them. Besides he hath not one patch of Scripture to attest that proposition. Again I deny the *minor*, for Christ saith not there, that those wise and prudent men never heard of the Gospel in its power. The words are not, I thank thee that thou hast hid the Gospel from them, much less, that thou will never reveal it to them, But, *These things*, which may be understood they way of his Judgments of which he had been speaking *ver. 20. 24.* and also how mens names are writ in Heaven, *Luk. 10.13-20. 21.* In *Matth. 13.11.* Its the Mysteries of the Kingdom, *Secreta, abdita*, the things only to be shewed to those that are Scholars to

[122] *Scrip. 3.*

Christ, as there are certain mysteries in trades that are for none but those that are bound prentices to know, and he there gives a reason in ver. 15. they had closed their eyes against the powerfull convincements of the Gospel, they refused to turn at Christs re-proofs, and therefore he would not pour out his Spirit, *Prov.* 1.22, 23, 24. These things he hath hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed to babes: by babes he means men humbled and emptied of themselves, like infants that knowing nothing are docible, and dispute not against what is taught them, but believe it though they comprehend not what is in it, attending till growing up to perfecter capacity they be able to comprehend the truth of it. By wise and prudent men he means them that being strong-parted, men of reason and learning, do think by reason to finde out truth, or to be the measure of truth propounded, able to judge of what is said to them, and therefore believe not upon the bare authority of the Master as Children and babes do, but measuring what God says by their reason and prudence, judge many things to be cross to reason and absurd, and so receive them not. Now these men while they thus lift up their wisdom, and think to comprehend truth in a way of reason, they finde fault with truth, overlook, despise and condemn it, and so come not to see into the mysterious things of it, which God hath put out of that way of reason in which they think to finde it: But men that think not themselves wise, but are willing to learn of, & to be taught of God and his word, and therefore dare not but own and receive his sayings, and cry to him for light about them, they finde wisdom, and to them he shews one thing after another, even the mysteries of the kingdom, *Prov.* 2.2, 6. thence the necessity of mens becoming humble as little children, and that they that are wise in this world become fools (that is deny their own reason and wisdom, not leaning to it as it objects against, and findes absurdities in the truth of God) that they may be made wise. Now though God doth this according to his meere good will, yet he doth it also as a just judgment upon some for exalting their reason against Gods word, as in *Isa.* 29.13, 15. and also to abase flesh, that he that glories may glory in God, and that men might be instructed to deny themselves and cease from their own and other mens wisdom, becoming as babes in a simple belief of Gods sayings, so should they understand what now by the just will of God is hidden from them. I might apply it by way of Caution to these very men who exercise not babe-like simplicity

in giving credit to Gods word, but exalt and lift up their own understanding; they are sick about questions, [123] as the manner of unbelief is, and say with *Nicodemus*, *How can these things be?* To what purposes should Christ dy for All, seeing all are not saved, and many hear not of it, &c. who have the truth and usefulness of it hidden from them, God having not ordained that men should know it by reason and wisdom, but by faith and supplication. Thence that in *Isa.* 9.9. If ye will not believe, ye shall not understand: and that in *Jam.* 1.19. Be swift to hear, slow to speak, be more ready to hear what God says, then to exercise thy reason in objecting against God. Yet I will not say that Christ dyed not for these men, that being prudent and full of humane wisdom, and exalting that above faith, have the things they dispute against hidden from them; that would be found (as too harsh, so) too unjust a censure. Some of these wise and prudent, from whom these things are hidden, may become babes, and then have them revealed to them. Again we may apply that saying to the mysteries of Christ revealed to weak despised men, to be published by them, and not to the Scribes and Pharisees and wise men, that so the glory of God might not be obscured by their Wisdom, as if that found out or helped forward the propagating of the Gospel: but even those things though revealed to poor, weak, simple men, were not to be concealed by them, but to be divulged to the wise and prudent also for their conversion or just confusion if they (when revealed) would not accept or yield up to them, for what he told them secretly in the ear, they were bidden to proclaim openly upon the house tops. And then Gods chusing weak simple men to be the first Teachers, and so by consequence the first understanders of the divine truth, doth neither prove that others that were wise and prudent, were left destitute of the means of salvation or operation of the Spirit in them, or much less that Christ dyed not for them, or for All men, but only, That these wise and prudent, would they be saved, must stoop to God in embracing the knowledge of his mind, by weak and sorry men; and that indeed is the Genuine meaning as I conceive of that Scripture. Whenas God, had he pleased, might have opened his mysteries to the Learned Rabbies, Scribes and Pharisees, to have been divulged by them, he pleased to hide them from them, putting them beside their way, and to reveal them to others, poor simple men, by whom they were to be preached to them and to All Nations, and

[123] 1 Tim. 6.
3. 4.

that meerly out of his good will, that no flesh might glory in his presence, &c.

[124] *Scrip.* 4. in
cap. 3. lib. 2. His next alledged place is *John* 10.15, [124] 16, 27, 28. which we have before considered, and shewed the vanity of his inferences from it, there is no new thing here to be spoken to, that is not there answered, except that he tels us of Christ dying as a Shepheard spoken of in that place, and Therefore he dyed only for his sheep; which indeed is a new fallacious argument, Logicians call it *fallacia à dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*, as if I should argue thus, In 1 Pet. 2.21, 22. Christ is spoken of as dying, as a pattern of patience to believers suffering unjustly from men; *Ergo* he dyed for none but actuall believers so suffering. Our question is whether Christ dyed for All or no, not whether he dyed for All as a Shepheard: though he laid not down his life for All as a Shepheard, for sheep to preserve them in a life fore-given them, yet he might and did lay down his life for All as a ransome to deliver them out of a Death come upon them for the sin they fell into in *Adam*, and to be a propitiation for their sins, &c. To *Matth.* 20.28. a Ransome for Many, we have spoken in *Chap.* 1. *Lib.* 1. for *John* 11.52. He dyed for that Nation, and not for that Nation only, but to gather together the children of God scattered abroad. That tels us he dyed for the Nation which were not all Elect people to eternall life, there being in it those Scribes and Pharisees whom he cald generation of vipers. 2. He saith not, For the Children of God, much less for the Children of God only; but shews that that was one end of his Death reaching further then the Nation, namely to gather the scattered Jews, or to bring all that should believe, into an unity of faith and priviledges by slaying the enmity (the Law of ordinances) between them: this puts no limitation to the Death of Christ, nor saith that any were excluded it.

[125] *Scrip.* 5. His next is *Rom.* [125] 8.32, 33, 34. which (indeed) is brought as a consolation to believers in affliction, assuring them they have God to justify them, and he greater then any against them to condemn them; and then they have Christ to intercede for them, who had also dyed and risen, and he would not faile them, it being his business to present believers and walkers in the Spirit perfect before him, as we noted before: he that had given his Son for them, would surely supply them with all strength, them that were the called of God and believers in him. “Now whereas Mr. *Owen* observes, that *this act of*
“*giving*

“giving Christ to dy for them, was the greatest expression of Gods love toward believers. I answer, That the Apostle couples two acts together there. 1. His giving Christ for them, that expresly. 2. His giving him to them, thats intimated in that repetition {συν'αὐτῷ}, with him; for God gave not all things to be crucified with Christ, nor did he give Christ to believers or to any in his beating him, but delivered him up to Death and judgement, and Christ gave up himself to bear the wrath of God, but as one dead and risen, God gives him with his excellencies to men. Yea this is said to be done to the murmuring, unbelieving Jews, who not receiving him, deprived themselves of that life, and all those glorious things in and with him. But to go on with Mr. Owens observation. He infers from that, thus, “If God gave his Son to dy for All, then he had as great an act of love, “and made as great a manifestation of it to them that perish, as to them “that are saved. But this follows not, for though in it self it was exceeding great, yea compared singly with other acts as to the outward expression, the greatest act of love to give Christ to dy for men, yet in regard of the heart of God in it, and the conjoying that act with others, he manifested not, nor acted so great love to them that perish, as to them that are saved. 1. I say, in regard of the heart of God, for in chap. 8. Mr. Owen tells us, Gods love is his *velle bonum creaturis*, his purpose and will of grace; which if so, then thats to be accounted the greatest to them, to whom he purposed the greatest good by that act, which was but the *medium* of good to men. Now in as much as he purposed more grace to some through that gift then to others, to the saved then to those that perish, though in the *medium* they all shared, yet it cannot be said that he manifested, or acted as much love to one as to another: To illustrate it take this comparison, David put his life in hazzard from the Israelites when he fought with the Philistin, in that he laid his life down at the stake as it were, [126] and it was the greatest act of love he could have shewed to his friend to lay down his life for him, yet in this act he might love his Father with a more intense love then many others of them; yet he hazzarded his life for them all, and shewed forth that act of love to them all that in expression is highest. 2. In respect of other acts. Though that act was greater then any other act of love (I say suppose that) yet not so great as that and other acts also joyned with it. He loved believers with that and diverse others, as in compelling them in, &c. 3. Yea suppose all loved alike in that, yet if some

[126] 1 Sam. 19.
5.

[127] As Hosea,
9.15.

of them all so alike loved, requiting that his same like-love worse then others, [127] are left, and he takes their slighing his so great love so ill, that he will love them no more: And others not so requiting him, but accepting it, continue in his love (as the phrase is *Joh. 15.10.*) and he saves them, shall we say he loves not these more then the other? If *David* venture his life for All the *Israelites* alike, and after that he coming to have Power and Government, one is by that knit to him and loves him again, as *Jonathan* did, and he enters into Covenant with him to be his choise friend; and another regards him not for this, but churlishly requites him, as *Nabal* did, and for that he destroyes him; shall we say now That *David* loved *Nabal* as much as *Jonathan*, because he acted the same highest act of love for them both formerly? would not that be a notorious falshood? And is not this then a notorious fallacy in Mr. *Owen*?

2. He infers, *That for whomsoever he hath given his Son, to them "also he will assuredly freely give all things.* But I deny, that the Apostle sayes any such thing. But thus. *That having given his Son for us all, he will surely give us all things with him.* *Us*, that is, such as believe on him; *Us*, that are in Christ, that are called according to purpose, &c. *Jonathan*, or *Abigail* making this Inference, If *David* spared not himself, but put his life in his hand for us all, when we were strangers to him, will not he that had so much love to us then, give us (*Us*, his federates and dear friends) with himself (having also given himself to us by Covenant) whatever is in his power to the half of his Kingdom? Will it follow from such a speech that Therefore whomsoever *David* loved so well as to venture his life for them against the Philistin, to them he will give any good thing thats desirable of him, yea, though many of them are his arch-enemies, and do rebel against him? Who sees not this to be a false Inference? and yet such is this of Mr. *Owens*. The believer doth, or may expect all good things from Christ that died for them (even upon that consideration that he died for them,) and shall have them; therefore whosoever he died for, shall have all good things too. Thence also that Faith is not in the number of that All things spoken of, appears, because the parties thus speaking, and of whom this is spoken, are actuall believers before the making of this Inference. That conception is like this, He that was at such cost, as to make a great Feast for us (who are brought in to it already, and are at it with thankful acceptance) how shall he not give *Us* to eat any dainty that is provided,

therefore its from this speech inferable, That he that was at such cost to make such a feast, will make all that he invited, to come and eat every dainty of it. Whereas he saith, “*His description of those persons there spoken of to be Elect, not All, but those chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, confirms the restraint of the Death of Christ to them alone.* 1. He proves not, nor I am perswaded can he, That any man yet uncalled hath that denomination of Elect in Scripture. 2. We may see the vanity of his Argument by this insuing Similitude. *David* venturing his life, and conquering the *Philistin*, and obtaining the Kingdom, Shall he not stand by his friends, familiars and kindred? He that did that for them, when mean, will he suffer any enemy to vex and spoil them being invested with the power of the Kingdom? *Ergo, David* hazarded his life, onely for his friends, familiars, and kindred, and not for any that were his enemies, or that afterward dealt injuriously and rebelliously against him. Is this a good inference, The Elect of God (be they what they will) shall be preserved by the Death, Resurrection, and Intercession of Christ from perdition (which is all the Apostle there says, he sayes not they are the adequate object of Christs Death) Therefore Christ died for no more then they, nor desired any good thing to be granted to any other, but to them? Who that understands Reason would not hiss out such arguments? So from these words of the Apostle concerning the Elect; *Who is he that condemns, its Christ that died;* doth this Inference fairly follow? That whosoever he died for shall not be condemned? more then from this; If *David's* brother, or good Subjects had said, Who is he that accuses us? Its *David* the King that ventured his life for our good, and now raings to defend us from harm, it would follow, *Ergo*, None that he ventured his life for against *Goliah*, shall be put to death for any after-carriage toward him. It doth but undeniably appear to me from all this, that Mr. *Owen* understands not the drift of the Apostle, nor sees the maner of his reasoning; but no whit evident, That Christ died onely for the Elect, as he sayes.

He next Allegation is, *Eph. 1 7. We have redemption in him*, [128] That is still, we that are brought to him, made accepted in him, translated into his Kingdom (as *Col. 1.14.* and as himself grants in his Chapter against the *Socinians*, where he denies any of the Elect to be freed from wrath till regenerate) we have (that is, injoy or possess) Redemption, that is, remission of our sins, clearing & freeing us from all out

[128] *Scrip. 6.*

our bonds, &c. Therefore all that he died for, or; Therefore he died onely for us. Is this right reasoning? put it into form and then judg of it; its thus. If the believer hath redemption in Christ, Then all that he died for, But the believer hath, &c. I deny the Consequence of his *Major* Proposition, and leave him to prove it. And it in what sense All have release, and in what not, we have said before. There is redemption in Christ for All to seek after, and so remission with him, preached or predicable to all, that they might look after it, but, All for whom he died, I say, have it not, that is, have not received it, and so enjoy it not. How also they may be (comparatively to what their case should have been) blessed, and how not blessed, in that sense spoken of, *Rom.* 4.6, 7. we have shewed in *Chap.* 7.

[129] *Scrip.* 7. His next is, [129] 2 *Cor.* 5.21. *He made him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*, that is, in believing on him. Thence he infers, All that He was made sin for, are made the righteousness of God in him. Its like that, He brought them into *Canaan* that they might keep his Statutes, *Ergo*, All that were brought into *Canaan* kept his Statutes; as we noted at the beginning. So *by his stripes we* (we believers) *are healed*, *Ergo*, All that he died for, shall, though they never submit to have the playster applied. *David* by hazzarding his life brought us his friends to honor, *Ergo*, He ventured his life for no more but them that come to honor. As weak is that from *Joh.* 15, 13. “*Greater love than this hath no man*: If he acted the greatest, Why not all the rest? In which there is nothing but Reason exalting it self against the Word of God.

David put his life in his hand for All *Israel*, Why, seeing that was the greatest act of love a man could shew, did he not do all other acts of love to them all as to *Jonathan*? Again, This life is more then food, *Matth.* 6.25. Why then doth God suffer any to perish for want of food, which is the less, seeing he hath given them life which is the greater? Why doth he not inrich and furnish them to the utmost? Where is the sobriety of Faith that should keep men from being sick about such questions?

[130] *Scrip.* 8. His next is. [130] *I pray for them, I pray not for the world, and for their sakes I sanctifie my self.* *Joh.* 17.9.19. *Ergo*, He died onely for them. This is answered before, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 2, 3, 5. Its like this, A Prince procuring pardon for a company of Rebels, releases them from the sentence of death, and by publishing his grace to them, gains in some of

of them to be his servants, whom he makes his Favorites, and employs them to negotiate for him with the rest, that they also might become his servants and finde favor. Being about to leave that Country, and go a far journey; he commits them to his Father, and intreats him to have a special care of them his Servants and Favorites, admit them at all times into his presence, make them acquainted with his counsels, assist them in their work against all Opposers, And tells him in his request making, he asks not those things for the Rebels yet standing out, but for those reconciled ones for whom in special he set himself apart to make this request, and yet intreats him also, That whoever of the Rebels yet in Arms shall by their ministration be won in to like affection and service to him, they might finde like respect from him as they, *Ergo*. This Prince procured not the former pardon for all the Rebels, or did not rescue them from the death they were going to. *A baculo ad Angulum*. Such also is his last.

His last is, *Ephe. 5.25. Acts 20.28. Christ loved the Church, [131] and gave himself for it, Ergo*, Christ died not for all. *David* fought with the *Philistin*, and exposed his life to danger for his friends and Fathers House (suppose) to bring them to honor. *Ergo*, He did it not at all for All *Israel*. The Church, People called, are properly the object of Christs care, to be washed and presented glorious, as a fit Bride for himself, *Ergo*, He loved, he died for no more. Its like this. A mans wife is properly the object of his Conjugal affection, *Ergo*, A man may love none but his wife with a love of charity. The brazen Serpent was to heal no more then looked up to it, Therefore it was provided for none to look to, but them that did look to it, and were healed. Such are Mr. *Owens* Inferences. Christ eyed such as were to be given him of the Father, as a people that would stand in need of much healing and washing; and provided in his Death, that such should have what ever tends to their perfection, *Ergo*, he laid down his life for no more to ransom them and set them at liberty to seek after him. A Prince ransoming a thousand prisoners, makes it in his bargain, that all of them that submit to him, upon view of this act, should be made Courtiers, Onely fifty of them submit, and are made so, *Ergo*, he ransomed no more out of Prison. Such Arguments as these are scarce worth so much time and labor as to answer. No one of the places alledged by Mr. *Owen*, says, That Christ died not for All, or tells us, that there are some that he died

[131] *Scrip. 9.*
10.

B b
not

not for; nor can such a Conclusion be fairly, and by Scripture-proof be inforced from any one of them, or all of them together. And whereas he thought to have added more, He did better as he did, except they had more force in them. And so I have passed through all his Arguments, which I have found propounded with more confidence of their weight then he had reason. And so we have done also with his Third Book.

Lib.

Lib. Quartus;

A VIEW OF, AND A REPLY TO HIS FOURTH BOOK.

His Fourth Book is spent about answering our Arguments for the extent of Christs Death as a Ransom. So that, as in the other three, we had his Arguments to throw down; So in this we have to defend our own against him.

CHAP. I.

A view of an Answer to the Premises laid down by him in his first Chapter.



IN the first Chapter of this Book, he lays down some Previous Considerations, as Grounds upon which he intends to frame his Answers to our Arguments. Of which,

1. The first is, [132] about “*The innate Sufficiency of the death of Christ, That the death of Christ is sufficient*” [132] *Consid. 1.*
 “*for the Redemption of the whole world, for the expiation of all the sins of*
 “*All and every man in the world, and that arising from the dignity of his*
 “*person, & the greatness of the pains that he suffered, he undergoing the*
 B b 2 “*whole*

“whole curse of the Law and wrath of God due to sin. This (he says) is its own Internall worth (which I will not deny) but then he adds that, “Its being a price for any, and being beneficiall to them according to the worth that is in it, arises not from that, but is meerly Externall, “and depends upon the Intention and Will of God: The intention of the offerer and accepter that it should be for such some, or any. All which I will grant him also. But thence he comes to view the Distinction used by some Protestant Divines, “Of his Dying for All Sufficenter “but not Efficaciter, in regard of the Sufficiency of the Ransome he paid, but not in regard of the Efficacy of its Application; which he denies, except in this sense, “That it was sufficient to have “been made a Price for All, but it was not a sufficient price and ransom for All, not because not sufficient, but because not a Ransome. In which he speaks,

1. Improperly, as to his own intention, for that it was a Ransome, is as undoubtedly a Truth, as that it had an innate sufficiency for All, but he should have said (had he spoken rightly to his own meaning) not because not sufficient, but because not intended for All as a Ransome.

2. Untruly, and so as he overthrows that distinction, for that which was not done at all for All, was not sufficiently done for All. Now I on the contrary affirm, That it was sufficiently indured for All, yea as a ransome, yea and so effectuall with God too for All, that he inflicts not upon All, what justice exacted according to the sentence gone out upon *Adam* and All in him; had he dealt with All men according to that word, He and all in him had that day perished and been cut off for ever: but Christ interposing, made All things to consist, and upheld the pillars of the earth, which else were dissolved. Yea God deals mercifully and bountifully with All, and dispenses of his goodness to All, quite contrary to the Demerit of All in that sin. And further he hath done for All so sufficiently in his Death, that He is a meet object for All to believe on, and hope in, and (especially where the Gospel-proclamation comes) its great unrighteousness and iniquity in men, not to depend on him, live to, and serve him; even as great or greater then it was for the *Israelites* brought wonderously out of Egypt, not to believe Gods word for bringing them to *Canaan*. He hath done so much for All and every man, that he is worthy they should look up to him, and able in so doing to save them without renewing his sufferings, or making a new bargain about them for them.

His

His inferences from that first premise I shall view also: they are

1. "That he conceives, [133] *That the Assertors of Universall Redemption, do much undervalue the infinite value and worth of the Death of Christ*, which I deny, and challenge him to make it good against us, which he assays, "*By telling us that we Affirm that a door of grace was opened by it for sinners, but deny that any were effectually carried in at the door by it.* Which 1. Is a false imposition, for we affirm that the sight and discovery of this hath such vertue in it, that it effectually pulls in many at the door, reconciles, washes, begets to hope, &c. Yea this is the proper or ordinary way of Gods bringing in men effectually; to glorify his Son in these his sufferings and sacrifice to them.

2. Suppose we should say he obliged not God by his Death to bring in any at All; yet it will not thence follow that we extenuate the value and worth of the sacrifice of Christ. If Mr. Owens principle be true it salves that, for he says, "*Its being a price for this or that man (sure then by consequence too for this or that thing) ariseth not from its inward worth, but is meerly externall to that, arising solely from the Intention of the offerer and acceptor, that is, from the mutual part or Covenant agreed upon between them.* Therefore if it was not agreed upon by Christ and God, that God should bring in this or that man, or any at all to believe in him, it would be no diminishing the vertue of it, that being not hereby to be measured. No, should we say any of, or All those things that he imputeth to the Arminians, viz. "*That God might if he would and upon what condition he would, save those for whom Christ dyed, and Christ procured not a right of salvation for any, so that God might have dealt with man according to a legall condition again, or that all and every man might have been damned, and yet the Death of Christ have had its full effect, &c. That Christ purchased no more for any, then that they might go to hell with;* yet supposing that such had been the Covenant between God and Christ (as doubtless they do suppose so, that so express themselves) by Mr. Owens own principle before laid down, we should be acquitted of dishonoring or undervaluing the Death of Christ therein; that not being the Measure of its worth, what he purchased by it, but what the dignity of his person and greatness of his sufferings. The things purchased being only according to the agreement between God and Christ, not the sufficiency of his Death to have purchased by it. Such expressions may not rightly declare the

agreement between God and Christ about the end of his sufferings, but no way deny the inward worth of them by his principles, from which this is wondrously inconsequently inferred.

- [134] *Infer.* 2. 2. His second is, [134] “*That the innate vertue and sufficiency it hath, is a foundation to the generall preaching of the Gospel to All Nations, and of the right that it hath to be preached to every creature, because the way to salvation it declares is wide enough for all to walke in.* How that should be a foundation for that, I see not, more then the paying for ten prisoners in a thousand, ten times as much to ransom them, as might have sufficed to have ransomed them all, but yet excluding in the bargain All but ten, is a good foundation to go tell all those thousand that there is very good news for them All; ther’s as much paid for ten of them, as would have ransomed them All ten times over but 990. of them were excluded the bargain, yet good ground to bid every one of them look for freedom by it. Sure its not the wideness of the way that is ground enough to tell All, that there is good news for them, but the liberty that they may have to walk in it. The Truth is that Doctrine not only makes the Gospel needless to be preached to All, but needless also to be preached at All, seeing none for whom Christ dyed can possibly miss of life, by their doctrine, All their sins past present and to come being satisfied for, and of due to be discharged, should they hear nothing at all. But he infers further.

- [135] *Infer.* 3. 3. That, [135] “*That inward sufficiency in it self (made insufficient to the most by that exclusive intention) is a good ground to call all men every where to Repent and to believe.* I wonder what ground that can be for that. Sure as much as the telling a thousand prisoners That one had paid as much for the ransome of ten of them, as would have sufficed for the ransoming ten times so many as they all are, is a good ground to call upon them All to have good thoughts of him that gave the ransome for them some, to be sorry for their faults against him, and to be broken at the hearsay of his love to them, and expect every one of them to be set at liberty by vertue of that Ransome. I pray what greater ground should a thousand men have, All to look for deliverance, because of the payment of so much for so few, more then if they should hear that he had paid only so much as would suffice to ransom them few. How can we exhort All to admire and be affected with Gods love to them, mourn for their follies against such a lover of them, love him for his love, and hope that he by
 vertue

vertue of Christs Death will fully save them, if we cannot say by the word of God (which is only meet to beget divine faith) that Christ hath dyed for half, nay for any of them (for such may be the case for ought any of them know of their whole Congregation) Is our humane conjectures and peradventures that such and such a one may be of that Number, ground enough to bid men affect, and love, and hope in God, as one that hath loved them? Or do we speak of Faith and Repentance, neither springing from Love believed, nor accompanied with love to God in our hearts? Sure such Faith and Repentance are not those the Scriptures call for. Or can we expect that the telling men of its infinite sufficiency will beget hope in them, more then if it were onely sufficient for them for whom it was intended, whenas they are told they are never the more included in its intendment by vertue of its infinite sufficiency, then if it was far less sufficient? VVe may, its true, assure men of salvation if they be believers, or do believe, but can we (upon that ground) assure any one of good ground for their believing, or that Christ is an object meet for them to believe on, that he is appointed as a Mediator for them, or is able to save them? For can we say he is able to save any more then those that were included in his intention? If he should save any more, he must make a new bargain for them, and pay a new price for their salvation. VVhat is this better then Law-preaching, to say, If thou believest thou shalt be saved? The Law promises life to those that keep it, but affords not motive and spirit to effect what it requireth. So doth their Doctrine promise life upon Faith, but gives no straw, affords no certain object that such or such have cause to believe on him, demonstrates no love to the soul to draw it in to believe, for thats uncertain, such Preachers give but an uncertain sound, that cannot affirm, that the VVord of God saith, That there is any thing done by Christ for any one man in their Congregations, that may evidence it a just and right thing for him to hope in God for salvation.

*“But he tells us, That when God calls upon men to believe, he doth “not in the first place call upon them to believe that Christ died for “them, but that there is no name under heaven whereby they may be “saved, but only of Jesus Christ. Well, and is there not an intimation in that that Christ died for them? Sure he that excepts the Name of Jesus Christ, intimates he hath a Name by which they may. And
what*

what is that? *Name*, Either signifies Power and Authority, or the report and fame that goes on him. Now he that leaves it uncertain, whether Christ died sufficiently for them (as he confessedly doth that leaves it uncertain whether Christ hath died for them) leaves it also uncertain, whether Christ hath power by his death to save them. Nor can they fame him to be one able and ready to save them; and so they cannot preach, that there is a Name of Jesus by which they may be saved. So that the proof he brings, overthrows the Assertion which it is brought to prove. Can men be called on to believe in God, and not through a Mediator? And can they look through a Mediator on him, when they know not of any they have? He then that calls upon me to believe through Christs Mediation (as whoever calls upon men rightly to believe must do) doth intimate, that there is something in his Mediation for me to be encouraged to believe in God by, and so by consequence, that he died for me; else (be the merit of it never so great) its no ground of Faith to me. And surely, however Mr. *Owen* determines, God hath no where so determined, nor the Apostles so Preached. One tells us, That the *Record* of God (which he that believes not makes God a lyer) is this, *That God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son, He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life*, 1 Joh. 5.10, 11, 12. And surely this is the onely full ground of drawing men to the Son, when they are told by the VVord of God, that God hath given them life in his Son, and the way to have it, is to have him, but rejecting him, and not coming to him for life, they reject life, and deprive themselves of what God hath given them. He that believes not this in every part of it when declared, makes God a lyer; and will not, nor can come in to him to believe on Christ. If he believe not that God hath given him life, then will he either despaire, or seek it by Works, and not by Faith; if not that this life is in Christ, then will he not look to Christ for it, or believe on him. If he think he may have it and not have Christ, and have Christ or not have it, then will he neglect believing on Christ as a thing unnecessary, or unprofitable for him. So *Peter* tells the people, *Acts* 3.23. God sent Christ to turn every one of you from your iniquities. And *Paul*, *Acts* 13.37. tells them, that Remission of sins was Preached to them in Christs name, both equivalent to Christs Mediating, and dying for them, and coming for their sakes. And so in 2 *Cor.* 5.19. and *Matt.* 224.9. The Declaration of Gods good will to them

is laid down as the ground of exhorting them to come in to God. And to say no more, See what the testimony is, of which God made the Apostle Paul an Apostle, and Teacher of the Gentiles in Faith and Verity. Is it not that in 1 Tim. 2.4, 5, 6, 7. *God would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledg of the Truth, for there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a Ransom for All?* And the appearance of the love of God to man, was it that brought *Paul* himself in, Tit. 3.4, 5. Was it ever found that a man was called by God to trust in that that he never set up for him to trust in! to stay upon Christs blood, and Christ shed none for him? So that I hope by this, the vanity of Mr. *Owens* Inferences from his first premise appears, and that his understanding of the Distinction of *Sufficiency*, and *Efficiency*, together with the Consideration of the dignity of the Sacrifice of Christ, in regard as of his person, so of the greatness of his pains, holds forth onely this to us, That God, to make his Sons sufferings more valuable then needed to be for the bargain intended, put him to more pains then he needed to have endured, which is a piece of blasphemy. But I pass from that Consideration.

“2. *His second premise is about the Dispensation of the Covenant of “Grace, [136] and inlarging of the Kingdom of Christ after his appearance “in the flesh, opposed to the former Dispensation, restrained to one Peo- “ple and Family. And this (he says) gave occasion to many general “expressions in the Scriptures, which are far enough from including an “universality of all Individuals. All which I grant him, and will In- stance a few such expressions for him, as that of Peter. [137] In every Nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness is accepted of him. And that, The Gospel of Christ is the power of God to salvation to every one that, believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile, And that, The Lord over all is rich in mercy to all that call upon him. Which (with other like expressions) are general and opposed to the restrictive speeches proper to the former Dispensation, large enough to take in the Believers and Elect of all Nations, and to remove the re- straining expressions, and yet far enough from comprehending an Universality of all individual men, all not having these adjunct qua- lifications. But of such expressions is not our Controversie, but of those that are comprehensive of an universality of all Individuals, as All, All men, The whole world, Every one. Now that in them is in- tended onely the Elect of All Nations, is to beg the Question, and*

[136] *Consid. 2.*

[137] Acts 10.
34.
Rom. 1.
16. and
10.13.

is denied by us, and that neither weakly nor groundlesly, as I hope will appear, when we view the particular Scriptures. There are other passages in that Consideration untrue also: "*As that there is not in the world Greek, Jew, Circumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, &c. but Christ is All in All*; that is only truly of the new Creature, Col. 3.10, 11. not of the world. Again, "*That the Spirit was poured out upon all flesh in its being poured out upon the Apostles*. That was of it indeed, but not the accomplishing or full fulfilling of it, that's referred yet to a further day, in which the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the water shall cover the Sea; that indeed was partly fulfilled that was foreshadowed about their Sons and Daughters prophesying. Again that "*That in Rev. 5.9, 10. contains a Distribution of that that is set down more generally in other places* (meaning the 1 Tim. 2.6. and the like) which is untrue, for that speaks of another business, the buying men to God to serve and live to him by the blood of Christ, not only as shed by him, but also as presented in its vertue and excellency to their hearts (as *Hosea* bought him a wife by a price given to her; and as God bought him a people by bringing them out of *Egypt*, and doing great things for them, which prevailed with them to be Gods and not their own) and this is out of all Nations and Languages. But the other in 1 Tim. 2.6. comprehends all the Nations and Languages out of which these were taken too; whence also there is Gospell still to be preached to all Nations and Languages, &c. after these redeemed ones are mentioned, Rev. 14.4, 5, 6, 7. What he says to *John* 11.52. is answered before in the close of the last Chapter of the third book.

[138] *Consid.* 3. 3. His third Premise is, [138] That we must distinguish between mans duty and Gods purpose. Thats true, God doth not alwaies purpose to make us do what we ought to do, or effect what he wils us to do. Nor do we confound these two, nor say that God purposed to make all to believe that he bids to believe (whether they listen to him or not) or save all that he bids look up to him and be saved (whether they look to him or not) but we would fain have Mr. *Owen* shew us that God ever bids any man attend upon an ordinance that was not provided for him, and punished any for not attending on what was not ordained for them to attend to, that he bids any believe in Christ, for whom he did not send Christ; bid any believe in his blood, for whom he shed no blood. As we distinguish between the precept and purpose of God, so do we also between the foundation

foundation of the precept and his purpose; and affirm that God bids not men to attend to him for Good, where he hath not appointed them some *medium* in attendance to him, in which they might have good. He bid none look to the brazen Serpent for whom he had not set it up, nor punished any such for not looking to it. So that for his after-inference, I shall only put this to Mr. *Owen*, to shew that it is acceptable to God, and the duty of man, that any man for whom Christ dyed not, and for whom God sent him not, should believe and stay upon his Mediation, or approach to God by him; that those men whom Christ excluded his Mediation, as much as he did the Devills, have any more duty lying upon them to believe in Christ, then the Devils have, or that they should in so doing be any whit more acceptable unto God. As we would not confound Gods precept and his purpose, so neither would we disjoyn Gods precept from the true ground of it.

4. His fourth is, [139] “*That the Jews had an ingrafted erroneous persuasion, that the salvation or deliverance of the Messias or promised seed, belonged only to themselves who were the off-spring of Abraham according to the flesh*, which is also untrue; they ever held and believed that any people of any other Nations being converted and proselyted to them were capable of fellowship with them in their ordinances and blessings, and thence they endeavoured to make many proselytes, which had been bootless, had they thought by so doing they should yet have had no share in their blessings; the rest, its true, that remained unproselyted, were looked upon as Dogs; but any man, though not of *Abrahams* seed, yet by Circumcision, and being proselyted, did grow into one body with them. Thence the false Apostles, zealous of the Law and honor of the Jewish Nation, did not plead against Gentiles coming to their privileges, but that as Gentiles and Uncircumcised they should be so admitted: that was their great stumble, as in *Acts* 11.3. *Thou wentest into men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them*, and Chap. 15.2. *Except ye be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, ye cannot be saved*, but to the proselyted Gentiles, as well as to the Jews of the flesh of *Abraham* they preached from the beginning without scruple, as in *Acts* 2. Peter and the rest preached to peoples of all Nations round about that were proselytes, &c. and so in *Acts*. 6.1, 2. *Their Church consisted of Jews and Grecians*. Not that, but this was the Myserie, that the Gentiles being yet such, uncircumcised in the flesh, should be made fellow-

[139] *Consid.* 4.

of the same body, and partakers of the promises of Christ: But he tels us, “*That this taking in of the Gentiles gave occasion to many generall expressions, which we have granted before: But that therefore the words, All men, World, Whole world, signifie only the people of God scattered throughout the Whole World, I deny, and desire Mr. Owen to prove, seeing those expressions of All that fear God, Jew and Gentile, All that believe, Jew and Gentile, &c. were sufficient for that purpose, expressions used frequently when the Apostles speak of the participation of the speciall benefits that come by Christs Death, as salvation, acceptation to favor the promises of God, &c. in which cases the words All men, the World, the Whole world, are never used. Its never said the Whole world is accepted of God, All men shall be saved, &c. and yet in those cases there are such words used as exclude all limitations of those things to the Jews. In every Nation he that fears God, &c. All that call upon the name of the Lord: Whosoever believes, Jew or Gentile. And had that been all the reason of the Apostles using generall expressions, and had it been his intention in them to include none but the people of God, those expressions had been large enough, and apter for that business, affording no occasion of misconception or contention; therefore we conclude, that seeing they had and used other words to include all that are the subject of Gods promises in Christ, which included but them, and all of them of all Nations, they had some further reason in using these larger expressions, of All, Every one, the Whole world, &c. in the business of the Death of Christ and the Gospel preaching, especially, seeing they use not those largest words in affirming the injoyment of Eternall life and salvation to men, which yet are injoyed, as far as Mr. Owen would extend their signification. Beside, what made the use of those large expressions to the Gentile Churches for rooting out of the Jews that foresaid opinion? and yet to the Gentile Churches he most frequently uses it; or what did that make to perswade the Eunuch or Gentile to take hold of the Covenant when he uses them to those that had taken hold of it already? besides, would not those other expressions of Whoever calls upon the name of the Lord, Jew or Gentile, or Whosoever believes, Jew or Gentile, &c. have sufficed to those purposes that Mr. Owen pretendeth. So that this gives not light into the sense of those words, All, and Whole World, used by the Apostles in this business of Redemption. Nor proves he them to hold forth a generall distribution*

only into men of All sorts (which the other phrases more cleerly do) and not a collective Universality. That in John 11.52. we have answered before, and it falls into the number of those places, that speaking of the injoyment of the speciall priviledges of the Saints (such as Union together in priviledges must needs include) use not a Generall or Universall expression, but a Generall qualified expression. This was one end of Christs Death, That all the Children of God in all Nations, that is, all believers should be made one in priviledge, but it answers not those expressions that say, he dyed for All and Every one. It shews what was one intention of his dying, not the extent of the Object of his Death in every intention.

5. He tells us, "*The Generall words All, [140] and the World, &c. must be considered and weighed with the context. Accipimus legem, We* [140] *Consid. 5.* desire so to do, and not to triumph meerly in the bare expression, as he saith, though we have more reason to triumph in them, then they in inferences, and those lame ones, from no expressions that can seem to inforce them. Nor can he make it good, That our taking the letter of the Scripture in the declaration of the principles of our faith, will uphold the Anthropomorphytes, there being in the Scriptures contradictory expressions to their conceptions, and no one Scripture that says the things attributed to God, have the form of the same things in men; but we challenge Mr. Owen, or any of them All, to shew us one expression in Scripture contradictory to our Assertion; any that says Christ did not dy for All, or for any one particular man or people. Nor will it uphold the Papists conceit of Transubstantiation, they finding no letter of Scripture that contains that conception, either Name or Thing, no Scripture that says he called the bread his body, much less that says, that bread was turned into his body. So that that charge is fond and vain. He passes in this to view the severall acceptations of the word World in Scripture, pretending only to view the significations of the word {Κόσμος} (which indeed is only pertinent) but he forgot that the word {οἰκουμένη} is translated World too, as well as {ἅλων}, and is different from the word {Κόσμος}, else sure he would not have produced Luk. 2.1. to shew that the World, called {Κόσμος}, signifies the Roman Empire, unless he was not willing to see that, because his party usually (though impertinently) alledge it to straiten the signification of the word {Κόσμος} in this controversy.

To let go other acceptations of it, he tells us, "*It sometimes signifies*"

“sies, *The Good, Gods people, either in designation or possession*, for which he alledges *Psal. 22.27.* against which I except. 1. That the word *World* is not in the originall, its {כל אפסי ארץ}, and so the Greek renders it, {πάντα πέρατα τῆς γῆς}, All the ends of the earth. 2. Nor is it probable that all there spoken of shall be, or are godly men; for in the *Distribution* afterwards there is mentioned amongst them, them that go down to the dust; which may signifie to destruction. And its said many of those that profess Gods name in the latter dayes (even of the Gentiles) shall be foolish Virgins, even at that time, and of them Sathan shall deceive multitudes and gather them to battell against the holy city. So that more shall turn unto the Lord, then prove through-believers; The other places of *Joh. 3. 16, & 6.33, 51.* we deny to be taken in that sense, except we should read *Joh. 3.16.* thus, God so loved the Elect, or the good or better part of the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth should not perish, which to me seems non-sense, the word {πας ὁ πιστεύων}, whoever believeth, having the force of a distributive or partitive to the word *World*, otherwise it had been proper to have said, that they or it believing should not perish, or that it should believe and not perish. In *Ioh. 6.33, 51. & 2 Cor. 5.19.* we say he begs the question, and brings no ground that confirms his saying, we shall refer the further consideration of them to due place. That in *Rom. 4.12.* is very impertinent, for it makes the words of the Apostle to sound thus, that the promise was made to *Abraham*, and to all the people of God (for thats the force of the word, his seed there) that they should be heirs of all the people of God; which is a piece of non-sense. We say that the word *World* there, signifies *Mundum Continentem*, not only the inhabitants, but all the things of the *World*, as in *1 Cor. 3.21, 22.* All things are yours, the world &c. chiefly the world to come, The world, as heaven and earth and all things shall be made new. That in *Rom. 11.12, 15.* is impertinent too, and untruly alledged in that sense. The *Words, Riches, and Reconciliation*, signify but the way or means to inrich and reconcile; for that the fall of the Jews was not the formall riches and reconciliation of the world, [141] is as clear as the noon-light, but that was the occasionall way of inriching and reconciling the *World*, not only the Elect and Godly, but the rest, though many by rejecting the riches of Christ preached amongst, and the word of reconciliation preached to them, with the grace therein tendred, were not actually

[141] Upon Ro.
11.15.

actually enriched with the riches proper to the Saints, and reconciled in their hearts. As wholsom Laws and good Government are the hapiness of a Nation, that is, the way and means of making a Nation in general happy, though many by their evil-bearing them, and rebelling against them, should actually pull down mischief upon their own heads: So the goodness of God extended to men in the Gospel and Ordinances of God, is a Table to them, though they by their unbelief turn it into a snare, *Psal.* 69.22. and is a mercy to men in general, though many by observing lying vanities, put away their own mercy from them, *Joh.* 2.8. That place in *Col.* 1.6. Evidently signifies, *Mundum continentem*, place, not persons. Thence the change of the phrase. Its come to you, as also in all the world, He saith, Not to you and to All the world. In the *World*, signifies Place; To the *World* had signified *Persons*: The Gospel is Preached in the world to men. That in *1 Joh.* 2.2. We deny to signify the godly onely, we shall view his proofs for it when we come at them. I might shew also some beg'd, presumed, and proofless Applications of divers Scriptures quoted by him, to shew that the word World signifies men rejected, and accursed, as *Joh.* 15.19. and 17.25. with some others, which in their expressions might have been applied to *Saul*, and many persecuters of Christ that were after converted, but I pass them, with divers other things less pertinent. VVhat he promises upon this Observation we shall speak to when we meet it. Whereas he further notes, "1. That there is often in Scripture an {ἀντανάκαλασις}, an ingemination "of the same Word in a several sense, We grant it, but his Application of it to *John* 3.17. as concerning the different significations of the word *World* in those two phrases, *Not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved*, we say is begged, and desire any one clear proof that any believer, or number of believers living in the world, are called the world, *The present world*. He notes, "2. That no Argument can be taken from a phrase of speech "in the Scripture in any particular place, if in other places thereof "where it is used, the signification pressed from that place is evidently "denied, unless the scope of the place, or subject matter of it do inforce "it. This we consess, as to Argument, though to Faith a place may be sufficient where the Argument will not inforce it by this rule. As to Instance. *All that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth, some to the resurrection of life, and some to the*

the resurrection of condemnation. By his Rule we cannot conclude, That All, and Every man shall arise out of their graves, because the word All is taken in many places but for the generality of men, not for every individual. *As All men seek their own, &c.* Therefore from the word All we cannot inforce that signification. Again, The scope of the place will not inforce it, for its independent to the preceding Verses, except in this, that therein Christ asserts his glorious Power and Authority fore-spoken of; That he had life in himself, power to quicken and raise up whom he would, which might be demonstrated, as well in quickning the generality of good and bad in their graves, as in every individual. Again, That distribution, *Some to life, and some to condemnation,* inforces onely that good and bad shall rise, not every individual of either. Nor is the matter *Res necessaria*: Its in the power of God, and in his Will to raise All or some, every individual, or but the most and generality. And yet though reason cannot be pressed to conclude it in so large an extent, yet Faith may be perswaded so to believe it; It being ground enough for Faith to believe it so largely, That the words may bear it, and there is nothing of evidence from God against the largest it will bear. It being sauciness in man to put in his limitations in matters of Faith, where Gods Spirit elsewhere, or the matter spoken of, doth not necessarily inforce a limitation.

