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Phil. i, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. Some preach Christ even of Envy and Strife, and some also of Good Will: The one preach Christ of Contention, not sincerely, supposing to add Affliction to my bonds: But the other of Love, knowing that I am set for the Defence of the Gospel. What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your Prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.
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TO THE
Honourable Commissary General
EDWARD WHALLEY.

SIR,

Though weakness and distance have prohibited me that converse with you which sometime I did enjoy, yet have they not excused your former Kindness out of my Remembrance. Received Benefits should not Die before us: If the Donor kill them not by Retraction, the Receiver must not Suffocate them by Oblivion; nor prove their Grave, who was intended for a Storehouse, if not a Garden where they may be Rooted and be fruitful. In those hearts where Benefits Live, the Benefactors Live too. And those that Live in our Estimation and Affection, we desire their Names may be inscribed on our Monuments, and survive with ours, when we are Dead. While we live also we more regard their Judgments of us, than other mens; and are more ambitious of standing right in their esteem; and therefore are willing that our just Apologies may be in their hands, to hinder misapprehensions, and resist unjust Accusers. May these Reasons excuse my prefixing your Name to these Papers, and directing them first to your Hand: (Custom having led me into that Road, wherein I do not unwillingly follow.) It is not for
for Protection or Patronage of my Opinions: For that I referre them wholly to the Father of Lights, the I luminating Spirit, and the Light of that Truth which they contain and Vindicate. Nor do I desire that you should make these things your Studies; they being more fitted to the use of those Students, that can lay out much of their time on such things. I confess I had rather see in your Hands, the Holy Scriptures, and Books of Practical Divinity, than these Controversies: and had rather hear such Practical Discourses from your Mouth. So farre am I from soliciting you to any Sicular Opinion of mine, that I solicit you not once to read these Books; save onely when any Opinion in them shall be Accused, to turn to the Words, and see what is said. It is the Practical Christian that holds fast the Truth, which many eager Disputers soon lose. Doting about Questions that engender Strifes, is not the Religiousness that God approves; what ever the Professours of this Age may imagine. It is the most Practical Teachers and People in England commonly that are the most Orthodox. I have oft noted many men's Prayers to be much freer from Libertinism, then their Sermons; and their Sermons, then their Writings and Disputes. That's a mans Judgement indeed, which he dare reduce to Practice, and own before God.

The Work of these Papers have been to my minde somewhat like those sad Employments wherein I attended you: of themselves, grievous and ungratefull; exasperating others, and not pleasing myself (besides the ruinating of my bodily health) And as the Remembrance of those years is so little delightful to me, that I look back upon them as the saddest part of my life; so the Review of this Apologie, is but the renewing of my trouble: to think of our Common frailty and darkness, and what Reverend and much valued Brethren I contradict; but especially for fear lest men should make this Collision an occasion of Division, and by receiving the sparks into Combustible Affections, should turn that to a Conflagration which I intended but for Illumination. If you say, I should then have let it alone: The same answer must serve, as in the former Cause we were wont to use. Some say, that I who pretend so much for Peace, should not write of Controversies. For myself it is not much Matter: but must Gods Truth (for such I take it) stand as a Butt for every man to shoot at? Must there be such Liberty of opposing it, and none of Defending? One party cannot have Peace without the others Consent. To be Buffeted and Assaulted, and Commanded to Deliver up the Truth of God, and called Unpeaceable if I defend it and resist, this is such Equi-
ty as we were wont to finde. In a word, both Works were ungratefull to
me, and are so in the Review; but in both, as Providence and mens on-
set imposed a Necessity, and drove me to that Strain, that I must Defend
or do worse; so did the same Providence so clear my Way, and draw me
on, and sweeten unusual Troubles with unusual Mercies, and Issue all
in Testimonies of Grace, that as I had great mixtures of Comfort with
Sorrow in the Performance, so have I in the Review: And as I had more
eminent Deliverances and other Mercies in those years and Ways of
Blind and Doleful, then in most of my Life beside; so have I had more
encouraging Light since I was engaged in these Controversies. (For I
speak not of these few Papers onely, but of many more of the like Nature
that have taken up my time.) And as I still retain'd a Hope, that the
End of all our Calamities and strange Disposings of Providence, would
be somewhat Better then was Threatned of late: so Experience hath
taught me to think, that the Issue of my most ungratefull Labours shall
not be vain; but that Providence which extracted them hath some use to
make of them, better then I am yet aware of; if not in this Age, yet in
times to come. The best is, we now draw no blood: and honest hearts
will not take themselves Wounded, with that blow which is given onely to
their Errors. However, God must be served when he calls for it, though
by the hardest and most unpleasant Work. Onely the Lord teach us to
watch carefully over our Deceitfull Hearts, lest we should serve
ourselves while we think and say, we are serving him; and lest we
should Militate for our own Honour and Interest, when we pretend to do
it for his Truth and Glory!

I hope, Sir, the Diversity of Opinions in these days, will not dimi-
nish your Estimation of Christianity, nor make you suspeft that all is
Doubtfull, because so much is Doubted of. Though the Tempter seems
to be playing such a Game in the world, God will go beyond him, and turn
that to Illustration and Confirmation, which he intended for Confusion
and Extirpation of the Truth. You know its no news to hear of some In-
grant, Proud and Licentious, of what Religion soever they be. And
this Trinity is the Creator of Heresies. And as for the sober and Godly;
it is but in lesser things that they disagree: and mostly about words and
Methods more then Matter (though the smallest things of God are not
Contemptible.) He that wonders to see wise men differ, doth but wonder
that they are yet Imperfect, and know but in part; that is, that they are
yet Mortal sinners, and not Glorified on Earth! And such wonderers
know not what man is, and it seems are too great strangers to themselves.

[* 3]
And if they turn these differences to the prejudice of God's Truth, or dis-honour of Godliness, they shew themselves yet more unreasonable to blame the Surne that men are purblind. And indeed were Pride and Passion laid aside in our Disputes, and men could gently suffer contradiction, and heartily love and correspond with those that in lower matters do gain say them, I see not but such friendly debates might edifie.

For yourself, Sir, as you were a friend to sound Doctrine, to Unity and to Piety, and to the Preachers, Defenders and Practisers thereof; While I conversed with you, and as frame informeth us, have continued such; so I hope that God who hath so long preserved you, will preserve you to the end, and be that hath been your Shield in corporal dangers, will be so in spiritual.

Your great Warfare is not yet accomplished: The Worms of Corruption that breed in our bowels, will live in some measure till we die ourselves. Your Conquest of your self is yet imperfect. To fight with your self, you will finde the hardest, but most necessary Conflict that ever yet you were engaged in; and to overcome your self the most honourable and gainful Victory. And think not that your greatest trials are all over. Prosperity hath its peculiar Temptations, by which it hath foiled many that stood unshaken in the storms of adversity. The Tempter who hath had you on the waves, will now assault you in the calm; and hath his last game to play on the Mountain, till nature cause you to descend. Stand this Charge and you Win the day. To which, as one that is faithful to you, I shall acquaint you in a few words, what his temptations are like to be, and how you should resist them: If you are already provided, a Remembrancer will do you no harm.

1. The first and great Assault will be, to entice you to Overvalue your present Prosperity, and to Judge the Creature to be better then it is, and to grasp after a fulness of Honour and Wealth, and then to say, Soul, take thy Rest. As you love your Peace, your Life, your Soul, your God, take heed of this. Judge of Prosperity as one that must go Naked out of the world: Esteem of earthly Greatness and Glory as that which will shortly leave you in the dust. Why should it be proper to Dying men to be Wise, and to Judge truly of this world, when all the living undoubtedly know that they must Die?

2. At least the Tempter will persuade with you to enjoy your Prosperity to the satisfying of your flesh; and tell you that the free use of the Creatures is your Christian Liberty, and therefore you need not deny your selves those Delights that God affordeth you. But remember that it is the seem-
...sweetness of the Creature that draws men from God: The Pleasantness of the Condition is the most dangerous. If ever you would have your soul Prosper, make no provision for the flesh to satisfy its lusts: A better man than any of us, was fain to tame his body and bring it into subjection. Mortification is a necessary, but much neglected part of the Christian Religion.

3. Should the Tempter prevail in these, it would follow, that God would be much forgotten, former Engagements violated, and the Invisible things of the Life to come would be seldom thought on, and less esteemed. O think on him that remembred you in your greatest straits! Its a provoking sin to break those Engagements which depth of Extremity, or Greatness of Deliverance, did formerly constrain us to make with our God: Ingratitude makes a forfeiture of all we have. And think not well of your own heart, when you cannot think more sweetly of another world than of this. Its unhappy prosperity that makes God to be more slighted, and the Glory to come more unfavourly to our thoughts, and makes us say, It is best to be here.

4. Another dangerous Temptation that will attend these, will be, to disregard Christ's Interest through an over-minding of their own: To play your own game, and lay out your chiefest care for yourself, and make God's business to stoop unto your own. Where this prevails, the hearts of such are false to Christ: While they pretend to serve him, they do but serve themselves upon him. They will honour Christ no longer then he will honour them. And when they are once false to Christ, they can be true to no other. Their friends are esteemed but as stepping stones to their Ends. When they can serve them no longer they reject them as unprofitable. Ever Remember, that man stands safest that Essometh no Interest contradictory to Christ's; I had almost said, None but Christ's: For even Christ himself was made his own, and then his own will be Christ's. God is more engaged to secure his own Interest then ours. There is no Policy therefore comparable to this, to Engage most deeply where Christ's chiefest Interest lieth, and to Unite our own to his, in a just subordination. He that will needs have a standing divided from Christ, Independent on him, or Equal with him, much more in Opposition to him, is sure to fall. It will break the greatest Prince on Earth to essometh an Interest inconsistent with Christ's, when he doth but arise to plead his Cause. Study therefore where Christ's Interest most lieth, and then devote all your own to the promoting of it: and hold none that lives not as the Vine on the Wall, or rather as the branch in the Vine, in Dependance upon his. And upon Enquiry you will finde, that Christ's
Christ's Interest lies much in these two things, the Piety and the Peace of his People. The Reformation of his Churches, and the Uniting of them (at home and abroad) are the greatest works that any can be employed in. To which ends God's chiefest means, is an Able, Godly, Diligent Ministry, to Teach and Rule his flocks according to his Word. All the Interest that God hath Given you, he expecteth should be speedily, diligently and undeservedly employed to these Ends. Delay not, you have but your time. Think it not enough to do no harm, or no more good then those below you. Your standing is unsafe when you do little or nothing for God. He is not bound to hold you the Candle to do nothing, or to work for your self. Work therefore while it is day: the night comes when none can work.

5. Another Temptation that you must expect, will be, to have your minde swell with your Condition: and to disrepect the inferior sort of your Brethren. But I hope the Lord will keep you small in your own eyes, as remembering that you are the same in the eyes of your Judge, and your shadow is not lengthened by your successus, and that you must lie down with the Vulgar in the common dust.

Sir, Because the matter of this Book may be less useful to you, I could not direct it to your hand, without some words that might be more useful. I do not fear lest you should take my faithfull dealing for an injury, or interpret my Monition to be an Accusation; as long as you so well know the Affections of your Monitor. The Lord be your Teacher and Defence, and Direct, Excite, Encourage and Succeed you, and all that have Opportunity to do any thing to the Repairing of our Breaches, by furthering The Reformation and Unity of the Churches: Which is the earnest Desire, and daily Prayer of

Your Servant in the work of Christ

RICHARD BAXTER.
ACCOUNT
Given to his Reverend Brother
Mr. T. Blake
Of the Reasons of his Dissent
From The Doctrine of his Exceptions
in his late Treatise of the Covenants.

John 3.7.
Little Children, let no man deceive you: He that doth Righteousness,
is Righteous, even as he is Righteous.

1 Tim. 4.8.
Godliness is Profitable unto All things, having Promise of the Life that
now is, and of that which is to come.

London,
Printed by A. M. for Thomas Underhill at the Anchor and
Bible in Pauls Church-yard, and Francis Tyton at the
three Daggers in Fleetstreet, 1654.
ACCOUNT

OF

A

REIGN OF THE Q."

WITH

THE

F

E

O

R

C

A

O

R

T

E

N

A

C

O

A

A

R

I

N

O

G

N

E

R

T

F

F

O

T

G

H

L

E
The Preface Apologetical.

Of sweet a thing is Christian Love and Concord, and so precious are the thoughts of Peace to my Soul, that I think it unmeet in this contentious Age, to publish such a Controversie as this, without an Apology: which, its likely, may be needful, both as to the Matter and the Manner. Not that I dare rather choose to Excuse a fault, then to forbear the committing of it: But that I would have the Reader judge of things as they are. Just Apologies are not a cover to our faults, but for removal of mis-representations, and healing of misapprehensions, that those may not be taken for faults which are none, or those to be of the greater size, which are but ordinary infirmities. Whether my Apology be Just, the Reader must judge.

I do so heartily Love Peace, that I have hard thoughts of Controversie: yet do I so Love the Truth, that I refuse not to contend for it. Though the strait be great, yet its no other then we are usually put to, even in lower things. The most noble and excellent ends, may have some distasteful means: which as none that is in his right senses will choose for themselves, so none but a slave to his senses will refuse when they are necessary. It is no Contradiction in such a case, but true Discretion, to Choose the thing which at the same time we do Abhor: To choose it as a necessary Means, and yet to abhorre it for its Ungrateful Nature. We are contented to seek, and buy, and take that Phyfick which we so abhorre, that we have much ado to get it down or to retain it. The Lord knows, that contending is distasteful to my soul: though my corrupt nature is too prone
prone to it. Much studying of Controversies hath oft discomposed
my minde, and interrupted my more sweet and heavenly thoughts,
and unfitted me for publack and private duties; so that I as sensibly
finde my self a loser by it, as by some other avocations of a more
aliene nature. Yet dare I not be so selfish as to cast it off. That must
be endured, which may not be desired. We may not pretend the
disadvantages to our souls (much less any lower) against apparent
duty, and service to the truth of God. Many ways hath our Ma-
fter to make us a full reparation for our losses. What then shall I
resolve on? Neither to Delight in Controversie: nor totally to
Refuse it. Not to rush upon it unadvisedly, nor to be carried into
it by blinde Passion and partiality, nor yet to cast away my Captains
Colours, nor to draw back when I am preft. Not to militate for any
Faction, but for the Faith; nor for vain-glory and credit, but for
Christ: And this with such a differencing the Person from the
Caufe, that as it respecteth the error, it shall be bitter and conten-
tious; but as to my Brother, it shall be a Conference of Love. I
abhorre almost nothing more in Divines, then laying too much
upon the smaller controvertible Doctrinals, and making too much
of our Religion to consist in curious and
unnecessary speculations, if not unsearch-
able, unrevealed things; contradicting
one of their first Maxims, that [Theo-
logy is a Practical Science.] An honest
Philosopher saw the evil of this*. Yet
must Gods commands be obeyed, and
the Truth defended, and the Church
confirmed and edified, and the soul of
an erring Brother be relieved, though
at a dearer rate then a verbal Dispu-
tation.

It is about five years since I wrote a small book about Justificati-
on, and being in great weaknese and expectation of death, I was
forced to deliberate, Whether to publish it with its many Imperfe-
tions, or not at all? I chose the former, supposing the Defects and
Crudities would be charged only on the Author, and that some Light
might notwithstanding appear to the Reader, which might further
him in the understanding of several truths. I durst not so far value
reputation, as to be injurious to Verity, for fear of discovering my
own infirmity: Its no time to be solicitous about the esteem of men,

* Seneca. Epif. ad Luc. 102. 
Non debitis hoc nobis esse propo-
sum, argutias fore, & Phi-
losophiam in has angustias, ex
sua Majestate destrabere.

Quanto fatis est ire aperta
via, & retta, quam sibi ipsi
fleulus disponeere, quos cum mag-
nam molestia debeas relegere? Ne-
quide enim quequam alio iste
Disputationes sunt, quam inter
se petita captandum lusser.
when we are drawing near to the Judgement Seat of God. When this Book came abroad, it fell under very different Censures, as most things use to do that seem to go out of the ordinary road. Too many overvalued it: Some were offended at it. Hereupon being afraid left by Ignorance or Rashness I should wrong the Church and Truth, I did in the end of my Book of Baptism, desire my Brethrens animadversions and advice: which accordingly many of the most pious and Learned men that I know in the Land, were pleased to afford me; and that with so much Ingenuity, Love and Gentleness, as I must needs confess my self their Debtor, as having no way deserved so great a favour: and I do hereby return them my most hearty thanks. After this my Reverend and Dear Brother Mr Blake in a Treatise of the Covenants, did publish a Confutation of some things in my Book (among many others whom he deals with, Mr Powell, Mr Tombes, Mr Owen, Mr Firmin, &c.) wherein I found nothing but tenderness and brotherly Love, as to my person; and no such inclination to extrems in his Doctrine, as I found in some others; but much Moderation and Sobriety, as indeed the Gravity, Piety and Integrity of the man, would promise to any that know him. Only I thought it might have been more convenient to him, to me, and to others, if I had seen his exceptions before they had been published, that so having known what I would reply, he might have published only so much as he remained unsatisfied in. But as it seems, his Judgement was otherwise, so is it no whit to me offensive. Yet when I had read his Book, it was my Resolution, to send him privately my Reply, that so we might consider how farre we were agreed, and how farre the difference was only seeming and about words, and might publish only the remainder to the world, by joynt Consent. The Reasons of this Resolution were these: First, Because I was loath by tedious altercations, to hinder the Reader from discerning the Truth: It is the course of most voluminous Disputers, to tire their Readers with Contendings about words, that they can hardly finde out the true state of the Controversie; much les discern on which side is the Truth. Which might be much remedied if men would but lovingly first debate the matter in private, and cut off all the superfluities and verbal Quarrels; and then put out only the material differences by joynt Consent, having Corrected even in the language and manner of debating, whatsoever was displeasing or seemed injurious to either party. Secondly, Because I unfeignedly abhorre contending, and never wrote any thing that way, but when
I was unavoidably necessitated. Thirdly, Because I so well know my own frailty, and proneness to be over-eager and keen, and un-mannerly in my style, and the frailty of most Brethren in being Impatient hereof; yea of many in judging themselves wronged when they are not, and making some plain speeches which were but necessary or innocent, to seem proud, contemptuous, and slighting as to mens persons, racking them to a sense that was never intended, I therefore thought it safest to avoid all occasions of such mistakes, which may be injurious to themselves, as well as to me. Fourthly, Because the Lord hath of late years by a strange, unresistible work of his power, fastened in my soul so deep an Apprehension of the Evil of Dissentions, and of the Excellency and Necessity of the Unity of Brethren, and the Peace of the Church; and in order here-to, of the healing of our Divisions, that it sticks in my thoughts night and day, and the Zeal of such a Reconciliation doth eat me up; so that I make it the main study and business of my Meditations, which way I might do any thing towards its accomplishment. And I was much afraid, lest if I wrote by way of Controversie, I might, by exasperating my Brethren, hinder this happy work. He that knoweth my heart, knoweth that these were my thoughts: Hence- upon I did in the first Page signifie to M. Blake, this my Resolution, which when I was forced to alter, I would not alter the words of my writing, but having given this account of the reason of them, I shall let them go as I wrote them.

Before I had finisht my Reply to Mr. Blake, comes out Mr. Kendal's Book against M. Goodwin, with his Digression against me: After this, I was informed of divers others that were ready to write against my Doctrine, and some that had written, and were ready to publish it, and divers others that were desirous to send me their Animadversions. I did therefore apprehend (and so did many learned Friends) an unavoidable Necessity of appearing more publicly, both to spare my Friends the labour of writing the same things to me over and over, which so many others had written before; and to spare myself the time and pains of endless private Replies (which have this three years taken me up, and hindered me from more profitable work:) and also to prevent mens publication of more such writings as have already been published; seeing when none know what I can say against them, the rest may go on in the way as these have done, and trouble themselves and the world in vain. Besides, I understood that some were offended at my silence, as mis-inter-
preting it to be from contempt. Being therefore necessitated to do something of this kinde, I could not (according to the Laws of Justice or Friendship) deal publickly with any, but those that had begun to deal publickly with me. Its true, there hath been long unanswered, a Book of Mr. Owens against some things which I had wrote which concerned him. But I never thought fit (nor yet do) to Reply to that: 1. Partly because it containeth so little matter of real difference between him and me (and most of that is answered by Mr. Blake, and in my Reply to Mr. Kendall:) The main Points being, Whether Christ suffered the same which the Law threatened, or the Value, or that which was equivalent? (wherein he yieldeth as much as I need) and, Whether the Covenant be Conditional? and, Whether the Obligation to Punishment be dissolved before we Believed, sinned, or were born? And to vindicate the Truth in these two or three Points, I conceive it not so meet a way, to do it in Answer to that Book, wherein ten times more words would be bestowed in alterations, and upon the by. 2. Besides, I was never necessitated to a Reply to that Book, nor once desired, and I will do nothing of that kinde, which I know how to avoid. 3. But indeed my greatest reason, was the consciousnesse of my temerity in being so foolishly drawn to begin with him; and the consciousnesse of my fault in one or two unmannery words of him, and consequently the consciousnesse of my duty to be first silent. It is not fit that I should both begin and end. But these Brethren that I here Reply to, did begin with me.

Upon these Reasons, I sent not my papers to Mr. Blake, but resolved to publish them, with my Reply to Mr. K.

As for Mr. K. himself, I know not the man; but by his writings he appears to be a Learned man: And I will hope his humility may be answerable to his Learning, though he here express it not: We are all poor frail sinners; and above all do hardly Master our Pride; the fire whereof in an unmortified soul, doth make fewell to it self of Gods excellent Gifts, till it have turned them all into salt and ashes. That which this Learned man hath troubled himself to write concerning my self, I will not insist on: It is not for my self that I am disputing, but for the Truth, so farre as I know it: I can truly say as Augustine to Hierom, Obscreto per manufactudinem Christi, sit te las; dimittas mibi; nec me vicissim ledendo malum pro malo reddas. Lades enim si mihi taueris errorem meum, quem forte inueniris in Scriptis, vel in dictis meis. Nam si ea in me reprehenderis, quae
repellendom non sunt, te potius latus quam me; quod ab sit a moribus, & sanete proposto tuo, ut hoc facias voluntate legendi culpans in me aliquid dente malevolo, quod mente veridica scis non esse culpandum, &c. Fieri potest ut tibi videatur aliquid quam veritas habet, dum tamen aliquid abs te non fiat quam charitas habet. Nam & ego amicississimam reprehensionem tuam gratissime accipiam, etiam si reprehendi non meruit, quod recte defendi potest: Aut agnoscam simul & benevolentiam tuam & culpam meas; & quantum Dominus donat, & alio gratiae, in alio mendatissimus veniam. Quid ergo? fortasse dura, sed certe salubria verba tuae tanquam cestus Entellis pertingescam. Caedebatur ille: non curabatur: Et ideo vincet batur, non sanabatur. Ego autem si medicamente correctionem tuam, tranquillus accipero, non dolebo. Si vero infirmitas vel humana, vel mea, etiam cum veraealer argentur, non potest non aliquantulum contristari; Melius tumor Capitis dolet cum curatur, quam dum ei parcirur, & non sanatur. Hoc est enim quod acutis vidit, qui dixit, Utiliores esse plerunque inimicos objurgantes, quam amicos objurgare metuentes. Illi enim dum rixantur dicunt aliquando vera, quae corrigam: isti autem minorem quam oportet exhibent justitiam libertatem, dum amicitiae timent exasperare dulcedinem. Non mihi esse debet molestum pondus cratis tuae, dummodo comiter pateat culpa mea. I do not feel myself hurt by the words of Mr. K. against my self, much less by any free disclosure of my faults. But I confess I desired more Clemency to his Adversary, and more humble sense of his own frailty, when I read some passages in him against Mr. Goodwin. For example, part. 3. pag. 112, 113. much of two pages are taken up in [* A Solemn Profession of his discerning the just hand of heaven, and the spirit of slumber on Mr. Goodwin, and the pompous display of his folly, to appear most ridi
culous, &c. ] even daring to [* adore the hand of God in infatuating his parts, that Balaams Asi may see the hand of the Angel against the Prophet] with more of the like. And what is the matter? Why Mr. Goodwin over-
feekingly wrote the word [* Antecedent ] for [* Consequent] and [* Con-ssequent ] for [* Antecedent.] A hainous crime! When I read such passages as these in him, I began to think, how well I had sped, and tantum non, did owe him thanks for handling me so gent-
ly, even in those passages that others most blamed. But I saw
faw it was no wonder, if all my words were sifted to the bran. * Indeed I more desired in
Mr. K. a conscience so tender as would have strained at

some of all those palpable untruths in matter of fa&c, then a milder language to

my self. But he tells us in his Epistle, that Aliquando innocentius delinquendum
eras, ne doceas in quibus condonandis, &c. Et quidmi mibi gratular felicita quadam err-
ratula, &c. Whether he think also that he should innocentius delinquere, & falsiter
errire, that there may be matter for the honour of God's Grace, as well as mans,
I cannot tell.

2. As for the Manner of my handling these Controversies (which is the next thing that (more) needeth an Apology,) I expect to be blamed for these three things: 1. For unprofitable Altercations and Repetitions. 2. For too much curiosity and obscurity in some distinctions. 3. For too course and sharp a style.

1. For the first, I knew not how to avoid it, without inconvenience. I must follow the leading of them that I reply to. I must not digress too farre, to fetch in more usefull matter then they put into my hands. Yet I think I have done somewhat in that kinde, as far as I saw fit. And when the same words of theirs, require the same answers, I am forced sometime to repeat them, where the occasion is repeated. Yet I can promise the Reader that I will not go near so far in this way of repetition, as more learned disputants do, and in particular Dr. Twiss.

2. For the second Exception, I must say, that many are mistaken in my way, in that they discern not the difference, 1. Between Necessary distinguishing and unnecessary. 2. Between Curiosity in the main Cause, and in the Means of discoursing it. 3. Between curious Notions that are thrust on the Church and poor ignorant people, as Necessary and Certain; and such as we are forced to use with Learned men to discover their mistakes, and to expugne curiosity of Error or Uncertainty, by exactness of indagation, and as curious an explication of the Truth. I am somewhat confident that my curious distinguishing (as some call it) is but of the later sort, in all these respects. For example, In the present Controversie about the Instrumentality of faith to Justification, that which offendeth me is, that Divines should be so dangerously curious, as to make a Logical Notion of such Necessity, which God's Word never used, nor for ought I know, the Church for many a hundred year; and which poor people cannot comprehend: Yea and that they may lay so much of the difference between us and the Papists on this point, thereby
thereby most dangerously hardening them, when they shall discover our Errou; and occasion them to triumph over us, and to think, that the rest of our Doctrine is like this? And that this Instrumentality is still so contradistinguished from Merit, as if there were no third way of Faiths Interest in our Justification, but it must needs be the one or the other. Yea and the most Learned in the upshot flie to this, that Credere is not Agere, but Pati, and is but Affio Grammatica, or the name of Action, but Physically or hyperphysically a suffering. Is not here a curious Doctrine of Faith and Justification? If Aristotle had been a Christian he could not have comprehended it: Much more is it too fine for vulgar wits (as well as too false for lovers of the Truth.) In opposition to this, and in compassion of plain Christians, I only say, that faith is the Condition of our Justification; or that the reason why we are Justified by it (supposing its Object, and its Aptitude) is, because the Free Donor, Law-giver and Justifier will have it so, and hath designed it to this Office in his Promiue or Testament. I think this is plain Doctrine, and fit for plain men. There's scarce the simplest man in the Town, if one offer him the Soveraigns pardon for Rebellion, on Condition he will thankfully Accept it, and promise to Rebell no more, but he knows this to be the reason why his Acceptance hath an Interest in his pardoning (viz. as the fittest Condition freely determined on by the Sovereign) without any more ado. And I think to reade him a Logick Lecture about Active or Passive Instrumentality, would more abuse then enlighten his understanding. Yet the subtilties of those whom I oppos'd, doth force me oft to distinguish, to expugne their Sophistry: and I am forced to use more accurate means to defend a plain Truth. And indeed, he that Defineth and Distinguishes well teacheth well. Confusion is the Mother and Nurse of Error. Truth loves the Light. It is not found Distinction that I blame in any, but fancies and vain curiosities, and carrying us from Matter to Words, and making an appearance of difference, where there is none, and calling Confusion by the name of distinction or explication. I am sure a few obvious Distinctions, have been a Key to let many a truth into my understanding.

Moreover I must desire the Reader to consider, when things seem too curious to him, and hard to be understood, whether it be not from the Nature of the subject matter, rather then from any unnecessary Curiosity in me: If the matter be such as will bear no more familiar and plain enodations and explications, I cannot help that.
As Seneca faith, Epist. 58. Platon imputes, non mihi hanc rerum difficultatem. Nulla est autem sine difficultate subtilitas. I cannot better speak my minde then in the words of Austin, li. 5. de Trinit. c. 1. Ab his etiam qui ista lecturi sunt, ut ignoscant peto ubi me magis voluisse quam petuisse dicere animadverterint, quod vel ipse melius Intelligens, vel propter me eloqui difficultatem non intelligint: Sicut ego eis ignoro, ubi propter suam tarditatem intelligere non possunt. Pardon my obscure difficult expressions, and I will pardon your dullness of apprehension.

3. For the third Exception, viz. the sharpness of my file, I have these things to say, 1. I dare not, nor will not wholly excuse it. I am too conscious of my frailty, to think my self innocent in this. I confessed my fault as to one even now; and I confess as to another (Mr Walker) I committed the same fault, by too unmannerly provoking expressions (Though I will take none for a competent Judge of the degree of my fault, that hath not read his Answer to 7. Goodwin, and Mr Gatakers Vindication of Mr Wottons Defence.) The other passages that some accuse me of, are, I think, upon a forced mistaken sense of my words. The most real sharpness that ever I was guilty of, was against Mr Tombes in my Book of Baptism: and its too probable that in this against Mr K. I have transgressed: which if I have done, I heartily desire him, as I do all other Brethren whom I have offended, in compassion of humane frailty, to remit it; as I heartily do all those passages of his, which his Readers do generally judge to unsavoury. However I do adjure every Reader, that would not break the ninth Commandment, and wrong God and themselves and me by false censures, that they impute not my sharp expressions to a disfent of Christian Unity and Peace, or a hatred to my Brother: and that by too impatient reception, they make it not an occasion of disaffection, or breach of peace in themselves. For the Lord knows, that, though my words may be too rough and earnest, yet my soul longeth after the Unity and Peace of the Church. And I never yet wrote against any Brother so sharply, but I could heartily live with him in dear Love and Communion; as I am confident I should do with these, if they were near me: For sure I am, I disagree not with those with whom I do converse; nor ever fell out with any Brother, to my remembrance, since I was a childe. Charge me with unmeet expressions if you please; but with no further Unpeaceableness, Disaffection, or Con-
tempt of my Brethren; then you can prove. 2. I must intreat the Reader to distinguish carefully, between my speeches against the Person, and against the Errour or Cause which I oppose. I confess, when I am confident that it is Errour that I speak against, especially if it appear to be foul or dangerous, I am apt to shame it, and load it with Absurdities, and shew the nakedness of it to the Reader: In this case, I finde many take it as if I spoke all this of the Person, and cenfured him as absurd, as I do his Opinion: which is an injurious charge; seeing a wise man may hold an absurd Opinion. And I think, as I must not speak contemptuously of my Brother for a lesser Errour, so neither must I for his fake, speak lightly and favourably of his faults. Errour is not like confessed sins, which none dare own, or encourage others in: but it is a Vice that disposeth men to Infect all they can; and emboldneth them to defend it, and fearlessly to draw all others into the guilt. And therefore it needeth the most potent opposition, and the souls of our Brethren need the most effectual preservative: And that must not be only by a naked, dull Conflation, but also by a discovery of the foulness, the sinfulness and dangerousness of the Errour. The Affections have need to be awaked, as well as the Understanding informed, in the present case, as well as against common moral Vices. I am sure Seducers make no small advantage, by moving the Affections, and why they that speak Truth should not do so, I cannot tell. If we must so in Preaching, so must we in some Disputings, still supposing that Information go first, and exciting application be but subservient, and be not the leading, or the principal part. Those that take intellectual Errour to be no sin, must deny the understanding to be under a Law, and its acts to be participative voluntary, and being commanded by the Will. And if Errour be sinne, we may have leave to disgrace it and deal with it as sinne, provided that we maintain our Charity to the erring Brother. I am bound not to hate my Brother in my heart, but plainly to Rebuke him, and not suffer sin to rest upon him. If he take it ill, that makes not me the offender, nor will discharge me from my duty. 3. I confess I think we are commonly too tender ear’d in such cases: of which I have spoken my minde already in the end of the Preface to my Book of Baptism. I have oft wondered to think what patience we expect (and justly) yea and finde, in many of the worst of our hearers, when we speak to them as cuttingly as possibly we can (and all too little:) and how little
little we exercise or can allow to one another! And what silken ears
the Preachers of humility have themselves? And I cannot but ob-
serve the strange partiality of the best: how zealous they are against
a Toleration of Errors; and yet how impatient of being told of
their own. Other mens should be cut down with the Sword, and
theirs may not be plainly confuted by the Word: nor can we so skil-
fully butter and oyl our words, but that we shall be taken for con-
temners of our Brethren. Not that I am free from the same disease:
but (though proud hearers judge him a proud speaker that deals
plainly with them, yet) I can truly say of that sin, to the praise of
my Physition, as Seneca Epift. 8. Salutares admonitiones velut medi-
camentorum utilium compositiones litteris mando, esse illas efficaces
in meis ulceribus expertus: quia etiam disperfanata non sunt, servere de-
serrunt. Reftum iter quod fiero cognovi, & lassus errando, aliis mon-
stro. And for my own stile in writing, it is but such as I would use
in free speaking, if any Brethren were present: and I think they
would then bear it. I would not be furious, nor yet would I be blockish;
nor speak as without life about the matters of life. I lay
of earliness as Seneca of wit, Epift. 75. Qualis sermo meus estet
si una sededere mus, aut ambularemus, tales esse Epistolam meam volo, que
nibil habeant accersitum, aut fictum. Si fieri posset quid sentiam offen-
dere, quam loqui, mallem. Etiam disjutarem, nec supplerem pedem,
&c. hoc nunum plane tihi approbare vellem, omniam ista sentire
que diceremus, nec tantum sentire sed amare. Non jejuna esse & arida
deflo, quae ad rebus tam magis dicentur. Neq; enim Philosophia ingen-
io renuntiat. Hac fit propositi nostri summa: quod sentimus, loquamur;
quod loquimur sentiamus.

4. One thing more I desire: that if my words be any where of-
fensive, the Reader will do me that right, as to consider diligently
the words that I Reply to: for without that, you cannot equally
judge of mine. Though I do not feel my self smart by any words
of Mr. K’s, yet I knew not well how sufficiently to Reply to them,
without manifesting them to be as they are. I remember Hierom,
speaking of one Evagrius that pleaded for the Stoical impassionate-
ness, faith he was, Aut Deus, aut Saxum: I am neither: and
therefore must speak as I am. Yet this I will promise my most of-
fended Brethren, that in the harshest of my Writings, I will not
give my adveraries half so hard language, as did either Hierom the
most Learned of the Fathers, or Calvin the most Judicious and

(a 3) Happy
Happy of the Reformers, no nor as Dr. Twisse the most Learned opposer of the Arminians. And I remember what it was that Hieronym complained of (advers. Ruffinum) Canino dente me rodunt, in publico detractentes, legentes in angulis: Iadem Accusatorem & Defensores; cum in aliis probent, quod in me reprobant: quasi Virtus & Vitium non in Rebus sit, sed cum Authorum mutetur.

I cannot blame the Reader if he be weary of this long Apologie, and ask, To what purpose are all these words? To whom I truly answer; More for thy sake then mine own: because some angry Divines that dissent, do raise such an odium against my Writings, upon the pretences before intimated, that they may thereby hinder thee from receiving any benefit, and entertaining the Truth. For my own sake, I confess it little troubleth me; for I know it hath been the case of my betters, and I have greater matters to be troubled for. I can say as Vit. Strigelius Epist. ad Wesenbech. a little before his death, Ego editione talium pagellarum nec nomenis mei vanam gloriam quero, nec auctupium pecuniae exerceo: Sed cupio Deo declarare meam gratitudinem pro maximis beneficiis; & Ecclesia ostendere meam confessionem, demisi mediocribus ingenii aliqua ex parte prodeste. Horum finium cum mihi optime sum Consciis; non metuo quorumdam insolvas aut venenas reprehensiones, sed me & meos labores Filio Dei commendo. Scio meum Vitae curriculum & breve & exiguum esse: Quare in hac brevitate peregrinationis ea dicam, scribam & faciam, qua migrationem in vitam aeternam non impediant. This Learned Divine (Strigelius) himself, and before him Melanthon, as peaceable as Learned (and many another besides them also) have been so tired with the cenfures and reproaches of Divines, that it made them, if not weary of living, yet more willing to die: So that Melanthon thus wrote down before his death, the motives of his willingness to leave this world.

A dextris.

A sinistris.

Disce des a Peccatis:

Liberaberis ab arumnis &
a Rabie Theologorum.

Venies in Lucem:

Videbis Deum:

Intueberis Filium Dei:

Disce illa mira arcana qua in hac vita intelligere non potuisti: Cur hic sinus conditi: Qualis sit copulatio
duarum naturarum in Christo.

Nay
Nay it is not only Dissenters, that do terrifie people from reading what I have written, by telling them of I know not what latent dangerous Errours; but even they that are of the same opinion with me: For example, I lately wrote, that [the Doctrine of Infallible perseverance of all the sanctified, was my strong opinion; and I was persuaded of its truth,] and I argued for it from Scripture; yet because I so far acknowledged my own weakness, as to say, that I was not so fully certain of it, as of the Articles of the Creed, and because I say, I think it unsafe for a backsliding scandalous Christian, to venture his salvation merely on this controverted Point,] what offence is taken? what reports spread abroad? some proclaiming that I wrote against Perseverance (even when I wrote for it;) Others that I am turn'd Arminian: Others that I am dangerously warping! In so much that some of my nearest friends, for whose good I published that Book, were ready to throw it by for fear of being infected with my doctrine against Perseverance! The enemies Instruments be not all unlearned nor ungodly.

For my part, I commend their zeal against Error, so it be Error indeed, and so they will moderate it with Charity and Humility. I am as strongly persuaded that its the Dissenters that erre, as they are that I. And were they as zealous against Error indeed, I think I might have spared the labour of such Writings as these. But I remember how they reprehended Beatus Rhenanus for his supposed covetousness, Beatus est Beatus: attamen sibi. So are such Brethren charitable, sibi & suis. And all this comes a studio partium, and because the Doctrine of the Unity of Christs Body, and the Communion of Saints (as Saints) is not reduced to practice; and we love not men so much for being of the same Body, as for being of the same Side or Party with us; nor for being in the same Christ, as for being of the same Opinion. If he that knows Christ knows all things; and if Interest in Christ alone be enough to make us Happy; then is it enough to make our Brother Amiable; though still we may be allowed the dislike of his faults.

Which side the Truth lies on, in the Points here debated, I willingly leave the Reader to judge according to the evidence that shall appear to him in the perusal. I desire no more of him, but Diligence, Impartiality, and Patience in his studying it: And I again intreat my Brethren to believe that I write this in an unfained Love of
of Peace and them: and that accordingly they will receive it: and where they meet with any of the effects of my infirmity, which may seem provoking and injurious to them, they will compassionately remit them; remembering that Heaven will shortly Reconcile our differences.

Kedermister, Aug. 1. 1653.
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The
The Prologue.

My Reverend and dearly beloved Brother, I remember that when I met you last at Shrewsbury, you told me that you had sent to the Prelie a Treatise of the Covenants, and desired me not to be offended, if you published in it some things against my Judgement: Your Treatise is since come to my hands, and upon a brief perusal of some part of it, I am bold to let you know this much of my thoughts. 1. That I very much value and honour your Learned Labours, and had I been Mr. Vines or Mr. Fisher, I might rather have given (in some respects) a higher commendations of your Book:

And especially I love it for its sound discoveries of the Vanity of the Antinomians. 2. So farre am I from being offended at your Writing against my Writings, that (as I have oft said concerning Mr. Owen, since I saw his Book against me, even so do I by you) I never honoured you so much (though much) nor loved you so dearly (though dearly) before as since; for I see more of your worth then I saw before. For where I err, why should I be offended with any brother for loving Gods Truth and mens souls, above my Errors, or any seeming Reputation of mine that may be ingaged in them, and for seeking to cure the hurt that I have done? God forbid that I should seek to maintain a Reputation obtained by, or held in an opposition to the Truth. I take all my Errors in Theology (even in the highest revealed points, participaliter) to be my sinnes; but especially my divulged Errors: And I take him for my best friend, that is the greatest enemy to my fins. And where I err not, I have little cause for my own sake to be offended at your opposition. For as you are pleased to honour me too highly both in your Epithetts and tender dealing, yea in being at so much pains with anything of mine, and in flocking to a publick opposition of that which you might have thought more worthy of your contempt, so I know you did it in a zeal for God and Truth, and you thought all was Error that you opposed; so that in the general we fight under one Master, and for one Cause, and against one Enemy: You are for Christ, I. For Truth and against Errors, so farre as you know it, and so am I. I know you wrote not against Me, but against my Errors, real or supposed. And truly, though I would not be shamefced or impenitent, nor go so far as Seneca, to say we should not object a common fault to singular persons (Vid. Cor. de Iré, l. 3. c. 26. p. (mibi) 452. no more then to reproach a Blackmore with his colour; yet I
see so much by the most Learned and Judicious, to assure me that humainum est error, and that we know but in part, that I take it for no more dishonour, to have the world know that I err, then for them to know that I am one of their Brethren, a son of Adam, and not yet arrived at that blessed state where that which is childish shall cease, and all that is imperfect shall be done away. Only if my Errors be greater than ordinary, I must be humbled more then ordinary, as knowing that my sin is the cause that I have no greater illumination of the Spirit. I have truly published to the world my indignation against the proud indignation of those men, that account him their enemy that shall publicly contradict them.

2. Yet must I needs tell you, that in the points which you contradict, I finde no great alteration upon my understanding by your Writings; whether it be from the want of evidence of truth in your Confutation, or through the dulness of my Apprehension, I hope I shall better be able to judge, when I have heard from you next. I think I may safely say, it is not from an unwillingness to know the Truth. And one further difference there is in our Judgements: For my Judgement is, that it is not so convenient nor safe a way to publish suddenly a reply to your opposition, as to tell you my thoughts privately (seeing we live so near) and to bring the Points in difference by friendly collations to as narrow a compass as we can, and make as clear a discovery of each others meanings as may be; and then by joint consent to tell the world our several Judgements, and our Reasons, as lovers of the Truth and of each other; that so others may have the benefit of our friendly Collations and Enquiries; and may be thereby advantaged for the more facile discovery of the Truth. Truly I would have all such Controversies so handled, that all the vain alterations might lye in the dust in our Studies, and that which is published might be in one Volume friendly subscribed by both parties. In this I perceive by your pravity, your Judgement differs from mine; and that you rather judge it fitteft to speak first by the Press, that the world may hear us. I crave your acceptance of these Papers, rather in this private way, and that you will signifie to me in what way I shall expect your return, wherein I think it fitter you please your self then me. I shall faithfully give you an account of the effect of your Arguments on my weak understanding; but not in the order as they lye in your Book, but I will begin with those Points which I judge to be of greatest moment.

§ 1.

Mr. Blake's Treat. of Covenants, pag. 79:

It is also true that faith accepts Christ as a Lord, as well as a Saviour: But it is the Acceptation of him as a Saviour, not as a Lord, that Justifies: Christ Rules his People as a King, Teaches them as a Prophet, but makes Atonement for them only as a Priest, by giving himself in Sacrifice, his blood for Remission of sins: These must be distinguished, but not divided: Faith hath an eye at all, the blood of Christ, the command of Christ, the doctrine of Christ, but as it lies and fastens on his blood, so it Justifies. He is set out a propitiator through faith in his blood, Rom. 3.14. not through faith in his command. It is the blood of Christ that cleanseth all sin, and not the Sovereignty of Christ. These confusions of the distinct parts of Christ's Mediatorship, and the special offices of faith may not be suffered. Scripture assigns each its particular place and work; Sovereignty doth not cleanse us; nor doth blood command us; Faith in his blood, not faith yielding to his Sovereignty doth Justifie us.
§ 1.

R. B. This is a Point of so great moment in my eyes, that I resolve to begin with it. I doubt not but the difference between you and me is only about the bare methodizing of our Notions, and not de substantiis rei: But I doubt that your doctrine being received by common heads, according to the true importance of your expressions, may do more against their salvation then is yet well thought on: And that not per accidens, but from its proper nature; supposing the impression of the soul to be but answerable to the objective doctrinal seal. I am no friend to the confusion that you here speak against; and I am glad to find you so little in love with it, as to pass your judgement that it is not to be suffered: For now I rest assured that you will not be offended, when here or hereafter, I shall open your guilefulness of it; and that you will not be unwilling of what may tend to your cure. These two or three necessary distinctions I must first here premise, before I can give a clear answer to your words.

1. I distinguish still between constitutive Justification or Remission by the Gospel grant or Covenant, called by most Justification juris, and Justification per sententiam Judicis. 2. I distinguish between constitutive Legal Justification as begun, and as continued or consummated. 3. Between the Physical operation of Christ and his Benefits on the intellect of the Believer per modum objecti apprehendi, as an intelligible species; and the moral conveyance of Right to Christ and his Benefits, which is by an act of Law or Covenant-donation. 4. Between these two questions, What justifieth ex parte Christi? and What justifieth, or is required to our Justification ex parte pecosaior? 5. Between the true efficient causes of our Justification, and the mere condition, sine quano, &c. cum quid. 6. Between Christ's Meriting mans Justification, and his actual justifying him, by constitution or sentence.

Hereupon I will lay down what I maintain in these Propositions, which (some of them) shall speak further then the present Point in Question, for a preparation to what follows.

Prop. 1. Christ did Merit our Justification (or a power to justify) not as a King, but by satisfying the justice of God in the form of a servant.

Prop. 2. Christ doth justify (constitutively as King and Lord, viz. ut Dominus Redempitor, i.e. quoad valorem rei, he executeth it, ut Dominus gratia benefaciose: but quoad modum conditionalem conferendi, ut Mediator & Benefactor. For it is Christ's enacting the new Law or Covenant, by which he doth legally pardon or confer Remission, and constitute us Righteous, supposing the condition performed on our part. And this is not an act of Christ as a Priest or Satisfier; but joyntly, ut Benefactor & Mediator.

Prop. 3. Christ doth justify by sentence, as he is Judge and King, and not as Priest.

Prop. 4. Sentential Justification, is the most full, compleat and eminent Justification; that in Law being quoad sententiam, but virtual Justification; though quoad conditionem debitum et relationem, it be actual Justification.

Prop. 5. Faith justifieth not by receiving Christ as an object which is to make a real impression and mutation on the intellect, according to the nature of the species: I lay, To justify, is not to make such a real change. Though some join with the Papists in this, and tell me, that as the Divine Attributes make their se-
veral moral Impressions on the soul according to their several natures, so do the satisfaction and merits of Christ, apprehended, procure comfort and joy, and a justifying sentence to be pronounced in the soul itself: and so the apprehension of Christ's Sovereignty causeth our subjection (which last is true.)

*Prop. 6* Faith therefore can have no Physical Causeation or Efficiency in justifying; seeing that the work to be done by us, is not *mecipsos Justificare*, in whole or in part, but only *se acquirendum Beneficium gratis sed conditionali cum collaturn*; It is a Relative change that is made by Justification, and not a Real or Physical.