“He nextly instances the word *All*, “*Denying that its ever said, “That Christ died for All men.* Which we have answered before. We grant it sometimes is applied Distributively to sorts, and sometime collectively, but deny that the word holds forth such a Distributive acceptation onely in the places controverted. His instance of *Joh. 12.32. I will draw All men to me,* is but beg’d: That it signifies all sorts we grant, That it signifies not All individuals we desire him to prove. He thinks to prove it thus, “*That all that come to him by the “Fathers drawing, he will in no wise cast out.* But herein he prevaricates. For its not said in any Scripture, That all that God draws come to Christ. Without his drawing none can come to him, but that every one that he draws come, we finde not. He drew Ephraim with the cords of love, and the bands of a man, but no where says, that they came to him upon it, but seems rather to complain against him of drawing back from him, *Hos. 11.3, 4.2.* Nor doth Christ say, My Father shall draw all to me, but he speakes of his own drawing. 3. Nor is it manifest what drawing he speakes of, whether of
Grace,

Grace onely to believe, or of power also to be judged. The latter it may be, or both. For of judging he was speaking immediately before. And that not upon the gracious inquiring after him, as most refer it to that. *vers.* 20.21. But upon the Fathers voyce coming to him, that he would glorifie him, *vers.* 28, 29. Immediately upon which he says, *Now is the judgment of this world*, He says not the conversion of the world, but the judgment, and that began in the Prince of it. Now shall the Prince of the world be cast out, and then afterward he will draw All to him, being lifted up First, on the Cross, secondly, in the Gospel, thirdly, By the right hand of God to the Throne of Glory, a part of which glory is to judg All. Being thus lifted up, he will draw all to him, either by Grace to own him, or by his Power to be judged by him. And this he spake signifying what death he should dye, as on the Cross so a publike death, and such as in and by which he should receive authority over all flesh, &c. VVhy any should exclude this drawing to judgment, I see not, he speaking of judging the world, and why to deny it without reason for it, I see as little. Such a drawing I finde in *Psal.* 28. {Μή συνελκύσης}. {μέε} *Draw me not with the wicked*, &c. So that as this place is beg'd for his purpose, so its impertinently indeavored to be confirmed. That *Rev.* 5.9. Is the interpretation of that Text *Joh.* 12.32. the Scripture tells him not: thats beg'd and untrue also. For if they were the All, who are called the four Beasts, and twenty four Elders, who and what then were those 144000; mentioned to sing before those Beasts and Elders, and said also to be redeemed? *Rev.* 14.2, 3, 4. which number of 144000. agrees with the number of the sealed *Chap.* 7. Besides whom, were yet an innumerable number out of all Nations, Kindreds, &c. If the first were the *All* spoken of by Christ, who were the other two numbers exceeding that *All*? The following proof of {πάν λαχων}, I conceive impertinent too: for Did they take for Tithe the tenth species onely, and not rather the tenth individual in Geometrical or Arithmetical proportion of every species? And so {πασαν νότον}, as if Christ cured not every particular disease of the people where he was, and that were brought unto him, for of them onely he there speaketh. So his instance, {ἐν παντι τόπω}, 1 *Tim.* 2.8. That it cannot mean every individual place. I Answer, It means any individual place, where ever men come, none that I know excepted. And that in opposition to an elected place onely, as formerly in *Jerusalem*. And if Mr. Owen will but grant us the same liberty of in-

the words {πάντας} & {πάντων}, in verse 4. and 6. We desire no more. I know not that the Apostle excepts either heaven or hell, when the believers come into them, but they may pray in them. *Paul* conversed in heaven, and I believe he prayed there too in his there conversing, *Phil.* 3.20. and for Hell, *Jonas* prayed out of the belly of it, *Jonas* 2. And why others may not too that can pray, I know not, if ever God try them so far as to cast them into it. His other Exceptions I pass over; the whole *Postulatum* if granted being not material against us, as we shall see, I hope, in due place. “*He gives us some conclusions about the signification of the word All, as* “1. *That it signifies All believers, so as to be restrained to them. So* “*he says it is in Rom. 5.18. To all men to justification of life.* But there he is manifestly out. For the Apostle himself subjoyns the Substantive to the word All, All men, {πάντας ανθρώπους}, not {πάντας} {πιέυντας}: That the word Man is equipollent to the word *Believer*, is another question, which I leave for Mr. *Owen* to prove. For for my part, I think not that all men are onely believers, and none but they, men. The 1. *Cor.* 15.22. *In Christ all shall be made alive*, He says, is not All men, but All believers onely. In which he intimately asserts one of these two Propositions, either that all men shall not rise or be quickned to life again; or, that it shall not be in, or by Christ (for so this word {εν} often signifies) quoting, *Epes.* 4.10. He tell us, *That he might fill all things*, signifies, *That he might onely fill all believers*; And so that in *Psal.* 33.5. may not be applied to Christ, *That the earth is full of his goodness*. Which, as I am not bound to believe it, because I have but Mr. *Owens* word for it, so neither do I, no more then that there is, or may be no act of justification in any sense, no not in the publike person, none to life without faith, because thats the ordinary way to life eternal.

2. He says, “*All is used sometimes for some of All sorts*, its the same he said before, only he backs it with another impertinent proof; for *Jer.* 31.34. says {כלם}, all of them, that is, of the house of the *Judah* and *Israel* in the latter dayes, not of All sorts of men, and sure it is all the *Israel* of God, the confessors of his goodness in faith that are taken into the Covenant, and shall know God; not only some of all sorts of them, and whereas the Apostle Paul translates it {πάντες}, All, in *Heb.* 8.11. he supplies the want of the Pronoun Affix in the next phrase, {ἀπομικροῦ αὐτῶν ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν}, and I hope, All from the least of them to the greatest of them, is as plain

as All of them: he quotes also the 1 *Tim.* 2.1, 2. and tells us he thinks the Apostle by All, means All sorts, and so he doth; but that he means but some of All sorts is void of proof, for he saith not, some Kings and some peasants, but Kings and all in Authority, he names but one Genus of men, men in authority, and he says all of that sort, And why not all of all the other sorts as well as that? I expect some reason (more then I shall meet with) before I believe it. Why all Merchants, all beggars, &c. may not as well as all in authority be the object of my prayers, I know no reason: I think I have as good ground to think All of the one shall be saved, as All of the other. So that these are but impertinent observations to the purpose: But then,

3. *“He would have us compare the Generall expressions of the old and New Testament together; the Lord affirming in the New to be done, what was foretold in the old should be done; so that they are answerable to and expository one of another.* Well, I accept the motion, but then this comparison must be *ad idem*, but so Mr. Owen compares not, for he compares prophecies of the conversion of Nations & families to the Death of Christ for all, and his mediation for them: but this is not equal. The dying of Christ for a man was not the fulfilling of the prophecy of the conversion of that man, and of his coming to Christ. [142] Those prophecies agree with these speeches, God put no difference between them and us after that by faith he had purifyed their hearts; and this, The Gentiles glorified the Word of the Lord & believed, so many as were ordained to eternall life, and this, The Gospel is come to you as in all the world, and brings forth fruit as it doth also in you, and many the like. But that he gave himself a ransome for All and is the propitiation of the sins of the whole world, expound these praedictions of the conversion of All Nations, I deny, for these say not, All believe, or come to his holy mountain, &c. that invitation in *Isa.* 45.22. Look to me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; is a call, not a propheticall assertion That all the ends of the earth, shall look to him and be saved. So that this also is but a fruitless inept comparison. Whereas he says, *when God saith he will wipe off tears from all faces,* [143] *it hinders not but the Reprobates may be cast out to eternity.* I answer, He did in and by his Death wipe off tears from all faces; giving himself a ransome for All, and being the propitiation for the sins of the whole world he keeps off many a judgment that else would seize upon all, and produce many tears and much sadness to them, yea and delivers all, from many a trouble and sorrow that would else overwhelm them: though he doth not

[142] Act. 15.9,
& 13, 48.
Col. 1.6.

[143] Esa 25 7.
8.

wipe off all tears from off all faces, as he will do off from some name-ly such as believe on him and follow him, *Rev.* 7.17. and 21.4. Others abusing his goodness, and sinning against those mercies towards them and deliverances of them, pull upon themselves tears and sorrows afresh, that shall never be wiped off them. And besides, its more equal that the Apostolical expressions should expound the prophetical, then on the contrary the prophetical to expound them, the prophetical expressions being as in a darker manifestation of Christ, so more obscure then the Apostolically, who were to unfold the things of God more plainly. And to speak in the light what was told them in darkness.

[144] *Consid.* 6. 6. He bids us observe, [144] *“That the Scripture speaks of persons and “things often according to appearance and not to reality; as calling “men wife, just, and righteous, &c. he names no Scripture-instance for them, but I hope he knows of righteousness in morall acts and performances, and that reall and true in its kind, an humane righteousness not only in semblance but in reality, though not enough to present a man righteous to God as pertaining to his rule for admittance into his Kingdom; and so wisdom after the flesh, which is really a fleshly humane wisdom, though not the wisdom of God but foolishness with him, and yet a real wisdom in its place and kinde for worldly things, Luk. 16. but of the Death of Christ there is but one kinde, so that it must be really or not at all. His instance of Mat. 27. 53. that Jerusalem is called the Holy city, and yet it was a den of thieves, is his mistake, to conceive holiness to be inherent frames in the heart, which Jerusalem as a place and building was not capable of: Holiness (as we have noted before) in Scripture more frequently signifies the being separated to God for his name and service, and so it was really holy not seemingly only: Nay rather in appearance it should be unholy; but in its reall consecration and separation to God (a thing not visible to the eye) a holy eye. So he instances 2 Chron. 21.23. “That the Gods of Damascus smote Ahaz, which “(says he) were but stocks and stones, and could never help nor smite him, but it was God that smote him. Sure he hath forgotten that the Gentiles did not only sacrifice to stocks and stones, but to Devils also by them idols, 1 Cor. 10.20. And I trow the Devills might really smite him, or strengthen men to it, and yet God supremely smite him too; God as supreme Judge, Sathan as the executioner or hangman, using men as instruments as in the case of Job. So that this fails too, but much more his after-proof of John 5.18. where he brings the Jews imputing to Christ that he brake the Sabbath day*

day, in which they spake falsely to interpret Gods sayings by his Apostles by, as if he spake so mistakingly too. To which he adds, “*That many things proper and peculiar to the children of God are often assigned to them that live in outward communion with them, though in truth aliens in respect of inward participation of the grace so assigned.* But whether things were so assigned to them by the unerring and infallible spirit of God, or by the erring and fallible spirit of men, he tels us not, nor in what Scriptures they assigned things to them as erring men that wrote not by Gods spirit. Therefore I can say no more at present to it, but that his conclusion, “*That some may be said to be redeemed, {κατὰ δόξαν}, which are not so {κατὰ την ἀλήθειαν}, is ungrounded and hath {οὐδεμίαν αὐτῇ ἀλήθειαν}.* A dangerous suggestion of a rule which men may make use of to any Scriptures as well, and subvert the truth of them, as is also his next consideration, viz.

7. “*That the Apostles spake many things according to the judgement of charity, otherwise in themselves untrue, [145] and therefore those things not to be exactly squared and made answerable to verity in respect of them of whom any thing is affirmed.* This I say in substance is one with the former, and both of them are dangerous principles, and the very openers of the gap to all the abundance of error brought in by the Antiscripturists, they are directly their principles, That the Apostles writ as other good men by a judgment of charity and appearance, and so what they say may be false, we must not square them to verity because they would not then hold out. And grant this that the Apostles were not in all things guided by an infallible spirit (except where they themselves faithfully tell us so) and where shall we stay? who shall tell us where that infallible spirit assisted them, and where it left them? Nay though *Paul* tels the *Thessalonians*, That he knew their Election and that of God, yet *Mr. Owen* will tell him he might be deceived in that knowledg though. 1 *Thes.* 1.4. and 2 *Thes.* 2.13. But I believe *Paul* durst not have said, he knew it, if he did but think so, out of a charitable perswasion grounded upon a truth fallibly applied to, or discerned in them. But perhaps the Apostles spake not of Election there, as *Mr. Owen* doth. He thought, perhaps, that it might be made firm or sure, and perhaps it might be neglected. He perhaps spake of it, as *Moses* of the Election of the *Israelites*, who though he tels them they were chosen to be a special people to God, *Deut.* 7.6, 7. and yet freely too, yet

tells them, That if they walk after other Gods, and forget Him, they should surely perish as the other Nations that he destroyed before them, *Chap.* 8.19, 20. I do but propound that to Mr. *Owens* consideration, as also whether he by Election meant not an actual choise of them, in pulling them out of the world, and bringing them to look after his salvation. But however I will by no means yield him, That the Apostle spake at random, and out of a fallible humane conception of charity, and not by the infallible Spirit, and so he hath no advantage for his following. *And why not?* why not, when he says, *That Christ died for some that might possibly perish.*

[146] *Consid.* 8.

8. He tells us of *The infallible connexion according to Gods Will and purpose of Faith and Salvation.* [146] Which we grant, understanding it of Faith rooted in the heart, and having singled the heart to God, for otherwise there is a degree or kinde of Faith not so infallibly attended with eternal salvation, as that compared to the stony ground, *Matth.* 13.19, 20. *And in those that made shipwrack of faith and a good conscience.* But he says, “*That thats the substance of the “Gospel promulgation, whoever believe shall be saved, thats the onely “thing held out to innumerable, That Faith shal be attended certainly “with eternal life.* Truly I believe that thats All the Gospel held out to innumerable indeed. For they that know of no other Gospel predicable to them (at least believe it not) how should they preach it? And truly, though thats a truth, yet not a truth meet to beget Faith, but that declares God in Christ an object fit for souls in general and particular to believe on. That thats all the divine Truth that God bids us preach as Gospel to innumerable of men, I deny. He quotes for it, *Matth.* 16.16. 1 *John* 5.11. but fails in them of his purpose. He shews his mistake of the first, in that he thinks that that in *Mark* 16.16. is a declaration of the Gospel that they should preach. As if our Saviour had said, This is the Gospel you shall preach, *He that believes shall be saved, and he that believes not shall be damned.* Now that this cannot be the Gospel is plain, for then the latter sentence, *He that believes not shall be damned,* should be part of the Gospel too, and so good news, which I suppose, will be hardly judged so. The truth is, Our having Saviour bid them preach the Gospel, informs them what should be the consequences of their preaching it, *He that believes,* that is, that believes the Gospel that you preach, shall be saved, but he that believes not but rejects it, shall be damned. The Gospel that they were to preach was his Mission
into

into the world as the Saviour of it, his Death for our sins, his Resurrection, Ascension, &c. with the promises of Life to them that believing the Gospel believe on him, and so the Apostle preached also (as we have before shewed.) We declare to you good tidings, that God hath performed his Promises to us in raising up Christ from the dead. And be it known, that in this mans name is preached to you remission of sins. And to instance no more, his other proof is plain, that they preached more fully then as he tells us. For in that 1 *John* 5.11. He says not onely this is the Record, that life is in Christ, and he that hath him hath it, but also (which he leaps over) God hath given us that life eternal that is in Christ, so as that it behoves us to receive it in receiving him, or else we are ingrateful and guilty of our own destruction. Whereas he chargeth us with a "*Conditional will in God for saving men*, I speak not of any thing conditional in him, but I say, God propounds to men salvation on condition, and will make good his VVord where-ever that condition is performed by men. That which follows in this Consideration is spoken to generally before, and therefore I shall pass it, and come to the next Consideration.

"9. *He mindes us of the mixt distribution of Elect and Reprobates,* [147] *Consid. 9.*
 "[147] *Believers and Unbelievers throughout the world, in the several*
 "*places thereof, in all, or most of the single Congregations, and thats an-*
 "*other ground of tendring the blood of Christ to them for whom it was*
 "*never shed.* Here are a heap of beg'd questions, all without proof;
 As 1. That some are Elect and others Reprobates, before the Gospel come to them, and fasten upon some to pull them to Christ, and his Justice pass upon others in hardning them for their rejection of Christ. 2. That there are believers, and unbelievers in the Congregations throughout the world antecedently to the Gospels publishing to them, and therefore the Gospel must be tendred to All, and the blood of Christ offered to them for whom it was never shed. 3. That there are some men for whom Christ never shed his blood, and that God hath ordered it to be offered to them. But 4. Chiefly, This is to be admired, that the holy Ghost that knows the secrets of God, and revealed them to the Apostles, should out of these grounds, affirm, that Christ died, and gave himself a ransom for All, when he wrote to one of the Churches. All which are no matters of our Faith till they have better proof. VVhat he says of the Promises there is impertinent, for its not of those we speak, but
 of

of the affirmations of the extent of Christs Death, Propitiation, and Ransom, which are not promises upon any condition propounded, but Declarations and Assertions of things done for us in Christ, that are grounds to us for Faith: Even such grounds as upon which the Apostles exhorts to Faith, *Matth. 22.4. 2 Cor. 5.19, 20. &c.* and from them (though not from the promises which are the believers portion) Faith meets with something to perswade us of his Death for All. VWhereas he says the offer is not absolutely universal. If he speak of it as profferd in act by men, its true, but if as proferable and according to the terms of its Proposition in the Scripture, its untrue, for there its expresly said, *To all the ends of the earth, and to the whole Creation.* For Gods refusing to bestow Faith. I would have him shew me that God any where expresses himself as unwilling and unready to bestow Faith upon men (where they have not first wilfully rejected him) as if it was a vain thing to preach to most, and for most to hear, because God will not afford them power of believing.

[148] *Consid. 10.* “10. *His last Consideration is of the several degrees of Faith, [148] tending to clear this, That men have an object fit to believe on, though they believe not that Christ died for them.* Which I deny, for this believing on God (the onely ultimate object of Faith) being a reliance or depending on him; presupposes an apprehension of God, as one able and willing to help him, and that apprehension springing from his VVord reporting him to be such, which cannot be apprehended with this in question, Whether God hath given Christ for him or not? for if that be doubted or uncertain, its uncertain too, whether God be willing to help him, seeing he hath appointed help no ways but by him, and through his dying for men. But let us see what are his Positions. He tels us there is,

1. This “*That sinners cannot have salvation in themselves, in as much as all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, Nor can be justified by the works of the Law.* This is indeed a truth to be believed, but not properly Gospel or good news, much less doth it shew the object to be believed on.

“2. *That life is to be had in the promised seed.* But this is a lame Proposition, for it expresses not whether life is there for them to whom its preached, or onely for some they know not who. If the latter, this not yet meet to beget faith in God in them, it being yet uncertain wheher he be an object for faith to them. That many believe not
this

this that are outwardly called, is not material, nor proves that there is no more Gospel-Truth that appertains to them proposable to them. And indeed, one thing that makes many not believe it, is that they regard not the report of it, and they regard it not perhaps because it propounds nothing for certain that may be beneficial to them.

“3. *That Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified at Jerusalem was this Saviour.* This also is a truth to be believed, but yet affords no certain ground or motive for any mans expecting good from God to himself, nor propounds him as a fit object for this or that man to believe on. But then

4. He says, “*The Gospel requires resting in this Christ as an All-sufficient Saviour, with whom is plenteous redemption, able to save to the utmost all that come to God by him.* But can a soul rest on him that it knows not to have done any thing for it to rest in? To rest in, is to sit down, and be at quiet in the belief of something in which the soul sees it need stir no where else for satisfaction, but it may certainly have it there. But how can a man preach to any one, or he believe that Christ is an All-sufficient Saviour as to him, and so meet for him to rest on for safety, and yet cannot say by the Word of God That Christ died for him, or was appointed by God to be a Mediator for him to rest on? Is Christ sufficiently furnished for saving a man without an offering made to God for him? Or can he remit his sins without shedding blood for him? To come to God by Christ is through the viewing and considering his Person, Sufferings, and Mediation to be encouraged to hope in God, and in that hope to ask and waite for his salvation. Now what am I more helped for trusting in God, by believing that all that finde such encouragement in him as Mediator, as that they are raised up to hope, and to have confidence in God thereby, have Him Al-sufficient to save them, if in the mean time not knowing whether he be sufficient to save me, that is, whether he hath done any thing as Mediator for me, I cannot see encouragement from thence to hope and rest on God for his saving me? Its true, few within the Pale of the Church may finde strength to perform that act of resting on God, and that is because they see not, nor are shewed what ground they have to do so. They are held in suspense about their right to rest on him, or to think he is appointed for them. They see not the way of entrance to God, how then should they approach by it, but deceive themselves oftentimes

in thinking they approach to him when they do not. The Truth of God which being believed should work in them effectually to draw them to God, is kept back from him, viz. That there is a Mediator between God and them, who hath died for them. That Word of God, is suspended upon acts in themselves, which indeed properly slow forth from that Truth first believed by them. Its love in God discovered to us that makes us hope in, and stay upon him, but that in this way is held back from men till they do hope in him, and so the Cart is set before the Horse; the thing that should draw us is set after our drawing in. O poor preposterous way that souls are led in!

5. Now after all this, He tells us, "*We are called on every one in particular to believe the efficacy of the Redemption that is in the blood of Christ towards our souls.*" This also is obscurely, or preposterously laid down: For why, I pray, says he, *The efficacy of that Redemption is then to be believed, and not rather our interest in that act of the Redeemer in giving himself a ransom for us?* Doth he think that came in before? why then did he in no place mention it, and shew where it comes in that we are to believe that Christ died for us? The efficacies of his Redemption in and upon us, we indeed look for, and expect in and upon our coming to him, and we therefore come to him that we might receive them, even grace and mercy to help us in times of need, and in believing and resting on him we shall experiment them. After believing we are assured of remission of sins, and eternal life; but where come we to know that Christ died for us, and so that the Mediation of Christ hath that in it for us that we may be imboldned by to hope in God? Men talk of Gods working faith by an Almighty power in them, as if he wrought it through the Air, and not by opening his love and goodness in the Mediation of Christ, and so by his VVotd that declares him. I cannot but question a great many of these mens faith, whether they yet know what it truly is, they talk so strangely of the working of it. Its by an Almighty power its true, ay but thats put forth in the Record of the Gospel concerning Gods goodness in Christ to us. Doth he mean by efficacy of Redemption, but this, that Christ died for us? Beside that, thats an notable confusion of an act done without us for us, and the operations of it by faith in us, it crosses the way of the Apostles, who laid down the Gospel thus; *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man* (they staid not there. Nor yet at this) *the Man Christ Jesus.* Which is all the Gospel that Mr. Owen hints at that is to be

be preached before mens coming to rest on God, but the Apostle goes a step further, *Who gave himself a ransom for All*. All this the Apostle, the Teacher of the *Gentiles* in faith and verity, lays down as the Testimony of God, the object of our Faith concerning God and Christ, the foundation of our approaching to God for salvation, and the demonstration that God would have us saved. Now whats the matter that men can dare to venture upon all the other parts or steps of the Gospel Truth, to be preached to men; as that there is a difference between God and Man, a Mediator and Saviour appointed for men, and that this is the Man *Jesus Christ*? and then instead of the last, *He gave himself a ransom for All*, boggling at that and avoiding it as a dangerous rock, put in this, That you must rest upon that Mediator and God in him, before you have ground to believe that He gave himself ransom for you, and then you shall know that he gave himself a ransom for All that believe, and so for you. Doth it not plainly appear, that men have departed from the Faith, or Doctrine of Faith laid down by the Teacher of the *Gentiles* in Faith, and that that he calls *Verity*, is accounted a dangerous *Very-lye*? and yet they say they can set before men an object of Faith as rightly as the Apostles. No, no, Our charge yet stands faster against them then that the strongest hand of them All can move it. They cannot preach, or represent God Doctrinally in that their way as an object that the people they speak to hath good ground to rest in for safety and satisfaction; for they know not (confessedly) whether he hath appointed Christ as a *medium* of access for them, and as a Sacrifice and Ransom for their souls, They can tell men he is able to save them that believe (provided they be the Elect, otherwise not) but cannot assure that he is a meet object for them to believe through, because they cannot assure them he hath done any thing for them. And thus we have viewed his previous Considerations. Come we now to view his following Answers to our Arguments.

CHAP. II.

An Answer to his evasions from those Scriptures that declare Christ sent for the world, and the whole world.

BEfore he comes to the Arguments that he would Answer, he dips his Pen in Gall, and slings durt upon the faces of them that

will not forsake the sure Word of God to take heed to his contradictory Conclusions made against it. Pretending his Opinion to be undeniably confirmed by the Word of God, by many Demonstrations, and innumerable Testimonies of Scripture, though not one place hath been brought to the purpose for it. Yea, I will make Mr. *Owen* this offer, That if he can produce any one Testimony of Scripture that denied Christ to have died for any one man of the world, or that limits his Ransom and Propitiation to fewer then *All*, I say, That limits it, and I will yield him the Cause, and say, that I have been egregiously deceived. But to let that pass.

Our first general Argument he frames weakly, and then makes us by reasoning as weakly to defend it, that so he might have the more advantage against it. I would make this, and the second from general expressions of Scripture into one, thus

That Matter (or Article) of Faith, [*Argum.*] that is (frequently) delivered in the largest and most general expressions of Scripture, without other Scripture in any place excluding any, or limiting as but to some, is to be received according to the latitude of those large expressions. But such is this business of the Death of Christ as the Ransom, its delivered in the largest and most general expressions, and no other Scripture any where limits it but to some, or excludes any particular. Therefore according to the latitude of those expressions its to be received. The *Major* of this is founded upon this Rule, *Every Word of God is pure*, nothing to be added to it, nothing to be taken from it. But to limit where it no where limits, or to exclude where it excludes not, is to take from it of our own heads, and therefore is not to be attempted. Besides, it may be seen by induction. No other Truth that is so frequently laid down in such general terms is taken limitedly to fewer, if no other Scripture limit or restrain it, or the very Circumstances of the places where it is, as might be instanced in Creation, Sinfulness, Preservation, Resurrection, Judgment. The *Minor* hath been cleared throughout this Discourse, that though there be places that speak not of all its object (as also there are many about Creation, Sin. Resurrection, Judgment) yet there is no limitation of it in any of those places as a Ransom or Propitiation to a less object then the general places will reach to. And that the largest expressions are used about it, is clear, as *All men*, *Rom. 5.18* *1 Tim. 2.6*. *Every one*, *Heb 2.9*. *The whole world*, *1 Joh. 2.2*. That those phrases are in themselves extendible to *All*,
and

and Every man in the world, is plain, and confest by Mr. *Owen*, That sometimes in the Scriptures they are so used, and that very usually too, and most properly, as is easie to shew, And therefore may so signifie there. His Argumentations from the word *World*, I disclaim, nor doth he finde any so to use them as he propounds them. We argue not the extent simply from the word *World*, but from the words *All*, and *Every*, and *whole World*; and we understand the word *World* extendible as far as them, not from the word *World* simply, but from these other places reaching it to the whole World, and All men. As when its said, *God created man upon the earth*, the force of the word *Man* proves it not that he created every Man in the world, but yet we believe it extendible so far, because other Scriptures say it of All Nations of men, and that he made them of one blood. The Argument from the word *World*, we use against their conceit of *For the Elect onely*. In that we never finde any Scripture, calling the world *Elect*, or the Elect the *World*, but distinguishing them from the world, they being in election separated from the world, They that would have us restrain general words but to some particulars, must shew us some ground for it, that the Scripture somewhere in the same business so restraineth them, for the restraining of a word usually and Properly of a large extent in other things, is no sufficient ground for our straitning it, in this, or another thing where the Scripture doth not plainly declare that it ought to be so straitned. And this is our defence against them in straitning this Word to the *Elect*.

But Mr. *Owen* endeavors to shew, that the general words in such places ought to be straitned from the consideration of the places themselves. Beginning with that in *Joh 3 16*. In which (the great Saviour of the world assisting us) we will follow him. He thereupon first gives us our construction of the place, and that with as much weakness as he can. I shall give my Paraphrase my self thus. God beholding man faln (even the men of the world) pitied him in that condition, and out of pity to him, sent him for a Saviour his own onely Son, to this end, and with this intention, that he dying for him, and rising again, and being perfected for saving man, all those of mankinde whosoever that upon declaration of him do believe on him, should not perish but have eternal life. In which observe,

1. That the motive of Gods sending his Son, was that love or good will that he bore to lost man, and readiness to shew forth

his mercy to them in providing a fit medium and way to salvation.

2. The object of this love was Mankind *faln* (as here expressed) indefinitely, but as other Scriptures explain this indefinite, *All men*, the *whole world*.

3. His act of giving was both to death for men, and in the Gospel preaching Him to men as an object to be believed on.

4. The end, *That whosoever believes should not perish*. In which we have

1. The Way to the participation of the choise benefits of him, *viz.* believing on him.

2. The Extent of that choise benefit, *whosoever believes*. In which is also the freedom for all, or any to look after that benefit, and through Faith to obtain it.

Now in this Mr. Owen differs from us, "*That he notes the world to signifie lost men of all sorts both Jews & Gentiles peculiarly loved, and that love to be an unchangeable act or purpose of Will concerning their salvation intending absolutely the salvation of all this world to whom he gave him, & that whosoever believeth, not to be a distributive of that general the world, but the very self-same with the word World.* Before he confirm his own, he labors to evert the other, and

1. Against that pity or propensity to be affirmed to be in God to the good of the creature, he says thus, "*If there be no natural affection in God whereby he is necessarily carried to any thing without himself, then no such pity or affection to their good as is here intended.* I deny the Consequence, for though there be no such thing as necessarily is so carried, yet there is thats voluntarily and freely carried so. Gods Will that is in him to do this or that, is not necessarily carried to do this or that, but freely, but being freely carried to this or that, its necessarily carried in a way suteable to his holy & good Nature. Now that there is that in God that carries him to desire or approve freely the good of man, appears in that he is said to be Love, 1 *Joh.* 4.8. Now Love freely seeks the good of things. So again he swears that he delights not in the death of the wicked, but rather that they should turn & live. Yea, and saith of him that dieth, That he hath no pleasure in his death, *Eze.* 33.11. & 18. *ult.* And bewails those that had miscarried through their folly, and deprived themselves of his mercy, *Psal.* 81.11.14. *Isai.* 48.17, 18. And so our Saviour, the express Image of God, wept over, and pitied the folly and misery of

of Jerusalem, Luke 19.41. But then he says, "*This intimates imperfection in God, But he is not imperfect.*" I answer no, the imperfection is in our conception, this in him is highest perfection. As Moses saith, He is perfect, though he says, He took the *Isaelites* out of Egypt to bring them into Canaan, and many came not in, that might seem an imperfection in God, and that he failed of his expressed purpose, but the imperfection is in our apprehension. So he said of *Elies* house, He would establish it, but afterwards said otherwise. But we are to believe what he says, though it seem to us, who want ability to comprehend him, to argue imperfection. The rest of his Reasonings are meer carnal, he brings no patch of Scripture to prove that God hath not such good will to man, but vainly pries and inquires, "*Why doth not God ingage his power to accomplish it, and how comes it hindered?*" Which are brutish reasonings against Gods Assertions. When he says, Hadst thou done thus, I would have done so, and so. And O that thou hadst done so, And I delight rather he should live, Then to say, why doth not God effect it then? Nay rather, Who is vain brutish man, dust and ashes, to dispute against God, and reject his Words upon his shallow Reason? Will man propound to God what shall be Wisdom to him! Doth not he indeed say, That his Wisdom is foolishness to men? And doth not Mr. Owen here make it good, and say, "*Its brutish wisdom amongst men?*" But know, O vain Earth-worm, That the Wisdom of God is indeed foolishness to men, and they cannot comprehend it, and the wisdom of men is foolishness to God, 1 Cor. 1.19.22.23, 24. Its wisdom (O vain man) to give credit to the Word and Oath of God, and say Amen to it, That he delights not in the death of the wicked, but rather that they shall turn and live, how ever foolish it seems to man, and whatever absurdities his wisdom findes in it: For the foolishness of God is wiser then the wisdom of man, and that weakness and imperfection that appears in Gods wayes, is stronger then the strength of men. *His ways are unsearchable & his judgments past finding out*, Not to be measured by the shallow models our Reason, but his Words are all Words of Truth, and he that will understand his Wayes must believe them, and be willing to deny the wisdom of the flesh (which is enmity to God, and which God will de-stroy) and become a fool that he may be wise. The Scriptures, we see, in *Psal.* 81.14. *Isai.* 48.17, 18. *Ezek.* 33.11. and 18.32. 1 *Tim.* 2.4. hold forth what I speak of. The Nature of God which

is Love, acting forth it self in expressions of good Will to men, yea, men in general, and such as miscarry. His other exception with its confirmations, being onely against his acting necessarily, are all vain and invalid.

For conformation of his own Exposition, "*That by Love is meant an unchangeable purpose, or act of his Will to save them, He gives this Reason, Because its the most eminent and transcendent love that ever God bare, or shewed towards any miserable creature.* Well, Let us first reade it according to his Exposition, and see what it will help him. It will run thus. God so Loved, that is, unchangeably purposed the salvation of the world, *That he gave his onely begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, &c.* Which is in effect, that he so unchangeably purposed the salvation of lost mankinde, as that he provided the most eminent transcendent *medium* for it to be saved by upon condition of believing. And so it will be an unchangeable conditional purpose to the world, and an unchangeable absolute purpose to believers that have that condition. And may it not consist, or rather spring from his pity and compassion to faln man so to will and purpose? Yea, and may not the word *Love*, rather signifie that pity in which he so purposed, then that purpose that sprung therefrom, seeing its the more prime moving cause of his sending Christ that is here spoken of? Or will this Exposition content him? No, (though this is as much as the words will bear with the following expressions in the Text) yet this is not it he aims at; but this, That his Love signifies, an absolute unchangeable purpose of saving every one for whom he gave Christ, and so of giving, and causing them all effectually to receive whatsoever is needful to their salvation. But the Text speaks not up to this conception, for then it should rather have been thus, God so loved the world, that he gave his onely begotten Son, and will make it believe in him so that it shall never perish, &c. But neither such, not to that purpose is our Saviours expression. Such an expression indeed would have represented God as propounding the salvation of the world, as an end undertaken by himself to accomplish and bring about with all the mediums conducing thereunto without condition on our part, whereas our Saviour speaks of it as an end propounded to, and attainable by the world on condition of believing, as healing was to the wounded *Israelites* by looking upon the brazen Serpent, unto which Christ is resembled, *ver.* 14, 15. Christ so sets Gods good will

will before the world there, as may let it see and move it to believing as its duty: But as M. Owen would have it understood, we may say VVhat He would fasten upon us, *Solvite mortales curas*, &c. Let every man take his own course, and swim down the stream of a fatal necessity. If there be any salvation to be had for him, he must have it, God will bring him to it though he look not after it: and if it be otherwise, its in vain to think of it, its not so much his fault, as Gods Wil that he beliefs not, as a late Resolver hath too badly insinuated. While he determines that there is no other cause why some believe not the Gospel preached to them, but only the Wil of God himself.

As for his Reason, *viz.* because this is the most eminent and transcendent love of God, &c. That would be considered how far its true, and whether it will insorce his conception quite beside the tenor of our Saviours expressions. Love may be considered, either according to the things it acts forth as tending to the good of the party loved; or according to the inward strength of affection, as affording us means of good, or possessing us of that good. In regard of the first, this wasa most glorious eminent and transcendent act of Love. God afforded many means of good to the world, but none of them in themselves so worthy and so glorious as his Son, nor is there any thing in which either so much of Gods heart or good will to the world is to be seen that he delights not in their death, but rather in their conversion and living, or so much good to be met with as in him. In nothing hath God condescended more to man, or provided so much good for him. As to its act then, and provision of means to our good, this is the most eminent act of his Love to us. But yet this act of giving Christ is but the provision of good for us, and of the best mean and way to it. Its not the possessing us of the good in him; with reference to that, some that were loved so, as to have Christ given as a way to life for them, may not be the objects of so intense affection as others for whom he also gave Christ; nor come to experiment that love of Delight or Fellowship, in which his Love in giving Christ perfects it self in them that believe on him. This act then, I say, of love to the world, in which God gave forth Christ, though it be the most eminent and transcendent in regard of his provision of a mean to its good, and though it be that through which the most choise delightful acts of his Love are met with by those that believe on him, yet as its comprehensive of the world is not an absolute purpose of all their salvation. The same most eminent expression of

Love may be acted toward many, and out of exceeding great good will to them All too, and yet may not be with the like intensness and eminency of affection and purpose for endeavouring to make it beneficial to All, as we noted above in the instance of *David lib. 3. cap. 9*. In a word Gods greatest love to the world, was not an unchangeable absolute purpose of saving every one of them, and therefore the giving Christ out of love to the world, was not a giving him out of such a purpose to save every one of them. The phrase, *So God loved*, will not evince it. For though that word [So] intimates so exceedingly, so really and heartily, to such a remarkable astonishable heighth, yet it proves not either that he loved it equally to his Son, or so as to purpose absolutely the eternal salvation of all of them. For our Saviour expressing that [So] tells us that it was so as to give his Son, *That every one that believes in him should not perish*, &c. but not so as to give all things to it, as he says of his Son, v. 35. which yet is the same love in which he loves his chosen, his called and believing ones. *Joh. 17.24*. Nor says he, so as to cause them to believe in him, and have eternal life. So that that word [So] will not prove that his conception.

Its true (as he also minds us) That the Scripture says, God commended his Love to us in this, *That Christ died for us*, though thats not all the commendation of it, but that he did that for us while we were sinners and ungodly. And I think its a marvellous commendation of his Love that he died for All while sinners; and they are the more to blame that withhold this so great commendation from multitudes by which they should be induced to believe in him, love, and serve him. But will that prove that that Love was not his compassion and pity towards men, that is therein commended, or that it was an unchangeable purpose of making all those he so loved to answer his love with love again, and so to attain to eternal salvation? Cannot Love be commendable, exceeding commendable, except it be so received by all it acts towards as to make them grateful, and so to attain the effects that it produces to the grateful? Was not Gods Love to *Israel* in bringing them out of *Egypt* by a mighty hand and outstretched arm, and taking them out of the midst of another Nation by signs and wonders, to be a people for himself, and speaking to them out of the midst of the fire from heaven an exceeding commendable love, a love flowing from (and most eminently of) his Covenant made with

with *Abraham*, *Deut.* 4.31, 32, 33, &c. and yet all they, to, and upon whom all those most glorious acts of his love were acted, were not therefore possessed of that end, The land promised to I to which they tended; nor was his love therein then a purpose absolutely to possess them of that end, except (as Mr. Owen here argues) he failed of his end. The greater commendation it is of Gods Love that he gave Christ, the greater ingagement it is to the world to believe on him, love and serve him, and the greater its sin that it not so answer such a love to them, and the greater will his terror be in judging them, that Christ died for All, and yet many that had their lives through his Death, lived not to him, 2 *Cor.* 5.10, 11.15. for God is a jealous God and may be provoked to jealousy by men; and what is jealousy but love intruded, or the fury that springs up from love abused, as when he that loves hath his love slighted and others prefer'd before him? Sure the Apostle uses this very love and its greatness as an argument of terror to them that ill requite it, reject it, or receive it in vain, 2 *Cor.* 5.11. with 6.1. *Heb.* 2.3. and 10.26.29. and 12.22.24.25. 2 *Thes.* 2.10, 11. which were vain arguings, if because this love was so commendable, therefore it was an absolute unchangeable purpose of bringing all that Christ was given for, to eternal salvation.

But he says further (*Argum.* 3.) “*That Gods love is a Velle bonum alicui, a willing good to them He loves, and therefore sure they are the object of his Love to whom he intends the good which is the issue and effect of his love, viz. not perishing but having eternal life, But that happens onely to the Elect, Believers, &c.* In which Mr. Owen slipt out of the matter in hand, the nature of the love, to the object of it, and builds his Argument but upon an Axiom of the Schoolmen that were not so far Gods privy Councillors, as that we may build our saith upon all their Maxims. And he faults too in his Argument. For whereas his *Major* speaks of Gods intending that end and issue that men perish not, His *Minor* tells us of what happens, which makes his Argument to continue a *Quartus terminus*. Surely God tells us, he so far intends not perishing & eternal life to others, that he hath no delight in the death of the wicked, but rather that they turn and live, and that he willeth not that any perish, but that all come to Repentance, *Ezek.* 33.11. 2 *Pet.* 3.9. I know because men think themselves wise in this world, and prefer their Philosophical Rules before the Apostles counsel, *To become fools that they may be wise,*

that they will not bear the truth of those sayings, but muster up objections against them, and say with *Nicodemus*, How can these things be? if God willed not that they perish, but that all should come to Repentance, then these things must happen to all, and none are loved of God, but they to whom those things happen. And so they will teach men to blaspheme that goodness of God that leads men to repentance, and to say, It was not goodness because they are not prevailed with, but according to their own hard hearts, treasure up wrath to themselves by sinning against it, yea and will make this so wonderfull a transcendent testimony of Love no love, except it had been, God so loved the world, that he not only gave his son that every one that believes might not perish, but also will make men so to believe and receive him that they shall never perish. VVell then might the Israelites for the far greatest part of them say, Its in vain for us to serve God, and wherein hath he loved us? seeing whatever great things he did for them, they found not that he so absolutely purposed their eternall salvation that he would by his omnipotent power compell them to it, for but a remnant of them shall be saved. But for that willing none to perish, but rather to turn and live, and so a willing salvation to men, God may be said so to will two wayes. First, In willing it to be, and so providing it in Christ and propounding it to men, &c. and willing or requiring them to look to him for it, with promise of conferring it on them in so doing. 2. To purpose or determine that this or that man absolutely shall be saved. In the first way he hath willed salvation to the world in generall, having put it in Christ and willed the Gospell to be preached throughout the VVorld, and they all to listen to it, and obey it, but not in the second way. Now some may not receive, or receive in vain Gods grace, willing their salvation in the first way, and turn it into wantonness, and so it hath not in them its effect it hath in others that receive it throughly: shall we therefore conclude There was no grace extended to them, the other only and not they were the object of his love in providing salvation for and propounding it to the world? But he adds,

(4) “*This that was the cause of giving Christ, is the cause of giving all good things with him, Rom. 8.32. therefore it must be towards them only that have all those good things.* I deny the consequence. The same love that led God to appoint the brazen Serpent for healing, led him to heal them that looked up; *Ergo* he set it up only

only for them that looked up. This argument slides also from the nature of the love to the Object of it. The same love that led God to give his Son to the World, leads him to give eternall life to them of the World that believe, and so to give us that believe All things; but it follows not therefore that the object of Gods love in its first act was not distinct from, or at least not larger then Believers.

(5) “His last argument is from the word {Ἀγάπη????}, which signifies (saith he) *to rest in his love, and so it must be a peculiar love.* This is but vain, for this word is used of Christs love to the young man that had great possessions and went away from him, [149] *Mark.* 10.22. {ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν}, and so to the Israelites of old that were many of them loved no more, and so to Judas, *Psal.* 109.3, 4. [149] Vers. 21.

2. “He tells us, *There is a difference in our acceptions of the word “World, which I conceive to be sinfull mankinde in generall, He, to “be the Elect scattered abroad in the World with a Tacit opposition “to the Nation of the Jews.* My Reason for mine is, 1. Because the word World (speaking *de mundo contento*) primarily so signifies, as, He shall judge the World in Righteousness, *Psal.* 9.8. How then shall God judge the World? and, All the World is become guilty before God, *Rom.* 3.6, 9. 2. Because Christ is expresly said to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole World, the Ransom for All men. 3. Because it here sustains the nature of a whole, out of which believers are taken as parts. He loved the world, that every one that believes, that is, that every one of it or of the world that believes, &c. thats evidently the sense of the place. Now its non-sense to say, That every one of the Elect that believe, for that intimates that some of them might not believe. Its as if he should have said of the Israelites, He brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, that they that follow him obediently in the wilderness might enter into *Canaan*, like that in *Iohn* 12.48. where the same phrase is used, I am come a light unto the world, that whosoever believes in me should not abide in darkness, &c. He is a light to every man, *John* 1.9. a light to them that hate his light, *Joh* 3.19. but they for hating of it shall be deprived of it and abide in darkness, *John* 12.35, 26. but all of this world to whom he vouchsafes his light, that believe in him, shall not abide in darkness.

But Mr. Owen says, “*By the World are meant the Elect scattered abroad in the World opposed to the Nation of the Jews;* that this last

clause is untrue, appears by this that he was speaking this to a Jew to draw him to believe, and therefore the Word World must not be opposed to them as excluding them: but let us see how he refutes ours, and confirms his own opinion.

Against our latter observation from the reading of the Words, He so loved the Elect that all of them that believe should not perish, viz. that it would seem by that as if some of them might not believe, he replies, why? "*Because he sent his Son that they might not perish!* To that I answer, No, but because the phrase is Distributive, not [that it believing] as supposing that all that VWorld that Christ was given for shall believe, but [that whosoever, or every one that believes] as supposing that though there is ground for all the VWorld to believe, yet all would not. So that the place holds not forth that Christ must and will keep from perishing All for whom he was given, as Mr. Owen suggests, but all whosoever and whatsoever that believe in him. But he answers again, "*That God designs the salvation of all them in express words for whom he sent his Son.* To that I reply, that (by designing, &c. meaning his purposing to bring them All to eternal salvation) its openly untrue, for he says no such thing there, that he loved the world, and gave his Son that every one of it should be made to believe and be saved, as I appeal to the Text it self, but if he mean, (as he doth not) that salvation might be propounded to it, and it have a way by which it might in believing come to be saved, then I deny it not, but so its said of unbelievers, *John 5.34, 40.* VWhereas we say that, {ἵνα πάντες ὁπί-} {ζεύων} is divisive and partitive as to that *Totum*, the word world going before: to this he says, that If it be so, then it restrains Gods love to some and not to others. I answer No, but it it shews by whom and by what way the utmost end of this love, or most choise blessing of it is to be enjoyed. Gods love in providing a *Medium* through which men might look for and meet with salvation respects the world in generall; nor doth that saying, that whosoever believes, put a bar against any of the world, as if they might not in looking up to Christ be saved, but it implies that the world as simply such, or as in that state of sin and blindness in which God out of pity sent his Son for it, is not the object of Gods absolute intention to give eternall life, but those of it that believe; and the word Whosoever, is both an encouragement for all or any to believe, and carries in it a supposition that the whole VWorld likely might not believe

believe. As the setting up the brazen Serpent (to whom Christ is compared, *ver.* 14.) was an act of love to all the strange Israelites, though the benefit of healing was to be obtained in their looking up to it, and by none of them that refused to look up; so was the gift of Christ to the world, though the unbeliever not receiving him is not saved. But then,

2. He denies that that phrase is restrictive, but only declarative of his end, how its not restrictive I have even now said, but that its Distinctive, not taking in the whole world as the certain Object or subject of eternall life, is shewed also, and is very evident I conceive to all that have but common judgment, and so that its not only Declarative of his end, but declarative of it in such a way or expression, as implies that the Object that injoyes that end, may (at least) be fewer then the object of giving him to such an end. Its not, that all the world shall not perish, but that whosoever believeth perish not, &c. Besides no other Scripture says that the whole world for whom Christ was given, did or shall believe on him, but expresly to the contrary, that some to whom God gave Him as the true bread, saw and believed not, *Iohn.* 6.32, 36. and that many to whom he came received him not, He came to his own things, amongst which his own Nation was, and his own Nation or people received him not. So that for his exposition we have nothing but his bare saying; and that offering violence to the Text too; as if it had been said, {ἵνα πιστεύσῃ} {καὶ μὴ ἀπόληται}, that it should believe and be saved, &c. indeed he after adds some reasons, we shall weigh them also.

1. His first is, “*From what he said before about that love where-
“with he loved it, which was such a love as cannot be extended to All,* which being refuted before, needs no further Answer. [150] The world of mankinde share in this great act of Gods love, the sending forth of Christ, and yet not all attaine the utmost intention of it.

[150] See before
Li. 3. Ca. 9.

2. His second is from vers 17. “*Giving a reason of this that he
“says it was an act of his love to the world; whereof he gives a double
“proofe, one Negative, he sent him not to condemne the world, the
“other affirmative, but that the world through him might be
“saved, he says, the word World there must needs signifie believers and
“Elect, because its said that the World through him might be saved,
“which if it be understood of any but believers, God must needs fail of
his*

his end. This is answered before in the first Chapter of the first Book, where he have shewed.

1. "That the word saved is sometimes used in a lower sense then the having eternal life, as the deliverance out of that condemnation fore-come upon us, and so the world may be said to be saved, and the grace of God saving to All men, *Tit.* 2.11. *Rom.* 5.18. 1 *Tim.* 2.6.

2. That such speeches do not always declare the intention of God which he will bring about, but an end propounded to men, which they in attending to the means set before them ought to press after, and might attain to, and that its his good will they should look after it, and in looking after it attain to it. See the Instances thereof *Acts* 17.26, 27. *Joh.* 1.7. *Psal.* 105.44, 45. Like to which is this. *He sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved;* that is, That he being filled with authority, power, and sufficiency to save them, they might have him as a Saviour or way to salvation to look and listen to, and in walking in his Light and Truth might attain salvation. Which end set before them, they many of them miss by despising him who is the way to it. Therefore our Saviour distributing the world in two parts in the next *verse*, tells us, not who might have been saved by him, but, who they are that attain the end propounded to them, *viz.* *He that believeth on his Name, he shall be saved.* He will do his Office to all that come to him for it, according to Gods appointment. But he that believeth not (he that when Christ speaks to them that they might be saved (as in *Joh.* 5.34.) turn a deaf ear to his words, [151] harden their hearts, neglect so great salvation, and refuses him that speaks for heaven,) he is now judged, Now in the day of the Gospel. However God might wink at mens ignorances in former times, yet Now God will not bear it that men should despise him that speaks to them more fully for their good (His Son preaching salvation to them,) but judges him. The word judges him, and the Spirit condemns him, and makes this word of salvation a Saviour of death unto death to him, because he hath not believed on the Name of the onely begotten Son, because he did not trust to him for healing, when the Gospel declared such readiness and ability in him to heal them. Which why, or how it should be, if Christ was not sent for them, and was neither sufficient nor willing to save them, as was said, *Chap.* 1. I cannot discern. So that this Argument serves not his purpose.

[151] Heb. 2, 3.
and 12.25.

“3. The third is, “*That its not unusual to call Gods chosen people, the World, This I deny, and he endeavors to prove from John. 4.42. The Saviour of the world. “Which saith Mr. Owen, he onely is of them that are saved: a Saviour of men not saved, is strange.* But how that may be true, we have hinted in the former Argument. Besides, [152] Is this so strange to denominate a person by his Authority and Office, rather then from his actings onely in that Authority. May not a man be called Lord chief Justice of all *England*, though he do not execute Justice to all persons in *England*, or cannot so do by reason that many decline his Justice-executing? So, may not a man be called, and indeed be a Physition for a whole Town by the appointment of Authority, though many in it refuse to take Physick of him when they are sick? And is not many a man constituted Minister of, and preacher to all such a Congregation, when yet perhaps half of them despise his Ministry, and refuse to hear him? Shall not he be called the Minister of that Parish wholly, because many refuse to have his Ministry acted towards them? So Christ is the Saviour of the World, both in that, 1. He is He in and through whom God is the Saviour of All men, God not saving any man in any sense immediately, but his Son doing all from him, *Joh. 5.22.* And 2. In regard that he is set up and held forth in the Gospel as filled and furnished for saving All, or any man upon looking to him, and all commanded to look to him to be saved by him. And in the same sense He is said to give life to the World, both in that its through his Mediation that the World hath a being under goodness and patience, contrary to the desert of their sin, which (had God dealt with man according to the demerit of *Adams* sin, and the strict sense of his own VVord pronounced upon him) none in the world had had, but (if they had not been all forthwith cut off in *Adam*) their beings would have been as far from Gods goodness and mercy, as the being of the Devils, which is not worthy the name of life, nor is so called in any Scripture, as mans is. And this is (as I conceive) that life out of which he prays that his malicious enemies might be blotted, for in the book of the righteous (which is of eternal life) they are not written, *Psa. 96.28.* for which life He gave his Flesh to bear that sentence, that otherways in the day in which *Adam* sinned should have faln upon him and the whole world in him; As he is called the Light that inlightneth every man that comes into the world, meaning it of lower hints of light then what the believer peculiarly receives from

[152] According
to 1 Tim.
4.10.

him. So that his other Quotations of *John* 6.33.51. are as meerly beg'd as any other, and as little pertinent, they being thus to be interpreted. As also that he gives, exposes, and holds forth life in the Gospel to the world, as in *ver.* 32. The Father is said to have given him to them, and yet the world neither receives him, nor the life tendered and freely given in and by him, *Joh* 1.10, 11. and 5.4. and 6.36. But he tells us that Christ in *John* 10.27, 28. Says, He gives life to his sheep onely; which is neither right nor pertinent, for he neither puts in the word *onely*, nor speaks of the life of the world, but of eternal life. Which, if we take given for a free holding forth to men, [153] so as that they may have it for nothing if they will accept of it (as the word *given* is many times used, As where its said the *Jews* gave Christ Vinegar to drink, and he refused it, and they gave him gall, &c.) then he gives it to the world, even to others then do accept and receive it, as is said above to *Joh* 6.33. But if we take give for such an imparting it, as is accompanied with receiving it, so neither we, nor *Joh.* 6.33. says, that he gives eternal life to the world, much less, as it is in *Joh.* 10.27, 28. he gives it them, and they shall never perish. Could he but have shewed us one word to that purpose, that the world shall never perish, it had been to purpose. For *Rom.* 4.13. and 11, 12, 15. we have answered them before in the precedent Chapter. The falling of the *Jews* is called the *Riches* and *Reconciling* of the world, as the decay of Trade in another Country, and diverting it hither, may be said to be the inriching of this Kingdom. In which the word *Kingdom* may truly signifie the whole body of the people, though many through idleness and riotousness in it may deprive themselves of that inriching which it brought them, or gave them fair advantages of. Besides, the world, the Nations in general, not the Elect in them onely, were reconciled or taken into savor as to the Gospel-preaching to them, and opening of the Kingdom for them, which before they had no such liberty to, but were looked upon as unclean, in respect of having the Kingdoms outward Ordinances, and Priviledges allowed them, but now were cleansed by God, and accounted clean as to them; and that also was their riches though not the riches of the glory of the Saints, they indeed have yet further riches, even Christ in them the hope of glory; which many of the world reconciled as to the former (of which the Apostle evidently there speaks, the *Jews* being cast off from that, and not from inward Union with God which they had

not

[153] Compare

Mark 15.

23. with Luke 23.

36.

not ever that were broken off) might and did miss of, by observing lying vanities forsaking their own mercies, *Jonas* 2.8. either by unbelief or negligence in a vain cursory receipt of the Ordinances and grace of Reconciliation therein tendered. So that neither doth that conclude the thing intended, namely that by the word world, is there meant only Gods Elect and Chosen. His proof from *Colos.* 1.6. [154] We have before spoken to in *Chap.* 1. That of 2 *Cor.* 5.19. We have also spoken to largely before in the Chapter about Reconciliation. Onely I shall add here, that the word world cannot there mean the Elect onely, for then no need of fearing that any toward whom that grace was vouchsafed should receive it in vain, as is intimately feared by the Apostle. *Chap.* 6.1.2. As for the Argument used from the Non-imputation there spoken of, we have shewed it to be weak also. God reckoned not the sins of the world to it in that he winked at them, and did not demand satisfaction at their hands for them, but preached forgiveness to them, which indeed was a very great blessing, but it comes to life and happiness onely upon them that receive it, and believe, as the Apostle says, *Rom.* 4.6, 7, 9. His reasons why the Elect should be called the *world*, as they are (especially the three first) very slender ones, so they do all fall to the ground, except it can be first proved that it is so called.

[154] *Lib.* 3. *ca.* 6.

4. His fourth Reason is like *Nicodemus's*, *How can these things be?* Why doth not God give the Gospel to all then? who do any perish? &c. He might as well say, If God brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, that they might go to *Canaan*, why did he not make them all trust in him, and carry them all thither? This is not to believe the VVord of God, that says, *Christ is the Propitiation for the sins of the whole world*, &c. But to set our Reason against it, though we could say, God hath told us more about his revealing Christ then he doth believe. viz. That He is the true Light that inlightneth every man that comes in to the world. But hewil there say too (as the manner of our darkness and unbelief is at every truth of God that it cannot comprehend) *Durus est hic sermo*, How can this be? for he will scarce conceive that the Word can sparkle through the Humanity united to it into the hearts of every man, except the Manhood too be plainly declared, or that that divine being that the *Gentiles* are led to see in the VVorks of God, is no other then the VVord that was incarnate, and is the true God, this may seem as strange to him as that to the *Jews*, *Before Abraham was I Am*, and may meet with as many stones

about it. For Truth is full of Paradoxes to the wisdom of the Flesh, though plain to him that findes understanding. Besides, God hath sent his Gospel to All Nations and Peoples, though many have put the light from them, and chosen darkness rather, even whole Countries and Peoples, and therefore shall be justly condemned, not for that they had it not, but because when God sent it, they received it not, but have from age to age slighted and rejected it.

5. He heaps up another nest of absurdities upon us. As 1. *“That we cannot understand this to be All, and Every man, except we grant some to be loved & hated from eternity.* But how our granting that should depend upon that large extent of the Word, it will pose Reason it self to conceive, and Scripture too. Sure he meant, Except we deny it, as we do, if by hatred he mean a purpose not to send his Son for them, without their disobedience to his Son, and the light extended through him to condemn and destroy them. 2. He says, *“We must make the Love of God toward innumerable to be fruitless and vain.* We deny that too. For there-through they enjoy their lives, liberties, patience, bounty, goodness, hints of truth to their mindes, some more, some less, as he sees fit in his wisdom, and God shall receive much glory. Though its true (and no absurdity to say) that some do reject much grace, or receive it in vain, in regard of many further fruits it would effect, yea, and turn that that was for their welfare into a snare. Turning that grace and goodness into wantonness that should lead them to repentance. 3. That then the Son of God is given to them that never hear word of him, nor have any power to believe. Answer. Its not said, He gave him to the world, but gave him simply out of love to the world, and give him he might for them, to whom so properly he may not be said to give him. I suppose you think he was given for, if not also to some children that die in infancy, and yet they never hear of him, and so many former Jews might never hear of him distinctly as that he should be crucified, and yet they had good by that they heard not of. Death came in upon All through Adam, though many never heard of him, and so may and doth much mercy by Christ to such as never hear distinctly of him. And did men in that mercy grope after God (as the Apostles say) they might haply finde him. What power God gives to men to yield up to the light that comes from him, I cannot say for others, I am not in their bosoms, but for my self, I am sure more then I have acted forth, and followed him in. And that
God

God gives no power to believe, or at least soberly to attend to God that they might be helpt to believe, but onely where men indeed do believe, is as inevident, as that God gave not power to *Adam* to forbear eating the forbidden fruit, because he did not forbear. I cannot see into those secrets, how far God acts, or acts not upon others, but the not seeing such secrets shall be no reason to me to wave what is revealed (if not plainly in this, yet) in other Scriptures of larger expression. If Mr. *Owen* see into mens spirits, and can tell us what God doth to all, and how far he deals with them, or finds the Scripture expressing it, let him demonstrate to us, that God doth give no power to any to attend to him in the ways wherein he useth to beget faith according to the means vouchsafed, but onely to them that are actually brought to faith, and I shall listen to him. 4. He says, "*Then God is mutable in his Love.*" Answer. That follows not, for so far as he says he loved it, he acted, and never altered it, he did give his Son (and never reversed it) *that "whosoever believes should not perish, &c.* And yet we being mutable, and corrupting our selves, God may say to us, as well as to *Ephraim*, *Hos. 9.15. I will love them no more*, and yet the alteration in us onely, not in him. The effects of the same act may be different to an object without difference in the act, as the same shine of the Sun may refresh a sound eye, and yet hurt the same eye when sore. 5. Then he says, "*He gives not all things to All to whom he gave his Son.*" This with the Scripture alledged for it, is once and again answered before. "6. *Then he knows not certainly who shall believe and be saved.*" Which no more follows from it, then this, God loved *Israel* to bring them out of *Egypt* that he might bring them that followed him into *Canaan*: But he brought not all the *Israelites* into *Canaan*, Ergo, If he brought all the *Israelits* out of *Egypt*, he knew not who would believe in him, and follow him into *Canaan*. What a piece of Non-sense is such an Inference? But against the enlarging of the object, he further thus reasons from the next particular, [*That who so believes*] thus

"*If the object be restrained there to believers, then that depends upon the will of God, or upon themselves, If upon themselves, That contradicts, 1. Cor. 1.7. and men make themselves to differ. If upon God, then we make the place say thus, God so loved All, that but some should partake of the fruits of his Love, and to what end then did he love All? Is not this Out with the Sword, and run the Dragon*

[155] Acts 28.
26, 27.
with Joh.
12.40.

“*through with the Spear?* To which I answer, That the second act, the giving the injoyment of eternal life, is here asserted but for them that believe; and both the appointing life to the believer, and the effecting of that faith depend upon Gods Will. As we can make no Law upon what terms to have that life, So neither can we work in our selves that condition upon which God giveth that life. Faith is the gift of God. [155] Yet this latter is so of God, as that it is not without some actings of man, to which he exhorts men, and for want of which he justly faults them, yea brings them not to faith. Its by mans hearing, though not of mans power. Whence, though one man listen to the means, and is brought to believe, and another that had as much power to have listened, stop his ear, and believes not; yet it follows not that the first made himself to differ, because not his listening, but God by it gave the faith; no more then one *Israelite* looking to the brasen Serpent, & being healed, might be said to have made himself to differ from another that looked not up in point of healing, in which they had both yet remained alike, had not God given healing to the one, and not to the other. The impertinency of the Allegation of 1 *Cor.* 4.7. I shewed before. Nor yet follows that other Inference, That its but thus, *God loved All* that but some might partake of the fruits of his love, For 1. There are other fruits then eternal life, of which all partake. 2. There is no exclusion of any from that condition by which we may partake of that. When he says, *That every one that believes*, Its to incourage all to believe, not to hinder any. The whole Argument is but like this. God brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, that he might bring them that obeyed and followed him into *Canaan*. Either that restriction was determined by Gods Will, or their own. If their own, then they made themselves differ one from another, contrary to the Apostle. If by Gods, then the sense is, He brought all out of *Egypt*, that he might bring but some into *Canaan*. To what end then, I pray, did he bring All out of *Egypt*? Is not this, Out with the Sword, and run the Dragon through with the Spear? Is not this folly andfopperry thus to reason, or from such a reason to deny the Truth of Gods Word, and say, God surely did not bring any out of *Egypt* but whom he brought into *Canaan*. Or will he ascribe Caleb and *Joshuah*’s faith more to will, then the believing that which is attested by the VVord of God (or by the powerful working of miracles, or the like) is the Truth of God?

Ay,

“*Ay, But if believers onely be the object that shall have salvation, Then the general ransom is an empty sound.* Answer. It is so to Unbelief, as God himself is in respect of that infinite satisfaction that is in him, and so was Gods bringing *Israel* out of *Egypt* to them that believed not. Such is the pernicious nature of Unbelief, that it turns wholsom food into poyson, but to such as have learned to become fools, that God might make them wise, to those that learn to subject their reason to Gods Truth, its not so, for they finde it a motive to draw them in to believe in God, and to admire his Love to men, and the depth of his judgments towards them; yea, in a word, to teach them to deny ungodliness, and live godlily, as *Tit.* 2.11, 12. And they finde it a very wholsom useful Truth to hold forth to others, to let them see cause for believing in God, and hoping in him, and to charge them with folly and madness, that having such ground to believe yet refuse it. The most pretious Truth that is, is an empty found in respect of spiritual good to the Unbeliever. Shal we conclude, *Ergo*, its a falshood? Gods goodness it self that lead men to Repentance is an empty thing to those that harden themselves against it, and brings them to no spiritual good or happiness, shall we therefore teach men to say God is good to none but them that rightly use his goodness and receive the fruit of it in life eternal? Is not this to teach men to despise the riches of Gods goodness? O the blindness of our reason in the things of God, & the folly of preferring it as Umpire in matters of our faith, waving the Word of God that should rightly guide us. But yet this let me say, Unbelievers shall see, and finde one day, that this general ransom was no empty thing in it self, it was meerly their folly and wickedness that made it so to them, and then it shall be full of dread and terror to them that they have denied him that bought them. His premises being such humane mistakes, high thoughts lifted up, and strengthened against the Scripture-Declaration, his Conclusion, that Christ died not, or God gave not his Son for them that believe not, &c. falls with them, They being notable justifications of all Unbelievers, and Patronizers of slothfulness, from which these things follow: That to Unbelievers God was not an object meet to be believed on by them, nor had any reall reason to love him, they being ever hated by him, and he never doing them any good in his Son. That the want of faith was no fault of theirs, for they could no way have avoided what they did in not believing, God neither gave them
cause

cause nor grace to believe, &c. But I shall rake no further in so unclean a dunghill, that savors so much of Satan, and justifies the case of all Unbelievers.

CHAP. III.

A consideration of 1 Joh. 2.2. and 2 Cor. 5.19. In Answer to what Mr. Owen says about him.

IN his third Chapter he proceeds to another instance of Scripture for us, viz. 1 John 2.2. *He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins onely, but also for the sins of the whole world.* Urged by us both from the plain full expression, which (except in opposition to some called out of the world) always signifies *All men, the world*, and then *All men*, besides those spoken of, with, or opposed to it when so joyned. And 2. From its opposition here to believers, or speaking of it as a distinct party beyond them. To pass by his frivolous exposition of men living in all parts of the world, which is as good as nothing by way of opposition to us, That expression reaching to All men in the world, except it were bounded with some limitation, as onely some of all sorts living in All places. And then we challenge him to shew us the words, whole world, so taken in any divine expression. I shall view his more serious reply consisting of an indeavor to do these three things. “1. *Clear it to whom the Apostle writ.* 2. *What his purpose and aim in this place is,* 3. *What the meaning of Christs being a propitiation is, and what he means by the whole world.*

1. For the first, he saith, “This Epistle was peculiarly directed to the Jews. But he holds in his proof of it. For 1. *“He confesses he hath nothing in the Epistle that nominates them to whom he writ it, to make the assertion infallibly true, de fide;* and so what he can say is no matter of faith, nor sufficient ground of limiting what what is evidently propounded in it to our faith. Onely he brings probabilities (as he calls them) that it was intended to the *Jews* (to them onely he must mean, or he says nothing to the purpose) they are these four.

“1. *That John was one of them that was to preach to the Circumcision with Peter and James, Now they writ to the Jews, Ergo,* “John

“John *also*. I answer, Whether by the twelve Tribes, and the strangers scattered abroad, *James* and *Peter* mean the *Jews* onely, is questionable, seeing the place where the ten Tribes were carried was scarcely then known, nor yet is. And besides, the Christians are taken into their place and made one body with them, and I suppose are by our Saviour meant to be the twelve Tribes, when he says, The Apostles shall sit on twelve Thrones judging the twelve Tribes of *Israel*, *Matth.* 19.28. *Luke* 22.30. And the Christians were strangers to the world more then the scattered *Jews*, even the *Gentile Christians* also because of their conversation, 1 *Pet.* 4.3, 4. And sure that in 1 *Pet.* 2.10. Sometimes not a people, but now a people, agrees rather to the *Gentiles* then the *Jews*. Again, We finde *Paul* was one of them that was to preach to the *Gentiles*, the prime of them, and yet its supposed he wrote to the *Jews* the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. However, that he preached often to them is manifest, *Acts* 17. &c. So *John*, though firstly, he was to preach to the *Jews*, yet did take care of the seven *Asian Churches*, and living after all the rest of the Apostles took care of all the Churches as an Apostle, and its most probable that he writ to them all too; his Epistle being Catholike, that is, universal, and without any particular limitation and inscription to any Church, or any sort of believers more then them of *James* and *Peter* were. Yea, he inscribes it to believers indefinitely, not to *Jew* believers. *Chap.* 5.13. *These things have I written to you that believe*, He says not, to you that are believing *Jews*, or the like, but {ὅμῶν τοῖς} {πιστεύουσιν}. Believers then, as such, and so all such, are those he directed it to, that they might know that they have eternal life, &c. So that there is more probability, yea, more from the very letter of the Epistle, against his conceit, then for it. But

2. He tells us, “*John frequently intimates, that those he wrote to received the Word from the beginning. Now the Jews had it first preached to them.* He instances *Chap.* 2. *ver.* 7. *That commandment which ye heard from the beginning.* The words are thus. *I write no new Commandment to you, but an old Commandment which ye heard from the beginning, the old commandment is the word that ye heard from the beginning.* Now who would conceive, that the meaning of that is this, The word that ye heard before the *Gentiles*? The truth is, He tells them, He writes no new Commandment to them, but that which they always had heard from the beginning of the

Gospels being preached to them, They should not think they preached one to them at first, but now (as some false Apostles would perswade them, and as many Deceivers would do believers now) that its necessary that they should have some other Doctrine then that at first preached to them, some higher things then the Gospel contains, new things that they never heard of before; no, says he, its but the same, as in *ver.* 24. *Let that therefore which ye have heard from the beginning abide in you,* Let not that slip, those first fundamental Truths, [156] and if that abide in you that ye heard from the beginning, ye shall abide in the Father and in the Son. Its the same in substance with that of *Paul* to the *Gentiles* at *Corinth*, I *Cor.* 15 1, 2, 3. *I do you to wit of the Gospel which I preached to you, not of another, but that which ye also received, and in which ye also stand, and by which ye are saved, if ye keep in memory how I preached to you, viz.* How that amongst the first truths (*{εν πρωτοις}*) *Christ* died for our sins. *Keep*, saith he, *those truths heard in the first place, the word of the beginning of the Gospel of Christ, as Marke calls it, Mar. 1.1. and as its called, Heb. 6.1. The Word of the beginning of Christ, and in Chap. 3.6. {αρχην τῶπος ασεως}, the beginning of the Confidence, those Doctrines which first begat confidence in them, thats the old Commandment, though new in it self, and comparatively to former Dispensations in shadows in darker Ages of the Church. So that makes not one jot for him. Beza In locum expounds it Verbum Evangelii ab iis jam pridem auditum quibus inscribitur Epistola, Christianis sc. minime novitiis, &c.*

“3. *He argues from the opposition between us and the world, as a “Jew reckoning himself with the Jews, in opposition to the rest of believers in the world, Which he thinks is enough alone to manifest whom he wrote to. But this is the most improbable of all the rest, as if the Apostle writing to all believers would not reckon himself one with them, whether Jew or Gentile, but keep open yet the old distinction, which the Gospel came to take away. Again, How usual was it with Christ, speaking to believing disciples of the Jews, onely to oppose them to the world, and by the world to mean unbelieving Jews also? as in Joh. 15.19. and 7.7. and 17.14. So Paul to the Gentiles as to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 11.30. opposes the world to believers of the Gentiles, and by the world means all final unbelievers, Jew and Gentile. Nay, if this had any force, then in 1 Joh. 5.19. he should strengthen the Jew in their obstanacy (which he*

[156] With that
also in
Revel. 2.
24, 25. and
3.3.

he says they had) against the Churches of the *Gentiles*, for there he opposes himself and those he wrote to, to the whole world besides, in like manner as here. We know that we are of God, and the whole world lies in wickedness. Now if he writ as a *Jew*, reckoning with the *Jews*, and set himself with them in opposition to All other believers in the world, then he says there, That he and the believing *Jews* were of God, but all the Churches of the *Gentiles* lay in the wicked one. And who would not abominate such an Exposition? Nay, Mr. *Owen* should do well to finde any one place in all the Scripture, where the word *world* (specially spoken of with distinction from believers or any sort or Nation) signifies another sort or kinde of believers. So that thats vain too.

His last is, “*His mentioning and given cautions of Deceivers, Seducers, Antichrists, &c.* As if any man that mindes the Scriptures could be ignorant that these kinde of people did pester also the *Gentile* Churches, as the *Galathians*, *Corinthians*, Churches of *Asia*, &c. And that the Apostle *Paul* was as circumspect of the *Gentile* Churches, and as careful to preserve them from these Seducers as possibly could be, and so that *John* living after the rest of the Apostles needed as much to war and watch over them as an other Churches. Nay, he that shall equally weigh things will say, there was more need for them then others, because they receiving the Gospel from the *Jews*, the Deceivers of the *Jews* had more influence upon them then upon their own Churches, for they were apt to question *Pauls* Doctrine upon this ground, that others of the *Jews* that pretended Authority from the Apostles taught otherwise. Besides, that the great stumble of the false Apostles was in the *Gentile* Churches, that they wanted Circumcision which the *Jewish* Churches wanted not: to say nothing that we finde them troubling the *Gentiles* often, but never that they troubled with such Doctrines the *Jewish* Churches, *Acts* 15.3, 4, 5.23, 24. So that I shall need to say no more to that first Consideration, having undermined it, and made it unable to afford that patronage to his Gloss that he puts upon it.

2. For the scope and aim of the Apostle. “*It is, saith he, to give consolation to believers against their sins and failings. If any man sin we have an advocate, &c.* But herein also he comes short. For though 1. I grant that he writ to comfort believers, all or any believers, and not believing *Jews* onely, and that that was his main aim,

yet it was not all; for 2. He affords them also a Direction in case of other men, to improve their interest in their Advocate by Prayers, Intercessions, &c. for them according to *Pauls* direction to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 2.1. &c. Thence its to be noted, That he says not, If any of you sin, but indefinitely, If any sin. But suppose he aim onely at the comfort of believers, what then? He adds, “*Then he can speak of none but them onely, and that the extending it to All, can possibly make nothing to the end proposed, namely, the Consolation of believers.* But sure he is out here. For the consideration that Christ renders God propitious to strangers (such his power and prevalency with him) is an argument much conducing to perswade them, that he will render him much more propitious to his children that are wounded for their follies, and fly to him. And I conceive the Apostle may be understood so to speak in *Rom.* 8.32. *He that spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us All*, That is, for us All men, one and other, *how shall he not with him* (having given him to us also, as *Beza* notes on the place) *give Us* (that is, his chosen ones) *All things*? He that doth good to good and bad, to them that are unkinde, and ill-requiting, will not he do good to us that love him, and are born of him? Surely if this afford no comfort, I know not what will. Nay, I see nothing in the Text aggravate the consolation more then this. Its like that in *Matth.* 6.26, 28. *He feeds the Fowls of the Air, and clothes the Lillies, how much more you his children*? So here Christ is free for All to come to God by, how much more you that have believed and are his peculiarly. He procures that graciousness, and kindness or mercy, be extended to the whole world, how much more to you his choice Inheritance? Thats the very voice of unbelief that counts this light Manna, and retorts the Argument, as *Mr. Owen* doth. “*They perish most of them through unbelief, so may I too.* So might the Disciples have retorted; Ah Lord, but many of the fowls of heaven are taken and kill’d, and perish for want of food, and so may we do too. The Argument is strengthened from that, If God care for Birds, made to be taken, and killed, and for Lillies that fade, and are cast into the Oven, much more for you that are his children ordained to an eternal inheritance. So, If the world, many of whom yet perish, finde Christ ready to do them good, till they have made themselves void of all excuse, and hardned their hearts against him, much more will he be ready to accept us, and pass by our offences who believe on him. Yea, if their perishing

is

is for their unbelief, and they might be brought into special favor did they believe, what cause have we to believe on him, and not let go our belief! And yet in this the Apostle doth no more throw the consolation of believers to Dogs, then Christ did throw the consolation of his Disciples to the fowls, or then *James* doth the believers consolation to Dogs, in *James* 1.5. Nor is Christs dying for men, the childrens proper portion; thats yet to prove, but the Kingdom and Priviledges of Christ in the injoyment of God, which we do not throw to any Dogs, which yet men are not accounted as meerly natural, but as Rebels against the grace of God, proud scorner, *Prov.* 9.8. except it be by some conceited *Jew* like spirits that count themselves the onely Elect and Priviledged people, and all others as refuse and reprobate beside themselves, and men of their opinion, &c.

3. For the words, *Propitiation and the whole world.* 1. The word *Propitiation* in the Greek {ἱλασμος}, (coming of that Verb the *Publican* uses, {ἱλάθητί μοι}, Be merciful to me, whence the Lord is said to be {ἰλεως}, merciful, and of which comes {ἱλαστήριον}, signifying *The mercy Seate*, (Though we translate it *Propitiation*, *Rom.* 3.25. But indeed is the *Propitiatory*) In Hebrew is {כפר} of {כפר} that signifies to cover. Whence he argues, “*That to be a Propitiation is to cover sin, appease wrath, and reconcile God, so as to make the sinner be pardoned and received to mercy for his sake, so that the Law shall never be produced or brought forth to his condemnation. Whence he asks, Are the sins of every one expiated? Is God reconciled to every one? Is every sinner pardoned? Shall none have the transgression of the Law charged on him? Why then is not every one saved?* For Answ. to this. 1. I say, That he prevaricates in what he notes upon the word *Propitiation*, in Greek {ἱλασμος}, which he confounds with {ἱλαστήριον}, that signifying the *Propitiatory* or *Mercy Seate*, this the *Propitiation*, or *Sacrifice* offered to make atonement. Concerning which, 2. He doth not, nor can prove, that the offering of it up to God for a person, or persons, did in it self cover that persons sins, and exempt him from the punishment of them according to Law, or reconcile them actually to God, except where the persons whom it concerned closed with it, or came by faith unto God through it: the atonement made for all the Congregation on the day of expiation, did not exempt such a one, as whose soul was not afflicted within him that day, from cutting off, *Levit.* 16.29, 30, 31. with *Chap.* 23.28, 29.30. So in

2 *Chron.* 29.24. Its said, *An atonement* was made for All *Israel*, and yet ten Tribes of them were in Captivity, and many of the rest laughed *Hezekiah* and his zeal to scorn. That by that offering they were so much as typically and legally all reconciled to God, and their sins against the Law expiated, so as the punishments appointed in the Law for despising it, were not to be inflicted upon them, I fear Mr. *Owen* will not be able to demonstrate. Nay, the Apostle intimates, in *Heb.* 10.26.29. That they that had the sacrifice of Christ offered up for them, and the blood of it in some sense sanctifying them, [157] wilfully after the knowledg of the Truth sinning against it, and despising it, have no more benefit of it, there remains not further a sacrifice for them. It seems there was one, even that of Christ for them before, The Propitiatory Sacrifice did indeed expiate sin, and reconciled legally the person to God when it was accompanied with Faith in him that brought it, or for whom it was offered, or with a submission unto God according to Law; and so the comers to this Sacrifice of Christ, have all those effects by him enumerated to perfection, but not all for whom it was offered, or for whom he is a Propitiation. 3. A Propitiation he is for them all in this, That by his offering of himself, he is that Thing or Person unto which God having respect is propitious or favorable to them, deals not with the world according to their deserts, but is patient and bountiful to them, delights not that any perish, but that all should rather come to Repentance, unto which his goodness and patience also leadeth. As also in this, that Christ is He that hath done so much in his Death, and Mediation for the world, that he is set before it in the Gospel as a mean of reconciliation, and acceptance into the favor of God, he is free for the whole world to come to God by, and any person of it may finde favor with God through him. Yea, 4. The sin of the world, even of *Adam*, and all in him, is so covered or expiated by his Death and Sacrifice, that God took not the forfeiture of our lives according to the desert thereof, out of respect to him, but in that sense (at least,) justification of life is to all: both a being under mercy here, and away to life for us in Christ for hereafter. That Law I finde not (I mean the Law inflicting death upon *Adam* and all his Posterity for eating the forbidden fruit) shall be produced against any as the cause of perpetual ruine. Yea, that the whole world through this Sacrifice of Christ are brought neer to God, the Kingdom exposed to them, and no man

to

[157] {ὁὐκ ἔτι
λείπεται}.

to be called common or unclean as formerly (So as upon that ground its unlawful for him to enter it,) we have shewed before, [158] so that this word cannot straiten the following words signification; Which in the next place comes to be spoken to. *viz.* The whole world, in which the greatest weight lies, and of which he saith, “*That it being seven or eight times in the New Testament, it cannot except in one, and that in Re necessariâ, be made appear that it compriseth all and every man.* To which we say, That we affirm not that it so signifies here, because its evidently a distinct party from believers: but we say it signifies All besides them, and they and the whole world beside, are all, and every man. And I desire him to prove, that the words *whole world* when distinguished from believers doth not signifie all the rest, and with them make All and every man. He instances (1) *Rev.* 3.10. where the word is {ὅκουμένη} not {Κόσμος}, and so not so pertinent: and yet his note there is not right, for he saith, “*There it cannot signifie All and every man, because whereas its said, an hour of temptation should come upon All the world, its said, some shall be preserved from it,* But the words are {ἐκτῆς ὥρας}, out of, not from, and a man may be preserved out of that that comes upon him, as the preserving the Israelites out from Egypt doth not argue but that they were in it first. The hour of temptation comes upon all that dwell upon the earth, but all are not preserved in that, and out from that hour of temptation, from being swallowed up of it. However, The word *whole earth* there may signifie all but them that should be preserved, and with them All and every one, and thats enough to our purpose. 2. *Col.* 1.6. Is impertinent, as I shewed before, and his observation that it signifies onely believers, is very vain. The Apostle says not, It brings forth fruit in all to whom it comes, thats evidently false, if he meane it of fruits to life, but in all parts of the world it did. The same impertinency is in that of *Rom.* 1.8. It speaking of place, not of persons too; *In all the world, not by all the world.* The like, or worse, is in that of *Luke* 2.1. where neither the word {Κόσμος} is used, nor the speech the Word of God, but of a proud Emperor, that was the tenor of his Decree, not the Appellation of God put upon them. His Conclusion then that “{ὅλος ὁ Κόσμος}, is nothing but {Εκκλησία καθολική}, is groundless. By that rule. 1 *Joh.* 5.19. and *Rom.* 3.19. (which he forgot) should signifie the whole Catholike. Church lies in wickedness, and is guilty before God, &c.

[158] Acts 10.
28.

“2. He

2. He says, "*All Flesh, All Nations, All Men, &c. are as large as the whole world.* I Answer, In themselves they are, but they may be otherwise used. This is to fly from the terms, not to explain them, to tell us what other words signifie, not that thats spoken to: and yet in his Instances of the use of those words in the Prophetesies, there is this disparity which he considers not, *viz.* That the *whole world* is spoken of as a distinct party from (and a party reaching beyond) those that are clearly spoken of as believers, beyond the *we* that walk in the light, confess our sins, that have an Advocate, &c. But "*in those Instances, That All flesh shall see the salvation of God, All the ends of the earth shall remember and to turn to God, He will pour out his Spirit upon All flesh, &c.* There is in none of them places such a distinction, as speaking of a party at present existing beyond those that are believers. To say nothing that those are Prophetesies not affirmed of people in all times, but onely fully to be fulfilled in the last times, in which all flesh, good and bad then living, shall see God saving his people, and every eye shall see Christ the salvation of God coming in the clouds of heaven; and all in the last dayes shall remember and turn to the Lord, so that the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters shall cover the sea; and the Lord shall be one, and his name one in all the earth. Though I believe all of them shall not be through with Christ and his people, for after a thousand years Satan shall deceive many multitudes of them, Rev. 20.8, 9. Yea, then also shall the Spirit be poured upon all flesh, the power and breath of God shall in abundance be upon it, to abase and confound it, not to make all flesh grow and be admired, or prophesie, and do wonders, but then shall the sons and daughters of Sion prophesie. It shall be a spirit of Prophesie upon them; but he says not so to all flesh upon whom its poured. So that those may be taken in the fullest latitude of those times, and of those ages pointed at chiefly, without any error I conceive. The Spirit of the Lord shall breathe upon all flesh and make it wither, as in *Isai.* 40.6, 7. And in the children of Sion it shall be a spirit of Prophesie. Now whereas its said, that that was fulfilled in the day of Pentecost, *Acts* 2. I answer, Prophetesies of that nature have a twofold fulfilling. 1. In a first-fruits, so it was then, and since in its measure in the Churches. 2. Fully, in the full accomplishment of them, and then it shall have its latitude and extent. Again. 2. When its said, This is that spoken of by such a Prophet, its not always meant, this is the full accomplishment

of that, or the thing primely pointed at there, but this is of the nature of that, as in Matth. 2.17. The weeping of the *Bethlemitish* mothers for their children kill'd by *Herod*, was as that spoken of by *Jeremy*, Chap. 31. There was then such a weeping as was there spoken of. But yet to any Reader its evident, that the Prophet *Jeremy* aimed not primely at that, but at the carrying away of the *Ephramites* descended of *Joseph*, and so of *Rachel*. Thence that promise in the next *verse*, They shall come again from the land of the Enemy. So that in *Acts* 2. was a pouring out of the Spirit to abase the flesh, and a giving them to Prophesie, as was spoken of in *Joel*, though *Joels* eye pierced further then that very pouring it out upon those persons in that manner, and those present insuing effects. “*That All the Nations shall be believers, I grant, and then “the whole world, ye all that believe shall have little difference, and so “much those places, and that of Isai. 2.2. will hold forth.* But that the *whole world*, now or in *Johns* time, were so, or that the words *whole world* distinguished from believers, who have Christ a propitiation, signifies onely believers: I deny the former, as evidently false, and the latter as a groundless conceit.

3. He reasons thus. “*The words whole world signifies sometimes “the worsor part of the world, and why may it not then the better?* To which I answer, that the word world hath reason when distinguished from men called out of the world, and opposed to them, to signifie the worsor part, because distinguished from the better. But why when distinguished from the better, it should signifie the better, I know none. I ask him why in that case it must not signifie the worse too. Now here its manifestly extended beyond the better part, Us that have an Advocate, and not for us onely, but for the whole world. If he could finde me any place where its distinguished from a bad party, as bad as any can be, there we might allow it happily so to signifie rather then here. After these considerations (and from them) he mentions some small reasons which are all spoken to in what is said already, except the first, viz. “*That he speaks not of “Impetration, but of Application, but none ever said that the Appli- “cation of the death of Christ is universal.* To which I answer, That what ever it speaks of, its Vniversal; we must not square the Scripture to our speakings, but our speakings to the Scriptures. 2. Its not spoken here of the application of Christs Death by Faith, but of what Christs death doth with God for All

men, or rather what Christ is with God for them, by vertue of it, not what Christ doth in men, nor the fruits that follow upon this Propitiation believed in by men, as *Rom.* 3.25. doth. This Scripture, *1 Joh.* 2.2. tells us what Christ is with God for All the world, that in *Rom.* 3.25. tells us how God propounds him to men in the Gospel, and what he is to become to them by Faith, and what benefit they shall receive. There is the mercy Seat, here the atoning Sacrifice, as here considered he keeps off many a blow from All, as there propounded and received by Faith he brings to us remission of all, &c. His other Reasons and Reasonings being fore-spoken to, I pass.

He is out again about *2 Cor.* 5.19. when he tells us, “*That the world that God was reconciling* (ver. 19.) *was the Us that he reconciled and put the word of Reconciliation into the hearts of* (ver. 18.) [that is indeed the Apostles and Preachers of the Gospel onely] which is so evidently false, that it needs no other answer then the noting of it. For why doth the Apostle exhort others still to be reconciled, and stile themselves the Ambassadors of God for that, if the World that God was Reconciling was only the Ambassadors of Reconciliation? His confounding [*hath reconciled us by Christ*] and [*was reconciling the World in Christ*] deserves not looking on, the rest we have spoken to. Onely where he saith, “*That* [God “*was in Christ reconciling*] *holdeth out an actual work of Reconciliation, and must be either Conditional or Absolute.* I answer, What God hath done already is absolute, but the Reconciliation to be accomplished on mens part, and in men, is conditional, and the actual reconciling on Gods part, and tendring the accomplishment of it in men on condition, are competible enough, as Gods actual leading *Israel* towards *Canaan*, and the tendring to bring them into *Canaan* conditionally to many individuals were. But then he asks, “*What is that condition?* I answer, That they listen to, and cordially receive the grace of God. But then he says, “*The words must signifie either that God was reconciling a believing world, or an unbelieving world.* I answer, Neither, properly, for the world could be looked upon as neither (if he mean of believing in, or unbelief of Christ) as God was laying its sins on Christ, and punishing him for it, and preparing means to reveal his goodness to them; for till there be an object of Faith, virtually, or actually fitted for our faith to lean on, and till that be discovered, the world is not chargeable with unbelief in it,
nor

nor can believe on it. It was a *world* at enmity with God, and not believing (yea without any known ground of believing) in him, till the revelation of Gods goodness to them come unto them. His *Dilemma* was answered long before.

“*He affirms, that all that God was in Christ reconciling, shall be reconciled*; but I desire his proof for it, for the Apostle intimates that some might possibly receive that grace in vain, and so not be reconciled. Whereas in answer to *T. More*. “*He asks if all the Elect are not men*. I answer, that that was not questioned, but whether the Apostle saying, that he perswaded men, meant that he perswaded the Elect only, or others? Whereas *T. More* saith, That 2 *Cor.* 5.18. saith, that some of those men were reconciled to God for whom Christ died. “*Mr. Owen saith its most false*. But sure he knows not what he says, if he say that 2 *Cor.* 5.18. says, That all that Christ died for were reconciled, or that the Apostle in that verse speaks not but of some, namely, themselves that were employed to preach to others, as also if he affirm that all them that the Apostle perswaded, were in their first perswading reconciled.

He tells us *Joh.* 1.9. may be read thus, “*The true light is that that coming into the world inlightneth every man*. But thats not much material, for it must needs come before it inlighten. The matter is, that it inlightens every man. Now to say that this is every man that is inlightned, a *Mr. Owen* saith, is to leave the matter spoken of wholly uncertain, for that may be All, or None, or the Most, or the Fewest. Upon this his note he might have put that observation, [viz. “*That some corrupt the Scriptures*] better then where he put it. What follows in that Chapter in its substance all answered already. Onely I must note, that he abuses *Luk* 2.34. Telling us that it says, *Christ was set for the fall of many*; stopping too soon, and leaving out a main word of the Text, for its thus, *For the fall and rising again of many*. And yet a Decree to condemn some for not listening to, and believing in Christ sent for them to be their Saviour, may well stand with (yea necessarily presupposeth) a Decree to send Christ to be their Saviour first, or as looked upon in a condition preceding that their not believing on him, but rejecting him. And so we have scaled the walls of his Defence against that part of our first *Argument*.

 CHAP. III.