*Prop. 7*. The Legal, formal interest, or conducibility of Faith to our Justification, cannot therefore be any other then that of a Condition, in the proper Law-sense, as the word [Condition] is used, viz. that species of conditions which they call *Voluntaria vel Positivaria*, and not *Casuales vel Mixtae*.

*Prop. 8*. Scripture doth not say (that I can finde,) that Faith justifieth; but that we are justified by Faith: I therefore use the latter phrase rather then the former, both because it is fittest to speak with the Scripture, and because the former speech seemeth to import an Efficiency: but the latter frequently imports no more then a meer condition. Yet I will not quarrell with any that speaks otherwise, not refuse to speak in their phrase while I dispute with them, as long as I first tell them my meaning.

*Prop. 9*. Though, *ex parte Christi*, our several changes proceed from his several Benefits, and parts of his Office exercised for us; yet, *ex parte nostris, i.e. fideri*, it is one entire apprehension or receiving of Christ as he is offered in the Gospel, which is the Condition of our interest in Christ and his several Benefits; and the effect is not parcelled or diversifified or distinguished from the several distinct respects that faith hath to its object. Christ meriteth Remission for us as Satisfier of Justice; and he actually justifieth us as Benefactor King and Judge, and he teacheth us as Prophet, and ruleth us as King. The real mutations here on us, receive their diversification partly from our faith, because there faith doth efficere or causare; As we learn of Christ because we beleive him, or Take him for our Teacher: We obey him because we Take him for our King, &c. But it is not so with the Conveyance of meer Right or Title to Christ and his Benefits. Faith doth not obtain Right to Remission and Justification distinctly as it receiveth his Righteousness, or him self as Priest; and so Right to the Priviledges of Christs Government, distinctly as it taketh him as King; nor Right to Adoption, as it taketh him as a Father; nor Right to Glory, as it taketh him as Glorifier: no more then all inferior benefits (as Title to Magistracy, Ministry, Health, House, Lands, &c.) proceed and are diversified by the divers aspects of our faith on Christ. The true Reason of which is this; That Right to a benefit is the meer effect of the Gift (Donation) or Revealed Will of the Giver: And therefore no Act of the Receiver hath any more interest, or any other then it pleaseth the Donor to assign or appoint it to have. So that (*supposita actus natiura*) all the formal Civil interest comes from God's meer Will, as Donor: (for to the Absolute Benefactor doth it belong, as to conferre all Right to his freely-given Benefits, so to determine of the Time and Manner of Conveyance, and so of the Conditions on the Receivers part.) The nature of the Act of Faith is causeth by God, as Creator of the old and new Creature; I mean of our natural faculties, and their supernatural endowment or dispositions: And therefore this is presupposed in ordine natura to faiths, Legal interest: As God is fitst the Maker of faith, before he is the Maker of.
Adams body: Faith is to be considered as being Faith (i.e. such acts exercised about such objects) in order of nature, before it can be rightly considered as justifying or the condition of Justification: Seeing therefore it receives all its formal Legal interest from God, as Legislator and Donor of Christ and his benefits, which is after its material aptitude ad hoc efficiunt; its interest must not be gathered directly, ex natura actus, but ex constitutione donantis & ordinantis: And therefore you must first prove out of the Gospel, that it is the Ordination of God, that as Christ's several actions have their several effects for us and on us, so our faith shall be the proper condition of each of these various acts, quâ apprehendit, as it Beleeveth or Accepteth each distinct effect, or Christ distinctly as the cause of that effect, & etiam consideratum in medio causandi. But, alas, how invisible is the Proof of this in all your Writings? (I will leave the rest of the Propositions, by which I intended here together to have opened some more of my sense, till afterwards, because I will not interrupt the present business.) Here, either my Understanding is too shallow to reach your sense, or else you are guilty, quod literam, of very great confusion; (which one would think should have beenfallen you at any time, rather then when you are blaming others of unsufferable confusion:) and yet quod sensum involutum, of more dangerous, unscriptural, unproved Distinction.

1. Your expressions confound Christ and his Actions, with mans faith in our Justification: Or, these two Questions [By what are we justified ex parte Christi?] and [By what are we justified ex parte nostri?]

2. Your implied sense, even the heart of your reasoning, consisteth in this assertion, that [As our Right, as to the several benefits received, is to be ascribed distinctly to several distinct Causes on Christ's part, so also as distinctly are the particular Benefits, quod Debitum vel Titulum, to be ascribed to the several distinct apprehensions of these Benefits (as most say) or of Christ as diversly causing them (as some say.)] And here I cannot but complain of a treble injustice that you seem to me guilty of (even in this elaborate Treat, wherein you correct the Errors of so many others.)

3. Against the Truth and Word of God, in implying it to have done that, even in the great Point, the Constitution of the Condition of Justification and Salvation, which is not to be found done in all the Scripture.

4. Against the souls of men: 1. In such nice mincing and cutting the Condition of their Salvation, to their great perplexity, if they receive your doctrine. 2. And also in not affording them one word of Scripture or Reason for the proof of it, which is injustice, when you are Confusing others and Rectifying the world in so great a Point. 3. Lastly (and lastly) it is evident injustice to your Friend, to Accuse him (for it is no hard matter to know whom you mean) with confounding the distinct parts of Christ's Mediatorship, which he still distinguishes as exactly as he can: though he do not distribute as many offices to Faith, as there are objects for it, or as he doth to Christ's several Works. Why did you not name one line where I do confound the parts of Christ's Offices? I pray you do it for me in your next.

I will not trouble you much with Arguments for my opinion in this Point, seeing you meddle with none already laid down, and seeing I have done it over and over to others, and because I am now but Answering to your Confutation. Only let me tell you, that the Proof lieth on your part. For when I have once proved, that God giveth Christ and his Benefits to man, on Condition he will Believe in Christ or Accept him: If you will now distinguish, and say, It is Accepting his,
his satisfaction, which is the Condition of Justification, and Accepting him as King, which is the Condition of Sanctification or Glorification, &c. you must prove this to be true. For noneft dicingueudam vel limitandum ubi Lex non distinguis vel limitas. If God say [Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved,] and you say, [Believing in him as Priest is the only Condition of saving thee from guilt:] and Believing in him as King, is the only Condition of saving thee from the power of sin, &c. you must prove this which you say. Or if you will not say [It is the only Condition] but [the only instrument] you give up the Cause. For the word [Condition] is it that expresseth its nearest Legal Interest in justifying or conveying any Right: and that which you call its Instrumentality, is but the natural Aptitude and Remote Interest.

1. It is the Receiving of Christ as Christ that justifieth (as the Condition of Justification) But he is not received as Christ, if not as Lord-Reedeemer.

2. Justifying faith is (say the Assembly) the Receiving of Christ as he is offered in the Gospel: But he is offered in the Gospel as Saviour and Lord, and not as Saviour only: Therefore, &c.

3. Justifying faith is the Receiving of Christ as a full Saviour: But that cannot be except he be received as Lord. For to save from the power of sin, is as true a part of the Saviours Office, as to save from the guilt.

4. Justifying faith receiveth Christ as he justifieth us, or as he is to justifie us: But he doth justifie us as King and Judge and Benefactor; as he satisfieth and meriteth in the form of a servant under the Law.

5. If receiving Christ as a Satisfier and Meriter, be the only faith that gives right to Justification, then on the same grounds you must say. It is the only faith that gives right to further Sanctification and to Glorification: For Christ Merited one as well as the other.

6. Rejecting Christ as King, is the condemning sin: Therefore receiving him as King is the justifying faith, Luk. 19.27. Those mine enemies that would not that I should reign over them, bring, &c. The reason of the consequent is, because unbelief condemnieth (at least partly) as it is the privation of the justifying faith: I speak of that condemnation or peremptory sentence which is proper to the new Law, and its peculiar condemning sin, eminently so called.

7. Pfar. Killing the Son and submitting to him as King, is made the condition of escaping his wrath.

8. Matt. 11.28, 29, 30. The condition of Base and Rest (from guilt, as well as power of sin) is our coming to Christ as a Teacher and Example of meekness and lowliness, and our Learning of him, and Taking on us his yoke and burden.

9. That faith which is the Condition of Salvation, is the Condition of Justification or Remission: But it is the receiving of Christ as King, as well as Satisfier, that is the Condition of Salvation: Therefore, &c. 1. Justification at judgement, and Salvation (from hell, and adjudication to Glory) are all on the same conditions, Mat. 25. & ubique. 2. Justification is but the justifying of our Right to Salvation; i.e. fencing us as Non res Pana (quia Diabolus et obligatio) et quibus debetur premium: Therefore Justification and Salvation must needs have the same conditions on our part. 3. Scripture no where makes our faith, or act of faith, the Condition of Justification, and another of Salvation. But contrary ascribeth both to one. 4. When Paul argueoth most zealously against Works and for Faith only, it is in respect to Salvation generally, and not to Justification only. Eph. 2. 8, 9. By grace ye are saved through faith, &c. Not of works, lest any
any man should boast. Tit. 3.5. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his Mercy he saved us, &c. Never more was said against Justification by Works (which Paul excludes) then against Salvation by them: Nor is it any more dishonour to Christ that he should give Justification or Remission on Condition of our Accepting him as King, then that he should give salvation on that Condition. 5. Pardon of sin and freedom from hell, must needs have the same Condition: For pardon respecting the punishment as truly as the sin. 

Pardon & Remission adversa: Pardon dissolveth guilt; Guilt is the obligation to punishment. Yet I speak here only of a plenary and continued pardon.

10. Lastly, If Accepting Christ as Lord-Redeemer, be the Fides qua Justification, i.e. qua est condition Justificationis, then it is nearly, strictly and properly the Justifying act of faith, as the accepting of Christ's Righteousness is: But the antecedent is granted by all Divines that I have had to do with: Therefore, &c. For the general cheat is by the distinction of Fides qua Justification (that is, say they, the Accepting of Christ as Saviour and Lord, by a faith disposed to fruitfulness in obedience) and Fides qui Justification (and that is the Accepting of Christ's Righteousness as our formal Righteousnesses, say some: Or the Accepting of Christ's Righteousness as the meritorious cause of our Righteousness, say others: Or the Accepting of Christ himself as Priest, say others.) Now this Fides [Quâ] either respecting the mere matter of faith, or it respecting the formality of the effect, or it respecting the formal Reason of faiths interest in the effect, ut medium, vel causa.

1. If [qua] respect only the matter of faith, then 1. it is an unstrict phrase; for [qua] and [quatenus] are strictly used to express the formal Reason of things. 2. And then the Accepting of Christ as Lord must be the Fides Quâ too: for that is confessed to be materially an act of that faith which justifieth. 2. If [Quâ] respect the formality of the effect, and so the respect of faith to that effect rather than another; then faith is not [justifying] quâ recipit Christum, sed quâ justificat: And so the distinction contains this truth, That fides qua justificat etiam justificat, sed non quâ sanctificat: & c contra. But neither of these can be the sense of them that use this distinction in our case. 3. It must therefore be the former reason of faiths interest in justifying that is expressed by [Quâ:] and then it implies the begging of the Question, or this false supposition [that Fides qua fides justificat] I mean not quâ fides in gener, but quâ hoc fides, viz. quâ est fides in Christum satisfactorem, vel acceptatio Christi. Indeed the term [Accepting] implies the gift and offer, and the constitution of that acceptance for the condition: But the act itself is but the Matter apro to be the condition: If Christ had been given (or pardon) absolutely, or on some other condition; then believing in him would not have justified. Therefore fides in Christum quâ talis doth not justify; but quâ conditionis Testamenti praefis: though fides in Christum quâ talis had in its nature a singular aptitude to be chosen and appointed to this Honour and Office. So much to shew the vanity of that distinction (of much more that might be said.) Further the consequence of the major Proposition of my Argument, is made past all dispute, to them that will but well consider this: To (be the condition of our Justification) speaks the nearest interest of faith in our Justification, that is, as it is medium legale; or that kind of causality which it hath; which is to be causa fine qua non,& cum quâ: Therefore it is a meer impossibility that the Receiving Christ as Lord should be the condition of our Justification (or the fides quâ est condition, as they speak) and yet that we should not be justified by it as a condition, when performed? It is no sounder speech, then to say, that is an efficient cause, which doth
Some Conditions (and most among men) are Moral impulsive causes: Faith is rather a removens probitens, and each nothing in it that so well deserves the title of a Cause, as of a Condition: though unbelief may be said to be the Cause of our Not-being justified, as such causes are said to move God, when we speak according to the manner of men: Indeed if they will say (according to their principles) that "Fides in Christum Dominum que est conditio non justificant per modum infinuandi; I shall grant it: But then, I shall say as much de fide in Christum satisfaciuntem. 2. Thus they grant it the interest of a Condition in our Justification: and I intend no more. We are justified by faith as the Condition of Justification: Therefore we are justified by every act of faith which is the Condition: For, "as quatenus et omne valet consequentia. Thus I have given you a few of those many reasons which-might be given, to prove that the Accepting of Christ for Lord Redeemer, and not only as Satisfier, or not only his Righteousness, is that Faith by which as a Condition we are justified. And what had effects it may produce to teach the world that the only justifying act of faith is, The Accepting of Justification as merited by Christ's blood, or the Accepting of Christ's Righteousness to justify them; it is not hard for an unprejudiced man to discern. For my part, in all my experience of the case of the ungodly that I have tried of, I can find no commoner cause of their general delusion and perdition, than this very doctrine; which they have generally received, though not in such exact terms as it is taught them. I never met with the most rebellious wretch (except now and then one under terrors) but when they have sinned their worst, they still think to be saved, because they believe: And what is their believing? why they believe that Christ died for them, and therefore God will forgive them, and they trust for pardon and salvation to Christ's death and God's mercy: This were good, if this were not all; but if Christ were also received as their Sovereign and Satisfier and Teacher: But if this were the only justifying act (as they usually speak) then I should not know how to disprove him that should tell me, that all men in the world shall be saved that believe the Gospel to be true: or at least, the far greater part of the most wicked men: For I am certain that they are willing not to be damned, and therefore Accept, or are Willing of Christ to save them from damnation: and I am sure they are Willing to be pardoned as fast as they sin, and that is, to be justified: and therefore must needs be Willing of Christ to pardon them (supposing that they believe the Gospel to be true): What therefore shall I say if a wicked wretch thus argues: He that hath the only justifying act of faith is justified: But that have I; for I Accept of Christ to forgive and justify me by his blood: Therefore, etc. Shall I tell him that he disbelieves, and is not willing? Why, 1. Long may I so tell him before he will believe me, when he feels that I speak falsely and slander him. 2. And I should know that I flander him my self: Supposing that he believe that there is no pardon but by Christ's blood, (as the devils and many millions of wicked men do believe:) For I know no man in his wits can be willing to be unpardoned and to burn in hell. Shall I give him the common answer (the best that ever was given to me,) that though the only justifying act be the receiving Christ or his Righteousness to justify us, yet this must be ever accompanied with the receiving him as Sovereign, and a resolution to obey him? Perhaps I may so puzzle him for want of Logick or Reason; but else how easily may he tell me, that this receiving Christ as Lord, hath either the nature of a medium ad solum, or not? If it be no medium, the want of it in this case cannot hinder the Justification of that man that is sure he hath the sole justifying act itself: For as
meet signs or idle concomitants do nothing to the effect, so the want of them hinders not the effect where all causes and means are present: But if I say, that this act of faith is a means to Justification; then I must either make it a Cause, or a Condition, or invent some new medium not yet known.

But you say [Sovereignty doth not cleanse us, nor doth blood command us.] Anf. 1. How ill is Sovereignty put in stead of the Soveraign? I say not that the reception of Christs Sovereignty doth justify (those words may have an ill sense) but we are justified by receiving Christ as our Soveraign (which much differs from the former.) 2. Christ as Soverain doth cleanse us, both from the guilt and power of sinne, by actual Remission or Justification, and by Sanctification.

3. Suppose you speak true, as you do, if you mean it only of Meriting our cleansing: What is this to our Question? But you adde [Faith in his blood, not faith yelding to his Sovereignty doth justify us.] Anf. This is something to the purpose, if it had been proved. But will a nude and crude Assertion change mens judgements? or should you have expected it? A text you cite, and therefore it might seem that you thought it some proof of this, Rom. 3. 24. But all the force of your Argument is from your dangerous addition, which, who will take for good Exposition? The text faith, He is set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his Blood. And you adde [Not through faith in his Command.] Sed quo jure nescio. Your exclusion is either upon supposition, that faith in his Blood is equipollent to faith in his Blood only; or else it is on some mysterious ground, which you should the rather have revealed, because it is not obvious to your ordinary Reader to discover it, without your revelation. If the former; 1. By what authority do you adde [only] in your interpretation? 2. Will you exclude also his Obedience, Resurrection, Intercession? When by the obedience of one many are made righteous? and Rom. 8. 33, 34. It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. 2. But the thing that you had to prove was not the exclusion of [faith in his Command] but of [faith in Christ as Lord and Teacher] or either: Receiving Christ as Ruler, goeth before the receiving of his particular Commands. And for the text, Rom. 3. 24. It was fittest for Paul to say [by faith in his blood] because he intends to connote both what we are justified by, ex parte Christi, and what ex parte nostri, but the former principally. I will explain my thoughts by a similitude or two.

Suppose a Rebell be Condemned, and lye in prison waiting for Execution; and the Kings Son being to raise an Army, buyeth this Rebell, with all his fellow prisoners, from the hand of Justice, and sendeth to them this message; If you will thankfully acknowledge my favours, and take me hereafter for your Prince or General, and lift your selves under me, I will pardon you (or give you the pardon which I have purchased) and moreover will give you places of Honour and Profit in my Army: ] Here now if the Question be, What it is on the Princes part that doth deliver the prisoner? It is his ransom, as to the Impeachment or Preparation: and it is his free-Grant, which doth it, as to the actual Deliverance. If it be askt: What is it that Honoureth or Enricheth him? It is the place of Honour and Riches that by the Prince is freely given him. But if you ask on the offenders part, What it is that delivereth him as the condition? It is not his accepting Pardon and Deliverance (or the Prince as a Pardoner or Ransomer) that is the sole Condition of his pardon and deliverance from death: Nor is it the Accepting of the Honour (or of the Prince as one to honour him) that is the sole condition of
of his Honour: Nor is it accepting of Riches, that is the sole condition of enriching him. But it is entirely the accepting of the Prince for his General, and thankfull acknowledging his Ransom, that is the Condition of all together, and hath as near an interest in one part of the Benefit, as another.

Or suppose the condemned prisoner be a woman, and the Prince having Ransomed her, doth send this offer to her, That if she will thankfully acknowledge his favour, and take him for her Redeemer and Husband and Prince (to love, honour and obey him) he will deliver her, and make her his Queen, and the shall partake of all his Honour and Riches.] Here now if the Question be, What is it on his part that Redeemed her? What that Delivered her? What that honoured her? What that enriched her? each effect must be ascribed to its proper cause, and the causes not confounded: And the must distinctly apprehend, by what way and cause each privilege comes. But if you ask only, What it is on her part that is the condition of enjoying these Benefits? Why it is but one entire, undivided Condition before mentioned: Will you here subtilly distinguish and say, that her taking him to deliver her, is the sole act which is the condition of her Deliverance? and her taking him to Dignifie her, is the sole condition of her Dignity? and her taking him as Rich, or to enrich her, is the sole condition of her enriching? No, it is one undivided condition that equally gives her interest in all. Much less is it the Accepting of his Riches, that is the sole condition of enriching her. Yet if any should in one Question include both, What on his part did save her from death? and what on her part? then it must be express as Paul did in the forementioned text, in our case: It is her Marrying or Accepting a Mercifull Redeemer. I should wrong you, by seeming to imply a doubt of your Apprehensive, if I should spend words in application of this to our case. Having been so much too tedious already, I will only add, That the common doctrine in this Point, requires that there be as many acts of faith as there are Benefits from Christ to be received; and that each one is the Instrument of receiving that particular benefit: and so one act of faith Justifieth, another Adopteth &c. And that act which receiveth Justification, which they call the Passive instrument thereof, in the upshot of all their Disputes they so describe, that it is apparent they mean ipsa Justificationem passim: And so with them Credere & Justificari must be Synonimall terms: For to receive Justification, is nothing but to be Justified.

§ 2.

Mr Bl. Here are several acts of Justifying faith, Heb. 11. but those are not acts of Justification. It is not Abrahams obedience, Moses self-deniall, Gideon or Sampsons valour, that were their Justification: but his Blood who did enable them in these duties by his Spirit. Paul went in these duties as high as they, living in more clear light and under more abundant Grace. I doubt not he out-top them, and yet he was not thereby Justified: as 1 Cor. 4.4.

§ 2.

E B. It is a strange phrase to call any act of faith [An act of Justification.] If you speak properly, you must mean it efficient vel constitutive: either that some act of faith is an act of Justification, as the efficient (but that farre from
2. The diligent seeking of him. 3. Beleevine that he is a rewarder of them that do so. 4. Coming to him. (If this be distinct from the second.) When the holy Ghost doth of purpose in the whole Chapter set forth the glory and excellency of faith, I dare not be one that shall imagine that he speaks all this of a lower sort of faith, and quite left out the nobler part which justifieth, from his praises.

3. Yet you should not (in my judgement) have called [Abrahams obedience, Moses self-denial, Gideons valour] acts of Justifying faith: Are these acts of faith? If you mean that these acts are fruits of faith, its true: Or if you mean that an act of faith did excite the soul to each of these acts, and so you mean not the obedience, valour, &c. but the act of faith which excited it, then you might call those acts of justifying faith: But if I had called valour and obedience so, I should have been blamed.

4. What mean you to say Obedience and Valour was not their Justification? Do you think that any act of faith is Justification? You mean (if I may conjecture from your after-doctrine) the instrument of Justification.

5. But then how come you to say next, that it is Christ’s blood? The blood of Christ is the meritorious cause of our Justification, which improperly may be called also, the Matter of it: But I think it is neither our Justification formally, nor the instrument of it in proper speech.

6. But I thought the content in your Dispute had been, Which is the justifying act of faith, and which not? and therefore when you denied those in Heb. xii. to be acts of Justification (which I am forced to interpret [justifying acts]) I expected to finde the true act affected; but in stead of that I finde the opposite member, is [The blood of Christ.] Is this indeed the Controversie? Whether it be [Accepting Christ as Lord] or [the blood of Christ] that justifieth? Never was such a Question debated by me, in the way here intimated. I am wholly for you, if this be the doubt: It is Christs blood that justifieth meritoriously. But yet
we are justified by faith too, as the condition of our interest in free justification. And why should these two be put in opposition? I look when you had affected and well proved that it is not taking Christ as Lord but only faith in his blood that is the condition on our part, of our attaining justification.

7. It would prove a hard task to make good, that there are several acts of justifying faith, by which we are justified; without flying to great impropriety of speech. By [justifying faith] you must mean, the act, habit, or renewed faculty: If the act, then I think you will say, it is but one, or not many: Or at least every act, which is justifying faith, must needs be such as we are justified by: Or else why should that act be called [justifying faith]. 2. But I doubt not but you mean the habit: And then 1, you confess that the habit is [justifying faith] which is true; not only as it helpeth to produce the act, but even as it is in itself: But that will overthrow the doctrine of instrumentality. 2. It requires another kind of disputing then I here meet with, to prove that acts and habits of man's soul, are of so different a nature, that where the acts are specifically distinct by the great distance and variety of objects, yet the habit producing all these is one and the same, and not distinct as the acts: and that obedience, self-denial and valour, are acts of the same habit of faith, as is the accepting an offered Christ. 3. If you should mean by [justifying faith] the faculty as sanctified, then all other acts of that faculty as sanctified, or of the Spirit there residing, might as well be called acts of justifying faith. But I will not imagine that this is your sense.

8. 1 Cor. 4. 4. is nothing to our business. Paul was not his own justifier: Though he knew not matter of condemnation (sentu Evangelico, for no doubt he knew himself to be a sinner) yet that did not justify him, because it is God only that is his Judge. Can you hence prove, that accepting Christ as Lord, is not the condition of our justification? Then you may prove the same of the accepting him as Saviour. For Paul knew nothing by himself, as if he were guilty of not performing the one or the other: yet was he not thereby justified.

§ 3.

Mr. Bl. James indeed faith, that Abraham was justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son on the Altar, Jam. 2. 21. but either there we must understand a working faith, with Pilgrim, Parthus, Pembly, and confess that Paul and James handle two distinct questions, The one, Whether faith alone justifies without works? which he concludes in the Affirmtive: The other, What faith justifieth? Whether a working faith only, and not a faith that is dead and idle? Or else I know not how to make sense of the Apostle, who freely infers from Abrahams justification by the offer of his son, And the Scripture was fulfilled, which faith, Abraham believed God and it was imputed to him for righteousness. How otherwise do these accord? He was justified by works: and the Scripture was fulfilled, which faith, he was justified by faith?

§ 3.

R. B. I. E James must use the term [Works] twelve times in thirteen verses, (a thing not usual) as if he had foreseen how men would question his meaning, and yet for all that we must believe that by [Works] James doth not mean [Works] it will prove as hard a thing to understand the Scripture.
as the Papists would persuade us that it is: and that there is so great a necessity of a living deciding Judge.

2. Do but read over all those verses, and put [working-faith] in stead of [Works] and try what sense you will make.

3. No doubt but Paul and James handle two distinct Questions, but not the two that you here express. Paul speaks of Meritorious Works, which make the Reward of Debt, and not of Grace, if you will believe his own description of them, Rom. 4.4. But James speaks of no such Works, but of such as have a conformity with Grace, and necessary subordination to it: I prove it: The Works that James speaks of, we must endeavour for and perform, or perish (supposing time.) But the works that Paul speaks of, no man must endeavour, or once imagine that he can perform, viz., such as make the reward to be of Debt and not of Grace. Paul speaks indeed of faith collaterally, but of Christ's Merits and free-Grace, directly and purposely: So that the chief part of Paul's controversy was, Whether we are justified freely through Christ's Merits? or through our own meritorious Works? But James's question is, Whether we are justified by faith alone, or by faith with obedience accompanying it; and both as subordinate to Christ's Merits? Paul's question is, Of the meritorious Cause of our Justification: James's question is, Of the condition on our parts, of our interest in a free Remission; supposing Paul's question determined, that Christ only is the Meriter. Paul speaks of Justification in 100, both in the beginning and progress, but especially the beginning: But James speaks only of Justification as continued and consummate, and not as begun: For both Abrahams and every man's was begun, before Works of Obedience: Though a disposition and resolution, and engagement to obey do go before.

4. If with the named Expositors, you understand by [Works] a working-faith; either you grant as much as I affirm, in sense; or else you must utterly null all the Apostle's arguing, from vers. 13. to the end. For if by [Working-faith] you suppose that James meant that God did not only make [Faith it self] to be the principal condition, but also [its Working] in obedience, when there is opportunity, to be the secondary condition (or part of the condition) of Justification as continued; as being the necessary modus, or effect (both which it is in several respects) then you say the same in sense as I do, only changing the Scripture terms without and against reason. It is ordinary to make the modus or quality of that matter which is the substance of the condition, to be as real a part of the condition as the matter it self. As when you oblige your Debtor to pay you so much current English money; it is here as necessary that it be [English] and [Current] as that it be money. If you promise your servant his wages, on condition he serve you faithfully; here [Faithfulness] is as real a part of the Condition, as [Service.] If a man take a woman in Marriage, and esteem her in all his Lands, on condition that she will be to him [a chaste, faithful Wife]; here her chaste fidelity is as true a part of the condition, as to be his Wife. So if God say, [He that hath a Working faith shall be justified and saved, and he that hath not, shall perish.] Here as faith is the principal part of the condition, so that it be a [Working] is the secondary, and as real a part of the condition, as that it be faith. And if Satan accuse you for not-believing (at Judgement) you must be justified, by producing your faith it self, so if he accuse you as having a faith that was not Working; how will you be justified but by the Works or Working disposition of that faith?

C 3

5. As.
§ 4.

Mr. Bl. All works before or after conversion, inherent in us, or wrought by us, are excluded from justification.
§ 4.

R. B. 1. The term [Works] signifies either such as a Workman doth to deserve his wages for the value of his Work; which make the reward to be of Debt and not of Grace; and so its true: Or it signifies all good actions; and so this saying is contrary to the scope of the Scripture. 1. Faith and Repentance are such works and wrought by us. 2. James affirteenth the inclusion of such works. If you lay, But faith and repentance justifies not as Good works: I easily grant it: That they be Good, floweth from the Precept: That they justify, floweth from the Promise, constituting them the Condition. If they should justify because Good, their goodness must be such as may accrue to a Meritoriousness: But yet they must be Good, before they can justify as Conditions of the free Gift: yea and have a peculiar eminent goodness, consisting in their aptitude to this work, and to Glorifie the free Justifier. Mat. 2.5. Rom. 2. James 2. with the greatest part of Scripture, look not with such a face as your Proposition. This may serve to your following words.

§ 5.

Mr Bt. And these things considered, I am truly sorry that faith should now be denied to have the office or place of an instrument in our Justification: may scarce allowed to be called the instrument of our receiving Christ that justifies us; because the act of faith (which is that which justifieth us) is our actual receiving Christ, and therefore cannot be the instrument of receiving. This is too subtle a Notion: We use to speak otherwise of justification, Faith is the eye of the soul whereby we see Christ, and the eye is not sight. Faith is the hand of the soul, whereby it receives Christ, and the hand is not receiving. And Scripture speaks otherwise: We receive remission of sins by faith, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified is received by faith, Acts 18.26. Why else is this righteousness sometime called the righteousness of faith, and sometime the righteousness of God which is by faith, but that it is a righteousness which faith receives? Christ dwells in us by faith, Eph. 3.17. By faith we take him in and give him entertainment: We receive the promise of the Spirit through faith, Gal. 3.14. These Scriptures speak of faith as the soul's instrument to receive Christ Jesus, to receive the Spirit from Christ Jesus.

§ 5.

R. B. 1. I know not how to meddle with Controversies, but some body will be sorry or angry, which side ever I take. I am sorry that I have made you sorry, but not for that Doctrine which caused it; which yet I shall be, as soon as I can see cause for it.

2. Why would you not here attempt to prove, that which you are so sorry should be denied, viz. That faith is the instrument of Justification? Will all your Readers take your complaint for a demonstration of the error of what you complain of?

3. I was as sorry that men called, and so called faith the instrument of Justification, as you are that I deny it: And as your sorrow urged you to publish it, so
did mine urge me. And my sorrow had these causes (which I am content may be well compared with yours; that it may appear which were the juicier and greater.)

1. No Scripture doth either in the letter or sense call faith an instrument of Justification. 2. I knew I had much Scripture and reason against it. 3. I thought it of dangerous consequence, to say, that man is the efficient cause of justifying and pardoning himself, and so doth forgive his own sins.

4. Yet all this had never caused me to open my mouth against it (for I truly abhor the making of new quarrels.) But for the next, viz. I found that many Learned Divines did not only assert this instrumentality, but they laid so great a stress upon it, as if the main difference between us and the Papists lay here. For in the doctrine of Justification, say they, it is that they Fundamentally err, and we Principally differ: And that in these four Points.

1. About the formal cause of our Righteousness, which, say these Divines, is the formal Righteousness of Jesus Christ, as suffering and perfectly obeying for us (or as others add, In the habitual Righteousness of his humane nature;) and others, The natural Righteousness of the Divine nature.

2. About the way and manner of our participation herein, which as to God's act, they say is imputation (which is true) and that in this sense, that Legally we are esteemed to have fulfilled the Law in Christ.

3. About the nature of that faith which Justifieth, which, say most of our foreign Reformers, is an assurance, or full persuasion of the pardon of my sins by Christ's blood.

4. About the formal reason of faiths interest in Justification, which, say they, is as the instrument thereof.

I doubt not but all these four are great Errors. Yet for these must we contend as the Reformed Religion and here must lie the difference between us and the Papists. That which troubled me was this: To think how many thouand might be confirmed in Popery by this course, and what a blow it gave to the Reformed Religion. For who can imagine but that the young Popish Students will be confirmed in the rest of their Religion, when they finde that we are in these? and will judge by these of the rest of our Doctrine? Especially when they finde us making this the main part of the Protestant Cause, what wonder if they judge our Cause naught? This is no fancy, nor any needless fears, but such a real blow to the Protestant Cause, as will not easily be healed. Had Divines only in a way of freedom used this phrase, and not made it so great a part of our Religion, to the hazarding of the whole, I had never mentioned the unfoundness or other inconvenience of it. Now to the thing itself, Your Arguments for faiths instrumentality to Justification, I will consider when I can finde them: You begin with (and say more for) faiths instrumentality in receiving Christ. You can say no more of me concerning this, but that [it will be scarce allowed to be so called.] This intimates that I make it no matter of contention: nor do I know how I could have said less, if any thing; when its only the unkindness or impropriety of the phrase that I mention, and not the sense: which I thought with so much tenderness I might do, upon reason given, it being no Scripture phrase. If faith be the instrument of receiving Christ, then it is either the Act or the Habit of Faith that is the instrument: They that say, the Habit is the instrument, speak not properly, but far more tolerably than the others do. If gracious Habits are properly called instruments of the soul, then so may other Habits: And why is not this language more in use among Logicians? if it be so unquestionably proper? But I perceive
perceive it is the Act of faith that you call the instrument: for you answer only to what I say against that. I drew up a Scheme of the several sorts of Giving and Receiving, in Answer to another Learned Brother: which, for the necessity of distinguishing here, I would have added, but that so operous a Reply would be unsuitable to your brief Exceptions. Receiving Strictly taken is ever Passive: Receiving in a Civil, Ethical, less proper sense, is but the Act of accepting what is offered: When it is only a Relation, or fud ad rem that is offered, Consent or Acceptance is an act so necessary ordinarily to the possession (or proper Passive reception) that it is therefore called Receiving it self: yet is indeed no efficient cause of the Passive reception or possession: but a condition sine qua non, and a subjective disposition; and so makes the subject capable of the benefit: but being no efficient it can be no instrument. Yet still I say, that if any will please to call it an instrument in this sense, I will not quarrel with him, for the impropriety of a phrase; specially if some men had the same ingenuity as others have, that say, it is but instrumentum metaphoricum. But to say, that the act of faith is the instrument of Ethical Active reception (which is it that I argued against,) is to say, Receiving Christ is the instrument of it self. Now let's see what you say to this.

1. You say, It's tooabant a Notion: That deserves no Reply. 2. You say [We ule to speak otherwise of faith.] Thats no proof that you speak properly. You say [Faith is the eye of the soul; and the eye is not right. Faith is the hand] Ans. 1. Strange proof! not only by Metaphors, but by metaphors of more humane use. 2. Is the act of faith the eye of the soul as distinct from sight? and the hand as distinct from receiving? Tell us then what actual seeing and receiving is? To speak metaphors and contradictions is no proving your Assertion. Next you say [Scripture speaks otherwise.] That to the purpose indeed, if true. You cite, Aths. 18, 26, where is no such matter. If [By] signifies an instrument, all cause, it is either Alwaies or Sometimes: You would not have your Reader believe that it is Alwaies. If but sometimes, Why do you take it so granted that it so signifies here? Why did you not offer some proof? This is casual Disputing. Next you say [Why else is this Righteousness sometime called the Righteousness of faith? Sometimes the Righteousness of God which is by faith; but that it is a Righteousness which faith receives?] Ans. 1. Its properer to say, Credens recipit credente, The Believer by believing receives it: Then to say, Faith (especially the act) receives it: But if you will use that speech, it must express but formalem rationem credendi expositiory, and not the efficiency of faith, and therefore no instrumentality. It is the Righteousness of God by faith, because God gives it freely (Christ having merited it) upon condition of mans faith. You add [Eph. 3:17. Christ dwells in us by faith. By faith we take him in.] Ans. You only change the question: We are speaking of faiths instrumentality in receiving Right to Christ, or Christ in relation: and you go about to prove the reception of his Spirit, or graces really, or himself objectively: For Christ is said to dwell in us, 1. By his Spirit and Graces. 2. Objectively, as my friend dwells in my heart when I love him. The text being meant of either of these, is nothing to the purpose. 2. Yet here you do not prove that [by] signifies a proper instrument: no more then your actual intellestion is said to be the instrument of Truths abode in you; when it is said that Truth dwelleth in you by intellestion. The same Answer serves to your following words about receiving the Spirit. 1. Its nothing to our Question. 2. You give us but your bare word that Scripture speaks of faith as the souls instrument, even in receiving the Spirit of Christ, much less in receiving Right to Christ.
Christ. But still remember that from first to last, I profess not to contend with any about the use of this phrase, of faiths instrumentality in receiving Christ. It is its being really the proper instrumentall efficient cause of Justification, which I denied, and resolvedly more then ever do deny. This you next come to, and say,

$\text{§ 6.}$

Mr. Bl. The instrumentality of it in the work of Justification is denied, because the nature of an Instrument (as considered in Physical operations) doth not exactly belong to it; which if it must be always rigidly followed, will often put us to a stand in the assignation of causes of any kind in Moral actions. The material and formal causes in Justification are scarce agreed upon, and no marvel then in case men minde to confend about it, that some question is raised about the Instrument. But in case we shall consider the nature and kind of this work, about which faith is imploied, and examine the reason and ground, upon the which faith is disabiled from the office of an instrument in our Justification, and withal look into that which is brought in as an instrument in this work in the stead of it, I do not doubt but it will easily appear, that those Divines, that with a concurrent judgement (without almost a dissenting voice, have made faith an instrument in this work) speak most aptly, and most agreeably to the nature of an instrument.

$\text{§ 6.}$

R. D. But is this certain? Do I therefore deny faith to be the instrument of Justification, because the nature of an instrument [as considered in Physical operations] doth not exactly belong to it? I said 1. The action of the principal Cause and of the instrument is one action. Is not this true of moral operations as well as Physical? If it be not, you must make us a new Logick before you can reasonably expect that we receive your Logical Theology. 2. I said, the instrument must have Influc to the producing of the effect of the principal cause, by a proper causality: that is, in suo genere. Is not this true of Moral operations as well as Physical? Its true, Moral causes may be said to have a less proper causation then Physical: But 1. The instrumental must be as proper as that of the principal. 2. There is a wide difference between, causam Moralem, and causam Moralitatis. Efecti naturalis potest esse causa moralis, vel imputativa: Et effecti moralis felicit Etibei, (ut Debiti, Juris, Meriti,) potest esse causa remotior naturalis. It may well be called a proper causation, when the effect is produced by as full a causation as the nature of the thing will admit (as in relations that are by mere reluctancy.)

2. You say [the material and formal causes of Justification are scarce agreed on.] But doth that give you a liberty to assert what you lift, or what cannot be proved true, because all men see not the truth? I should have thought you should rather have thus concluded: [Seeing Divines themselves cannot agree about the assignation of these Logical, unscripturial notions in the business of Justification, therefore it is a meer Church-dividing cause, to place so much of the Protestant Cause in such notions, and insist upon them as matters of such necessity and weight, as is done in asserting faiths instrumentality to Justification.] Your argument (in the issue and tendency) is like that of plundering soldiers in time of flight; that say, Now they are altogether by the ears, we may take that we light on: why should they
they question us, till they agree among themselves? 3. Whether this phrase be so apt as you affirm, we shall better know when you have said something to prove it. If Divines have been so concurrent in it, as you say, that there is scarce a dissenting voice, I hope I am the more excusable, if it prove an error, for opposing it: For it is pity to let so many mistake themselves, mislead others, and make us part of a new Religion.

But Sir, what's the cause of this sudden change? Through their great condescension, I have received Animadversions from many of the most Learned, Judicious Divines that I know in England: And of all these, there is but one man that doth own the Doctrine of faiths Instrumentality; but they disclaim it all; some with diestall, others with a modest excuse of them that use it, and the gentle interpretation of [a Metaphorical instrument] and that remote: for so they would have me interpret our Divines. I told you this when I saw you, and you asked me, Whether Mr. C. were against it? To which I answer, Not so much as divers others that write to me; but judge you by his own words, which are these, [Obj. But though faith be not the instrument of our Justification, may it not be called the instrument of receiving Christ? Ans. I think it may be called a Condition, then an Instrument of our Justification.] So far Mr. C.

§ 7.

Mr. Bl. The work about which faith is employed, is not an absolute, but a relative work: a work of God towards man: not without the actual concurrence of man: such in which neither God nor man are sole efficient; nor any act of God or man can be sole instruments; but there must be a mutual concurrence of both.

§ 7.

R. B. A Dangerous Doctrine, in my Judgement, to be so nakedly affirmed: No doubt: but Justification is a relative change, that it is not without the actual concurrence of man: for he must perform the Condition, on which God will justify him. But that God is not the sole Efficient, nor any * Act of God, the sole Instrument, I durst not have affirmed without proof: and much less have undertaken to prove.

* I suppose the word [Art] is used so largely, as to include the Law itself.

§ 8.

Mr. Bl. This must needs be granted, unless we will bring in D. Crisp's passive recipiency of Christ: Christ's abode in man without man, in spite of man, and suppose him to be justified in unbelief.
§ 8.

R. B. T

His is very naked asserting. Why did you not shew some reason of this ill consequence? Its past my reach to see the least. a. Why do you still confound Christs real abode in us by his Spirit, with the relation we have upon Justification? when even now you affirmed, it was a relative work (as you call it) I pray, by the next shew us more clearly, how these absurdities follow that doctrine which affirmeth, That God is the sole Efficient cause of our Justification, but having made mans Belief and Content the Condition (whose nature is to suspend the effect, till performed) he will not justify us till we first believe and content. This is my Doctrine plainly.

§ 9.

Mr Bl. A

nd faith is disabled from this office in Justification, by this Argument: If faith be an instrument, it is the instrument of God or man, &c. I Ans. Is the instrument of man: and though man do not justifie himself, yet he concurreth, as a willing ready Agent with God in it. God is a justifier of those that believe in Jesus, Rom. 3. 26. God hath set Christ forth a propitiation through faith, Rom. 3. 25.

§ 10.

R. B. I f this be not palpable contradiction, saying and unsaying, my Logick is les then I thought it had been. If it be Mans instrument] of Justification; and yet [Man do not justifie himself.] Then either Man is not Man, or an Instrument is not an Instrument, or Justifying is not Justifying. Had you only affirmed it to be mans act, and Gods instrument (how absurd soever otherwise yet) you might have said, Man doth not justify himself. But if it be mans instrument, then man is the principal cause (in respect of the instrumentall.) For ensae instrumentum est causa principalis instrumentum. And can he be the efficient cause, and yet not effect? Is not that to be a Cause and no Cause? In my judgement this doctrine should not be made part of our Religion; nor much stress laid on it if it were true; because its so obscure: That man concurreth as a ready Agent, who doubts? but doth that prove him or his faith the efficient cause of his own pardon and Justification? Is the performer of the condition of [Grateful full content] no willing Agent, unless an efficient Cause? The text you cite doth not speak of instruments, for ought I can finde.

§ 10.

Mr Bl. A

nd because it is the instrument of man in a work of this nature, it is also the instrument of God. As some have observed a communication of Titles between Christ and his Church (the Church being called by his Name) so there is a communication of actions in these relative works. Christ dwells in our hearts by faith, Eph. 3. 17. We believe and not Christ: and yet faith there is Christs instrument, whereby he takes up his abode. God purifies the hearts of the Gentiles by faith, Act. 15. 17. They believed and not God: yet faith is Gods instrument in the work of their purification. So on the other side, the Spirit is Gods work: yet we by the Spirit do mortifie the deads of the flesh, Rom. 8. 13.
§. 10.

R. B. If this be indeed true, That it is mans instrument of Justification and Gods both; then both God and man are both *cause principals partiales*, by coordination making up one principal cause. This I hope you will not downright affirm: I deny it on this reason: Every absolute Donor (I mean, who is absolutely owner of what he gives) is the total cause-efficient principal, of his own Donation: But God in justifying is an absolute Donor (giving remission and Righteousness) Therefore, & c. 2. Or else God and man must be principal causes one subordinate to the other; and each total in his own knnde. This must be your meaning, by your first words: But then which of these is the most principal cause, and which the subordinate? It is hard for a better wit then mine to know your minde by your words: For when you say [Because it is mans instrument, it is also Gods instrument.] It may seem that you take it to be mans instrument first, or else how can it be therefore Gods instrument [because] it is mans? But yet whether you speak de ordine consequentis vel consequentiae, de ordine effendi & efficientis, vel de ordine dicendi & colligendi, I know nor. However, I will not be so uncharitable as to imagine that you take man for the most principal cause, and God for the subordinate; but contrarily. But then you do not only make man the pardonor and justifier of himself, but you make him the nearest total cause of it: and so it would be as proper to say, Man forgives himself, as that God forgives him: And so faith would be only mans instrument directly, as being the nearest cause principal; and Gods instrument remotely. As if I hold my pen, and you hold my hand, the pen is proxime my instrument, and remotius yours. And so God should justifie and pardon man, by himself, as Gods instrument: As if a Judge had committed Treafon, and the King should give him authority to Judge, Pardon and Absolve himself. But how much might be said against this? To justify *efficienter* is  *actus Reipublie* : *sed homo non est reipubli sui ipsius* (in the sense in hand:) Therefore he cannot justifie himself. Indeed if you had spoke only of the Justification in foro conscientiae you might well have ascribed it to man as the efficient cause: but that you speak not of.

2. The communication of Titles that you speak of, is 1. very rare. 2. Uncertain whether at all found in Scripture. That Text 1 Cor. 12. 12. seems rather to leave out [the Church] as understood, then to communicate Christs Name to it: *q.d.*, [So is Chrift and the Church.] I would advise all friends of mine to take heed that they presume not on this slight ground to communicate Christs Name to the Church in their ordinary speech. 3. But who can tell what you mean by a communication of actions? Your putting [Communication of actions] in contradistinction from [Communication of Titles] makes the proper sense of your words be, that Christs doth as really communicate actions themselves, as he doth Titles themselves. But that is not better then a plain impossibility: For the communication will make it another action. The accident perisheth, when separated from its subject: and therefore the fame accident cannot be communicated. But its like you intended to have said, That there is a common or mutual attribution of each others actions, or one is entitled to the actions of the other; and so mean only a communication of the Name *quod medium producendii*, and not of the actions themselves. But then, either this is an improper figurative way of speech; or it is proper, and grounded in the nature of the thing. If the former,
then it is nothing to our Question, who are not enquiring whether there may not be found some Figure in Rhetoric according to which faith may be said to be mans instrument of Justification and Gods? but whether it be so properly and indeed? And if you could finde any Scripture that so speaks figuratively, calling faith mans instrument and Gods in Justifying; (as you cannot) this would do nothing to the deciding of our Controversie. It is therefore a grounded attribution that you must prove, where there is also a real instrumentality, and to the Name fixed to the Thing. And how prove you this? Why, as before, Eph. 3. 17. you say, [We beleive and not Christ; yet faith is Christs instrument, whereby he takes up his abode.] But this is toofacil disputing to satisfie. 1. Here is not a word to prove that it is a relative Indwelling that is here spoken of. I need not tell you how singular you are in this Exposition (if you so expound: If not, you say nothing.) 2. If that had been proved, yet here is no proof that [by] signifieth instrumentality. 3. Much less that it is Christs instrument. How easily are all these affirmed? I think Christ dwells in our hearts, as I said, 1. By his Spirit and Graces; and so he is said to dwell in us [by faith.] 1. Formaliter, faith being the principal part of that grace which dwelleth in us. 2. Conditionaliter, Faith being a condition of our right to the Spirits abode. 3. Efficienter, as the act of faith doth directly cause the increase, and to the abode of the habit; and also as it excipeth other graces. If you will call this efficiency an instrumental efficiency, I think it is no proper speech: We do not use to call the act of intellect in, Mans instrument of knowing or increasing the habits of knowledge: but I will not contend with you about this: Nor yet if you say, This act of believing is Mans instrument (of exciting and increasing grace in himself) directly, and Gods instrument remotely: As my pen is immediately my instrument, and remotely his that holds my hand. Or rather I should say, as my action in writing is improperly called my instrument, and his. And thus man may be said (yea more properly then thus) to sanctifie himself, and God to sanctifie man by himself: But in Justification the matter is far otherwise: Man doth neither Justifie himself, nor God justifies man by himself. The second way of Christs dwelling in us, is Obje-ctively. And here if you will speak so improperly, as to say that mans act of believing is his instrument of receiving Christ as an Object, or of the Objects abode in the soul, I will not contend with you about it: Only as I would desire you to make this phrase no great part of Religion, nor lay too great a stress upon it, so also to remember, 1. That it is but the species and not Christs himself that is objectively received, and thus dwelleth in us. 2. That every other grace that hath Christ for its object, is thus far an instrument of receiving him, and of his abode in us, as well as faith: but none so properly and fully as knowledge. And 3. That thus Christ dwells objectively in every wicked man that thinketh of him: Though doubtelesse not in that deep and special manner as in his chosen.

3. And yet further, as a consequent of the first sort of indwelling, Christ himself may be said to dwell in us Civilitier, vel Moraliter, that is, Reputative, because his Spirit or Graces dwell in us Naturaliter: As a man that keeps possession of a house by his son or servant, or by his goods: And here also, if you have a minde to the term Instrument, you may, for me, say that Christ keeps possession by faith or the Spirit as his instruments: But then you must consider, 1. That this is by no communication of Actions and Titles: but here is a real ground for this speech. 2. That it is not faith as mans act, but faith as Gods grace wrought and maintained
rained in us, by which he may in this sense be said to dwell in us, or keep possession of us. 3. That thus every grace may as truly be said to be Christ's instrument of possession or indwelling, as faith: so he dwelleth in us by love, hope, trust, desire, joy, &c. but most properly by the Spirit or new Creature, or whole body of Sanctification.

4. That all this is nothing to prove faith to be man's instrument and God's (yea or either alone) to effect our Justification.

The same answer serves to Act. 15. 17. God purifieth man's heart by faith: 1. From the power of sin, and that is by faith: 1. Formaliter. 2. Efficienter, as is before expressed. 2. From the guilt of sin; and that is by faith as a condition on man's part (and not as an instrument:) By or through which God is said to purify or pardon us; 1. In that he conferreth remission only on this condition; and so dost constitute the formal office of faith in justifying. 2. In that by his Spirit he causeth or giveth faith itself, and effecteth the matter. Though, whether this Text reach to Justification, I will not Dispute. So that you do but nakedly affirm, and not prove that faith is God's instrument or man's in justifying.

Lastly to what you say from Rom. 8. 13. I reply, 1. An Adjutor or Concourse is ill called an instrument. Must the Spirit needs be our instrument, because it is [By] the Spirit? As if [By] signified only an instrument?

2. All this is nothing to the business of Justification. Prove but this, that man is as true an efficient of his own pardon or Justification, as he is of mortifying the deeds of the body, or of Progressive Sanctification, and you shall carry the Cause: I will not then contend whether the term [instrument] be proper or improper.

§ 11.

Mr. Bl. Man neither justifies nor sanctifies himself, yet by faith he is raised to close with God in both: And so faith as an instrument receives Righteousness to Justification: and therefore is called, The righteousness of faith, which is our Justification, and works Sanctification; provided you understand not the first work, which is properly Regeneration, and precedent to faith; but the further progress and increase of it, &c.

§ 11.

R. B. 1. Faith justifie not himself, and yet faith be his instrument of justifying, then farewell old Logick.

2. If man sanctifie not himself, under God, as to the progress and acts of sanctification, then farewell old Theology. God bids men wash them, and purifie their hearts, and cleanse their hands, and make them new hearts, &c. and Peter faith, Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, &c. 1 Pet. 1. 22. And we must cleanse our selves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God, 2 Cor. 7. 1. with many the like.

3. [To close with God] in pardoning me, signifieth not that I pardon my self, or that I or any act of mine is an efficient cause of pardon.

4. When you say, that [Faith as an instrument receiveth righteousness to Justification] you speak exactly the conceptions of most Divines that I have met with,
or read, that go your way; and therefore these words deserve a little further consideration. Their meaning, as far as I can understand of the whole business is this: 1. They conceive of Christ’s own righteousness, wherewith himself was righteous, as given to us. 2. They conceive of the act of faith, as the instrument of receiving this. 3. Upon the receiving of this, they conceive we are justified, as a man that receiveth Riches is Rich, or that receiveth Honour is Honourable. 4. Because faith is the instrument of receiving righteousness, therefore say they, it is the instrument of Justification. For Justification constitutive, is but a relation resulting from righteousness received. This is the summe of the common judgement of most that I have read.

But these things must be more accurately considered, I think. And 1. It must be known, that the Righteousness given us, is not the righteousness whereby Christ’s person was Righteous: (for accidents perish being removed from the subject;) but it is a Righteousness merited by Christ’s satisfaction and obedience, for us.

2. It must needs be known that the faith which is the Justifying condition, is terminated on Christ himself as the object, and not on his Righteousness which he gives us in Remission: Remission or Righteousness may be the end of the inner in receiving Christ; but Righteousness or Remission is not the object received by that act which is made the condition of Justification: or at least but a secondary remote object; even as a woman doth not marry a man’s Riches, but the Man; though it may be her end in marrying the man, to be enriched by him; nor is her receiving his riches the condition of her first Legal right to them; but her taking the man for her husband. And as a Patient being promised to be cured, if he will take such a man for his Physician, and wholly trust him, renouncing all other: Here it is not receiving Health, or a Cure that is the proper Condition of the Cure: Health and Cure is the end for which the Physician is Accepted and Trusted: but it is himself as a sufficient faithful Physician which is the object of that receiving, which is the condition of the Cure. The like may be shewed in other Relations, of a Master and Scholar, Prince and Subjects, Master and Servants, &c. Receiving the persons into relation, from whom we expect the benefit, goes before receiving the benefit itself by them; which is usually the remote end, and not the object of that first reception which is the condition. Our Divines therefore of the Assembly do perfectly define Justifying faith to be, A receiving and resting on Christ alone for salvation, as he is offered in the Gospel. It is of dangerous consequence to define Justifying Faith to be the Receiving of Justification or Righteousness.

3. In my judgement, it is a mere fancy and delusion, to speak of the receiving righteousness that we may be justified constitutive thereby, in such a sense, as if the righteousness were first to be made ours, in order of nature before our Justification, and then Justification follow because we are righteous; and so these were two things: For to receive Righteousness, and to receive Justification is one thing, Gods justifying us, and pardoning our sin, and his constituting us righteous, and his giving us righteousness, is all one thing under several notions. Yet as God giveth, 1. Conditionally. 2. Actually: So man receiveth, 1. Receptione Ethica affixa, figuratively called receiving. 2. Receptione Physica, proprium passivi: The former goes before Justification: but only as a small, and secondary part of the condition, if properly any (it being the accepting of Christ himself that is the main condition:) The latter is nothing at all but Justificari, commonly called, Passive Justification.

4. Christ's
4. Christ's Satisfaction or Redemption (solvendo pretium) and merit, cannot be properly received by us: For they are not in themselves given to us (but as Tropically they may be said to be given to us, because the fruit of them is given us.) It was not to us, but to God, that Christ gave satisfaction, and the price of our Redemption. And yet justifying faith doth as necessarily respect Christ's satisfaction and merit, as it doth our Justification thereby procured. It is therefore the acknowledging of this Redemption, Satisfaction or Merit, and the receiving of Christ as one that hath redeemed us by satisfaction and merit, and not the receiving that Redemption or Satisfaction our selves. To lay therefore, that the justifying act of faith, is only the receiving of Christ's Righteousness or of Justification, is to exclude the receiving of Christ himself any way; even to exclude him as satisficer from the justifying act: and to exclude from that act, his Redemption, by bloodshed, satisfaction and merit: For if it be only the receiving of righteousness, that is the justifying act, then it is neither the receiving of Christ himself, nor yet the acknowledgement of his Satisfaction and Redemption by his blood; and so they must lay of these as they do of the reception of Christ as Lord, that it is the *fides qua justificas*, sed non *qua justifiscas*.

5. If faith shall be said to be the instrument of Justification ex nomine, because it is the receiving of that Righteousness whereby we are justified, then it will follow that faith must also be called the instrument of our enjoying Christ, *ex nomine*, because it receiveth him, and the instrument of our Adoption, *ex nomine*, because he receiveth Adoption; and so the same act of faith which entitles us to Justification, doth not entitle us to any other blessing; nor that act that entitles us to Christ, doth entitle us to Justification (unless there be several justifying acts:) but every particular mercy hath a particular act of faith as the instrument of receiving it: which is no Scripture doctrine.

6. It must be remembered that the thing that faith receives naturally and properly, is not Christ himself, or his righteousness; but the *species* of what is represented as its object. And that faith's reception of Christ himself and his righteousness, or of right to Christ, is but *Receptio metaphorica*: vel *actio ad receptionem propriam recipiendam*: and that the true reception, which is *passit non agere*, doth follow faith, and therefore Christ himself is received only *Receptione fidei ethica*: activa, metaphorica*: species Christi predicati recipiendarum* receptione naturalis, intelligendo: *Fas ad Christum recipiendum* receptione naturali passiva*, propriid*: That which is conditionally given (on condition of acceptance or the like) and offered to be accepted; this is received; *Receptione fidei ethica*: whereupon followeth the actual efficacious giving of that thing, (the condition being performed, which suspended it:) and this the believer receiveth, *Receptione passiva*, propriid*: but it is not his *faith* that receiveth it.

7. The great thing therefore that I would desire to be observed is this; that though faith were an instrument of the foresaid objective, or of the Ethical, Metaphorical reception of Christ (which yet is not properly, being *ipsa Receptio*,) yea it is not therefore the instrumental cause of the passive, proper reception of Right to Christ or Righteousness. Of this it is only the condition and not the proper instrument. (For I shall shew hereafter that it is impossible it should be both:) It doth morally qualify the subject to be a fit patient to be justified, as M. Benjamin Woodbridge truly, in his excellent Sermon of Justification. The reason of this is, That it is only Donation or the will of the Donor signified, that can efficiently convey a right to his own Benefits. The Receiver is not the Giver, and therefore
fore not the conveyer of Right, Every instrument is an efficient cause, and therefore must effect: and it is only giving that effecteth this right. Now if the giving (the donation) had been absolute, it had absolutely conveyed right; and faith would have had no hand in it, as being no condition: Or if the gift had constituted another condition, that other would have had the causing interest that faith now hath (ut causa sine qua non.). So that the nearest and formal interest of faith is, Its being the condition; and its apprehension of its object, is but the remote aptitudinal reason, being ipfa fides. The great thing therefore that I affirm is this, That if you will needs call faith the instrument of apprehending Christ, or righteousness, yet doth it not justify proxime & formaliter, As such; but As the condition of the gift performed.

3. And if you will speak improperly, and call faith as it is the performed-condition [instrumentum Receptionis] it is not therefore instrumentum Justificationis: In a few words, this is the summe: 1. Faith is an Ethical, Metaphorical reception of Christ. 2. If any will speak so improperly as to call this, The instrument of this Ethical reception; I will not contend with him. 3. This Ethical reception Active, is constituted by Christ's Testament, the condition of Passive proper reception of Right to Christ, and with him to his Benefits. Faith must first be faith, i.e. apprehenso Christi, in order of nature before it can be the condition of Right. 4. It justifies therefore quâ condito, and not quâ fides in Christum: or as they improperly speak, quâ instrumentum Christi apprehendens. 5. If any will take the word Instrument so improperly and largely, as to comprehend the condition, then you may further say, [Faith is not only the instrument of Active reception, but of true Passive reception of Right to Christ, and so of receiving Justification.] 6. But this is quâ condito praestita, and not quâ apprehensio Christi. 7. And therefore every act that is part of this condition, may so be called, instrumentum recipiendi. 8. And if it were, as they would have it, that faith is the instrument co nomine quiæ Christi apprehendit, then every grace that apprehendeth Christ must be the instrument too: And doubtless Knowledge, Love, Hope, Delight, &c do apprehend, or receive Christ in some sort; and have him for their object. 9. Though I will not contend with him that will lay, [Fides non quâ fides, sed quâ condito praestita, est instrumentum morale recipiendi juxta Christum et justificationem ab ipso promeritam.] Yet (as I think he laieth a snare for himself and others, in turning the plain and proper term [Condition] into an improper term [instrumentum Recipiendi],) so I think it not to be endured that therefore faith or any act of man, should be called the instrument of Justification. For though you may in a strained speech say, that Recepitio moralis activa being made the medium or condition Receptio: but in passing passive, may therefore be called instrumentum recipiendi, and Credere vel acceptare said to be morali: vel reputativa pati; (and for every condition quâ condition is termed a Receptive instrument) I say, though I will not quarel with this speech for mere unfitness; yet it is a higher and more dangerous error to lay That faith or any condition is therefore instrumentum Justificationis. It is not an instrumental efficient cause of the effect, because it is medium sine quâ non recipitur: As Reali vel naturali receptio Justificationis, is not Justificare, sed Justificari, to much more evident is it that Moralis & imputativa Recepitio Justificationis, non est Justificare, sed medium necessarium ad Justificari.] 10. Lastly, I lay again what I said in my Aphorisms; These two Questions must be distinguished: What is the nearest reason of faith's interest in Justification? And, what is the remote reason? or why did God assign faith to this office?
To the first, this is the only true Answer: Faith Justifies rather then any thing else, because God in framing his deed of gift, was pleased to make faith the condition: The meer constitution of the Donor is the cause. To the second, this is my Answer: God chose faith to this office of being the justifying condition, rather then other duties, because it was fittest: as being in its own nature, An acceptance of a freely given Christ, and Life with him (which men call the instrumentality.) I have the more fully opened my meaning here together about this point (though with some repetitions) that I might leave no room for doubting of it, and misunderstanding me.

§. 12.

Mr. Bl. The Spirit will do nothing without our faith, and our faith can do nothing without the Spirit. Man cannot justifie himself by beleev'ing without God, and God will not justifie an unbelieving man. Faith then is the act of man; man beleev'es, yet the instrument of God, that justifies only beleev'ers.

§. 12.

R. B. 1. The Spirits working in Sanctification, is nothing to our question of Justification. 2. The Spirit worketh our first faith without faiths co-working; and that is more then nothing. 3. The Spirit moveth faith to action, before faith move it self; and that is more then nothing. 4. It is not so easily proved as said, that the Spirit never exciteth any good act in the soul, nor yet restraineath from any evil, without the co-working or instrumentality of faith. But these are beside the point. 5. When you have laid down one Proposition [Man cannot justifie himself by beleev'ing, without God, ] how fairly do you lay down this as the disjunct Proposition? [and God will not justifie an unbelieving man.] Concedo totum. Is that your Conclusion? Would you have no more? Who would have thought but you would rather have laid [ Nor will God justifie man, unless his faith be the instrument of it? ] And do you not seem to imply that man with God doth justifie himself, when you say [Man cannot justifie himself by beleev'ing without God? ] No, nor with him neither? For none can forgive sins but God only, even to another: but who can forgive himself? Indeed I have thought what a sad case the Pope is in, that is the only man on earth that hath no visible pardoner of his sin: he can forgive others; but who shall forgive him? But I forgot that every beleev'er forgiveth himself; for I did not beleev' it. 6. How nakedly is it again affirmed, without the least proof, that our faith is Gods instrument in justifying? Doth God effect our Justification by the instrumentall, efficient causation of our faith? Let him beleev' it that is so happy as to see it proved, and not barely assumed.

§. 13.

Mr. Bl. So that which is here spoken, by way of exception, against faith as an instrument, holds of efficient and instruments, sole and absolute in their work and causality. But where there is a concurrence of Agents, and one makes use of the act of another to produce the effect that in such causality is wrought, it will not hold.
§. 13.

R. B. E. H. e that will or can make him a Religion of words and syllables, that either signify nothing, or are never like to be understood by the learner, let him make this an Article of his faith. 1. What you mean by [absolute] I cannot certainly affirm, unless that which is never a principal. 2. Nor know I whether by [sole] you mean Materialiter, Formaliter, vel Respectively quod causam principalem. 1. Two materials may concurre to make one formal instrument: Here the instrument is but one, though the matter of it may be of divers parts. Sure this is not your sense, that faith and something else materiably concurre to make one instrument. 2. An instrument may be called [sole] formally, when it is the only instrument, and there is no other concurret to the effect. If you mean that my exceptions hold against none but such sole instruments, then it is more nakedly, and more truly asserted: nor do they hold over the more or less, whether the instrument be sole or not: else they would hold against few instruments in the world. For it is not usual to have an effect produced by a sole instrument: especially of subordinate instruments, though it may be usual as to coordinate. 3. An instrument may be called [sole] Respectively, as to the principal cause: viz. It is not the instrument of many principals, but of one only. Is this your meaning, that my exceptions would hold, if faith were only mans instrument, or only Gods; but not when it is both? If so 1. This is affirmed without the least shew of proof, or reason: why my exceptions hold not as much against that instrument of a double principal, as of a single? Surely the nature of an instrument is not varied by that. 2. If God and man be both principals (as they must be, if faith be the instrument of both) then either coordinate or subordinate; but neither of these, as I have argued before. Man neither forgives himself under God, or with God, if you speak of one and the same forgiveness. Though I know there is another kinds of forgiveness, whereby a man may forgive himself: whereof Seneca speaks, de Ira, when he faith, [Why should I fear any of my Errors, when I can say, See thou do so no more, I now forgive thee.] lib. 3. cap. 36. 0 for one proof among all these affirmations, that [here is such a concurrence of Agents, that God makes use of the act of man, to produce the effect of Remission] and that as an instrument, and not only as a meer condition, sine qua non.

§. 14.

Mr. B. The Promise or Grant of the New Covenant in the Gospel, is (instead of faith) made the instrument in the work of Justification. This is indeed God, and not mans. It is the Covenant of God, the promise of God, the Gospel of God: but of itself unable to raise man up to Justification.

§. 14.

R. B. You have been farre from satisfying me in asserting the instrumentality of faith in Justification. You here come more short of satisfying me against the sufficiency of the Gospel-grant as Gods instrument. You say, This indeed is Gods, not mans. I say, There is none but Gods: for non datur instrumentum, quod
Mr Bl. I Trust is often tendered and Justification not always wrought, and so disabled from the office of an instrument, by Keckerman in his Comment on his first Canon concerning an instrument. As soon as the instrument serves not the principal agent, so soon it loses the nature of an instrument. He instanceth in an horse which obeyth not the reins of his rider, but groweth refractory: then he ceased to be an instrument for travel. A sword is not an instrument of slaughter, where it slayeth not: nor an ax an instrument to him, when it cuts not. Neither is the Gospel an instrument of Justification, where it justifieth not.

R. B. I Am too shallow to reach the reason of these words. I know you had not leisure to write them in vain, and meekly to fill paper. And I will not be so uncharitable as to think you willing to intimate to the world, that I had wrote or thought that the Gospel was the instrument of justifying a man that was never justified. Do you think I know not a Cause and Effect are so related, that formali ter it is not an efficient before it doth effect? Though it may still be the same Thing, and have the same Aptitude to produce the Effect, even when it is not applied: and therefore by many Logicians is laxly termed a Cause still. 3. Nor can I perceive you make this a medium of any argument: except you would argue thus: The grant of the Covenant is not an Instrument of justifying unbelievers that never were justified: Therefore it is not a full or proper instrument of justifying believers that are justified.] Or else, therefore faith is an instrument as well as the Gospel. To your Reader that is no wiser then I, these words therefore, are at the best but lost labour. For I suppose this Argumentation you will not own.

Mr Bl. When the Minister is a Minister of condemnation, the favour of death to death, there the Gospel becomes an instrument of condemnation and death.
§. 16.

R. B. I. So it is, if there be no minister where it is known any way. 2. I speak of God's grant or promise in the Gospel: you speak of his condemnation. 3. If the threat be the proper instrument of condemnation, a pari, the promise or gift is the proper instrument of justification. Saw you not this when you wrote it?

§. 17.

Mr. Bl. The efficacy that is in the Gospel for justification, it receives by their faith to whom it is tendered.

§. 17.

R. B. Darkly, but dangerously spoken. Darkly, for its possible you may mean, that it receives it by faith as by a condition sine qua non est subjectum proxime capax: and so I grant the sense: dangerously, For the words will seem to any impartial Reader to import more; specially finding what you say for faiths instrumentality before: viz. That the Gospel receives its efficacy from faith, or by faith as the instrument which conveyeth that efficacy to the Gospel: which if you mean, I would for the Truth's sake, and your own, that these words had never been seen. For if faith give the Gospel its efficacy; 1. It cannot be as a concourse-instrumentall, coordinate; but as a superior, more principal cause to the subordinate. 2. If it were the former that is meant, yet were it intolerable.

1. Nothing but a superior cause doth convey efficaciam causandi to another, and this must be either, 1. Influendo in potentiam inferioris. 2. Vel in actum. To say that man's faith doth either of these to the Gospel-grant, is such a doctrine as if I will not dare to argue against, lest you take me thereby to accuse you of being guilty of it.

2. Faith cannot as a concourse, convey any efficacy into the Gospel: For a coordinate concourse doth influenza immediate in ipsum effectum, at non in concurse potentiam vel actum.

3. If you had only said that faith doth concurr in efficiency with the Gospel, to justification; you had said more then you bring any proof for: But let's see what you bring in stead of proof.

§. 18.

Mr. Bl. Heb. 4.2. Unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them: but the word preached, did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. 1 Thes. 2.12,13. You received not the Word of God, as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the Word of God, which effectually worketh in you that believe.

§. 18.
§. 18.

R. B. But where's your conclusion, or any shew of advantage to your Cause? 1. In the first Text, the Apostle speaks of the words profiting in the real change of the soul; and our question is of the Relative. The Scripture meaneth, the Word had not that further work on the heart, as it hath in them that mix it with faith: will you interpret it thus: [The Word did not justify them.] 2. Its true, that the Word did not justify them: but that's consequential only of the former unprofitableness. Once prove that man is but as much efficient in justifying himself, as he is in the obedience and change of his minde or actions; and then you do something. 3. Is here ever a word for the Gospels receiving its efficacy to Justification by faith? no nor of its so receiving that real profit of sanctification, which is here meaned, neither. Its weak arguing to say, The Word profited not, because it was not mixt with faith: therefore faith conveys it to its efficacy of sanctifying, yea of justifying. You cannot but know the sequel would be denied. In progressive sanctification, and obedience, and exercise of graces, the word and faith are concaufes, and one will not effect without the other: But it followeth not that therefore faith gives efficacy to the Word in this (much less to Justification where faith is no efficient.) For concaufes have not influence on each other, but both on the effect. The want of faith may hinder the Word from that further work on the soul, which presu mopeth faith (for faith is not wrought with faith's cooperation:) and thats all that the Text faith: But may not the absence of faith hinder, unless when present it doth effect? I am sure in Justification, where it is but a condition, it may. The nature of a condition, when the gift is free and full, is not to effect the thing, but to suspend the efficacy of the instrument, till it be performed. As (if I may use so gross a similitude) the clicket of a Cross-bow doth hinder the bow from shooting, till you stir it; but doth not add any force to it, when you do stir it.

The second Text: I know not how you mean to make use of; unless you argue thus: The Word worketh eftually only in Believers: therefore faith conveyeth efficacy to the Word. I think I need not tell you, that I deny the sequel (not to speak of the antecedent:) not yet to tell you that this speaks not of working the relative change of Justification.

§. 19.

Mr. Bl. So that the Gospel, in itself considered, is wanting in that honour assigned to an instrument, to have influx to the producing of the effect of the principal cause, by a proper causality. If none dare say, that faith hath such an influx, they may much less say that the Word hath such an influx.

§. 19.

R. B. The Gospel, in itself considered, without the coordinate or subordinate, or superior causality of faith, hath this honour so fully, clearly, beyond all doubt, that no man that is a preacher of this Gospel should question it: Much less should prefer the causality of faith, in saying, that [we may much less give this honour to the Word.] or say this of the Word, then of our own faith. Yet
the Gospel without the concomitancy of faith, doth not actually justify: else faith were no condition or causa sine qua non: But that is no dishonour to the Gospel; not defect of power, which faith must supply. But the force of the instrument being meerly from the Donors will, he willeth that shall then (and not till then) efficere, when the condition is performed. I appeal to all the Divines, Lawyers and Logicians in the world; when the thing to be conveyed is but Debitum vel jus ad rem, and the effect is but a Transcendental relation (as debitum is.) Is not the Voluntas constitutiva vel Donantis the only principal proper efficient? And is not the signum voluntatis constitutivum, the proper efficient instrument, that the wit of man can imagine. Is not the Testament of a man the most strict and proper instrument of conveying right of the Legacy to the Legacy? Is not a Covenant, Contract, Deed of gift, the most proper instrumental efficient cause of the dunes of the thing given or conveyed? It is not only a Law term, but a term of the strictest Logic, to call these a mans instrument: for conveyance. Is not a præmiant or priviledging law, in the most strict and proper sense the Legislator's instrument, effecting the debitum praemii vel privilegii? It is evident that the clearest definition of an instrumental efficient cause doth agree to these: as far as the nature of the effect (Relatio debiti vel juris) will admit of full or proper efficiency. For these instruments are the very fundamenta proxima of these relations. Can you prove the like, (yea and more) of faith, and will not? But I pray once more remember that it is not the effecting of a Physical change, but a relative, the conveying of Right that we are speaking of: so full an instrument is each of these that the very name of the effect is oft given to them. So a pardoning instrument is called A pardon: the instrument of donation is called A deed of gift. The Law is said, præmiari & punire, quia constituit debitum praemii & pana.

§ 20.

Mr. Bl. Embles therefore affirming the Word to be an instrument of Gods Spirit, presently adjoins, Now instruments are either cooperative or passive, and the Word must be one of these two: Cooperative, he faith it is not, and gives his reason: It is therefore, faith he, a passive instrument, working only per modum objecti, as it contains a declaration of the Divine Will, and it proposeth to the understanding and will the things to be known, beleived and practised.

§ 20.

R. B. Mr. Pembles speaks of the Word effecting, or as the instrument of sanctification. We speak of it as conveying right to Christ, and as justifying. What is that to this? 2. When did Mr. Pembles prove that the Word or other objects are passive instruments? You know he goes against the stream of Philosophers; and then his reasons must swaye more then his authority: And his reason, which you say he gives, is but this, It cannot be declared what operative force there should be in the bare declaration of Gods will, &c.] But I will undertake to declare that an operation there is by the agency of this declaration; though not punctually how it operates: I have read many that say that objectum operatur in genere cause finalis: and others that say it opereth in genere cause efficientis: some laying it effecteth Physically, others that it effecteth morally, others that objectum operatur
operatur naturaliter, at proponens objectum oft tantum causam moralem; others that it is causa efficacis objectum praecipue est effectum earum operationum qua ab illa immediate exerceratur; sed causa finalis effectu altiorum operationum qua ab illa sunt priorum interveni, as Burgersdis speaks: But I remember none that call it Instrumentum passivum: yet not only the object, but declaration and all, Instrumentum passivum. For my part I am of Scotus minde, that Objectum operatius efficienter & per modum nature in intellectum; sed moralist tantum in voluntatem; irresistibly and necessarily on the intellect (considering it as an intellect, and not so far as it is sub imperio voluntatis & ita ejus operationes sunt participative voluntaria;) but on the will not so. And I am sure this passive instrumentality of the Word in sanctifying, doth very ill agree with the language of Scripture; which makes the Word to be mighty, powerful, pulling down strong holds, sharp, dividing, &c. The seed of God by which we are begotten, lively, the Word of life, saving mens souls, quickening, sanctifying, cleansing, &c. But what's all this to Justification?

§ 21.
Mr Bl. So that if Burgersdisius his gladius and cultur be active instruments, and Keckerman's Incus instrumentum fabricationis, and his scannum & mensa accubitus, & terra ambulationis; yes it followeth not, as is thence inferred, that there is no passive instrument. Here is an instrument that is passive.

§ 21.
R. B. These words import an intimation that I said all these were active instruments, which should not have been done, when I manifested that I took some of them for no instruments. 2. These words intimate, as if I concluded hence (if not only hence) that there are no passive instruments; which should not be, when I only brought in these as Objections to be answerd, and argued with Schilber against passive instruments; thus: Every instrument is an efficient cause: All efficiency is by action: Therefore every instrument is active. If you chose rather (as ordinarily you do) to silence my reasons then answer them, yet you should not have intimated, as if I had given you none, or but such as I gave nor. 3. I look for your proof of a passive instrument; and not to say [Here is an instrument that is passive] as if you were demonstrating it to my eyes, when you bring nothing but singular Mr. Pemblis singular word. And I doubt whether you believe him or your self throughly; for if you did, I think you would preach but coldly. I am persuaded you look your preaching should operate actively: And indeed so it must or not at all; for pari non est operari; and therefore Pemble denieth it to cooperate, and to operate. Be not offended if I doubt whether you believe this your self, in your Studies, Preaching, Writing and Exhortations. 4. I doubt not but that which doth only realiter part, may be called an instrument moraliter vel receptuatus: but then its receptive instrumentality consists in a receptive activity. 5. And I doubt not but the disposition materia may, by a borrowed speech be called instrumentum recipiendi; and so instrumentum passivum, i.e. Passiois, i.e. Receptionis: but all this is nothing to the business. 6. If it were proved that there were a hundred passive instrument:s, it would never be proved that faith is one (as an instrument signifies an efficient cause) of God's work of justifying us; neither Really nor Reputatively is it such.

§ 22.
Mr. Bl. I

§ 22.

That which is produced by an efficient or principal agent to the producing of an effect, and receives activity and power from some other, is a passive instrument and not active.

§ 22.

R. B. Stranger yet! 1. Its nothing to the nature of an instrument active or passive, whether [it be produced by the principal agent] or not, so it do but subservive that agent. 2. If this proposition be true, there is never an active instrument in rerum natura: For Angels and men, calor, fignum, and all creatures are produced by God as the principal cause to the producing of some effects (except there be any ulterior effectus found out which are not causes of other effects) and they all receive activity and power from God. Those that are most for passive instruments lay, calor is an active instrument. But if I use fire to warm my beer, or burn any thing, this receives its activity and power from another, and therefore must be no active instrument, with you. If there be no active instrument, when I thought there had been no passive instrument, I was far wide. 3. But what mean these strange words of [Activity and power received] if the instrument be not active? Is not the Potestas here meant, Potentia efficiendi? and is not all effect action by action? And is not the activity here mentioned, an activity in causing? What? and yet no active instrument? Be not offended with me, Dear brother, if I confess, that you and I differ in more points than one, and in our Philosophy as well as Theology.

§ 23.

Mr. Bl. But the Word is produced and held forth of God for the work of Justification, and hath its power of working elsewhere.

§ 23.

R. B. Yet more strange! 1. Is it not enough that you take the Word to be a passive instrument of Confirmation and Conversion? and all the work that it doth on the souls of your hearers really? but you must signify the Word to be the passive instrument of Justification too? Is there anything in the whole world that can more unifiably be called a passive instrument, then the Covenant of Justification? Why, it is God's only instrument of active Constitution of the dueness of the benefit? Though it be but actione moralis, ut signum voluntatis donatoris. The Debitum results from the Grant, Deed of Gift, Testament, or Instrument of Donation or Conveyance, as from its fundamentum proximum; and is the fundamentum proximum Relationis a passíve Instrument?

2. The Word hath its power of working elsewhere; that is, from God; but not from man's faith: Farre be such a thought from my soul.

3. I suspect by your words, when you say [the Word is produced and held forth of God] and by your discourse all along, that you all this while understand not
not what I mean by the Covenants justifying: (yet I had hoped you had understood the thing it self.) You seem to think that the Covenant justifies by some real operation on the soul, as the Papists say; and our Divines say, It sanctifies; or as it justifies in foro conscientia, by giving assurance and comfort. But Sir, I opened my thoughts of this fully in Aphor. pag. 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179. I scarce bestowed so many words of any one particular point. I speak not of the effect of God’s Word, as preached to mens hearts: but as it is Lex promulgata, & Fædes, & Testamentum, and so doth convey Right, or Constitute the ducens of the benefit? This is the Record that God hath given us, eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son, &c. 1 Joh. 5. 11, 12. This Gospel-donation doth constitute the ducens of the thing given, to us; and thus the Covenant justifies, as a written pardon under the Kings hand, or an act of grace or oblivion, doth pardon. Do you not oft read in Divines of Justification Juris, vel Legis, as distinct from Justification Judicis, vel per Seulementum? I referre you to what I said in the cited place.

§. 24.

Mr. Bl. Forgiveness of sins is preached in the Gospel, Act. 13. 32. But it is those that believe that are justified. Faith through the Spirit gives efficacy and power of working to it.

§. 24.

R. B. I should tremble to say so: What Romanist by the doctrine of merit gives more to man in the work of Justification! If our faith give efficacy and power to the Gospel to justify us, then we justify our selves when the Gospel justifies us! then the Gospel is our instrument of Justification! And can this be unless it be also said that we made the Gospel? Then God and we are concourses in the Gospels act of Donation: And is it the same power and efficacy for justifying, which the Gospel receives from God, and which it receives from faith? or are they divers? If divers, shew us what they are; and which part of its power and efficacy the Gospel receives from faith, and which from God? If they are the same, then God must convey justifying efficacy and power into faith first, and by faith into the Gospel: which who imagineth? or why should I be so vain as to stand to confute it? O that you had condescended so far to your Readers weakness, as to have designed to shew him, Quomodo satitur Evangelium recipiendo? & Quid recipit ut fiat potens & efficax? & quomodo hoc potentia & efficacia sui in se? utrum eminenter ut formaliter? utrum sibi fides id communicavit quod nunquam habuit? & quomodo agit sibi in hoc influentia causativa in Evangelium? with many more of the like, which you make necessary to be enquired after. And why gave you no proof from Scripture or reason for a point that is so new, that I think never man printed before you, for so far as I can learn at present: That faith gives efficacy and power of sanctifying or exciting Grace, perhaps some before you have delivered: but that it gives efficacy and power of justifying, I think not any.

2. And sure you do not take the foregoing words for proof: If you do, I desire your Reader may not do so, What though only Believers are justified by the Covenant? Doth it follow that faith gives efficacy and power to the Covenant to justify? Then either there are no conditions or causes sine quibus non: or else they
they all are efficients, and give efficacy and power to other efficients: What if your father bequeath by his Testament a piece to each of his sons? to one on condition he will ask it of his elder brother, and thank him for it: to another, if he be married by such a time: to a third, if he will promise not to waste it in prodigality: Do any of these conditions give efficacy and power to the Testament? No: Yet the Testament doth not efficaciter agere till they are performed. Why is that? Because all such instruments work morally, only by expressing in signa the Will of the Agent: and therefore they work both when and how he will; and it is his Will that they shall not work till such a time, and but on such terms; and so he frames the conditions himself, as objects to suspend his Testament or other instrument from acting or effecting, till they are performed: but not to give efficacy and power to his Testament. If the gift be in diem, the instrument receives not efficacy and power from the Time, quando venit dies: no more doth it per presentationem conditions.

3. Your terms of [Faiths giving power through the Spirit] tell me, that sure you still look at the wrong act of the Gospel; not at its moral act of Conveyance or Donation, but at its real operation on mans heart: For neither Scripture nor Divines use to say, The Gospel remittereth sin, or justifieth by the Spirit: Nor doth the Spirit otherwise do it, then by enditing the Gospel; unless by the Spirit you mean the Godhead in Essence, and not in Personality. Sanftification is ascribed to the Spirit as the efficient, but so is not forgivene and Justification. Nor do I like your phrase, as to sanctification it self: That faith conveys efficacy and power to the Gospel through the Spirit: For I, I had rather say, The Gospel and Spirit, or the Spirit by the Gospel, convey efficacy and power to faith, then faith to the Gospel. 2. How faith should convey this through the Spirit, is quite beyond my reach: Doth the Spirit receive any influx from faith, and thereby a power, and then convey this to the Gospel from our faith? But its like you mean, the Spirit doth it through faith.

§ 25.

M. B. So that neither the Gospel, nor faith in the Gospel, should in this office of an instrument in Justification be deemed their due honour. The Gospel received by faith, is a plenary instrument in this work: and faith embracing the tender and promise of the Gospel. The Gospel is an outward instrument, saith Ravanelly: faith an inward: they both make up one instrument full and compleat: yet faith is more aptly and fitly called an instrument: Seeing that faith gives efficacy, as an instrument to the Word: the Word may be without faith, and so no instrument at all: but faith alway presupposeth the Word of promise: it is not without its object.

§ 25.

R. B. 1. Had you first proved any such honour due to faith, and so to man, as to be the instrument of Justification, yea and more fitly then the Gospel, so to be called, then you might fairly have thus concluded. But I like not Arguments that have but one part, being all Conclussion. I will lay more for the Gospels instrumentality. Signum voluntatis Donatoris constituens jus ad beneficium Donatum (etf in diem vel sub conditione) est Donatoris instrumentum maxime proprium: Sed Testamentum Christi est signum voluntatis divinae jus nostrum ad Christum
& Justificationem passivum constituens, (viz. subconditions, & actualiter quando præsumtus condicio: ) Ergo Testamentum Christi est instrumentum hujus donationis, maximè præsumtum. For the major, examine it by all the qualifications of an instrument, and it will appear undoubted. 1. Subservit causa principalis, sollicitat voluntari donatoris. 2. Actio ejus & principalis sunt eadem actio: sollicitat Donare, vel constituere debita semper. The true definition of an instrument agrees to it: Instrumentum est quod ex direzione alterius principalis agentis infinit ad producendum effectum se nobiliorum: vel, per quod causa alia operator. sic, ut hoc elevetur ad effectum se nobiliorum, fei ultra perfectionem & juam & effectus sue. 4. Venit in the most perfect instrument 3 for instrumentum comelias est quanto magis est sim proportionatum: ut Aquin. 1. 2. q. 188, a 7. But Gods Legal grant is most perfectly proportioned to the conveyance of right to Christ, and his benefits. Proved this much of faith, as to Justification, before you again tell the world that faith is more fitly called an instrument of Justification.

2. If the Gospel received by faith be a plenary instrument of justifying, as you say: Then 1. How is faith more fitly called an instrument? 2. Then Recipere Evangelium is instrumentum justificandi maximè præsumtum (as you think) making the Gospel a compleat instrument.

3. If faith and the Gospel be both full compleat instruments, then either ejusdem effecti per eadem actionem, vel per diversas: not per eadem actionem, For 1. Then they should be one instrument. 2. Their esse is so different that their operari must needs be different. 2. If per diversas actiones, then coordinate or subordinate: You think subordinate, it seems, and that faith gives power and efficacy to the Gospel 3. If so, then faith doth modo & sensu nobiliori justificare quam Testamentum. But thats farre from truth: For 1. It is most proper to say, The Covenant-grant justifieth: or the Law of grace justifieth; but it is less proper to say, Faith justifieth: and Scripture never faith so that I know of; but that we are justified by faith. 2. You say your self that faith is but a passive instrument: but the Testament is active, (morally in its kind.) 3. Recipere Evangelium is not so properly justificare, as is immediate justificare, Remittere, jus ad Christum & remissione constitutum, which is the Gospels a&. Credere non est tam propriè justificare. Much more might be said of this, if necessary.

4. How plain a contradiction do you speak, that faith and the Gospel are two instruments: and that both make one compleat instrument. They might have been said to be materially two things, making one instrument without contradiction; but not without notorious untruth.

5. For it is no better when you say, they make up one compleat instrument. For 1. You said before that faith gives power and efficacy to the Gospel: which if true, then the Gospel is an instrument subordinate to faith, and therefore not one with it. 2. The Gospel is causa totalis in suo genere, fully as an instrument conveying right, quando vel venit dies, vel præsumtus condicio: therefore it is not causa partialis, vel pars causa. 3. There is such a disparity in the actions of each, viz. Credere, and Remittere vel donare Christum & Remissionem, that they cannot possibly as causa partialis, constitute one compleat cause: For one immediately and properly produce the effect: the other not so. 4. You say, that they are both passive instruments: But so they cannot make one instrument: For surely nec patiuntur idem, nec ab codem; nec formam justificacionis Evangelium patiendo recipit. Though indeed your authority must do more then your reasons, to prove it of either.
6. If faith be more aptly and truly (as you speak) called, an instrument, then it is a proper speech to say, Faith, or man by faith, forgiven sins; then that The Covenant-grant or Condonation, or act of pardon doth forgive them. Sed Absit!

7. When you have well proved that repeated dangerous assertion, [That faith gives efficacy as an instrument to the Word;] you may next take the boldness to speak out its confessions, and say, Gods Word is the Believers words: the Believer enableth Gods Law of grace to forgive him: Thus the Law of grace is defective in power, till the Believer perfect it: Credere non est actus subditi, vel Legatus, sed Praesidium, Judicis, & Testamenti: Ergo Homo habet autonomiam sapienti Justificandi, & &ibi ipsi condonandi, & credendo banc exercet autonomiam.

8. Your strange proof is oft answered. What though the Word without faith is no instrument? Doth it follow that therefore either faith makes it an instrument, or is an instrument in itself? The King grants an Act of Oblivion or Pardon to a thousand Traytours, on condition that by such a day they come and seek and thankfully accept it: Doth their seeking or thankfull Acceptance, give power and efficacy as an instrument to the Kings Pardon? Or are the Pardon and Acceptance one compleat instrument? Or is it more fit to call the Traytours Acceptance, the instrument of his Pardon, then the Kings Act? Credas qui credere posse est.

Twifte faith, An audebit Arminianus aliquis affirmare Remissiorem pecatorum esse operationem fidei? Nam est nisi credentibus contingat ista Remissio. Dices, sedem sateem praecessit quidam esse ad Remissionem pecatorum confessandum. Ego autem ratione dicatur efferre fidei, sed in greater tantum causa dissipativa. Twill. Find. Grat. l.1. par. 2. §. 25. p. 273. So he oft faith both of Faith and Works, that they justify only in causal dissipativa: and therefore in one kind of causality; and not as instruments properly so called.

§. 26.

Mr Bl. Therefore to wind up this whole Dispute in which I have laboured to be brief,
(though I fear some will think I have been too tedious;) seeing that those that make faith the instrument in justification, make the Gospel an instrument likewise, and dare not go about to strip it of its honour: I hope that they that make the Gospel an instrument, will acknowledge faith to be an instrument in like manner, being in their efficacy as instruments so inseparably joined, and so all the Controversie will be fairly ended and concluded. Amen.

§. 27.

R. B. 1. If this be a Dispute, I am none of those that think it too long: I scarce finde a line in many Pages: It is in my eyes too short, that it seems as nothing.

2. Your motion for decision will take, when man is proved to be God: then mans act of Beleewing may fairly share of the same honour with Gods act of Legal forgiving: And yet then I shall demurre on the preferring it: But till then, I love Peace and Unity, but not on such a compromising, as to share the honour of the Redeemer with the redeemed, of the Creator with the creature, of the Sovereign pardoning, with the Traytor pardoned.
3. I like Amen better than Ergo: and Herbert's transformation I much applaud; but not the substitution of Amen, for a necessary Ergo. This *nonum falsi dispositandi genus*, that can prove all with a word, an *ipse dico*, and wipe off all that is opposed with a wet finger, I never liked. I must next take in what you add after wards.

---

**S. 27.**

Mr. Bl. Pag. 91.

Obj. *It* is said by another, *If* faith be a condition of the Covenant of Grace, then it can be no instrument of our Jusification: *If* it be a condition in this Covenant, it justifies as a condition, and then it cannot justify as an instrument, and so I pull down what I build, and run upon contradictions.

Answ. I answer, I should rather judge on the contrary, that because it is a condition of the Covenant in the way as it is before express, that it is therefore an instrument in our Jusification. God sends the gift of righteousness to be received by faith: *He* Covenant for this faith; for acceptance of it: By believing then we keep Covenant and receive Christ for Jusification: we as well do what God requires, as receive what he sends; we do our duty, and take God's gift; and thereby keep Covenant, and receive life, and so faith is both a condition and an instrument.

---

**S. 27.**

R.B. But do you take *officium* and *conditio* to be all one? I easily yield that we may do our duty in believing, though it were an instrument: But a condition is more then a duty: yea then a duty to be performed for the obtaining of a benefit. *Cujusvis* faith, *Conditio est Lex addita negotio que donec praefetur eventum suspenderit; Vel est modus vel causa qua suspenderit id quod agitur, donec ex post-facto confirmetur. Or as Myrsinger, Cujus quid in casum incertum (i.e. contingens) qui potest reddere ad egressum non esse confirmatur. And they are divided into *Pootestasius, Casuales, Mixtas*: Ours is of the former sort, and I define it, *cujus* the condition of the Covenant to be, *Actio voluntaria de futuro, a Deo Legislatore & Christo Testatore in nova Lege, Federe, Testamento requiri*, ut ex eis praestatione constitutur jus actuale ad beneficium: vel, ut obligationem & eventum suspendat donec praestetur. For ex stipulatatione conditioniali neque obligatio neque aetio nulla est; an que conditio eveniat: *Quia quod est in conditio, non est in obligatione. Ut Myrsing. in Instr. Schol. pag. 523.*

2. You must consider that it is not de conditione contratam conditionis & emptioniis, vel emptiensiis, vel locationis, or any the like, that is *proper pristium*: but it is the condition *prae donationis*, but somewhat partaking naturæ Feudi, as to some of the Benefits. This being premised, it is evident that faith cannot justify both as a condition, and as an instrument of Jusification. For either of them importeth the *proximum & causalem rationem* of faith, as to the effect: But it is utterly inconsistent with its nature to have two such different nearest causal interests. To be an instrument of justifying, is to effect *it per medium instrumenti*: To be the condition, is to be the *causa sine qua non*, which doth not effect, but suspend the effect till performed: It hath the name of a cause, (and sometime is *ex materia a moral impulsive*, and sometime not) but it hath the true nature of such a medium ad
ad finem, as is no cause. As faith cannot be both efficient effecti, et effectum ejusdem.

efficientis, nor be both the efficient: and constitutive cause (material or formal.)

no more can it produce one and the same effect of Justification per modum instrumenti efficientis, and per modum conditionis sine qui non. 2. Else you must reign the pardoning act to run thus [I will pardon thee on condition thou wilt pardon thy self by believing, as the instrument:] and not only [on condition thou accept Christ.] 3. It belongeth to the pardoning instrument to conferre the right to the thing, that is, to dissolve the obligation to punish: and to constitute the condition of this Right or Pardon: For Donatur eis constitue conditionem etiam in ipsa instrumentali Donatone. But faith doth not conferre Right; for thy self say, It doth but receive it: It doth not dissolve the obligation, but accept a Saviour to dissolve it: It doth not constitute the condition of right; for you acknowledge it is the condition it self.

To conclude this Point, for the compromizing or shortening this difference between you and me, I will take your fairer offer, pag. 75. or else give you as fair an offer of my own. Yours is this: [Faith is considered under a double notion. First as an instrument (or if that word will not be allowed) as the way of our interest in Christ, and priviledges by Christ.] In this general I easily agree with you.