*An Answer to his fourth Chapter, about the words All, and Every,
used
in divers Scriptures that speak of this business.*

HE next sets himself to oppose our perswasion or faith, as it leans upon those Scriptures that expresly say, *He dyed for All*. And that he needs to do, or else he should acknowledg himself to be exceedingly blame-worthy; for that in express tearms point blank, contradictory to the express tearms of the Apostles, he hath very frequently in this Treatise, denyed him to have dyed for All. If he will make his saying to be Gospel, he must pull down the sayings of the Apostle, and the Gospel he preached, and make that no Gospel, and those expressions to be dangerous and erroneous; which because he durst not do, in direct opposition to him (as he is bold to do against us) therefore he indeavors subtlly to undermine the Apostles expressions; telling us, That “*no strength of Argument can be taken from the words themselves, that so generally express the matter, because the word All is often taken for fewer then every man in the World*. Now that the word All is sometimes so taken, I grant, that is, in places where reference is had in it to particular Nations, Countries, Families, societies, &c. in which the foregoing passages manifest, that the writer speaks not of all the world, or of men indefinitely, as also in certain Historical narrations of mens sayings, & many times when the things spoken of, are the actions, counsels & passages of men; In which places yet it signifies, the Generality or Universality of men in those places, parts, societies, &c. or so far as the actions, speeches, and carriages of men may reach. Of this nature are, *All shall know that ye are my Disciples. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. Ye are our Epistle, read and known of all men*. All took John to be a Prophet, *All Judea went out to John to be Baptized, &c*. But that ever the Scripture speaking of God and his actions, thoughts, will, knowledg toward men, uses the expression All men (without some particular reference to some particular place, Country, or Kingdom only spoken of or to) and therein means fewer then all Generally or Universally, much less that he thereby signifies the Elect or Believers, or the like, I do deny, till I can see something brought to convince me otherwise, especially in Doctrinal

and fundamental truths; such as the Creation, Redemption, Resurrection, and Judgment are. And I conceive in such cases, its not ground sufficient to straighten and limit our faith about a truth so expressed; (no other Scripture denying it of any, or restraining it only to some) that these general expressions in places not Dogmatical, or not speaking of the actions, thoughts, &c. of God toward men, but of mens sayings, actions, &c. (whose abilities are of lesser circumference) signify less then All Universally. I think by Mr. Owens Rules, the Apostle to the *Hebrews* argued very fallaciously, when from the word *All*, (the very word excepted against) he thus argues, *Heb. 2.8. Thou hast put all things under his feet. In that he put all things under him, he left nothing not put under him.* To this Mr. Owen might as well except, and say, That follows not; for the word *All things*, doth not signify Universally and collectively, but only some things of all sorts, and sometimes only the elect and believers. Now if the Apostle so reason in that Doctrinal expression, in things attributed to God as the Agent, I would fain see some reason why also we may not infer from this, *He gave himself a ransom for all men, Ergo, He left out no man from his ransom-giving.* If he answer, we do not see all men ransomed, we might reply in the Apostles words, neither do we yet see all things put under him. Our sight or not seeing of things, is no sufficient ground of denying credit to Gods sayings. But I pass on to view Mr. Owen in what “follows, in which first, *He falls upon the consideration of 1 Tim. 2. “4. God wills all men to be saved; in which he considers, 1. What is “that will of God there spoken of. 2. Who are the All of whom the A- “postle is there treating. To the first he says, The will of God is taken “either for the will of God intending, or will commanding and appro- “ving, and wishes us to take our option of what we will understand it.* To that I answer, That of his will intending to effect their salvation, I do not understand it (if by saving we mean in eternal life, otherwise I may) the form of speech is passive; not, God will save all men, or God purposes and determines to save all men: but God wills all men to be saved. Nor is it, God will bring all men to the knowledge of the truth, but God wills that (or would have) all men come to the knowledge of the Truth, and in such like speeches the word signifies, its desirable, or approved of God, that all men be saved, &c. He hath provided a *medium* by which they might, and he desires that they would be saved, &c. as in *Psa. 81. Oh that my*

people had he arkened! &c. Isa. 48.17. Oh that thou hadst hearkened to my Commandments! and Luke 19.41. Oh that thou hadst known, at least in this thy day, &c. and 2 Pet. 3.9. Not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to Repentance, according to that Ezek. 34.11. As I live, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that he should turn and live. And so the word {θέλω} is often used, as Mark 12.38. {θελόντων ἐν σολαῖς περιπατεῖν}, the Pharisees desired, or liked to walk in long Robes. So Mark 14.36. {οὐ τί ὁ θέλω} not what I will, that is, like or desire: so Cor. 7.7. {θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς ἐμαυτον}, I desire that all men were as I am, that is, that they had such power over their wills and affections as I have, that they could abstain from marrying, or marry as they see cause or ground, as I can. So we take it here to signify *voluntatem beneplaciti*, Its good in his sight that All be saved. And thence he commands All every where to repent, and to look to him and be saved. Now to this he replies, that then this All, can be no more then “to whom he granteth the means of grace, which are indeed a great many but not the hundreth part of the posterity of Adam. But here,

1. I deny his inference. *He approves the salvation of Infants, that have not those means of grace he speaks of.* 2. We say, that those that have the most full means of grace, are others then Mr. Owen bounds it up to, so that yet his exposition is untrue. 3. We say with the Apostle, that God created all Nations, that is, Adam and all his posterity, to seek after him, and wills them to feel after him, from any one of whom he is not far off; yea, he hath granted the knowledg of truth, (Rom. 1.18.) as the words are here, {εἰς} {ἐπίκνωσιν ἀληθείας}) to all the Heathen, debarring none of them from it, but would have them acknowledg what they see, and not smother as they do. Yea, he hath sent out his Gospel to them all, willing them all to come to that, though many have rejected it, and hinder one another from coming to it. [159] Now whereas he says, *That “stream of light which the Gentiles have about God, cannot save them;* So I say of the Scriptures too of themselves: but he from whom that light comes, and to whom it leads, is able to save them, and the Gospel is his power to salvation to them that believe it: and he would have all look to him and grope after him, by what they have, and let him alone with what follows: And though Mr. Owen tells us, “that it will not follow from thence, that Christ dyed for All; yet I conceive

[159] Mark 16.15.
Col. 1.23.

conceive it doth; God never commanding any to look to him and be saved, or never approving any mans saving, (so far as I can find) but in, and by the vertue of a Mediators Death, it being point-blank contrary to the rule of his justice, to save a condemned man upon whom he hath pronounced Death, without satisfaction by Christ. But because we have a firmer bottom for that, even that that follows *ver. 6.* I shall here wave it.

Having left us to our option, he gives us his own opinion, *viz.* “*That it seems to him exceeding clear, that his efficacious will is here intended, viz. the will of his purpose, and that its here affirmed that he will “save All, which is evidently false, for the words are not {ὅς πάντας} {ἀνθρώπους θέλει σῶζειν}, who will save all men. I would wish Mr. Owen who is so lavish in his expressions against others pretended sorry and irrational dealing (as he shews himself to be cha. 6.) would put on his Spectacles, and minde well what he affirms as truth when he writes again, for as he falsifies the affirmation, so he indeavors to confirm his conception by a sorry argument, viz. “That the purpose of God “should be the bottom of our prayers, which contradicts his former previous consideration, cap. 1. where he asserts that between Gods purpose and our duty there is no connexion: And against the practice of the Saints, as of Jeremy, who prayed for a people that God determied to destroy, and give over to their enemies. And contrary to our Saviour, who prayed the Cup might pass from him, though he submitted himself to his Fathers Will. Its enough that we do what God bids us, and what he tells us its acceptable to him though we know not his purposes. If he approve all mens being saved, and coming to the knowledg of Truth, thats ground enough for our so desiring too, and furthering it what we can. So Pauls desire and prayer for Israel, were, that they might be saved, even them whom he generally says of, that they were blinded, Rom. 10.1, 2. and 11.5, 6. His Premises being so faulty, his Conclusion must needs be untrue, viz. “That all men then must be saved, if by all men be “meant every man in the world. To the consideration of which words he nextly proceedeth.*

“2. *By All men (he says) the Apostle intends all sorts of men indefinitely living under the Gospel, or under the enlarged dispensation of “the means of grace. That this is in it no man (I think) will deny, but that this is all the truth of it, I expect he should confirm; but in coming over it again he says, “That by all men is meant, only of all sorts*

sorts of men, that is, but some of all sorts; Which is larger then the former expression in this, that, before he confined it to men living under the Gospel, now to all sorts indefinitely; for indeed there is a sort of men, that through their own former wickedness, or others slothfulness, have not the Gospel now preached to them as we have, as the *Indians*, &c. which here he may seem to include too; and then this latter expression contradicts the former; but scanter in this, that he said before, all sorts of men, which might reach to all of all sorts. Now its but of all sorts, that is, but some of all; which he endeavors thus to confirm.

1. “*That the word All most usually signifies in Scripture many of all sorts, and therefore it must do so here too.* To this I answer.

1. That his Proposition is false, Where it signifies many of all sorts onely in Scripture once, it signifies all of all sorts of those things whereabout the word is used twenty times. And this I will undertake to make good against him.

2. In those very places he propounds to shew, that it so signifies, he doth but *Petere principium*. ★ We have spoken to them before

★ Viz. About Christs curing all diseases, and the Pharisees titthing all herbs.

3. I say, That when it speaks of the actions of God towards men, or of his purposes, thoughts, knowledg, or the like, it very seldom, if ever, signifies in any other place (but many of all sorts) but all generally or universally, if the speech be not bound up to some particular Place or Countrey. Besides,

4. Did it so elsewhere, it would not follow It must do so here too. “Whereas he says, “*There is nothing to impel another signification thats larger.* I answer, yes, This, that its laid down as a ground of praying for all men. Now we are not to limit our prayers to some of all sorts, for then we should be ready to say, though we refuse to pray for such and such as we have not seen sin to death, yet we have done our duty. Yea, though we pray but for them all that seem to be of our minde of all sorts, for then we might say we have prayed for some of all sorts, & thats all thats required: however, in praying for the Church only, we might say, we have prayed for many of all sorts, and so that we have done what is required (there being as we think some of all sorts of the Church) and so we should elude the Apostles exhortation by our own Tradition, as the *Jewish* Elders used to do with Gods Commandements: the Apostle speaking here of all men, as a distinct party from (yea all the residue above and beyond) the Church of God, who are to pray for them. And that his former

former gloss is untrue also, of all sorts of men living under the enlarged dispensation of grace is here evident, for we are not onely to pray for all those that live under the Gospel, but for all not under it also, that it might be extended to them; seeing he would have all men imbrace that, and be saved by him. But by Mr. *Owens* Exposition we need not pray for enlarging the Gospel to those *Indians*, or any further then it is, but onely pray for such as have it preached unto them, and not for all of them neither, but for some of them, which when its left to our judgments and wills to regulate us in, the Apostles precept will scarce amount to this, Pray for whom ye list, or will.

2. He says Paul leads us plainly to this Interpretation, for having "*wished us to pray for all men, he expresly intimates, that by all men, he understands men of all sorts, ranks, conditions, &c.*" To this I say, That his intimating that we should pray for all sorts and ranks, doth not prove that he limits it to but some of all sorts and ranks, which is the thing to be proved. Nay, The words of the Apostle confutes such a limitation rather, for he says not, for some Kings, some people, &c. but for Kings indefinitely, and all in Authority universally: so that he mentioning but one sort of men, as especially to be prayed for amongst all men (because they are such as all the rest are chiefly concerned in) and bidding us pray for all them, that is, all in Authority, and place of Government, he rather shews us by that instance of all of one sort, what he would have us do in all the rest, then any way teaches us to limit it but to some of all. For that those words contain a formal distribution of All into many sorts, I deny. But onely there he particularizeth one sort, in praying for whom, all the rest under them are in a manner included, so that his paralleling it with *Jer. 29.31.* where after the people are mentioned, Kings, Queens, Eunuches, Princes, Carpenters, Smiths, is both vain and impertinent. For besides that there is no such distribution here, except he include Carpenters and Smiths, under that phrase, *All in Authority*, it would not (did he) serve his purpose, it not proving a limitation of the former General to but some of all sorts; As if *Jeremy* had said, Some of the Kings and Queens and Princes onely were carried away.

3. He says "*We are to pray for all whom God would have to be saved, But we ought not to pray for all and every one, knowing that some are Reprobates, and sin to death, concerning whom we have an express Caution not to pray for them.*" To this I answer, First, That

the words are not, Pray for All that God would have saved, but absolutely, Pray for All—for God would have all saved, &c. Secondly, We are to pray for all, or any whosoever by this Precept; only the other tells us how long, till we see they have sinned to death. That doth but exclude a certain condition or sin of some, not exclude their persons in all conditions. Nor are we to judge any Reprobates by an eternal purpose, and so exclude them. God nowhere calls any so, but such as have actually rejected (and are given over of) him. As he doth good, and affords patience and mercy till then to lead them to repentance, [161] so, till then we are not to reject them. Thirdly, Nor are the words, Thou shalt not pray for him, but There is a sin to death; I say not, that thou shouldst pray for, or concerning it.

[161] 1 Joh. 5.
16.

[162] Isai. 49.
4, 5.

4. He says, “*All shall be saved whom God will have to be saved, for who hath resisted his will?*” Answer, That all shall be saved that God would have to be saved, I deny, For God would have all men saved, [162] but all men shall not be saved. He would often have gathered *Jerusalem* (for that often plainly refers to his coming in his Prophets by his Spirit, and in his many great works done for them, for often he came not in the flesh to them) and yet they were not gathered. He hath pleasure or will (as the word {כפצתי} signifies) that men should rather turn and live, then sin on and die, but all of whom that is spoken do not so, &c. His confirmation is no divine testimony, but he onely strikes in with the Caviller, *Rom. 9*. For thats not *Pauls* affirmation or Doctrine, That none resists the Will of God; but its the voice of fleshly Reason cavilling against sound Doctrine. Thou wilt say to me, why doth he yet complain, for who hath resisted his Will? Therefore it may suffice to answer, as the Apostle doth, Nay but, O man, who art thou that answerest against God? that art bold to contradict Gods Word with thy reason? Who art thou? thou canst not see wood for trees, as we use to say, thou art in thy reason resisting him, and yet thou saiest Who hath done it? Many a man rejects and resists the Counsel of God to his own hurt. The Kings and Rulers that take counsel against Christ, resist Gods Will or Counsel, they stand up against it, *Psal. 2.1, 2*. Its true, they overthrow it not, but they miss of the good it would have brought unto them had they submitted to it. They may *Stare contra consilium Dei*, they cannot *evertere consilium Dei*. Had the Apostle said, He will save all men, Mr. *Owens* reason had been weighty, but as it is said, it is not. Many
a man

a man doth not what God would have him, nor attains what God sets before him, See *Psal.* 81.11, 14, 15. *Isai.* 48.17, 18. *Luke* 13. 41, 42.

5. He says, “*God would have no more to be saved then to come to the knowledge of the truth, for these two things are conjoyned in the Text.* But 1. If Mr. Owen means of coming to it by outward hearing, we deny it, He would have Infants saved too, that he wills not to listen to the truth. 2. If otherwise, we deny his *Minor*, *That God would have not All in all Ages come to the knowledge of the truth.* His confirmations of it are not concludent, *viz.* *Psal.* 149.19, 20. He shewed his Word to Jacob, *his Statutes and his Judgments unto Israel, he dealt not so with any Nation, &c.* That says not, he would not have all in those ages come to know the truth. If his not dealing so with them, as with *Jacob*, argue it, then he would not have *Job* and his friends, or any of other Nations come to know it, for he dealt not so with any of them as with *Israel*. Though he revealed his Statutes and Judgments in that manner and measure to the *Jews* onely as to no Nation else, yet he would have had the Nations about them at the hearing of his name by them have come to them for it. And besides, the Apostle saith not, and come to know his Statutes and Judgments, but to know Truth. And truth they had, ask the same Apostle else. He tells us so in *Rom.* 1.11. *They imprisoned the Truth in unrighteousness.* Sure they had it then, though they had it not so much, nor were so dealt with as *Israel* was. And he would not have had them imprison it in unrighteousness, and bound it by their understandings and exaltations of their own reasons as they did, but retain and acknowledge it, and submit to glorifie God in it and be thankful. So might they have had the truth come more in upon them, and revealed much more unto them. Nor matters it that God suffered them to walk in their own wayes, and winked at those times of ignorance, *Acts* 14.15. and 17.30. for that shews but his patience, partly in not consuming them for their follies, and partly his Justice in giving them over to their own delusions: but not that they had not truth, or that he would not have had them own and acknowledg it, and seek after him in it; nay, both those places intimate the contrary. The first saith, he left not himself without witness, in that he did them good, &c. The other, that even some of their own Poets had, and held forth such glimpses of truth, as had they minded and submitted to them, they would not have worshipped Idols and Images of their

own framing, but groped after him that made themselves. Nor doth the hiding of his mystery from former Ages confirm it (*Col.* 1.26.) for that was the uniting of *Jews* and *Gentiles* in such glorious privileges in Christ, which is the mystery there spoken of, which was hidden too from the *Jews*, Yea, from the *Apostles* too in former Ages; and yet they had Truth, though not all Truth. *Matth.* 11.25, 26. was before spoken to. But 3. Besides all this, we may say, that he speaks not here of the Ages past, nor in the time past. Its not {ἐθέλεσε} or {ἤθελε}, he in times past would, nor is it, he will bring all to know the truth, But now for the present, he wills all to come to know it. Over and above what they had formerly, God now sends his Gospel unto all Nations, and would have them come to know it, embrace it, and propagate, and preserve it to all their individuals and posterities. This he would have them do, and this is approveable before him, and acceptable to him, and so God wills all to be saved. He would have had them acknowledge Truth in times past, but now he would have them much more come to it, and acknowledge it, it being more fully opened. So that our Assertion and Exposition will bear up it self against his Arguments. We may use the *Apostles All men* without limiting or restraining it, (which is all I desire) and defend our selves against the loud clamor of Error, and Heresie, which the spirit of Error fastens upon us by those that have exalted their reason above the Scripture, and carry themselves as Masters to it, not scholars of the Spirit of God in it: not onely the words themselves but the scope of the place too will bear us out, but it will not them that limit it to the Believers, and to the Elect, for (beside that they never are called all men) we finde both precept and practice for praying for such men as are not so, but prove reprobate; and we finde God by his Spirit contesting with many to seek him, and to look after, and receive the knowledg of the Truth, and be saved by him, which yet for rejecting those his wrastlings, have been rejected, as is plain to any that minde, *Psal.* 81.9, 10, 11, 14. *Prov.* 1.22, 23, 24. *Matth.* 23.37. *Luke* 19.41. &c. “Now for “these All that the Apostle says, God would have to be saved, and come “to the knowledg of the truth, Mr. Owen confesses the 6. verse proves, “that Christ gave himself a ransom; that All being of the same extent “with this in verse 4. Therefore he said not right, when he denied that the Scripture saith, he gave himself a ransom for All men; that in ver. 4. being expresly All men. And also his Conclusion here is wrong,

wrong, *viz.* That Christ died, and gave himself onely for his Elect, and such as shall be eternally saved, for thats the sum of his Conclusion. His Argument from the word *Ransom*, and so the commutation he speaks of is answered before in *lib. 3. cap. 5.* Mr. *Rutherfords* reasons being the same in substance with what we have had before in Mr. *Owen*, I shall not insert any thing of them here, nor give them any other answer, then what I have given in Mr. *Owen* to him.

2. The next place that he endeavors to bear off the force of, is *2 Pet. 3.9.* *God is patient to us, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to Repentance.* “*To avoid the light of which, he “corrupts the Text by adding to the words, but detracting from the “sense; he will have it read, that he is patient toward us, not willing “that any of us should perish, but all of us should come to Repentance.* By such liberty he might answer any Argument, For he doth like the *Papists*, when we tell them of being justified by Faith, and not by Works, they can answer with this addition, the Works of the Law; we are not justified by them, but by other works we are. Besides, who are that Us none of which he would have perish, and all of whom he would have come to Repentance? He says, “*Those “that had pertook of the precious promises, chap. 1.4. whom he calls Brethren, chap. 3.1.* (and that he might be sure to make the text speak what he would have it, he runs back as far as *Math. 24.*) *the Elect*, intimating, that they include some part of the world uncalled. But besides that, he no where proves that, and that its very far fetcht to find the substantive of this word [*ἡμῶς*] there, can that be any reason of his patience? Could any of them perish, should Christ come the sooner, who can in no wise be deceived or drawn away by perverse Doctrines from Christ? Or are those that have received the precious promises of eternal salvation, and Brethren to the Apostles, in danger to perish, if Christ should come sooner, who are ready to think long for his coming for their deliverance? Or are they yet short of Repentance? *Apaga has nugas.* The plain sense is, That God is patient in behalf of us that believe, and doth not speedily execute Judgment for us, (as the like phrase also signifies in *Luke 18.7, 8.*) though he be much provoked to come and plead our cause, and destroy ungodly men; yet he forbears, not willing any should perish, not being hasty to destroy any, as one that would have them perish, or as one that delighteth in their destruction; but

affording all men in general space for repentance of their follies, and evils, desires and approves of it, that they repent, his goodness and forbearance leading to that, even such as abuse it, and treasure up wrath against themselves by it, as is affirmed of *Jezabel*, *Rev.* 2.21. and others, *Rom.* 2.4, 5. Now, as we desire not to stretch the latter clause to every individual, (as to Infants while not capable of it) so neither can it be limited to the Elect only: he willing others also (as that fore-quoted Scripture proves) to come to Repentance; but to the generality of men we do extend it. That God hated any from eternity, he hath often said, but never yet proved it, nor hath he shewed, that God denies repentance to any, before they put away obstinately what would lead them to it. He that gives that which leads to Repentance, cannot be said to deny it to them to whom he gives that, while that is giving to them: as he that gives a plaister that will heal, if men according to the power they have would apply it, cannot be said to deny healing, though some refusing to apply the plaister are never healed.

3. The next place sought to be eluded is, *Heb.* 2.9. *That by the grace of God he might tast Death {ὅτι ἐρ πάντος} for every man.* Where first he “tells us, all acknowledg that {ὅτι ἐρ πάντος} is put for {ὅτι ἐρ πάντων}, *Every one, is put for All, by an Enallage of number.* Which as he but begs, so see I no ground for granting him. Its as proper a speech to say, {ὅτι ἐρ πάντος}, as {ὅτι ἐρ πάντων}, if not a tittle of the Law shall pass away till all be fulfilled, then why should we causlesly let such a change be made of whole words of the Gospel, seeing the Gospel is more permanent? But then again he tells us, “*That this expression of Every man, is commonly used in Scripture to signify men under some restriction.* That its so used in speeches about mens actions, thoughts, knowledg, &c. and in places where the foregoing speeches to which it hath reference, are evidently bounded up to particular Nations, Countries, Parties, I grant; it then signifying but any one without restriction, that come within the reach or opportunity of such men, to act such things towards, as are in those speeches spoken of, or that appertain to those places or parties, as in that of *Col.* 1.28. but that in speeches, in which its coupled with God or Christ, as Mediator, acting, willing, purposing, or knowing, it signifies but some of those that it refers to, I deny, cheifly in matters of fundamental concernment, as the death of Christ for men is. That that he produces from *1 Cor.* 12.7. might seem to evert the truth of this,

this, *The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man.* But to that I answer,

1. That there is not the same word, its not {πάντι}, but {ἐκάστω}, which is a Distributive alwaies of some Totum before mentioned; which there is {περὶ πνευματικῶν}, about spiritual men, the members of Christ, to every one of them, (not {ἀνθρώπων}) is the Spirit given; and the like is that {ὅλον} in 1 Cor. 4, 5. Then shall every one (that is, of the Stewards or Embassadors of Christ) have praise of God, in which I conceive, is also a *Synecdoche Speciei pro genere*, praise for judgment or doom. But that it fignifies *All, and Every one here*, Mr. Owen will not allow for these Reasons. 1. “*Because to tast Death, is to drink up the cup due to sinners; Which is as good a note as Mr. Garners, that to tast, is to put a tast and rellish into it. “That to tast signifies, so to drink up a thing, that no one drop remains for any to drink after one,* (as Mr. Owen saith) is an exposition of the word Tast, contrary to its usual signification; for men are said to tast when they do but sip or make tryal, or the sweetness or bitterness, &c. of a thing; not when they eat or drink it all up. Sure when Jonathan tasted a little honey, the meaning is not, that he eat all up that he found, 1 Sam. 14.43. or when some are said to tast the good word of God, and powers of the world to come; the meaning is not, that they had got all the knowledg that was to be had of them, and left none for others. Surely Mr. Owen thinks not that the righteous tast of any afflictions or drop of anger, and therefore this of Christs death need not be propounded to them by way of consolation, to let them know that he experimented what they suffer, and knows how to succour them, for they need no succour that grapple with no death. But grant that he tasted and swallowed up into victory too that death which was common to all in Adam, and thence will raise all out of it, by the vertue of his Death and Resurrection. Will it thence follow there may no second Death befall any ★ for despising and despiting him, living still to themselves, and not to him? or that whoever perish in a second death, Christ never tasted the first for them, even that displeasure which would have for ever taken away all dispensations of favor and goodness to them? But 2. He tells us, “*He sees an evident appearing cause why he should use that phrase, and call them for whom Christ died All, viz. because he writ to the Hebrews, who were deeply tainted with an erroneous opinion, that the benefits purchased by the Messiah were proper*

★ *De secundâ morte ita, Ambr. in Comm. in Rom. 5. 14.*

Est & alia mors quæ secunda dicitur, quam non Adæ peccato patimur, sed ejus occasione propriis peccatis acquiritur.

to

to them of that Nation, excluding all others. Not to question here, whether they had any such conception (which we have spoken to in *chap. 1.*) but supposing it to have been so, yet how doth this expression any way help them? The Apostle should rather have been the more wary of writing but the Truth to them, and telling them that is was for every one that believes, for that might have bin better born, then for every one, as if he extended to one and other, believer and unbeliever. If that had been an error, he would not have made way for it, to put the *Jews* out of one error into another that might rather more stumble them then the other, it being an expression of large extent. Sure if in any place, this might have been limited to the Elect and believers, it ought to have been to those that were ready to stumble that but they should share with them.

“3. He tels us, *There is a description of those for whom Christ died, “in the Chapter, which will not suit to All, viz. many sons to be brought “to glory, the sanctified ones his brethren, the children that God gave “him, those that are delivered from bondage of death, &c.* That Christ died for them, and had in his eye such ends in his dying for them, as are spoken of with reference to them, is true. But that he died for them onely, or that those after-clauses are a full description of that *All*, or every one that he died for, I deny. 1. Because its suits not with the phrase here [*every one, or All*] by his own confession. Sure that can be no description of the persons contained in the word *All*, that will not suit with the expression it describes, or that will not suit to *All*. 2. Its against those other places we have spoken to. 3. Its an uncouth exposition, making the word {πάντος}, which is an Adjective, and so cannot have a full signification in it self without another word, as its Substantive, to stand alone without a just signification, till another verse (between which and it is a full period) come to make up its sense, and then that that is supplied for its Substantive is of a different number, and hath another Adjective of number joyned with it. A thing unusual, and scarce to be parallel’d in any other place. And here I might take up Mr. *Owens* own words, in *lib. 2. cap. 4.* Such is the powerful force and evidence of the Scripture-expressions of this truth, [164] that it scatters all its opposers, and makes them fly to several hiding corners, as Mr. *Garner*, upon this is forced to make the word {γεύσεται} a Verb transitive, and to signifie to put a tast into death, leaving the word {πάντος} as it was. Mr. *How*, (with as silly an evasion, as his throwing by the Proposition which he should

[164] Mr. *Hows*
Answer to
the *Uni-*
versalist,
cap. 1.

should have opposed *in terminis*, and not as he did, thrust another into its room, and bend his Arguments against that: as if I defending That Faith alone without Works justifies, a Papist should come and tell me I mistake the question, I should say thus, Faith which is alone without Workes justifies, and so spend his Arguments to prove that false) he I say will have it read, Hee tasted whole Death, or every Death, and not to expresse for whom at all: though to make way for that conceit he breaks downe all Grammer rule and example, making {γεύσεται}, a Verbe of sense, to governe a Genitive case with the Proposition {ὅπῃ} without giving any one example for such a thing. And now *M. Owen* (as also *M. Stalham*) as fondly will make it stand alone without a Substantive, till the other Verses afford it two or three; whereas indeed its substantive was intimated before (as its ever in other places understood to be man, when its put alone without another to declare its meaning) *Lord what is man* (sayes he) *that thou art mindfull of him! or the son of man that thou shouldst visit him! thou madest him a little lower then the Angels* (which was true of him in *Adam* and in *Christ* both) *thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, thou hast set him over the workes of thine hands* (which is true too of man in *Adam* and in *Christ*) but we see not All things yet put under him, (that is, under man, spoken of before with reference to a second subjecting them in the world to come) but we see *Jesus* (made lower then the Angels, that he might tast Death by the grace of God for every one) for or by the suffering of Death crowned with glory and honor. We see him who for that end that he might suffer Death for all, or for every one of the rest of men (of whom he had been speaking) by Death attained to this, to have glory and honor, though not as yet to have all things put under him. The one part of that prophecy is fulfilled though the other be not. The next verse of bringing many sons to glory, is not spoken of, as of his work, but as Gods. He made Christ perfect through sufferings, that he should be their cheif Leader or Captaine in the way to Salvation, in which he speaks of Christ under another Notion then in this Verse. For there are two considerations here of the Death and sufferings of Christ: one as he is the propitiation and gave himselfe a ransome suffering in stead of Sinners, and thats in the 9. verse, for every man. 2. As having the promise of a seed, or as God having a purpose to make some sons in him by Faith, to which he must first be viewed as a propitiation for man, that he might

be an Object of their Faith, and a *medium* of their sonship) he was to be their patterne and Leader, their Captaine and Example in the way, to whom he would conforme them, and whom they might have as an example for direction and incouragement in their believing, and this end of his sufferings respecteth onely those that being brought in to believe on him, should need his example to encourage and guide them in such trials and sufferings, especially for God, as thereby they are exposed to. So he speaks of his dying and sufferings, *ver.* 10.14.18. *Chap.* 4.17, 18. *1 Pet.* 2.21. *Christ suffered for you, leaving you an example that ye should follow his steps.* So also *Heb.* 12.2, 3, 4. Now *M. Owen* confounds these two together into one, and makes his sufferings as a Captaine and Leader in the way to life, to be but of equall latitude with his suffering by way of propitiation: And so he would cut off all propitiation from the old Fathers and Believers, who had him not as their example to look at in their sufferings: and 2. from all Infants that cannot have him as their example to walke by, and 3. from all, till believes and in the way of Salvation, for neither of conversion or any such thing as is of that nature was he an example, he never being out of Gods way. And this indeed is the very issue of that argument against the latitude of that Scripture, in its signification according to its expression.

4. Another Scripture that he seeks to elude, is *2 Cor.* 5.14 15. where rendring a reason of his earnestness in perswading men, one and other, because of the terror of the Lord in the day of Judgement to which they must all come; he tels them The love of Christ constrained them so to doe, upon this ground *that Christ dyed for All*; for from that he was led to infer these two principles. 1. That then All dyed or were dead: all were dead in point of Sentence is proved in this, *that Christ dyed for All*; which he would not surely, if any of them had not been so dead: or thus, in that one dyed for all, then all dyed (in him) in his dying, it was as if all had dyed for themselves, and so there is mercy for them, a way to life opened in and by Christ, and so ground of Preaching to them, exhorting and perswading any or every one of them (as *Colos.* 1.28.) *to repent, be reconciled to God, seek his face &c.* as one that was not far from them, but to be found of them. 2. That he having done that, he would have them live to him in the life he gives them; otherwise (as in *ver.* 10, 11.) it would be terrible with them at the day of Judgement, when he cals them to an account, how they have spent their lives that they had by him.

“Against

“Against this, he denies that all are bound to live to Christ, but only “they to whom he is revealed, nay indeed, only they that live by him, “and have Spirituall life in and with him. I am glad when error speaks out so farre that men may discern it; for by this the false Teachers are well helped with a plea; they may say they were not obliged to live to him, and therefore ought not to be punished the more for that that they denyed him to be their Lord and to serve him. And so all those in *Math.* 25.41, 42, 43. they may say to him, what had they to doe to live to him in his people, to feed and cloath him? &c. what had they to doe with him? they were not bound to be his servants, and to seek his ends; they never see him &c. but if they had no obligation to live to him (even they that say they never knew or saw him to be lived to and served) how comes he to plead against them, and judge them for it? Where there is no Law, sure there is no transgression, if there was no obligation upon them to live to him, then it was no chargeable fault upon them that they did not so live, but sure all the world shall one day see that they had something of his Law, though they heard not of his Death. But by *M.Ow.* rule they should not be obliged to seek after God, for many of them perhaps riever heard distinctly, that God created them and made all things for them. Its the light and truth that he conveyes to every man that is the rule of their living to him, and according to their failing in that he will condemne them, *Ioh.* 1.9. *Ro.* 1.18. 19. *Rom.* 2.12. *Mat.* 25.31, 35, 36, 41, 42, 43, &c. their being under previous obligations hinders not this according to what knowledg, or means of knowledg they had of him though but as God, for he is that God manifested in flesh that made & governes all things. Whereas he says, the [*All wee*] *v.* 10. *are All believers, especially the Preachers of the Gospell*; thats true, but except he mean they onely, its impertinent. If he meane so, yet (as he cannot prove it so) it followes not were it proved, that the All here that Christ dyed for (which more manifestly is to be referred to the men he perswaded, this being but another reason rendred of that at which his enemies the false Apostles stumbled) means only all believers; nor can it probably be so, that they were the men only in danger of Gods terror, for how then did Christ purchase all good things to them? sure to be out of the danger of that is one good thing also. But to passe that, let us view his after strange Assertion, *viz.* That by All, is meant, only the Elect of God, All believers: which to me is strange, for that there is not any

mention of those words in the Chapter, much less amongst those preceding verses, of which this is rendred as the reason; but let us view his arguments for it, *viz.* 1. “*That here the Resurrection of Christ “is conjoynd with his Death. He died for them and Rose againe; but “for whomsoever Christ riseth, he rose for their justification, Ro. 4. ult. “and they must be justified, But All are not so. Ans. 1. That his Resurrection is conjoynd is true, and so it is intimately in all the other places of 1 Tim. 2.6. Heb. 2, 9. and where ever his Death for us is mentioned, its intimately the Death of him that rose againe; for had he not risen he could not have been a ransome or propitiation; its not said here he rose again for them, but simply, He rose againe; which indeed he must needs be conceived to have done as an Object to be lived to; we cannot live to a dead man. 2 That for whomsoever he riseth, he riseth for their justification, and they must be justified; the places of Rom. 4. ult. & 8.34. say not, they being believers onely that there speak applicatively of themselves. He dyed for our sins, this he did as and while we were ungodly; and he rose againe for our justification, that we believers (as in *ver.* 24. To whom it shall be imputed, we believing in him that raised up *Jesus*, he raised him with this intention that we believers) might be justified. The coupling of two such speeches together do not argue that the objects of the acts mentioned in them are of equall latitude, as in *Cor.* 4. 14. He that raised up the Lord *Jesus*, will also raise us up by *Jesus*, and present us with you. Its not a good Inference, because they two are put together, therefore all that are raised by *Jesus* shall be presented with the believers. And yet 3. If by Justification we mean a right and just giving Sentence of freedom from that Death that was come upon us in *Adam* as the reward of his disobedience, so I grant it in its latitude, according to *Rom.* 5.18. to All men to justification of life, or if it be meant justification in the publick person, as that that is open for all to partake of, upon obedience of Faith, and so for our justification, be onely that we might be justified in his person, and that he being perfected might be fitted to justifie All or any man upon his believing, so I grant it too, and affirme that he is able and fit to justifie All upon their looking by Faith unto him. Otherwise if it signifie, that we undoubtedly might have that justification, and be presented righteous and acceptable before him, then the equall extent of all so justified, and all he dyed for, is denied, and not at all proved from those places as is said before: Justification so*

not

not being an immediate fruit or effect of Christs resurection, but following upon Faith as is plaine, *Rom.* 5.1. *Gal.* 2.16. *Tit.* 3.5, 6. *1 Cor.* 6.11. whence its said *to be by Faith, by the name of the Lord by the Spirit of God &c.* But inasmuch as he could neither be an Object of Faith to any, nor any be discharged from their sins, nor presented righteous in him, had Death swallowed him up, and he never risen, (*2 Cor.* 15.14, 15, 16, 17.) therefore he is said *to rise for our justification*, that he might justify us in believing on him, and so us that beleve on him. That justification in the most speciall sense doth come upon many that Christ dyed for, is granted, and so both meet in many the same persons, and such may say they are the Object of both; but that thence they have equall Objects in point of number, is denied. Those *Israelites* that intred into Canaan, might truly say, the Lord judged *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians* to bring us out of Egypt, and he led us in the wilderness to possesse of *Canaan*; and yet all that came out of *Egypt*, or were led in the wilderness, were not possessed of *Canaan*.

2. “*He says he speaks there of those only, who by virtue of Christs death live to him, are new creatures, to whom the Lord imputeth not their trespasses, who become the righteousness of God in Christ.* How God imputed not to the world their trespasses we have shewed before, for the rest of the expressions they containe a shamefull way of reasoning, Because that was one end of his dying for All that they might live to him, therefore he dyed for no more then them that do live to him and fulfill that his end. By that way of reasoning I will prove that God made not all, because all seek him not, from *Act.* 17. 26, 27. If *Paul* had said, He dyed for all that live no longer to themselves but unto him, it had been to *M. Owens* purpose, but when he sayes no such thing, but He dyed for All, that they that live should live to him, To say that he vouchsafed a mercy to no more then they that fulfill the end of that mercy, is exceeding lame reasoning. By that Argument *John* bare witness of *Christ* to no more then them that believed; *Johns* Gospell was written for the use of no more then they that believe it, *Joh.* 20.31. [165] God brought no more out of Egypt then them that kept his Statutes; *John* bare witness onely to those that received *Christ*, *were made the sons of God, received of his fulnesse grace for grace, were borne of God, saw the glory of Christ as the onely begotten of God.* For those phrases follow that other expression in *Ioh.* 1.7, 12, 13, 14, 16. Just with as much coherence to it

[165] *Psa.* 105, 43, 44.

as those phrases that Mr. *Owen* reckons up, follow this we speak to in this Chapter. And if we might take that liberty in expounding any verse we please, by all the verses that follow it, so as to say the subject spoken of in the one, is what ever after is spoken of in the other (as Mr. *Owen* doth here, and in *Heb.* 2.9.) we should make mad expositions.

“3. *He tells us, The Article {ὅι}, is joyned with {μόπτες}, they all died, or were dead, evidently restraining that All.* Thus *He*. But what *All*? That all that died. That Article is not put to Christ died for *All*, but to *All* died, and therefore were there any such force there in the Article, it makes nothing against us, for we speak not of restraining the *All* that died, nor indeed is it any other then Relative, if one died for *All*, then they *All* died. But that he treats only of believers there, is meerly proofless, as it hath been shewed. By this reason, in *Rom.* 5.19. the making men sinners by *Adams* fall should be restrained, because its {ὅι πολλοί}, the many, or those many were made sinners. These are sorry evasions.

“4. *He tells us, All those spoken of by the Apostle are proved to be “dead, because Christ died for them, and that in a spiritual death to sin.* His proof of which latter clause is *Vorstius & Grotius*, good proofs to build our Faith on. But 2. He says “*The Text proves “that to be the sense.* But what part of the Text saith it? Why, he tells us, “*That the intention of the Apostle is to prove that all for “whom Christ died, are so dead to sin, that they should henceforth live no “more thereunto, but to him that died for them.* What a heap of vanity is here! this is *Idem per idem*. The Apostle means by Dead, *Dead to sin*, because its his intention to prove all Dead to sin. Where is there any such word as *Dead to sin*? Or what ground was this for his being so zealous, as if he were beside himself in pressing men to believe and live to Christ, if they were all dead to sin already? What means he by [*so dead to sin, as that they should live no more to it,*] means he so, that they ought to live no longer to it? I would know of him, who is not so dead to sin that he ought not to live any longer to it? Nay, doth not his saying, That they might not henceforth, &c. argue, that hitherto many did what they ought not, though Christ had died for them a long time before? Or means he that they should, that is, that that should be the event, they shall live no longer to? Then I would fain finde proof for it in the Text. Is, that they might not, and they shall not, all one? Doth
not

not Sense and History confute this? Doth not many a man that Christ died for, yet live to himself? Did all believe *Johns* Witness because its said, He bare witness that all might believe? He says, *this* “*agrees with Rom. 6.5.* but thats untrue too, for this speaks onely of Christs dying for us, and to what end; that speaks of our being baptized into Christ, and planted into his likeness. But to that we spake before, *lib. 3. cap. 4.*

“5. *He tells us, The Apostle speaks here of Christs Death in re-
spect of application: The effectualness of Christ towards those for whom
he died, is here insisted on.* But the falsity of this is sufficiently discovered in what is said already. In a word, here is not one concluding Argument. His conclusion is very wrong, “*That here is no men-
tion for Christs dying for any, but those that are dead to sin and live
to him.* Let any man read the Text, and he may see that untrue. For that says not, He died for all that live no longer to themselves, &c. but he died for all, that they that live might live no longer to themselves, intimating, that as yet many do not as they ought to do. But I am weary with raking in such impertinent Arguments.

5. Another Scripture, is 1 Cor. 15.22. *In Christ all shall be made alive;* Whence we argue. All that Christ raises out of Death, he died for, that they might be so raised. Else how comes it by man, if not by something acted in the humane Nature, and not onely by the divine Power of God? But Christ shall make all alive. But Mr. Owen tells us, “*This All, is but All believers, because he brings Arguments
from Faith, the Gospel, and such things to prove it, and speaks after
of Christs members, them of whom he is the first fruits.* As if the Apostle might not speak of the Resurrection of all men, and yet speaking to believers bring proofs fitted to them. And as if his after-mentioning of such as believe, proves that he asserted not the Resurrection of any but them. Its plain, some of the *Corinthians* denied the Resurrection of the Dead, not onely that they themselves should arise, but also the dead in general, *ver. 12.* Now what they denied he asserted. VVhich its clear also, is a Truth not to be demonstrated by reason, but meerly to be believed upon divine Authority, and the foundation of it laid in Christs Resurrection. And therefore, whereas Mr. Owen (and *Beza* too) object this, “*That the
Apostles Arguments are taken from the Resurrection of Christ, the
hope, faith, customes, and expected reward of Christians, which would
have been ridiculous to be held out to the men of the world to prove*
“the

“*the Resurrection of the dead in general.* Its very absurd. For 1. The Apostle never held out other Arguments to the Heathen then Christs Resurrection, which he preached as a matter of faith to them, and declared as a matter evidently known to themselves, *Act. 17.30, 31.* 2. They being believers that denied the Resurrection of the dead in general, he might well shew the inconsistency of that denial with their own principles, and how it overthrew the most of those things which they made profession of as Christians. For the dead in general not arising, then neither should they arise and receive the reward of their faith and sufferings. His arguments of that nature shew but that they were Christians he writ to, capable of such demonstrations, not that he asserted only the Resurrection of Christians. But (2.) He says, “*The word {ζωοποιεῖν}, denotes a blessed Resurrection, a Resurrection to a good life and glory.* VWhich is but his assertion; much more, “*That its never used about the common Resurrection.* For, I pray you, doth not the Lord Jesus use it of the Fathers quickning the dead in general, *Joh. 5.21.* As the Father raiseth the dead, and quickneth them, and is not the Sons quickning whom he will, both applied after to his quickning here, and raising all hereafter? Doth that hinder the truth of his quickning whom he will, that he will quicken *All*? So, *1 Tim. 6.13.* Is it not said, That God quickneth, or gives life to all things, and can that be in a blessed Resurrection? Doth {ζωοποιεῖν} signifie more then to make alive, and shall not all the dead be made alive? How else shall they come forth of their graves, and receive their doom? The Apostle here having shewed that Christ rose again, proves by that, that the dead shall arise too, and that by Christs getting victory over death comes the Resurrection. As man brought in death, so by man came in again the Resurrection of the Dead for as in, and by (for the word {ἐν} is often *By* in signification) *Adam all dye*, so *in* (or *by*) *Christ all shall be made alive.* He says not all in Christ, As if he spake of the believers onely, but *in* (or *by*) Christ, all shall be made alive, which he declares orderly: First Christ, then they that are Christs at his coming, then afterwards [{ἔπειτα}] comes the end, thats the third step, namely the general Resurrection of the rest which is the end of all, as is declared, *Rev. 20.6, 11, 12.* Now that Christ may not be called, *The first fruits of those that sleep*, with reverence to All (as Mr. Owen suggests) I see no ground, more then that he may not be called the first-born of every creature, and the believers a first-fruits of

of his creatures, *Jam.* 1.18. Nor doth his making peculiar application of the usefulness of this Doctrine to believers, hinder his affirming the Resurrection in general; For thats an usual thing to make special application of any general doctrine to those to whom he treats of it, as from Gods bounty to all, to press believers in case of want of wisdom to ask of God, *Jam.* 1 5, 6. and so from the doctrine of the general Judgment asserted, to infer the account giving of believers, and to draw useful deductions to them in special, *Rom.* 14.11, 12, 13. So his arguing here also is unsatisfactory.