If that satisfie not, I propound this, Call you it an instrument of receiving Christ, and consequently righteousness; and give me leave to call it precisely a condition, or a moral disposition of the subject to be justified: and I will not contend with you: So be it, you will 1. not say too great a stress on your own notion, nor make it of flat necessity, nor joyn with them that have made the Papists believe that its a great part of the Protestant Religion, and consequently that in confuting it, they refell the Protestants. 2. Nor say any more that it gives efficacy and power to the Gospel to justify us, and is more fully then the Gospel called an instrument. 3. Yea, I must desire that you will forbear calling it at all an instrument of Justification, and be content to call it an instrument of receiving Justification: and I would you would confess, that too to be an improper speech. If you resolve to go further, let me desire you hereafter 1. To remember that its you that have the Affirmative, that faith is the instrument of justifying us: and I say, It is not written, you addre Scripture: Therefore shew where it is written, expressly or by consequence. 2. Do not blame me for making sincere obedience part of the meer condition (wherein I think you say as much as I) and so as giving too much to man, when you give intolerably too much more as to make him the instrumental efficient cause of forgiving and justifying himself. 3. Above that I have yet said, I pray forget not one thing: to prove faith to be the instrumental efficient of sentential Justification (which is most properly and fully so called) as well as of Legal constitutive Justification. For that the great point of which you have just nothing (pace Pauli et dicit dicam) of which you should have said much. And so much for the Controversie.
§ 28.

Of Evangelical Personal Righteousness.

Mr Bl. Pag. 110, &c.

There is yet a third opinion, which I may well doubt whether I understand, but so far as I do understand, I am as far from assent to it as either of the former: and that is of those, who do not only assert a personal inherent Righteousness, as well as imputed, against the Antinomians; but also affirm that this Righteousness is complete and perfect: which if it were meant only of the perfection of the subject, as opposed to hypocrisy, dissimulation, or doubteness, implying that they do not only pretend for God, but are really for him; that they do not turn to him feignedly (as Israel was sometime charged, Jer. 3. 10.) but with an upright heart: Or of the perfection or entireness of the object: (respecting not one, or only some, but all Commandments) which is called a perfection of parts; we might readily assent to it. The Covenant calls for such perfection, Gen. 17. 1. Walk before me and be thou perfect: and may have their witness in Scripture that they have attained to it, as Noah, Gen. 7. 9. Job. 1. 1. Hezekiah, Is. 38. 3. But a perfection above these is maintained: a perfection complete and full. [Righteousness signifies (as is said) a conformity to the Rule, and a conformity with a quittance or an imperfect rectitude is not a true conformity or rectitude at all: Imperfect Righteousness is not Righteousness but unrighteousness. It is a contradiction in adjecto; Though holiness be acknowledged to be imperfect in all respects, where perfection is expected, in reference to the degree that it should obtain, or the degree which it shall obtain, or in reference to the excellent object, about which it is exasperated, or in reference to the old Covenant, or the directive, and in some sense the preceptive part of the new Covenant; In all these respects it is imperfect; and Righteousness materially considered is holiness, and therefore thus imperfect: but formally considered, it is perfect Righteousness or none; this not in relation to the old Rule, but the new Covenant.] Upon this account they are charged with gross ignorance, that use and understand the word Righteous and Righteousness as they relate to the old Rule; as if the godly were called Righteous (besides their imputed Righteousness) only because their sanctification and good works have some imperfect agreement with the Law of Works. This and much more to assert a personal perfect inherent Righteousness, as is said: all which as it is here held out, is new to me, and I must confess myself in ignorance all over. I never took imperfect Righteousness to imply any such contradiction, any more than imperfect holiness.

§. 28.

R B. The third opinion you rise against, is that which you take to be mine, as your citing my words doth manifest: but you confess your self uncertain whether you understand it or not. There is a possibility then that when you do understand me, you may prove your self of the same Opinion.

In the mean time it is your Reasons which must justify your strong difference, which I shall be bold to examine. Where you say, I do not only assert a personal inherent Righteousness, as well as imputed, against the Antinomians, but also affirm that this Righteousness is perfect.] I Reply: Either you suppose the
later proposition to be an addition to the former, in terms only, or in sense also: If only in terms, the sense being the same, I suppose you would not oppose it. If in sense, then it is either somewhat real, or somewhat modal, which you suppose the later to add to the former: Real it is not, for Res & perfectio Rei, are not distinguished as Res & Res, but as Res & Modus. It is therefore but a modal addition: And it is such a Modus as is convertible with Ens. And therefore there is as much imported in the first Proposition [We have a personal inherent Righteousness] as in the second [We have a perfect personal inherent Righteousness.] For Ens & Perfection are as convertible as Ens & Bouum, or Ens & Verum.

You add [If it were meant only of the perfection of the subject, as opposed to hypocrisy, &c. or of the perfection or entire of the object (respecting not only One or Some, but All Commandments) which is called a perfection of parts, we might readily affent to it.]

To which I Reply: 1. Your terms are uncouth to me, but I will do my best to guess at your meaning. A perfection of the subject is perfectio essentialis vel accidentalis. The former is no more but esse subjectum, vera & propria. The latter may be variously taken, according to the variety of accidents: But certain I am that the subject is imperfect, quod ad perfectionem accidentalem. And therefore in this large expression, you seem to say much more then I. You and I, who are the subjects of Righteousness, are imperfect, though perfectly subjects.

2. That which you call here perfectio subjecti, it is nothing but the truth of the immediate subject, as I understand you. Fussitio est vel causa, vel persona, vel substantia confiderata vel in causa vel in persona. Causa est subjectum proximum: Persorii est subjecti unum primum & principalis. Fussitio causa, est vel actionum vel habitum & dispositionum. Perfecti sunt habitus & dispositiones, & actiones vel perfectiones essentiales & transcendentalis & interspersi, & interspersi sunt. It seems therefore that you here say as much at least as I, for the perfection of the inherent Righteousness, (if not more) for I am sure you speak more unlimitedly.

3. I do charitably conjecture, that when you speak of [a perfection of the object] you do not mean as you (peak, but you mean a perfection of our Acts as they respect the object, extensively (for whether you include or exclude intention, I know not.) Here must I distinguish between objects of absolute necessity, (and so of the acts about those objects) which a man cannot be justified or saved without: and 2. Objects of less necessity (and so acts) which its possible to be justified and saved without. In regard of the former, I confess our acts may be fai to be [Truly acts that are exercised about such objects] if you will call that perfection (as in a larger sense you may:) But as to the later, I acknowledge no such perfection. And therefore (for that which you call [A perfection of parts]) I acknowledge that every righteous man, hath a perfection of the essential parts (that is, he wants them not) but not of the integral always; much less of accidents, which are improperly called parts.

Next you repeat some of my words, and then add [All which as it is here held out, is new to me, and I must confess my self in ignorance all over.] Reply: I cannot help that, but I will do towards it what I can, that it may be none of my fault: and therefore will let you know my meaning. And in opening the sense and nature of [Perfection] I cannot give you more of my mind in
in a narrow room, then Schiller hath laid down in Metaph. i. c. 17. **Perfection est:**

1. **Schiller** apt ad essentiam nihil deest. Scaliger, Exerc. 140. p. 470. **Omnem quod est, hic est, &
   perfecum, & totum, & perfectione.** It is a Metaphysical Transcendental Perfection that I speak of, which hath no contrary in Being; which consisteth in the presence of all things necessary to Being: and that only of an inferior, derived Being, such as the creature is; for we meddle not with the infinite Divine Being or perfect on. Nor do we take it in a comparative sense, but in an absolute: this being a Righteousness perfect in its kind, though a more perfect kind accidentally, may be found out: I take it rather nominally then participally: but still remember that I take it not de perfectione accidental, sed essentiai: And therefore I still maintain that in several accidental respects our Righteousness is imperfect.

Now to know how our Righteousness is essentiai perfect, let us consider what is essential to it. Its form is a Relation of our actions and dispositions immediately, and our selves remotely, as compared with the Law or Rule. This Law (besides the constitution of the reward and punishment considered in themselves, of which we now speak not) doth 1. Constitute (I mean efficiently determine) what shall be our duty in general. 2. It determineth more specially, what part of this duty, shall be the condition of our Justification and salvation, sine qua non. When we come to be judged at God's bar, he that hath performed the condition shall be justified, though he have omitted much of the other duty: but all that have not performed the condition shall be condemned. (But remember of what it is that this is the condition: viz. of the new Law of grace, whose office is to make over to us Free remission of sins, and salvation through the satisfaction and merits of Christ: and not the condition of that Law, which gives the reward directly for the work.) Take up altogether then, and you will see that 1. Righteousness is formally a relation: 2. And that not of our actions or dispositions to the mere precept of the Law, determining of duty as such, (commonly called the moral Law;) but 1. to the Law, as determining of the condition of life or death; 2. to the promise and threatening of that Law, which are joined to the condition. So that [to be righteous] signifieth (quod legem novam) these two things: 1. [**Non obligatus ad peum, & cui debesur primum.**] 2. [**Qui conditionem impunitatis, & premii praestit.**] The first question in judgment being [**An sit obligatus ad peum, vel non ? & an primum fu debitum ?**] therefore the former is our first and principal righteousness, and here to be pleaded. But before the first question can be determined, the second must be raised and resolved, [**Hic pradstitit conditionem ?**] And here the second is our Righteousness (conditionis pradstiti) by which we must answer the accusation [**Conditionem non pradstiti.**] That is, [He lived and died an unbeliever or impenitent.] So that 3. You see that our first Righteousness [**Non reatus peum: vel jus ad impunitatem & ad pra- minimum.**] as it requireth Christ's perfect satisfaction, as a medium to it, by which all the charge of the Law of works, must be answered; so it requires our performance of the condition of the Law of grace, as another medium, by which Christ and his benefits are made ours, and by which the false accusation of being unbelievers and impenitents, and so to be condemned by the Law of grace it self, as having no part in Christ; must be answered, and we justified against it. 4. It is not only the form of our righteousness, that is transcendently perfect, but also the matter, as such, as it is the matter; that is, the subject actions and dispositions, are subjects truly capable of that relation. All this is no more but that it is a
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true Righteousness, and not equivocally or fallly so called: and so that even the matter or subject, is really the matter or subject of such a Righteousness. 1. The form here being a relation, in its self, admits not of degrees. 4. The matter or subject (cur dispositions and actions) though quæ materia, they have the forefaid metaphorical perfection, yet considered in its self, or considered in reference to the mere precept of the Law, and so in its mere morality, it is imperfect. As Schiller saith, Omne perfectum est ess: & omne ess est perfectum transcendentali, & essentiali perfectione: Duo huius modi adhuc possum entia vocari imperfecta. 1. Accidentaliter, quod sit intellect de æt quod ad integrum vel Ornamentum, vel atique ad intentionem statum pertinet. Et sub huius imperfectione etiam continetur imperfectione, quæ est in defectu partium materie minus principali: Nam materiae pertinet ad essentiam perfectionem, sed id compleur fatis fecondum partes principales in tuo heterogeno, qua sufficientes sunt ad radicandum & sustentandum formam, manifesto judicio, quod ablatis partibus minus principaliobus, manet prior species. Veluti si homo & carere pedibus, & brachis & auro & oculis, abhuc tamen est homo, &c. Atque ita per ablationem partium minus principiali rabil abhuc deest quod pertinet ad transcendentaliam perfectionem, quæ essentialis est ipsius hominis. Atque ita homo abhuc est perfecte homo, & perfecte ess: &a non huius im perfectione tollitur perfectione transcendentali, &c. 2. Possum vocari entia [imperfecta] comparate, quod sit intellect non habeam essentiam tam perficam & nobilim, quam alia. Ita materiae est imperfecta, quia non sit, & non nobilit sem ac forma, &c. Hae essur imperfectione iterum non tollitur perfectionem transcendentalam, quo minus transcendantner, perfecte dicantur quæ si sunt imperfecta, l. c. 1.

In both these respects I confess and maintain that our Righteousness is imperfect: that is 1. Our graces, holines, obedience, good works, are gradually imperfect, yea oft numero, as well as gradu. 2. The Righteousness which we have in or from Christ's perfect satisfaction and merits, is a Righteousness of a more noble and perfect kinde, then this inherent Righteousness required by the Law of grace: for the latter stands in subordination to the former, as a necessary means, i.e. condition to make it ours. Omne tamen ess est perfectum, non solum in genere ess, sed etiam in genere talum ess, &c. Et sic etiam materia, ets in comparatione ad alia entia, sit fatis imperfecta, tamen in suo genere habet omnino perfectionem, neque sic deest ci quicquam cum, quæ ad ipsius ess pertinent. Schib. ubi sup. n. 7. 8.

The like doctrine hath Calvinus Metaphys.Divin. p. 246, &c. de perfectione, fully: where of our imputed and inherent Righteousness, he saith, Prior denominatione extrinseca, posterior intrinseca, utraque vero, & realiter, ipsis competit. And these are two of his Porisms, Perfection non admits magis & minus: and Perfection ambiguitat accedere vel decedere. Multitudes might quickly be cited to the same purpose with these above-said, but that it is so known a cafe.

And thus I have done what at present I thought my duty, that it might not be my fault that you are [in ignorance all over.] But I have laid the lefs because I have lately more exactly opened the nature of our Righteousness, in Answer to the Animadversions of another Learned Brother.

You add [I never took imperfect Righteousness to imply any such contradiction, any more then imperfect holines.] Reply: 1. Holiness is taken 1. For [the relation of a Person or Thing dedicated to God:] and so I confess it admits not of a magis or minus any more then Righteousness. 2. But our common use of the word [Holiness] when about persons, is for the qualities or actions of a spiritually-renewed man: and so I further say: 2. That this also hath its transcendental perfection, as well as Righteousness. But here's the difference (which if you
you add to what is said before, you will more fully see my thoughts.) Holiness thus taken is a quality, which though it have the truth of Being, yet is intended and remitted, or doth recipere magis & minus. Righteousness is a relation, which in suo formali is not intended or remitted. Nay if you will exactly open it, it will appear that the Righteousness in question is a Relation founded in a Relation (the real conformity of our Acts to the Law or Rule, as it determineth what shall be the condition.) Yea more, that the very subiectum proximum hujus relationis, nec intenditur nec remittitur: and this is that I mean by perfection, besides the fore-said transcendental perfection. But (because these things are extolioris indagationis) understand that the reason of this my attention lies here: The Law as it is the rule of obedience, doth require perfect obedience in degree; and so here is an imperfection in our actions in the degree, as being short of what the Rule requireth; and it being these actions with their habits that we call our holiness (ab efficience & fine) therefore we must needs say, Our holiness is imperfect: And it our Righteousness were to be denominated from this Law, commanding perfection, we must say, not that such Righteousness were imperfect, because the holiness or obedience is imperfect; but it is none at all, because they are imperfect: For imperfect obedience or holiness is not a subject or matter capable of the relation of [Righteousness] according to that perfect Law which condemneth them, and admitted only gradually-perfect obedience, as capable matter, without which the form cannot be received. And to our faith, repentance, and sincere Gospel obedience, as compared to this perfect Law, are no perfect Righteousness, nor any Righteousness at all: And to this being the matter of our inherent Righteousness, I say, our faith and obedience are imperfect (though not imperfect Righteousness, because none) as thus compared. But then the Law as it is the determiner of the conditions, on which Christ and life shall be ours, hath made the matter or immediate subject, to be in punta, as it were, so that it cannot be more or less, because it is the sincerity only of our faith and obedience, that is the condition of Life, and not the gradual perfection. So that when we must be justified, the Question will not be, [Hast thou believed and obeyed perfectly?] but [Hast thou done it truly.] So that no imperfection of the matter consistent with sincerity, makes it less capable of the form, nor no perfection of degrees makes it capable of more of the form. The condition here is as truly performed, by true believing and obedience, in a lower measure, as in a higher: yea and this true performance is as full a Righteousness (in relation to this part of the Law) as if the matter of faith and obedience were more perfect: The strongest faith doth not make you Righteous in a higher degree, then the weakest that is true: For the strongest is but praestatio conditionis (which is the Righteousness in question) and so is the weakest. It is not therefore from this act of the Law (determination of the condition) that our graces or duties, are diversified as more or less perfect in degree, but it is in respect to the other act or part of the Law (determination of duty, as such.) So that in a word, Duty simply as duty, and holiness, or supernatural grace, as such, may be more or less. But holiness and duty, as the Matera requisitae vel subiectum proximum Justitie, consistit in indivisibili.

Only let it be remembred, that I speak this of the promise of impunity and glory everlasting absolutely considered, and not of a comparative degree of glory: For it may be yet consistent with this, that a greater faith, love and obedience, may have a promise of greater glory.
Remember also I pray you (if you will do me justice) 1. That I did only assert in my Aphorisms [1. A metaphysical perfection of Being, and 2. A perfection of sufficiency in order to its end] in our righteousness: 3. And the same transcendental perfection of Being, I affirmed of holiness itself, only adding, that it being a Quality may be intended and remitted, but Righteousness being a Relation cannot \textit{ex parte sui}. Now which of these perfections of Righteousness do you deny? Not that of sufficiency as to the end, as you expressly affirm. It must therefore be the transcendental perfection of Essence, And if that be denied, then Righteousness is no righteousness: for so \textit{omne ens perfectionis est}. And then you must maintain that it is but equivocally called righteousness, but indeed is not: fn. But yet this I find you not about, but rather confess the contrary, not only by affirming inherent Righteousness, but also affirming a double perfection of it, which you are pleased to call subjective and objective, and which can be no less then I here affirmed.

\textbf{§ 29.}

Mr. Bl. (1) \textit{Saith I am sure faith, All our Righteousness are as filthy rags, Isa 64.6.}

No greater charge of imperfection can lie against the most imperfect holiness, than the Prophet lays upon our righteousness. (2) Neither do I understand how holiness should be imperfect taken materially, and righteousness perfect, taken formally in reference to a Rule.

\textbf{§ 29.}

R.B. 1. \textit{Vill not all the imperfections of our Righteousness which in the Aphor. I asserted serve to warrant the Prophets comparison, without our denying the perfection of Being? That is, that it is truly Righteousness?}

2. My opinion of that Text is, that the Prophet means plainly, [We are an unrighteous people] or [we have no other Righteousness to glory of, but what is indeed no righteousness at all, no more then the filthy rags are clean] no nor so much; for they may possibly have some part clean. Yet that this is called Righteousness, is no wonder, when the next words are Negative, q.d. [our Righteousness is none; or is unrighteousness:] yea it is not unusual to give the name either from common estimation, or the persons profession, and especially from those actions which use to be the matter of Righteousness, though the form being wanting, they are not now actually the matter. So I think Solomon forbidden of us to give the name of Righteousness. Further, it's considerable, what Righteousness it is that the Prophet there speaks of, whether universal or particular? and whether Legal, consisting in absolute perfection; or Evangelical, consisting in sincerity? and also whether he speaks of himself and each individual, or only of the Jewish Nation described according to the generality or main part of them.

3. As for that next passage, where you tell us what [you understand not] I confess it seems strange to me: but I hope you make it no argument against the opinion which you oppose. If it were a good argument indeed, then the less a man understands, the better he might dispute. But let us see what it is that you understand not. 1. [How holiness should be imperfect taken materially?] Sure you understand that: for what else did you mean in the foregoing words, [No greater
greater charge of imperfection cane ly against the most imperfect holiness?]

2. It is therefore, no doubt, the other branch that you mean, how [Righteousness is perfect taken formally in reference to a Rule.] 1. That Righteousness in\[Senst Legali & forensi is a relation consisting in a conformity, or congruency to the Rule, I suppose you understand, seeing both Schoolmen, and Protestant Divines do so commonly affirm it: e. g. Scopes and Dr. Twiss oft. 2. That omne\[ens est essentialiter perfuitum, I suppose also you understand: and so that this Relation must be a perfect Relation, or none at all: where there is the form, there is the being; and therefore the word [Righteousness] spoken formaliter of our Righteousness, must needs express that which is truly Righteousness, and not equivocally so called. 3. Yea I suppose you understand, that Relations do not admit of majis and minus ex parte sit, but only when they are founded in quality, ex parte fundamenti vel subjecti: At least if any would deny that, yet the relation in question, being of the nature of [Parity,] and not of similitude only, (which are both implied in conformity) doth not so much as ratione fundamenti admit of intention or remission. These things being all to generally acknowledged, you leave me only to admire that you should say, You understand them not.

[§ 30.

Mr. Bl. I may (for ought I know) as well make holiness formal, and referre it to a Rule, and Righteousness material, in an absolute consideration, without reference to any Rule at all.

[§ 30.

R.B. I. Wether you take holines as signifying a Quality or Relation, there is no doubt but it hath its form, or else it could not have a Being? Did you indeed imagine that I had denied that? 2. But that holines in our common use of the word, doth formally consist in the relation of our qualities or acts to the Law, especially in that relation of conformity, that we are now speaking of, I finde not yet proved. Holines taken for the qualities and acts themselves, is no relation. Holines taken for Dedication to God, is such a kind of Relation as Donation is: It refers to God as the terminus: For omne sanctum est Deo sanctum. But to be [Dedicated to God] and to be [conformed to the Law or Rule] are not all one. 3. If you or any man refere to use holiness in the same sense as righteousness, if I once know your mindes, I will not contradict you, for I finde no pleasure in contending about words. But for my self I must use them in the common sense, if I will be understood. 4. That you may use the word [Righteousness] materially, without relation to any Rule, is as much as to say, We may denominate a materia sine forma. The form is relative. If you mean, We may denominate that which hath a form, from the matter, and not from the form, then I Reply, 1. Then you must not denominate properly and logically: 2. And then you must not call it Righteousness; except you mean ludere aequovoc, and speak de Justitia particulari ethica quasium enique tribunum, when we are speaking de Justitia Legali, Civili, Forensi, called by the Schoolmen Justitia universalis in our case. I am not of the Papists mind that make our Righteousness to be our new qualities, and confound Justitiam & Sanctitatem, finde Justificationem & Sanctificationem.

[§ 31.}
Mr. Bl. A nd in such consideration I do not know how there can be perfection or imperfection either in holiness or righteousness: It is as they come up, or fall short of the Rule, that they have the denomination of perfection or imperfection.

S. 31.

R.B. 1. A t the first view, the first sentence seemed to strange to me, that I thought it meetest to say nothing, because it is scarce capable of any apt answer but what will seem sharp or unmanly. For that which you say you may consider, is something or nothing: If something, and yet not capable of perfection or imperfection, it is such a something as the world never knew till now. But upon second thoughts I finde that dejusitia your words may be born; For it is nothing that you speak of. Legal Righteousness not related to the Law or Rule, is Nothing: And Nothing cannot be more perfect or less; thus negative. But that holiness taken for spiritual habits and acts, can have neither perfection or imperfection; or that they are capable of no perfection or imperfection in any other sense, but as related; nor yet in any Relations to God, or the person dedicating, save only in the relation to the Rule; all these for the first reason shall have no answer but a recital.

S. 32.

Mr. Bl. P aul's Gospel frame, whether you will call it righteousness or holiness is set out I am sure, Rom. 7. full of imperfection; yet all this as in reference to the Rule, as is answered, or fall short in conformity to it; ver. 22. I delight in the Law of God after the inner man.

S. 32.

R.B. 1. I S not [Righteousness] or [Holiness] as Scriptural, as Logical, as plain a term, and as fit for Disputants, as [Gospel-frame?] Till I know whether by [Gospel-frame] you mean, Habits, Acts, Relations (and what Relations) or what else, I shall pass it as uncapable of a better Reply. 2. Did not I acknowledge expressly as much imperfection as you here affirm of Paul's frame? Why then do you intimate by your arguing as if I did not? 3. There is a twofold Rule, or action of the Law, which our Habits and Actions do respect, as I have oft said. The first is the Precept determining of Duty simply. This all our Actions and Habits come short of; and therefore no man hath a Righteousness consisting in this conformity. The second is the promise, or that act going along with the promise, whereby God determineth of the condition. This is twofold: One of the Law of Nature and Works; and according to this no man is Righteous: for the condition and the duty are of the same extent, it being obedience gradually perfect; that is here the condition. The other is of the Law of Grace; which determineth what shall be the condition of our Right to Christ and Life. Paul never complaineth of an imperfection of Essence, of this last. It is of the former that he speaks. These necessary things should not be hidden,
hidden, by confounding the several Rules, or Offices of God's Law, which so apparently differ.

§ 33.

Mr Bl. And whereas a charge of ignorance is laid even upon learned Teachers, that commonly understand the word [Righteousness] and [Righteous] as it refers to the old Rule. I profess my self to have little of their Learning; but I am wholly theirs in this ignorance. I know no other Rule, but the old Rule, the Rule of the Moral Law; that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, and the only Rule.

§ 33.

R: B. Either I am an incompetent judge, through partiality, or else you had done but the part of a friend, yea of a candid adversary, to have taken in the rest of my words, which must make up the sense; which were these [As if the godly were called Righteous (besides their imputed righteousness) only because their sanctification and good works have some imperfect agreement to the Law of works.] I pray let the word [only] be remembered. 2. It is but in this one point that I charge them with Ignorance. And who is not ignorant in more points then one? If it be so proud and arrogant a speech as some other Brethren have affirmed it to be, then every man is proud and arrogant that differs from another, and disputeth the difference. For I cannot differ from any man unless I suppose him to Erre: And doubtless every man is so farre Ignorant as he Erreth. Must I then differ from none? yea from no Learned Divines? Why then when one affirmeth and another denieth, I must be of both sides, for fear of cenfuring one side as Ignorant or Erroneous. 3. I confess I was not well acquainted with the genius of many of my Reverend and truly Honoured Brethren. I thought that no godly man would have taken himself wronged, if a man told him, he had Error, no more then to tell him he had sin. I took it for granted that humanum est errare, and that we know but in part, and that sanctifying grace had so farre destroyed pride, and made the soul apprehensive of its imperfection, that, at least, men of eminent godliness could have endured patiently to hear that they are not omniscient nor infallible, and that they have some ignorance with their eminent knowledge? and why no: in this point as well as another? If any think that I arrogate that knowledge to myself which I deny to them: I reply, So I do in every case wherein I differ from any man living: For if I thought not my judgement right, it were not indeed my judgement: and if I thought not his opinion wrong, I did not differ from him. But if they will affirm that therefore I do either vilifie them, or prefer myself in other things, I hope they will bring better proof of their affirmation. For my own part I unfeignedly profess my self conscious of much more ignorance then ever I charged on any of my Brethren in the Ministry: yea I must profess my self ignorant in a very great part of those Controversies, which are most commonly and confidently determined by my Brethren. I speak not all this as to Mr Bl. but to other Brethren that have made so strange an exposition of this one word, and of one more pag. 51. [Vulgar Divines] as that they can thence conclude and publish me a lighter and contemner of my Brethren: As if they that know England, could be ignorant, that the Churches among us have many such guides, as may well be called Vulgar Divines: Take them by number, and
judge (in those Counties that I am acquainted in) whether the greater number be of the Profound, or Subtil, or Angelical, or Seraphical, or Irrefragable sorts of Doctors? or equal to some of these Reverend Excepters, whose worth I confess so far beyound my measure, that had I spoke of them as Vulgar Divines, they might well have been offended. But O that it were not true that there are such, through most of England, Wales, and Ireland (if any) on condition I were bound to Recant at every Market Cross in England, with a fagot on my back; so be it there were the same number of such choice men, as some of these my offended Brethren are in their stead. And then who knows not that the Vulgar or ordinary weaker Teachers, do take up that opinion, which is most in credit, and which is delivered by the most Learned Doctors whom they most reverence? So that the summe of my speech can be no worse then this: [It is the most common opinion] which is all one as to say [It is the opinion of the Vulgar Divines and some of the Learned, the other part of the Learned going the other ways] which is it that men censure for such an approbrious, injurious speech. Yet I will not wholly excuse it, nor this that Mr. Bl. toucheth upon. I confess it was spoken too carelessly, unmanerly, harshly, and I should better have considered how it might be taken.

As for Mr. Blake's profession [That he hath little of their Learning, but is wholly theirs in this ignorance.] I did still think otherwise of him; and durst not so have described him: but yet my acquaintance with him is not so great, as that I should pretend to know him better then he knows himself; and I dare not judge but that he speakes as he thinks. Let me be bold to shew him part of that which he faith he is wholly ignorant of: That [our personal inherent Righteousness, is not denominated from the old Law or Covenant, as if we were called Righteous (besides our imputed Righteousness) only because our sanctification and good works have some imperfect agreement to the Law of Works.] I prove thus:

1. If no man be called Righteous by the Law of Works, but he that perfectly obeyeth (so as never to sin) then no imperfect obeyer is called Righteous (nisi aequivocè) by that Law. But the Antecedent is true, Therefore so is the consequent.

2. If the Law of Works do curse and condemn all men, then it doth not judge them Righteous (nisi aequivocè.) But it doth curse and condemn all men: Therefore,

3. If the Law of Works do judge us Righteous for our works (taking righteous properly and not equivocally) then we must be justified by our works, according to that Law: Lex (u.) est norma judicii: & omnis qui est justus, est justificandus. Justificatio Legis est virtualiter justificatio judicii. He that condemneth the Just is an abomination to God. But we must not by the Law of Works be justified by our works: Therefore,

4. He that is guilty of the breach of all Gods Laws, is not denominated Righteous (nisi aequivocè) by that Law: But we break all Gods Laws: Therefore. Yea he that offendeth in one is guilty of all. Reade Brochwmd in Fæc. 2. 10. and Jacob. Laurentius, and Paulus Burgenfis (in Lyra) on the same Text. Vid. & Placæcum in Thefbus. Salmurienfis. Vol. i. pag. 29. S. 13. &c. Wotton de Reconcil. Part. 2. 1. c. 5. n. 16. Twift. Vindic. Græ. li. 2. part. 1. c. 15. pag. (vol. minore) 214. col. 2. See whether yours or mine be the Protestants doctrine. Here, if ever, it's true, thatBonus est ex causis integris.

5. If
5. If imperfect works are all finnes or sinfull, then they are not our Righteousnes according to the Law of works. (For it justifieth no man for his sins.) But the former is true: Therefore the later. I doubt not but you know the state of the Controversie on this point, between us and the Papists.

6. If the Law of works do denominate a man righteous, for imperfect works (which truly and properly are but a left degree of unrighteousnes) then it seems that all wicked men (if not the damned) are legally righteous: For they committed not every act of sin that was forbidden them, and therefore are not unrighteous in the utmost possible degree. And the Law of works doth not call one degree of obedience [Righteousnes] more then another, except it be perfect. But certainly all the wicked are not Legally Righteous (instead) Therefore.

7. If our Faith, Repentance and sincere Obedience, may be, must be, and is, called our Righteousnes, as it is the performance of the conditions of the new Covenant, or Law of Grace, then (at least) not only as they have an imperfect agreement with the Law of Works. But the antecedent is true: Therefore the consequent.

Let us next peruse Mr. Blake's Reasons, why [He is wholly theirs in this ignorance.] He faith: [I know no other Rule, but the old Rule, the Rule of the morall Law; that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, and the only Rule.] Rep. Sed distinguendum eft. The morall Law is taken either for the entire Law of works consisting of Precept and Sanction (and that either as it is the meer Law of nature, or as containing also what to Adam was superadded) or else it is taken only for the meer preceptive part of a Law, which is not the whole Law. In the latter sense, it is taken 1. For the preceptive part of the Law given to Adam. 2. For the preceptive part of the Law of nature redelivered by Moses. 3. For the preceptive part of the Law of nature, now used by Christ the Mediator, as part of his own Law.

2. We must distinguish of a Rule. 1. There is the Rule of obedience, or what shall be due from us? This is the precept (under which I comprehend the prohibition, it being but præceptum de non agendi.) 2. There is the Rule of reward, determining what shall be due to us: This is the conditional promise or gift, so far forth as it determineth de ipso premio. 3. There is the Rule of punishment, determining what shall be due to man upon his sin: This is the threatening. 4. There is the Rule of the condition of the reward or punishment, and of judging to whom they do belong, determining on what conditions or terms on their parts, men shall be saved, or else damned; (though the same acts were before commanded in the precept as they are duties, yet to constitute them conditions of the promise, is a further thing,) This is the promise and threatening, as they are conditional, or as they constitute their own conditions. I think the solidity and great necessity of all these distinctions, is beyond dispute. These things being thus, 1. What confusion is it to talk of the moral Law being the only Rule, when it is not one thing that is called the moral Law? and who knows what you mean? 2. How strange a thing is it to my ears, that you, even you, should so which own this, and so heartily profess that you take the Moral Law for the only Rule? For suppose you take it for the preceptive part of the Law of nature only (as I think you do:) That is but part of that very Law of nature: Doth not the Law of nature, as well as the positive Law, determine de Debito pane?, as well as de Debito officii? and is a Rule of punishment as well as duty. 2. Or if you took it for the whole Law of nature, is that the only Rule? 1. What lay you for matter of
of duty, to the positive Precepts of the Gospel, of Baptism, the Lords Supper, the Lords day, the Officers and Government of the Church, &c. Is the Law of nature the only Rule for these? If you say, They are reducible to the second Commandment: I demand 1. What is the second Commandment for the Affirmative part, but a general precept to worship God according to his positive Institution? And doth this alone suffice? Doth it not plainly imply that there are and must be positive Laws instituting a way of worship? 2. Do you take the Precept de genere, to be equivalent to the Precepts de speciebus? or to be a sufficient Rule without them? If the Moral Law, or Law of Nature, be to you, the only Rule, and a perfect Rule, then you need no other. And if God had only written the ten Commandments, or only said in general, [Thou shalt worship God according to his positive Institutions] would it have been your duty to have Baptized, administered the Lords Supper, &c. Doth the general Precept constitute this particular Ordinance as my duty? If not (as nothing more certain) then the general Law, is not the only Rule, nor sufficient in omniparte (though sufficient in suo genere, & ad partem propriam) for the constitution of Worship, Ordinances, Church, Offices, &c. or acquainting us with our duty therein. Moreover, did Christ in Instituting these Ordinances and Officers, do any more then was done before, or not? If no more, 1. It is superfluous. 2. Shew where it was done before. 3. Sure the fourth Commandment did not at once command both the seventh day of the week and the first. If more, then the former was not sufficient, nor is now the only Rule.

Moreover, doth not the Scripture call Christ a Lawgiver? and say, The Law shall go out of Zion, &c. Isa. 2. 3. And is he not the Anointed King of the Church; and therefore hath Legislative power? And will he not use the principal part of his Prerogative?

2. I think the Moral Law, taken either for the Law given to Adam or written in Tables of stone, is not a sufficient Rule to us now for believing in Jesus Christ; nor the same Law of nature, as still in force under Christ. For a general command of believing all that God reveals, is not the only Rule of our faith; but the particular revelation and precept are part. And a general command to submit to what way God shall prescribe for our justification and salvation, is not the only Rule, but that particular precept is part. And a general command of receiving every offered benefit, is not the only or sufficient Rule for receiving Christ, without the Gospel-offer of him and his benefits.

3. And I suppose you grant that as mans soul hath an understanding and a will, the former being a passage to the latter, in the former practical receptions being but ininitiate and imperfect, and in the latter perfected; so Laws have their prefaces declaring the grounds and occasions of them, oft times; and so the Laws of God have their Narratives, Histories and Doctrines, concerning the grounds, the subject, the occasion, &c. as well as the more essential parts, viz. Precepts and Sanction. These I spoke not of before in the distinctions. Now do you indeed think that the Law of nature, or what ever you now mean by the old Rule and Moral Law, is the sufficient and only Rule of Knowledge, Judgement and Faith? I take it for granted that you will acknowledge the assenting act of faith to be in the understanding: and that the Word of God is the rule of this assent. Had you in the old Rule or Moral Law, a sufficient and only Rule for your faith, in the Article of Christs Incarnation, Birth, Life, Innocency, Miracles, Death, Burial, Resurrection, Assent, full Dominion in his humane nature? &c. Was this Article
Article in the Creed before Christ's coming. [Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins?] Besides, matter of faith is also matter of duty: for it is our duty to believe all these Truths. But I think it was then no man's duty to believe that this Jesus the son of Mary was the Saviour, before he was Incarnate; or to believe that Christ was Dead, Ascended, &c. Therefore that which you call the Old Rule, is not as you say the Only Rule of our Duty in Believing.

4. But what if all this had been left out, and you had proved the Moral Law, the only Rule of duty? doth it follow that therefore it is the only Rule? Sure it is not, the only Rule of rewarding! For if you take the Moral Law, for the more preceptive part of the Law of nature, then it is no Rule at all of rewarding; for it is the promise, and not the precept that doth make due the reward. And if you take the moral Law for the whole Law of nature, it is a very great Dispute whether it be Regula praemiandi at all; much more as to that great reward which is now given in the Law of grace by Christ (yourself deny it, p. 74.) I dare not say that if we had perfectly obeyed, Everlasting Glory in Heaven had been naturally our due. And for Remission of sin, and the Justification of a sinner, and such like, they are such mercies, as I never heard the Law of nature, made the only Rule of our right to them.

5. The same I may say of the Rule of punishment. The privation of a purchased, offered Remission and Salvation, is one part of the penalty of the new Law, of which the Moral Law can scarce be said the only Rule. (None of them that were bidden shall taste of the Supper.)

6. But the principal thing that I intend, is that the Moral Law is not the only Rule what shall be the condition of Life or Death: and therefore not the only Rule according to which we must now be denominated, and hereafter sentenced Just or Unjust. For if the accuser say He hath not performed the conditions of the Law of grace, and therefore hath no right to Christ and Life] or say simply that [we have no right to Remission and Salvation;] if we can deny the charge, and produce our performance of the said conditions, we are then non condemnati, and the Law of grace, which giveth Christ and Life on those conditions, will justify us against that charge, of having no right to Christ and Life: But I think so will not the Moral Law. The Law of works justifieth no man but Christ: therefore it is not the Law of works by which we are to be justified in judgement. But some Law we must be justified by: for the Law is the Rule of judgement: and the word that Christ hath spoken shall judge us: therefore it must be by the perfect Law of Grace and Liberty. If it be then said against us that we are sinners against the Law of nature; we shall all have an answer ready [Christ hath made sufficient satisfaction.] But if it be said that we have no right to the pardon and righteousness which is given out by virtue of that satisfaction, then it is the Law of Grace, and not the Moral Law, that must justify us. Even that Law which faith [Whosoever believeth shall not perish, &c.] Moreover doth not the Apostle say plainly, that [Christ is the Mediator of a better Covenant, established on better promises: and if that first Covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second: but finding fault with them he saith, Behold the days come saith the Lord that I will make a new Covenant, &c.] Heb. 8.6,7,8. which speaks not only of Ceremonial precepts, but principally of the promissory part.

If you should say, This is the Covenant and not the law. I reply 1. Then the law is not the only Rule. 2. It is the same thing in several respects that we call a Law & a Covenant.
§ 34.

Mr. Bl. T

he perfection of this holiness and righteousness in mans integrity, stood in the
perfect conformity to this Law; and the reparation of this in our regenerate
estate (in which the Apostle placeth the Image of God) must have reference as to God for
a pattern, so to his Law as a Rule.

§ 35.

Mr. Bl. As an Image carrying an imperfect resemblance of its Samplar, is
an Image; so conformity imperfectly answering the Rule, is conformity
likewise.

§ 35.

R.B. 1. E

ther that Image is like the Samplar (as you call it) in some parts and
unlike in others, or else it is like in no part, but near to like. If the
later, then it is but near to a true Image of that thing, and not one indeed. If
the former, then it is nothing to our care. 1. Because it is justitia universalis, and
not particularis, that according to the Law of works must denominate the person
righteous, and not condemnable. 2. Because indeed no one word, action, or
thought of ours is truly conform to the Law of works.

2. Similitude, as Schibler tells you truly, doth lie in puncto as it were, and ex
parte sui admits not of magis or minus: and therefore strictè & philosophice loquendo
(fait he) that only is simile, which is perfectly so: but vulgariter loquendo that is
called simile, which properly is but minus dissimile. Scripture speaks vulgariter of-
ten, and not strictè and philosophice, as speaking to vulgar wits, to whom it must
speak as they can understand. And so that may be called the Image or likeness of
God, which participateth of so much of his excellency as that it demonstrateth
it to others, as the effect doth its cause, and so is less unlike God. I dare
not
not once imagine, that a Saint in heaven is like God in a strict and proper sense.

3. If all this were otherwise, it is little to your purpose. For in this conformity of ours, there is something of Quantitative resemblance, as well as Qualitative; and so it hath a kind of parity and equality in it, as well as similitude to the Rule. And I hope you will yield it past doubt, that parity admits not of magis or minus, what ever similitude doth.

§. 36.

Mr. Bl. Sincerity is said to be the new Rule, or the Rule of the new Covenant.

But this is no rule, but our duty, taking the abstract for the concrete, sincerity, for the sincere walking, and this according to the rule of the Law, not to reach it, but in all parts to aim at, and have respect to it. Then shall I not be ashamed when I have respect to all thy Commandments, Psal. 119. 6. And this is our inherent righteousness, which in reference to its rule, labours under many imperfections.

§. 36.

R. B. WV Hen I first read these words, which you write in a different character, and father on me, I was ashamed of my non-sense, for they are no better: but it came not into my thoughts, once to suspect a forgery in your charge: Far was I from imagining that so Reverend, Pious and Dear a Friend, would tell the world in Print, that I said that which never came into my thoughts, and confute that soberly and deliberately, as mine, which I never wrote; and which any man that would read my Book must finde, is wrongfully charged on me. And truly I dare not yet say that you are guilty of this: For though I have read my Book over and over of purpose in those parts that treat of this subject, and can finde no such word as you here charge me with; yet before I will lay such a thing to your charge, I will suspect that it may possibly be in some odd corner where I overlook it, or cannot finde it. But I see (if I am not overseen) how unsafe it is to report men's words themselves, much more their opinions, from the reports of another, how Grave, Sober, Pious and Friendly forever. If when we are dead, men shall read Mr. Blake's Book that never read mine, and there see it written that I said [Sincerity is the new Rule, or the rule of the new Covenant.] Can any blame them to believe it, and report it of me, as from him, and say [What shall I not believe such and such a man, that reports it in express words?] But let this go, with this conclusion: If indeed I have spoken any such words, I retract them as non-sense, and when I finde them I shall expunge them: If I have not, patience is my duty and relief; and I have long been learning, that we must suffer from Godly and Friends, as well as from ungodly and enemies; and till I had learned that lesson, I never knew what it was to live quietly and contentedly.

The rest of this Section hath answer enough already. No doubt but sincere obedience consisteth in a faithful undertaking to obey the whole preceptive part of God's Law, both natural and positive: But no man can by it be denounced righteous (nisi equivoce) but he that perfectly obeyeth in degree.

§. 37:
§ 37.
Mr. Bl. A Perfection of sufficiency to attain the end, I willingly grant, God condescending through rich grace, to crown weak obedience: in this sense, our imperfection hath its perfection: otherwise I must say that our inherent righteousness is an imperfect righteousness, in an imperfect conformity to the rule of righteousness, and without this reference to the rule, there is neither perfection nor imperfection in any action. See D. Davenant disputing against justification by inherent righteousness upon the account of the imperfection of it, de init. habit. p. 349, and how fully he was persuaded of the imperfection of this righteousness appears by sentences prefixed before two Treatises, as may be seen in the margin.

§ 37.
R.B. 1. Our term [otherwise] is ambiguous. If you mean that in some other respects you take righteousness to be imperfect, so do I, and that a little more then you acknowledge. If you mean that in [all] other respects you take this righteousness to be imperfect; why then do you wrong your Reader with equivocation, in calling it [Righteousness] when you know that transcendental perfection is convertible with its Being? 2. A natural perfection or imperfection, actions are capable of without a relation to the Rule: though that be nothing to our business, yet you should not conclude so largely. 3. Many a School Divine hath Written (and Gebief at large) that our actions are specified a fine, and denominated Good or Evil, and to perfect or imperfect a fine more specially and principally, then a Lege. But this requires more subtilty and accurateness for the decision, then you or I in their loose Disputes do shew our selves guilty of.

As for what you say from Reverend Davenant, I Reply, 1. Do you not observe that I affirm that which you call Our righteousness inherent, to be imperfect, as well as Bishop Davenant, and that in more respects then one? yet one would think by your words that you had a mind to intimate the contrary. 2. Yea I say more, that in reference to the Law of works, our works are no true righteousness at all: And I think he that faith, They are no righteousness, faith as little for them, as he that faith they are an imperfect righteousness. Yet, if the truth were known, I do not think but both Davenant, and you and I agree in sense, and differ only in manner of speaking. My sense is this: Our obedience to the Law of God is so imperfect, that we are not just but guilty, and condemnable in the sense of the Law of works: therefore speaking strictly, we are not righteous at all in senso forse, according to this Law: but speaking improperly, and giving the denomination a materia, or ab accidens aliqua, & non a forma, so we may be said to have an imperfect legal righteousness, while equivocally we call him just, that is but comparatively less unjust then another. For though righteousness in senso stricto, have no degrees, yet unrighteousness hath many. 3. And I suppose you know that Bishop Davenant doth not only say as much as I concerning the interest of works in Justification, but also speaks it in the very same notions as I did. If you have not observed it, I pray read him de Just. Hab. &c. cap. 30. pag. 284. &c. 31; p. 403, 404, 405. &c. 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 582.

And then I would ask you but this Question: If the accusation charge us to have
have no right in Christ and Life, because we died unbelievers and impenitent, or rebels against Christ; must not we be justified against that accusation, by producing our fault, repentance, and sincere obedience it self? and if fo (then which nothing more certain) are not these then so farre our righteousness against that accusation to be pleaded? And if it be not a true righteousness, and metaphysically perfect, and such as will perfectly vindicate us against the accusation of being prevalently and finally unbelievers, impenitent or rebels against Christ, there is no Justification to be hoped for from the Judge, but condemnation to endless misery.

Moreover, the Thesis that Dauccant proves in the Chapter which you cite, is inhauentem justitiam non esse causam formalem justificationis nostre coram Deo, And if that be true, then it is impossible that it should have the formal reason of righteousness in it. For if there be vera forma, there must needs be the formatum, and he that hath true formall righteousness, must needs be thereby constituted Righteous, or justified constitutivi; and then he must needs be sentenced Just, who is Just.

But then note that Dauccant speaks of that universal righteousness, whereby we are justified against the accusation of being sinners condemnable by the Law of works; (and here Christ's satisfaction is our righteousness) and not of that particular Righteousness whereby we must be justified against the accusation of final non-performance of the conditions of the Covenant or Law of grace: For there it is the performance of those conditions, which must it self be our righteousness, and so far justify us.

Doctor Twisse against Doctor Jackson, pag. 687, faith, [Yet I willingly grant that every sin is against God's good will and pleasure, as it signifies his pleasure what shall be our duty to do, which is nothing else but his commandment. And it is as true that herein are no degrees; every sin is equally against the Commandment of God.] I think I may with much more evidence of truth and necessity, say it as I did of Personal Gospel-righteousness, then he can do of sinne. And so much be spoken of that Controversie.

§. 38.

How farre unbelief and impenitency in professed Christians are Violations of the New Covenant.

R.B. Mr. Bl. pag. 245. c. 33. doth lay down a Corollary, That Impenitence and Unbelief in professed Christians, is a breach of Covenant. Though I take that to be intended as against me, yet I am uncertain, because he reciteth no words of mine. I have no more to do in this therefore but to clear my own meaning.

1. The word [Covenant] is sometyme taken for Gods Law made to his creature, containing Precepts, Promises and Threatnings; Sometime for mans promise to God. [Violation] is taken either rigifly for one that in judgement is esteemed a non performer of the conditions: Or laxly, for one that in judgement is found a true performer of the conditions, but did neglect or refuse the performance for a time. Taking the word [Covenant] in the latter sense, I have affirmed that man breaks many a Covenant with God; yea even the Baptifmal vow it self is so broken, till men do truly repent and believe. But taking the word
[Covenant] in the former sense, and [Violation] in the stricter sense, I say that to none violate the Covenant but small unbelievers and impenitent; that is, no other are the proper subjects of its peremptory curse or threatening. I think not: my self called to give any further answer to that Chapter of Mr. Blakes.

---

R. B. Mr. Blake's 32. Chap. I take to be wholly against me, and though I know nothing in it that I have not sufficiently answered, either in the place of my Book of Baptism, whence he fetcheth my words, in the Appendix in the Animadversions on Doctor Ward, or before to Mr. Tombs, yet because I take it to contain doctrine of a very dangerous nature, I will more fully Answer it.

§ 39.

Mr. Bl. Ch. 32. A Dogmatical faith entitles to Baptism.

3. It further follows by way of Consequence, that a Dogmatical faith (ordinarily called by the name of faith Historical, such that assents to Gospel truths, though not affecting the heart to a full choice of Christ, and therefore was short of faith which was justifying and saving) gives title to Baptism. The Covenant is the ground on which Baptism is bottomed: otherwise Church-membership would convince no title, either in infants or in men of years to Baptism: But the Covenant (as we have proved) is entered with men of faith not saving: and therefore to them Baptism is to be administered. How the consequent can be denied by those that grant the antecedent; Baptism denied in foro Dei, to men short of saving faith, when they are in Covenant, I cannot imagine: Yet some that confess their interest in the Covenant, deny their title to Baptism, and affirm, If men be once taught that it is a faith, that is short of justifying and saving faith, which admitted men to Baptism, it will make foul work in the Church.

§ 39.

R. B. Before I give a direct Reply to these words, I think it necessary that I tell you, How farre I take Unregenerate men to be in Covenant with God, and how farre not: and that I also discover as farre as I can Mr. Blake's minde in this Point; that it may be known wherein the difference lieth.

The [Covenant] is sometime taken for Gods part alone, sometime for our part alone, sometime for both conjunct, even for a mutual Covenanting. As it is taken for Gods act, it significheth 1. Either some absolute promise of God, made 2. Either to Christ concerning men, or on their behalf (and so the elect may be said to be in Covenant before they are born, because Christ hath a promise that they shall be saved, and the non-elect are in Covenant before they are born, because Christ hath a promise of some good to them.) 2. Or to men themselves: And that is either 1. Common, or 2. Peculiar to some. 1.Common: as the promise made to fallen mankinde that a Saviour shou'd be sent to Redeem them. The promise made to the people of Israel that the Messiah should be of them.
them according to the flesh, and personally live among them; and preach the Gospel to them. The promise made to Noah and the world, that the earth should no more be drowned with water: The promise of preaching the Gospel to all Nations (which is common, though not absolutely universal:) the promise of a Resurrection to all the world, and that they shall be judged by Christ the Redeemer, and (at least those that heard the Gospel) on the terms of the new Law, and not on the more rigorous terms of the Law of entire nature: the promise of a fuller and clearer promulgation and explication of the Law of grace, when Christ should come in the flesh: the promise of a fuller measure of the Spirit to be poured out, for Miracles to confirm the Christian Doctrine to the beholders, hearers and actors; that there shall be a Ministry Commissioned to Disciple and Baptize all Nations, maintained to the end of the world (which gives Ministers right and authority to Baptize them;) and if there be any other the like promise of the means necessarily antecedent faith. Thus farre many thousands that are unregenerate, and non-elect, may be said to be in Covenant, that is under these promises. 2. Some of these absolute promises are peculiar to some: as to one Sex (though common as to that Sex) as the mans superiority: to one Age: to one Degree in order of nativity (as to the elder brother to have some superiority over the younger, Gen.4,7.) to one Nation, as to the Israelites were made many peculiar promises; and those before mentioned which I called common as to all Israel, were peculiar to them (some of them) in exclusion of other Nations. And some to particular persons, good or bad: as for success in barrell, or other enterprizes; for aversion of some threatened judgement; for the abating of some inflicted punishment; for some temporal or common blessing; of which sort we finde many particular promises which God by some Prophets made with particular men. In all these respects I say wicked men have been under a promise, yea men not elect to salvation: and thus far they may be said to be in Covenant with God. But this is but a lax and improper speech, to say (such are in Covenant) to be used now among Christians that have used to give the name [Covenant] by an excellency, to another thing. Also now wicked men are not under peculiar personal promises of temporal things, as then they were, because now there are no extraordinary Prophets, or other the like Messengers or Revelations from God to make such particular promises to men. (Yet I will not say God hath restrained himself from this, or cannot, or will not do it at all, or that no man hath such Revelations; but only 1. That it is not usual. 2. Nor is God engaged to do it.)

So for the absolute promise of the first special grace (first faith and repentance) to be given to all the Elect (supposing that there is such a promise:) this is made to none but the ungodly and unregenerate, though elect (unless you will say, it is made to Christ for them, or rather is a prediction of good eventually to be conferred on them.)

But though in all these respects wicked men are under a promise, yet it is none of all these that gives them right to Baptism. There is no question of any but the last: and for that I have proved in my Appendix against Mr. Bedford, that it is not that Covenant that Baptism sealeth, Whither I refer you to avoid Repetition: much more easie is it to prove, that it is not that bare promise that gives right to Baptism. For many are Pagans and Infidels to whom that promise belongs, So much for the Absolute promise.

2. As for Conditional promises to man, they are either
1. Peculiar: as extraordinary promises of temporal blessings conditionally made to some particular persons heretofore. Of these I say, as of the former, Wicked men may be under such promises; but these give not right to Baptism.

2. Common: such as are not made to this or that man more than others, but to all, at least in the tenor of the grant, though he be not promulgate to all. Of this sort. 1. Some suppose certain promises to go before the great Law of grace. 2. But I yet know not of any but the Law of grace itself, (anon to be described.) 1. Those that do suppose some such antecedent promise, are of two sorts: 1. The Arminians and Jesuits. 2. Such as Mr. Bland about Church-Ordinances. 1. The Jesuits and Arminians speak of two such common promises. 1. One of the giving of supernatural means of Revelation to men, on condition of the right use of natural Revelation. As if God had promised to all Heathen and Infidels that never heard of Christ, that they shall have the Gospel sent them, if they will use the light of nature well, or will seek out for the Gospel. 2. The other promise which they imagine is, that God will give supernatural or special grace (viz., the first grace of faith and repentance) to men, on condition they will use well their common grace and means. I know of no such promise as either of these in Scripture (of which see Davenant in his Dissertation of Universal Redemption.) When any Arminian will shew such a promise in Scripture, we shall yield. But yet I will tell you how far I yield. 1. I yield that God doth actually give temporal blessings to wicked men: But this is no Covenant or promise. Yet it gives them a right to enjoy them de praesenti while they do enjoy them; so that it is not found Doctrine of them that say, Wicked men have no right to the creature, in whatsoever they possess, and that they are but usurpers. For if you see one naked in the street, and put him on a garment; he hath right to wear that and enjoy it, while you permit him: But yet because you promise him nothing for the future, he is not certain a moment of the continuance of that right or possession, for you may take it off him again when you will. So wicked men have right and possession of God's mercies by actual collation de praesenti, but not by promise de futuro, or by such proper donation, as gives them the full propriety (for so God weth not to part with the propriety of his creatures to any.) 2. I yield that God doth give to Heathens, who have but natural light, some helps which have a tendency to their further advancement, and doth appoint them certain means to be used for the obtaining of a higher light, and that he giveth them sufficient encouragement to go on in the cheerful use of those means, in impossibilities and probabilities of success; so that they are unexcusable that use them not. These Mr. Cotton calls half promises (as who knows but the Lord may do thus and thus? Pray therefore if perhaps the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven thee, &c.) But promises properly they are not. God hath thought meet to keep himself disengaged from this sort of men. 3. The very same I yield of men in the visible Church using common grace, as well as they can: that is, that God hath appointed certain means which such men are to use for the getting of special grace: that those that perish, do justly perish, for not using those means so well as they could, and for not believing: that he hath given them sufficient encouragement to use such means by examples, experiences, the nature of the means, and some half promises of success: but no promise properly so called. 4. I yield that he actually gives saving grace to wicked men: or else none could have it. But this they can plead no right to before they have it.
2. The second sort of promises before the great Covenant of grace, is signified by Mr. Blake (and if there be any other that go that way, as some do, and that with some difference among themselves:) and that is a promise of Church-privileges upon condition of a faith not justifying or saving. Here some annex special grace to these Church-privileges, and so fall into the Arminian strain. So Dr. Ward against Mr. Gataker, doth make a common (not-justifying) faith, the condition of Baptism, and then that Baptism a means non ponenti obiciem of the certain Justification of all the Baptized, and so, at least, the infants of all common professors, baptized, should be certainly justified. But I finde not Mr. Blake any where owning this connexion of special grace, and efficacy of Baptism on such: therefore I suppose it is but some common mercies that he supposed this promise to make over to the Baptized. But I will enquire further into his opinion anon.

2. The common or general promise-conditional, which I acknowledge, is the new Law of grace, or of faith, wherein God promiseth [to be our God, and will be his people] and [to give us Christ and Life, if we will accept him as he is offered in the Gospel] or [that he that repenteth and believeth, shall be justified and saved] and he that doth not shall be damned: Whereunto is also annexed, the promise of temporal mercies, so far as they are good for us; as appurtenances to the main blessings of the Covenant. Now I will tell you how far wicked men are under this great promise or Covenant. 1. As it is a conditional promise on God's part, or a Law of grace enacted conditionally giving Christ and Life to all men, so all men are under it; or the subjects of it: that is, All the whole world, as to the tenor of the Law of grace, following the meek ensigns and all that hear the Gospel, as to the promulgation. 2. So as it hath a precept conjunctly requiring them to believe and repent for remission and salvation, so all are under it, that hear it. 3. So are they as to the annexed threatening upon their unbelief and impenitency. 4. So as the Preachers of the Gospel do by Commission from Christ, apply all this to them, and insist on them by name to repent and believe, and offer them Christ and the other benefits of the Covenant, if they will repent and believe; so wicked men are still under the promise or Covenant, as to the Nunciative offers and exhortations, which is somewhat more than a mere promulgation of it as a Law. All these wares, or in these respects, I yield that wicked men, or unregenerate men, may be under promise, or God's Covenant. But this is not strictly to be in Covenant: nor is this it that the right of Baptism belongs to: For all this belongs not only to Pagans, but even to obstinate Pagans that persecute this Gospel, and draw cut the blood of those that thus preach it to them: whom I suppose, few Divines judge meet subjects for Baptism.

And thus we have spoken of God's act in the conditional promise, before the condition be performed by man, and so before God's promise do actually conferre right to the sinner. As for the act of God's Covenant afterwards, I shall speak of it anon.

2. Having said thus much of God's act of promise or Covenant, and seen how far the wicked may be said to be under that promise or Covenant, we must next consider of their own promise to God, or the act of Covenanting on their own part. Mans Covenanting with God, or his entering the Covenant of God pronounced to him, is either 1. to be considered in respect of the efficient; 2. or of the object. As to the efficient, it is either 1. The act of the whole man, i.e. of the mind;
minde and body: 2. Or of part only: and that 1. either of the minde alone: 2. or of the outward man alone. 2. Objectively considered, it is either 1. A true proper consent agreeable to the formall object (or to the object in its absolute necessary respects and nature.) 2. Or it is an imperfect consent, analogically or equivocally called [Covenanting] when it is not suited to the formall nature of the object. This error is 1. About the object simply in it self considered. 2. About the object comparatively considered: as God compared with the creature. And both or either of these errors is 1. Either in the intellect: when it doth not understand the nature of the object, and Gods terms on which only he offers his blessings; or at least doth not practically understand it, but speculatively only. 2. Or of the Will: when it doth not really consent to the object, and terms of God, though they be understood, at least, speculatively. 3. Or it is, both the error of the understanding and the will.

Having thus necessarily distinguished, I will lay down in these Conclusions, how far man is in Covenant with God as to his own act. 1. Man may oblige himself by Vows to particular duties, that are not of the substance of the Covenant, and yet be wicked. 2. Yea man may oblige himself to things indifferent, and some think to evil, as Jeptha, so far as to enlaine himself in a necessity of sinning, whether he perform it or not. 3. That which God requireth of man on his part, as a necessary condition, to his right in the benefits promised by God, and that God may be, as it were, obliged actually to man, is the sincere resolved consent of the Heart or Will. 4. Yet he requireth for several reasons, that the external profession of consent be added, where there is capacity and opportunity. 5. God doth as absolutely require to our participation of his blessings, and that his Covenant may be in force actually to give us right to them, and he, as it were, obliged to give us the things promised, that we understand the absolutely necessary part of the object of our consent, or acceptance; and that with a practical knowledge. 6. As absolutely doth he require that we do really consent according to that practical understanding. 7. It is essential to God as the object of mans faith, to be his supream Lord and Rector as Creator, and his ultimate end and chiefest good: and so must he be apprehended and willed by all that indeed take him for their God: as also to be perfect in Being, Widsom, Goodness and Power, and of perfect Veracity. 8. It is essential to Christ as the object of our faith, to be God-man, that in our nature hath Ransomed us, by the Sacrifice of himself on the Crofs for us, and Died, and Rose again, and is now Ascended in Glory with the Father, and is Lord of us all, and will Judge according to his Word to Everlasting Joy or Punishment. 9. It is essential to the object of our faith, as such, to be considered comparatively. As that God be taken not only as our good, but our chief Good, to be preferred before every creature: that he be taken not only as our Lord, but as Sovereign Lord, to be obeyed before all other: that Christ be taken for our only Saviour, and for our Lord-Redeemer, to be also obeyed before all creatures; particularly before and against the devil, the flesh, and the world. 10. Where these essentials are not in the apprehension of the object, there is not truly the consent, or faith, or covenanting which God hath made the condition of his Promise; and therefore such are said (as to the Faith, Consent and Covenant so required) but equivocally or analogically to Consent, Covenant or Believe: when truly and properly it is to be said, that they do not Consent or Covenant. Consent hath relation to the offer: and if it be not the offered thing that is consented to, but somewhat else under that name, then it is not
not indeed Consent: for there is no Relate without its Correlate. Covenanting (in the present sense) implies Gods propounded Covenant and terms. For our entering the Covenant, is not a Making of terms, but an Accepting of the terms made to our hands and tendered (with a command to accept them.) Now if we do not consent to the same terms propounded, it is truly no Accepting, nor no Covenanting: For God never offered to enter into Covenant on such terms, and that which was never offered, cannot be properly accepted; nor can we Covenant with God in a mutual Covenant, on terms contrary to those which he propounded.

The Civil Law saith, Ignorantis non est Consensus. A God that is inferior to creatures in Rule, or in Goodness and Defirableness, is not God indeed. And therefore he that takes God in this sense for his God, takes but the Name of God, and not God himself, but an Idol of his brain. A Christ that is only a Justifier and not a King and Governour, is not the Christ that is offered us of God; and therefore no man is called to accept such a Christ. To erre therefore about the very essence of the Object, as such, is to null the Act, it can be no Consent or Covenant or Acceptance truly at all, but equivocally only. 11. The same may be said of counterfeit Covenanting, when it is only orctenum, with the mouth and not the heart. 12. Yet may an oral counterfeit Covenanting oblige the party to the duty promised (in our case) though it give him no right to the benefit offered, nor is God as it were obliged to perform his Covenant to such. 13. The like may be said of the foresaid equivocal erroneous Confecting, Accepting, Covenanting. If the error be through the fault of the man himself, his act may oblige himself, though God remain disobliged, and though he have no right to the thing promised by God. Thus much I thought meet to say, for the opening of that branch of the Question, How far men unregenerate may be in Covenant, as to their own act.

But the great Question is yet behind, Whether these men be in Covenant with God, as to Gods actual engagement to them: so far as that Gods promise is in force for conveying actual right to them as to the promised blessings? and so whether it be a mutual Covenant, and both parties be actually obliged? And thus I say that wicked men are not in Covenant with God, that is, God is not in Covenant with them: Neither have they any right to the main blessings given by the Covenant, viz. Christ, Pardon, Justification, Adoption, Glory: Nor yet to the common blessings of this Covenant, for they are given by the same Covenant and on the same conditions as the special blessings: So that though they may have right to them at present on the ground of Gods present collation, or trusting them with them (as a servant hath in his Masters stock) yet have they no right by Covenant: For it is Godliness that hath the promise of this life, and of that to come, as being the condition of both; and it is seeking first Gods Kingdom and Righteousness, that is the condition on which other things shall be added to us. The same holds of Church-privileges and Ordinances quod possessionem not proper to the faithfull.

So that in the conclusion, I say, that though wicked men have many promises from God, especially the great conditional promise of Life, if they will repent and believe; and though they are also obliged by their own imperfect, equivocal Covenanting with God; yet God remaineth still unobliged to them, and they have no actual right to the benefits of his promise; because they have not performed the condition of their first right, that is, have not Covenanted truly with God, or entered the Covenant which he propounded; having not consented to his terms,
not accepted Christ and Life as offered in the Gospel: And therefore it is the most proper language to say, that none but sincere believers are in Covenant with God: For the rest have but equivocally Covenanted with God, and God not actually engaged in Covenant with them (for while the condition is unperformed there is no actual obligation on the promises) and so it is no proper mutual Covenant: And consequently those men in proper strict sense, are no true Christians, but analogically only.

Yet because we have no access to their hearts, and therefore must judge of the heart by the profession and outward signs, therefore we must judge these probably to Covenant with the heart, who do profess to do so with the tongue; and those to Covenant entirely and without error in the essentials, who profess so to do: and therefore we must judge them probably to be true Christians, and truly godly men (till they retract that profession by word or deed:) and therefore we must judge them probably to be truly in Covenant with God, and such as God is, as it were, obliged to justify: and therefore we must give them the name of Christians, and men in Covenant with God: and therefore we must use them as Christians in works of charity, and in Ordinances, and Church communion: and so must use their children as Christians children. The warrant for this usage and Judgement, I must desire the Reader to take notice of, in what I have written to Mr. Tombs Objections on 1 Cor. 7. 14. and to Dr. Ward, and against Mr. Tombs Precurser more fully: For to repeat all here again would be tedious and unnecessary. When Christ saith to us, [If a Brother repent, forgive him] here by [Repenting] doth Christ mean plainly Repenting, or the profession of it? No doubt, repenting it self. Why, but how can we that know not the heart, know here when our Brother repenteth? Will Mr. Bl. say therefore that none is obliged to forgive? Rather we know that man must judge him to repent that professeth so to do: and therefore forgive him that professeth it. Not because professing was the assigned requisite condition: but a sign of that condition: and therefore we are to accept of no profession, but what probably signifies true repentance. For if we knew a man dissembled, or jeered us in professing repentance, we are not bound to do by him as a penitent. So God commandeth us to love and honour them that fear the Lord, that are faithfull, that love Christ, &c. But we know not who these be: Are we therefore disobliged from loving and honouring them? Or will Mr. Bl. say that we must not honour them, lest we mistake and give that honour to one that hath no right to it? (as he saith about the Sacraments; hereinjoining with Mr. Tombs.) Those that profess to fear God and love him, we must love and honour as men that do fear and love him: yet in different degrees, as the signs of their graces are more or less probable. In some common professing Christians, we see but small probability: yet dare we not exclude them from the Church, nor the number of true believers, as long as there is any probability: Others that are more judicious, zealous, diligent, and upright of life, we have far stronger probability of; and therefore love and honour them much more.

Mr. Blake therefore in my judgement had done better, if, with that moderate, Reverend, Godly man Mr. Stephen Marshall, he had distinguished between these two Questions, [Who are Christians or Church-members?] and [Whom are we to judge such and use as such?] and to bring in the unregenerate in the later rank only.

Next we are to see what is Mr. Blake's judgement herein, that we may not argue against him before we understand: which yet I think I shall in some measure be forced.
[65]

forced to do, or say nothing, 1. I finde it very hard to understand what persons they be that he takes to be in Covenant: 2. And as hard to understand what Covenant he means. For the first, I finde it clear that negatively he means, They are not truly Regenerate persons, but Positively how they must be qualified I finde not so clear. Pag. 189. he faith it was with all that bore the name of Israel (which is no further true then I have laid down in the former Conclusions) so that it may seem that he takes all to be in Covenant that bear the name of Christians. What? though they know not what Christ or Christianity is? Is taking a name, entering into Covenant? The poor Indians that by thousands are forced by the Spaniards to be baptized, are said to know so little what they do, that some of them forget the name of [a Christian] which they assumed.

Pag. 192. he faith [All professed Christians, so called, are in an outward and single Covenant] 1. What? those that are called professed Christians, and are not? No: sure that's not the meaning: else mens miscalling might put them in Covenant. It is then those that are so, and are called so: But will it not serve, if they are so, unless called so? 2. He means either those that profess the name of Christianity, or the Thing. Of the insufficiency of the first, I spoke before. For the second, if they profess the whole Essence of Christianity undisssembled, I think they are truly Regenerate. If they profess but part (as to the Matter both of Assent and Consent, of which I spoke before in the Conclusions, and which we have in this County lately set down in our Profession of Faith) then it is not Christianity which they profess: for part of the essence is not the Thing: where an essential part is wanting, the form is absent. If it be the whole matter of Christianity that is professed, but Dissembled; then as he is equivocally or analogically a Believer or Christian, so I yield he is a member of the Visible Church, which so far as it is only Visible, is equivocally called, The Church: of which I have fuller spoken in Answer to Mr. Tomes Precuror. I know Mr. Bl. thinks, that there may be an undisssembled Profession, which yet may not be of a saving Faith. But then I yet conceive it is not an entire Profession of the whole essential object of Christian faith, viz. of Assent and Consent. It will be a hard saying to many honest Christians to say, that a man not justified may believe every fundamental Article, and withall truly profess Repentance of all his sins, and to Take God for his Sovereign to Rule him, and his chief Good to be enjoyed to his happiness; and to take Christ for his Lord and only Saviour, and his Word for his Law and Rule, and the holy Ghost for his Guide and Sanctifier, and the rest which is essential to Christianity.

Pag. 192. He faith of all that externally make Profession (These engage themselves upon Gods terms.] But if they do so sincerely they are sincere Christians: If not sincerely, they are but equivocally Christians. Some think that in the 11th Chapter of the 3rd part of my Book of Rest, I gave too much to an unregenerate estate: and yet I think there is nothing contrary to this that I now say. He that professeth not to preferre God and the Redeemer before all other things, professeth not Christianity: and he that professeth this and lieth not, is a Regenerate justified Christian.

Pag. 200. he describeth his unregenerate Christians to be such [as Accept the terms of the Covenant.] And this none doth indeed but the sanctified. If Mr. Bl. will say, that the unregenerate may do it, he will make them true believers: For what is true faith but an Accepting of Christ and his Benefits on the Covenant terms? Though I confesse others may falsely say, they Accept him.
 Pag. 110. he faith [Laws tendered by a Prince, and received by a People, make up the Relation of King and people (yet indeed, that's not true, for it is the Receiving the man to be our King which is antecedent to the receiving his Laws, that makes the Relation.) A marriage Covenant tendered by a man, and accepted by a Virgin, makes up the Relation of Husband and Wife: Covenant draughts between man and man for service, make up the Relation of Master and Servant: Now the Gospel Covenant is all of these between God and a People.] Rep. The Accepting Christ in this Covenant is true Justifying Faith: If an unregenerate man have this indeed, then he is justified, and Faith and Justification are common things, which I will not believe. If Mr. Bl. mean that the external profession of this Acceptance, alone, doth make up the Relation, I say, as before; It may oblige the Professor, but makes not up the Relation of Real Christians, because God consenteth nor, nor is actually in Covenant and obliged. The differences Mr. Bl. must take notice of, between his humane Covenants, and ours with God, or else he will marre all. Men know not one another hearts, and therefore make not Laws for hearts, nor impose Conditions on hearts: and therefore if both parties do profess Consent, though dissemblingly, they are both obliged, and the Covenant is mutual. But God offers to Consent, only on Condition that our hearts Consent to his terms; and therefore if we profess Consent, and do not Consent, God Consenteth nor, nor is, as it were obliged.

Next Mr. Bl. proceeds there to tell us, that the Accepting the Word preached, is the note of the Church. But that is a more lax ambiguous term than the former. Some call it accepting the Word, when they are content to hear it: Some when they speculatively believe the truth of it. These are no true notes of true Christians, or Churches (in the first sense of the word Church.) Others Accept but part of that word, which is the necessary object of Faith, of whom the like may be said. It is the Accepting Christ and Life in him, offered by this word, which is Christianity it self, or true Faith; and the profession of this, is that which makes a man a Member of the Visible Church (He may accept it for his Infants also.) So much for the indigation of Mr. Bl.'s meaning about the description of his visible Christians.

Next, what he means by [Covenant] I confess I despair of knowing. Sometime he speaks as if he meant it but of their own set of Covenant, whereby they oblige themselves. But ordinarily, it is evident, that he speaks of a mutual Covenant, and makes God to be also in Covenant with them. But what Covenant of God is this? Pag. 192. He saith [they are in an outward and single Covenant.] But what he means by a single Covenant, I know not. He there also chooseth to express himself in Par. words, who distinguisheth inter beneficia & fidei (which he denieth them) and fidei (which he alloweth them.) But I confess I know not what fidei is, except one of these two things: 1. A Right to enter Covenant with Christ: and so have Infidels. 2. Or a Right to the Benefits promised in the Covenant: and this he denieth them. If he meaneth (as Par. seems) a Right to be esteemed as Covenanters, and used as Covenanters, by the Church (though indeed God is not in Covenant with them,) this we easily grant.

But Mr. Bl.'s common phrase is, that they are [in the outward Covenant] and what that is, I cannot tell. I know what it is to covenant, or tenus, only outwardly, or by a dissembling profession, or else a profession maimed, or not understood; and I have said, that hereby they may further oblige themselves (so far as the creature can be said to oblige it self, who is not Nis, but wholly Gods, and is under his absolute
(sole suit obligation already.) But it is God's Covenant and that we are enquiring after. In what sense is that called Outward? 1. It cannot be as if God did as the dissembling creature, **one time**, with the mouth only covenant with them, and not with the heart, as they deal with him: 2. I know therefore no possible sense but this, that it is called [Outward] from the Blessings promised which are outward. Here therefore, 1. I should have thought it but reasonable for Mr. Bl. to have told us what those outward Blessings are that this Covenant promiseth. 2. That he would have proved out of Scripture that God hath such a Covenant, distinct from the Covenant of Grace, which promiseth Justification and Salvation, and having other Conditions on our part. For both these I cannot finde what outward blessings he means but Church Ordinances and Priviledges. These consist in the Word, Sacraments, Prayer, Discipline. For the Word, God doth bestowth it on Infidels, and in England there are men that deride the truth of Scripture, and esteem it a fiction, and yet for credit of men, come ordinarily to the Congregation. These have the Word given them, and so have other unregenerate men: but not by Covenant that I know of. Even the godly have no Covenant affuring them that for the future they shall enjoy the Word, further then it is in their hearts (except that promise with a reserve, If God see it Good, &c.) Where hath God said, If thou wilt with thy mouth profess to believe, I will give thee my Word preached? 2. For Baptism, It is part of our profession it self. And though God hath commissioned us to Baptize such professors and their seed, yet that is not a Covenant with them: Nor do I know where God saith, If thou wilt I will give thee Baptism, if thou wilt but say, thou believest, or if thou wilt profess seriously a half faith: More shall be said against this anon. 3: For the Lords Supper the same may be said. God hath no where made a Covenant, that they shall have the Lords Supper that will profess faith. To reign God to make a Covenant with men, whose condition shall be oral profession, and whose Blessing promised, is only the **sudum signum**, a little water to wash men, and a little bread and wine, without that Christ, and Remission of sin, Mortification and Spiritual Life, which these Sacraments are in their Institution appointed to signify, seal and exhibit, this is, I think a groundless and presumptuous course. 4: The same may be said of Discipline: which, alas few Churches do enjoy, I desire therefore that those words of Scripture may be produced where any such outward Covenant is contained. I take outward Ordinances and other blessings to be a second part of, or certain appurtenances to the blessings of the great Covenant of Grace, and given by Covenant on the same condition (of true faith) as Justification it self is: but allowed or given by Providence, where and when God pleaseth, and sometime to Infidels that never made profession, as to some of them (the Word and temporal mercies) and not assured by promise to any ungodly man, that from Providence receiveth them.

At last, after this necessary explication, I come to Mr. Bl.'s words which I pronounced to Reply to. And first, when he saith [A dogmatical faith entitleth to Baptism.] I reply, 1. A meer Dogmatical, Historical faith, is only in the understanding and that not Practical neither. Now if this be the condition of the outward Covenant, then it may consist with a Renouncing Christ, and open disclaiming him, yea a persecuting the very Christian name: For a man may speculatively and fleetly believe the word of God to be true, and yet may openly profess, I love the world, and my pleasure, and honour, so much better then Christ; that I am resolved I will be no Christian, nor be baptized, nor take Christ on the terms that he is offered on.] At last, he that professeth Ablust only, and will not...
profefts content also, doth not profefts Christianity: For Christianity and true faith lieth in the Wils content, as well as the understandings Assent. 2. And how can Mr. Bl call this Dogmatical faith, a covenanting? when covenanting is known to be the expression of the Wils content, and not the profeftion of an opinion. 3. If a Dogmatical faith be the condition, and make a man a Christian, then he may be a Christian against his Will: which was yet never affirmed.

But Mr. Bl, in his explication of this Dogmatical faith, addeth by way of exclusion[though not affecting the heart to a full choice of Christ.] Where he feems to imply (though he express it not) that the faith which he meaneth doth affect the heart to a choice of Christ which is not full. But if so, then 1. It is much more then Assent, or a mere Historical Dogmatical faith. 2. But is the choice which he intimateth Real, as to the Act, and suited to the Object? That is, the real choice of such a Christ as is offered, and on such terms? If so, it is Justifying faith. If not, either it is counterfeit as to the Act, or but nominal as to the Object, and is indeed no choosing of Christ. Though perhaps, it may not be suited to the Accidentals of the object, yet to the Essentials it must, or else it hath but equivocally the name as a corps hath the name of a man.

He faith, "The Covenant is the Ground of Baptism, otherwise Church-membership would evince no Title, &c." Repl. i. I take Gods precept to be the Ground of Baptism, as it is officium a Duty, both as to the baptizer and the baptized: and his Promise, or his Covenant Grant, to be the Ground of mens Right to it, as it is a Benefit given directly by God; and their own true content, faith or covenanting (which with me are all one, for all that you say against it) to be the condition of that Right. But then I think that in foro Ecclesia a dissembler may claim that Right which strictly he hath not, and we muft grant him what he claims when he brings a Probable ground of his claim: And in that it is Ministers duty to Baptize such, they may indirectly, and quoad Ecclesiam be said to have Right to be Baptized. I say Indirectly, yea and improperly: for it is not the result of Gods Covenant Grant to them; but of his precept to his Ministers, and his Instructions, whom they ought to Baptize.

2. I argued from Right of admission to Church-membership, with Mr. T. and that Right: I take the heart-covenant (of Parent or parties themselves) to be the condition of, as to the Invisible Church-State, and the Profession of that Covenant, not alone, but joynd with it, to be the condition of true Right before God to Visible-membership; though men are but to use him as one that hath true Right, who by an hypocritical profession seems to have Right.

Where he takes me to grange his Antecedent, that [the Covenant is entred with men of faith not varying] he doth me wrong: For in the properest sense (i.e. as if God were actually, as it were, obliged to such, in the Covenant of Grace, I never said it: But how far such are in Covenant or under promise, I have by necessary distinction explained before: and I think it be seen not a serious Treatise of the Covenants, wherein in this Question is so largely of purpose handled to have confounded those several considerations, and dispute so seriously before the Reader can tell about what.

The words which Mr. Bl questioneth, I confess are mine, against Dr. Ward, and I did not think in so gross an opinion Dr. Ward would have found any second to undertake that cause.

§ 40.
Mr. Bl. I. **ALL that hath been said for the latitude of the Covenant, may fairly be applied in opposition to this Tenent, for the like latitude of Baptism.**


R. B. **Therefore did I say the more of the Covenant before, to shew your confusion and mistake in that. It is not every Covenant or Promise that Baptism is the Seal of.**


Mr. Bl. **ALL the Absurdities following the restraint of the Covenant to the Elect, to men of faith saving and justifying, follow upon this restraint of interest in Baptism.**


R. B. **What Absurdities follow such a restraint of it to sound believers, as I have asserted, I should be willing to know, though with some labor I searched for it, Bear with me therefore, while I examine what you refer me to. It is pag. 209, where you charge those Absurdities. And the first is this, 1. This restriction of the Covenant (to shut out all the non-regenerate) makes an utter confusion between the Covenant itself and the conditions of it; or (if the expression do not please) the Covenant itself and the duties required in it; between our entrance into Covenant, and our observation of it, or walking up in faithfulness to it. All know that a bargain for a summe of money, and the payment of that summe; the covenant with a servant for labor, and the labor according to this covenant, are different things. Faithful men that make a bargain, keep it; enter covenant, and stand to it: But the making and keeping, the entering and observing are not the same; and now according to this opinion, Regeneration is our entrance into Covenant, and Regeneration is our keeping of Covenant: before Regeneration we make no Covenant; after Regeneration we break no Covenant, there is no such thing as Covenant-breaking. All this makes an utter confusion in the Covenant.**

Reply 1. I have seldom met with a complaint of confusion, more unreasonably, where the guilt of it in the plaintif is so visible as to tarry all the work so much. 2. I cannot give my judgment of the intolerableness and great danger of your mistake here manifested, without unmanerliness. I will therefore say but this; It is in a very weightie point, near the foundation, where-in to err, cannot be safe. In my Aphorisms I gave my reasons (pag. 265) for the contrarie. It is a truth so far beyond all doubt, that our own Covenanting is a principal part of the condition of the Covenant of Grace, as that it is, in other terms a great part of the substance of the Gospel. 1. The conditions are im-
posed by God, and to be performed by us; the same act therefore is called our conditions as the performers, and God's conditions as the Imposter and Promiser, giving his blessings only on these imposed conditions. Most properly they are called the conditions of God's Covenant or Promise, rather than of ours; for our own Promise is the first part of them, and our performance of that Promise but a secondary part. For 2. God's Covenant is a free gift of Christ and Life to the worldly condition of their Acceptance: this our Divines against the Papists on the Doctrine of merit, have fully proved. Onely this Acceptance must have these necessary modifications, which may constitute it suitable to the quality of the object, and state of the receiver. It must be a Loving, Thankful Acceptance: and it being the Acceptance of a Sovereign, and Sanctifier, it contains a Resolution to obey him. Our Acceptance, or Consent, is our Covenanting, and our faith. So that our Covenanting with Christ, and our faith is the same thing: that is, our accepting an offered Saviour on his terms: Or a Consent that he be ours and we his on his terms. And who knows not that this Faith, or Covenanting, or Consent, is the condition by us to be performed, that we may have right to Christ and Life offered? 3. Indeed there is here with joined a promise for future duty: but mark 1. what; 2. and to what end; 1. It is principally but a promise of the same consent to be continued, which we already give: and secondarily, a promise of sincere obedience, 2. It is not that these future promised acts shall be the condition of our first Justification, or right to Christ; but solely the condition of the continuance of our Justification, it being certainly begun, and we put into a state of favor and acceptance, merely on our first consent or covenanting, that is, believing or receiving Christ.

That all this is no strange thing, (that our own Covenant Act should be also the Primary condition of God's Covenant) may appear by your forementioned similitudes, and all other cases, wherein such Relations are contrasted. If a King will offer his Son in marriage to a condemned woman and a beggar, on condition that she will but have him, that is consent, and so covenant and marry him: here her covenanting, consenting or marrying him, is the performance of the condition on her part, for obtaining her first Right in him and his: but for the continuance of that Right, is further requisite. Primarily the continuance of that consent; secondarily the addition of Subjection and marriage-faithfulness. Yet though consent begun, and consent continued, be both called consent, and are the same things, it is only the beginning that is called marriage: so is it only begun faith, which is our marriage with Christ, and constitutes us Regenerate, or converted. And therefore you do not well to talk of Regeneration being the keeping of our Covenant. If by Regeneration you mean not God's Act, but our repenting and believing, then it is our keeping God's Covenant, by performing the condition, i.e. Our obeying him in entering his Covenant; but it is not the keeping of our own Covenant: for our making or entering Covenant, is our principal condition, on performance whereof we are justified; yet in so doing, we promise to continue that consent or faith: and so the continuance is our Covenant-keeping.

As for your instances of the Covenant of paying money, and doing work, had I used such instances, what should I have heard from those men that already charge me with giving too much to works in justification? you should have considered, that our Covenant, 1. is not principally to pay, and to labor, but to receive. 2. nor is it only de futuro, but de praesenti: A consent to have Christ
for our Lord, Redeemer, Saviour, Head and Husband in present and for the time to come, though the very relation conferred to, doth indeed oblige us to the future duties of that Relation. By this time, I leave it to the Reader to judge, who it is that introduceth confusion about the Covenant, and whether this be an error of the lower size?

As for that you add, that then there is no Covenant-breaking; I Reply, 1. Quod essentiam & posibilitatem there is. 2. Quod existentiam, there is a breaking of mere Verbal and of Erring half Covenants. But if you think that found Covenanting may be utterly broken, then you are against the certainty of perseverance. As for the texts you cite, I say 1. The Israelites broke God's commands, which are called his Covenants. 2. They broke their particular Covenants, about reforming Idolatry and such particular sins. 3. They broke their Verbal and equivocal Covenant or Promise to God, whereby they seemed to Accept him on his terms, but did not; and therefore had not his obligation again to them, but yet thereby obliged themselves.

Your 2. Abfurdity is, that then there are no Hypocrites. Reply; Rather, Then all unregenerate professors are Hypocrites. They pretend ineerly to real proper Covenanting, and they do Covenant but Verbally, and equivocally. Your Answers to the objection therefore, pg. 211, 212, have not the least strength, where you say, The Covenant which they enter is their pretence for God; I Reply, they do therefore but pretend to take God for their God, which is the proper Covenanting. How else could you next say, that they are guilty of hypocrisy? Doubtless they had hypocrisy as well in entering the Covenant, as after in pretending to stand to it. Is it not you rather, that consequentially say, There is no Hypocrites (among these at least) in Covenanting, who make them all to Covenant truly and unfeignedly? And where you say, that then they do but pretend to the stage, and to hypocrisy: It is a strange feigned consequence, without the least shew of proof. What! is he but a pretender to Hypocrisy, that takes on him a Christian, when he is none? (Suppose he never Covenanted) or he that takes on him to confest or covenant in heart, when he doth it but in words, and wilfully difembles? Yea, if they think they Accept Christ, not knowing what Christ is, and so do not Accept him as he is offered them, and yet go on in a supposition that they are Christians; these seem to have done what they did not, and to be what they are not: and therefore are Hypocrites, though not purposely difembling.

For your 3. Abfurdity, I have said enough against that charge to Mr. Tombes, which shall stand, till you confute it, as the contutation of yours. And so much for your feigned Abfurdities,

---

Mr. Bl. To make the Visible Seal of Baptism, which is the Privilege of the Church Visible, to be of equal latitude with the Seal of the Spirit, which is peculiar to invisible members, is a Paradox.
R. B. **But you take it for granted that we do so; which is too easy disputing. We**
give the Seal of Baptism to all that seem sound Believers, and their seed; and we say, the Seal of the sanctifying Spirit, is onely theirs that are such Believers. But if you speak onely of Covenant-Right to Baptism, covan
deo, by his gift of Covenant, then I make them of the same extent: supposing that by the Seal of the Spirit, you mean somewhat common to every true believer. 3. But if it be the formalis Ratio of Sealing, that you look at; I say, God sealed to the wicked his Covenant or Promise as it is made to them, (of which before): He sealed the conditional Covenant, which they seemed to Accept, (which if they had not seemed to Accept, he would not have commanded the annexing of the Seal); and so God may be said to do it, in that he commandeth his Ministers to do it. But it is not such a sealing, as leaves God actually obliged to fulfill the promise, as he is to them that perform the condition. But of this more in its own place.

S. 43.

Mr. B. **The great condition to which Baptism engageth is not a prerequisite in bapt-
ism. This is plain; no man is bound to make good his condition, before engagement to conditions: no servant is tied to do his work, before he hath received his earnest, no soldier to fight before he is lifted, or hath given in his name. But faith that is Justifying to Accept Christ is the Condition to which Baptism engageth.**

S. 43.

R. B. **What is the conclusion? therefore Justifying faith is not a prerequisite in Baptism: or according to the simile, therefore no man is bound to accept Christ to Justification before he is baptized. I confess, the reading of such passages in Grave, Learned, Godly Divines, and that with such confidence uttered as undoubted truth, and that in zeal to save the Church from the errors of us that are contraire minded, doth very much convince me of humane frailty, and that the best of men do know but in part, and in a little part too: and it makes me less angry at those unlearned mistaken men, that have of late so troubled the Church: and to say with Seneca, *Iniquus est qui commune vitium singulis object, &c. quanta in his Jusior Veniat, quae per totum genus humanum vulgata sunt? Omnes inscienti, &c. improvidi summi; omnes incerti, queruli, ambitiosi.* Quod lenioribus verbis alius publicum abscondam? Omnes mali sumus. Quicquid taceat in ali reprehendi, id uniusque in suo fini inveniet. Quid illius pallerem? illius maciem nostas? Penitentia est. Placidiores taceat invicem sumus, Mali inter malos vivimus. But to the matter.**

1. Then it seems, if a man believe sincerely and savagely, the main use of Baptism, as engaging, is past already. Must any sound believer then be Baptized? or onely unsound believers and Infidels that will promise to believe hereafter?
after? But I will shew the foulness of this error anon, and therefore let it pass now. 2. But you say, This is plain; to whom? all men have not the truth, that are confident that they have it; I see that you say, No man is bound to make good his Condition before engagement, &c. very dangerous: It is not our condition only nor principally, as to the efficient obligation, nor at all as to the Justification. Are we poor worms, our own Gods and Lords, that we should be disobliged till we will be pleaded to oblige our selves? Our faith is Gods Condition as the Impofter; three several Bonds hath he laid upon us. 1. As Legiflator of the Law of Grace, he hath commanded us to believe in, and accept an offered Christ. And is Gods command insufficient to oblige us, till we oblige our selves? then more happy are Pagans then I imagined. 2. As the Donor of Christ and Life, and the Author of the Promise or Deed of gift (and so Christ as Testator) he hath made our sincere faith the condition; saying; If thou believe, thou shalt be saved. Hereby we are bound to believe, as a necefary means to salvation. This is but a sanction of the first obligation. 3. The like may be said of the threatening, He that believeth not shall be damned; which God addeth as Legiflator to this Law, so that every man is bound to found believing, as the necefary condition of salvation, before he doth confer himself, or oblige himself to it; even by an obligation which is ten thousand fold stronger then any that he is capable of laying on himself.

3. It is also a very high mistake, to think that our Covenanting or Consent, (which is our actual believing) is none of our condition, when it is the great and principal part of our condition; yea, all the condition of our begun Justification (not taking the word Faith too narrowly). You will perhaps say, These are our conditions as subjects, but not as Covenanters. Reply. They are our conditions as subjects called to Covenant, as we are the persons to whom the Covenant is offered: They are constituted by God as Donor, Benefactor, and Author of the Covenant or Promise, and not merely as Rector. It belongeth to the Donor to determine of the conditions of his own gift, on which they shall become due or not. Yet doth God make no transactions with men but as with subjects; and therefore even when he deals with us as Benefactor and Donor in free gifts, it is still as Dominus & Rector Beneficencis: he lays not by his Dominion or Sovereignty, nor these Relations to us.

4. For your instance of servants and fouldiers, they leave out the great part of the condition of the Covenant of Grace: which is, that we consent to be servants and fouldiers. The Relation must first be entered; God must be taken for our God, and Christ for our Redeemer, Lord, and Saviour; the Holy Ghost for our Guide and Sanctifier: This is Faith and Covenanting. This goes before working and fighling. But this Covenanting is the great condition of Gods Covenant. As when the forementioned Prince is offered in marriage (with his Dignities and Riches) to a condemned beggar: as it is a gift, and covenant propounded on his part, and actually to be entered, it is consent, or marriage-covenanting on her part that is the condition; yea, and all the condition of her first right to him and his riches and honors. So in your instance: It is the servants consent or covenant to have such a man for his master; and the fouldiers consent and covenanting to have such a man for his General; that is the condition on which one hath all his first right to the Privileges of the family, and the other to the Privileges of the Army. Is not this consent necessarie in our present case? If you would have spoke to the point, you should have said thus,
No servant is said sincerely to consent or covenant to be a servant, before he have received his carnest : No soldier is said to consent or covenant truly to be a soldier, till he be enlisted; which are both plainly false. Baptism is as the lifting; Consent (which is saving Faith) is the heart covenant, prerequisite to lifting, and not the work to be done after, except you speak of the continuance of consent. Baptism is the solemnizing our marriage with Christ. And it is a strange marriage, wherein the woman doth only promise that she will begin hereafter to take that man for her husband, but not at present. Nay where such present consent is not requisite, is a feigned or nominal, or half-consent, the condition on which a woman hath Right to the man and his estate, and a full consent hereafter the thing that she is engaged to.

5. In your minor, But faith that is Justifying to accept Christ, is the condition to which Baptism engageth; either you mean only the continuance of that faith, and that is true, but not your meaning I think. Or you mean, the beginning of that faith (as doubtlefs the foregoing words shew that you do); and then why had we not one word tending to the proof, which would in this place have been very acceptable to me. I will anon make an argument of the contrarie.

You seem to me in all this to mistake the very formal nature of a condition, as if it received its denomination from our promise to perform it, when as, by the consent of all Lawyers that I have read of it, it is denominated from the determination of the Donor, Testator, or other Impofet; and most evidently and unquestionably it is so, in unequal contracts, where one is the Benefactor, and hath the absolute power of disposing his own favors.

§. 44.

Mr.Bl. That Faith upon which Simon Magus in the Primitive times was baptized, is that which admitted him to Baptism; Simon himself believed and was Baptized, Act. 8. 13. But Simons Faith fell short of saving and justifying.

§. 44.

A.B. Concedo totum ; sed defideratur conclusio; That may be said to admit to Baptism, which so qualifies the person as that we are bound to baptize him, as being one that seemeth found in believing, as Simon did. But this is not Enititulating, or, having Coram Do & a sedere, Right to Baptism: nor doth prove that it is not saving Faith which God in his Covenant makes the condition prerequisite to such a Right to Baptism.

§. 45.

Mr.Bl. In Case only Justifying Faith give admission to Baptism, then none is able to baptize: seeing this by none is discerned: and to leave it to our charity, affirming that we may admit upon presumption of a title when God denies, I have spoken some
§ 45.

Being you have read what I have said to Mr. Tomes against this Objection, I shall take it as needless to say more, till you confute it: 2. I say not that solely justifying Faith gives Admission to Baptism. I say that the seeming or Probable Profession of such a faith gives Admittance. 3. Nor is it left to our Charity, but imposed on us as a Duty to Baptize those that profess sound belief: but whether the Profession be probably serious, or not, our understanding, and not our Charity must judge. And if you go not that way too, then it seems you would Baptize a man that should apparently jest or deride Christ under colour of professing: which were to Accept that as a Profession which is no Profession. For it is no further a Profession than it seems to be serious and express what is in the heart. 4. Though God deny the justness of the hypocrites Title in form a Dr. yet he doth not deny it to be our duty to deal with them, for their Profession, as with those whose Title is just. 5. I know not what Chapter it is that you refer us to for more. 6. Having lent Mr. Hudson's book out, I have it not now by me, and therefore cannot confult him: but I suppose you would use the Arguments which you thought strongest.