6. The last place spoken to in this Argument, is that in *Rom.* 5.18. as by the offence of one (or one offence) to all men to condemnation; so by one righteousness to all men to justification of life. To which (not having read it right, for he translates {ἐἷς πάντας ἀνθρώπους}, upon all men, when indeedt signifies but unto all men, neither the condemnation nor justification in their full signification coming upon all, Christ holding the first off, and the wilful folly of men in rejecting Christ, holding the other off from coming upon many) He thus replies “*That by the words, All men, can none be understood but those upon whom the free gift actually comes to the justification of life meaning to eternal life.* Which I deny, for that by the like reason *Adams* sin should bring the sentence of condemnation, to, or towards none but them that actually are condemned and perish. But how proves he it? Why, after the old fashion, by taking those expressions which he pleases, in the former verses, and making them expositions of this, and so he tells us, “*They are they that are said to receive the abundance of grace, and the free gift of righteousness to reign in life by Christ, to be made righteous by his obedience, &c.* Just as if I should expound that in *Rom.* 14.11. [*Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God*] by taking the former expressions, *viz.* None of *us* lives to himself, and none of *us* dies to himself: &c. *Whether we live or die we are the Lords.* Why dost thou judg thy brother, &c. and so gather thence this Conclusion, That by every knee, and every tongue, is only meant of all that live to Christ, and are Christs, that are brethren, &c. These are his kind of reasonings, which how palpably gross they are, and unbecoming a man of learning, I leave to all to judg: He tells us further, “*That the resemblance between Christ and Adam stands but in this, that the one brought the guilt of condemnation upon all those in whose room he stood a publike person, which indeed were all*

“men: and the others obedience and righteousness, brought justification
 “and salvation upon all them that he stood in the room of as a publick
 “person; thats the sum of his discourse upon it: which (though if by
 justification and salvation, he means but an acquitting them from
 that charge or judgement that should have forthwith destroyed All
 in *Adam* upon his sin, and so a giving them an escape from that, or
 a justifying and putting salvation into Christ as the publick person;
 for all it may be granted, yet it) both changes the Apostles phrase
 as before was noted, reading (upon) for (to) and leaves it unde-
 termined, whose room he stood in, and if he speak of justification
 from all sins past and present, with acceptation into favour, and
 communication of eternall life; is to be denyed, and I desire his
 proof for, it. In the meane time whereas he speaks of *Christs All*
 and *Adams All*, there are no such words in the Text, but in both
 branches expresly {ἐῖς πάντας ἀνθρώπους},
 not {πάντας τοὺς αὐτοῦ}, & {πάντας}
 {τοὺς αὐτοῦ} as he would have it. But against *T. M.* he sayes “that it
 “seems a monstrous doctrine that Christ should stand in the room of
 “reprobate persons, hated of him from eternity, such as he knew not, hid
 “the mysteries of salvation from, and refused to pray for, who were
 “damned already in Hell, and irrecoverably past the limits of re-
 “demption.

To all we have before spoken, and shewed how he mistakes in all
 these particulars; he stood not in their roomes as reprobates, or as
 damned in hell, nor say's the Scripture he hated any from eternity,
 or refused to pray for any, except in a speciall Prayer made for spe-
 ciall Priviledges, for actuall believers only, and men as so considered
 in the future. But men were reprobated and damned for rejecting
 the beams of light and truth that came from him who first virtually,
 and after actually bare that blow, that should at the first otherwise
 have destroyed them, and All men. He might as well have said, that
 its a horrible thing to conceive as the Apostle intimates, *that its pos-
 sible any should be destroyed for whom Christ died, and bring upon them-
 selves swift destruction, whom he bought &c.* as is intimated, *Rom. 14.*
15. 1 Cor. 8.11. & 2 Pet. 2.1. And indeed many truths seems mon-
 strons and absurd to reason, if it be made umpire in our believing.
 As for Christs being Advocate ({παράκλητος}) to them, *T. M.* never
 affirmed, “that he being Priest, Prophet and King over and for
 them, may destroy those that refuse to be sprinkled by his blood,
 count the blood of his sacrifice a common thing, refuse to hear his
 voice

voice as a Prophet, and to have him rule over them as a King, is no strange thing to them that believe Scripture expression, as *Numb.* 19.20, 21. *Heb.* 2.3. & 10.25.26, 29. *Act.* 2.22, 23. *Luk.* 19.14, 27. “Whereas he says *T.M. brings 7 Arguments to confirme that Christ stood in the room of all*, he exceedingly wrongs him in making him to bring for arguments some things that are without all colour of being intended as Arguments by him, as that *Adam* lost not Election (which he onely put in by way of Parenthesis, not as a proof of that Assertion) and those that he notes as his 5th. and 6th. Arguments, being onely branches of the declaration of his judgement. To say nothing that he abuses his Reader in other passages; as whereas *T. M.* saith, that God glorified his Son in making him a publick Person, by death to restore all men lost by the first *Adam*, *Heb.* 2.9. and that he wrought redemption and righteousness with God for men, in the behalf of all men, being indeed the publick Person, & in this his publick place not betruſted with fewer then the first *Adam*; in which passages he declares his judgment, grounding it upon certain Scriptures, as *Heb.* 29.1 *Cor.* 15.45, 47. 1 *Tim.* 2.5. *Rom.* 5. *M.O.* reports him as if he said these are the expressions of the Scripture. But the fuller sight of his wrong dealing with him, I leave to the rational comparison of their Books, by them that are not blinded with prejudice with either of them, or of the matters undertaken by them. And as for his answers to those devised Arguments, I shall not spend time and paper about them. Onely whereas he saith “*that Christ is no where compared to Adam in respect of the extent of the Object of his Death, but only of the efficacie of his obedience*: That that is false, the Scriptures in hand evidently sheweth, for he saith not onely, *As by one offence judgement came unto condemnation, so by one righteousness to justification of life*: but expresly maketh the comparison too in regard of their objects; As by one offence to all men to condemnation, so by one righteousness to All men to justification of life. I would faine know of *M. Ow.* what the Apostle says in the 18. v. distinct from what he said before in the precedent verses, taking away his equalizing of the Object. So that that speech looks but like an Assertion of one resolved not to own a truth, be it never so plainly exprest, if it suit not with his own opinion that he maintaineth. “*Again, whereas he denies that Heb. 2.9. holds out that Christ stood in the roome of every man, and refers us for proof to what he said to that Scripture*: his saying to it being proved impertinent and

vaine already, we need not here give him any further Answer. Sure he that dyed for every man, stood in the roome of every man. in that his dying, or else *M. Owens* own Argument from the force of the words {ὕπερ} & {ἅντι} chap. 10. lib. 3. “are meer vanities. Whereas he “says further, that no one word of God says that all men were given “to Christ to redeem. I answer, nor did *T. M.* say so, but having spoken of the Death of Christ in the roome of all mankind, and his Resurrection, he added by Parenthesis, that they are all given him and shall be brought unto him, quoting for proof *Phil.* 2.8.11. *Rom.* 14.9. which intimates his meaning to be, that they were given into his dispose as upon his resurrection, and that all are given to Christ in that sense *Psal.* 2.8, 9. fully declares, *I will give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the Earth for thy possession, and thou shalt rule them with an Iron Rod, &c.* But I deny that ever the Scriptures say God gave any man to him that he should dye for him. In dying for men he bought them rather, and upon that God gave all to him in a generall way to rule over them, and he gives him some by his gracious call, to be his peculiar charge, and to be set free by him from all their inthralments in conscience, and from the power of pollution and temptation. Whereas he says, “*Christ is called the last Adam in respect of the efficacy of his death to “the promised seed.* If he meane in that regard only, its but his meer Assertion, and so till it be proved needs no more answering, it being the same in substance with what he said before against the extent of the Object of his death, contrary to *Rom.* 5.18. which we have even now answered.

“Against this passage of *T.M.* [that Christ by his death brought all “men out of the Death they fell into by Adam] he opposes this, that “the Death men fell into in Adam was a death in sin, and the guilt of “condemnation thereupon. For which he quotes *Ephes.* 2.1, 2, 3. To which I desire the Reader to remember what I said above about Redemption, Chap. 5. lib. 3. that we fell into a twofold death in Adam, one as the naturall and proper fruit and consequence of that sinning, the deadening all our powers to that that was spiritually good. 2. The wages and punishment of this sin, that is, destruction and utter ruine. [166] The latter of these Christ bare for us, not the former; for then he should have had our pollution in him too, which is crosse to truth. Therefore when we speak of bringing us from the death we fell into in Adam, we are to be understood, of

[166] Ioh. 8.31,
32.

of that Christ endured for us, not the other, which he brings us out of by his Word and Spirit received into us, and not by his dying onely, or Resurrection also. And therefore *M. Owen* here prevaricates, as in another passage fastned upon *M. More*, he abuses him, for he no where tells us (as *M. Owen* charges him) that the presenting himself just before the Father, was the ultimate thing by Christ intended, not a tittle that way.

He hath also many heavie words against *M. More*, for saying, God accepted the Sacrifice of Christ as if all had dyed, risen, sacrificed, satisfied, &c. which spring from his owne mistake, as if Christ in dying for All, was said to dye and satisfie for all sins that ever they should or might commit, and so procure an acquittance and discharge from them All to be without faile as on his part, and what ever failing in any condition happen on their part made over unto all; which as its contrary to those intimations that speak of their perishing, for whom Christ dyed, as a thing possible; yea, and of some ments pulling swift condemnation upon themselves, whom he bought, which could not be were that position true; so its also a gap to all carelesness and licentiousness, for then let all men take what course they will, Either Christ dyed for them or not: if not, no endeavour can do them good, God is their enemy and hated them before they offended him, even from all eternity, and they must have no better, do what they can, then what the hatred of an Omnipotent God will produce unto them: if he did, Then *eia agite*, nothing can pull a dram of wrath upon them, their score are all wiped off, both what they have run into and what they shall. The Apostle never preached such Doctrine, but that they that walk in the light, as he is in it, that walk not after the Flesh but after the Spirit, that are rooted in the Faith, and not moved from the hope of the Gospell, shall have this benefit by Christs death, that no condemnation shall befall them, all their sins are cleansed &c. Verily, Christ putting himself into the place of *Adam* in the day that he sinned, and in due time bearing that heavie death that else had seised on All and overcoming it, and presenting himself to God as a Conqueror over it, was far more acceptable to God, then if all men in the world had dyed and overcome. For we had done it but for our selves, and out of love to our selves; but he out of obedience to his Father and love to us, and the same worke is far more acceptable to God, when done out of Charity, then when done out of selfe-

and meer necessity. Beside the dignity of his Person, and nearness to his Father far above ours; but I pass that too.

“*He objects further against T. M. because he sayes (comparing Christ and Adam in respect of the effect and fruit of their works in the publick place) that as by the sin of Adam, all his posterity were in and by him deprived of that life and righteousness they had in him, and are fallen under sin and death (though secretly, invisibly, and in some sort inexpressibly) so by the efficacy of the obedience of Christ, All men without exception are redeemed, restored, made righteous, justified by the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, the righteousness which is by the faith of Jesus Christ being unto All, &c. Thus M. Owen relates him, upon which he infers. “What remains then but that All should be saved? the Holy Ghost affirming, that all those whom he justifies he also glorifies. Rom. “8.30. & thence runs into that Rhetorick (which as we shewed above belongs to his Doctrine) Solvite mortales curas. Besides which he excepts also against his parenthesis and quotation of Rom. 3.22. to which I shall first Answer, and then to his Inference. 1 “He says he “knowes not what he means by secretly, invisibly, and in some sort inexpressibly, sure he supposes not that these things may be made the Objects of our senses. I answer, He doth here Nodum in scirpo, quarrels at what is true without exception; for may not both sinne and death be both seen and felt in their power inwardly? doth not all the powers of a man feel the paines of Death, and the conscience see and feel the guilt of sinne, and yet no one of all them condemned in Adam in that day of his sentencing felt them but Adam, nor could they not being as yet descended from him, and yet all of them were virtually condemned and should have perished in him, had not Christ stept in; are there not *sensus interni*, as well as *externi*? why else calls the Apostles some men {ἀπειληγκότες} Ephes. 4.19. And is not this imputation in some sort inexpressible? can any set it out to the full? If they can, I would I could see them do it. 2. “He calls “him Impostor &c. because he quotes but part of Rom. 3.22. the righteousness of God by the faith of Jesus Christ unto All, &c. And is this is such a piece of evill as to make him worthy the name of a wicked Impostor because he stopt there and cited not the following passage, and upon all than believe; which he apprehends to speak to a further businesse? What name deserved M. O. then for gelding the Text in Lu. 2.34. as we noted at the close of the 3d. Chapter?*

Sure

Sure he was there the Impostor. Alas, how many such advantages might I have taken to have given *M. O.* such Epethites for leaving out, adding, altering expressions of Scripture more groundlesly? That the righteousnesse of God is unto All, the Apostle sayes, and that was as much as he needed in that passage to make use of: but that it comes upon all that believe, pertaines to his following consideration, and is frequently acknowledged by him, and whereas *M. Owen* says, the word [Believe,] pertains to both *Alls*, its but his conception, the Text is not, {ἐἰς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας}, and therefore except he give us some proof for it, *Mr. Moore*, and I too, may question what he says, yea, and make use of this part of the verse too, to prove, That the Righteousness of God (according to the Gospel-Declaration) is to *All*, without deserving the name of Impostors; this very place, *Rom.* 5.18. holding out that [{δικαίωσις}, is {ἐἰς πάντας}, {ἁνθρώπων}, not only {ἐἰς πάντας πιστεύοντας}] justification is to All men, may warrant us to understand that so, without danger of heresie or imposture: but that it comes upon as many as it extends towards, I have no such Scripture proof to warrant me. Surely *Dr. Preston* in his *Treatise of Faith*, about *pag.* 8. asking whom Gods Righteousness is giving to, and answering, to All without exception, thought it not an Imposture, but called it the ground of all comfort or consolation: nor made he such a conclusion, *Ergo*, it comes upon All, and so All shall be saved, *Solvite mortales curas*, &c. But I shall now pass to his Inference. And first I note, That *Mr. Owon* deales fraudulently with *T. Moore* in relating him: for whereas by way of distinction, and to prevent mistake, he says, That this recovery is in Christ, so as that in him, and by him in that done, and wrought in his own body, they are again redeemed, restored, and made righteous, and that it might be said as things are looked upon in Christ, who was in the room of All, that (as all in the former respect have sinned, &c. so) all are justified freely by his grace, &c. This clause [*In him, and as things are looked upon in Christ*] which was the principal distinguishing clause in this parallel, he wholly omits and fals upon the rest, as if he had said, They are in themselves justified, redeemed, restored, &c. and then upon this man of Clouts he falls very foully, as if he beat all to pieces *Master Moores* comparison in it. The leaving out that Clause, which was the most special thing in it, made way for all the following absurdities that *Mr. Owen* puts upon him, and the keeping that in, would Answer them all. For
a man

a man may be all this in another, and yet not the better for it in the issue. For I ask, Were not we once all righteous, holy, innocent, in the image of God in *Adam*? Did not God make us so there? And what now shall we infer, holy and righteous, and yet condemned, dye, accursed? will God cast his own Image into hell? And shall we produce the Scriptures, that the righteous shall shine as stars in the Firmament, but all were made righteous in *Adam*, *Ergo*, *All shall shine as stars in the Firmament*: but this is untrue, and contrary to Scripture, Many shall perish, *Ergo*, All were not righteous in *Adam*. Who would not hiss out such reasonings? Again All were sinners, and condemned to death in *Adam*, yet *Enoch* never died, and *Elias* was taken up into heaven, and many shall be glorious with Christ. Like this, The *Kingdom* is all at peace, and agreed with the *King* in its body Representative the *Parliament*, therefore none in the *Kingdom* opposeth him, nor shall any ever be condemned by him, suppose he come to power for doing any thing against him. *Auditum admissi risum teneamus*? Christ the representative person was justified, and so all justified and restored in him, Therefore all men in their own persons shall be eternally saved. He cleared the score for them as Death was come upon them in *Adam*, Therefore though they remain Rebels, yet in themselves they must be saved. These things being the off-spring of Mr. Owens fraudulency, how impertinently is that Scripture quoted by him, Rom. 8.30. that speaks of justification as coming upon men by receipt of Christ, {ὃς ἐδικαίωσε}, *those that he justified, he glorified*. And again, How vain is his inference; *whom he justified he glorified Ergo*, all that he justified he glorifies too. Might we not by the like authority from this foregoing passage [*whom he called them he justified*] deny that wisdom called those in *Prov.* 1.24. That she gave over to destruction? and those many that were but some of them chosen. *Matth.* 22.14. or else he must of necessity grant that either some are justified that are after reprobated, and were never chosen, or else that he made but an inconsequent inference. Besides, He imputes a meer falshood to him, when he informs his Reader, as *T. Moores* Assertion, *That the righteousness of God comes upon all Unbelievers*; quite contrary to his Assertions, as any man may see that reads his Book, yea, quite contrary to that for which Mr. *Owen* faulted him as stopping at that phrase, unto *All* Whether Mr. *Moore* now hath corrupted the Word of God, or Mr. *Owen* mistaken and corrupted Mr. *Moore*, let the Reader judg.

“But

“But before he leaves this Place and Chapter, He gives us some Arguments to prove, That Christ in his Obedience, Satisfaction, &c. was not a publike person for every man in the world, Elect and Reprobate. Believers and Unbelievers. A thing that we affirm not, as he expresses it, viz. We say not that he sustained the person of any, either as Elect or Reprobate, in giving himself a ransom from the death come upon all for their sin in Adam, but of men as faln, not as Reprobated for rejecting his Truth, nor as elected through obedience of the Truth: and therefore his first Argument being against his sustaining the persons of men under the notion of Reprobates, and the seed of the Serpent, &c. needs no further answering. Otherwise we say, that for them that by denying the Lord that bought them come to be rejected, and to be of the feed of the Serpent, Christ sustained the place of a publike person, as onely faln and condemned in Adam, his other arguments follow, viz.

“2. Christ as a publike person represented only them, for whose sakes he set himself apart for that office and imployment wherein he was such a representative; but upon his own testimony which we have, Joh. 17.19. he set himself apart to that service and imployment for the sakes onely of some, and not for all and every one, Therefore he was not a publike person in the room of All. To which I answer, 1. By denying the Minor, for neither doth Christ say for their sakes only I sanctifie my self, nor were they there spoken of, all the believers; so that had he limited it to those only, he had by this argument represented onely them that were sent into the world, as he was sent, to preach the Gospel (for to them that speech is there applied) and so excluded all that should believe through their words: Read Joh. 17.18, 19, 20. 2. Nor doth he tells us that that he sanctified himself to there, was all that in which he was a publike person and representative in giving himself a ransom, and if that be not proved, he says nothing.

“3. Christ as a surety was a publike person, but all are not in that Covenant of which he was a surety, Therefore not a publike person for All. This Argument, is fallacious, leaning upon this foundation, If Christ was not a publike person for all in every respect, Then for all in none, which we deny. His being a surety relates to his undertaking in heaven to see the Covenant which he hath already sealed performed to the parties to whom it appertaineth. Its like this, The Parliament as a publike body have ingaged their publike faith for seeing all them paid that have lent them any thing, but all the

Commons in the Kingdom have not lent to them, and so they are not ingaged to all of them in that way: *Ergo*, they are not the Representative of all the Commons in the Kingdom. The business of Christs Suretiship he quite mistakes, as if the Apostle there affirmed him to be a Surety for all for whom he died; which that place says not.

4. His Argument from Christs Satisfaction, and *Rom.* 8.33, 34. alleged to prove it, I have answered before in *l.* 3 *c.* 7. & *l.* 1. *c.* 3.

“5. *The fifth says, That Christ never did any thing in vain in respect of any for whom he was a publike person. But many things which he did as a publike person were altogether in vain and fruitless, in regard of the greatest part of the sons of men, &c.* To which, If by fruitless he mean totally, both in respect of His, and his Fathers Glory, and their good, then the *Major* is confessed, and the *Minor* denied. For he was glorified, and all they in their day had mercy and goodness by his Death, even they that then at the time of the accomplishment of his Sufferings were dead: But if he means in regard of mens receipt of that utmost benefit that they might have received by it. Then I deny the *Major*. For Christ as a Prophet and Teacher speaks to many men in vain, in that respect, See *Isai.* 49.4. *And I said, I laboured in vain*, speaking in the person of Christ, as the 5. and 6. verses make it plain. So *Matth.* 23.37. and so the Apostle intimates that some that departed from the Faith, and turned aside to seek righteousness in their works, abrogated Christ to themselves, and made his Death as a vain thing, crucifying him again to themselves. *Gal.* 2.21. and 5.2, 4, 5. *Heb.* 6.5, 6. And that some receive his Grace in vain, 2 *Cor.* 6.1, 2.

6. His next is, “*That if God was welpleased with his Son in what he did as a publike person in representing others, then must he be welpleased with all those whom he did represent, either Absolutely, or Conditionally. But so is he not either way with all, &c.* As pertaining to an absolute welpleasedness, I deny the *Major*. *David* might be welpleased that *Joab* mediated for *Absolom*, and yet not welpleased with *Absolom*. As for a conditional welpleasedness we deny the *Minor*, That God would not be welpleased with all men upon condition Did all submit to him, seek him &c. they should all finde him pleased with them. Through Christs Mediation he would have been welpleased with *Cain*, upon this condition, that he had believed and done well, as *Abel* did, *Gen.* 4.7. So with *Pharaoh*, had he

he loved his people, and learned the knowledge of God by them, *Matth.* 25.35, 36, 41, 42, 43, &c.

7. His last Argument is onely a quotation of many Scriptures that say, “*He prayed not for the world, when he requested peculiar favors for believers, That he gave himself a ransome for many, Gave himself for his sheep, his Church, is our forerunner, shall save his people, &c.*” to which we have before answered.

CHAP. V.

A Vindication of our use of those Scriptures, which we say intimate a possibility of such to perish for whom Christ dyed.

WHEREAS we have often made use of such Scriptures as intimate the perishing of such as Christ dyed for; *M. Owen* in the next place seeks “*to wrest them from us, intimating that we therein do injury to the consolation of poor souls, and make vile the precious blood of Christ, and esteem it as a common thing.*” Against which our defence is what he himself supplies us with in his Preface, That we must not lye to comfort souls, and dawb them up with mortar not duly tempered, To tell them that either Christ dyed for them, or not; If he did they are sure to be safe, they cannot out-sin the efficacy of his blood upon them, nor fail of the inheritance; sure our way to comfort souls is not by such words as the Scripture warrants not. But while we comfort souls by minding them what God hath done for them in Christ, and what he is ready to do further; we are also to let them know, that its in his way, in attending to his word, looking to his son, abiding in him, &c. that they shall meet with all the efficacy of Christs blood to eternall salvation; so it will cleanse them from all their sins, and present them righteous, and obtain the dispensation of Spirit to them to abide in them for ever. But if they neglect and slight him, they cannot escape his chastisements: which negligences too upon confession of them and turning from them, it is ordered to wash away, but abidden in they shall for them be cut off from him, and I think this is according to the Apostles manner of preaching; See *Rom.* 8.1. 13. 1 *Ioh* 1.7, 8, 9. *Joh.* 15.2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10. &c. & 14, 15, 16, 17. But other wayes of comforting from it, we know none. And if to speak

of it as the Holy Ghost speaks of it, be to vilifie and count it a common thing, I know not wherein truly to magnifie it; we must stick to his speaking, however any censure us for so doing. And yet we account the blood of Christ truly precious, as being the blood of God, the blood of the Covenant, and as such, not common to All, much lesse prophane and of little vertue. We judge it of infinite esteem with God, so that it obtains what ever according to the agreement between Christ and him it requireth; and being obeyed, and the sprinkling of it received, it speaks peace, purges the conscience, cleanses from sin, keeps off punishment; yea (abid in) it leads up the soul thats sanctified by it to all perfection: yea, so ver-
 tuous we judge it, and of such value with God; that he most severely revenges mens slighting and contemning it, not believing on it, or not abiding in it; yea, to utter destruction, according to the intimations of these Scriptures that we come to speak to; That which he makes an Argument of our slighting it, that we make an Argument of our prizing it, and counting it precious in the sight of God; even that he so severely punishes and destroyes them, that having it shed for them & propounded to them, would not trust it, but rebelled against him that shed it. I think it springs from the preciousness & excellency of Christ, [167] both in himself, & with God, that God so severely punishes those that believe not on him, that refuse to Kiss him.

[167] Psa. 2.10,
 11.
 Ioh. 3 36. It nothing hindred the preciousness of the Feast (*Mat. 21.4, 6, 7.*) that they that were bidden were so severely destroyed for refusing it: [168] nor is it an undervaluing of Gods goodness, that men for hard-
 [168] Rom. 2.4,
 5.
 Iude 4.13. or of the grace of God, that some *turning it into wantonnesse, procure to themselves the blackness of darkness.* The better a thing is that God propounds to us, and calls us to, the greater is his displeasure against its rejectors; [169] they shall lesse escape and be more punished, that neglect the salvation preached by *Christ*, then they that neglected what was preached by *Moses*. Gods speaking in a way of grace to people, and calling to the blood of the Covenant, as they are greater encouragements to hear him, and hope in him, then when he spake from Mount *Sinai* in terror; So shal the slighting such a way as affords such encouragements, be more severely punished, *Heb. 12. 18, 22, 24, 25.* We esteem not a Plaister lesse precious, because men that will not apply it, or not let it lye on, are not healed by it; but if it cure every wound to which its applied, and on which its

its permitted to lye, we highly esteem it. *M. Owen* should remember that himself granted that the innate worth and vertue of a thing and its efficacie as to persons, are very different, and that not to be measured by this; therefore these are but Sophistical flourishes to scare souls from receiving the truth, or leading to a negligence in attending to it, while they carry in them this intimation, that if a man can but find an act of Faith in him at any time (though perhaps thats but his conceit too) the blood of Christ belongs to him, and he is sure enough from falling, no matter for abiding in Gods wayes, and taking heed to his Word; he may hear any Doctrine, do any thing, the vertue of Christs blood will preserve him from finall mis-carrying, and to say it will not, is to dishonour it. Truth will fling off many such foolish flourishes as these, which yet I meet with, taken up, and used sometimes with great confidence in Pulpits: but I confesse I pity them that so do. The Word of the Lord is a reproach to them, and they cannot bear it: they will not give that honour to Christs blood, that God gives it in the Scripture, but yet will plead for an honour of their own framing: like the old *Pharisees* that honoured the Sepulchers of the Prophets, and in the mean time believed not their witness, and killed their successors. I shall shut up this point with *M. Owens* own words in his Preface. If we maintain the vertue of Christs blood, let us do it in his own language, or be for ever silent: that is preciousnesse in it, that God ascribes to it, our inventions though never so splendid in our own eyes, are unto him an abomination.

The places oppugned by him in their native intimations and significations, are *Rom.* 14.15. 1 *Cor.* 8.11. 2 *Pet.* 2.1. *Heb.* 10.29. which we do not bring to prove (as he suggests) that Christ dyed for All, and every man in the world; but to prove that he dyed for more then the Elect, and so use not so directly for the proof of the extent of it to its fulnesse, as to disprove their limitation of it to the Elect and Believers. Let us view what he sayes to them.

1. The First is, *Rom.* 14.15. *Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ dyed.* We say thence, that the Apostle intimates that one may perish for whom Christ dyed, else his admonition was altogether groundlesse, as empty and superfluous, as if he had bidden them, not to make Christs blood by his Father to be abhorred, or not to pull the stars out of the Firmament, &c.

“To this *M. Owen* (*ut nodum quem solvere nequit, gladio dissecet*)
“denies

*“denies that there is any such intimation (he might as well have said “these words are not written) onely sayes he, others are commanded not “to do that that goeth in a direct way to destroy him; he should have added, but which never so much done could never have so destroyed him; and so they might have answered, Ah Paul, thou settest a scar-crow before us, we can never do that; we are sure, between all our stumblings of him, and his destruction, that Christ hath dyed for, there is as great a gulf set, as between hell & Abrahams bosome. But he adds “they might be dehorted from that thats in it self impossible because though the one could not perish in respect of the event, “yet the other might give occasion of perishing in a procuring cause. To which I answer. 1. That I never finde the Apostle giving such dehortations. 2. I ask, is there any procuring cause of his perishing for whom Christ dyed? Can any thing procure that the bloud of Christ shed for him, shall not save him? if not, why talks he here of a procuring cause of that that cannot be procured? if yes, then he grants what he fights against. The Apostle sayes not, Do not that that might destroy thy brother had not Christ dyed for him; but, “destroy not with thy meat him that Christ dyed for. From that sleeveless Answer, he falls to question, if a man may not be dehorted from attempting that that he cannot possibly do? To which I say, yes; by shewing him that he goes about an impossibility, as Gamaliel did, Act. 5.38, 39. but there is no such way of dehorting here; no, nor doth he dehorte from attempting it onely, but from doing it. He sayes not, Attempt not to destroy him, you will lose your labour in it (nor doth he intimate that they had so wicked an aime in what they did, as to seek to destroy him) but, Destroy not him for whom Christ dyed, do not that which may have such an issue upon him. I would have him furnish me with one Instance, in which God bids a man not to do that, that according to his own declaration he hath told him cannot possibly be done: so he had done more, then by putting the question. His instance of the Souldiers not breaking the bones of Christ, is nothing, except he could shew, that though it was revealed to them that they could not possibly do it, yet God bid them not to do it. He asks further, “If every one be damned that “one attempts to destroy by grieving him with uncharitable walking? I answer, thats not materiall, its enough that every one (though Christ dyed for him) is destroyed, who by reason of anothers uncharitable walking is turned aside from Christ, so as that he never
more*

more walks with him and owns him. After all this, he calls such Arguments as this Men of Straw; but such as he cannot beat down with any fair dealing. Thats his policy to amuse the Reader, and scare him from it, by casting disgrace on it, when he cannot evert it. Lastly he tells us, “*That he denies not but many perish utterly, whom “we in our walking are bound to account so redeemed.* I might put him to it to prove it that we are bound to judge such, or such a man elected, or redeemed, that is not. But suppose it true; yet this serves not his purpose, for the Apostle speaks in the generall Theory, not with speciall application to this or that; joyns in a Precept destroying, and him that Christ dyed for; though we may judge this or that man Elect that is not; yet should we say in the generall, bring not an Elect man by deceit to destruction, *M. O.* would go neer to tell us there is a repugnancy *in terminis*, that in that we say a man is Elect, we intimate, its impossible for him to be so deceived. We do not say, Destroy not Christ, because we know that none can; If that was but the Apostles meaning, it was better to have said, *Indeavour not to destroy him, for whom, for any thing thou knowest, Christ dyed.* But Destroy not him for whom Christ dyed, contains an implication *in terminis*, if it be declared too that none such can be destroyed. So that in all this he hath but trifled.

2. The second place is *I Cor. 8.11.* “*Shall thy weak brother perish “for whom Christ dyed?* which (he saith) hath a little more strength then the other. Therefore we must look for a little more weakness in his Answer to it, in which he flies about, and knows not where to fasten. First, by Perishing “*there, he cannot apprehend that there “is meant eternall damnation.* Why so? there is no reason given, except that the occasion was eating things offered to an Idoll; and sure by such an occasion to fall back to Idolatry, or serving Christ and Idols together, is enough to plunge a man into eternall condemnation (which the word also, when speaking of men, and no mention of some bodily judgement or danger made in the verses whereabout its used most frequently, [170] if not alwayes, signifyeth) and “*he confesses such a sin is damnable in it self, and that for any thing “that lyes in us, he will perish.* A but the Apostle addes, for whom Christ dyed, and so intimates that his dying for him will not keep him from it that stumbles, and turns away to Idolatry finally upon any occasion. That God alwayes revenges sin with damnation,

[170] See Crys.
in hunc
locum.

we

we thence infer not, no more then we can from that, *No fornicator or Adulterer shall inherit Gods Kingdom*; but that he so avenges it in all, that by occasion of offences persist to stumble at Christ, we fear not to infer. Surely his after words are no reason of his not understanding by perishing, eternal damnation, viz. “*That he was but a seeming brother, and that Christ did but seem to dye for him*. Sure he thinks hypocrites, and such as Christ died not for, may so perish. But he gives that, I suppose, for a second Answer, and so he mightily changes the case, and turns the Apostles words into another form, for now in stead of, And shal thy weak brother perish for whom Christ died? he hath made it, And shall they counterfeit brother perish for whom Christ did but seem to dye? Nay, he tells us, “*As he is said to be a brother, so Christ is said to dye for him*; That is, he counterfeited, and made the Church believe he was a brother, and Christ counterfeited too with him, and made him, (nay the Church too) believe that he died for him. Do not these things quite enervate all the force of the Apostles Arguments and Aggravations, which are three especially, “1. *He is thy brother, and therefore thou oughtest to care for him*. 2. *Thy weak brother, and therefore to be the more tendered by thee*. 3. *Christ died for him, and wilt thou destroy him*? Had they been of Mr. Owens minde, they might easily have retorted it thus; If he be a brother indeed, and Christ indeed have died for him, he will continue with us, and cannot perish, for Christ hath procured all good things for him, and so preservation, &c. But if he do fall, we have but discovered a hypocrite, and parted with him, and discern that Christ never died for him. Is this to expound the Scripture, or to pervert and elude it? But why did he but seem to be a brother? Surely hypocrites use-rather to boast themselves of strength, and seem to be strong, then to appear weak; they use not to dissimble and counterfeit the lowest places, or least strength, as we may see in *Jehu*. “*But we are brethren onely by Faith*. Thats untrue. In a Church-Fellowship, Faith and Confession make brethren, with professed agreement in joynt worshipping. And such also as have true illuminations, and some measure of saith in believing the truth, and seeking God therein, may, and do turn aside as the Scriptures witness. As the *Galathians* did run well (not hypocritically, but well) and yet some of them *Paul* greatly scared, for they were turned away from him that called them. And others put away a good conscience, making shipwrack of faith,

1 *Tim.* 1.20. Sure a counterfeit profession never makes a good conscience. Weak believers not yet settled and rooted, nor so far prevailed with, as to be brought to commit their souls to Christ, nor made one with Christ, and his chosen ones in spirit & thoroughness of heart, are in danger of falling off by corrupt doctrines and temptations, if they take not diligent heed to Christ and his doctrine. Thence the Apostles were especially earnest in watching over, & admonishing such. And yet that faith, truth, confession, goodness of way and walking they had, might truly denominate thē brethren. And such the Apostle speaks of here as had had some illuminations, and their hearts closing with the truth, yea, the truth so powerful in them as to pull them out of the worlds way and fellowships, and made them attend amongst the Church for further knowledg, and divine teachings; yet being not established, and so thoroughly united to them in Spirit, they might be shaken and turned away again by offensive carriages. But that the Apostle should mean him thou countest a brother, and Christ to have died for, or wish him onely to avoid endeavouring his perishing, is a meer perverting of the Apostles saying: The Apostle uses not to speak things contrary to truth, to suit with seeming appearances to men, as we noted above. As for his making us draw an universal Conclusion from this or the other Scripture, viz. That therefore he died for all Reprobates, its none of ours, but this; Therefore the after perishing of men proves not that Christ died not for them, as they use to argue; nor did he dye for the Elect onely, as they say.

3. The third place is, 2 *Pet.* 2.1. *Denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.* In which he questions every thing, As 1. *Whether by Lord, be meant Christ as Mediator?* “2. *Whether by buying be meant an eternal Redemption by the blood of* “Christ. 3. *Whether it be spoken according to Reality or appearance.* To the first he says, “*It rather signifies God the Father, because the* “word {δεσπότης} *is every where given to him.* To which I answer, 1. Christ calls himself {οἰκοδεσπότης}, which is all one with {δεσπότης ὁ υἱος τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ}, *Matt.* 10.25. & *alibi.* 2. *Jude* in his Epistle, which is almost word for word the same with this *Chapter*, tells us (speaking of these men) that they deny {τὸν μόνον δεσπότην θεον, καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν ἰησοῦν χρίστος} ; the onely Master, God, and Lord Jesus Christ, where [171] *Beza* strongly con-

[171] a *Vnicus articulus*

omnibus istis epithetis communis, omnino declarat Christum esse Herum illum unicum. Vid. Bez. in locum.

that all those Epithites are given to Christ, there being no pause between them; and but one Article prefixed before them All, blaming *Erasmus* much for otherwise rendring it. Nay, He tells us, That one ancient Greek Copy (*Codex Complutensis*) reads it thus, { τὸν μόνον θεὸν καὶ δεσπότην, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἰησοῦν χριστὸν }. And sure if that [172] place that answers this so exactly ascribe that title to him; its not to be denied, that this doth it too. But he says, “*Its not a proper word for our Saviour in that work of Redemption, because its such a Lord and Master as refers to servants and subjection, but the end of Christs purchase is always exprest in words of more indearment.*” But this is frivolous, for in 2 Cor. 5.15. *He died for all that they might live to him*, expresses subjection, and to be as his servants, as the end of his death. So in 1 Cor. 7.22, 23. upon this ground that Christ bought us with a price, its said, *He that is called being free, is the Lords servant*, and so in *Rom.* 14 7, 8, 9. Thence the Apostles through redeemed by Christ, I trow, stile themselves the servants of Christ. To say nothing that the word {Κυριος} is used to denote as much reference to subjection as this can; and {οικοδεσποτης} used over all in the house, Elect and others. See *Matth.* 15.27.27. and 18.25.32. *Joh.* 15.15. *Matth.* 20.1.16. 2. Was not such a word as argued their duty of a subjection, fittest to aggravate their sin of denying subjection? Whereas he says, “*God only in the following verses is named, and not Christ.*” Thats not so, for in ver. 20. where he speaks again to this Apostacy of theirs, they are said to have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But 3. Suppose it be meant of God, Is not Christ as Mediator God too? And is not God said to purchase his Church with his blood? *Acts* 20.28. Doth he buy any into his Church, but by the Death and bloodshed of Jesus Christ. He says, Yes, and thats the second thing to be spoken to, in which he says “2. *Its uncertain whether this buying was made with the ransom of his blood, or by the goodness of God delivering them by the knowledg of the truth from Idolatry.*” To which I answer, By both. The goodness of God is not extended to faln man but by Christs death. The Declaration of which (as so testified) is the truth that God makes forcible for drawing men to himself from their Idolatry, *Tit.* 3.4, 5. 1 Cor. 15.2, 3. *Deum.* Illà enim omnia prædicata de uno subjecto Jesu Christo prædicantur; cum unus tantum sit articulus ({τὸν}) communis omnibus ille prædicatis. Zanch. de trib. Elohim.

[172] b *Vide etiam* Zanch. in Jud 4.

Qui Deitatem

Christi inde arguens, hæc habet.

Petrus verò à quo

Judas desumpsit sua, docet

Jesum Christum esse

hunc {δεσποτήν}

quem falsi doctores negant.

Etiam {δεσποτήν} (inquit Petrus) qui illos mercatus est

abnegantes: quis mercatus nos

est nisi Christus

suo sanguine? &c.

Et Paulò post, Confirmit Judas Christus

sum esse hunc {δεσποτήν}

nostrum

unus tantum sit articulus ({τὸν}) communis omnibus ille prædicatis.

Zanch. de trib. Elohim.

par. 1. lib. 6. & 5.

That there must be a price is evident, and I finde no other price mentioned in the New Testament, but the blood of Christ, either as shed, or as also testified; if Mr. *Owen* doth, let him shew it; for us to devise prices, is to add of our own heads to the Scriptures. Now if Christ be the price, its not material, whether we say that the Lord that bought them be God or Christ, the act of buying or purchasing being attributed to both, *Acts* 20.28. *1 Cor.* 6.20. *Rev.* 5.9. Christ buys men unto God, and God buys men by Christ. God gave Christ as a price to purchase men, and Christ gave himself for, and gives himself to men. And there are these two things in this buying, or price, by which people are bought. 1. Christ given by God and Himself to the Death for men, that they might be preserved and delivered and from the destruction due to them in *Adam*. 2. Christ given of God, and by Himself to them, in point of tender and free offer, as in *Joh.* 6.32. and (at least) good things given unto them, by and through him. And as I understand, none are said in Scripture to be bought or redeemed from their vain conversations, or unto God from men, till this price made known to them, buy them off from their love to those other things, and ingage them for God to be his. Thence men reason inconsequently, from those Scriptures which say By the blood of Christ, men out of all Nations, Peoples, or Families, are bought or redeemed to God, [173] which speak of the efficacy of his blood declared and believed, ingaging their hearts and spirits to and for God (as *Hosea* bought him a wife by a price given her, *Hos.* 3.2.) to deny the extent of Christs given himself a ransom, and dying for men. These two things then I understand in this place of *Peter*. 1. That God had given Christ to the death, and he gave himself a ransom for these false Teachers amongst all the rest of men, and thereby they, with all other, were delivered from perishing in that sentence of death which should in *Adam* have (else) destroyed them, and had with others their liberty to the Church and Kingdom of Christ. 2. That God in the Gospel presenting this his love unto them, and this his Son that dyed for them (or the Son presenting himself so) and so as the onely Lord and Saviour, able and ready to save them, with promises of salvation upon their submission to him, bought them, or disingaged their hearts from their former idols, worships, vain and evil ways (called, ver. 20. the pollutions of the world) and had ingaged and purchased their affections to his Gospel, People, Salvation,

[173] As that in
Rev. 5.9.
and 14.4.
and 1 *Pet.*
1.18, 19.

and Glory set before them, and so to the service of him; and they now after all this denying him (as the *Israelites* after their bodily redemption did. *Deut.* 32.6.) “*They brought upon themselves swift destruction.* If Mr. Owen would fasten any other sense upon this place, he must shew us that any people are said to be bought or redeemed from their vain conversations (as these were ver. 20. for such are the pollutions of the world) by any other price then the blood of *Jesus*, 1 *Pet.* 1.18. or 2. That some are bought with that for whom it was never shed. That God glorifies it to, and purchases those by it for whom it hath done nothing, nor shall do any thing; for we have proved and do believe him to have dyed for All. If he perform either of those two things, we shall listen further to his exposition. Whereas he says “*The word {ἀγοράζω}* answers to the Hebrew word {פרה} he deals not ingeniously with his Reader. For the word {פרה} in all those places he brings for proof of it viz. *Deut.* 7.8. & 15.15. and *Jer.* 15.21. and in all other places generally so far as I find yet, is in the Greek translated by the word {λυτρόω}, and not by the word {ἀγοράζω}, and so those places of 1 *Pet.* 1.18. and *Luke* 1.78. may better be applyed to that observation that Mr. Owen thence makes then this. The Hebrew word that Answers to “{ἀγοράζω} is the word {קנה}. He objects further the Apostles not mentioning the Word Price. [174] But thats frivolous, for if we speak of buying things (especially of Gods buying) a price is necessarily intimated as the correlate to buying, though we may buy the grace of God without price, yet he buyes not us at that rate, we are well paid for what ever God hath of us. “*Whereas he would have this buying to be onely a deliverance by Gods goodnesse from the defilements of the world, a seperation of them from them by the knowledge of the truth.* Besides that that note is grounded on his former mistake, that the word {ἀγοράζω} answers to the Hebrew {קנה} to deliver, I would faine have him shew me that God extends any (reall) goodnesse to men without Christs buying them from their obligation to the misery contracted to them by *Adam*, or else that rather confirms that Christ dyed for them, and the knowledge of him as so dying for them, and able and ready thereby to save them, bought them; yea, what else is it to know him Lord and Saviour? How Lord but by dying for them especially? how else a Saviour? Againe, did God give them any thing in that truth made known to them worthy their forsaking the world for him? had they
any

[174] Isa. 55.1.

any share, right, interest in that truth, namely in the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*? was there any good for them to get there? (for to be sure the worlds good they were not like to get by that knowledge in those dayes.) If yes, then whence proceeded that if he never dyed for them, if it declared no salvation as attainable by them? would men leave all and expose themselves to persecutions for meer uncertainties, when they could not be told that Christ had done any thing for them, or God by Christ? or that Christ was a Mediator for them to attaine to happinesse by? If they had no right to the truth, nor that had any thing of goodnesse in it for them, what had they to doe with that truth that so little concerned them? If he say it had matter of advantage in it, for them for ought they knew, they might think it had though it had not. Then I answer, they had made but a blind bargain, and they knew not the Lord and Saviour *Christ Jesus*. It was rather a mistake about him that gave them that escape from the worlds pollutions, then any knowledge of him; had they known him rightly, they should have known that they had no such reason to let all go for him that had excluded them his mediation, and could not save them, not having dyed for them: And then having made some tryall, and not finding that which they had mistakingly looked for, but that he was a dry tree and barren wilderness to them; was it not more excusable that they should leave him and take such comforts as the world would afford them, and not go on to suffer for him that would not save them, he having not dyed for them? “*Whereas he further adds, that the Apostle is silent about “washing them in the blood of the Lamb; what a sorry shift is that? How many places speak of buying men, and yet mention not the washing them in the blood of the Lamb, where yet there is no doubt but his blood was the price that bought them; as to instance, in Rev. 14.4. & 1 Cor. 6.20. Again, What is it to wash in the blood of the Lamb? I feare there may be some mistake in that. Is it any thing else, but when the death, sufferings or blood of Christ declared in the Gospel & set home by the Spirit, do cause the heart for his loves sake that so loved it, to renounce its vanities, affections, lusts &c. and removes its fears, despairs, horrors, &c. that the guilt of sin before the remedy was known filled it with? do we think that this washing the souls in the blood of Jesus is without application of the blood to it? Was there ever such a washing heard*

of, in which the *medium* of the washing and the thing washed, were not to each other applyed? Or do we fancy any bodily or material application of the material bloud of Christ that issued out of his side? Sure its nothing but through the Spirits revelation of the death and sufferings of Christ for us, and the hope therein set before us, a cleansing of the heart and conscience from guilt and pollution. And is not that intimated here? Is not the knowledge of *Jesus Christ* Lord and Saviour, to know him as one that dyed for us, and is appointed to be our Mediator and way to God, able and ready to save us by vertue of those his sufferings for us? could there be lesse in that knowledge of Christ that will give a man escape from the worlds pollutions? and when that knowledge doth wash from pollutions, is it not the bloud of Christ therein known that washes? Was not that it that washed Paul from his former conceits in his Pharisaisme and from all his pollutions? *Phil.* 3.7, 8, 9. *Tit.* 3.4, 5, 6. and that washed the believing *Corinths*, *1 Cor.* 6.11. because he names but the knowledge of *Jesus Christ*, and the appearance of Gods love to man, the name of Christ and Spirit of God as the way of his and their washings, shall we say neither he nor they were washed in the bloud of Christ? These are sorry evasions, unmeet to shift off the shining truth with. 3. “*But his last evasion is vainer then any of these, viz. That he might speak of them only {κατὰ δόξαν}, not according “to Truth, but according to appearance; for which he quotes again that formerly answered place of 2 Chron. 28.23. As if the Apostle writing Dogmatically, and laying down Prophetically declarations of things that would be, and aggravating the hainousness of their sinne that should deny Christ, should conjoyn things according to truth not conjungible. If he had spoken of some particular person then in being, there had been somewhat more shew for such an evasion, and yet in truth not enough to make the Apostle couple as incompatible things together in his expressions, as to talk of Christs or his Elects perishing. But much lesse colour when he speaks of things in the Theory and Dogmatically, not with Designation of this or that person. This is but all one as to say, Christ (or God) seemed but to be their Lord and Master, and they to be his servants by way of purchase, and so they had the more ground of denying him, seeing he was not what he seemed to be, nor had done what he seemed to do. And whereas he addes “That its the custome of the “Scripture to ascribe all those things to every one that are in fellowship “of*

“of the Church, which are proper to them only that are true spirituall
 “members of it; as to be Saints, Elect, &c. (Not to examine the truth
 of that again) were it so, yet it could not be of force here; these in
 the very formality of them as the subject spoken of being stiled false
 Teachers. Sure though he might write to All in fellowship with the
 Church (that is in Doctrine and Profession) as Saints &c. as in
 some sense they were truly, yet its not supposeable that he judged
 these he looks upon as departed from the Truth, and false Teachers,
 to be such, or to be bought by Christ, if he thought indeed such
 manner of people were never so bought. To be a member of
 the Church, and to be Elect, are terms very competible, but to be
 (and so to be spoken of) as a false Teacher bringing swift destructi-
 on on himself, and yet in the same view to be looked upon and spo-
 ken of as bought by the Lord, if no such are indeed bought, is *compo-
 nere non componenda*, to couple words and things together that are
 we not competible, like those that talk of Almighty nothings. So
 that wee see no solidity in his exceptions to this place neither.