§ 46.

Mr. Bl. Here it is objected: 1. When Christ faith, Make me Disciples of all Nations, baptizing them, he meant sincere Disciples, though we cannot ever know them to be sincere. I Answer, In case I make this first Objection brought against me, my seventh and last Argument for me, it will fully discover the weakness of it; and thus I form it. All that are Disciples unto Christ, and made Disciples for Christ, are to be baptized: But some are made Disciples to Christ, that are short of Faith saving and justifying, as hath been proved at large: This Discipleship that Christ here mentions is such of which whole Nations are in capacity, as is plain in the Commission; to which this Nation (with others) hath happily attained according to the manifold Prophecies before cited: Of these the whole Universal visible Church consists, so irresistibly proved by Mr. Hudson in his Treatise of that Subject, and his Vindication. Now if whole Nations; yea the whole Universal visible Church (consisting of Disciples Nations) were all Believers, it were a great happiness; the Election would be as large as Vocation, when Christ faith, Many are called, but few chosen.

§ 48.

To vindicate my Objections: If it be not sincere Disciples that Christ means in that Text, then no Apostle was bound by that Commission and great Precept to endeavour the making of sincere Disciples (but only counterfeit and half Christians:) But the Antecedent is false, therefore, &c. 2. For your Argument, I grant the Conclusion; and what would you have more? But knew
you not that it is not the thing in question? 3. I grant the Minor, taking the word Disciples equivocally, as a Corps is called a man; and I confess it usual to take the word: but otherwise I deny the Minor. To be Christ's Disciple (as to the aged) is to be one that has unfeignedly taken Christ for his Master, to teach him and rule him, renouncing the contrary guidance of the Flesh, the World, and Devil; and it implies that he hath already learnt his necessity of Christ's Guidance, and who Christ is, and what a Master, & to what end it is that we must learn of him, and what are the great conditions on which he receiveth his Disciples. And I think they that do this sincerely, are justified: and they that do not, are but seem Disciples; but if you will call such Disciples (as we must because they seem so) then you may say, They are Really such (seeming) Disciples.

4. To your confirmation, I deny the Minor: and I say, that it is so new Doctrine to affirm that whole Nations are not capable of being found Believers, that it deserved one word of proof. Much less should you have hid your Minor, and turned it into a Negatio existentie, when it should have been but a Negatio capacitatis. Doth it follow that a Nation is not capable of found faith, because they have it not? or will not have it? 5. Do you think Preachers yet be not bound to endeavor the saving Conversion of whole Nations? If you say, No; you take them off the work that their master hath set them on. If you say, Yea, then you think they must endeavor to persuade men to that which they have not a capacity of. 6. If there be any Nation incapable of Faith, then God cannot make them Believers. But that is not true, therefore, &c. 7. You say not well that the whole Universal Visible Church consisteth of Disciplèd Nations, if you mean [only] as you seem. For then poor scattered Christians in a Heathen Nation, should be no part of the Universal-Visible Church. 8. Vocation uneffectual, is common to Pagans. Vocation throughly effectual, is of the same extent as justification; and (I think) Election, Vocation which is effectual only to bring men to an outward Profession of saving Faith, is larger then Election, and makes men such whom we are bound to Baptize.

---

S. 47.

Mr. Bl. Obje. 2. When he faith, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, here Faith goes before Baptism; and that not a common, but a saving Faith; for here is but one Faith spoken of, and that is before Baptism. Answ. 1. This is the weakest of all Arguments, so reason for a precedence of one before another, from the order in which they are placed in Scripture. So we may say, John Baptized before he preached the Baptism of repentance, for his baptizing is mentioned before preaching of Baptism, Mar. 1. 4. So we may say, We must have glory first, and Virtue after; for so they are placed by the Apostle, 2 Pet. 1. 3. All that can be collected is, that we must in God's ordinary way of conferring salvation, have both Faith and Baptism; though there be not the like absolute necessity of Baptism as of Faith. Baptism being necessary, necessitate præcepti, Jesu Christ having instituted and commanded it; but Faith necessary both necessitate medi & præcepti, seeing Christ not only commanded it, but salvation can at no hand be obtained (by men in capacity of it) without it: And it hath been well observed, that in the words following, the like stress is not laid on Baptism as on Faith: not [he that is not baptized] but [he that believeth not] shall be damned.
§. 47.

If affirmations be good proof of the weakness of Arguments, then this is sufficiently confuted. But to the rest: 1. I confess there may be a Hyporon Protelon in the Scripture; and in such a case we may not gather the real precedence of that which is first named. But otherwise, I know not whence we should better gather the natural order then from Scripture order in expression. If I may by the order of your speeches gather the order of things in your conception and intentions, then may I observe the Holy Ghosts order also to the like ends: for I suppose you speak not more orderly then the Holy Ghost. But I may sure to that end observe the order of your expressions, therefore. Moreover, this is not one Text going against the order expressed in most others: but contrarily, the same order is usually observed in other Texts that speak of Faith and Baptism, putting Faith first. Furthermore, this is not a meet Historical Narration, or circumstantial passage, but it is the very sum of the Law of Grace, solemnly delivered by Christ to his Apostles (with their grand Commission) before his Ascension: and where may we expect if not here; where in so few words is expressed the substance of the Covenant? Moreover, it is not dogmatically and in general precepts only, that this order is held, but in particular precepts, directing in present matter of execution. The Eunuch must Believe with all his heart, and so others commonly must profess belief, before they must be Baptized: and the Scripture gives no hint that this is one kind of Faith, and that another, Matt. 1. 4. shews first in General what John did in the wilderness, viz. Baptize: and 2. in what order he did it, viz. first preaching that Baptism of Repentance to them. That 2 Pet. 1. 3. is spoken in perfect Logical order: It speaks not of Christs order of Execution, and our order of Intention, but of Gods and our order of Intention. If it had been said that he gave us glory and vertue, it had been a Hyporon Proteron: but it is only, he called us to glory and vertue: And of ends the Ultimate is the first in Intention, and all ends are so before their means; and therefore may well be so in expression.

2. I think as Baptism is truly Medium ad salutem, so it may be said to be necessary, necessitate mediis, as well as necessitate preceptis: only with a distinction of necessitie, according to its Degrees; Faith is absolutely necessarie; as sine quan non, and Baptism is of an inferior necessity, sometime but ad bene esse, & sacramentum. Lastly, the command foregoing, Disciple me all Nations, Baptizing them: seteth Faith (in present or persons at age themselves) before Baptism, as included in Discipling: And if this text which contains the Commission, put not Faith before Baptism, is like others do not, and then why may not any Heathens that will, be baptized: and the text speaks but of one faith, for ought I can finde.

§. 48.

Mr. Bl. 2. Let Peter where he speaks of salvation by baptism, interpret these words, Baptism doth now also (faith he) save us by the resurrection.
Section of Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 3:21. and then explains himself. Not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God; this answer or restitution to the outward administration of Baptism, is that which follows upon Baptism; but Justifying Faith is that restitution (as least a principal branch of it) and therefore there is no necessity that it go before, but a necessity that it must follow after Baptism. It is true that in men of years, Justifying faith sometimes goes before Baptism; as in Abraham it went before Circumcision: but it is not of necessity required to Interest us in a Right, neither of Baptism nor Circumcision.

§ 48.

R. B. I will not now stand to enquire of the fitness or unfitness of your term, Restitution, as here used. Varro useth Restitutio as being the same as stipulati: and Civilians use it but rarely. In every stipulation they make two parties, the Stipulator (which is he that asks the question) and the Promiser (which is the answerer, that obligeth himself). Though rarely and unusually also, the Promiser be called Stipulator. But I suppose it is Responsio Promissoris, that you mean by Restitution, and not another Interrogation whereby a double stipulation is made; supposing this your meaning I reply:

1. Why did you not give us one word for proof, that this Restitution is a thing following Baptism? This is too dilute and easy disputing. I took the contrary for an unquestionable truth. The best Interpreters judge, that Peter means here, the Answer whereby the Promiser in Baptism did solemnly oblige himself: which was to two Questions, Credid in Patrem, Filium & Spiritum Sanctum? Credo. Absumeras Diabolum, mundum & Carnem? Abseruus. And who knoweth not that these went before the application of the water? (of which more anon.) Doth not mutual consent expressed go before the sealing of the Covenant? Doth Christ bid us Baptize men into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost; and would you have us do this before they profess their consent? shall we Baptize them first, and ask them whether they believe and consent after?

2. I gratefully accept your Concession, that Justifying Faith is that Restitution. Which is your minor: (that is, Justifying Faith, professed). And thence I conclude, that then Justifying faith is Essential to the mutual Covenant, and so without it, God is not thus in Covenant with men: For who knows not, that ever read Civil Law, that there is no stipulation sine Promissione, which you call (and so do other Divines) Restitution? and that this Restitution is an essential part of the contract, called stipulation? This being past doubt, it follows, that Justifying Faith being our Restitution, is an Essential part of the contract or Baptistical Covenant. And it is apperant that Peter meant not any other contract which was to be entered between God and man, after the Baptistical Contract, and different from it: for then he would not have said Baptism saveth us; and have interpreted it, de fidi responsione vel promissione, & non de nudi litione.

3. The Concession which you were forced to, about men of years, how it doth cut the throat of your cause, I shall shew you anon.
§. 49.

Mr. Bl. O bj. 3. That faith to which the promise of Remission and Justification is made, must also be sealed to, (or that faith which is the condition of the Promise, is the condition in foro Dei of the Title to the Seal). But it is only solid true faith which is the Condition of the Promise (of Remission). Therefore it is that only that gives Right in foro Dei, to the Seal. 

A professor of Faith, that upon those terms, God engages for, and puts his Seal for Remission and Salvation, is sufficient for a Title to the Seal; and the performance of the condition of the necessity to attain the thing sealed. To promise service and fidelity in war, is enough to get lifted, as to do service on necessity to be rewarded.

§. 49.

R. B. 1. Both Sacraments rightly used, are a mutual Sealing to the mutual Covenant. As in the Lords Supper; Taking and eating, is our Sealing, professing action; so in Baptism, receiving the water applied, is our Sealing and professing Pahison: (For we are more Passive in our new birth, than in our feeding for growth). So is the presenting of our persons, or our children, of our delivering them up to Christ, as his Disciples. It is therefore our part, as well as God's, that is Sealed to.

2. Where you say, A professor of Faith may engage to a lively working Faith; you mean, either a Professor of that lively faith, or a Professor of a dead, not working Faith. If the first, it is a contradiction to say, He professeth to have a lively Faith; and He only engages to believe hereafter. For if he profess to have it already, then he can engage only to the Continuation, and not the Inception of it. If you mean the latter, then I shall shew you anon, that any professing a Dead, not-working Faith, is not in Scripture called to Covenant with God in Baptism, to believe lively for the future, (inceptive) and to believe for the future with a working Faith. In the mean time, this should be proved, which yet I never saw. You suppose then, such a professor as this, coming to Baptism, laying, Lord I believe that Thou art God alone, and Christ the only Redeemer, and the Holy-Ghost, the Guide and Sanctifier of thy people; and that the World, Flesh, and Devil is to be renounced for thee; but at present these are so dear to me, that I will not forsake them for thee; I will not take thee for my God, to Rule me, or be my Happiness; nor will I take Christ to Govern me, and Save me in His way; nor will I be Guided or Sanctified by the Holy-Ghost, but hereafter I will, and therefore I come to be Baptized.

3. That which you judge undeniable, you see I deny. It is not therefore de facto undeniable. When you and I can each of us attain to such a height of confidence,
confidence, of the Verity of our several Contradictory Propositions, in a matter of such moment; and about the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, which the Apostle reckoneth as the milk of Babes, who are unskilful in the word of Righteousness (Heb. 5, 12, 13, 14, and 6, 1, 2,) it encreaseth my conviction of the great necessity of toleration of some great errors, even in Preachers of the Gospel. For either yours or mine seem such. I finde no proof of your undeniable Proposition. 1. The Seal is but an affix to the Promise; therefore that which is the condition of the Promise, is the condition of the Seal. 2. The use of the Seal is to confirm the Promise to him to whom it is Sealed; therefore the condition of the Promise is the condition of the Seal. 3. If the Promise and Seal have two distinct conditions, then there are two distinct Covenants (for from the conditions, most commonly are contracts specified; and therefore wenibechius and such like Logical Civilians, call it the form of the contract, or stipulation to be either Dura vel in diem, vel sub conditione, and those sub-conditions are specified oft from their various conditions.) But there is not two Covenants, therefore; but of this more anon.

4. Is it not against the nature and common use of Sealing, that it should be in order before the Promise or Covenant? and that men should have first right to that Seal on one condition, before they have right to the Promise; and then have right to the Promise after on another condition? 5. If it be so undeniable, that that Faith which is the condition of the Promise, is not the condition in foro Dei of Title to the Seal; as you affirm; why do you then build so much against Mr. Tobe, on that argument from Act. 2. The Promise is to you and your children; arguing a Right to the Seal, from an Interest in the Promise?

6. Where you say, that an acknowledgement of the necessity of such faith, with engagement to it, is sufficient for a Title to the Seal. I Reply, then those that at present renounce Christ, so it be against their knowledge and conscience, and will engage to own him sincerely for the future, have right to Baptism. A convinced perseveror may acknowledge this necessity, and engage, that before he dies he will be a true Believer, and yet resolve to be no Christian till then, no not so much as in profession.

7. Your instance of service & fidelity in war, runs upon the great mistake which I have so often told you of. The formal Reason and denomination of a condition, is from the Donors constitution or imposition, giving his benefits only on the terms by himself assigned; and not from our Promise to perform them. And therefore our Promise it self, is the chief condition of Gods Promise, and (to speak as your self did). Our Justifying faith being our Restipulation, that Restipulation is not only part of our condition, but the whole as to our first Right to Christ, Justification and Salvation; though that Right shall not be continued, nor we actually glorified, but on condition both of continuing that faith, and of adding (if there be opportunity) sincere obedience, in perseverance to the death.

Mr. Bl. 4. As for the argument ad hominem, framed against those who make initial or common faith, sufficient to entitle to Baptism, and yet affix Remission of sins to all Baptism, even so received without any performance of further engagement; I leave to them to defend who maintain such Doctrine, and to speak to the Absurdities that follow upon it.
§ 50.

If you avoid the dint of this argument, by forsaking Dr. Ward here, yet it may perhaps appear that your own way is clogged with more Absurdities then a few.

§ 51.

Mr. B. That of Philip to the Eunuch, seems to carry most colour; The Eunuch must believe with all his heart, before he must be baptized; and I have known it trouble some, that are fully convinced, that a Dogmatical faith gives title to baptism, satisfying themselves with this answer, that however Philip called for such a faith which leads to salvation, yet did not express himself so far, that no faith short of this gives title to baptism.

It may be answered, that a Dogmatical faith is true faith, suo genere, as well as that which satisfitches; therefore I know not why men should give it the term of false Faith, seeing Scripture calls it Faith, and such as these Believers, and the heart in such a Faith (as to an active assent) is required. If we look into the Eunuchs answer, in which Philip did not satisfy, and proceeded upon it to baptism, it will take away all scruple: his answer is, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God: There is no more in that then a common Faith: this is believed by men not justified: yet this Faith entitles to baptism, and upon this confession of Faith the Eunuch is baptized.

§ 51.

Mr. B. That will not trouble you, which troubleth others. To your answer I reply 1. When we do, with the Scriptures, enquire after Faith in Christ crucified, we may well call that a false Faith which pretends to be this, and is not this, however true in suo genere. Faith in Jupiter, Sol, Mahomet, is true in suo genere; and so is humane Faith: yet I would call it a false Faith, if this should be pretended to be Faith in Christ. To believe in Christ as man only, or as God only, or as a Guide to Heaven only, and not as a Redeemer by ransom, or as one that is to justify us, but not to sanctifie or Rule us; each of these is true in suo genere, but false if they pretend to be that which Scripture calls Faith in Christ, and which denominateth Believers. So is it to believe with the understanding speculatively and superficially, and yet to Diftent with the will. I think, if a man say, This is the Son, the heir, come let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours; we will not have this man Reign over us: that these are not true Believers, nor have right to Baptism, though their belief that he is the heir, be a Dogmatical Faith, true in its kinde.

2. As Amphilus Medulla li. 1. cap. 3. § 20. Quamvis in Scripturis aliquando Assensus veritatis, que est de Deo & Christo, Joh. i. 50. habetur pro vera side, includitur tamem semper specialis fiducia, atque ad eo omnibus in locis ubi forma est de salutaris side, vel presupponitur fiducia in Messiam, & indicatur tantum determinatio vel applicatio ejus ad personam Jesu Christi, vel per asfensus illum designatur, tanquam ef
sectum per suam causam. And as words of Knowledge and Assent, do in Scripture oft imply affection and consent, so on the contrary, words of consent and affection do alwaies imply Knowledge and Assent. And therefore Faith is sometime denominated from the Intellectual & Believing, and sometime from the Will as Receiving.

3. Do you not know how ordinarily even saying Faith itself is denominated from the Intellectual Act alone ? when yet you'll confess the Will is necessearily an Agent in this ? many texts might quickly be cited to that end. Those that "Amenus calleth may suffice: Joh. 11. 25, 26, 27. He that believest in me shall live. Believst thou this ? you Lord, I believe that thou art that Christ the Son of God, that was to come into the world. Such was Nathaniels faith. Joh. 1. 49, 50. 1 Joh. 4. 15. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. And 1 Joh. 5. 1. Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God. Here is more then Right to Baptism. The great doubt was then whether Christ were the true Messiah, and therefore this was the greatest and most difficult part of Faith, to Assent to this; and therefore the whole is denominated from it, it being suppos'd, when they believed him to be the only sufficient and faithful Physician, that they were willing to be healed by him in his way.

4. If you think, as you seem by your answer to do, that a man may Assent to the Truth of the Gospel with all his heart, and yet be void of Justifying Faith, you do not lightly err. Though an unregenerate man may believe as many truths as the Regenerate, yet not with all his heart; Christ faith Math. 13. The word hath not rooting in him. Doubtles, whether or no the Practical understanding do unavoidably determine the Will, yet God doth not sanctifie the understanding truly, and leave the Will unsanctified : which must be fald, if the Dogmatical Faith, that is the Intellectual Assent of a wicked man, be as strong as that of a true Believer. Dr. Downham in his Treatise of Justification, and against Mr. Pembie hath said enough of this, to which I refer you. I take that answer as equal to silence, which yet Mr. Bl. so highly values, as to say, It will take away all scruple.

§. 52.

Having Replied to your Answer, I shall be bold to trouble you with some more Arguments to this point. Mr. Blake affirmeth, that Justifying Faith is the great Condition to which Baptism engages, and therefore not prerequisite to Baptism; and that an acknowledgment of the Necessity of such Faith with engagement to it, is sufficient for a title to the Seal: and so it is a Dogmatical Faith which entitles to Baptism, in which Baptism we must engage to believe with a lively and working Faith hereafter: Against this Doctrine I argue: 1. From Authority (beginning with the lowest Argument). The Reverend Assembly in their Advice for Church Government, Printed after the Directory, pag. 58. of the Church say thus, Particular Churches in the Primitive times were made up of Visible Saints, viz. of such as being of Age, professed Faith in
in Christ, and obedience unto Christ, according to the Rule of Faith and Life; taught by Christ and his Apostles; and of their children: and they cite Act. 2, 38, 41, last: compared with Act. 5, 14. 1 Cor. 1, 2, compared with 2 Cor. 9, 13. Now if the profession of this Saintship in Faith and obedience according to the Rule, were necessary, then the profession of justifying Faith was necessary: For this is justifying Faith without doubt. And if so, then it is not a Faith short of this which is the condition of Church membership; for then the profession of that other imperfect Faith might suffice of which more anon. See also the Assembly's Confession, cap. 28. § 1. 6. and the two Catechisms of Baptism, where 1. observe the ends of Baptism, that it Sealeth Remission, Regeneration, Adoption, &c. 2. the subject, that none are to be Baptized at age 'till they profess their Faith in Christ and Obedience to him. Which if they do sincerely, no doubt that Faith is no less then justifying. See also what that truly Iudicious, Learned, Reverend Divine, Mr. Gataker hath, Replyed to Dr. Ward, (viz. against those words which I confuted, not knowing that it was Mr. Gataker that the Doctor did with) in Mr. Gataker's Despectatio de Baptismatis Infantium vi & efficacia, pag. 71. where he also cites Luther, Calvin, Bucer, Whitaker, &c. and therefore I will cite no more. (Mr. Marvin in his late Sermon for Unity, I mentioned before.) A hundred might easily and truly be cited to this purpose.

Argu. 2. My Second Argument shall be from the Testimony and Practice of the purest Antiquity. 1. Justin Martyr, in his Second Apolgie, relating the Churches custom in Baptizing, faith, As many as being persuaded do believe these things to be true which we teach, and do promise to live according to them, they shall learn by prayer and fasting to beg pardon of God for their former sins, our selves also joining our prayer and fasting: Then they are brought to the water and born again, in the same way as we our selves were born again: So for the other Sacrament he addeth, This food we call the Eucharist, to which no man is admitted, but he that believeth the Truth of our Doctrine, being washed in the Laver of Regeneration, for Remission of sin, and that so liveth as Christ hath taught.

2. Irenæus, i. 4. c. 13. shews that Abrahams Faith by which he was justified, is the same with the Christian Faith, yea with that whereby we begin to be saved. And cap. 76. having reference to the Baptismal Covenant, wherein men deliver up themselves to Christ, he saith, Si igiur tradiderit ei quod eum est, id est, frigidum in eum & subjectionem, percipies ejus a tempore, &c. nisi perfectum Dei opus; si autem non credideris eis, & fugeris manus ejus, crite Cauto in te, &c. Iste enim si quid vocarent ad Nuptias, qui autem non obedierunt ei semetipsos praevarit vis, in verâ veni.

3. Athenagoras in Legat. pro (Christianis p. 3. estis ἐν χριστιανίς παιδές ει με πρωνεὶς) τὴν λόγον. Nullus enim Christianus malum est, nisi habe professionem simulaverit. He therefore that only professeth, is but a counterfeit Christian; and he that professeth any thing lower then Holynefs or an obedientiall Faith, doth profess somewhat short of Christianity, and not Christianity itself.

4. Tertullian Apolog. cap. 44. Speaking how the Heathens were fain to punish one another in Prisons and houses of Corrections, addes, Nemo ille Christianus, nisi plane tamen Christianus, aut si alius, jam non Christianus; No Christian comes there unless meerly because he is a Christian; or if otherwife (i.e. as a wicked liver) then he is no Christian. And de Baptismo, he saith, (cap. 6.) Ita & angustus baptismi arbiter superventuro spiritui sancto eius dirigit ablatione delitorum quomque sines impetrat, obsequia in Patre & Filio & Spiritu Sancto. Many places might be cited in him, that shews, they took the Baptized for justified Believers.

5. Cyprian Epif. 23. Namcum Dominus dixit in nomine Patris, Filii & Spiritus
sunt gentes singuli, & in Baptismo, praterita peccata dimittis, &c. And Epist. 2. S. 2. 
Sed poiquam unde genitalis axiitia superioris aevi laber decessit, in expiationem ptus ac pu-
ram defuper se lumine infinito, poiquam celitus spiritus hausti in novum me hominem 
Nativitas Secundae reparavit, &c. But it is so well known a fact, that Antiquity 
runs wholly this way, that I think I may spare the labor of transcribing any more. 
I had at hand the full testimonies of Clemens Alexandr. Orig. Epiphanius, Athanasius, 
Lentianus, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Bish. Cyril of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Syncius, 
Hierom, Macarius, Eusebius, with divers others, which I now call by as tedious and 
unnecessary, but shall produce quickly, if I once finde it of any use. Yet two or 
three brief ones I will add, which shew that it is the Covenanting or Professing of 
true Obedience, and consequently of a lively working Faith that is required, and 
not the profession of an unfound faith only.

in a word, we ought to judge, that the force and faculty of Baptism, is nothing else but a 
Covenant entered with God, for ( or a Promise made to God of ) a Second 
Life, ( or a new Life ) and a more pure course of living: And therefore that we shall all exceedingly 
fear, and with all diligence keep our Souls, lest we be found to have violated this Covenant. 
And doubtless to enter such a Covenant sincerely, is the work of a Faith not thire of 
justifying: and therefore it is justifying Faith which in Baptism is professed, and 
therefore required.

7. Bpfl. Amph. c. 9. As we believe in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, so are we 
Baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. And Confession as captain 
leads the way to salvation: and Baptism sealing up our Promise ( or Covenant ) follow-
eth. (It is then a seal of our Promise, as well of God.)

8. Chryifiofmon, Tom. 5. Homil. ad Neoph. Would we did answerably go on, and 
those Symbols and Covenants wherewith we are bound, did lock in our hearts: we have 
confessed Christ’s Government; we have renounced the Devils Tyrannic: This Hand-
writing, this Covenant, this Symbol we are taught is conscribed: See that we be not again 
found Debtors to this handwriting.

9. Hierom, Dial. advers. Lucif. faith again and again that Baptisma non est ( & 
nulnum est ) sine spiritu sancto: which saying, though I approve not, yet that and ma-
ny more passages in that Dialogue fully shew his judgment in this point.

10. Saluian de Gubern. l. 4. initio, faith, Nam cum hoc fit hominis Christi fides, 
fideliter Christi mandata servare, fit absque dubio ut nec fideum habeat qui insidet est, nec 
Christum credat qui Christi mandata concusat. Ac per hoc totum in id revoluitur, ut 
quod Christiani nominis opus non agit, Christianus non esse videatur. Nomen enim sine aet
ate officio suo nubit est. Et lib. 3. p. 66. Quid est igitur Credulitas vel fides? opinor 
fideliter hominem Christo crederem, id est, fidelem Deo esse, hoc est, fideliter Dei mandata 
feruare, pag. 67. Insidetis fit necesse est, qui fidei commissa non servat.

Argu. 3. If it be required in Baptism, that men do sincerely promise for the fa-
ture to believe savingly, and to obey Christ sincerely, then justifying Faith is re-
quired in Baptism. But the Antecedent is acknowledged by Mr. Bl. ( except the 
word sincerely,) He yieldeth that men must in Baptism engage to do this hereafter. 
Now I would know of him, whether God require them to make this engagement fe-
riously, sincerely, & firmata anima, or not? If not, then God calls them but to 
Dissimul, which is not true. If yea; then I say, This is justifying Faith it self, 
or at least comes from it, if it be a Promise to do this presently without delay. For 
he that will heartily engage himself to obey Christ as his Sovereign, and rest on him 
for salvation, must needs be resolved so to do. But he that is so resolved, is a true 
Believer:
Believer: For his will is sanctified; or else he could not be thus resolved. But if it be only for so long time hence, that a man promiseth to believe and obey sincerely; with a referve and resolution to live wickedly till then, I hope few will believe that this is the condition of Baptism, or the true Baptismal Covenant.

Argu. 4. They that are to Renounce the World, Flesh, and Devil, are to be true believers (to justification); but they that are to be baptized, are then to Renounce the World, Flesh and Devil: therefore &c. The major is evident, in that renouncing these, is a renouncing them as Rulers that would command us before God, or as worldly, fleshly pleasures or profits, might seem our chief good, to be preferred before God. Now it is none but the sincere believer that can so renounce these. All others are servants to them, and make them their end. The Minor is proved thus. 1. There can be no manus to the Terminus ad quem, but there must also be a Terminus à quo. The World, Flesh and Devil, are the Terminus à quo: without which we cannot be said to take God for our God, or Christ for our Lord-Redeemer. 2. De facto, this Abre-nunciation hath been used in the Churches Baptism, ever since the Apostles days, as far as we have any History to guide us. Tertullian, Cyprian, and all Antiquity who are that write of these things, put that past question. And I dare not think that Christ's Church hath ever required that as necessary in Baptism, which was not requisite till afterward. And if Mr. Bl. say, that they did but promise for the future, not to follow the World, Flesh and Devil before Christ: I Reply, They renounced them at present, and thereby shewed the present conversion and Resolution of their hearts; that it was afterward that this was to be manifested in action.

Argu. 5. They that are required to believe sincerely in the Father, Son and Holy-Ghost, are required to believe to Justification. But such are all that come to baptism. Therefore, for the major, it requires no more proof, but to explain what it is to believe in the Father, Son and Holy-Ghost. And our Divines against the Papists have enough proved, that the phrase of Believing in, comprehended the a& of the will as well as of the understanding. To believe in God, is to take him for our God: to take him for our God, is to take him for our Sovereign, Ruler and Chief good. This none but a sound believer can truly do. Mr. Bl. confesseth elsewhere, that this is the summe of the Covenant, to take God for our God, & give up our selves to be his people.

For the Minor: They that are to be baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, are to believe in the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost. But all that are baptized, are to be baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy-Ghost; therefore.

Were it necessary, many Texts might be cited that prove it is not only Assent, but a believing in Christ, that is requisite. The very Creed shews it, which hath Credo in Deum, &c. which Creed, for the main Articles of it, the Church hath ever required all to profess, that would be baptized, before the application of the water. And then that this is required to be done sincerely, needs no proof with them that will not believe that God commands or loves dissembling. So that I conclude, This sincere Faith is required in and before baptism, and not only to be promised that we will perform it hereafter.

Argu. 6. They that are required to repent sincerely are required to believe to justification at the same time. But, all that come to baptism (at age) are required to repent sincerely; therefore.

The major is evident. 1. In that sincere Repentance and true Faith are inseparable. 2. In that Remission is promised to all that truly Repent, as well as to them that believe. The Minor is proved from several plain Scriptures, Acts 2, 38.
just and be Baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of sins: And it was no half of common Repentance that he calls them to; for Remission of sins was to be its Consequent. If Mr. Bl. lay here also, That it is the weakest of all Arguments, to argue from the order expressed in Scripture: I shall say I will not believe him; because I suppose Scripture in such Practical directions, speaks not more confusedly or preposterously then he or I would do. Aft. 11, 18. It is called Repentance unto life, which the Gentils had before and in their Baptism: yea they had first the Holy-Ghost, Aft. 10, 47. And Heb. 6, 1. Repentance from dead works is a Principle. Paul, the Jaylor, and all that we read of that were Baptized, did repent or seemed so to do; and were required to do it before Baptism. If Mr. Bl. say, It is a Repentance short of that which is saving, that is here required; I would he would describe it to us, and tell us wherein it is short? 1. Objectively, I hope he will not deny but it is every sin; that men should repent of. 2. Subjectively, it is doubletless, sincere, and not counterfeited, that is required. I conclude therefore, that seeing saving Repentance is prercquise to Baptism, by Gods appointment, and not only to be promised to be afterward performed, we must say the same of saving Faith.

Aign. 7. If saving Grace be not required in Christ's Baptism, then it required less then John's Baptism did. But the Consequent is false: therefore so is the Antecedent.

The Consequent of the major is all that requires proof. Which I prove from many Texts, Mat. 3, 2, 6, 8. He first preacheth Repentance, and causeth them to confess their sins, and reprehends the Pharises that came in Hypocrifce, or with unsound Repentance. And it was true Repentance; for Remission of sins was annexed, Mar. 1, 4. And it may not only be required after Baptism, but before; and it is called the Baptism of Repentance, because in it they profession Repentance. So Aft. 13, 24 and 19, 4.

Aign. 8. If Faith-Justifying be required before Remission of sin, then it is required of God before we come to Baptism (or in us before we bring our Infants). But such Faith is prerequisite to Remission of sin; therefore.

The consequent is proved thus. Remission is the end and immediate consequent of Baptism, where men come as God hath required them. Therefore, if sincere Faith be prerequisite to Remission, it is prerequisite also to right to Baptism.

I prove the Antecedent: Aft. 22, 16. Ananias faith to Paul, Why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins. This was a present Remission, and not a future only. So Aft. 2, 38. Be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of sins. And it is a Faith which hath the Promise of Remission which Peter requires of the Gentils before he baptize them. Aft. 10, 43. Aft. 13, 39. the Apostle tells them, All that believe are Justified; when he is persuading them to believe. It is therefore a believing to Justification, which he was persuading them to. Rom. 6, 3, 4. Know ye not, that as many as were Baptized into Jesus Christ, were Baptized into his death? therefore we are buried with him, by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, so we. It is therefore in the act of Baptism, that we are buried and rife Sacramentally, to signify the present change of our state from the Grave of sin. So Col. 2, 11, 12, 13. and 1 Pet. 3, 21. Baptism is said to save us, but not the external washing, without the answer of a good conscience; which affordeth two arguments. One in that Baptism saveth, and therefore leaves not man (when rightly used) a child of:
of wrath afterward. 2. In that the Answer of a good conscience is required to concur with Baptism: for to the Apostle plainly intimates, and the best Expositors understand it, and not of a thing to follow, as Mr. Bl. doth. Eph. 5. 25, 26. Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctifie and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. Wherefore Paulsupposeth them cleansed that are Baptized: 1 Cor. 6. 11. Such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are Justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, &c. And Expositors judge that the Holy-Ghost refers to the sign as well as the thing signified, to the Sacrament as well as Sub stance, when he makes washing so necessary, and speaks of washing us from our sins in the blood of Christ, Rev. 1. 5. Though he make them not equal in necessity. Joh. 3. 5. Except a man be born of water, &c. Heb. 10. 22. Let us draw nigh with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. If it be the end of Baptism, to wash our hearts from an evil conscience, (i. e. a confciencia mali) then it is the end of Baptism, to Seal the present Remission of sin: But &c. therefore, Tit. 3. 5. He saved us by the washing of Regeneration: It is a saving work that Baptism is appointed to do. By Regeneration I understand, our new Relative State, at least principally. He that is in Christ is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new. He hath a new head, is a member of a new society, the old guilt of sin is done away, the old enmity between God and us; we have a new Father, new brethren, new right to farther blessings, as well as a new heart. Regeneration is too narrowly taken for a Renovation of the heart alone. So that I think Remission and Reconciliation and Adoption, are meant by Regeneration, in Tit. 3. 5, and Col. 2. 11, 12. The speaking of Baptism, and the heart-circumcision therein received or professed, faith, they put off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, being buried with him in Baptism, &c. So in 2 Pet. 1. 9. The Apostle faith, He that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see far off; and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins: that is Sacramentally, and as far as the Church could go in purifying him: which shews that the end of Baptism is (by oblation and coemunization) to purge men from their old sins; or as Paul speaks, The sins that are past, through the forbearance of God, &c. Rom. 5. So that Remission of sins at present, being the end of Baptism rightly received, it must needs follow that Justifying faith is prerequisite to the right receiving it, and that it is not some other Faith, nor is it enough to promise Justifying Faith for hereafter.

Argu. 9. If the Apostles use to communicate the proper Titles of the Justified to all that are Baptized, (till they see them prove apostates or hypocrites) then they did take all the Baptized to be probably justified (though they might know that there were hypocrites among them, yet either they knew them not, or might not denominate the body from a few that they did know.) But the Antecedent is true; therefore.

I need not cite Scriptures to prove that the baptized are called by the Apostles, Believers, Saints, Disciples, Christians: Mr. Blake hath done it already, chap. 28. Now who knows not that salvation is made the Portion of Believers, Saints, Disciples? But what, is it another sort of them? or doth Scripture use to divide Saints, as the Genus into two Species? Not that I know of: It is but as an equivocum in sfa aequiparata: The Apostles naming men according to their appearance and Profession, and calling them such as they probably might be.
Why else should they call them such, had they not seemed to be such, and professed it? The names therefore do not primarily agree to these as a true Species of Believers, Saints, Disciples, Christians; but secondarily, as the name of a man to a Corps, or as the name of a Habit to a disposition, by translation, or Analogy.

But to put the matter beyond doubt, I wish Mr. B. to consider, that its not only these forementioned titles, but even the rest which he will acknowledge proper to the Regenerate, which are given by the Apostles generally to the baptized. Adoption is ascribed to them, Gal. 3. 26, 27. For ye are all the children of God by Faith in Christ Jesus: for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. 2. The same 3 exalbledth them Union with Christ; ye have put on Christ. 3. And Union with his body; ye are all one in Christ Jesus. 4. Yea the next verse adjoins, And if ye be Christ's, ye are Abrahams seed, and heirs according to the Promise. What more proper to the truly sanctified? So the Apostle faith to all the Churches of Collos in general. 5. That they had put off the body of sin, being buried with Christ in Baptism, wherein also they were risen with him through the Faith of the operation of God. Col. 2. 11, 12. 6. Yea in 1 Cor. 6. 11. He tells the Corinthians, they were washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus; so that Justification it self is ascribed to them. Col. 2. 13. The Apostle tells them, God had quickened them with Christ, having forgiven them all trespasses. 7. Yea he like he faith of their salvation. 1 Cor. 15. 2, Eph. 2. 5, 6, 7, 8, yea he tells them verse 19. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-Citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God; and if any should think that Saints and Citizens, and the household of God, do here signify but common Privileges of the visible Church, he adds, And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-Stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth to an holy Temple, in the Lord; in whom you also are built together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. Where most plainly the Church is manifested to be but one, and that one to have saving Privileges, and consequently, those that have not these, to be but equivocally Christians.

Many more texts might be produced, where the most particular Privileges of the Saints are given to whole Churches in common: which shows that the name is by Analogy or equivocally given from the sincere, to the rest, because we are to judge and denominate on probabilities.

Argu. 10. If the profession of Justifying Faith be requisite in Baptism, then the Faith so professed is requisite to the right receiving of it (and not only to be performed hereafter.) But such profession is requisite, therefore.

The major is as true, as that God requireth no man to lye and dissemble, and to profess that with his mouth which is not in his heart: nor doth he make lying the condition of his Covenant, (let them call it an outward Covenant, or what they will: if it be Gods Covenant, this can be none of the condition.) For, it must first in order be a Duty, before it be made Conditional. And no lye is a Duty. Professing is a Duty to them that have the thing, they profess: but to others, immediately and in sensu composito, it is a hainous sin, and no duty: thought it be their duty still to get Faith first, and then to profess it.

The minor is proved already, in the foregoing arguments, and more shall be anon. It is no less then justifying Faith that Christ's Church hath ever to this day required, the Baptized to profess before the application of the water. To believe,
believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and profess Repentance for all sins, and to renounce the world, the flesh and Devil, &c. And when Mr. Bl. maketh profession enough to give Right to baptism, I would know whether he mean the profession of Justifying-Faith, or not. If yea, then Justifying Faith is prerequisite, or else the profession of it could not. If not, then the profession of true Christianitie is not requisite; but of some part of it. For, as I have showed, it is not the true Christian Faith, but some part of it only, if it be short of that Faith which is justifying. And let men say no more, that profession is it that entitles to Baptism, without the thing professed, when they take even profession it self of true Christianitie to be consequent, and not prerequisite.

Argu. 11. If Baptism be the solemnizing of the mystical marriage between Christ and the baptized, then true justifying Faith is of God required thereto; but the Antecedent is true; therefore,

Therefore is it said that we are baptized into Christ, and into one body. And the Church hath ever held the Antecedent to be true. The consequence is evident, in that no man but the sound believer, can truly take Christ as a Husband and Head; for so to do is justifying Faith. It is Christ himself first in order, and then his benefits that are offered in the Sacraments. The main business of them is to exhibit Christ himself to be received by a marriage Covenanting. The signs are but means and instruments, as a twig and turce and Key in giving possession; When the minifter in Christ's name, faith, Take, Eat, &c. it is not only bread that he bids men take, but first and principally Christ by Faith. *Johannis Vadiniius (Aphorism. de Eucharistit, t. 3. pag. 82.) much commendeth a laying of Chrystosms, viz. if thou hast no body, then Christ would have delivered thee all these gifts nakedly (or immediately); but because thy soul is conjunct with a body, he hath delivered them in and with these sensible things. It is one of the greatest errors that can be committed in the Sacraments; to overlook Christ himself who is offered, and to look only either to the signs or to his other gifts. We receive him first as our Saviour, our Sovereign, Redeemer, our Head, our Husband, our Captain and Guide. He therefore that comes to these ordinances, doth pretend thus to receive Christ: and doubtless to receive him thus sincerely, is true justifying saving Faith: and therefore it is saving Faith that is called for to the due Receiving of the Sacraments. And doubtless God means a sincere, and not a seeming, dissembled, nominal Faith, in his command.

Argu. 12. If there be no such Covenant mentioned in the Scripture, (especially to be sealed with baptism) wherein men engage themselves to perform hereafter their first act of true Repentance and justifying Faith, then Mr. Blakes Doctrine is unfound: but there is no such Covenant; therefore,

Men are often in Scripture called to Repent and Believe; but nowhere (that I know of) to Covenant with God that they will hereafter begin to do it sincerely; much less is there such a Covenant sealed with Baptism. They that affirm such a thing, let them prove it, if they can.

Argu. 13. If, according to Mr. Blakes Doctrine, no true sound Believer, or Penitent person, can regularly be baptized; then his Doctrine is unfound. But the Antecedent is true; therefore,

The consequence is proved before. The Antecedent is proved thus: According to his Doctrine, saving Faith, accepting Christ to Justification, is the great condition to which Baptism engageth, and is not requisite therein.
Therefore be that already performeth that condition, is past such engaging to do it initially hereafter: and so hath no use for baptism as to that engagement to the great condition: so that if such a person be baptized, it must be to other ends then the Ordinance is appointed for, and so not Regularly. The like may be said of Gods part: for to such a Believer God should Seal Remission past or present; whereas according to Mr. Bl, the Ordinance is instituted to Seal Remission future.

Argu. 14. If the Doctrine opposed be true, then the Gospel preached before baptism, was not instituted, nor is to be used, as a means (at least an ordinary means) of saving conversion (i.e. of producing saving Faith and Repentance) But the consequent be false; therefore so is the Antecedent.

It would be tedious and needless to the Intelligent, to heap up Scripture proof of the minor, viz. that the Gospel preached before baptism, is appointed for an ordinary means of working true conversion. We see it was ordinarily done, else Preachers could not endeavor it, or hope or pray for it. The consequent is manifest, in that Mr. Bl, makes this true justifying Faith, and consequently true Repentance, to be not-prerequisite to baptism, but to be engaged for as to the future performance. And therefore regularly it must be only the word after Baptism that must truly Convert, or not at all.

Argu. 15. If Mr. Blakes Doctrine be true, then regularly it must be supposed that all persons are in a state of damnation immediately on their baptism; and if they then dyed, should perish. But the consequent be false; therefore so is the Antecedent.

For the Consequent; if Mr. Blake mean, that it is any space of time after baptism that we engage to begin our justifying Faith, then the consequent is undeniable: for till then, the person is unjustified. But if he mean that in baptism they must engage to believe to justification in the instant of time, then this is to make such Faith necessary in the instant of baptism; and this is but an evident vanity, to suppose a man not believing to justification, who yet can and must promise to do it in the same instant, or the next.

Argu. 16. If it be only true justifying Faith that gives men right coram Deo (by virtue of his Covenant) to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and so be prerequisite to that Sacrament, and not only to be promised for the future, then the same may be said of baptism. But the Antecedent is true: therefore.

The consequence is proved, 1. In that the Sacraments are both Seals of the same Covenant. 2. It is right to Church-privileges in general that Mr. Bl, ascribes to his Dogmatical Faith, and therefore to one Sacrament as well as the other. For the Antecedent, I think our brethren that would so fail keep the Church and Ordinances pure, would hardly admit a man to the Lords Table, that they were sure did not take Christ for his Lord, or that would say, I believe all the Creed and Word of God, but I will not have Christ Reign over me at the present, but I promisethat hereafter. I will see Doctor Drake against Mr. Hunskey, whether they would admit such. Hierom argues thus, from Baptism, to the Administration of the Lords Supper: therefore I may do it as to the receiving Quamobrem vero ut ut ut usaviscendi ei licentiam tribus ejus baptisma probas, aut repromus ejus baptisma, quem non exstimas sacerdotem. Reque enim fieri potest, ut qui in baptismate tamitis ejus, sit apud aliiare peccator. Hier. Dial. adv. Luciferian.
Argu. 17. That Doctrine which feigneth an un-sealed Covenant for giving right to the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, is unsound: But such is Mr. Blakes, therefore.

No Scripture can be brought to prove such an outward Covenant of Gods: And it is against the common reason and custom of men, that a second Covenant should be drawn to convey right to the Seal of the first Covenant, seeing right to Covenant and Seal go together: and if there must be another Covenant to give right to that, then by the same reason there must be another to give right to that, and another to that, and so in infinitum.

To the Antecedent, it is apparent that Mr. Bl. distinguishes ex parte Dei, between the outward and the inward Covenant. It is probable that he thus distributes them from the blessings promised, whereof some are inward, and some outward: for though he explain not himself fully, yet I know no other sense that it will bear. It is evident that his outward Covenant hath no Seal. For it is a Covenant de figillis conferendis: If therefore it have a Seal, it is either the same which is promised, or some other. Other I never heard of: they nowhere tell us what is the Seal of their outward Covenant. The same it cannot be: for the same thing cannot be the materia fœderis or the Legacy it self, or the benefit given, and the Seal too of that Covenant whereby it is given.

Argu. 18. That Doctrine which makes it the regular way in Baptism for all men to promise that which they can neither sincerely promise nor perform, is unsound: but such is Mr. Blakes, therefore.

The disabilitie which I here speak of, is not such as is in a Godly man, to do any good without Christ and the Spirit, as is in the second cause to act without the first: or in a partial cause, to act without its compartial: but such as is in an unregenerate man to do the work of the Regenerate: or in any broken instrument, or disabled agent, to do its own part of the work till it be altered, and made another thing, as it were. For the consequence, it is evident in that,

1. No man should ever perform Gods command concerning covenanting.
2. And no mans word were fit to be taken concerning the performance of his own Covenant. 1. Whether God may or do command some men or all men, that which they have not abilitie to perform, is nothing to the point. For yet he gives some of them abilitie, and causeth them to perform it, when he makes it necessarie to salvation. But in this case God should enable no man (regularly) to that Baptifmal Covenant which he commandeth, nor should any obey his command.

For he commandeth them sincerely to take him for their God, and promise to Love, Believe, and Obey him hereafter. (For to dissemble the commands none). But this unrenawed Soul can do, or ever did to this day. They cannot resolve it: therefore they cannot sincerely promise it: and if justifying Faith must regularly begin after Baptism (as being the great condition to which it engages, and not prerequisite): then it is only unregenerate men that are the regular subjects of Baptism.

2. And its plain that he who cannot sincerely promise, (and therefore doth it dissemblingly, or with a half heart) nor is able to perform his promise, is not to be credited. God himself never enables an unregenerate man, to believe and repent savagingly, while he is such, in sensu composito: and therefore is it likely that it is ordinately and regularly such dead men that must Covenant to Repent and Believe to justification. Renewing Grace must intercede, which is not in their hand: how then can they promise to do the
the works of the truly Gracious. God may invite and command the dead to live, yea and to do the works of the living, because he gave them life, and gives them means for revival. But I know not where he calls such men to promise to do it: much less is the constant Baptismal Covenant such.

Argu. 19. If the Distribution of the Church into visible and invisible, be but of the subject by divers Adjuncts, and not of a Genus into its Species, then that part, or those members which are merely visible, are indeed no part or members of the Church so distributed, (but are only equivocally called a Church, Christians, Church-Members, &c.) But the Antecedent is true, therefore.

The Antecedent is not only the common Doctrine of the Reformed Divines against the Papists, but is expressly affirmed by Mr. Blake in this his Book. The consequence is undeniable, in that Adjuncts are no part of the Essence, much less the Form, or the whole Essence; and therefore cannot denominate, (but equivocally,) instead of the Essence. Note, that visible is not the same with visible.