“Whereas in his winding up he tels us that this will not conclude Vni-
 “versall Redemption, and 2. That those who are so redeemed may pe-
 “rish, is contrary to expresse Scripture, and 3. That this could be no
 “peculiar aggravation of the sin of any, if the matter was common to
 All. These are but prevarications. For 1. We conclude not hence
 the universality of Christs death, but onely that its not so bounded
 up to the Elect onely as Mr. Owen and his partners bound it.
 2. That its contrary to expresse Scripture, as to Rev. 14.4. That any
 so redeemed should perish, is a speech fallacious and untrue. For
 1. How knows he that that in Rev. 14.4. is expresse Scripture and
 speaks according to truth, and not only according to appearance
 more then this? might not we by as good Authority say
 that the Apostle speaks there but according as things seemed
 to him in a vision, but not that all he sayes there is spoken
 according to truth, as he hath to say so of *Peter* here?
 2. What means he by So redeemed? if only that Christ dyed really
 for them, and not in shew only, and that the knowledge hereof, and
 of that salvation that thereby is in him (even for them to look after,
 and attainable to them by Faith) bought them really off from the
 world, and engaged them to Christ, then there is no such passage in
 Rev. 14.4. as that none such can perish. That speaks onely of a cer-
 tain number redeemed from the earth, and men that were virgins
 and

and defiled not themselves, but followed the Lamb where ever he went. But it says not, either that All bought by Christ, and brought to escape the pollutions of the world by the knowledge of him, do keep themselves such unspotted Virgins, and walk constantly after Christ, nor that they shal All be saved. Not a syllable to that purpose. It says those 144000. did keep themselves Virgins pure and chaste to him, and that they overcame and triumphed according to the promises set before the Churches in general. But these false Teachers did not so, but returned back again to their pollutions, and therefore though bought (yea, the rather for that) they should be destroyed. I wonder that men have no more fear of God before them, then to say the Scripture expresses such things as are not expressed in it, and in the mean time tell us, they are but appearances (like seeming dreams) that are expressed. 3. How this is a peculiar aggravation of their sin, may be seen by what is said above, viz. in that it hath more in it then meerly a dying for them, yea, more then is common to every one, especially in the degree of their being bought. As also further, in that all do not so disserve him that bought them, no not all of them that perish, as these that by false doctrine should deny him, and lead many others into the transgression with themselves.

4. The last place is, Heb. 10.29. of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who counts the blood of the Covenanted a common thing, &c. He should have done well to have taken in ver. 26. also. *If we sin willingly after the knowledg of the Truth received, there remains no more sacrifice for sin, &c.* And told us whether such a one as so sins had any sacrifice before his so sinning or not? and so whether they deprived themselves of any benefit they might have otherwise had by Christs Sacrifice. I have asked one or two that question from whom I could never yet get answer to it. But let us view what he says to that other verse. He tells us *"Its an argument to perswade to continuance in the Gospel-Doctrine taken ab incommodo, and that 1. He speaks here onely of professors of the Gospel, and so it cannot be applied to All [thats granted, nor do we so apply it, but to prove that mens perishing for whom Christ died, is a thing that the Apostles supposed, and so that Doctrine that confines Christs Death to them onely that shall be eternally saved, is erroneous] 2. That the Apostle asserts not what is, or may be, but onely adds a commination upon a supposition, (to deter from a thing impossible, he should have said) but if the Apostles speech doth*

doth not imply a possibility for one that is sanctified by the blood of Christ, to count it a common thing, and so to fall into condemnation; yea, if this doth not sometime fall out, how is it that men generally make use of this place to describe the sin against the holy Ghost that is unpardonable? Is there not such a sin as that? or do they take incompatible and impossible expressions to describe it? Certainly, if the description be of impossibilities, and things that never fall out, then the thing defined is of that nature too. Again, will any say that its never found that any man tramples Christ under his feet, that is, despises and scorns him? or that none ever despite the Spirit of Grace? I suppose all will agree that these things (sometimes at least) are committed. And why then shall we think that the expressions of either side are suppositions of things that may be, and sometimes are, and onely think otherwise of this that lies between them, and is as much supposed as either of them? Either let us say they are none of them possible, or else say they are all so, or shew some weighty ground to the contrary. He tells us "*Paul supposed, that if the Marriners left the Ship, Acts 27. they could not be saved, and yet it was not possible that they should not be drowned, because God had told him he had given him all that were in the ship with him.*" But, first, that concludes not this supposition to be of a thing impossible, at least no more then it doth the other too, that before it, and that after it, or then it doth any other supposition in Scripture, it being to another business. Secondly, That saying of God might not hold forth to *Paul* that it was impossible they should any of them be drowned. For *Paul* was not unacquainted that God oftentimes in such speeches intimates a condition. As when he told *David* that *Saul* would come to *Keilah*, and the men of *Keilah* deliver him up, 1 *Sam.* 25.11, 12. and yet neither of them came to pass, because there was intimately, *ver.* 13. this condition in his Answers, *viz.* if *David* staid there. So he told *Ely*, that his house, and the house of his Father should walk before him for ever, yet he after tells him it should not be so, because he had not hearkned to him, 1 *Sam.* 2.30. so he said by *Jonas*, *Yet forty days and Niniveh shall be destroyed*; and yet there being a condition implied in it, they were not destroyed, *Jonah* 3. and 4. So *Paul* knew how to interpret Gods Sayings, that they held forth a certainty of the event upon submission to him, by them to whom they were spoken, in the use of such means as he sets before men, but yet include a possibility

of missing, upon tempting him, or rebelling against him; and so he might well say, Except these men abide in the ship, ye cannot have Gods Promise accomplished, ye cannot be saved. God doth not so promise us an end, thats that to be attained, though we tempt him, and reject the means; as clearly appears by multitudes of the rebellious *Israelites* failing of the promised Canaan. Yea, the words, *I have given to thee all that are in the ship with thee*, might signifie a giving their lives into his hand, so that he using the means propounded of God to him, they should be preserved, but his neglect of them might have been a willing throwing away, or letting go what God had given him. Again, thirdly, the case is different in this, That there *Paul* had a promise of all their lives, but I know no one word that says, none of them that Christ died for, or that are sanctified in any degree by his blood can or shall perish. That they that believe in him, hear his voyce, and follow him, shall not, its confest; but in those speeches there is intimated an abiding, and perseverance, for else its an evident case they would not. But that all that do at any time, in any measure or degree believe, or that at any time hear his voyce, shall alwayes do so, or that they that in any degree are sanctified, shall persevere therein to the end, and cannot neglect Gods Salvation, and by willing neglects fall away, I finde no Scripture that affirms it, but much to the contrary. That he hath for ever perfected by his Sacrifice those that are sanctified, is true, if either we look upon perfection as provided in himself for them, *viz.* that thereby they are so compleatly furnished with all things needful for them, that they need not to turn any whither else for any perfection, he being a fountain of living waters for them: or if we understand it of his former dealings in all times propounded as an encouragement for our abiding in him, he hath for ever perfected his sanctified ones by that one Sacrifice, and therefore we may comfortably attend to him, in and by that, for perfecting us also, nothing being able to keep us from that perfection to be had in, and by it, but our renouncing that that is appointed for our perfection. That many do believe for a time, and turn away again, is affirmed in Scripture, as also that that faith was operative in them to make them rejoyce and spring up as the green corn on the stony ground, yea, to purge them from their former sins, to give them to escape the pollutions of the world through lust, to make them devote themselves to God, &c. which I think is that the Apostle calls their sanctification.

tification. So that, except Mr. *Owen* can produce a Scripture that says, That All that are ever sanctified by the blood of the Covenant, shall not, nor can perish, but shall be eternally saved, his instance is not parallel with this in hand. “*That admonitions and warnings of things that in regard of Gods purpose, shall never come to pass*, are not in vain and fruitless, we grant: it being supposed that such a purpose hath appointed to keep off such an issue by such admonitions & those admonitions and warnings being taken and submitted to by them to they are given. But that ever God so purposed concerning all that at any time or in any degree are sanctified, and that none such ever do, or can reject such warnings and fall away, is the thing in question and to be proved, First, before we can grant that so it is here, and that that strengthens our conception to the contrary beside what is said above, is what the Apostle says *ver. 25.* where he tells us some were in those waies that lead to this back-sliding, with reference to whom he admonishes them the more earnestly and backs this warning with these threatnings.

“3. *He tells us that these made profession of all these things, and that an open renouncing these, deserved such a commination, though the Apostates never had any such true interest in the blood of Christ, &c.* But I answer that their professing such things as they had not, is both a devise of which the Text speaketh nothing, and it comes not up to the case by the Apostle propounded, nor suites with the type to which he alludes; for he alludes to the people in the wilderness that were really delivered from the Egyptian bondage, and had the blood of the Old Covenant sprinkled upon them as really as others, though they made not so good an use of it, nor were perswaded to such stedfastnesse in the Covenant by it; he speaks of such despising the Law as the Law it self declares. Now to match with this such as onely boasted of those things but Christ never did any of them to them, and so that had no such reall ingagement to *Christ* as they had to *Moses*, is unparallel. Beside, the case propounded is thus; what such a one is worthy of that being so sanctified should despise that blood that sanctified him; not what he is worthy of, that never having such an engagement to that blood, but onely boasting himself of it should despise it, so that thats impertinent too.

“4. *He saith, It was the manner of the Saints and Apostles to speak of all baptized persons as sanctified, and so mentions back-sliders as they were esteemed so to be.* To which I answer as before, that that is

to make the Apostles not to write in things Dogmaticall and Doctrinall after an infallible Spirit, but after a fallible judgement of their own and other mens. Besides, the Scriptures say not they so judged of any in their writings that were not so. But suppose they did so, yet after what rule walked they in so doing? He says in *Chap* 1. the rule of charity, to which I answer, that that might perhaps be ground for so speaking of men while they walked in the Doctrine and Profession of the Church; but no ground for so speaking of Apostates as such. Thats not charity, to suppose that a man that doth so trample under foot the Son of God, sin wilfully after the knowledge of the truth, &c. to have ever been sanctified by the blood of Christ, if they that so do never were or could be so; or if those that ever were so, could never do as is here supposed.

5. *“He says if the Text be interpreted positively, and according to the truth of the thing, then these two things follow. 1 Faith, and Sanctification are not the fruits of Election. Ans.* That follows not, but onely this, That then All Faith and Sanctification are not the fruits of such an Election as he speaks of. And thats true enough. For I suppose he will say the faith in them that fell away, compared to the springing up of seed on stony ground, was not the fruit of Election; nor yet that goodness of conscience that some put away, nor that escaping of pollutions that others fell from, all which I look upon as equivalent to this sanctification, and indeed to be the very thing here spoken of. 2. *“That believers may fall finally away,* which I do believe they may, such as we have spoken of, and I think Christ himself implies it too; and all that Mr. Owen can say cannot disprove it.

6. *“He says: Nothing in the Text inforces that these persons spoken of must needs be truly justified and regenerated believers, much lesse, that Christ dyed for them, but onely by strained consequences.* The first part of which is not to our purpose, how far they were believers or how regenerated; but for the latter of them, that Christ dyed for them will inevitably follow, both from that its said There remains no more sacrifice for sin upon such sinning, which to me implies that there was one for them till then; and also in that such are said to have been sanctified by the blood of the Covenant; except he can shew that ever the blood of a sacrifice sanctified any for whom and whose sanctification it was never shed. Whereas he says *“The ancients called Baptisme. {Φότισμος}, & {ἀγίασμος} in*
“which

“which by a solemn aspersion of the symbole of the bloud of Christ, they were externally sanctified & set apart &c. intimating that the Apostle might mean but that too, its too weak. He should tell us how the Apostles use to call things, not how other Ancients; and particularly that the Apostles ever call the outward Baptisme or the Water in it the bloud of Christ, and their Baptisme the being sanctified by that bloud though it was never shed for them; else he says nothing. For the Apostle say’s not, the symbole of the bloud, but the bloud of the Covenant sanctified him. Again he he says “{ἁγιαζω} in *Scripture* “frequently signifies to Consecrate and set apart to Holy use. True, I believe thats always in the signification of it, or its very seldome (if ever) otherwise, and so the bloud of the Covenant is supposed to have sanctified these; but that he calls an appearing, counterfeit sanctitie, sanctification, here I desire his proof for it before I can yeeld it. But his conclusion from all this is most impertinent, viz. “That then no true, real, internal sanctification proper to Gods Elect, is “here intimated. For, 1. The most true, real, speciall sanctification accompanying Election, is a setting them apart to Holy, to most Holy use, and consists more primarily in that then in any thing else, and is resembled by those phrases used of old about the Temple. 2. Who can imagine that we in this Argument endeavour to prove that sanctification here signifies a sanctification proper to the Elect, who endeavour hence to prove that others besides the Elect had the bloud of Christ, not only shed for them, but also in some measure operative in them so as to sanctifie them? and yet we deny that this sanctifying was but a meer externall setting apart to the enjoyment of Ordinances. The Apostle tels us in that parallel place of *Heb.* 6 4, 5. they might taste the good word of God, and of the powers of the world to come, and partake of the Holy Ghost; and *Peter*, that they escaped the pollutions of the world, which is more then a setting apart to Ordinances onely. And let this suffice to this Chapter.

 CHAP. VI.

Some Observations upon, and Replies to his Answers to the 20.

Chapt. of T. M. Universality, &c.

His 6. Chapter hath little in it (though it be very long) but what is answered before; it containing an Answer to the 20. Chap. of *T. M. Book*, Intituled the *Universality of Gods love, &c.* is much of it but a Repetition of things spoken to before (as that Chapter occasioned) with much insulting and accusing Rhetorick against him he answers. Therefore I shall onely take notice of here and there a passage in it, especially those that are not before spoken to, that I may not repeat, nor grow over-tedious. “*In his first page of it, he charges our Doctrine with discrepance from the word, & self-contradiction*, but produces not one place or thing in which his charge is made good; in the mean time we have shewed his not only discrepant from, but point-blank contradictory to the word God, as much as For All, and Not for All, can be contradictory. He tels us p. 4. of this *Cha.* (that is of his book the 261.) “*that they say not that the Scripture in one place restrains what is in another place spoken more largely, as if in some places its said for All men, and in others not for All; but one place expounds another in it; as those places that say, He dyed for his Sheep and Church; &c. declare what that All is for whom he is said to die.* The first part of which is very true, and we have made use of it; the second very false and without all proof. Such a way of Interpreting it is, as did we apply it to any other thing almost, we should evidently destroy the faith. For by the same rule we might say, that the Scripture saith he dyed for his Church and Sheep &c. but when he saith he dyed for the ungodly, the unjust, All men; he declares who are his Church and Sheep, viz. the ungodly, unjust, the enemies of God and in a word, All men. So again the Scripture saith, God made all Nations, and all men, and we believe it; but then when he says he made *Israel*, that is, the Elect of all Nations, who are called the *Israel* of God, he expounds who are the All that he made. So, All that are in their graves shall come forth, that is true and we believe it; but when its said *they that are Christs shall rise at his coming, and them that sleep in Jesus will*

will God bring with him, thats the Interpretation of that All that shall rise So *God is good to All*, *Psa.* 145.9. that is he is good only to *Israel*. *Psal.* 73.1. This is the way of Mr. *Owens* interpreting, which deserves as bad Rhetorick as he can give *T.M.* But I will not retaliate in that kind with him; onely I will reach him back his admonition. "*Oh let not M. Owen be of them that corrupt the word of God.* In the close of the same page he says, "*That our Sanctification is ascribed to Christs Death*, *Heb.* 10.7. I answer, The comers to the Sacrifice (ver. 1, 2.) are sanctified by that sacrifice according to the will of God. Its Gods will that the believer in it be sanctified by it. But if he means that his act of dying sanctifies us before believing (except in that sense that *Peter* speaks of, when he saith *God taught him to call no man unclean or common*, *Act.* 10.28.) then he contradicts his own expressions against the *Socinians*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 8. *pag.* 151. and he goes beside the expression of the Scripture. In page 267. He saith "*He would not have us turn Indefinite propositions into Universals*; and we tell him again, that we would not have particular propositions the measure and Interpreters of Universals: As his Sheep to Interpret All; *T. M.* argument had this intimation in it, that such indefinites as Sinners, Ungodly, are not to be limited by us, where Scripture elsewhere doth not limit them.

He often quarrels with his reasoning and frame of Arguments, where they are as good or better then the greatest part of his own; as in his 4th Argument, he quarrels with him for not bringing in the *Medius terminus* over again in the conclusion; as any that compare his last note upon that Argument, with the Argument it self, may see. And I think thats a great fault in reasoning, and that which he elsewhere faults him for. But I think *P.* or *Passion* blinded his reason; or else God let him fall into that oversight, that he might see that some grains of charity are needful to be afforded to them we deal withall, because we our selves may have the like or greater infirmities then those we reprove in others.

In pag. 270. He says, It was never denied by any that Christ dyed for all. But thats not so, for with those very expressions abundance quarrell; yea, any that reads his Book may find that he himself flatly denies it, without the addition of the word *Men*, above forty times (to speak within compass) But he says the "making All to be All men, and Every man, is our addition; which we have formerly spoken to, and Answered; yea, and shewed that some effects and consequences

of it are expresly said to be to All men. For the challenge he after makes, I have undertaken it here with him, though not in every passage in terminis; but thus, I will maintain that the death of Jesus Christ, had not onely the Elect and them that shall be saved eternally for its object; but was in generall a ransome for All men: and that Christ hath thereby obtained life and salvation in himself, free for all men, or any man to look to him for, and to partake of in believing. In pag. 271, 272. there is a controversie about that in *Ioh.* 1.7. that all men [$\{\delta\iota' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\}$] through him might believe; whether that be spoken of *John* the *Baptist*, or of the Light to which he witnessed. Authors there are of both minds, yet it must be attributed to *M. Mores Sophistry learned from the old Serpent*, to apply it to the Son of God, the light witnessed to. And yet for ought I can see, or he can shew, there is neither danger in so applying it, nor incongruity with the Text. All that he says against it is, That “*we are said to believe* $\{\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\varphi\omega\varsigma\}$, & $\{\epsilon\iota\varsigma\}$, & $\{\epsilon\pi\iota \chi\rho\iota\varsigma\omicron\nu\}$, not $\{\delta\iota' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\}$; in and on him, but not by him, in which he is out; for I can shew him where we are all said to believe $\{\delta\iota' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\}$ viz. 1. *Pet.* 1.21. $\{\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\iota' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\}$ $\{\pi\iota\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\varsigma\}$, that by him to believe in God. So that more of the Old Serpent was in *Mr. Owens* answer, then in *Mr. Moors* Position. Whereas *T.M.* having said that God wills all men to come to the knowledge of the truth, adds, that God will not be wanting in sufficiency of helpfulness to them; if as light comes, they suffer themselves to be wrought upon and to receive it. *M. O.* in pag. 273. all to berates that saying, and tels us “*There is in it of the poyson of the old Serpent, the Pelagian poyson of Free-Will and Popish-Merit of congruity*, with I know not what: as if he thought it spake too well of God, whom they rather make to be an Abaddon, a man-destroyer, as if he made them in hatred, and with intent to ruine them, and therefore is not so gracious to them. But I would *Mr. Owen* would disprove the saying, and shew that God ever denyed sufficiency of helpfulnesse to any one for coming to know the truth of God, that as light was afforded, received it, and submitted to it; or else be more sober then to speak so evilly of things he knows not, and that deserve no evill from him. Free-will, further then God frees it, and Merit of congruity we utterly disclaim, and what he calls the Arminian Universall grace, we well understand not. What good God doth to any, it is of mercy, not of merit: and that he doth more to all, and gives them more liberty of will then they walk up to,

to, I am perswaded, till Mr. Owen refute it. In pag. 275. Whereas T. M. speaks in his Argument of *Will and Power* in the Spirits moving, sufficient to bring men to believe. "Mr. Owen in his Answer, pag. 276. mistaking his expression, talks of the Spirits giving Will and "Power to men to believe: Whence his Query; How a man may have a Will given him to believe, and not believe, is groundless, as to his Discourse, and needs no answering. But he further denies, "That any internal assistance is required to render a man excuseless for "not believing, if he have the object of faith propounded to him, "though of himself he hath neither Power nor Will of himself so to do, "having lost both in Adam. To which I say, 1. Man having power to attend the outward *Mediums* of faith in which the Spirit useth to convey Light, Understanding, Convincement, and to draw men to believe, if he neglect them, he is inexcuseably chargeable with unbelief, though he never had internal Power or Will given him of believing. He that dispises the means that are suited to his power, despises the end propounded in the means, and may be charged for not attaining it; this I believe. And this Answers in part to one grand objection of our opposers; Have men power to believe? We say thats no matter, let them hear, and attend in means afforded, and as God convinces in them, let them confess their follies, and turn in his reprovings according to that ability he gives them, more or less, *Ut supra, cap. 4 lib. 3.2.* That man had Power and Will in *Adam* to believe in Christ, and there lost both, I deny; for there was an incompetibleness with that his innocent condition, and believing in Christ a Mediator, for this implies sin which that estate knew not. Again, it was a vain thing that a man should have Power and Will to that which was not for him in that condition; nay, which he could not come to have need of, but by losing that condition in which he had that power and will, and so the power and will also supposed to be had therein: we use to say, *Deus & natura nihil faciunt frustra.* Mr. Owen must bring some proof for that more then his bare affirmation, before it will pass with us for an Article of our Creed.

"In pag 280. "He undertakes to clear the meaning of Ezek. 18. "23.32. and 33.11. to belong nothing at all to the extent of the ransom (which indeed more directly speak to his willing that all men be saved, and not willing that any perish, but that all come to Repentance; to which purpose, and in some such like cases I have made

use of it: and so more remotely it intimates the ransom, and Christ as Mediator, he being the way by which there is both ground of returning, and an object meet to be returned to, for life propounded to us, and provided for us) But he endeavors to bound this up to the Israelites, “*Only in respect of outward judgements, and to that purpose, 1. He would have us minde who this is spoken of, or to, and says, “doubtless its onely to the house of Israel. Which is fallaciously answered; for, propounding two questions, he answers but to one, and yet passes it, as taking it for granted, that in that one both are answered. He asks of whom, or to whom he speaks: and he answers, doubtlesly he speaks to the house of Israel only, which as its not denied, so is it unsatisfactory too. For the persons spoken of in a Proposition, may be of larger extent then the persons spoken to. As to instance, The Apostle speaking to the believing Ephesians. Chap. 5.3, 4, 5. Bids them flee fornication, wantonness, &c. for saith he, for such things comes the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Shal we say that because he speaks to the believers at Ephesus only, Chap. 1.1. therefore that saying, The wrath of God comes upon the children of disobedience, is true concerning them onely? Or because in 1 Cor. 6.9. he speaks to the believing Corinthians only, or at most, but to believers that call upon the Name of the Lord Jesus, therefore that proposition, No unrighteous person shall inherit the Kingdom of God, extends to them only to whom he speaketh, Ver. 25. So because its said, Hear now O house of Israel, therefore the extent of the Proposition, ver 11. is but this, He delights not in the death of the house of Israel, as Mr. Owen makes it; as if the wicked, and the house of Israel were convertible terms, and equipollent, and of equal latitude. Is not this fallacious arguing? The medium brought to prove a Conclusion is not of greater extent then the Conclusion? or the Minor Proposition must be the measure of the Majors quantity? as if because going to prove a lye to be avoided, the Minor is but this, A lye is a sin, therefore the Major, viz. that sin is to be avoided, extends no further then to the sin of lying. Who knows not, that its usuall with the Prophets and Apostles from indefinite and universal propositions of truth, to infer particular instructions and reprehensions? &c. As from this, God gives liberally to All, to infer, If any of you want wisdom, ask it of God, Jam. 1.5. The man is blessed that trusts in God, therefore taste ye, and see how good he is, Psal. 34.8. And such is the Prophets way here. The people despair because of Gods judgments*

ments

ments threatned, or repine at his chastisements. God indefinitely by his Prophet lays open his good-will towards men, and thence exhorts them to take heart to seek and turn to him. Thus, God delights not in the death of the wicked, but that they rather turn and live, therefore not in your death, therefore turn and live; that that is Gods way in general, may make for your instruction and encouragement in particular. Now 2. “*Whereas he asks what will, that is, that God wills not the death of the wicked in.* I answer, as before, his Will of welpleasedness, as the word {פָּנָה} signifies. Its not desirable or approveable, that wicked men go on in sinful ways and dye, but rather turn and live. And this may be true even of those that have not such express commands and Revelations of his minde as others. God would not have them smother what truth they have, but glorifie him according to what they know of him, and be thankful, & seek him, as *Rom.* 1.18, 19.21. *Act.* 17.26, 27. 3. He tells “us, *We miserably mistake the meaning of the Prophet, because he speaks but about temporal judgements upon their land,* &c. I answer, That he speaks about them is true; but that he speaks but about them, and that the word (*death*) holds forth there no more but temporal death, and the word (*live*) but a natural earthly life and prosperity, as if he might have pleasure in their eternal death, though not in their temporal, and as if he delighted not to give them eternal life upon their repentance, or, as if the Proposition is but true of the outward, because applied to comfort them, in that also these things, I say, are untrue, and I deny them. Did the putting away their evils, and turning to God, and making them new hearts, respect only their avoiding temporal judgements, and living in outward happiness, when the Scripture often tells us, That it pleases God many times to confer outward happiness upon, and keep off temporal judgments from those that never think of turning, but live in all wickedness. See *Psal.* 73.1, 3, 4, 5, 6. *Jer.* 12.1. *Job* 20.7, 8.9, 13. Surely from Gods not delighting in the death of sinners any way, may be argued, that he desires not their destruction from this life; as from Gods wrath coming upon the children of disobedience, that then the believers disobeying should be sorely chastened, and yet sore chastisements here, not be all thats contained in the word *wrath*, as affirmed to come on the children of disobedience; these are frothy arguments, and not beseeming Mr. *Owen*. Its more frothy to limit an indefinite Proposition to some few particulars, where no-

thing inforces it, as to draw from thence a Conclusion general. Nay, indefinite propositions are most usually of general signification (as might easily be shewed) in the Scriptures: but I leave that to the observation of the Readers. Only minding them, that this is by the Apostles Paul & Peter affirmed in the general, as in 1 *Tim.* 2.4. 2 *Pet.* 3 9. So that Mr. Owen here hath said nothing to purpose. He says (p. 283.) “*That the ends of the earth, Isa. 45.22. are they that look up to God.* A strange Collection, he might as well say [from *Isai.* 55.7, 8. *Let the wicked forsake his ways*] That the wicked are they that forsake their ways and turn to God. If the persons exhorted are always the performers of what they are exhorted to, that would be wonderfull. And yet he says that his glosse is beyond denyall; and again, “*That onely Elect and Believers are there,* and in *Isai.* 49.6. clearly intimated. I marvell by what Argument he can demonstrate it, that we may not deny it: Sure his *ipse Dico* is not enough for it, and yet thats all he brings to prove it.

He tells us p. 287. “*That its most certain that the Lord Jesus sends not his servants with a lye, to offer that to all that belongs but to some, and asks what is thence concluded.* I answer, That M. O. is in an error then, in saying, The Death of Christ is onely for the Elect; For if the Lord Christ sent not his Servants to offer that to All, that belongs only to a few, and yet he sent the Gospel with the Contents thereof to be offered to All, then it follows, that that that is therein offered pertains not onely to some few. For otherwise he grants, they that so offer it are sent with a lye. That its offered to All, he grants partly here, and partly in *Chap.* 1. where he said “*The Gospel is to be preached to All Nations, and hath a right to be preached to every creature.* Therefore unlesse they that are to Preach it should preach a lye, the Contents of it pertain not onely to some, but to All. “*Quod erat probandum.* Whereas he says, “*We are to prove that Christ dyed for All, aswell them that never heard the Gospel, as for them that do.* I Answer, That pertains not to us; but to believe what Christ by his servants hath delivered to us; that he dyed for All and every one, and is the Propitiation for the sins of the whole world: which is proof and ground enough for our believing that he dyed for them also, the phrases being sufficiently comprehensive. If any will bring in that limitation to the Apostles expression, they must shew us just warrant for so doing. Its enough to us to believe the generality and Universality of it, that the Scrip-
ture

never excludeth any from it, but in generall Universall phrases affirmeth it.

*“In pag. 288. he speaks as if T. M. affirmed that we are bound to “pray for every singular man that he may be saved, and supposed that “there is nothing else that we are to pray for men, but that they may be saved by Christ. Which (to give the mildest language) are more mistakes of him; for as he affirmed neither of them in his proof to which M.O. Answers, as any that read it may see; so it suffices that we pray for all in generall, that God would reveal the knowledge of his truth unto them, and spread abroad his Gospel amongst them, and afford them such testimonies of his goodness as may lead them to Repentance; and for what other things may concern their welfare here, the lesse is no whit excluded by praying for the greater. Though indeed I know no warrant we have in all the Scripture to pray God to save eternally (that is, to give the privileges proper to believers, to) them that have not yet believed. How “Act. 8.22, 24. proves it false, that an assurance of Christ dying for men in particular, is not our ground of praying for them (as M.O. says) I am yet to learn, except he can prove that Peter was not assured that Christ dyed for Simon Magus, which he that extracts out of that place must be somewhat more skilfull in Chymestry then I am. Whereas pag. 290. he says, “we turn the “most intense and incomparable love of God towards his Elect, into “a common desire, wishing, and affection of his Nature, opposite to his “Nature, and fayling of its end. Its a great mistake as to us at least, and to the party he there opposeth. We grant Gods love as intense and incomparable to his Elect, as he by any Scripture proof can make it, and far more incomparable then here he imputes to us. Whereas he says that in Tit. 2.11, 12. “is not a common love, he begs that Assertion: for the words are the grace of God {ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις}, saving to All men hath appeared. And if saving to All men, be not common, I know not what expression can argue it common. And yet that then “it must save All men in eternall life [as he implies “this grace doth All them to whom it is extended] is in my view as as great an inconsequence as that; If the Lords mighty power was a saving power to all the *Isralites* out of *Egypt*, then it must certainly save them all, all the way into *Canaan*. “That the {φιλάνθρωπία} too spoken of Tit. 3.5. was such as that the believers therein and therethrough “received the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost*

is granted; but that therefore, All that were comprehended in it do, and shall receive them, is another inconsequence, not yet proved, no more then *Caleb* and *Joshuahs* being by the power of God and his presence with them in the Cloud, the Manna, &c. prevailed with to believe, and so were preserved and brought into *Canaan*, would enforce that all that he put forth his power toward, and vouchsafed his presence among, and gave his Manna to, and the Pillar of a Cloud to lead them &c. they were so prevailed with to beleive, and brought into *Canaan* also. *Hujus modi inconsequentis illius scaturit liber.*

P. 292. He faults *T. M.* for rendring “*they love darkness rather than light*, to be a choosing darkness rather than light, which is a meer trifle, for he that loves one thing rather than another, prefers that thing and choseth it before the other. And whereas he adds, “*that there is no comparison instituted between their loving light and loving darknesse, as if they had loved both, but one more then the other*; that nothing overthrows his saying. For where one thing is loved, and not another, there is choice also as well as when two things are loved one above another. And yet his denyall of their loving both is not true in all men that love darknesse. Many a man loves the truth in many things, and approves it, that yet loves his lusts more, and so prefers them before it; as those that (*Joh. 12.42.*) *Loved the praise of men more then the praise of God.* There is no question but they honored & desired the praise of God, but yet so, as that to have it they would not loose the praise of men. So *Herod* revered *Iohn*, and bare good will to him, but yet preferred his *Herodias* before him. But whereas from that phrase *Ioh. 3.19.* *T. M.* inferred, surely there was light for them; *M.O.* trifles again about that, and says, “*He durst not say that it was the counsel of God that they should receive it.* To which I say, Sure it was his counsell to them to receive it, and they rejected the counsel of God against themselves, *Luk. 7.30. Pro. 1.23, 25, 29, 30.* Indeed what he counsels or purposes to do himself, or cause to be done, that shall stand, and so much that in *Isa. 46.10.* saith, But what he counsels us to do, is not always done by us, though onely in his counsels obeyed there is standing safety for us. But by [for them there was light] its evident *T.M.* meant it was presented to them, as that that they had right to look upon and receive, yea, ought of duty to have received; And not onely it was a common stock, as light in the Sun for blind men, as *M.O.*

M.O. speaketh, for these men see the light and something in it that crossed them in their purposes and designs, else would they not have hated it. Blind men take not delight in one colour more then in another, seeing they discern no difference, whereas there, and in *p.* 293. he says that these places of *Ioh.* 2.8. *Mat.* 16.26. *Rom.* 2.5. *Hos.* 13.9. make nothing against his position, nor for the extent of Christs Death, he is much mistaken, or will not acknowledge what is presented to him. He says, *Jonas* 2.8. tells us that they that “*for-sake God, forfeit their mercies temporall and spiritual, which they had before received.*” But can any man be said to receive a reall mercy from God, who have nothing from him but in hatred, & with a tendency to aggravate their misery, as is necessarily implied by *M.O.* opinion, which tells us that God hated many from eternity, whom Christ dyed not for, and yet will judge them the more severely for the abuse of every thing they have, though given in that hatred. Count you that a mercy, to choak men with Gold, or to hang wedges of it about their necks, and throw them into the Sea to drown them? have they any Spirituall mercies from God for whom Christ dyed not, and did he so in his opinion for Idolators and Back-slayers from God? Besides, he speaks not out all the truth; for men not onely through observing lying vanities forsake what they have, but much that they might have had, as is plain, *Psal.* 81.14, 15. *Luk.* 19.41. *there are things pertaining to their peace,* that they miss off; and how could they had any such things, if Christ never dyed for them, or was not Mediator for them? If it be said that our Saviour speaks thus of outward peace and mercies; besides that thats too scanty an exposition, seeing Christ preached the Kingdome of God to them, its no sufficient evasion: God usually punishing men with deprivation of temporal mercies, for neglecting eternall, *Mat.* 22.7. *Psal.* 2.10, 11, 12. He says *Rom.* 2.5. *speaks of the Gentiles, who had the works of God to teach them, and the Patience of God to wait upon them, yet made bad use of both,* which is too slender an Answer to the place. Could he not finde it in the Text that they led them to repentance? and can he shew us any ground of Repentance and change of mind, for any man that hath no cause in and from God for it, nothing better to be enjoyed by them in and with God, then what he sets his mind upon already? or that any have any such favours afforded them, as lead to Repentance, with whom God deals according to the sentence pronounced upon All in *Adam*;
and

and for whom Christ never came to procure any such things for them: or that Christ procured such things for any for whom he did not interpose himself between the Sentence of Death and them? Sure these things deserve a little more consideration then he affords them. Besides that, they make against his exposition of 2 *Pet.* 3.9. where he would tie up Gods willing men to come to Repentance, to the Elect only; for here he speaks of Gods goodness and patience, leading such to Repent, as treasure up wrath to themselves by occasion of Gods goodness to them. [175] Sure he will not tell us they are the Elect onely too. He makes little of those expressions in which men are said to *lose their own souls*, but onely as if therein was intimated, “*That they make the losse of them sure to themselves*; then it seems it was not sure enough to them in *Adams* sinning; and why not? Sure *Adam* lost us All sure enough: If *Christ* did nothing for recovering them, they are lost sure enough, without any mans doing any more to loose them. But perhaps he means that they make it evident to themselves that Christ did nothing for them, and so that they remain lost by *Adam*. Sure this is a new way of exposition; and before it pass for currant, he must prove, that to lose or save in Scripture signifies onely to make it evident that a thing was lost or saved before-hand, or that we are said to lose by doing this or that, that that was lost out of our power before we did that. As that if a Corporation have forfeited their Charter, and it was taken from them an hundred years ago, so that now they have none, yet they that are now of it do forfeit and lose it by so doing something that they should not; let him shew us that the Scripture speaks in that language, and we shall listen to his evasion. His after Collection from *T. M.* is spoken to before, its but his own misunderstanding of him, and so are all his Inferences drawne from it.

For his Argument from Gods expostulations, *pag.* 296. it is to shew that God wils them to be saved, and delights not in their destruction, which opposes *M. Owens* Interpretation of 1 *Tim.* 2.4. and by consequent intimates Christs interposing himself between God and them, there being no salvation to be had for any but in him, and those expostulations being with others then the Elect, about looking and listning to him, &c. What there is in God we cannot tell, but as the only begotten Son hath revealed to us, and that is indeed, that there is in him no imperfection. But that he desires not those
mens

[175] Mat. 6.26.
Mark 8.
36.

salvation that miss of, it he hath no where told us that I know of: but often the contrary, and yet that may be in him without imperfection. We are no competent Judges by our narrow conceptions of his perfections. There is that in and with him that seems foolishness to our wisdom, and weakness in our judgements, that yet is wiser and stronger then we can conceive of, *1 Cor.* 1.22, 23, 24. Its sauciness in us to prescribe rules to Gods wisdom and perfection, and rashnesse to say what is or is not in God, but as Christ hath revealed to us. *Obedience is better then Sacrifice*, and a simple belief of his words, better then our wisest reasonings against them. In *pag.* 298, 299. There is some difference about judging All men by the Gospel. Indeed it should be said according to the Gospel, the difference is grounded on the divers understanding of that phrase, *Rom.* 2.16. They take it that this Truth, *That all shall be Judged*, is according to the Gospel. We understand it also that Christ in judging shall proceed according to the Gospel. Not that we mean that they had heard not the Gospel shall be judged for rejecting, or not believing what they heard not; but that they shall be judged onely for and by what they had given them, and they received or abused; but that Christ in judging, by, and for those things, shall not go according to the Law of Creation, requiring them to have done according to that that was given them in *Adam*, and so according to the strict rule of that first Obligation; but only as in rejecting Light and Truth given them, or accepting it, they have sinned against, [176] or submitted to God dealing with them, in and by the Mediator, the Word of God, by whose interposition of himself between God and them, their lives, liberties, mercies, and all the light they had since the Fall, was derived to them, *Joh.* 1.9. and so according to the Gospel that relates Christ to have died for them, and to be Lord over all thereby. And that such shall be his proceeding in Judgment, I am the rather perswaded by that of Christ himself, in *Matth* 25. 31.46. &c. where declaring the maner of his Judging All Nations; he tells us his Rewards, and punishments shall be given according to mens carriages of themselves towards him in such *Mediums* as he appeared in to them. He Judges men to life, as feeding and cloathing Him; to death, as not doing such and such things to him. Which he makes out to be an equal sentence, though many shall reply, that they never see or knew him, as an object to be so or so acted toward by them. He mentions nothing there to be charged upon them as

[176] *Rom.* 1.
18, 19, 20,
21.

acted by Adam, or by them, but with reference to himself, which deserves also some consideration. Whereas in page 299. “*He tells us of Totus mundus ex toto mundo, a whole world out of the whole world*; That he says without book, I mean, without Gods Book (speaking of the world as it now is) having borrowed it from *Prosper*, or at highest from *Austin*. But we desire not to prefer the Traditions and Documents of the Elders (though they might be in many things worthy men in their times) so highly as for them to juggle out, or by them to Interpret Apostolical Doctrine: or by them to teach men their fear towards God, as was of old, and yet is too common a fashion. Philosophical Speculations, and the Elders Traditions, are used as pillars in Gods building, and many lean more upon them, then on the pillars of Gods own erecting, setting up their posts and pillars by his, and slighting his for them, which we approve not. Lastly,

“*Whereas he says, The common faith, is the faith of Gods Elect*. I easily grant it, and say, That the Apostle in *Tit. 1.1, 4.* in both places means, *The faith delivered to the Saints*, the Doctrine of Faith (as its no unusual thing for him to do) which is the faith of Gods Elect, because its that which they believe and hold forth to others, even to the world; and its the common faith, because as its believed by them All, so its common to the world in point of right to be preached to them, and imbraced by them. Its that that contains good news for, and matter to be believed by All. But I have done with these his prevarications, with which he Answers *T. Moors* twentieth Chapter. I have passed over many of them, the whole being a heap of mistakes, and disdainful jerks, anwhat seems to be of any weight, is already fully answered.

CHAP. VII.

A view of, and Reply to Mr. Owens Answers to some other pretended Sophisms (as he calls them) against his Doctrine.

IN his last Chapter he pretends to Answer some usual *Sophisms*, and captious Arguments of the *Arminians*, which he stiles *empty Flourishes* yet remaining. As first, this Argument.

That which every one is bound to believe is true. [Argum.] But every one is bound to believe that Christ died for him; Therefore that Christ died for every one is true. An Argument, which for my part I own not

not in this form, as to All, and every man in the world, it being not preached to every one, that Christ died and is risen. And I conceive that God requires not an explicit faith of propositions, that they have no Revelations of giving them ground to believe. But thus I own it, against their restrictive doctrine of tying Christs Death to the Elect onely, *viz.* That which of every one to whom the Gospel is preached, is required as necessarily to be believed, that he might come to believe on Christ for salvation, that is, for every such man true in it self. But that Christ died for him in particular is required to be believed of every one to whom the Gospel is preached as necessary for his believing in Christ for salvation. Therefore for every one to whom the Gospel is preached: That is true.

The *Major* leans upon this truth, That he that is required to do, or believe any thing, is therein required to do or believe all those things that are necessary thereto, so as that without his doing or believing of them, he cannot do or believe those other things required of him. The *Minor* we shall speak to by and, when I have examined some things that he saith to the *Minor* of the Argument as mentioned by him. As

“1. He saith “*The believing that Christ dyed for a man, is the saving application of Christ to the soul, as held out in the promise.* In which he mistakes, for its onely a believing Christ to have so satisfied for his sin by his death, and to have such fulness of Redemption in him for him, that he may hopefully go to him for remission and salvation, there is good ground for him so to do, and its his sin if he having opened such a way for him to God and to salvation, he should neglect it. But for the promises, they belong only to those that through this belief of the grace of God, [177] are drawn actually to trust in Christ and love him; whence they are called the things prepared for them that love God, and that trust in him before the sons of men; and for the confirmation of these men in the expectation of those promises, the belief of Christs death for them is further usefull. The Death of Christ was for sinners, enemies, the ungodly, All men: but the promises of God in Christ, and so the Kingdome, are not the portion of any such; but men are made heires of them through believing, *Ioh.* 1.12. *Gal.* 3 26.29. *Tit.* 3.6, 7. so that here is a very fundamentall mistake as to the question in hand in this very saying.

[177] *Gal.* 3.22.

2. He says “*To believe that Christ dyed for any, must be with reference*

“ference to the purpose of God the Father, and intention of Jesus Christ
 “himself, and that that is it which with regard to any Universality
 “is opposed by him. Which words I well apprehend not his meaning
 in. If he mean by Reference to Gods purpose and Christs inten-
 tion; according as God purposed and Christ intended for them,
 or that God purposed and Christ intended that he should dye for
 them; so we indeed mean by that phrase. But if by it he means
 that God and Christ purposed in so doing eternally to save him;
 we so mean not that every man is bound to believe of Christs death
 for him: But that such was Gods purpose and intention in Christs
 dying for him, that if he believe in him and in God through him,
 he shall undoubtedly be saved, *Ioh. 3.16*. And yet we put no If unto
 Gods purpose, which as secret concerns not our Faith (for as *Luther*
 well says, *De Deo abscondito nulla est fides, cognitio, &c.* But we put
 that If, into the way of mens participation of that salvation as God
 hath revealed it. Besides to tell us how he opposes the Universality
 of Christs death, when he hath almost done opposing it, was not done
 (no though he had exprest himself more clearly in it) very learnedly.

He says, “*The term Every one, must relate to All men in the*
 “*like condition; which we grant it may. And that like condi-*
 “*tion (in my stating it here) is not only as sinners, unregenerate &c.*
 “*but also as the Gospell coming to them and reporting good news*
 “*to them in Christ, requires obedience of Faith of them, that they*
 “*may be puld out of that sinfull estate. Something he sayes to the*
 “*Major too, viz. “That that every one is bound to beleive, is neither in*
 “*“it self true nor false, but good; which to me is a Paradox; good*
 “*being not the Object of Faith but of appetite, desire and love.*
 “*Truth is the Object of Faith, chiefly of that that is divine and requi-*
 “*red by God; for men may believe, and in some cases ought to be-*
 “*lieve that, that in it self holds forth evill to them: as men are bound*
 “*to believe that they are sinners, though its good that they should*
 “*believe so, yet its not a good thing that they are bound to believe*
 “*therein, their being sinners is not a good thing.*

But now to the Minor, not only as in the first place mentioned by
 himself, but also in a manner as owned by me. He denies that eve-
 ry one thats called to by the Gospel Preached, is bound to believe
 in particular that Christ dyed for him. To make good which deny
 all; he sayes.

“*1 That no man is bound to believe that thats false: but that he*
 “*died*

“dyled for every man is false, and he hath proved it so before. This is Petitio Principii, and contrary to the Scripture. He is no competent Judge in his own cause, and any that reads my Answers may see his proofs have all failed.

*“2. Then (he says) men should be bound to believe immediately that “that is not revealed; though Divine Revelation be the Object of “all Faith. I deny this consequence from the Minor either as laid down by me, or stated by him in the second way. And whereas he says, “That the Scriptures do not hold out any where that Christ died “for this or that particular, as such, but indefinitely as sinners; specified “of times antecedently by Gods purpose, and consequently by their owne “purchased obedience. To the first of these passages, I say, that the Scriptures holding out an Universall proposition, of truth, are, though not immediately, yet mediately the Object of Divine Faith to any one particular for himself thats included in the generall. As when its said, All have sinned; To believe thence that I have sinned, is a Faith closing with and springing from that that is revealed, though not immediately in the expression, yet by undeniable intimation and consequence; And so in the case of the Resurrection and Judgement, in closing with this divine Revelation, that all shall rise and be judged, I necessarily upon the same divine Revelation believe that I shal rise and be judged also; Yea, unlesse I believe for my self, I do not believe the Divine Revelation as concerning All. So is the case here, God having revealed that Christ dyled for every one, and all men &c. In believing that Divine Truth, I believe that he hath done so for me; for that Divine Revelation includeth me as a man and one of the world. And if it be not so, I deny that any particular mans Faith in that particular can be proved to be grounded on the the word of God, or that he hath any right to believe on the Mediator, or that there is a Mediator for him. To the latter passage about the Scriptures, holding it forth only for sinners indefinitely, often so and so specified, I answer, 1. “Thats untrue, Its held out also for the world universally; 1 *Ioh.* 2.2. and for men generally, 1 *Tim.* 2.4, 6. *Heb.* 2.9. Again, “2 He contradicts himself, for if Scriptures specifie those Sinners for whom Christ dyled, to be such or such, then it holds not out his Death for sinners indefinitely. Scripture holds forth nothing in any place, but as it agrees with the truth of other places, and indefinitely and boundedly, are contradictions when spoken of the same subject; Sinners unlimitedly ($\{\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\}$) and*

limitedly ($\{\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\varsigma\acute{\omega}\varsigma\}$) are incompetent expressions. 3. I deny that the [*Objectum totale*] the full Object of the Death of Christ is any where specified, either by the purpose of God to save them eternally, or the consequent obedience found in them, which denyall we have managed throughout this discourse.

“3. *He saith, The purpose of God and his intention, is not propounded as the Object of the Faith of any*, but only his commands, promises and threatnings: the latter clause of which is not full enough; for neither are his commands properly the Object of Faith but of Obedience, nor are those things mentioned the onely object of Faith, sure his Declarations may have a share therein too. 2. His purpose and intention that he should die for this or that man, is necessarily involved in the object of Faith propounding that he died for All men. But his purpose or intention of bringing this or that man absolutely to eternal life, is not revealed as the object of Faith to any not united to Christ by Faith, and the inhabitation of the Spirit: But thats beyond our question, not intended at all in the Argument, as either way produced; and so its impertinently here mentioned by Mr. Owen. In this also is answered his fourth Exception, *viz. “That “no command in Scripture to believe, is to be measured by Gods purpose and intention.* His fifth onely answering to the *Minor*, as disowned by me, I have nothing to say to it. But then he says, “*That “the not owning the Argument as in the first way propounded, makes it “useless as to the cause defended.* To which I answer, That for Christs dying for every man in the world, we have more divine proofs then that can come to; but as altered into the second form, it proves that Tenent untrue, that Christ died onely for Gods Elect, and them that shall for ever be saved, against which I own it. Besides, this being granted, it will follow, That the Gospel being proposeable to All the world, and that obedience of Faith also requireable thereupon of All, there is the same truth in the matter of the Gospel concerning Christs Death for them all also, it being otherwise not proposeable, nor the obedience of Faith requirable of them. His answer to this, “*That its no safe disputing of what should or would “be, if things were not as God hath appointed them,* satisfies not. For as 1. We need not such disputings, were men contented to be so far fools as to believe Doctrines as God propounds them. And 2 As such suppositive Conclusions may be as strong and undeniable upon such supposed principles, as positive conclusions frô positive premises,

yea,

yea, and may illustrate positive truths too, at lest they are as lawful for us to use, as for them that oppose us. So 3. This is not onely suppositive but positive, that the Gospel is predicable to All, and therefore the commission runs to preach it to All, and I say its in this positive truth implied, that the truth therein declared (as true before mens faith) is true for All, for otherwise there would not be in it a predicability unto All, and ground for requiring Belief and Obedience of All (we have opportunity, and that we might preach it unto) upon such preaching it. But he excepts, *“That if the Gospel were preached to All the world, and All in the world, yet this is all the will of God, that could in general be signified by it to them, viz. That he that believes shall be saved, and he that believes not shall be damned, and so that God hath concatenated these two together, Faith and Salvation.* Which that its untrue, we have shewed before in Chap. 1. The Gospel declares good will to All, That God would have all men saved and come to know the truth, &c. *ut supra.* It argues mens wisdom have too much blinded them from seeing into, or understanding the Gospel, when they finde nothing in it for sinners, and men in general, but that they that believe shall be saved, and can shew them no good reason that any of them have to believe in God, more then the Law can shew that says, he that doth thus and thus shall live. For ought that they can tell them God hath from Eternity hated them, and there is no way to salvation made for them. Surely thats not so much as what he further points to, *That there is no name under heaven whereby they may be saved, but that of Jesus,* for that intimates that by that Name they may. But to this I have spoken sufficiently before.

*“To what he says about the not believing Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ and their need of him, that its a soul-condemning infidelity of such obstinate refusers to come in upon the Call of the Gospel; and not a refusing to believe that Christ died for every one of them in particular; I have answered also before; and say here further, That each of them are condemning. The last, because there is not a believing of the Testimony of God, that he bears of his Son, and so not a receiving the love of the Truth, the love that the Truth witnesseth, and so not a leaning upon his Mediation, nor an approaching to God thereby. For how should he come to God by his Mediation, that refuseth to believe that he died for him in particular, and so that his Mediation for him? “The Jews (sayes he) were charged
“with*

“*with infidelity for not believing Christ to be their Messiah.* And truly by Mr. Owens Doctrine he was not so. For how was he for them, if he was a Mediator for none but the Elect, seeing they persisted in unbelief and rebellion? Sure mens not believing their need of a Mediator, or that Jesus is He, proves not that they are not chargeable with not believing Christ to have died for them, no more then others not believing themselves to be sinners, proves that they are not chargeable with not believing in Christ. The object of Faith, I trow, is not to be measured by mens acts of Faith, but their acts ought to come up to that thats in the object.

But beyond all these, he hath somewhat more to the *Minor, viz.* “*That they to whom the Gospel is preached, are bound to believe with that faith which is required to justification onely.* I will not stand upon that word onely, I am content that he grants, They are bound to believe with that Faith; but then he assumes, “*That that is not a full perswasion that Christ died for any one in particular.* Here I except against the word *full perswasion*, as being a *Quartus terminus*, which is not fit for a Disputant to put into a Syllogism. Nor is it to the purpose, that it is not justifying Faith; its enough to this business if it be necessary to a justifying faith (according to the Revelation of the Gospel since his Ascension) to believe and be perswaded that Christ died for him in particular, though his perswasion be not full; [178] and that I say is necessary. For to believe to justification, is to believe on God through Christ, or in the blood of Christ, and that is from that that Christ as Mediator hath done and is further authorized to doe, to be perswaded to rest on God for salvation by him. Which I deny that any man can rightly come to, except he believe that that which God hath done in Christ, and that which Christ hath done as Mediator between God and man, was done also for him. I can Divinely gather no boldness from the blood or sufferings of Christ to approach the Holies, and look to God to save me, further then by a Divine Faith that leans upon Gods testimony I am perswaded that those sufferings of Christ concerned me, and were for me. But let us see how M.O. goes on in this business, and that is thus; He says, “*there is an order naturall in it self, and established by Gods appointment in the things that are to be believed, so that till some of them are believed, the rest are not required. As a man is not commanded (nor can be reasonably) to get to the top of the Ladder, by skipping all the lower rounds.* But what makes

[178] Rom. 3.25

makes this to prove the business in hand. 1. This shews that a man cannot come to believe with a justifying Faith, (the thing *ex confesso* required of them to whom the Gospel is preached) except he orderly believe those things that lead unto it, of which I contend, That this is one, to believe that God hath provided him Christ to be his Mediator, and that he hath died for him, and so that he hath good ground to believe in him, and rely on God through him; and so it makes for what I say; but it proves not that every step in that order are not required of every one to whom the Gospel is preached, that so he may come to that that is principally required, viz. To justifying Faith. His comparison is not worth a Rush to that purpose. For though I would not rationally bid a man climb up into a chamber by a ladder, and skip all the rounds save the highest, yet I may rationally bid him climb up to it, and go by all the rounds, and so by the highest, and I trow, his not going up one step will not excuse him for not going all, even up the highest too. He that commands me to believe with a justifying faith, surely commands me therein to go by every step that tends to it, and to believe all thats absolutely requisite for believing with that faith. 2. He here speaks against his main Concession, viz. That men that hear the Gospel are bound to believe with a justifying faith. For here he says in substance, That thats not required till they have first believed the truths that lead to it, and so Gods Commands shall be bounded by mans obedience. If any man to whom the Gospel is preached, shall deny to believe that there is such a one as Christ, that man is not required of God to believe in Christ, for its irrational to require him to believe in him, till he hath first obeyed him in believing the other. I suppose any man that understands reason, will rather think that Mr. Owen had not the exercise of reason about him when he here talked of irrationality: the first proof of his Argument contradicting his Argument. For the Argument saith, That they to whom the Gospel is preached are bound to believe with a justifying faith, and the proof says it is irrational that they should be required to that, till they believe that there is an object of faith To say nothing that the believing Christ to have died for a man, is not the highest step to that faith, as he supposeth. But after this he sets down his order, viz.

“1. That men are to repent and believe the Gospel to be the Word of God, to contain his Will, and that Jesus Christ therein revealed is the power and wisdom of God to salvation. 2. That there is an inseparable

“connexion between faith and salvation. 3. That there be a conviction by
 “the spirit of a necessity of a Redeemer to their souls in particular, where-
 “by they become weary, heavy laden, and burdened. 4. A serious full re-
 “cumbency, and resting the soul upon Christ in the promise of the Gospel,
 “as an Alsufficient Saviour, able to deliver and save to the utmost
 “them that come to God by him, Ready, able, and willing, through the
 “preciousness of his blood, and sufficiency of his ransom, to save every soul
 “that shall freely give up themselves to him for that end amongst whom
 “he is resolved to be one. Now (says he) in doing all this there is none
 “called on by the Gospel, once to inquire after the purpose and intention
 “of God concerning the particular object of the death of Christ, every
 “one being fully assured that his Death shall be profitable to them that
 “believe in him, and obey him: but after all this, and not before, it
 “lies upon a believer to assure his soul of the good will, and eternal love
 “of God to him, to send his Son to dye for him in particular. I might
 here return him his own words with admiration, Oh what a pre-
 posterous course is this, and how differing from the right way of the
 Gospel! 1. I would know what is that Gospel that men in the first
 place are to believe to be true: Is it onely that Jesus Christ is the
 power and wisdom of God to salvation, and the connexion of faith
 and salvation? That we have shewed before to be untrue. The
 Word of God it self tells us, that the Gospel used to tell men of
 Christs being sent of God, to turn them in particular from their
 sins, and to lay down that as the ground of Repentance, and be-
 lieving on him, [179] *Acts 3.26. And that God would have all to be saved,*
and come to the knowledge of the truth, for there is one God, and one
Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave him-
self a ransom for All; and can a man believe that to be true, and not
 believe that he gave himself a ransom for him? Is he no body? So
 that what he says in this first step, overthrows him. But 2. See the
 preposterousness of these men, that that the Apostle writ about the
 High-Priesthood of Christ to the believers as peculiarly useful for
 them, to lead them up to perfection in their faith and confidence, viz.
 [That Christ hath the office of an unchangeable Priesthood, & is able
 to save to the utmost all that come to God by him, because he ever
 liveth to make intercession for them] that is here produced as the
 ground to draw in unbelievers, though the intercession there mentio-
 ned is not affirmed there for any, as, & while yet unbelievers: and on
 the other hand, that which the Apostle tells us, was the Testimony,
 whereof

[179] 1 Tim. 2,
 4.6. And
 the Apo-
 stle says ex-
 presly, that
 that was
 the Testi-
 mony, or
 Gospel
 that God
 ordained
 and sent
 him to
 preach.
 ver. 7.

whereof God had made him a Minister & an Apostle to preach to the *Gentiles* that were ignorant of God (as that before repeated) that is not to be preached as true for any ones particular, and as so to be believed by him till they are made believers. Who would think that wise men should go so preposterous a way? but that its the judgement of God for their leaning to their own wisdom, and no more then is fore-propheesied, that God will destroy the wisdom of the wise, &c. 3. He impertinently mixes the object of faith with the operations of that object attended to and believed, as conviction by the Spirit of their need of a Redeemer, and recumbency in him with the truths of God that lead to that convincement, and reliance on him. The Argument is about the object of faith needful to be believed by all that hear the Gospel, that they may believe to justification. And he tells us of an order in the operations of God upon mens spirits, before they believe as they should do. And yet he minds not that the convincement of the great sin of unbelief is not kindly effected, till men see they have ground of believing, and yet believe not; till when the heart rather thinks it is sin and presumption to believe. But when it sees that Christ hath done so much for it, then it must needs be convinced that it sins greatly, in not betrusting it self wholly to him. 4. He confounds the object of faith about the Mediation of Christ, and the object of his Death, with the secret Purpose and Counsel of God about our particular right to, and injoyment of eternal salvation. 5. He talks of rolling the soul upon Christ in a Promise, whenas he cannot prove that any can have him in a Promise to be rolled on, further then he is supposed first to have dyed for him, the Promises being sealed in his blood, and the way of closing with them is believing in his blood; which how should men do while its wholly doubtful to them, whether they have any thing to do with his blood or nor? Indeed. 6. He supposes that a soul is brought to believe in God, and to trust in his mercie through Christ, before it know of any love in God toward it; whereas he uses to draw with the cords of love, and testimonies of his goodness. Its goodness seen in him leads us to repentance; Its not only a letting sinners see a need of a Saviour, & that there is one able to save them that go to God by him, that will suffice to draw in a man that yet cannot see him as a way for him to go to God by (as he is not for any otherwise then he hath died for them, *Heb.* 10.19, 20.) to rowl himself upon God for salvation. Never yet could any

sinner that indeed was convinced to be so, and to be under wrath, and that saw Gods Justice and Anger against him, hope in, and expect help from God by Christ, not being first perswaded that Christ had done so much for him, that he might have salvation through him. Many men may delude themselves, and take their own self-actings for acts of Grace, as the Pharisee did, *Luke* 18.10, 11. and from their endeavors, and self reformations, seem to commit themselves to God, and conclude themselves to be believers, that yet never knew what it is rightly to believe. The true Gospel-believers believe through Grace, [180] as they *Acts* 18.27. That is by the grace and goodwill of God declared to them in the Gospel. The grace of God appearing to them, teaches them to live godlily, and saves them from their former disobedient condition. *Tit.* 2.11, 12. and 3.4, 5. They do no, *per* {ὅς ἐρον πρότερον} (as the Pharisee) argue Gods grace towards them by their frames towards him, that God loved them first, because they (as they conceive) love him, but on the contrary, they therefore love him because he first loved them, and sent his Son for them. Believing Gods Testimony of what Christ hath done for them, they are helped through the power of God to believe in him, and cast themselves upon God for further saving. So the Apostles were led, *Rom.* 5.10. and not from believing on him, to argue that Christ died for them. So that this notwithstanding that Mr. *Owen* hath said, I yet stand to my former Argument, and shall not need to put it into the following frame in his Book, into which he puts it.

[181] *Concl.* 1. By this that is already said, [181] his following Conclusions appear clearly to be some of them untrue, some impertinent. *viz.* “1. That “all called by the Word; in what state or condition soever they continue, “are not bound to believe that Christ died for them by name, but such “as are so and so qualified. [Answ.] To which I oppose, and have shewed, That All called by the Word, in that state in which they are when called, and as its required of them to believe the Gospel, and to believe in Christ for salvation, are therein also necessarily required to believe, that God appointed Christ to be a Mediator for them, and that he hath died for them, and so is a fit medium for them to come unto God, and to believe in him by.

[182] *Concl.* 2. [Concl. 2] “2. That the Precept of believing with fiduciary confidence that “Christ dyed for him, [182] is not proposed, nor is not obligatory to all that is “called, nor the not performance of it any otherwise a sin but as it is in “the

“the root and habit of unbelief and not turning unto God for mercy. To that I answer. [*Answ.*] That the Precept of believing with fiduciary confidence, is proposed to all that are called by the word according to the Gospel (yea this *M.O.* granted before, inasmuch as it is justifying Faith) and so its obligatory to them all. And to that end (as it thereto necessarily conduceth) to believe that Christ dyed for them; the not believing which, is a giving God the lye, it being contained in the record given of his Son; which (contrary to his fift and sixt Conclusions) is too, that there is one Mediator between God and men, who gave himself a ransom for all men: and not onely that he that hath him hath life; but also first, that God hath given us eternall life, and that life is in his Son. See that expresly affirmed to be part of the Record of God, which the unbeliever makes God a lyer in not believing, 1 *Joh.* 5.10, 11, 12. And whether Mr. *Owen* hath dealt faithfully, or fraudulently with the Word of God, in leaving out the first part of that Record (as once before he left out, *God hath given us eternal life*) running into that fault, which more groundlesly he called the trick of the old Serpent in *T. M.* and put the name of an Impostor upon him for, I leave it to the Reader to judge. As for his

“3. *That no Reprobate for whom Christ died not, shall be condemned* [*Concl. 3*]
“for not believing that Christ died for him. It shall be granted him, when he hath proved what he here begs, viz. That there is any such Reprobate, for whom as faln in *Adam*, Christ never died. His

“4. *That the command of believing in Christ given to All, is not* [*Concl. 4*]
“in that particular obligatory unto any, but upon the fulfilling the con-
“dition thereto required; is sufficiently spoken to. It, with all conditions, or necessary conducements thereto are required of all those to whom the Word is preached. Amongst which necessities, the believing Christs Death to be for them, we have shewed to be one. Therefore I shall say no more here to it, but view what he says to a second Argument, viz.

That Doctrine that fills the mind of men with fears and scruples, whether they ought to believe or no, when God cals them to it, cannot be agreeable to the Gospell: But such is the Doctrine of the Particularity of Redemption, &c. To which he tels us. 1. [*Argu. 2*]
“That doubts and scruples, may either rise from a doctrine it self in
“its own nature, giving cause thereto, to those who perform their duty

S s 3

“rightly;

“rightly; or from corruption and unbelief, setting up it self against the truth of Christ. I answer, It’s corruption and unbelief, setting up it self against the truth of Christ in the Gospell, that makes men hold forth the Particularity of Christs Death as being undergone only for the Elect, and the Doctrine it self gives occasions and causes of scruple to men, in this, that men seeing their sinfulness, and looking upon God, but according to what this doctrine presents of him to them, they are wholly uncertain whether the Mediator was sent for them or not, and so whether God be an object of faith fit for them. 2. He tels us that obiection supposeth, “*That a man is bound to believe, that Jesus Christ dyed by the appointment of God for him in particular, before he believe in Christ Jesus; and that men that are of that perswasion of the restraint of the Death of Christ to the Elect, may scruple whether they ought to believe or not, which he says, is to involve our selves into a plain contradiction; for according to Scripture, for a man to be perswaded, that Christ dyed for him in particular, is the highest improvement of faith, including a sense of the spirituall love of God shed abroad into our hearts; the top of the Apostles consolation, Rom. 8.34. and the bottome of his joyfull assurance, Gal. 2.20. so that we require that a man do believe before he do believe and (suppose) that he cannot believe, and shall exceedingly fear whether he ought to do so, except he believe before he believe.* To this I answer, That for a man to be perswaded that Christ dyed for him, is no where made the highest improvement of faith: but only that faith by the belief of this hath been improved (and so may be) to highest pitches: the soul that perceives, see and mindes the love of God, therethrough commended, so as to be drawn to God thereby, abiding therein may grow up to great assurance therein; and find matter of exceeding great nourishment unto eternall life: But it follows not, that because from that believers have sprung up to such assurance of eternall life, as in the greatest tryals and temptations to trust in him for it, and make their boast of God (which is the highest improvement of faith) That the bare believing that Christ dyed for them, is the faith of full assurance. Some of the Israelites from beholding the great power and goodness of God to them, in delivering them out of *Egypt*, and bringing them over the red Sea, &c. were led to follow God with a full heart, and to be silled with a full perswasion that they should be brought into *Canaan* and possess it; but it followed not thence, that the belief or know-

knowledge that God so delivered them, was the faith of full assurance of entering into *Canaan*, by all that knew that they were thence delivered. So *Paul* was lead with confidence to trust in God for future deliverance, by this, that he had delivered him; and yet its not ever true, that he that believes that God delivered him from one danger, is confident he will from another; much less That that belief in all that so believe (yea or in any) is the confidence that he will deliver from another. 2. Whereas he askes if it include not a sense of the spirituall love of Christ; I answer, That where the Death and Resurrection of Christ are opened to the heart by the Holy Ghost, there the love of God is shed abroad into the heart also; but not wherever this proposition is believed, *viz.* Christ dyed for me: many a man believes that, and yet seeth not into the glory of it, nor the depth of goodness held forth in it, and so hath not the love of God therethrough shed into his heart; yet the minding God in this, is the way to meet with the holy Ghosts displaying that love. Many Israelites believed that God brought them out of Egypt, [183] that had not such a view of his power and love therein (or at least, like them that forget that they were purged from their old sins, forgot what they had seen) as to be lead to confidence in God for the future by it. 3. Whereas he says, "*By this a man must believe before he believe*"; What strange thing is that with reference to diverse acts of believing? did not he himself say, that we must have a faith of reliance and recumbence in Christ, and before that too believe many truths of the Gospell before we can believe that Christ dyed for us? so that there is believing before believing, and believing before believing again, and yet he counts that absurd in us, when we say only, we must believe the word of God to be true, before we can by it be led to believe in God; we must believe Gods goodwill to us-ward, and a medium provided for us by whom to go to God, before we can be perswaded to go to him by faith, whom otherwise we look upon as angry and dreadfull, ready to consume us. We cannot put our confidence in his blood, and there through rise up to assurance of eternall life, except we first be perswaded that he shed his blood for us; So long as we doubt whether he be a Mediator for us or no, and whether he hath given himself to ransome us from death, we shall doubt whether God will accept us or no, or whether he hare us from eternity or not, and whether we have any thing to do to take encouragement from the blood of Christ to approach him, because we

[183] 2 Pet. 1.9.

we know not we have any right unto it. Nor can Master Owen, nor all the world beside to help him, make it appear to be otherwise, but that the soul will question whether it may expect salvation from God, or betrust it self with God, so long as it knows not but he hates it, and Christ hath never done any thing with him for it.

3. He denies, "*That a perswasion, that it was Gods will that "Christ should dy for him in particular, neither is, nor can be necessary "that a sinner be drawn to believe, because other grounds will do it without.* The consequence of this, is, that many things were spoken unnecessarily by the Apostles, [184] as when Peter says, Christ was sent to turn every one of them from their iniquities. And Paul that the grace of God reconciling the world, [185] was to them, Corinthians, to perswade them to be reconciled. That he preached to the Corinths in the first place, that Christ dyed for our sins, 1 *Cor.* 15.2, 3. And so all those generall phrases that include mens particulars; But let us see what other grounds he gives, viz. "*That it is the duty of sinners, "as such, to believe, Math.* 11.28. *Isa.* 55.1. To believe, in what? in the blood of Christ, as *Rom.* 3.25? Then it supposes it shed for them all, and so its a truth according to the Gospell-declaration: but denying the extent of his Death, how can he make it out, that sinners as such ([*] which reaches to All sinners) ought to believe in Christ? What have sinners, if not Elect, to do with Christ? besides, he had said before, they must be sinners so and so convinced and qualified, before they are to be called upon to believe in Christ. And I fear he will upon second thoughts say, that those Scriptures hold forth, that sinners, not as such, but as so qualified with thirsting after Christ and being weary, &c. are there required to believe; but many a soul is hereby put upon doubting, whether it be Elected, or so convinced and thirsty, &c. as is required, and so whether God be not an enemy to it from eternity, and so whether it hath cause of trusting in him. 2. The command of God, *John* 3.23. That shews it to be its duty, if it could be proved to extend to it, for that says, That we believe in his name, and a soul may more justly doubt whether that *We* reach to it, seeing they that deny the extent of Christs Death and teach it to doubt of it, use such applicatives as *We* to oppose an Universality, and to signify but the Elect and Church, &c. This therefore yet leaves the soul to doubt whether it may hope in him for salvation, especially being told that these things God sends to

men

[184] Act. 3.26.

[185] 2 Cor. 5.
19, 20. &
6.1.

* *A quatenus ad omnem valet consequentia.*

men indefinitely, that the Elect onely might be brought to him; he hath no goodwill to any other, and that its Elect it knows not, commands to believe while men are taught to doubt whether the object to be believed in (as such) pertains to them, can give no more security from doubting, then the building with one hand and pulling down with another secures the building from falling.

3. "*The threats against unbelief.* That indeed doth as much as the threat for not keeping the Law, fills the soul with terror on every side, while it hears that God commands more to believe then have cause so to do, and threatens them for not believing, and yet gives them nothing to induce them to it; no evidence of his goodwill to them to draw them to believe: this may fill them with hard thoughts of God, representing him to them like one that bids another eat, or else he will kill him, but yet gives him no meat to feed on, no evidence of his goodness that may induce him to hope and trust in him.

4. "*The alsufficiency of the blood of Christ to save all believers.* This may make the soul say; O how happy are they that do believe, and that have his blood to drink, for its able to save them, but as for me I know not whether it belong to me or not, or whether one drop of it was shed for me, and so how I can lean upon it: I hear its not sufficient to save any that it was not shed for, not for want of inward worth in it, but because its not for them, and I may be one of them for ought I know.

4.5. "*The promise of life upon believing, and the assured salvation of all believers without exception.* These two are of the same nature with the former; only the soul hath this to except. Its not every believer, for many fall away in time of temptation, having no root in them, as my faith cannot have if I know not that Christ dyed for me, and so grow not upon Gods love therein evidenced to me. The soul cannot so believe as to love God (and so but with a dead faith) unless it believe his love first. It may see all its endeavors to believe, and to rest on God, to be but fleshly strivings out of self principles, and at the best it argues Gods love but from its own believing, which it may justly question, the heart being deceitfull, and he a fool that trusts for it for evidencing his condition. This is but a promise and an assurance of thriving to all that eat duely of a meat, which it knows not whether it may or can duely eat or not; for to eat the flesh, and drink the blood of Christ, and so to believe on them; is

when the soul beholding the love of God and Christ in his Death and sacrifice commended to it, doth gather boldness and encouragement to love and cast it self upon God, and so grows up into the full assurance of peculiar love to him, even to eternall life; without the knowledge of love to the soul first, it can but at highest come to this: It may be I am one that God loves, and perhaps not; well, I will leave thinking about it, and tying my self with thoughts (if I can) and let it alone, I must submit when all is done to be disposed to Heaven or Hell by him; which indeed is a condition most sit and needfull for the Gospell to be preached to, but is far from faith in God which works by Love, and is justifying. These things, The call to believe, the command, threatning, promise, &c. are good evidences that the ransome is given and accepted for All, and there is good provision in Christ for them (God never using to call men to any ordinance that he appointed not for them) and coming with this they may incourage thee to believe on, and love him that gave his Son for thee to believe on. And this (implied by them) is that declaration, that good tidings to sinners, that indeed draws them into believe through the spirits working in them, or else if they turn their backs upon it, renders them throughly guilty; when they shall say in their hearts, O, what did God for me! and what cause had I to believe, and to have stayed upon him, but I refused it! As the *Israelites in Egypt* were indeed sinners, for not believing when God had done so much for them to ingage them to it. His conclusion then under this head is false, viz. “*That those are enough to remove all doubts, and fears, much less (which I would rather urge against it) are they sufficient to incourage and imbolden the heart and frame it to believe; but more especially is that false that follows in him viz. “That those are All that the Scripture holds out to that purpose. It holds out others, as we have noted from Acts 3.26. & 13 37. 1 Tim. 2.4, 5, 6. but of this he can take no notice, they are nothing for his purpose. I could give him back here some of his own expressions, as that in pag. 283. “That if pride and error had not taken too much possession of mens minds, they could not so far deny what they reade in plain texts of Scripture (as if they had never seen them) to maintain their corrupt and false opinions. But he answers further.*

4. “*That that perswasion which asserts the certainty of the Death of Christ to All believers, and, 2. That affirms the command of God,*
and

“and call of Christ to be infallibly declarative of that duty which is required of the person commanded and called, which if it be performed will be assuredly acceptable to God. 3. That holds out purchased, free grace, to all distressed, burthened consciences whatsoever, and 4. Discovers a fountain of blood alsufficient to purge all the sin of every man in the World that will use the appointed means for coming unto it; that doctrine cannot possibly be the cause of any doubt or scruple in the hearts of convinced burthened sinners, whether they ought to believe or no. I answer, that this is in a manner the same with the former, and there answered. I will adde this touching the second particular, that its ambiguous, whether by the person called, he mean, by man in the preaching of the Gospell, or by God effectually, for many are of that mind that God calls not nor holds forth Gospell to all that the Ministers declare it to, but only to the Elect; & if he be of that mind too, its not so undoubtedly true to the hearer as he would make it, that God requires what the Minister doth, because they may be divided; the command and call may be intended only to some, that the hearer knows not whether he be one of or not, though the Preacher out of ignorance direct it to all; and this may beget much doubting in the hearer whether its Gods voice to or him no. Again he supposeth more in this Doctrine he pleads for in two last particulars, then is in it; as that it holds forth purchased free grace to all distressed burthened consciences; there are many among the Heathen have their consciences accusing them, yea & sometimes like furies burthening them; there are many that profess Christ, conscious of heinous sins, and are ready to despaire, and make away themselves for them; there are many burthened that they can no more walk up to the righteousness, and labor to stablish righteousness to themselves, and cannot be settled. Will Master Owen say that their doctrine holds forth purchased free grace to all these? that I deny, for it says he purchased free grace only for the Elect: and that all such are Elected, I suppose he will be put to it to prove; seeing many such go on in their sins notwithstanding their burthens, and many seek to put them off, and sometimes do stifle them by worldly employments and vanities, and many actually despair, and make away themselves. If he say he means not such, the matter is where it was, the distressed conscience may yet doubt (and is apt so to do) whether it may not be one of those in the issue. As for that in the fourth, that there is an alsufficiency in the blood of Christ for all

that will use the appointed means, &c. I will not stand to tell him (though I might) that his speech here is like one of them that in us he uses to tax with-holding Free-will, which seeing he declaims against, I hope he will be so charitable as to allow us the like liberty of speaking, without fastening upon us that *Odium*. But I say, (to pass that) I fear he will be put to it again to prove this also by his doctrine, seeing many are willing to run to Ordinances, and do any thing to have ease, and comfort, and yet afterward forget that they were purged from their old sins, and having escaped the pollutions of the world, and walked in the means appointed for a while, afterward imbrace the present world, and fall off again, which their doctrine intimates, they must do, and will, if not elected, or else never meet with any thing of God to purpose, though they should continue attending the means to the last gasp. I fear he will not say Christ had any Free grace for these; and yet all weary, heavy laden sinners, one and other Christ calls to him, yea, and the fools and scorners too, the wicked, unrighteous, and who not? to listen to his Doctrine for salvation. So that these are but fair flourishes, that being looked into, wind up onely in this, Though ye be never so much troubled and weary, and never so diligent now in the use of means, yet forasmuch as your Election is unknown to us, we cannot say that there is any thing purchased by Christ for you, or that the blood of Christ is sufficient to purge you, because we yet know not whether it was shed for you; whatever inward worth it hath in it, yet it being shed onely for the Elect, he may not be able to save you by it, nor unless ye be elected will all your use of means profit you, if you should continue in them. And so all depends yet (even its future use of means too) upon that hidden purpose; and till that be known, whether there be any cause for it to rely on Christ, and love him, and God in him, he knoweth not; so that all these answers avail him nothing; therefore he doth well to leave his answering, and fall to querrying, *viz.*

“What that is, that according to our perswasion, men are bound to believe when they first know that Christ died for them? I answer, They are to believe, that Christ is their lawful Lord, and able to save them, and that they ought to live to him, also that God is good and loving to them (which is not a thing known before-hand, (as he says) but in and through the knowing Christ to have died for them, as the Cause, though it be before the Effect, yet in ordins

cognos-

cognoscendi, it may be through, and in order of nature after the knowledg of the effect) which also the Spirit will there through be now glorifying, and presenting to the soul, (they attending the doctrine of Christ, and following him therein) till it raise them up to full assurance, as it did the Apostles Yea, upon the knowing of the death of Christ for them, its to believe that God delights not in their death, but is ready, in and through Christ to save them; and will do it, they (as they herein see good ground, and as also they are by the Gospel that declares it obliged to do) waiting on him, and trusting in him. Now whereas he says, *That they cannot, there being no fruits of his Death but what are common to All, which may be Damnation as well as Salvation.* Thats very untrue. 1. Damnation is not the fruit of his Death, but of mens abusing the mercies they have by his Death, and their refusing to listen to him, and look to him for salvation. 2. The fruits of his Death in them, and to them that come to him, are washing, purging, sanctifying, giving in remission, peace, joy, spirit, and life everlasting. So that, that is either an ignorant mistake, or a wilful slander; and yet, as its true, that some men may so abuse the Doctrine of Christs Death for them, or so disserve him, that his Death for them may be an aggravation of their punishment and misery, so in that sense. As the fruit of Gods Presence with the *Israelites* that led them out of *Egypt* into the Wilderness, was to them that believed (as they all had reason to have done) protection, and guidance into *Canaan*, and possessing them thereof; but to others that (causlesly) rebelled (through their own folly) destruction: So is Christ, and the Gospel of Christ, a Saviour of life to life in them that receive, but of death to death in them that reject him. So that, as he answered impertinently, and inconcludently for himself before, so he answers untruly, and irrationally here for us. But I leave that also.

From this he comes to tell us, *“That there are two things that both perswasions pretend to, the exaltation of Gods free Grace, and the Merit of Christ.* To the first of these he plays the Rhetorician, more then either Logician, or Divine. *“He asks what that free grace is.* And I answer, This, That God hath given his Son to die for All, and through him tenders salvation freely in the Gospel to All, Whoever will, let him come, he is ready to receive him, rejecting or reprobating none from it to destruction, but for their rejecting his Truth and goodness made known to them. His *Queries*,

“Whether it stand in Election, effectual Vocation, Justification, Sanctification, Redemption in the blood of Christ, (If by Redemption in Christs blood, he means the actual setting their spirits at liberty from sin and corruption, and from the power of Satans delusions, to worship and live to God (effected by the sprinkling of his blood upon them, *Heb.* 9.13, 14) as is there intended, *Rev.* 5.9.) miss the cushion. Though Free Grace standeth in all these things, which we maintain as well as they, yet the extent of it, we say not standeth in them, but in giving his Elect (one in whom his Election and purposes all are) to the death for All, and setting him up as a medium, to whom coming, any of them may (and in coming shall) finde Justification, Sanctification, Redemption, and what ever follows. which the Gospel holds forth freely to All, as ready in him for them, and to be dispensed by him to them upon believing, which so held forth is the medium also of his effectual calling. Whereas he asks, “*If it be not universally a figment of our own brains, or a new name for the old Idol, Freewill.*” I answer, That it is not the first, the authority of Gods Word acquits us, which we dare not for all the Sophisms he hath brought against it, renounce, to cleave to that *onely Elect*, which he, and the *Elders* traditions have created, and to which they bow the knew of their faith, more then to Gods Word. And if no device of our own, then no new name. For that Idol of Freewill, which we no more adore, if so much as they, who substracting the declaration of Gods good Will to men as pertaining to them (the *medium* appointed by him for his power to work in to uninthrall men, and impower them to believe) do yet call upon men to believe and get Christ, as if they had power of themselves to get him, and to believe on him, thundring damnation upon them that believe not, though they say God never gave any power to them, setting men upon an endeavouring by their own power, and approving their such endeavors, as the products of Gods Grace (as the Pharisee did *Luke* 18.10, 11.) though they have not declared that to them, as pertaining to them. We attribute no more to Will then the Scripture affords. Its meerly with our expressions suitable to the Scriptures that they quarrel at. As when we say, God would have done this or that, but they would not; they will not come to Christ for life; they did not chuse the fear of the Lord. These kinde of expressions, many when they hear from us (as if they were so wholly taught the Fear of God by the Precepts of men, or were so destitute

destitute of the fear of the Lord as not to minde whose expressions those have been) by and by they cry out; What have men free-will then? You set up Freewill now: as if the expressions of our Lord and Saviour were judged dangerous and hereticall by them, and not fit for his servants scarce to mention; but these are of those {ἄτιμοι} of whom *Paul* speakes, from whom we have need to pray God to deliver us. We know no power or freedom of will that men have to good, that God hath not given them. And we think it less derogation to his grace, and more agreeable to the Scriptures, to say, that God in his workings with men, gives them liberty and power to make use of, and listen to the means of light and life afforded them, and that when he in those means works and convinces, moves at and strives with their hearts, he gives them (in those strivings and convincements) power and liberty, to see and minde, and acknowledge what they could not do before, and in such acknowledgement yet to attend the means and grope further after him, if perhaps he may (when he hath unraveled them of themselves) inable them to believe; and that they wink with the eye, refuse and reject the means put within their reach and suited to their infirmity; or if they do attend them, yet that when they meet with reproof and conviction, they refuse to see or take notice of what God shews them, and to hear the inward voices of spirit that speak to them, rebell against the light, and pull away the shoulder, quenching, smothering, and imprisoning the operations of Gods Spirit and truth, and that for these things he justly rejects them: then to say that God doth nothing for men, gives no power to them, requires all that they had in Adam (for which the Scripture affords them not one title of proof) cals upon them to do things to which he gives no power or means, and yet condemns them for ever not for doing them, and yet such are M. Owens expressions: as when he says, “*We make God to propound life upon such a condition as he knows they cannot perform without him, and yet in it, he will do nothing for them, he will not give them it.* Which is a great mistake for want of believing the truth of God recorded: for when he bids men listen to him, and their souls shall life, if some refuse to listen, and others when convincements come tending to the saving them out of their sinfull condition, willingly turn from them and will not abide them, nor fall down under them, and so not listen to his inward convictions of them, but run away from him that would not be

be wanting in their further listening to him to quicken them up to believe, and so to gather them; shall we slander God, and say now, because these never come to that believing, that he would not bestow upon them that condition? he knows that they cannot believe of themselves, and he will give them no faith. Because they cannot believe of themselves, followes it therefore that they receive no power from him by which they might attend upon the means in which he uses to beget faith, and give it to men? shall he be said to deny them faith, when they refuse to listen to him that would gather them to the faith? says not he himself that he would have gathered *Jerusalems* children, and they would not? was not this gathering them, a bringing them by faith into himself (as the Chickens under the Hens wings) for safety? was not their refusall in not soberly attending to him, but shutting their ears against his sayings? shall we say he refused to give that that he chides them for refusing to receive? Come forth the best of you all, and prove that God hath not given you in his workings upon you, power to have sought him and attended to him better then ye have done, and then I will say your reasoning for the wicked is good, that he set salvation before them upon a condition that they could not have without his gift, and yet he refused to give it them, otherwise his after-comparison [in which he says, "*We make God like a man tendring a blind man a thousand pounds, if he will open his eyes which he cannot*"] is but an inept one, for God complains of men for shutting their eyes, and otherwhere bids them but look with their blind eye-holes, that they might see his word that he sends giving light to them that attend upon it, being never so blind. But enough to these Rhetoricall Flourishes, and Rabshekah like language against the glorious grace of God, and Scripture-truth, for which I am perswaded one way or other, serius aut citius, God will rebuke him. What he says about the Gentiles, is before answered, Where he gives less he lookes for less again; obedience to his truth being acceptable to him, and rebellion against him detestable, whether in more or less; nor will it be an excuse to them that they had no more, when they have voluntarily put away and rejected that more that God sent them, I mean the Gospell, or imprisoned and abused that less they had. And yet I am perswaded, many of them shall rise up in judgement with their lesse, against many amongst us that have more, he lets them know and perceive more then they acknowledg, and gives them
more

more of his goodness and kindness then they answer, so that when he pleads with them they shall have no excuse, *Romans* 1.18, 19, 20, 21.

That our Doctrine everts the whole Covenant of distinguishing grace, is another untruth; we hold and prove that the Death of Christ seals and ratifies it, and we think the free grace of God freely made it, and powerfully puls men into it as he pleases; holding it forth to men largely, and ready to enter into it any that will hear him, *Isa.* 55.2, 3, 4 Whereas he asks, “*Did that ever do good to any as to salvation which is common to all?*” he speaks as one despising the riches of the bounty of God that leads men to repentance, because of their wickedness that are not lead by it, teaching others also wickedly to blaspheme it. The Gospell thats common to good and bad, doth good to many, being the power of God to salvation to them that believe. The Death of Christ, yea and the patience of God thats common to all, is effectuell for good to salvation to many, and shall be to any that are led to repentance by it. ★ He asks further, “*If they be not the two properties of the grace of God, that it be Discriminating and effectuell.*” He should have proved rather then have moved questions only, We say it is both effectuell in all that receive it rightly, and Discriminates them both in priviledge and disposition from all those that reject it, and so doth this thats extended in Christ to All men. Besides the grace of God in the Death of Christ discriminates men from fallen Angels its {Φιλανθρωπια} not {Φιλαγγελία}. If he say all they for whom it is, and to whom it is extended in any degree, are made to receive it effectually to life eternall, we waite for his proof for it; but surely *Paul* intimates otherwise, 2 *Cor.* 6.1. These that follow are slanders, viz. “*That we make the bestowing of Faith no part of free grace, or at least leave room to free-will to have the best share in the work of salvation, even of believing it self,*” which is as untrue or more, then that *Naaman* had the best share in the work of his healing, because he washed in the river *Jordan*; or the blind man, *Joh* 9. in his receiving his eye-sight, because he went at Christs bidding to the pool of *Siloam*, and washed there; would that be good Doctrine, that Because upon the doing those triviall things God gave them healing, therefore not God and Christ, but themselves were to have the greatest share in the glory of it? *Apaga* has impietates calumniosissimas, of which nature is that too that follows, “*That this Assertion brings Roprobates to be*

★ The grace of God that is {σωτήριος πασιν ἀνθρώπος}, to all men saving, teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live godlily, righteously and soberly, &c. 1 it. 2.11, 12.

“the object of free grace, and denies the free grace of God to the Elect, “makes it Universall to all, but ineffectuall to the Elect, all to have a “share in it, and none to be saved by it; which are all as gross untruths against us, as he could have invented.