Argu. 20. If the man without the wedding Garment, had come Deo Right to be there, then would not the Lord have challenged him therein with a friend, how camest thou in hither, not having on a wedding Garment? If you will help him that was speechless to an answer, and say for him, Lord, he was compelled to come in at thy command; I Reply, He that compelled him by invitation, did not only bid him come, but to come, not only to come in, but to come in as a Guest shoul d, to honor and not disgrace the Feast. At least it should have been known as implied. It was no unrevealed thing.

Argu. 21. If Circumcision were the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, even a Justifying Faith already in being, then so is Baptism; but the former is certain, Rom. 4. 11, 12. He received the sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the Father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that Righteousness might be imputed to them also. The last words confirm the consequence also.

Argu. 22. Many texts of Scripture shew that it was Justifying Faith that was by God required in the aged in baptism: which I will cite together, and not stand to fetch an argument from each alone. Acts 2. 38, 39. was before cited, verse 41. It was they that gladly received the word that were Baptized. Acts 8. 37. also, is before spoke to; it must be believing with all the heart. Acts 16. 15, 16. is very plain; first Christ commands them to preach the Gospel: then he enacts that on this preaching, He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved. It is then a saving Faith. It is plain that Christ purposely puteth it before baptism, as its due place, even as that preaching to which Faith is here related is put before; and in that it gives us here the exact compendium of his new Law. And if it be not this saving Faith that goes before baptism, then Christ doth not so much as mention it. And to imagine that in this summe of his Covenant, he doth both leave wholly unmentioned that Faith which is the prerequisite condition of Baptism, and also put in its place another Faith, which is consequential, this is to suppose Christ to clogg the most essential parts, and clearest compendiums of his Law, with such insuperable obscurities that it cannot be understood. And say the like by all other Scripture, and you will make it more dark then the Papists accuse it to be. Acts 16. 31, 32, 33. The Taylor asks what he shall
shall do to be saved; Paul answers him, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house; to which end, they spake to him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house; and so, He was baptized, believing in God with all his house. The Faith that Paul here commends to him, was a saving Faith expressly: He that is saved to believe upon that command and instruction, is supposed to believe with the same faith that was so required of him, Acts 10, 47, 48.

The Gentiles there were not only true Believers, but had the Holy-Ghost before baptism, Acts 16, 15. The Lord opened Lydia's heart (which seems to signify a special operation of the Spirit) before she was baptized. Acts 18, 8. Cyprian and all his house believed on the Lord, which signifieth more than an Historical Faith. So Acts 19, 4, 5. It was believing on Christ, and in his name, that was the Antecedent to their baptism. Matt. 28, 19. Go, Disciple all Nations, baptizing them; that Discipling which is here commanded, is in order to go before baptism: but it is making men sincere Disciples that is here commanded; therefore. It is presupposed, what ever Discipling it be, that it is not the Event, but the Endeavor that is here made their duty. And if it be only common Discipleship, then the Apostles and other Preachers of the Gospel, are not commanded to endeavor to make men true sound Believers and Disciples, till they had first baptized them, which is untrue. Moreover the Baptismal Faith must be a Faith in Christ's blood; for the application of the water signifieth the application of Christ's blood; and therefore their reception of the one, signifieth the other: But Faith in Christ's blood, is Justifying Faith, Rom. 3, 25, 26. The Righteousness of God which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ, is unto all and upon all them that believe; Rom. 3, 22. It is therefore not equivocally called believing in Christ, as being but some part of that belief, which attaineth not this Righteousness. How many times over and over, do Christ and his Apostles promise pardon and salvation to all that believe in Christ, without distinction of believing; whence it seems evident, that it is but improperly and equivocally called believing in Christ, which is not Justifying and saving. See John, 3, 15, 16, 18, and 11, 25, 26. and 7, 38. and 12, 46, 44, and 5, 24. and 6, 35, 40, 47. and 14, 12, 1 John, 5, 1, 5, 10. 1 Peter, 2, 6. Rom. 9, 33. and 4, 5. and 10, 11. Acts, 13, 48. Moreover, how easily it is to bring many Texts that prove that it was true saving Faith it self that Christ and his Apostles preached to men, and endeavored to bring them to before baptism? Nay finde any one of them that ever did otherwise; whereas according to Mr. Blakes Doctrine, they should have persuaded them to a Dogmatical Faith only before baptism (I mean, to be before performed) and a Justifying Faith after. But I will add no more of this.

Argu. 23. The Church hath ever supposed baptized persons to be saved; unless they afterward did violate that Covenant. Therefore they supposed them to have the condition of salvation, Faith and Repentance.

Hence those high eulogies of baptism in most of the Fathers, wherein they are now mist-interpreted by many, as if they ascribed it to the external ordinance, whereas they presuppose, as the blood and Covenant of Christ, so the right qualifications of the party baptized; upon which supposition (which we are bound to entertain of all that make a probable profession) they did so predicate the glorious effects of Baptism, as well they might.

Argu. 24. Mr. Blakes Doctrine of Baptismal Faith, leaves us in utter obscurity, so that no man according to it, can tell whom to Baptize. He hath not
(that I can find) given us any description of that Faith which entitles to baptism; and I verily think is not able to tell us what he would have himself to be taken for it. If it were a mere Dogmatical Faith, then those should be baptized that were utterly unwilling, or at least unwilling to take God for their God, or Christ for their Lord and Saviour, and the Holy-Ghost for their Sanctifier; and should openly profess, I will not have this man reign over me, for I cannot yet spare the pleasure of my sin. If Mr. Bl. mean that there is requisite somewhat of the will and consent, though not so much as to justify; why did he not tell us what acts of the Will they be that are necessary? Is it only a consent to have God called their God, and themselves named his people? I will not be so uncharitable as to think that is his meaning; Is it only a consent to be baptized, and to hear the Word, and receive the Sacraments? then might it stand with the fore-said disclaiming of the Government of God and the Redeemer, and so of obedience. I think by that time Mr. Bl. hath but adventures to give us an exact definition or description of that Faith which he makes pre-requisite and sufficient to baptism (which I hereby instruct him to do) he will have set us up so fair a mark to shoot at, that with a very little skill it may be smitten to the dust.

Argv. 25. 1. Job. 2. 19. They went out from us, but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that it might be made manifest that they were not all of us. They were not therefore truly Christians, Disciples, Church-Members, but equivocally.

Argv. 26. I will end as I begin, with humane testimony. 1. Our Divines against the Papists, do generally plead that hypocrites are not true members of the universal Church, but as a wooden leg is to the body. I am loth to turn over books and transcribe without need, but I shall soon do it, if it be denied. 2. Our Divines against the Arminians, do suppose the first act of believing to be the first time that God is as it were engaged to man in the Covenant of Grace; and that it is dangerous to make God to be in actual Covenant with men, in the state of nature, though the conditional covenant may be made to them, and though he have revealed his decree for the sanctifying his elect: but he is supposed to dispense his mercies to the unregenerate freely, as Dominus absolvus, or as Reffor supralegis, and not by giving them a Legal or Covenant-right. And indeed, in my opinion, the Transition is very easy from Mr. Blakes opinion to Arminianism, if not unavoidable, save by a retreat, or by not seeing the connexion of the Consequences to the Antecedent. For grant once that common Faith doth covam Deo give right to baptism, and it is very easy to prove that it gives right to the end of baptism, God having not instituted it to be an emptious sign to those that have true Right to it. And it will be no hard matter to prove that it is some special Grace that is the end of Baptism, at least Remission of sin. And so upon the good use of common Grace, God should be in Covenant obliged to give them special Grace; which is taken for Pelagianism.

§ 53.

When I had Replyed thus far to Mr. Blake, I was much moved in my minde to have Replyed to his answer to Mr. Firmin on the like subject: and also to
to have then proved that the children have no Right to baptism, except the immediate Parent be a believer, for the sake of any of his Ancestors: and that the children of Apostates and wilfull obstinate wicked lives, should not be baptized, (as theirs,) and to have answered what Mr. Bl. hath said to the contrary: and this meerly in love to the Truth, left the reputation of man should cloud it: and in love to the Church and the lustre of the Christian name, left this fearful gap should let in that pollution that may make Christianity seem no better then the other Religions of the world. For I fear this loose Doctrine of Baptism will do more to the pollution of the Church, then others loose Doctrine of the Lords Supper; or as much. But I am very loth to go any further in Controversie, then I shall be necessitated: And if Mr. Firmin be living, I conjecture by his writings, that he is able easily to vindicate his own words: Not that I have low thoughts of the abilities and worth of my dear and Reverend friend Mr. Blake, but that I take his answers on those subjects to be very dilute, & pace tantis viris ita dicam: so great a disadvantage is an ill caufe to the most learned man. Mr. Firmin I know not any further then by his Book against Separation. But in that Book I see so much Candor, Ingenuitie, Moderation, Love to Peace, and some convenient terms for Peace discovered, that I am heartily forre that there are no more to second him, and that his incitements to accommodation are no more laid to heart. But the Peace-makers shall be blessed in the Kingdom of Peace, how little sooner they may succeed in this tumultruous world. For as where envy and strife is (contentious zeal) there is confusion and every evil work; so the fruit of Righteousness is sown in Peace of them that make Peace.

§ 54.

I had thought also at the first view, that it would have been necessary to have confuted Mr. Blakes 31. Chapt. when I found this Title: A man is covenant with God, and received into the Universal Church Visible, needs no more to give him access to, and interest in particular Visible Churches. But I know not whether he mean the access and interest of a stranger in passage or a Transient Member, or of a fixed Member. If of the latter, I should have proved moreover that there is Necessary both his Cohabitation, and his Consent to be a Member of that Church; and his consent to submit to the particular Pastors of that Church as his Teachers and Spiritual Guides in the Lord. But I finde in the following pages, Mr. Blake doth acknowledge all this himself.

I shall therefore pass on to some other subject; only remembering Mr. Bl. that as it is not Number of Arguments but Weight that will carry the Cause, so it is not Number that I trust to: and therefore if any one of those 26 Arguments foregoing be good, though 25 be bad, I must needs think the Cause bad which I argue against.
Whether Faith and Repentance be God's Works.

Mr. B. Chap. 15. So Mr. Baxter's Question is, how do you make Faith and Repentance to be Conditions of the Covenant on our part, seeing the bestowing of them is part of the condition on God's part? Can they be our Conditions and God's too? Answer, &c. And I shall not stand to distinguish of an Absolute and Conditional Covenant, and so making the whole in the Absolute Covenant to be God's, and in the Conditional this part to be ours (which I know not whether exactly understood, the Scripture will bear) but in plain terms deny that they are God's conditions, and affirm them to be ours. I know what God speaks in his Word, concerning these works; that he will write his Law in our hearts, and put it into our inward parts; that he will take away the heart of stone, and give an heart of flesh: which implies this work of which we speak. I know likewise what in particular is affirmed of Christ, that he is the Author and Finisher of our Faith, &c. Yet all this rises not up higher to make them formally God's acts; and not ours. Whose acts they be, his Conditions they are; this is evident. But they are our acts; we believe and repent; it is not God that believes, it is not God that repents, &c. Faith and Repentance are man's works, not God's works, which man in Covenant does, respective to salvation in the Covenant tendered. But the Apostle (some may say) in the next words tells us, That it is God that works the Will and the Deed. There he seems to take them from us, and ascribes the formality of them to God. In this cooperation of God's, whether they be formally our works, or God's, let Isaiah determine, Isa. 26. 12. Thou hast wrought all our works in us. When God hath wrought it, the work is ours; we have the reward, &c.

R. B. Mr. Blake's business here, is to confute the answer that I gave to that objection. A brief Reply may easily satisfy this confutation. 1. I did explain in what sense these were called Covenants, shewing that that which is called the Absolute Covenant, is in some respect no part of God's Legislative Will, and so doth not issue conferre, but only part of his Decretive Will revealed: but that in other respects it belongs to the Legislative Will, and may be called an absolute promise. And so the word conditions, applied to God, is taken for the thing promised, improperly called a condition; but applied to us, it is strictly taken; nor had I used the term condition as to God, but as it was necessary to satisfy the Objector, who so called it, intimating the impropriety of it. Also I did plainly shew that the thing called God's Condition, was not precisely the same with that called ours: Ours was Believing and Repenting; God's is the bestowing of these, as the Question expressed: or the giving us new and soft hearts, that we may do it ourselves, and do it readily and willingly, &c. as I expressed, pag. 46, because I was not willing to meddle (affirmatively or negatively) with the question of God's immediate physical Efficiency of our own act; yet I doubt not but God doth truly, powerfully and effectually (to the removing or overcoming all resistance) move the soul to the act itself; and therefore...
therefore it may truly be said, that not only Gods own \^ction, but also our \^ction of Believing; is the thing promised, (called his Condition by the Querist; and though improperly, yet in a language very common in Mr. Blakes Treatise). This much being premised, I Reply more particularly. 1. I will yet say that God hath such an absolute Promise, as well as a Conditional, till you give me better Reasons of your denial, or your Questioning whether Scripture will bear it. And I shall yet say that the giving of our Faith and Repentance, is the matter of that absolute promise. For your Argument to the contrarie, hath little in it, to compell me to a change. Your Major is, **Who** fees they are, **his** conditions they are; instead of proof, you say, **This** is evident. I Reply, 1. Negatively, it had been evident de \^ctione quatuor, that it is no ones Condition but his that performs it; as the condition is said to be his that performeth, and not his that imposeth it. But Affirmatively the proposition holds not universally. Nor Negatively, speaking de \^ctione qua est quid donandum. To your Minor, I could better answer if I could have found it. I expected it should have been this, But our Faith and Repentance are not Gods acts. But I know not whether I may be so bold as say, you will own that. Before you say, This rises not to make them formally Gods acts, and not ours: where 1. you cautiously speak the two Propositions copulatively; and 2. you put in the word formally, which may do much to help you out. For the former, it is enough according to your own Rule to prove them Gods Conditions and ours, if they be Gods Acts and ours: for you say, **whose** acts they are, **his** conditions they are; that is evident. It is not; therefore necessary that I prove them Gods and not ours. 2. It is hard to know whether your formally respect a natural or moral form. If the former act is the form; self, it is harder to finde out its matter. Accidents have not properly matter and form; but the subject is called its matter; but \^ction hath scarce so proper a subject as other Accidents have, seeing it is rather Agentis, then in agente inha- fivé: Of transients, its beyond doubt; and I think so of Immanents, unless we may with Scotus, take them for Qualities; If you speak of Moral formality, were it sinful \^ction, I should deny God to be the Author; but of Faith and Repentance I dare not do so; I think God is the Author of them formally as well as materially. But in your following words you say, But they are our acts; &c. God believes not, &c. I Reply; 1. To believe is our act; but to give us Faith, or to move us effe- ctually to Believe, as a superior Cause, this is not our work, but Gods. = 2. Let it be so; to believe is our work, and our condition; It follows not, that it is not Gods. 3. There are sufficient reasons why God is not said to Believe, though he cause us to believe If you go on the Predeterminants grounds, I suppose you know their reasons, who take notice of the Arminians making this objection. If you enquire of the Jesuits and Arminians, that go in the way of determined concourse, or of partial Causality, they think they have yet more to say, of which I suppose you not ignorant. Durandus his followers, think they have most of all to say, both why God should be said to believe, and why he is not the Author of the hin, in that they suppose that he causeth not the act immediately. And yet all these acknowledge God to be the cause of our act. But you adventure a step further, and say, Faith and Repentance are mans works, not Gods works. Reply; 1. What mean you then to yield afterward that God worketh all our works in us. (chole which he worketh are fore his works) And that, it is God that worketh in us the Will and the Deed. 2. I never met with any orthodox Divine, but would yield that Faith is a work of Gods Spirit. And the Spirits work is doubtless Gods work.
3. If you go the common way of the Predeterminants, you must acknowledge that God is the Physical, Efficient, Predetermining, Principal, Immediate cause of every act of every creature: and therefore doubtless of our Faith; and that both *Immediatione Viritus & Supposititi, so that it is more properly his act then ours. For my part, I confess my self of Bishop Dravenants minde who saith, (against Haard p. 116) As for the predetermination of mens Willis, it is a Controversie between the Dominicans and Jesuites, with whose Metaphysical speculations our Protestant Divines love not to torture their brains: Or at least they should not. I take it to be a point beyond the knowledge of any man, which way Gods works on the Will in the foregoing. Though if I must incline to any one way, it would be rather to *Durandus (for stronger reasons then I finde in Ludov. à Dola, who yet hath more then I have seen well answered), and left of all to the Predeterminants, for all the numerous arguments of the Dominicans, and the seeming strength that Dr. Twisse, Herevoord, Rutherford, and others of our own, do add to their cause. But yet I am far from denying our Faith and Repentance to be Gods Works; for I doubt not but he caueth them *ut causa Universitis, by his general Provindence, as they are natural Actions; and also by his special effectual Grace, *contra omnem Resistentiam, infallibly caueth them as they are the special gifts of the Spirit. So that I may say that you should say they are not Gods Works.

In the conclusion you add, Our dexterity in holy duties is from the frame into which Grace puts us: so still the work is ours, though power for action is vouchsafed of God. Reply; Both Velle & Persevere is the gift of God, and not only *Posse Velle & persevere. Why should I trouble the Reader to say any more to that point, when Dr. Twisse and others against the Remonstrants have said so much; and *Auffins so much before them all? And yet I never read a Remonstrant that would say that the work is so ours, as that it is only the power that is vouchsafed us by God. I conclude therefore that you have not confuted my answer; 1. In that you have not disproved the absolute Promis of the first special Grace. 2. You have not disproved God to be the Author of our Faith, so as that it is his work. 3. If you had, yet Believing which is our work, is not the same thing with giving Faith, or moving us to believe, which I say is Gods Work.

§ 56.

Of the Life Promised, and Death threatened to Adam in the first Law.

Mr. Bl. I finde no material difference in the Conditions on Gods part in these Covensants; Life is promised in both in Case of Covenant-keeping: and Death is threatened in both in case of Covenant-breaking. Some indeed have endeavoured to finde a great difference in the Life Promised in the Covenant of Works, and the Life that is promised in the Covenant of Grace; as also in the Death that is threatened in the one and in the other; and thereupon move many, and indeed incalculable difficulties. What Life man should have enjoyed in case Adam had not fallen: and what Death man should have dyed, in case Christ had not been promised? From which two, endlessly more by way of Controversy maybe drawn, by those that want neither wit nor leisure to debate them. In which the best way of satisfaction, and avoi-
dance of such puzzling mazes, is to inquire what Scripture means by Life, which is the good in the Covenant promised, and what by Death, which is the evil threatened. Now for the first, Life contains all whatsoever conduces to true Happiness, to make men blessed in Soul and body. All good that Christ purchases and Heaven enjoys, is comprised under it in Gospel expressions, &c. On the contrary, under death is comprised all that is injurious to man or mankind, that tends to his misery in Soul and body: The damnation of Hell, being called death (the uttermost of evils being the separation of Soul and body from God, Job. 8. 51. 1 John. 3. 14.) Sin which leads to it, and is the cause of it, is called death in like manner, Eph. 2. 1. And the separation of Soul from the body being called Death, sickness, plagues, are so called in like manner, Exod. 10. 17. Now happiness being promised to man in Covenant, only indefinitely, under that notion of Life, without limit to this or that way of happiness, in this or that place; God is still at liberty, so that he make man happy, where or however to continue happiness to him, and is not clogged up in his engagement either for earth or heaven. And therefore, though learned Camero in his tract, de triplici fædere, Theol. 9. make this difference between the Covenant of works and the Covenant of Grace; In the Covenant of Works (which he calls nature) Life was promised, and a most blessed Life, but an animal life in Paradise; in the Covenant of Grace, a life in Heaven and Spiritual. And Mr. Baxter in his Aphor. of Justification, p. 5. faith, That this Life promised was only the continuance of that state that Adam was then in, in Paradise, is the opinion of most Divines; Yet with submission to better Judgments; I see not grounds for it: seeing Scripture no way determines the way and kind, &c. And indeed there are strong probabilities, Heaven being set out by the name of Paradise, in Christ's speech to the thief on the Cross, and in Paul's vision, &c.

§. 36.

R. B. 1. Your opinion in this point is moderate, and (I think) sound. I have nothing therefore to say to you, but about our different expressions; and therefore excuse me if I be short; for I love not that work. I think your judgment and mine are the same. 2. Only remember, that it is Mr. Blake also that hath these words, p. 74. The Conditions on man's part in the Covenant of Works, were for man's preservation in stitu quo; in that condition in which he was created; to hold him in Communion with God, which was his happiness; he expected not to be bettered by his obedience, either respective to happiness (no more is promised then in present he had); nor yet in his Qualifications respective to his conformitie to God in Righteousnes and true holiness. What improvement he might have made of the Habit infused, by the exercise of obedience, I shall not determine; but no change in Qualifications was looked after or given in Promise; so far Mr. Blake.

If the Reader cannot reconcile Mr. Blake and me, let him reconcile Mr. Blake with himself, and the work is done.

3. But I confess that upon more serious consideration of several passages in the New Testament, naming and describing the work of Redemption, I am ready to think it far more probable that Adam was not created in Paradisum, but in Via; not in the highest perfection which he should expect, but in the way to it. But whether God would have given it him in the same place that he was in, or in some
some other (called Heaven) upon a remove, I take as Mr. Bl. doth, to be un-
revealed, and undetermined in the Promise. So that I could finde in my heart
to fall a confuting the same opinion in Mr. Blake, expressed in these last words,
which he confuteth in me; but that his former fave me the labor.

4. I confefs also that I spoke rashly in saying that it was the opinion of most
Divines, seeing it to hard a matter to know which way most go in the point. I
also confefs that the judgement of Camero, Mr. Ball, Mr. Gather, &c. swayed
much with me; but the silence of the text in Gen. much more: but I had
not fo well weighed several Texts in the New Testament, as I ought, which
declaring Redemption, give some more light into the point. The fame I say
concerning the quality of the Death threatened.

5. I agree to Mr. Blake's first conclusion, that the thing is indeterminate; or
at left, hard for us to know; but I cannot reconcile his premises with that conclu-
 sings; much less with this his latter speech p. 74. For if (as he faies) the
Life promised was all whatsoever conduces to true happiness, to make men blessed
in foul and body; (by conducing to, I fuppose he meant constituting) then either
the Celestial Degree of Grace and Glory conduces not to that happiness (and
then not to ours, who have no greater natural capacitie); or else I fea not how it
can be said that this greater blessednefs was not Promifed. Double of Adam
not in prefent poftifion to great a measure of holiness, to confirmed a State of
Holiness or Glory, nor so great and full a fruition of God, as Christ hath given
us a sure hope of in the Gospel. And therefore, though he fay, God is at li-
berity for the place and way, yet that is nothing to the kinde and measure.

6. Observe that the words of mine, which Mr. Bl. oppofeth, are but that Di-
vines are of that judgement.

§ 57.

Mr. Bl. And what I have faid of the Life promised, I say of Death-threatned,
&c. My Learned friend Mr. Baxter, enquiring into this Death, that
was here threatened, fayeth, that the fame Damnation that followed the breach of
the second Covenant, it could not be. Aph. p. 15. When I fuppose, is rather fhould
be fayd, that in Subfance and kinde it can be no other. Insidels that were never un-
der any other Covenant, &c.

§ 57.

R. B. 1. What also I have anfwered to the former, may fuffice to this for the
main. 2. One would think that you intended directly to con-
tradict me; but whether you do so indeed, I cannot well tell. I know nor what you
mean by Subfance and kinde, Pain and Lofs have no Subfance, but a Subjedt: I ne-
ever doubted but that it is the Lofs of the fame God, and Blessednefs (formally
considered) but I am yet very uncertain whether the Blessednefs Promifed by
Chrift, be not far greater in Degree, then that to Adam, and consequently whe-
ther the Pena Damni threatened in the Gospel be not far greater. Also I know
as to the medium Beflings, Relative, they are not the fame: To be deprived
by Unbelief, of Remiffion, Reconciliation, Adoption, the everlafting praising of
him
him, that Redeemed us by his blood, &c. these are true punishments on unbelievers, that reject the mercies offered to them: but these were none of Adams punishments. That was a Negation only to him, that is a Privation to them.

I profess also that I ever took the pain of Sense to be of the same nature, which was due to Adams Soul, and which is due to unbelievers. Only I then did and still do doubt, whether any Scripture speak of the everlasting Torments of Adams body; or whether it were not only his Soul that should eternally suffer, his body being turned to dust and so suffering the penalty of loss: Nay, whether the New Testament do not make Resurrection the proper fruit of Christs death and Resurrection? But of this I am not fully resolved my self, much less will I contend for it.

But I must needs say, that I took not a gradual difference in punishments to be inconsiderable. Nay I know that moral specifications are grounded in natural gradual differences. And Rewards and Punishments being moral things formally, they may and oft be said to differ species, and not to be the same, when naturally they differ but in degree. Yea, whether in naturals themselves, we may not sometimes find a specification in nearer degrees, is not so clear as rashly to be denied. There is but a gradual difference between the smallest prick with a pin, and to be thrust through with daggers in 20 places; yet I will not say that it is the same punishment.

§ 58.

Mr. Bl. Neither can I assent to that speech, To say that Adam should have gone quick to Hell, if Christ had not been promised, or Sin pardoned, is to contradict the Scriptures that make death temporal the wages of Sin. It were I confess to presume above Scripture, but I cannot see it a contradiction of Scripture. A burning Fever, Conflagration, Leprosy, Pestilence, &c. are in Scripture made the wages of Sin. Yet many go to hell through those diseases, &c.

§ 58.

R. B. I Willingly leave every man to his own judgement in this: But I think it most probable, that the separation of Soul and body was particularly intended in the threatening, Thou shalt die the death. Real. 1. Because this is it that is in prima significato called Death, and the miseries of Life, but Tropically, much more this or that particular miserie: which answers your objection about sicknesses. 2. This is it that Christ was necessarily to suffer for us: and if it had not been necessary for man to dye thus, by the Commination of that Law, then it would not thence have been necessary for Christ to dye this Death. For it was not the following sentence (which you call Leges post latas), which Christ came to satisfie or bear, but the curse of the Law. Gal. 3. 13, be being made a curse for us. Phil. 2. 8. Col. 1. 22. Heb. 9. 15. by means of death he was to Redeem the transgressors of the first Law; without Blood there is no Remission: The death of the creatures in sacrificings signified the necessity of this Death.
Death of Christ. I have met with none but Mr. John Goodwin that faith, Christ's readiness or willingness to have dyed, might have served the turn, though the Jews had not put him to death. Col. 1, 20. 14. Eph. 1, 7. Rom. 3, 25. Its true, the Apostle speaking of the necessary of Blood, in Heb. hath reference to the Constitutions of Moses Law: but then it must be confessed that that Law did in its Curse much explicate the former, and direct us to see what was threatened, and what must by the Messiah be suffered for us. Heb. 2, 14. Christ was to destroy by death, him that had the power of death, that is the Devil: but it seems, that the Law gave him his power, at the Will and Sentence of the Judge, for execution. 1 Cor. 15, 26, 54. Death is the last enemy to be overcome.

O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory? This is no doubt, the death now in question; it is the evils befallen mankinde in execution of the violated Law, that are called enemies. Though we dye, it seems, there was a necessity of Christ's dying to loose the bonds of our Death, and procure us a Resurrection. Rom. 5, 17. As by one man's offence death reigned by one, &c. That one man must dye for the people, Caiphas prophesied, Zeb. 18, 14.

3. The sentence uttered to contain what is threatened in the Law, and though part may be remitted, yet the other part is the same threatened. But God's Sentence on Adam, contained the penalty of a temporal Death. Though he mentioned not the Eternal, because he would provide a remedy, yet the temporal, as one part meant in the threatening he laid on man himself: Dull thou art, and to dust shalt thou return; This is not as you imagine, Lex post lata; but sententia Judicis Legis violata comminationem excogitans. When it is said, 1 Cor. 15, 22, In Adam all dye; it is, in Adam's sinning all became guilty of it, and in Adam then sentenced, all were adjudged to it. Which is intimated also Rom. 5, 12. Sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed on all men, for that all have sinned.

So that the sentence expressing this Death particularly, and Christ bearing it necessarily, and (add moreover) all mankinde, for the generality, bearing it certainly, and also Death signifying primarily the separation of Soul and Body, it seems to me most probable, that this Death was in special meant in the threatening.

But you say, He takes the same way where his Justice hath satisfaction; those that are priviledged from death as the wages of sin, thus dye. Reply. I do not believe you that any are Priviledged from death as the wages of sin, who dye. This is the part of the penalty which the sentence passed on the offender himself, for all the promised satisfaction by a Redeemer: Nor did the Redeemer satisfy to that end, to prevent our death, or to cause that it should not be the wages of sin; but to deliver us from under the power of it. Where you say, that this way of God with unbelievers is voluntary, not necessitated: I reply; So it may be nevertheless, because it was meant in the threatening. It is dangerous to imagine that God is ever the less free, or more necessitated, so as that his actions should be less voluntary, because of his determinations. He doth as voluntarily do what he hath predetermined to do, and foretold he will do, as if he had done neither. God changeth not, and therefore he is as voluntary in the execution, as he was in the determination.

5.99.
§ 59.

Of the Law as made to Christ.

Mr. Bl. Chap. 6. p. 25. And though Mr. Baxter doubts whether it be any part of God's Legislative Will, as it refers to Christ, but only as it belongs to us as a Prophetic what God would do in the advancing of Christ and his Kingdom, and to of us; Append, p. 39. Yet me thinks it is plain, seeing Christ acknowledges a command from his Father, in laying down his life, Joh. 10. 18. and the Apostle speaking of the work, saith, He was obedient in it, &c.

§ 59.

One that had not read what I write, would think by your Answer, that I had made a doubt whether there be any Law made to Christ at all or not? Whereas I spake only of that called the Covenant between the Father and the Son made from Eternity: or the promises expressed by the Prophets as to Christ in his meer Divine nature, not yet incarnate: For I conceive that Christ before the incarnation, may not be said to be a subject; and that God is not properly said to command himself, or covenant with himself, or make promises by Prophets to himself. But I deny not but that Christ as a man was under a Law, yea and a Law peculiar to himself, where to no other creature is subject; even the Law of Mediation, which deserves in the body of Theology a peculiar place, and the handling of it, as different from all the Laws made with us men, is of special use, and if well done, would do much to remove the stumbling blocks which the Antinomians fall upon.

§ 60.

Whether the Sacraments seal the conditional Promise absolutely? or the conclusion conditionally, when only one of the Premises is of Divine Revelation? And whether this conclusion be de fide, I am Justified and shall be saved.

Mr. Bl. p. 58. But that which I may not pass, is somewhat of concernment both to myself and the present cause in hand, &c.

§ 62.

I Need not transcribe these words, being of another, and not spoke to me. But I will pass my conjecture to his questions. 1. I conjecture that the Querist by Evading, meant Owning and Jussifying the Site, and so evading the blame. 2. To the second I conjecture the Querist had been lately conversant.
versant in Mr. Blake's book, and so it was in his memorie: and whether he
knew what those whom you mention do hold I cannot tell. 3. To the third;
If by Sacramental sealing, you mean Conditional sealing, I conjecture his con-
ceit might be this, that as the Promise may be conditionally tendered to In-
fidels, Murderers, or any other, so might the Seal, if it were but Conditional
as the Promise. As we may say to the worst; If thou wilt believe, thou shalt be
saved; so might we conditionally seal salvation to him. But I take this to be a
great mistake.

§. 61.

Mr. Bl, p. 40. Mr Baxter (who is put to it, to floop too low in the answer of
such trifles) in his answer to this now in hand, hath taken
much pains to finde out the way of the Sacraments sealing; and in the result, he and I
shall not be found much to differ; yet seeing providence made me the occasion of starting
the question, I shall take leave to take some view of what is said. Mr. Baxter says,
It is in vain to enquire, whether the Sacraments do seal Absolutely or Con-
ditionally, till you first know what is that they do seal; and in order to the finding
this out, he lays down the way that a Christian doth gather the assurance of his
Justification and Salvation; which is thus, He that believeth is Justified, and shall
be saved; but I believe, therefore I am Justified and shall be saved; I confess
if I had been put upon a discovery of that which is sealed in the Sacraments, this
Syllogism (I think,) would scarce have come into my thoughts, seeing the Seal is Gods
(as Mr. Baxter observes) I should have rather looked for one from him, then to have
supposed a believer to have been upon the frame of one.

§. 61.

R. B. This dispute is so confused, and so much about words that I would not
have meddled with it, (let men have made what use of yours they pleased,) but only for some matters of greater moment that fall in upon the bys,
in your handling it. I think your meaning and mine is the same. 1. I not
only said, (as you express,) that the Seal is Gods, but gave my Reasons to prove
a mutual Sealing as well as a mutual Covenanting. 2. What reason have you
why I might not illustrate the matter by this Syllogism, as well as another.
3. If you will have a Syllogism of Gods making, why did you not tell us when
or where you found it? and let us see as well as you, whence you had it, that we
may know God made it. God doth not neccffrly Syllogismos for himself, nor actn
immance: if he do it, it is only for us per actum transactum: and then it may
be found in his word. But more of that anon. 4. I should think (though for
illustration I judged it not unuseful) that it is of no necessitie for you or me to
talk of any Syllogism at all, in the enquiry after the sealed proposition. If it
be but one proposition, we may express it alone: If more, we may distinctly
express them; rather then that shall breed any difference, I care not whether
my Syllogism be mentioned any more: Let us see what yours is.

§. 62.
Mr. Bl. And such a one I should have looked to have gathered up from the Institution, and thus (I conceive) framed: He to whom I give Christ, to him I give Justification and Salvation: But here I give thee Christ; therefore to thee I give Justification and Salvation.

S. 63.

Q. B. 1. What mean you by gathering it? Do you mean that you will read it there ready formed? If so, shew us the Chapter and Verse? But that must not be expected; for you say anon, that it is something not written that is sealed. Or do you mean that in the Institution, God gives you the materials, and you form it your selves? If so, why blamed you mine, which is of man's forming, but yet as you suppose, the materials so far of God, that the conclusion is de fide. To give you the materials of a Syllogism, is not to give you a Syllogism; for the form denominates. I must therefore suppose a Believer yet to be upon the frame of one (as you speak). For I take you to be a Believer; and I finde you here at it very seriously. 2. I confess, (though I have no minde to quarre with your Syllogism) that I am never the better for the substitution of this in the room of the humane one. I know not the meaning of the first word, (but I will not stand on that, as being I know but a verbal slip) I do not apprehend what use there can be for this Syllogism in this business. 1. It is supposed that every Christian knows that Christ and Remission are given together; and when they know it, what use for syllogizing towards the explication of the use of that Seal? 2. Nay doth not your arguing intimate that the believer is more assured that Christ is given to him, than that pardon is given him? Or else if the former were not quid minus, how could it be a fit medium? you suppose his doubt to be of pardon and salvation, and the former brought to prove that, whereas I think, few doubt of one, but they doubt of the other; and I think the Sacrament sealeth the gift of Christ, as well as of pardon, as you confess. I see not but you might have laid down as conveniently in this one proposition, all that you say is sealed, I give thee Christ and Justification and Salvation. But this is of small moment.

S. 64.

Mr. Bl. The major here is not sealed; for the Sacrament's seal to the truth of no general Propositions, but they seal with application to particular persons to whom the elements are dispens'd, as Protestant Writers have defended against Papists, and put into the definition of a Sacrament, it seals then that which supplies the place of the minor in this tender, which is God's gift of Christ. In the Sacrament Christ faith, This is my body, he faith this is my blood; and this is said to all that communicate. Now whether this gift of the body and blood of Christ be absolutely or conditionally sealed, will be easily resolved. The outward Elements are given on this condition
condition that we receive them, that we eat and drink them. We have not Christ Sacramentally, till we have taken and eaten and drunk the Elements. We have not Christ in the Sacrament before our Soul's part in which answers to this eating and drinking. That which all do not partake of that receive the Sacrament is not Absolutely but Conditionally sealed in the Sacrament. None can miss of that which God absolutely grants and absolutely seals. But all do not partake of Christ in the Sacrament; therefore he is not Absolutely but Conditionally sealed in the Sacrament.

R. E. 1. Confusion maketh Controversies endless, and gives advantage to mistakes to prevail with the weak Reader. I shall first tell you what I mean by sealing, before we further dispute what is sealed; and how. Some sober men, no way inclined to Anabaptism, do think that we ought not to call the Sacraments Seals, as being a thing not to be proved from the word; (for all Rom. 4.) But I am not of their minde. Yet I think it is a Metaphor; and to make it the subject of tedious disputations, and lay too great stress upon a Metaphorical notion, is the way not to edifie, but to lose our selves. I am not so well skilled in Law as to be very confident, or to pretend to any great exactness in these matters; but I conceive that in general, a Seal is an Appropriate sign, when it is set upon things, as Goods, Cattels, &c. it signifies them to be ours; when they are applied to Instruments in writing, they have 1. the common end of a Seal, 2. a special end. 1. The common end is to signify by a special sign our owning of that writing or Instrument to which it is annexed. 2. The special end is according to the nature and use of the Instruments viz. 1. Some Instruments directed to a Community, or indefinitely to any whom it may concern. 2. Some to particular persons, or some few Individuals. Both of them are, 1. either Narratives de re. 2. Or obligatory Constitutions or acknowledgments de Debito. The former are either 1. Doctrinal, and so a man may give it under his hand and seal that he owns such or such a Doctrine, or profession of Faith, or form prescribed by him as Teacher to his Schollers or Heaters, &c. 2. Or Historical; and so a man may give it under his hand and Seal, that such a person is thus or thus qualified; or did this or that act, or suffered loss, pain, &c. 2. The Constitutions de Debito, are 1. De Debito officii, the Constitution of Duty. 1. By equals upon voluntary obligation by contrall (which concerneth not our business.) 2. By Superiors to their Subjects or Inferiors, which is either a Law to any or to some Community: Or else a Precept to some particulars. And so Soveraigns may give our Laws, and Proclamations under their hand and Seal; and Justices and Inferior Magistrates may seal their Precepts and Warrants, and Orders, &c. 2. Or they are de Debito Beneficlii; Constituted 1. by a Legislator or Rectior as such. 2. by a Proprietary or Owner or Lord, as such. 1. The former is either Absolute, as the Collation of some honors may be, and some acts of pardon, and the Divisions of Inheritances, as among the Israelites at their first possesfing Canaan; Or they are Conditional; And the Condition is either pure Acceptance (which is so naturally requisite, that it is usually supposed, and not expressed, and such Collations go commonly under the name of Absolute and Pure Donations, though indeed they are not). Or else some requisite service or moral action, which may properly make the Benefit to be Premium,
a Reward. All these being sealed, the Seal doth obligate the Benefactor or Donor, because the Instrument is obligatory, if it be for future conveyance. If a present Collation, then the Seal doth confirm the Receivers Right, against any that may hereafter question it. The like may be said of Acknowledgments, as of Constitutions: The Subject may acknowledge his subjection and Seal it; the Stipulator may cause the Promisor to acknowledge Duty or Debts, and to Seal it. So for Acknowledgments of Debts discharged, Rewards received, Conditions performed, &c. 3. The like may be said de Debito pane, when Penal Laws are sealed: and of Commisions and Warrants for execution; but this last concerns our calc.

So that the use of a Seal as such, is but to testify in a special manner that the Thing or Instrument is really ours, or that we own it: and so as Apostolus faith, to be Testimonium Secundarum, added to the Primary Testimonie of the Covenant or other Instrument. But the special end of the Seal ariseth from the nature and use of the Instrument sealed, and not from the nature of a Seal as such.

My opinion now upon the present Controversie, I give you in these Conclusions.

Concl. 1. Taking the word as strictly as we use to do in English, the Sacraments are not properly Seals, but Metaphorically. But taking the word Seal more largely, as it signifieth any instituted sign for testimony of ones owning the Instrument, Revealing, Promising, Exhibiting, &c., so they may be called Seals.

2. The Sacraments are not to be applied to universal or indefinite subjects; but to particulars: Indeed they cannot be entire Sacraments, without particular Application; that is, either to that particular Congregation, or a particular person: and still the Receptive Application must be personal.

3. Therefore not meer universal, or particular, or indefinite Enunciations are to be used by the Administer, but singulars also.

4. Yet I conceive that as the Universal Enunciation is first to be expressed; so is that universal that is sealed, though with application to singular persons; it being not a Collective, but a Distributive Universal; and not Distributive only in general singulorum, but in singula Generum: and therefore may be applied ad singula Generum.

5. I conceive that God may be said to Seal first the truth of the History of Christ's death and bloodshed: and also the Truth of the Doctrine of the Gospel, that this Blood was shed as a Ransom for sinners, and that it was for our sins that he dyed.

6. And this quod institutionem Sacramentorum, may be said to be intended to his universal Church; but quod exortum, & attestum applicationem, it is directly still to singulars.

7. I conceive also that in the Ministerial act of offering, and saying; Take, Eat, Drink, Christ may be said to Seal his Precept, whereby he hath made it the duty of man, to Take or Accept an offered Saviour with his benefits, on the Offerers terms.

8. Thus far there is no question but he sealeth to Hypocrites, as well as to true Believers.

9. Concerning the Promise or Testament, we must yet distinctly consider,

1. the Promise itself which goes first.

next,
next. 3. the Delivery or Application by offer which is next. 4. the Reception or Acceptance of the thing offered, which is next. 5. the actual efficacie of the Promise in Constituting the Right of the Receiver in the Benefit, which is next. 6. the mutual obligation of each Partie to fulfill the remainder of the Covenant for the future, which is the last.

10. That Seal which properly confirms the Gospel to be true; is miracles and other gifts of the Holy Ghost; but the Sacraments, though they may do much also to that, as they are a continued publick Commemoration, and so an excellent way of Tradition, yet are they especially Applicatory signs for renewing clear apprehensions, helping memoric, assisting in our Application of the general Promise, resolving our Wills, exciting our affections to a more lively sense of Christ's Love, and our sin and Duty, &c. and actually to help us in the Praises of the Redeemer by so solemn and sensible a Commemoration of his Redemption of us.

11. Ministers are Christ's Officers in Explication and Application of his Laws and Covenants.

12. Their Application or Explication is no Addition to the sense, nor any making of a new Law or Covenant. Therefore when God saith, Whosoever will believe, shall have Christ and Life; and the Minister saith, If thou A. B. wilt believe, thou shalt have Christ and Life; the Minister addeth not to the Promise, but applieth it according to its proper sense; seeing a universal Enunciation absolutely so called, may be distributed in singula generum, though a Universal secundum quid may be only distributed into Species or genera singularum.

13. And therefore to seal to that singular Enunciation, is no more then to seal to the Universal, but much less, if it were to that alone.

14. It is God's Legal Deed of Gift, or Promise written in Scripture, or otherwise expressed, to which the Sacrament is a Seal, and consequently to that singular enunciation, which is but part of the same Promise, and that as it is contained in the Universal: but not as it is a thing distinct from the Universal Promise, or as supposed to add to it, or contain more, for sense, in it; nor to the Application of the Minister, as such.

15. But for the right understanding of this, we must explain this word, to Seal to, which is of several significations: 1. It is one thing to seal to a thing as the Testimonium primarium, to which the Seal is the Testimonium secundarium. So the Instrument is sealed to. 2. It is another thing to seal to a thing as the subiectum materiae obfignatum: so the matter contained in that Instrument is sealed to. 3. It is another thing to seal to a thing as the finis cujus ultimus: so the good which the partie ultimately receives from that Donation, Contract, &c., as its end, is sealed to. 4. And its another thing to seal to a thing as the finis cujus proximus, vel prior: and so to our Right to Christ, our Remission, Justification, Adoption, &c. are sealed to. 5. And its yet another thing to seal to a person as the finis cui: and so God sealseth to us, the forementioned Covenant, &c. I mean that according to its several respects to these things, the words seal to have several significations. Now the application, the Right delivered, &c. may be said to be sealed to, as the finis proximus cujus: for it is sealed that it may be delivered and applied for conveying Right: but these are not sealed to as the subiectum obfignatum: that is the Promise or Grant itself, whereby Right is conveyed.

16. The
16. The Sacraments are not only Seals to the Grant or Promise, but furthermore are Exhibiting or Conferring signs, in subrserviencie to the Promise; as Instruments to solemnize the Collation of Christ and his Benefits. And this seems to be a far more remarkable end of them, than proper sealing: For Sacraments are such kind of signs, as those in the solemnization of marriage, in giving hands, putting on a ring, expressing Consent, &c. Or as the Crowning of a King, or the lifting a Souldier: or as a twig, a turf, or a Key in giving possession. So that the main use followeth the meer sealing.

17. As God's Universal Grant of Christ and pardon is but Conditional (in form or sense) to which the Sacrament sealeth; so the minister that distribueth the Universal to singulars, must do it but Conditionally, If thou A. B. wilt believe, thou shalt have Christ and Life: So that still it is no Absolute but a Conditional Promise or Grant that is sealed.

18. This Conditional Promise is sealed Absolutely and actually; for were it sealed only Conditionally, then it were not Absolutely sealed at all, till the Condition is fulfilled: but this sense would run thus, This Action shall be my Seal, when you believe, or perform some other condition. But I conceive God sealeth Absolutely, and therefore Absolutely, before men truly or really believe, when a Minister on his Command and by his Commission doth it.

19. Yet though God seal the Conditional Promise Absolutely to such as profess to receive it; that is, though he hereby attest that he owns that Promise as his Act or Deed; yet doth he not either Exhibit or Convey Right to Christ and his Benefits, nor yet oblige himself for the future Absolutely, but Conditionally only. For in this Conveyance and Obligation the Grant or Covenant is the principal Instrument, and the Sign the least principal; and both to the same use; and therefore the latter cannot Absolutely Convey, or Oblige the Promiser, unless the first do it absolutely too.

20. God may therefore seal his Promise, and thereupon offer Christ and Life to men that pretended a willingness to receive it, and yet not actually convey Right to Christ and Life, nor Absolutely oblige himself to pardon or save the sinner, because the party may refuse the offer, either refusing Sacrament and all, or only refusing in heart the benefit offered, at least as such and on the terms that its offered on, and on which only it may be had. And so when the sealing use is past, the Sacrament may lose its Conveying and obbling force (so far as we may say God oblige himself) for want of true Reception: and thus it doth with all unsound Believers.

I desire the Reader, according to this explanation to understand that which I wrote against Mr. Tombs in my book of Baptism, about the Sacraments sealing to the ungodly.

Having said thus much for the opening of my opinion, and the avoiding of Confusion, I return to Mr. B's words. And 1. where he faith, The major is not sealed; for the Sacraments seal not to the truth of any general Propositions, but they seal with application to particular persons; I reply, They seal no doubt with respect to particular persons; but that they may not seal both the general Promise and the singular as compriz'd in it, to that particular person, I hear not yet proved, viz. q. d. Having promised Christ and Life to every one that will Accept him, lest thou shouldest slander at this my Promise, I own it by this seal. 2. Where he faith, It seals that which supplies the place of the minor; viz. I give thee Christ: I reply, t. Its true; because this is no addition to the general Grant, but part
of its proper sense: For he that faith, I give it to all Believers, faith; in sense, I give it to thee if thou be a Believer. Otherwise God sealeth not to whom he promiseth not: and were not the singular Enunciation comprehended in the sense of the Universal, you could never prove that the singular is sealed. 2. But what is the meaning of your Miners, which you say is sealed? Is it an Absolute and simple Proposition or Enunciation, as you express it? Or is it a Conditional one? Do you mean, I will give thee Christ on condition that thou Accept him as offered: or, I will give him Absolutely: And by giving, do you mean proper effectual giving which conveys Right: or only an offer which conveys not Right till it be Accepted on the terms on which it offered? If you mean by gift, a mere offer, then it may be sealed Absolutely; for God doth Absolutely offer, where he doth but Conditionally Give. He doth not say, I will offer you Christ, on condition you will take him; for he offereth him whether men Accept him or not. If you mean a full gift, and mean the Enunciation to be Absolute, then that man shall certainly have Christ and Life, whether he accept him or not; or at least, accepting is no Condition. And then all that God so sealeth to, shall be faved. Nor will it help you to say, that he seals his Absolute Promise but Conditionally: for however, the man must needs be saved by such a Gift or Promise it self, though it were never sealed at all. If you mean (as I suppose you do) I give thee Christ to be thine, on condition that thou Accept him as offered: then 1. Why did you express a Conditional Gift, in Absolute terms, leaving out the Condition? 2. Why then are you so loth to yield that this Conditional Grant is Absolutely sealed, that is, owned by an express sign? As long as the Grant is but Conditional, yea and the sign it self, if doth Exhibit or Convey but Conditionally, what danger to say that it is sealed Absolutely? Is there not more inconvenience in saying that both the Grant is Conditional, and yet also that it is but Conditionally sealed?