But then he askes, “*In what point their Doctrine makes it not free “grace?* I answer, in that ye debar the greatest numbers of any liberty and possibility of coming to partake of it, ye make it not free to or for all, but bound it up to some few. We know in some regard ye make it free, that is, in point of any merit of it in them to whom yee say it is, but not free for any to come to, and hope in, as pertaining to them (nay for none so without much forced one by them to evidence that it belongeth to them) but he says, “*He calcs “not that grace that goes to hell?* No sure, nor we neither, nor is that goodness or patience that goes to hell, or Gospell that goes to hell; but I hope we may say, they that having free grace extended, and held forth to them, not receiving it, or receiving it in vain, or turning it into wantonness, may go to Hell, as well as they that abuse Gods goodness, patience, Gospell, and yet none of these things abused go to hell; [188] except in a sense to the disordered dismal conditions of men, to bring them from the nethermost hell in that sense, as David sometime speaketh, *Psal.* 86.13. & 6.3. I can but wonder that wise men should be so infatuated as to think there is any weight in such their sorry expressions: but for not enlarging it to all he says, “*Is it in their power to enlarge it?* No Sir, not further then it is, but its in your power surely to let it alone to have its own bounds that God hath given it, and so to speak largelyer of it then you do. “We know *he will have mercy on whom he will have mercy*, in point of more abundant striving with men and compelling them, and in receiving whom he pleases (even the worst of sinners coming to him) and hardens and gives over whom he will, and we know too by the same authority that he is good to all, and free for all to look to, would have all to be saved and come to know the truth, delights not in the Death of the wicked, but rather that he should turn and live, and that Christ hath given himself a ransome for all. Lets not have the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, neither with respect of persons nor of places of Scripture, either let us believe all or reject all. He says further, “*Should he throw the childrens bread to Dogs?* Nor Sir. nor yet be wiser and holier then God, to shun his words out of pretense of service to him, nor call that common that God hath cleansed, esteem any as Dogs but such as turn again, and bite against

[188] So Psal.
139, 8.
Jonas 2.3.

against the favours shewed them, and are scornors of the mercies tendred them, or deceitfull workers that bark against Gods truths, and are ready to bite too if power be given them, otherwise take heed that you deny not free grace to ungodly and sinners under opinion that they are Dogs to whom mercy is not to be tendred. He saith further, *“that they believe that the grace of God, works faith in all to whom its extended.* Yes, I believe that they are readier to believe their own conceptions, for which they have no Scripture proof, yea against diverse intimations of Scripture, then the plain Scripture-expressions. For the New Covenant here again mentioned by him, I have before expressed my self about it, I believe righter then that he can disprove it. *“What follows are generally revilings of the truth of God, & despising the grace extended to All as not worthy mens thanking God for it; a grace that doth no good, a sigment of our own making, &c. only he tels us he will pray for us that we may have infinitely more of his love then is contained in effectual Universal Grace and indeavor to keep people from being seduced by us.* For the first, We tell him its his unbelief of it makes it seeme ineffectual to him, [189] but to such as believe it we we find it effectual both towards God and others, and prove it an open doore and way for our approaching to him for those more especiall things that all through unbelief receive not. For the second, I pray God shew him and his companions in doctrine how much they stand in peoples light to hinder them from seeing that goodness by which they should be saved. But what need he indeavor to keep me from being seduced, Seeing he thinks it impossible for any that Christ dyed for, to be seduced, and all the rest must perish? to to what end will he busy himself to prevent impossibilities? or about them that God hath hated from eternity?

[189] Tit. 2.11,
12. & 3.4,
5.

What follows about Christs merit, are but Rhetoricall disparagements of the grace of God as Universall, in which he frequently puts the ly, or brat of our own brain, or some such like language upon Gods and his Apostles declarations, for such are these, That Christ dyed for All, and is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, &c. To which we shall give no other Answer (they being not Arguments but frothy flourishes) but remembring him that brought no railing accusations, refer it to the Lord to rebuke Sathan the adversary of Gods free-grace and goodness. He appllands afterward his own opinion, and casts dust upon the truth, representing his own in these four following propositions.

1. *“That Christ dyed only for the Elect.*
2. *That all those for whom Christ dyed are eternally saved.*
3. *That Christ purchased all saving grace from them (he means for All, & that so, as to be effectually made over to All for whom he dyed.*
4. *Christ sends the means and reveals the wayes of life to all those*
“for whom he died, I suppose he means in the declaration of
the Gospell to them in this their life time.

If M. Owen can prove any one of these to be true from Scripture (for in all this his book he hath failed of it) then I will be bound to give up the cause to him, and say that he hath done more then all his brethren could yet attaine to.

The Assertions he lays down as ours, are diverse of them meer slanders; as that we say, 1. Most of them for whom Christ dyed are damned, which is more then we know or dare determine, not knowing what a numerous increase there may be of believers in the last Ages of Christs reigne, nor being able fully to comprehend those sayings, 1 *Pet.* 3.19. & 4.6. 2. That he purchased not any saving grace for them that he dyed for. 3. That he ratified and sealed not any Covenant of grace with any federates. 4. Hath no intention to redeem his Church, &c. as if he had learned to practise that evill principle, *Calumniare andacter, hæerebit aliquid.*

His last disquisition is about Gospel-consolation, Whether perswasion gives the most? before wch he propounds some considerations, as

1. *“That all true Evangelicall consolation belongs only to believers:* but I think this at first dash is unsound; for I hope poor sad souls, that sit in distress, and through the sight of their sins dare not believe (nay prehaps are in despaire) have nothing in the Gospell to comfort them, and induce them to believe.

2. *“That to make out consolation to them to whom it is not due, is as*
“great a crime as to withhold it from them to whom it is, I grant that
both are crimes.

3. *“That T. M. attempt to set forth the Death of Christ so as All*
“might be comforted, is a proud attempt. I can say this for him of my own hearing from his mouth, that he is cleer in that, for I heard him say long since that the title was not of his appointing, but the Printers or some other above for him.

4. *“That Doctrine that holds out consolation to unbelievers from*
“the Death of Christ, is a crying Peace, peace, where God says there is
“no peace. Thats true, if by unbelievers he means men as such and so persisting, otherwise it may not be true, as is noted to the first: we
 endea-

endeavor not to comfort unbelievers in their unbelief (further then to let them see there is ground for their repentance) but as the Gospel was first preached to *Abraham* and his Family before the Law, so we preach the Death of Christ for all, as a *medium* to their better convincement of their unbelief and impenitence, and an argument to perswade them to Faith. (For how shall they indeed be convinced that its their sin not to believe, or be perswaded to believe, except they have God set forth as a meet Object for them to believe on?) And if they persist in their disobedience, we have in the Gospel-Declaration, [190] that that will strike terror and amazement into them for their unbelief. It was the preaching of Christ, and so of his Apostles (whom we desire to follow) first, to preach peace to the world, and exhort them not to rest without it, and in so doing, we preach peace to none but whom its to be preached to. God first hangs out a white Flag of Reconciliation and Peace in Christ, before he holds out his red of Judgement and Indignation, which follows where that peace is despised, *Mat.* 10.12, 13, 14, 15. Having premised these things, he lays down these four Conclusions.

[190] Acts 10.
36.
Luke 10.
5, 6.9.11,
12.

“1. *That the extending the Death of Christ to an universality in Object, cannot give the lest ground of consolation to them whom God would have to be comforted by the Gospel.*

2. *“That the denying the efficacy of the Death of Christ towards them “for whom he died, cuts the nerves and sinews of all strong consolation, “such as is proper for the believer to receive, and the Gospel to give.*

3. *“That there is nothing in the restraining Christs Death to the “Elect, that in the least measure debars consolation from them to “whom it is due.*

“4. *That the Doctrine of the effectual Redemption of the sheep of “Christ by the blood of the Covenant, is the true solid foundation of all “durable consolation.*

1. To confirm the first, He premises, *“That all Gospel-Consolati- “on belongs onely to believers;* which I have before shewed to be untrue. The Gospel propounds comfort also to souls ready to despair utterly, that they might believe. And the best way to comfort such, is, to let them know that Christ died for them, and that by opening to them (according to the Scripture-affirmation) the extent of Christs Death, and of Gods goodness therein. Having propounded that, he nextly argues against its being of use to believers, as that, (1.) [(1)] *No Scripture so propounds it.* Which is untrue also;

for that in 1 *Joh.* 2.2. doth, as we have seen, for Mr. *Owen* confesses his business there is to comfort believers, and the Apostle to that propounds Christ as a Propitiation for the sins of the whole world; and not onely of us the believers to be comforted. See what I have said

(2.) to it largelier, *cap.* 3. *lib.* 4. He says further, (2.) [(2)] “*That no comfort can accrue to them from that which is common to those, 1. That shall perish to eternity, [191] 2. That God would not have comforted, And 3. that stand in open rebellion against Christ; And 4. That hear not of Christ.* This also is disproved, *De facto*, from the forementio-
ned place, as was shewed before upon it. Besides; The Creation is common to them All that he mentions, and yet thats of Consolation to the believer; and so Gods Governing all things, the Resurrection, Judgement, &c. Gods Presence with the *Israelites* in the Cloud, was ground of exceeding comfort to those of them that believed, and yet it was common to them with the rest; and to them that believed not hastened their destruction.

- (3.) “*He bids men (3.) [(3)] consider by their own experience.* But who speaks he to here, and whose experience will he take in this matter? Them of his own minde? they believe it not, and therefore cannot experiment its good. If them that believe it, they will many of them say, That they have met with great consolation by it, and have been brought through it to believe, and walk both holily and hopefully with God. Yea, some in their agonies upon death-bed have met with great comfort in it, and dyed trinnphantly. But of these things Mr. *Owen* is no competent Judge, he being no believer of it. Verily they have been carried above all other, those considerations that reason suggests (from others perishing Christs Death notwithstanding) knowing that what ever befalls others its for their folly and unbelief, [192] of which they see this Doctrine gave no cause, nor gives any (but for faith) to them. No more then the consideration of Gods like dealing with our fathers in giving to them the Gospel, and like Gospel-Ordinances, in a sort, as to us, and yet their perishing for their unbelief, lusting, and abusing them, is an argument to discourage the Churches that have them now from believing. Men being led through the sight of Gods Grace in the Death of Christ to trust in him, they fear not wrath, but rejoyce in mercy, and in the hope of the glory to be revealed upon them. They see that in it for them, that (contrary to his reasonings) draws them to believe whatever others do that listen more to their reasons, then

to

Isa. 51.13.
Psa. 100.2.
1 Pet. 4 19.
Ps. 31.15.
and 103.
18.22. &c.

Heb. 4.2.
1 Cor. 10.
1, 2, 3, 4.
5.11.

to God in it. *Caleb* saw enough in Gods Presence to comfort them against discouragements from the strongest of enemies, notwithstanding that (yea, with never the less confidence because) many amongst whom he walked, were (for not trusting in it) consumed by it. But he says, "*A soul may object. Oh, but Christ is not a propitiation for all sins.* To which we can tell him, yes, except that sin against the holy Ghost. He hath so far obtained redemption for all other, that he can forgive them, yea will that his goodness and fulness of redemption prevailing with them to submit to him. And in waiting on him in his Gospel we can tell them too, that he will quicken them powerfully, bring them out of their prison doors, take them in, &c. In hearing they shall live. So that all that objection is but frothy.

"2. *To the second. That the extending Christs Death cuts the nerves of all firm consolation to believers* (which we have already disproved) he endeavors further to demonstrate thus. "1. *Because it divides the impetration and application.* *Answ.* It conjoyns them both as to believers (the parties spoken of) most firmly. We declare that whatever Christ hath impetrated thats specially good, he hath impetrated it to be conferred upon the believers, and sealed the Covenant made with them for ever. So that his after-reasoning there is vain, and indeed he leaves it as pertaining to the believer (the thing propounded) and applies the case to an unbelieving sinner. "2. *He says, We divide the Oblation and Intercession, and that makes against the believers consolation.* *Answ.* This is vain too, for we say, both these pertain to the believer. He ever lives to make intercession for those that come to God by him. Sure Mr. Owen hath been a prevaricator, and did it so exactly, that he hath not forgot to do it yet. These two Considerations might rather make against unbelievers continuing such, concerning whom we say, That Christ makes not so special Intercession as for others. And that to them that fulness in Christ shall not be applied or communicated. But this is beside the business, *Amphoram instituit & urceus exit.* We affirm, and strongly maintain them both as to believers; to which we also apply those two places cited by him, viz. Rom. 8.32,33, 34 and 1 Joh. 2.2. And yet in both places, I conceive he strengthens their consolation, from considering the general, as I have before noted. *If he gave his Son up for us All, how shall he not with him give us* (us the Elect of God, the Called according to purpose) *all things.* Is he so good

good to all? how specially good to us then that are made his friends and children? But we deny, that those further things (as there spoken of at least) are attributable to all that Christ died for, one and other, but onely to believers. 3. He says, “*Our denying the procurement of Faith, Grace, Holiness, the whole intendment of the New Coverant, cuts the nerves of believers consolation.*” We deny not that he obliged his Father upon his Covenant, to glorifie him, and bring in people to him according to his own good will. But suppose we wholly denied it, what is this against the consolation of believers that have faith already given them: we granting and firmly holding it, that he is to wash, sanctifie, lead & guide them by his Spirit, and intercede for them for their perseverance unto glory, and to mediate for them the performance of the new Covenant. Such sorry mistakes I sometime hear out of Pulpits, in which men meerly mistake themselves, and slander us. His Queries are all impertinent, and to no purpose: his Conclusions untrue, and against the comfort that this Doctrine affordeth.

3. In the third place, he endeavours to shew that their Doctrine “*hinders not the consolation of Believers.*” To that I say, That he dyed for Believers, hinders not their consolation that know themselves to be Believers: but that that he dyed for such onely, doth them no good, it being contrary to the Scriptures, and taking from them that Gospel that they should preach to others: and also that motive that should lead them out to Charity toward All, and to exhort them to prize and live to Christ; they not knowing to whom these things appertain, or not knowing at least the Gospel-ground for them. I say also that it hinders men that yet believe not, from seeing that Christ dyed for them, and so from believing in him. He says, “Many experiment the contrary. To which I say but this, That I have not yet met with any that I could perceive to be such, or to prove themselves such by the limiting of the Death of Christ. Indeed God may & sometimes doth work by indefinite propositions, as That he dyed for sinners, for the unjust, ungodly &c. these sayings being his own, and the subjects of them in themselves being of equivalent extent with Universals; so that though they do not actually lead out their conceptions and thoughts to the Universall extent, yet indeed virtually they do, while the Soul is drawn in by considering his Death as propounded to, or affirmed of men as under such a condition as is universall. For his reasoning, “*Christ dyed for Believers,*”

*“vers, I am such a one, therefore for me; though the Major is true, yet the Minor cannot well be affirmed of those that know not otherwise before, that Christ dyed for them (and if they do this medium is needlesse to them) for what Faith hath a man before he believe that Christ dyed for him, by which he may know and believe that Christ dyed for him? not a faith that worketh by love, because that springs from an apprehension of Gods love, for we cannot love him but as we behold him loving us first. Not a Faith by grace, because while men doubt or know not that Christ dyed for them, they know not the grace that the Gospel holds forth to move them to believing; seeing according to the Gospel-Declaration all grace runs by and through Christs mediation. And if not such a Faith then the Major and Minor agree not; for they will not say that Christ dyed for All that have a dead Faith, or conceits of faith wrought by self-endeavor, seeing men may have those & yet perish. So that this argument hath in it a great deal of deceit, and puts men upon many inconveniencies to prove the Minor, upon which all the grounds of their comfort stand. For upon that act of their faith, Christ himself with all his death and mediation is laid, that being the foundation they lay him upon, whereas those things as asserted in the word, for them, & credited by them, should lay faith upon him, & so themselves also upon him by faith. Whereas he says “that a better syllogisme then *this, He dyed for All men: I am a man, ergo, for me; I deny it: For**

1. This is a more immediate Divine Faith, as springing from, and being bottomed upon the Word of God, as hath been seen. 2. The Minor is more conspicuous and evident. 3. The grace of God is more admired, to see that he dyed for me while yet I am as other men, a sinner, then when by my industry I think I am framed to believe; for then I look upon his love through something found in me, in which I differ from others, which lifts me up above others, looking upon them as not so framed, but the other abases and leads to love and pity others, even sinners, that are as I. But oh the pride and vanity of mans heart, that prefers such consolations as take in something of the creatures frames with them, before those that have nothing but God to a naked creature to spring up all his frames from pure love without him! How many are the endeavours and strifts of men again and again to make out this proposition, I am a Believer, while in the mean time they reject and believe not that love of God to them as men and sinners, that should indeed in the

receit of it and the Spirits setting it home, make them believers, and spring up all those frames which they as it were by works of the Law endeavour after (and cannot that way attain) that they might evidence themselves to be believers, and when they think they have by much strift attained to believe, then those their strifts, their faith as they suppose with all the signs that they have annexed to it, are taken in together as the ground of their comfort and hope in God; yea, of their belief that Christ was sent and dyed for them, which yet they are at a losse in, questioning Gods love to them and their ground and cause of hoping in him, as they see cause to question their own love to, and so by consequence their own faith in him. A miserable way it is (God knows) that this Doctrine leads multitudes into, while they either curiously pry into Gods secrets, almost to destruction, or else look into themselves for fruits of faith, that may evidence them to have faith and so their Election, and so right to Christ and his Gospel, and all this before they can see that there is any thing in the Gospel that is good news to them, or any love in God towards them that works that Faith and those Fruits in its appearance, by which their Election should be discerned by them.

4. The fourth thing he leaves, onely desiring the Reader to peruse that place of Rom. 8.32, 33, 34. which I also commend to the Reader, that upon good grounds knowes himself a Believer, one in Christ, walking after the Spirit, and not after the flesh; for to such it is written, and to their consolation, ver. 1.28, 29, 30, &c. and I say to such its a *“rich Mine of firm, lasting comfort, consolation, joy, assurance, rest, peace, refreshment and satisfaction; no place fuller or sweeter that I know of, and all springing from the consideration of God as their friend and Father, justifying them, Christ that dyed for them and rose again now interceding at Gods right hand for them, that they may be one with Christ in priviledges and glory, and have the New Covenant fully performed to them. But if the Reader that believes desires to perswade others to faith: or if he be one that knows not whether God hath any goodwill to him or no, and so is not yet by faith in Christ, that place will afford little to him. But I desire him to read 1 Tim. 2.4, 5, 6. that God wils All to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, That there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a Ransome for All, &c. And if he believe that record of God, that testimony born to him and his*

Son

Son, he may therein see Gods good-will to him and good ground for him to seek him through Christ that gave himself a ransom for him, good cause to Repent of all his evils against him, that is so well affected toward him; good cause to leave his evill wayes of grieving him, and live to him, and love him that is so loving to him; good cause to hope in his mercy, and in that hope to call upon him, and seek to enjoy more knowledge of him and experience of his salvation, and good matter to hold forth to others for their conversion and bringing in to Christ. None of all which their restrictive Doctrine (which is Anti-Christian as it hinders the course of the Gospel of Christ, and keeps men in ignorance of the grounds they have to repent, seek after, love and hope in God, and not at all held forth in *Rom. 8.32.*) can lead them to; for by it none who yet believeth not, and so knoweth not himself to be Elected, can see any ground to believe in, live to, love, please or serve God, inas-much as for ought he knowes he is from eternity an enemy to him, and hates him; but it will lead him to go on resolutely in his way, and do what seems good to him, seeing by that its undeniably true that if Christ dyed for him he cannot miscarry, if otherwise, he must, doe what he can, as hath been noted; But let him that yet doubts of Gods love to him reject that devised Doctrine that contradicts the Scriptures, and letting alone the secrets of God (which pertain not to him yet to know, nor shall hurt him if he attend and yield up to that that is revealed, yea, shall be also profitably revealed to him if he submit to what is revealed, *Psal. 25.14.*) let him I say mind the record of God that he hath given of his Son, that he hath given himself a Ransom for All, yea, and that God hath given us eternal life (even us whom he commands to believe in the name of his Son *1 Ioh. 3.23.*) and this life is in his Son, *he that hath the Son hath life, & he that hath not the Son hath not life*; thence shall he see both ground to believe that God hath given him eternall life, and put it into Christ, and also both necessity and incouragement to believe on Christ, that in believing he may have that life, even that eternall injoyment of God in Christ, that will for ever satisfie him and make him happy.

F I N I S .

{Μόνω σοφῷ καὶ ἐλεήμονι θεῷ τῷ πάντων σωτῇρι, μάλισα δὲ πιστευόντων, ἡ δόξα καὶ σωτηρία, δυναμὶς καὶ κρατος εἰς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, Ἀμην}.

X x 2

A Sym-

A Symphony of some Ancient Doctors
of the Church, with the truth here defended,
added to shew that it is no novelty of yesterdays
standing, as some are pleased to charge it.

Chrysostome in Joh. 1.29.

Ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἄμνος (*loquitur de agno paschali*) οὐδενὸς καθάπαξ ἁμαρτίαν
ἔλαβεν: οὗτος δὲ (*loquitur de agno Christo*) τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης, κυνδυεύονταν γὰρ
αὐτην ἀπολέσθαι, ταχέως ἀπήλαξε τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θεοῦ.

Idem in Heb. 2.9.

Ὅπιδς χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπερ παντός γέυσηται θανάτου, οὐτὶ τοῦ πισῶν μόνον, ἄλλα
καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης, οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ὑπερ παντων ἀπέθανε, τί δὲ εἰ μὴ πάν-
τες ἐπίστρεψαν; αὐτος τὸ εἰς αὐτοῦ πεπλήρωκε, &c.

Clemens Alexandrinus. Orat. ad Gentes.

Ἀκούσατε μάκραν, ἀκούσατε οἱ ἔγγυς, οὐκ ἀπεκρούβη τίνας ὁ λόγος, φῶς ἐς ἡ
κόινον, ἐπιλάμπει πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, &c.

Athanasius De incarnatione verbi Dei.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον παρα πάντων ἔδει λοιπὸν ἀποδοθῆναι, ὀφείλετο
γὰρ πάντων ἀποθανεῖν, διὲ μάλιστα καὶ ἐπεδημήσεν τούτου ἕνεκεν μετὰ τὰς περὶ τι
θεότητος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἀποδείξεις, ἥδη λοιπὸν καὶ ὑπερ πάντων τὴν θυσίαν
ἀνέφερεν, ἀντὶ πάντων τὸν εἰς αὐτοῦ ναὸν εἰς θάνατον παραδιδούς, ἵνα τοὺς μὲν
πάντας ἀνυπευθύνους καὶ ἐλευθέρους τι ἀρχαίας παραβάτεως πόνη,
&c.

Et Paulo Post.

Θανάτου ἡ χρεία, καὶ θάνατον ὑπερ πάντων ἔδει γίνεσθαι, ἵνα τὸ παρα πάντων
ὀφειλόμενον γίνηται: ὅθεν ὁ λόγος ἔπει οὐκ διόντε ἦν αὐτόν ἀποθανεῖν, (ἀθά-
νατος γὰρ ἦ.) ἔλαβεν ἐαυτῷ σῶμα τὸ δυνάμενον ἀποθωνεῖν, ἵνα ὡς ἴδιον
ἀντὶ πάντων αὐτό προτενέγκῃ, καὶ ὡς αὐτος ὑπερ πάντων πάρων διὰ τὴν πρὸς
αὐτὸ ἐπίβασιν καταργησῇ τὴν τὸ κράτος ἔκοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τοῦτ' ἐς τὸ διάβολον.

Cyrellus

Those sentences forealleged are in English thus.

Chrysostome upon Joh. 1.29.

That Lamb (speaking of the Paschall Lamb or the Lambes offered up in the Jewish sacrifices) never took away any one mans sins: But this (that is Christ the Lamb of God) takes away the sins of the whole world, for it being in great danger to be destroyed, he quickly freed it from the wrath of God.

The same Author, upon Heb. 2.9. saith thus.

That by the grace of God he might tast death for every one; not for the believers only, but also for the whole world, for he dyed for All; but what if all believe not? yet he hath performed that which concerned him to do.

Clemens Alexand.

Hear ye that are afar off, and hear ye that are nigh hand. The Word is not hid from any, the Light is common, and shineth unto All men.

Athanasius in his tractate about the Incarnation of the Word of God

Now forasmuch as the debt of All ought to be paid (for All ought to dy) therefore for that cause especially he came and sojourned here, and after the manifestations of his Divinity by his works, it remained that he offer up *a sacrifice for All*, delivering up his Temple (the Temple of his body) unto Death for All, that he might discharge and free All from the old transgression.

And a little after in the same Tractate.

There was need of Death, and it behoved that Death should be indured for All, that the Debt due from all might be satisfied; wherefore the Word for that it could not dy (for it was immortall) took to itself a body capable of dying; that he might offer that as his own for All, and that he suffering for All by reason of his conjunction with that, he might destroy him that hath the power of Death, to wit, the Devill.

Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus Κατι χητ. ιγ.

Ὁ ζαυροῦ ξέφανος ἐφωταγὼ γησε μεν τοὺς ἐν ἀγνώτια τύφλους, ἔλυσε δὲ πάντας τοὺς ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας κατεχομένους, καὶ κόσμον ὅλον ἀνθρώπων ἐλυτρώσατο, καὶ μὴ θαυμάσης εἰ κόσμος ὅλος ἐλυτρώθη, οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀνθρώπος ψίλος ἀλλὰ ὅιος θεοῦ μονογενῆς ὁ ὑπεραπινθήσκων.

Theophylact in Johan. 6.51.

Νοεὶ δὲ μοι τοῦ κόσμου ζωὴν τάχα μεν καὶ τὴν ἀνάσασιν, ὁ γὰρ θάνατος τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν καθολικὴν ἀνάσασιν παντὶ τὴν γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπραγματούσατο, τάχα δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ μακαριότητι ζωὴν τοῦ κόσμου ζῶν ὀνομάζει: κἀν γὰρ μὴ πάντες παραδέξαντο τὴν ἁγίασμον καὶ τὴν ἐν πνεύματι ζωὴν ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὅγε Κύριος ἑαυτον ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου δέδωκε, καὶ ὅσον τὸ ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ ὁ κόσμος ἐσώθη, καὶ ἡ φύσις α' πάση ἡγιαθῇ δύναντι λαβεῖν νικᾶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀπέδρα δὶα τοῦ ἔντος ἀνθρώπου τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὥσπερ καὶ δι' ἔντος ἀνθρώπου τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὠλίσθη.

August. in Joh. 3.14, 15.

Serpens aneus in ligno positus venena vivorum serpentum superavit, & Christus in cruce suspensus & mortuus, antiqua diaboli venena restinxit, & omnes qui ab eo percussi fuerant liberavit.

Idem in Psal. 69.

Judas abjecit pretium quo ipse vendidit Christum, & non agnovit pretium quo ipse a Christo redemptus erat.

Prosper in Respons. ad object. Gallorum.

Christus dedit pro mundo sanguinem suum, & mundus redimi noluit.

Item sent. quartâ super capita Gallorum.

Qui dicit quod non pro totius mundi redemptione salvator sit crucifixus, non ad Sacramenti virtutem sed ad infidelium respicit partem, quum sanguis Jesus Christi pretium totius mundi sit. A quo pretio extranei sunt, qui aut delectati captivitate redimi noluerunt, aut post redemptionem ad eandem servitutem sunt reversi.

Vide Ambrosium in pag. titul.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus in Joh. Evang. lib. 11.25.

Quemadmodum praevaricatione primi hominis ut in primitiis generis nostri, morti addicti sumus: eodem modo per obedientiam & justitiam Christi, in quantum seipsum legi subjecit (quamvis legis author esset) benedictio atque vivificatio quae per spiritum est, ad totam nostram penetravit naturam.

Leo Epist. 72. ad Juvenalem.

Ut autem repararet omnium vitam, recepit omnium causam, & vim veteris Chirographi pro omnibus solvendo vacuavit: ut sicut per unius reatum omnes facti suerant Peccatores, ita per unius obedientiam omnes fierent innocentes, inde in homines manante justitiâ, ubi est humana suscepta natura.

Cyrrill

Cyrril of Hierusalem in his Instruction or Catechise, 13.

The Crown of the Cross is, that it inlightned those that were blind in ignorance, and loosed All that were held in bondage under sin, and redeemed the whole World of mankind. Nor marvell thou that the whole world was redeemed by it, for he was not a bare Man, but the only begotten Son of God that dyed upon it.

Theophylact in John 6.51.

By the life of the World perhaps he meaneth the Resurrection; for the Death of the Lord procured the Generall Resurrection of all the whole kind (or race) of man; perhaps also he named the life of holiness and happinness the life of the World, for though All have not received that sanctification and that life that is in the spirit, yet Christ gave himself for the World, and as to what appertained to him, the world is saved, and the whole nature sanctified, inasmuch as he hath received power to conquer sin, and sin fled away by that one Man, Our Lord Jesus Christ, even as by that one man Adam it (that is, the world, or the nature of man) fell into sin.

Austine in Joh. 3.14, 15.

The brazen Serpent put upon a pole of Wood overcame all the venome of the living Serpents: And Christ being hung upon the cross, and dying, quenched the force of the old poisons of the Devil, and freed All that were smitten by him.

The same upon Psal. 69.

Judas cast away the price for which he sold Christ; and acknowledged (or owned) not the price by which he was redeemed by Christ.

Prosper in Answer to some objections of the Gaules.

Christ gave his blood for the World, and the World refused to be redeemed (that is, actually set at liberty) by him.

So again.

He that saith the Saviour was not crucified for the Redemption of the Whole world, hath not his eye upon the pretiousness or vertue of that mystery, but upon the part of them that believe not; whereas the blood of Jesus Christ is the price of the whole World, from which price they are strangers, who either being delighted with their captivity refuse to be set free, or after they are set free return again unto their former bondage.

Cyrril of Alexandria upon Johns Gospell, lib. 11. cap. 25.

As by the transgression of the first man we were as in the first fruits of our kind bound over unto Death after the same manner by the obedience and righteousness of Christ, forasmuch as he subjected himself unto the Law who was the Author of the Law, the blessing and quickning which is by the Spirit (or Divine nature) hath pierced to our whole nature.

Leo in his 72 Epistle to Juvenal.

That Christ might reaire the life of All, he took the Cause of All, and loosed the force of the old handwriting by satisfying for All. That so as by the Guilt of one All were made sinners: so also by the obedience of one All might be made innocent; righteousness thence flowing down unto men, where is taken the nature of man.

I Might have added more Testimonies both Ancient and moderne, as amongst the ancient, *Ignatius*, *Jrenaeus*, *Theodoret*, &c. and amongst the moderne *Luther*, *Hemingius*, and in a word the generality of the *Lutheran* Divines, as also *Musculus*, *Vrsinus*, *Suffragium Britanicum*, Bishop *Davenant*, yea the Articles and Catechise of the Church of *England*, but these already alledged may be sufficient.

A
 Brief Answer (by way of *Appendix*)
 to some other Oppositions against, and
 Approaches of this Doctrine, lately uttered
 in a SERMON, &c.



Ince I had finished this Answer to Mr. Owen, I providentially met with some other Objections against, and aspersions call: upon this Doctrine of *Christs dying for All*, in a Lecture preached upon this Text, *Now abideth Faith, Hope and Charity, these three*: where the Preacher (being out of charity with it, because he had not faith enough to believe it) took occasion upon quoting those passages in *Tit. 1.1,4.* The *faith of Gods Elect*, and the *common faith*, passionately to set himself to disgrace it. I shall therefore here add this brief discovery of his mistakes, that such as heard him then, or have the like conceptions with him, in what was then uttered by him, may see the fallacy and corruption of such Allegations.

And not to insist upon that saying of his, That Faith, Hope, and Charity are the three standing dishes of a Christian upon which he is daily to feed, because, though it was a great mistake (as great as to make the act of eating, and the effects of the meat eaten and well digested the food we are to eat, Christ himself, his flesh and blood, and medially the Word as declaring him, being the proper and constant food that a Christian is to feed on, and Faith the exercise of feeding on him, and Hope and Love, the fruits thence springing) yet it being, as I conceive, but a mistake without any design in him, it may suffice to but mention it, that he may note therein his inconsideration. I shall apply my self to those things (then) that

Y y

with

with evident design were uttered by him to disgrace the Doctrine of the General ransom, against which

Argum. “1. He used this Argument, “*If Christ gave himself a ransom for All* (that was his very expression *verbatim*) *then are all ransomed. Now the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Sion, and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads, &c. But all shall not do so, &c.*

Answ. 1. Wherein its first to be minded. That the *Preacher* plaid the Tempter with his Auditory. It was his work to put an *If* upon divine Revelation, *If thou beest the Son of God, &c. Matth. 4.* That this upon which this *Preacher* put an *If*, is divine Revelation; see it plainly in so many words, *1 Tim. 2.6. He gave himself a ransom for All.* And surely herein too he tacitely undermined all those three in his Text. The *Faith of Gods Elect*, this being one prime part of that faith, or Gospel of faith that was given to the chosen servants of God, such as *Paul* was, the testimony whereunto God had ordained him to an Herald [Κήρυξ] and an Apostle to the *Gentiles*, as he himself tells us, *ver. 7.* a Doctrine fitted to beget faith in the hearts of men, because it demonstrates goodwill in God towards them, and presents them with good ground to look up to him, hope in him, and love him; and therefore the teaching men to question and deny the truth thereof, teaches them also to doubt whether they have ground to believe in God, hope in him, or love him; and they that doubt Gods Love to them, are also thereby deprived of the maine motive and inducement to love one another. Nor matters it, that it was a Scripture saying that he brought to undermine it with; For so the Tempter also set upon Christ, *Matth. 4.6.* and the evil both of the one and the other, was never a whit the less but the greater rather for that; because *Corruptio optimi est pessima*, to abuse one truth by Sophistry to discredit another truth, is to commit sacrilege to uphold falshood, and to set God at variance with himself, that so his Kingdom (if possible) being divided might not stand. But truth will discover such false jugglings to them that cleave stedfastly unto her words, so as that they shall have need to deny one truth for believing another; as Christ denied not either that divine saying that came immediately from heaven to him, nor the Scripture that the Tempter abused to corrupt him. *Wisdom is justified by her children in all her sayings.* The Scripture saying brought by
this

this Gentleman then, we shall not need to deny to uphold our Assertion, but onely shew him, that there is between them no real contradiction, and not that saying, but his Sophistry(mistake at best) made the opposition. For,

2. That Scripture speaks not universally of all ransomed by the Lord in every way and manner, and ad of his ransoming: Nor indeed of that act or way of ransoming, spoken of in 1 *Tim.* 2.6. at all, and the making good of these two Assertions will clear his abuse of that saying, as opposed to the general Ransom. Now to make them good, we shall do these two things.

First, Clear it, that there are divers ways, and divers acts of ransoming spoken of in the Scripture.

Secondly, That both those two places do not speak *ad idem*, to the same act or way of ransoming, and therefore there is between them no contradiction.

For the first, That there are divers ways of ransoming, see those two held forth in Scripture. 1. By price, as when a man gives a price, or sum to buy out a thing out of a forfeit, or thraldom. See that *Levit.* 25. 25. and 27. 19, 27. and that place in 1 *Tim.* 2.6. where ἀντίλυτρον, plainly signifies a price given for ransoming, or to buy out of some thraldom. Secondly, By power, and strong hand, without price. See that in *Isai.* 52.3. *Jer.* 31. 11. *Job* 6. 23. *Deut.* 9.26. And again of this (betides the other way of redeeming) there are divers acts according to diversity of bondages to be redeemed from, or Objects of Redemption, and all the Acts of God too, as the Redeeming out of bodily affliction and thraldom to men, *Job* 6.23. Redeeming out of the Grave, Infirmities, and Death, *Rom.* 8.23. called the Redemption of the body. Redeeming of the soul or spirit out of the power of pollution, *Tit.* 2.14. Or out of troubles, fears, and sorrows, through the conscience of sin, or otherwise. *Psal.* 130.8. A redemption of *Israel* out of *Egypt.* *Deut.* 9.26. And out of the hand of the *Assyrians.* *Isai.* 52.3. And from these last Monarchs & their Oppressions, *Jer.* 31.11. A redeeming the Church of Christ from Antichristian pollution and bondage, *Rev.* 14. &c. Now to apply an indefinite Proportion, speaking of some one or more of these ways of ransoming to the full latitude of an universal Proposition, speaking onely of some other act or way of ransoming, is very fallacious, and just like to this. Its said, 1 *Tim.* 4.10. *That God is the Saviour of All men*, Now if he be the Saviour of All, Then

he saves all: But they are a happy people that are saved by the Lord, *Deut.* 33.29. but all men are not happy, Therefore God is not the Saviour of All men. Two eggs cannot be liker one another, then this fallacious arguing is like to his. Or this, If there shall be a Resurrection both of the just and unjust, as is affirmed *Acts* 24.15. Then all men shall rise again, or obtain the Resurrection. But they that obtain the Resurrection, (or when men rise,) they shall be [[ἰσάγγελοι]] equal with the Angels, and the children of God, *Luke* 20. 35,36. and *Marke* 12.25. But all shall not be so, &c. Just such is his* fallacie, arguing from the ransoming by power in a more particular way, and in further acts, to the ransoming by price onely. Which I come nextly to shew, viz.

* *Amphibologia.*

2. That these two places speak not *ad idem*, that may be seen by comparing the places; for that in 1 *Tim.* 2.6 manifestly speaks of ransoming by price, and says, That Christ gave himself a ransom for All, that is, a price unto God and his Justice, to the intent that that sentence of condemnation that came upon All in the sin of one (in which all sinned, and were for it condemned,) being removed, All might have free liberty in that regard to look to, and set their hope in God, that sentence notwithstanding, and the goodness of God to be prayed for for All, might have free access unto, or upon All, to lead them to repentance that they might not perish. Or also that all might have free liberty of access into the Church and Kingdome of God through the preaching of the Gospel, they being ransomed from the Law of Commandments in Ordinances that formerly stood up as a partition wall, and debarred many from that liberty. But now that in *Isai.* 51. 10, speaks of a ransoming by power, as is plain in that Call, *Awake, awake, O Arm of the Lord, put on strength, as in the days of old, viz.* when *Egypt*, (there called *Rahab*) was broken by it, and a ransoming from oppression by evil men, and that not of any men, but of the *Israel* of God, such as first are brought to know and follow after righteousness, *ver.* 7,8. These being ransomed from wicked, Heathenish, and Antichristian power, shall return to *Sion* with singing, &c. thats plain, *ver.* 12. *Who art thou that thou shouldst be afraid of a man, and of the son of man that shall dye, &c.* and where is the fury of the Oppressor? To which that in *Revel.* 14.1. 4. is an evident allusion, where the 144000. that are said to be Redeemed from the earth, and from men, that is, from the Antichristian yoke of bondage over both bodies and spirits, are

Eph 2.15.

2 Cor. 5.

19.

Acts 10.

28.

are said to stand with the Lamb on mount *Sion*, and sing, &c. So that the Argument from this to the other is as inept, as if he had thus reasoned; If God ransomed All *Israel* out of *Egypt*, then they were all the ransomed of the Lord, but the ransomed of the Lord come to *Sion* with singing, &c. but they all did not so. With such fallacies did this Gentlemen in his Sermon deceive his Auditory. But I shall say no more to that Argument.

2. Besides which, he fell right-out with this Point, and charged it to be a doctrine of desperation. Then which I know not what charge could have had so little reason for it. But indeed there can be no great exercise of reason expected, when men are in a passion.

Is this the way to lead men to despaire, to ascertain them that God would have them to be saved, and that Christ died for them, that they might have a way and ground to look to God for salvation, and a Saviour compleatly furnished for saving them? To what purpose then did he before he fell into this strain, labour to perswade men to hope in God, by telling them God had no pleasure in the death of the wicked, if the telling and assuring men that God hath no pleasure in their death, but hath given Christ for them, be the way to desperation? I am confidently perswaded, that all that are in their right wits, will judge, that this tends more to keep men from despairing, then to tell them that Christ dyed but for here and there one, and that for the greater part God hath absolutely decreed to destruction, and provided no Mediator for them, through whom they may hope in him. O but he said (but he slandered when he said it) “*That this Doctrine denies all the ends and effects of the Death of Christ.* We have shewed the falsity of this in the larger Answer to Mr. Owen. He died that he might ransom all, that he might be Lord of All that the world through him might be saved, that is, in looking to him, that his Church and people that are called to, and believe on him, might be purged, sanctified, saved, and all these we affirm with the Scriptures to be the ends of his Death, and to be effected thereby according to his meaning. “*O but we deny that he purchased Faith by it.* How we grant not that, and how we grant it, I have shewed also in that Answer. But suppose we say, he did not oblige God to give it to this or that man, wherein doth that tend to desperation? We say not, as this Gentleman (as is supposed) was bold to resolve. That Gods onely Will is the alone cause wherefore all they that believe not, believe not in him, which

what is it other then to make God to keep the most men from believing? We say, Christ hath done so much for All, that they have good ground to believe on him, to do more for, and to them, and to seek after, hope in, and love Him; which their Position denies. And we say, God doth and will for his sake, and out of his free, mercy bring in many to believe in him. So that we can say as much as they, and they can say no more then we, to this or that particular, before he believe, to ascertain him that he thall believe; and we can say more then they in their limiting doctrine can, that might draw him to believe, for we can tell him, Christ died for him, and so they cannot say; so that our Position (which is also the Scripture Assertion) is freer from this heavy charge by thousands of degrees then what they say.

But neither yet did he think his anger sufficiently vented against this Point, he must needs minde his Hearers first of a Boyish Tale, or Story (as he called it, “Of the devil’s sometimes transform-
“ing himself into the shape of an Horse, and profering to carry men
“over some river, and then when they had gotten upon him, turning
“himself into a bottle of Hay, and so deceiving them : Such a Saviour
(he pretended that) this general ransom makes Christ to be. Charity was in his Text, and should have been in his heart, but I fear if he had any it was not at home, for neither truth nor charity appeared in this discourse. I could perswade my self, that where ever Charity was then, the Gentleman useth to be somewhat troubled with the Spleen; for would he else have come into the Pulpit with such a piece of blasphemy to the Apostles Doctrine, and to Christ as witnessed of therein ; and made such an incongruous odious comparison, as would have merited a chiding in some dull School-boy? For did ever any that held this General point, much less doth any thing contained within it self, represent Christ as profering to save men perfectly if they will trust themselves with him (as that must be the application of it, if it be not too boyishly applied) and then though they trust themselves with them, he leaves him in the mid-way, and deceives them? Sure this point says, Its them that will not trust themselves with Christ, and because they do not that, they perish, not that Christ fails any that put their trust in him. I feare this fabled Horse presented himself to this Gentlemans conceptions, and made him believe he would carry him through the difficulties of some brave confutation of this point, and then in the mid-way left him in deceits and fallacies. I could say more.

—Sed

— *Sed præstat motos componere fluctus.* Only let him beware of such illusions again.

He had this passage too, that the Gospel was not yet preached (he would not say to all Nations, or to all the World, but not) in all the world, or in all Nations, for then the end should be, *Matt.* 24. 14. But herein he both erred against the express sayings of Scripture, that says it was in the Apostles time come [[ἐν παντί τῷ κόσμῳ]], in all the world, and was then preached [[ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει]] in the whole creation under heaven; and also mistook the text quoted by him, as his reason, the end there being as well of *Jerusalem*, and the *Jewish* state, as of the world, those two being carried on in that Chapter together, as any that well minde the Chapter may perceive. The questions were propounded together of the ruine of the Temple (and by consequent the State) of *Jerusalem*, and of the end of the world; and the answers go so together, that its past any mans skill, I think, to sever them, so as to say. Thus far he speaks onely to the first question, and henceforth onely to the second. If there were a distinction, or much more a division to be made, the former part of the *Chapt.* in which that *Verse* is, should rather speak only of the former question, it being evident that the latter speaks of the other, and the desolations coming upon *Jerusalem* being clearly spoken of immediately upon this passage : when ye shall see *Jerusalem* compassed about with armies, then know that the desolation thereof draweth nigh, which answers to that in ver. 15. of *Matth.* 24. the verse next following his quotation, when ye see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not, as appears by what immediately follows, as the use of that sight in both places, viz. *Then let him that is in Judea flee into the mountains.* I conceive our Saviour there holds forth both the first preaching of the Gospel in all the world before the end of *Jerusalem*, and the renewed preaching of it after the great loss of it again out of the greatest part of the world, where it was before preached, before the end of the world. So that he did not well consider what he said neither in that Assertion. But I shall follow him no further, though other passages there were that were unhandsome. Those which seemed to have most force in them, and to take the most impression with men for denying credit to this, Truth, I have here detected the unfoundness of. I could wish the use that he and others in that way would make of it, might be this to be more considerative, and less rash and passionate in their Sermons, and learn not to exalt their own wisdoms, which perverts many, above the plain positive Divine Scripture Assertions. I know

Col. 1.6.
23.

we

we are all subject to infirmities, and some grains of charity we must allow one to another, if we will live quietly; but yet there is great difference between humane mistakes in sober debates or discourses, and the madness of rancour, and wrathful passion between humble inquiries after truth, sometimes tripping, and proud conceits of Wisdom, confidently with the fool in the *Proverbs* raging. But I shall say no more, Only the God of Peace and Truth, pardon one defers and infirmities, and fill our hearts with Peace and Truth, that with one minde and mouth we may glorifie and serve him, and in all sincerity walk before him. *Amen. Amen.*

FINIS.