3. You add, The outward Elements are given on this condition, that we receive them, that we eat and drink them: Reply, I never gave them but on a higher Condition, viz. If you will take Christ offered, take this which signifies, &c. And I think Christ never gave them but on condition, that men Accept him as well as the sign; though when they performed not what they pretend to do, he doth not suspend his act of Tradition: And in such a case it is a Delivering, but not a proper Giving. And I do not think that you use your selves to give the Sacramental signs meerly on condition that men will Take, and Eat, and Drink them: As you charge a further Condition on them, so I conjecture that if they should profess no more, then so to Take the signs, you would not deliver them.

Next you argue thus, That which all do not partake of that receive the Sacrament, is not Absolutely, but Conditionally sealed in the Sacrament. But all do not partake of Christ in the Sacrament; therefore he is not Absolutely, but Conditionally sealed: Reply, 1. What if I should grant all this? what is it to our present question? to Seal Christ is somewhat an uncouth phrase. It is either the Grant or Promise of Christ that you mean, which Gives Christ: or it is the Jus so Given: (For Christ himself in substance is not Given by the Covenant, otherwise then by giving us Right to him.) If you mean it of Right to Christ, then this is the Terminus proximus exhibitionis, and the more remote end of sealing; whereas our Question was of the subject sealed, and not of the end of sealing. And therefore you should not have thought that you conclude the Question, when
when you speak only to another question. But if by sealing Christ, you mean only sealing the Promise or Grant of Christ and Life in him; then I deny your major proposition. If you had said only, That which all do not partake of that receive the Sacraments, is not absolutely Given; I should easily have granted it: for it is Given on condition of Receiving; and even a sealed Grant may be uneffectual to Conveyance, through the interposition of the Difsent and Rejection of him that should receive. But you add for the confirmation of the major, None can miss of that which God Absolutely Granteth, and Absolutely sealeth; Reply, 1. But what is this to your major? was there any mention of Absolute Granting? This is somewhat a large Addition. 2. And what is this to the question between you and me? You know and acknowledge, that I say, It is the Conditional Grant that is Absolutely sealed: why then do you dispute against Absolute Granting and Sealing? This is loss of time to the best of your Readers; and for the worst, it may make them think my opinion is clean contrary to my own profession.

§ 65.

Mr. Bl. Or in case the Soul frame any Argumentation, I suppose it is to be conceived to this purpose; if God give me Christ, he will give me Justification and Salvation by Christ; but God gives me Christ; therefore he will give me Justification and Salvation. The major is supposed not sealed: the minor is there sealed: the Elements being tended by the Minister in God's stead, and received with my hand, I am confirmed that God gives Christ to my Faith; and the minor being sealed, the Conclusion to nomine is sealed. The proof of any proposition in a Syllogism, is in order to the proof of the Conclusion; and so the sealing of any proposition is in order to the sealing of the Conclusion; which indeed Mr. Baxter grants; when he says that the Proposition that God sealeth to runs thus, If thou do believe, I do pardon thee, and will save thee: For several passages in that Discourse, are I confess, beyond my weak apprehension.

§ 65.

R. B. 1. To your Argument there needs no more to be said than is said to the former. When God hath in one Deed of Gift bestowed on us Christ and Life, Remission, Justification, Adoption, &c. (1 John 5.10, 11, 12, John 1.11, 12.) it must be in case of great ignorance that the person that knows that God giveth him Christ, must yet be constrained by after arguings to acknowledge that he giveth him Justification. And how this argument tends to explain the nature of Sacramental sealing, I neither know, nor see any thing here to help me to know. If you will suppose such an Argument as this used for Application, I would not stick to yield it useful; What God doth by his Testament give to all men, on condition they will accept it, that he gives to me on condition I will accept it. But he gives Christ and Life in him, to all men if they will accept it; therefore to me: (Or if you will say, to all that hear the Gospel.) Though the use of such an Argument is more for lively Application, then confirmation of the Truth of the Grant.
2. Your supposition that your minor is sealed, and not your major, hath enough said to it.

3. The Sacraments may confirm your faith in Christ as given to you, otherwise then by sealing, viz. as they are signs for Remembrance, Excitation to sense and lively apprehensions of Gods Donation, and as they are signs instrumental in sole Conveyance of the benefit Given, as a twig and a turfe, and a Key in giving possession, and the words and actions of matrimonial solemnization or Contract.

4. It is new Logick to my understanding, that the minor being sealed, the conclusion co nomine is sealed : The minor or many an Argument may be true, and the conclusion false. And therefore when the case so falls out, that both minor and conclusion are true, or sealed, it is not co nomine, because the minor is true, that the Conclusion is so, (or is sealed, co nomine because the minor is to) but because both major and minor are so, and not then neither, but upon supposition that the Syllogism be found.

5. But to prove this, you say, the proof any Proposition in a Syllogism, is in order to the proof of the Conclusion : and so the sealing of any Proposition is in order to the sealing of the Conclusion : Reply; The first is true. 1. But what is this to the matter ? Is it all one to prove it and to be in order to prove it, to seal it and to be in order to the sealing of it ? Is the Conclusion proved on the proof of one Proposition ? No: therefore according to your own arguing, neither is it sealed by the sealing of one Proposition. 2. That the sealing of one Proposition is in order to the sealing of the Conclusion, I deny. 1. It may be a single Proposition that is sealed, not standing as part of a Syllogism : as this, I Give Christ and Life in him to you all that will Accept him. 2. It be supposed part of a Syllogism, it is enough sometime that the Conclusion be cleared or confirmed, or we enabled infallibly to gather it, by the sealing of one Proposition: but it is not necessary that it be the very sealing of the Conclusion, to which the sealing of that Proposition doth tend. When a Landlord hath sealed a Lease to his Tenant, he hath sealed this Proposition, If A. B. well and truly pay such Rents, he shall quietly enjoy such Lands : suppose the minor to be, But A. B. doth or will well and truly pay such Rents: suppose this minor Proposition either false or uncertain, will you say then that the sealing of the major was in order to the sealing of the Conclusion? No; the Conclusion is absolute, therefore A. B. shall enjoy such Lands : but the Proposition sealed is Conditional. It is enough that it secure his Right, if he pay his Rent, and that it enable him infallibly so to conclude, while he performs the conditions, though it tend not at all to seal the Conclusion. We seldom use seals to Syllogisms: and not to Conclusions as such, or co nomine, because a major or minor Proposition is proved: though the thing sealed may be to other uses made part of a Syllogism.

Yet I grant that where the Syllogism is such as that one of the Propositions doth morally contain the Conclusion in sense, though not in terms, there the conclusion is sealed when that one Proposition is sealed: because it is the sense and not mere terms that are sealed; and undoubted naturals are presupposed in moralitie, and therefore the sealing of one is the sealing of both: For example, if you argue either from a Synonimal term, or from the thing as Defined to the thing as named, or from the Genus to the Species, or from the Species to the Individual; thus, successum corroborat cerubrum: As Ambarum, vel electrum est succimum: therefore Ambarum vel electrum corroborat cerubrum: or thus, Privatio visus
Mr. Bl. THAT Believeth is Justified and shall be saved; is his major Proposition. This be faith is sealed unquestionably: when indeed I have ever thought, and yet think, that it is not at all sealed. Sacraments seal not to, the truth of any general Proposition, but with particular application as they are dispensed, so they seal; but they are applied particularly, Take, Eat, &c. This Mr. Baxter seeth pag. 69, and therefore in that absolute universal Proposition, he finds a particular Conditional Promise, to which he faith God sealeth: If thou believe, I do pardon thee and will save thee.

R. B. ALL this is answered sufficiently already. Only observe that by shall be saved, and I will save thee, I mean but shall have, or I will give thee present Right to Salvation; For the continuance of that Right, hath more then Faith for its condition.

Mr. Bl. THAT it sealeth not to the truth of the minor Proposition, But I believe, (he says) is beyond dispute, giving in his reasons. It should seal then to that which is not written; for no scripture faith, that I do believe; so certainly Sacraments do seal; they seal to that which is not directly written, they seal with particular application, but the man to whom they are applied hath not his name in scripture written; they seal to an individual person, upon the Warrants of a general Promise: though I do not say that Proposition is sealed; yet me thinks this reason is scarce cogent.

R. B. YOU deny not my assertion, but argue against the reason of it; as before by telling us what you thought, so here by affirming the contrary certain, you attempt the confutation of mine. To your instance I give these two returns: 1. It is equivocation, when our question is of sealing to a thing as the subjestum obsignatum, for to instance in sealing to a person as the finis cui.
The seal, that is to application as an end, not to application as the subject sealed.  

2. But if you respect not the person as the end of application, but as the party expressed in the promise, which is sealed, then I say, If you can prove that the universal Proposition doth not in sense contain the singulars, so that this singular, If thou believe thou shalt be saved, be not in Moral Law sense contained in this universal, All that believe shall be saved, (the Law supposing them all to be men and sinners) then I will prove, that God doth not properly seal to the singulars; But till then I suspend.

§ 68.

Mr. Bl. Mr. Baxter says, The great question is, whether they seal to the conclusion, as they do to the major Proposition? To which be answers, No, directly and properly it doth not. If the Proposition seems directly to prove the conclusion, then that which directly confirms any Proposition in a rightly formed Syllogism, confirms the Conclusion. If the Conclusion be not sealed, then no Proposition is sealed, or else the Syllogism is ill-framed.

§ 68.

R. B. This is too new Doctrine to be received without one word of proof. Doth he that sealeth the major of this following Syllogism, seal the Conclusion? All that truly receive Christ, are the Sons of God, and shall be saved. Judas did truly receive Christ; therefore Judas was the Son of God, and shall be saved. I think both Premises must be true, before the Conclusion will thence be proved true. And it is not sealed by God, when it is false.

§ 69.

Mr. Bl. Reasons are given. This Conclusion is nowhere written in Scripture, and therefore is not properly the object of Faith; whereas the seals are for the confirmation of our Faith; To which I say, It is written Virtuously, though not expressly. That I shall rise in Judgement is nowhere written, yet it is of Faith that I shall rise; and when I have concluded Faith in my heart, as well as Reason in my Soul, knowing myself to be a Believer as I know myself to be a man, I may as well conclude that I shall rise to Life, as that I shall rise to Judgement.

§ 69.

R. B. 1. When you oppose Virtuously to Expressly, you seem by Virtuously to mean in sense, though not in terms. If so, then your Syllogism is tautological. But take it in what sense you will in any propriety, and I deny that it is Virtually written in Scripture, that you or I do Believe, or yet that you or I are Justified and shall be saved. Yet I confess that some Conclusions may be said to be Interpretative vel secundum loquentiae moralem in Scripture, when but one of the premises is there;
there: but that is when the other is presupposed as being as certain: but of this
more anon, where you speak of this subject more largely.

2. To your instance, I say, it is by Faith and natural knowledge mixt that you
conclude you shall rise again. The Conclusion partakeeth of both Premises,
as to the ground of its certainty. That it doth sequitur, is a right gathered Conclu-
sion, is known only by Reason, and not by Faith: that it is true, is known
partly by Reason, and partly by Faith, when the Premises belong to both. Yet
though in strict sense, it be thus mixt, in our ordinary discourse we must
ominate it from one of the Premises, and usuall from the more notable, al-
ways from the more Debile. Scripture faith, All men shall rise; Reason faith,
you are a man. Though the Conclusion here partake of both, yet it is most
fitly said to be de fide, both because Scripture intended each particular man,
in the Universal; and because it is supposed as known to all, that they are men;
and therefore the other part is that resolveth the doubt, and is the notable and
more debile part.

Its I know undoubted with you, that conclusio sequitur partem debiliorem. Now
though Gods Word in it self is most infallible, yet in respect of the evidence to
us, it is generally acknowledged that it is far short of natural principles, and ob-
jects of sense, in so much that men have taken it for granted, that the objects of
faith are not evident (of which I will not now stand to speake what I think, but touch
it anon). Therefore it being more evident that you are a man, then it is that all
men shall rise, it is fittest to say the Conclusion is de fide as the more debile part. But can
we say so of the present Conclusion in question? Have you a fuller evidence that
you are a sincere Believer, then you have that, All sincere Believers are Justi-
fied? I have not for my part: But it seems by your following words that you have,
or suppose others to have, to which I say 3. If you have as evidently con-
cluded that Faith is in your heart, (saving Faith) as that Reason is in your Soul,
& know your self to be a Believer as evidently as you know your self to be a man,
then your Conclusion may be denominated to be de fide, as a parte debiliore. But
if this be not your case, it is most fit (for all the mixt interest of the Premises)
to say that it is not de fide, but from the knowledge of your sincerity in the
Faith, as a parte debiliore. And if it be your case indeed, you are the happiest man
that ever I yet speake with. But I know that no man ordinarily can have such
evidence of his sincerity; yet because I will not speake of you or others by my
self, nor judge others hearts to be as bad as my own, or as all those that I have
conversed with, we will if you please thus comprimize the difference: All those
whose evidence of sincerity is as clear as the evidence of their Reason and man-
hood, yea or more then Scripture evidence, so that Gods Testimony is pars de-
biliore in the Syllogism; these shall take the Conclusion, that they are Justified,
to be de fide; and all the rest shall take the Conclusion to be not de fide, but from
the knowledge of themselves: and then let the issue there whether more will be
of your mind or of mine. I think this a fair Agreement.

§. 70.

Mr. Bl. Otherwise (faith he) every man rightly Receiving the Seals, must
needs certainly be Justified and saved. I see no danger in yielding
this Conclusion; every man rightly receiving and improving the Seals, must be saved and
and justified. He that rightly receives the seals, receives Christ in the seals, and receiving Christ, he receives salvation. So be that rightly hears. Hear and your souls shall live. Isa. 55. So be that rightly prays. Whosoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved. Rom. 10.

§. 70.

R. B. I. B Y Rightly, I mean t, having Right to it, and that only in suo Ecclesia, and not Re&î. But I confess I should have plainly express my meaning. 2. Whether you here contradict not your Doctrine of Baptismal Faith, where you suppose Justifying Faith to be the thing promised by us in Baptism, and therefore not prerequisite in it, I leave you to judge, and resolve as by your explication.

§. 71.

Mr. Bl. A nd no man can groundedly administer the Sacrament to any but himself, because he can be certain of no man's justification and salvation. Upon the same terms that he knows any man may be saved, upon the same he may give him the Sacrament sealing this salvation. This argument as we heard before, is Bellarmines, and concludes indeed against Absolute seals in the Sacrament, but not against Conditional sealing, as is confessed by Protestant Divines.

§. 71.

R. B. I. I know it not to be true of any man that he shall be saved: therefore I may not seal it to any, by your Concession. God Seals to no falsity; I know not whether it be true or false that A. B. shall be saved. Yet it is on some of the Opposer's principles that I now argue.

2. I desire you not to answer it as Bellarmines argument, but as mine, seeing you choose me to deal with. 3. The Argument makes as much against my asserting the Truth of your Conclusion, as the sealing it: so that let your sealing be Conditional or none at all, I may not so much as affirm to any man whose heart I know not, the Conclusion which you say I must seal. The Conclusion is Absolute, Thou A. B. art Justified and shalt be saved; though the Major Proposition, or Universal Grant be conditional. Now if you will Seal this Absolute Conclusion conditionally, then 1. you will sin in the bare affirming it a true Conclusion, before you seal it, if you go but so far. 2. What is the Condition that you mean? I suppose true Faith. But if so, then where there is not true Faith, there you do not Actually seal: For a Conditional sealing, is not Actual sealing till the condition be performed; for the condition not performed suspends the act. And then you have mistaken in thinking that the Covenant is sealed actually to the unregenerate or ungodly. But if you mean any thing short of true Faith, how can you on that condition seal to any man, that he is Justified, and shall be saved. I do therefore rather choose to say, If thou believe thou shalt be
Mr. Baxter adds, I am sorry to see what advantage many of our most learned Divines have given the Papists here, as one error draws on many, and leadeth a man into a Labyrinth of Absurdities; being first mistaken in the nature of Justifying Faith, thinking it consists in a belief of the pardon of my own sins (which is the Conclusion) have therefore thought that this is it which the Sacrament sealeth. And when the Papists allledge that it is nowhere written, that such or such a man is justified; we answer them that it being written, that He that believeth is justified, this is equivalent. But Mr. Baxter doublets knows that many Divines who are out of that error concerning the nature of Justifying Faith, and have learned to distinguish between Faith in the Essence of it and Assurance; yet are confidently perswaded that the Sacrament seals this Conclusion, knowing that the Sacrament sealeth what the Covenant promiseth to the persons in Covenant, and upon the same terms as the Covenant doth promise it. Now the Covenant promiseth forgiveness of sins (as Mr. Baxter confesses) conditionally, and this to all in Covenant, and this the Sacrament sealeth.


§ 73.

Mr. Bl. And as it is an error to hold that to believe my sins are forgiven, is of the nature or essence of Faith, as though none did believe but those that had attained such assurance, (true Faith hath assurance in pursuit only, sometimes, and not always in possession.) So on the other hand it is a mistake to say, that it is no work of Faith. The Apostle calls it the full assurance of Faith, Heb. 10. 22, and describes Faith to be the substance of things hoped for; Faith realizes salvation which we have in hope to the Soul. A Description of Faith (faith Dr. Amesius out of a Schoolman) by one of the most eminent acts that it produceth; therefore I take this to be a good answer that is here charged with error, that when it is written, 'He that believeth is justified,' it is equivalent, as though it were such or such a man is justified, in case with assured grounds and infallible Demonstrations he can make it good to his own self that he believeth.

§ 73.

K. B. 1. If assurance be not of the nature or Essence of Faith, then it is not Faith: for nothing is Faith but what is of the nature and Essence of Faith: But according to Mr. Bl. assurance is not of the nature or Essence of Faith (for he faith, its an error to hold it); therefore according to Mr. Bl. assurance is not Faith. But I suspect by the following words, that by nature and essence, he means the minimum quod fe.

2. That which is but either Pursued or Possessed by Faith, is not Faith itself, (for nothing is the Pursuer and Pursued, the Possessor and Possessed; as to the same part: nor will Mr. Bl. I conjecture, say, that a less degree of Faith possesseth a greater) but according to Mr. Bl. assurance is but pursued or possessed by Faith; therefore is not Faith.

3. I know none that denyeth Assurance to be a Work of Faith, which Mr. Bl. here faith is a mistake to say, Love and Obedience are wroths of Faith, but not Faith itself.

4. I must have better proof before I can believe that it is Assurance of our own sincerity, or actual justification, which the Apostle calls the full assurance of Faith, Heb. 10. 22. Though how far this may concur, I now enquire not.

5. And as hardly can I discern assurance of our sincerity, in the description of Faith, Heb. 11. 1. Unless you mean that hope is part of Faith, and assurance the same with hope; both which need more proof. Hope may be without assurance: and when it is joyned with it, yet it is not the same thing. Only such assurance is a singular help to the exercise of Hope.

6. Its true that Faith may be said, as you speak, to realize salvation to the Soul; that is, when the Soul doubteth whether there be indeed such a Glory and
and Salvation to be expected and enjoyed by Believers, as Christ hath promised; where Faith apprehendeth it as Real or Certain, and so resolves the doubt. But when the doubt is only whether I be a true Believer, Faith resolves it not: and when the doubt is, whether this certain Glory and Salvation shall be mine, Faith only cooperateth to the resolve of it, by affording us one of the Propositions; but not both, and not wholly the Conclusion.

7. I am of Dr. Ames minde that it is one of Faiths most eminent acts, by which it is there described: But so think not they that tell us that is none of the Instrumental Justifying act which is there described.

8. This which you took to be a good answer, is that great mistake which hath so hardned the Papists against us; and were it not for this point, I should not have desired much to have said any thing to you of the rest, (about Conditional sealing) as being confident that we mean the same thing in the main.

9. You forsake them that use to give this answer, when you confine it to those only that with assured grounds and infallible demonstrations can make it good to themselves that they Believe, i.e. savingly. I doubt that answer then will hold but to very few, if you mean by Assured grounds, &c., such as they are actually assured and demonstrative.

10. Demonstrations may be infallible, and yet not known to be such to the person: but I suppose that by the word Demonstration, you intend that the partie deters it to be an infallible Demonstration: which sure intimates a very high kind of certainty.

11. Yet even in that case, I deny that the general Premise, in the major, is equivalent to the Conclusion, I am Justified and shall be saved: though I should acknowledge that the Conclusion may be said to be de fide, in that the Major hath the predominant Interest in the Conclusion, if so be that the man have better evidence of his sinceritie, then of the Truth of the Promise.

§. 74.

Mr. Bl. But this is said to be a gross mistake, and thus proved, as though the Major Proposition alone were equivalent to the Conclusion: But here being in our Syllogism, both a Major and a Minor, there is added further, or as if the Conclusion must or can be meery Credenda, a proper object of Faith, when but one of the Propositions is of Faith, the other of sense and knowledge: Here the Major is confessed to be of Faith; but the Minor, I sincerely Believe, is affirmed to be known by inward sense and self-reflexion. Here I must enter my dissent, that a Conclusion may be Credenda, an object of Faith, when but one of the Propositions is of Faith, and the other of sense and knowledge: yea that it will hold in matters of Faith both fundamental and superstitious.

§. 74.

R. B. 1. It was not this according to your limitations that was said to be a gross mistake; but as applied to ordinary Believers, though my reasons make against both.
2. You deal more easily to your self, then fairly with me, in your entred Diff- 
fent. 1. I said meerly Credenda, as confessing there is partly of Faith, and partly of 
knowledge, as the Premises are: and you leave out meerly, and put in Credenda 
alone, as if I denied it to participate of Faith. 2. I denied it thereforse to be a 
proper object of Faith; that is, a meer Credendum or Divine Testimony; acknowledge-
ing that it may be participative and partially, and not properly called an Ob-
ject of Faith; and you leave out properly, and only affirm it an Object of Faith, 
of what sort soever, in general.

3. I have answered this sufficiently, in telling you my opinion: i. e. The 
Conclusion still partakes of the nature of both Premises: and therefore when 
one is de fide, and the other naturaliter revelatum vel cognitum, there the Con-
clusion, is not purely either supernatural or natural, de fide, or ex cognitione natu-
ralis: but mixt of both. That its truly a Conclusion, following those Premises, 
is known only by Rational discourse, and is not de fide: but that it is a true Prop-
osition, is known partly naturally, partly by supernatural Revelation (which is 
that we mean, when we say it is de fide). But because it is fittest in our common 
speech to give this Conclusion a simple and not a compound Denomination (for 
brevity sake) therefore we may well denominate it from one of the Propositions, 
and that must always be a parte debile: And therefore when it is principia 
naturaliter not that make one proposition or sensible things, or what ever that is 
more evident then the truth of the Proposition which is of Divine Testimony, 
there it is fittest to say, The Conclusion is de fide, or of supernatural Revela-
tion; As when the one Proposition is that there is a God, or I am a man, or God is 
Great, or Good, or True. But when the other Proposition is less evident then that 
which is of Divine Revelation, then it is fittest to say, that the Conclusion is 
such as that Proposition is, and not properly de fide. For the Conclusion being 
the joint issue of both Premises as its parents or true Causes, it cannot be more 
noble then the more ignoble of them. This explication of my opinion is it that 
I refer you to as the substance of my answer to all that follows.

§ 75.

Mr. Bl. When Fisher the Jesuite told Dr. Featley that it was solid Divinity, that 
a conclusion de fide must necessarily be inferred one of two Propositions 
de fide, Dr. Goad (being present as Dr. Featley's Assistant) interpos'd in these 
words, I will maintain the contrary against you or any other: That a Conclu-
sion may be de fide, although both Propositions be not de fide, but one of them otherwise evidently and infallibly true by the light of 
Reason or experience; giving instance in this Conclusion, Chriftus eft risibilis, which 
he said and truly, was de fide, though both Propositions whence it is inferred be not de 
fide. Omnis homo eft risibilis, is not a Proposition de fide, or supernaturally re-
vealed in Scripture; yet thence the Conclusion follows in this Syllogism. Omnis homo 
eft risibilis: Chriftus eft homo: therefore Chriftus eft risibilis, which is a Con-
clusion de fide, affirming that Melchior Canus had judiciously handled and proved this 
tenant, which he said he could otherwise demonstrate to be infallible: To whom Dr. Feat-
ley assents, second Dares dispute, pag. 85. It were safe to frame many such Syllogisms. 
If an Heretick should affirm that Chrift had only a phantastick body in appearance only, 
how would you prove the contrary but with this Syllogism. He that is truly man, hath 
a true body, and not a phantastick body only. This is a Position in reason, Christ 
is
is truly a man: this is a Position de fide in Scripture, whence follows the Conclusion de fide, that Christ hath not a phantastick body; If one should deny that Christ had a reasonable soul, affirming that his body was informed by the Divine instead of a Soul, must it not be thus proved? Every true man hath a reasonable Soul: Christ is a true man, and therefore Christ hath a reasonable Soul. The Citie that ruleth over the Nations of the earth, and is seated on seven hills, is the seat of the Beast. This is a Scripture Proposition: But that Rome then ruled over the Nations of the Earth, and was seated on 7 hills, we know by History and Geography: whence the Conclusion follows, that Rome is the seat of the Beast. Abundance of these may be framed, where the Proposition opposite to the Conclusion, is either an Heretick, or at least an error in Faith. The Conclusion is of Faith Disputing against the Unitarians and Transubstantiantion; to hold up the Orthodox Faith, we are necessitated to make use of maximes of known reason. If they were denied us, the new Crew now start up, that deny all consequences from Scripture, and will have none but Scripture words, had here a notable advantage. This Argument well followed, would put Mr. Baxter himself to a great loss in some of his Arguments (for which yet I give him thanks) to prove that the Scripture is the word of God.

§ 75.

R. B. This is fully answered before, even in my last Section. 1. Dr. Good faith but the same that I say: only I distinguish 2. Between that which is purely de fide, and that which is only denominat'd de fide as the more debile of the Premises. In the latter sense the Doctors conclusions are de fide, in the former not. 2. When a Conclusion is denied to be de fide, it may be meant either as a Diminution of its evidence, or as magnifying its evidence above that which is purely de fide, or as equaling it thereto. When I say this Conclusion is not de fide, A. B. is Justified and shall be saved, I speak it by way of Diminution of its evidence and authority. And I confidently speak it, and doubt not to maintain it. But when I deny this Conclusion to be simply or purely de fide, I R. B. shall rise again, I distinguish nothing of the evidence or necessity of it. And when I thus argue, Omne quod sentit & rationinn: eft Animal. Ego R. B. sentio & rationinn: therefore ego sum Animal; though I say that here the Conclusion is not de fide, yet I intend thereby to extoll it for evidence above that which is de fide. And when I affirm this Conclusion to be de fide, I R. B. shall rise again, as denominated à parte debilitare, I do speak it in Diminution of its evidence, in comparison of that which is more evident in nature: The Premisses are these, All men shall rise again: I am a man; therefore I shall rise again (supposing we speak of men that dye). If the Major which is de fide, were as evident as the Minor, which is not, the Conclusion would be more evident then it is: and if neither were de fide, but both known naturally as the Minor is, the Conclusion would not be de fide, but would be more evident. This I speak that you may not think that I deny the Certainty, Evidence or Necessity of every Conclusion, which I deny to be de fide, either purely, or by prevalent participator. 3. For the Papists, though oftentimes they take the term de fide, as you and I do, for that which is by supernatural Revelation Divine, yet sometimes they take it for any point which is necessary to salvation to be held, without respect to the Supernaturality of the Revelation. How Fisher used it, I know not.

G g 3

4. I
4. I think your Conclusion, that Christ hath a true body, is purely de fide, and may be proved by mere Scripture Testimony, without your medium.

5. The advantage that you say the new Crew would have upon denial of the use of Maximes of known reason, I know not who gives them (except Veronis and his followers, against whom its long since I read and confuted to Vedeus in the main). But once again, and once for all, let me tell you, that if the other of your Premises be less evident or proveable than the very Word of God, and be more to be doubted of, then your Conclusion is not de fide. For nothing that is truly de fide, is less evident than the truth of Gods Word, and that part of the word in particular. But yet though in such a case we tell them that the Conclusion is not de fide, yet it follows not that it is untrue, yea or not evident: nor do we therefore deny the use of Reasoning from mediums of lower evidence then Scripture; much less of clearer evidence. But many consequences may be true, and yet not de fide when one of the Premises is de fide.

Note also for the understanding of what I have said concerning the evidence of the objects of Faith, that whereas we do usually so compare Science, Opinion and Divine Faith, as to conclude that Science is an assent both firme, certain and evident; Divine Faith is an assent, firme and certain, but not evident; Opinion is sometime firme, but never certain or evident; I do not speak in the language of these Divines and Philosophers, when I ascribe an Evidence to Divine Faith: But then you must understand that the difference is not (as I conceive) de ve, but de nomine; For I take not the term evident, in so restrained a sense as they do: As to instance in Rob. Baronius (that second Camera) who faith, Assensus evidens est sum quis per se, hoc est, qui sus sensus aut rationem, absque alterius informatione & testificatione per eum computationem, eum affinitur, esse veram: and he makes that an invident Assent, sum quis Assentit propotionem, non quod sensus, aut solida ratio cam veram esse demonstrat: sed vel quod levis & ineffecta ratio illud suadet, vel quod aliquis testetur cam esse veram; Philos. Theol. an. p. 148. But I think the term evident, is here too much restrained; and that with great inconvenience, and some wrong to the Christian Faith. I take that to be properly evident, which is to the understanding truly Apparent, or Descernable; which hath divers degrees: And the Negative addition (that it must be absque alterius testificatione) is not only superficial, but unsound; And may appear even from the Authors words; 1, where he opponeth these two, in describing invident Assent; non quod sensus aut solida Ratio cam veram esse demonstrat, and sed quod alias testetur cam esse veram. Where he grants that whatsoever solid reason demonstrateth to be true, that is evident. Now I say, that he should not have oppossed all Testimony to this. For solid reason doth demonstrate Gods Testimony to be true, and this to be his Testimony. 2. He ascribeth Certainty to Divine Faith, which he describeth to be an Assent, qui nimitur certo alicju aut solido fundamento, non vero levi aut fallaci racione; and he notes, that ad certitudinem assensus requiri, ut fundamentum quo mens nimitur dum assensum praebet; non solum ut sit in se certum, sed etiam ut attinenti tale videant; nisi enim ulla sciat rationem quae nimitur esse certam, ejus assensus nullo modo evit certus & solida. Now he confesseth that the object of Science must be evident; and here he faith, nisi sciat rationem esse certam. If he must have certitudinem, then he must have evidenciam, if all objects of Science are evident. And what is it to know, but to discern or understand a discernable, cognoscite, or evident object? How then can we (cive certitudinem, nisi sciendo alicquam certitudinis Evidentiam) I conceive therefore
therefore that it is true proper evidence which is allowed to Divine Faith, under this name of Certainty, even by them that say it is not evident: I know what a fit the School-men make about this point. The Question is not only de Evidentia fidei, but de Evidentiis Theologica also, which they distinguish from fides, as habitus primorum principiorum, & scientia Conclusionum are distinct. Though the most of the Schoolmen go the other way, yet some (as Henricus Quadbb, 12. q. 3. & Beza Archbishop, Hispalens. qu. 1. prolog. art. 3. not. 3. 4.) do affirm our Theology to have Evidence. Aquinas and his followers maintain it to be a Science; but that is, because they suppose it to be subalternate to the Science of God and the Gloryied. And therefore Aquin. 12. qu. 1. art. 5. c. denies those things to be seita que committer & simpliciter sub fide continentur, and that because omnis scientia habetur per aliqua principia per se nota, & per consequens visa. But I think that per consequens visa, will not hold without exceptions and limitations; and I suppose it to be ex principiis per se notis originally: Yet in the foregoing Article, Aquinas grants that though quae subjunt fidei Considerata in speciati non possunt esse simul visa & Credita, tantum in generali sub communivatione Credibilis fide visa sunt ab eo qui Credidit. Non enim Credet nisi evidet esse Credenda, vel propter Evidentiam signorum vel propter aliquod bujasmodi. And I easily confess that matters of so much supernatural Revelation are not in themselves evident, nor ab Evidentia ipsius vel mutt we prove it; But that we have Evidence of the Verdict of the Conclusions, by the Evidence of the great Principles and the Connection, I take yet for sound Doctrine. The Scotists in opposition to the Thomists make much a dote on the question Utrum Theologia sit Scientia: And if properly Science, it seems it must be evident. Scotus lays down four things necessary to Science strictly and properly so called; 1. Quod sit Cognitio certa, i. e. fine deceptione. 2. Quod sit de objecto necessario, & non contingente. 3. Debet esse Causa de Causa Evidenti intellectui, id est, a principis evidenter notis intellectu, by which he faith Science is distinguished from Faith which is cognitio obscura, enigmatic, & inexistent. 4. Quod bujasmodi principia seu causae ex terminis evidens intellectui debet applicari per disseri Syllogismum bonum & legitimum ad inferendam conclusionem: and so Science is defined Notitia intellectualis certa & Ev dens alius veri, necessarii, evidenter deducti ex principiis necessariis prae Evidenter notis. Yet Rada faith, the fourth of these is accidental. And I see not but we have even such a rigid strict Science of the objects of Faith. 1. It may be Notitia Intellectualis certa, as all confess. 2. And de objecto necessario. Only let me add, that when we make use of infallible Tradition de facto, in proving the soundness of our Records, that this was Contingens et priori, yet is it necessary a posteriori necessitate existentiae, and that as to the verity, though it be contingent, whether this or that particular man speak truth, yet considering but the force of objects and common natural inclinations in determining the Will, it may certainly be concluded that as to a whole Nation, or World, some voluntary actions are so Contingent, as that yet they are of a most certainly discernible event: Even men before hand may infallibly know that they will come to pass; (supposing the world to continue Rational;) As that all this Nation, or all Europe will not famish themselves willfully, and will not hang themselves, &c. is a thing that may as certainly be foreknown, as if it were not Contingent: much more may the Verity of such past actions be known. 3. And that it may have evident principles, shall be shown anon. 4. And then that it is discoursive, is clear. Though credere it self as it is the quieting and repose or confidence of the mind upon the authority or apprehended Veracity of the Revealer, is an effect of this discourse; seeing fiducia is not purely or chiefly, an Intellectual &gt;, nor se dem alien habere as it signifieth this repose: Yet the
the Truth received on the Speakers Trust or Credit, is received by the Intelle& in a
discoursive way.

Rada grante these Conclusions, 1. Theologia secundum se est vere & propriè scien-
tia. 2. Theologia Dei respectu corum quae sunt necessaria secundum se, est vere & propriè
scientia. 3. Theologia in beatis est propriè & vere scientia quoad omnes. 4. Conditiones
scientiae. Yet this eighth Conclusion is that Theologia prout est in nobis viatoribus non
est propriè & fictiæ scientia. And the great Argument to prove it, prout est in nobis
est invidens quia principia notit. Theologice sunt tantum Credita, so that all the weight is
laid on this invidence. Briefly, my reasons for the Evidence of the Object of Divine Faith, are these. 1. If it be evident that Deus est Verax, & Deus haec testatur, that God is true of his Word, and that this is his Word or Revelation, then Faith
has evident principles. But the Antecedent is true; therefore, Into these principles we
relieve all points of Faith: Whatevery God witnesseth is true; but the Doctrine of
the Resurrection, judgment, &c. God witnesseth or revealeth; therefore ; That God
is true, we have the same Evidence as that he is perfectly good, and that is, that he is
God; and that there is a God, I take to be as evident a Truth as any. In Nature to
Reason, though God himself be so far above our comprehension. That this is a Divine
Revelation, hath also its Evidence, in evident miracles sealing it to the first wit-
nesses; and in Evidently Infallible Tradition delivering down to us the Records
with the seals. I doubt not to affirm that some humane Testimony affordeth such a
Certainty as is unquestionable, because of the Evidence of that Certainty: as that
King James was King of England, &c. and of the matter in question we have as
great, and in it felt far greater. But of this elsewhere. 2. If Divine Faith give us a
Certainty without objective Evidence, then it is miraculous or contrary to nature,
or at least above it (not only as rectifying disabled nature, which I grant, but) as
moving man not as man, or the Intelle& not as an Intelle& which knows naturally
no other Axiom but upon fit objects, and what is wrought by them: It knoweth
no apprehension of truth, but as it is apparent or evidenced truth. To understand this
Axiom to be true, All men shall be judge, and to see no Evidence of its truth, are
contradictions. 3. As left it cannot be concluded in general, that the objects of
Faith are not evident to any, in that they were evident not only to the Prophets and
Apostles themselves, but to all the Churches in that age where they wrought their mir-
cacles. For as the formale fidei objectum, viz. Veracitas Revelantis, is evident to Na-
ture, and to all that have not lost reason; so that God himself was the Author or
Revealer, was evident to all them whose eyes and ears were witnesses of the frequent
Miracles, Languages and Gifts of the Spirit, whereby the truth was then sealed by
God. 4. That which hath no Evidence, cannot be Rationally preached to the world:
But the Doctrine of Faith may be Rationally preached to the world; therefore
Preaching hath a natural tendency to mens Conversion. It is a shewing men the Evi-
dence of Gospel Truth, and the goodness of Gospel objects, and so thereby per-
swading men to Believe the one, and Love and Accept the other. He that doth not
preach Evidentiam veritatis Evangelice, doth not preach the Gospel, in the first re-
spect, as he that preacheth not the goodness of Christ and his benefits, doth not
preach it in the other. Preaching is not like Chrisl's laying on clay and fspittle, which
hath no natural tendency to open the eyes: For the effect of Preaching, as such, is not
miraculous, no nor supernaturally otherwise then as the Doctrine preached being of
supernatural Revelation, may be laid to be a supernatural Cause, and so relatively the
effect called supernatural: though the same effect as proceeding from the Spirit which
is a Concause, or Superior Cause; may be truly called supernatural. 5. That which
may
may be discerned to be certain Truth, without special or extraordinary Grace, even by wicked men and Devils, hath some evidence which causeth this discerning or belief: But such is the Doctrine of Faith; therefore, I know some Divines to the no small wrong of the Christian Faith, say, None can really believe it, but the Regenerate. But the Jews believe the supernatural Revelations of the Old Testament, and the Divels and many a thousand wicked men believe, both old and new; experience tells us so: Christ tells us so, that many believe who fall away in perfection. James tells such men, that they do well in believing, but the Devil doth so too: else men could not reject or persecute the known Truth. To conclude it is commonly said that infused Habits, insinuuntur ad medium acquisitorum; and therefore the habit of Faith in the Intellect must be caused by an Impref of evidence: Though the Spirits supernatural act be moreover necessary, yet that makes not other causes unnecessary.

Rada, who concludes, that Theologia nostri non est evidens, gives but these two poor reasons (and I should as soon look for strong ones from him, as almost any man of his Religion or party) 1. Principia Conclusionum nostrae Theologie non sunt nobis Evidentia, sed Conditia: therefore nec Conclusions, &c. I deny the Antecedent, which he proves not; Veracitas Divina est formule objectum fidei, and that is evident, so is the Revelation, as is said. 2. He faith, Si conclusiones nostrae Theologiae essent Evidentes, postemus convincere Infidiles, ut sitem nostrum sufcipere, quia Evidentia concissa Intellectum. I answer, 1. The greatest Evidence supposeth other necessary concurrents for conviction, as a Will to understand, and divers other things which the wicked want. As it is not for want of evidence of present Objects, but for want of good eyes that a blinde man feethe not; so it is here. 2. Many Infidels do believe without special Grace: though not so deeply and clearly as to prevail with their Wills for a through conversion; yea the Divels themselves believe. And whereas he adds Pauls words, 2 Cor. 5. We walk by Faith, not by sight; it speaks not of Rational Evidence, but of sensitive, and that we confess is wanting. Faith is the Evidence of things not seen, Heb. 11. 1. Were it not for digressing too far, I would examine the 9. Q. Ab. Mater. 14. de fide de Aquinas de Veritate, and shew how ill he answers the nine Arguments, which he undertakes to answer, and how weak his own Arguments are for the proving that fides non potest esse de rebus seitis. And I should shew that Faith is a kind of Science; or if we will distinguish it from Science, it must not be so widely as is usual, nor upon the reason that it wanteth Evidence. But I suppose he that will impartially read Aquinas ubi sup. will without any help see the weakness of his answers, and how he seemed to stagger himself.

Yet let me add this caution or two; 1. I do not mean that every man who hath true Faith, doth discern the great and chiefest Evidence of the Truth of the Doctrine of Faith. 2. Where there is the same Evidence in the thing, there may be such different apprehensions of it, through the divinity of Intellectual capacities and preparations, as that one may have a firm Belief, and certain, and another but a probable opinion, and another none at all. 3. Though I take the Evidence of the Doctrine of Faith to be as full as I have mentioned, yet not so obvious and easily discerned as sensible evidence; and therefore (as one cause) there are fewer believe. 4. Also the distance of the objects of Faith makes them work less on the affections, and the presence and other advantages of Sensual Objects for a facile moving the Spirits, makes them carry men away so potently, by making greater Commotions in the passions; so that no won-
der if sense do prevail with most. I confess also that men have need of good acquaintance with Antiquity and other History, and the Seal of the Church in most parts of the world, to see the strong Evidence that there is of the Infallible Tradition of the Scriptures down to us: and to some obscure men, this may be invident; as it may be to one brought up in a secret Cloister, whether ever we had a King or Parliament or Laws in England. But the thing is not therefore invident to the industrious; No though it depend on that verity of Report, which as proceeding from each particular person is contingent; seeing there is Evidence of Infallible Verity even in the Circumstances of these Contingent reports. And as Rada, when he concludes boldly that cognitio Dei est secretum contingentium non est proprieta scientiæ, &c., yet seems to grant that God may have Contingentia ut necessaria, &c. non ut Contingentia: so it may be said in our present Case; the same Reports which are Contingent, are yet in other respects of Evident Verity, and so we know them.

But I judge I have been drawn beyond my intent to digest far on this point: but it is because it tends to clear the main point in question. To return therefore to Mr. Blake, I do not know the meaning of his next words, where he saith, that This Argument well followed, would put me to a great loss in some of my Arguments for Scripture, &c. Doth he think that I argue to prove the Divinity of Scriptures, from themselves alone as the Testifier thereof to our Faith? or that, I take it to be merely or primarily de fide, that Scripture is Gods Revelation? when I have professedly published the contrary, before those Arguments? where I have also added those words of Mr. Rich. Hooker, wherewith I will conclude this Section. Truly it is not a thing impossible, nor greatly hard, even by such kinds of proofs so to manifest and clear that point, that no man living shall be able to deny it, without denying some apparent principles, such as all men acknowledge to be true. Again, Scripture teacheth us that saving Truth which God hath discovered to the world by Revelation; but it presumeth us taught otherwise, that it itself is Divine and Sacred. Again, These things we believe, knowing by Reason that Scripture is the Word of God. Again, It is not required, nor can be exacted at our hands, that we should yield it any other Assent then such as doth answer the Evidence. Again, How bold and confident forever we may be in words; when it comes to the tryal, such as the Evidence is which the Truth hath, such is the Assent; nor can it be stronger if grounded as it should be; so far Mr. Hooker cited once more; Eccles. pol. p. 102, 103, &c.

Mr. Bl. To winde up all, though there be some difference in the way between me and my learned friend, yet there is little in the thing itself. Mr. Baxter saith that the Proposition to which God sealeth, runs thus, If thou believe, I do pardon thee and will have thee. The soul must assume the Minor. But I believe; from whence the Conclusion will follow, I shall be pardoned and saved. And I infer, the Major being sealed, the Conclusion that rightly issues out of it, having its strength from it, is sealed likewise; sealed to him that can make good that Assumption, But I believe, and upon these terms that he be a believer.

S. 76.
§ 76.

R. B. 1. The difference is so small that were it not for some scattered passages, I should scarce have replied to you. 2. All the quarrel arises from the divers understanding of the term sealed. I suppose that you include the confirmitv of the Receiver, and the conferring of Right to the Benefit, both which I have said are done Conditionally, as being to follow the Delivery and Reception; whereas I take it for the Testamentum secundarium, or that Obligation whereby the Instrument is owned; the following effects belonging to it in a further respect. I ever granted that by the sealing of the Conditional Promise, the Believer hath a singular help to raise the Conclusion, and be confirmed in it; but not a help sufficient, without the discerning of his own Faith, which is the Assumption. So that if you will, participaliter and consequentie, the Conclusion may be said to be sealed to him that hath the Condition (whether he see it, or not). But totaliter & directe only the Conditional grant is sealed.

3. The Conclusion issues from, and hath its strength from both Premises jointly; and no more from one alone, then if it were none at all; and therefore where only one of the Premises is sealed, and the other unsealed, there the Conclusion can be but as I said, participaliter & consequentie sealed; And though I grant thus much to you for reconciliation, yet I conceive it unfit to say at all, as in proper speech, that the Conclusion is sealed: which I make good by this Argument, Conclusion sequitur partem debiliorum, vel deteriorum. At Propositio non obsoletata est pars debilior vel deterior: therefore conclusion sequitur Propositionem non obsoletam.

And so it is on the same grounds to be denominated, not sealed; as a Conclusion is to be denominated Contingent, when one of the Premises is Contingent and the other Necessary; or to be Negative, when one of the Premises is Negative and the other Affirmative; or to be Particular, when one of the Premises is Particular and the other Universal; And therefore I still say, that it is fittest for you and me to say, that this Conclusion, Thou A. B. art Justified, and hast Right to Salvation, is an unsealed Conclusion: till you can prove the Minor sealed, Thou A. B. art a sincere Believer. For my part, I know not what objection can be made against either part of the fore-recited Argument, (the major being a Common Canon or Rule that holds in all Figures, and the Minor being yielded by your self) else I would answer to it.

§ 77.

Mr. Bl. R. Baxter's fourth and fifth Positions in the closing up of his Discourse should be considered. The Sacrament sealeth to God's part of the Conditional Covenant, and sealeth this Conditional Promise, not Conditionally but absolutely, as of an undoubted Truth. To which an ease answer may be given, in order to a fair Reconciliation. When the Covenant eyes to the condition, and the Sacraments seal upon the same terms that the Covenant eyes, the seal is properly Conditional, in case there is any such thing in the world as a Conditional seal. Neither is this Conditional Promise any absolute undoubted Truth, but upon supposition of the Condition put, and so both Promise and Seal absolutely bind.
never heard of, nor knew a Conditional sealing in the world; though I have oft heard of the effects of Obligation and Collation of Right to be Conditional, which are not only separable from the Terminus proximus of sealing, but also are directly the effects of the Covenant, Promise, Testament, &c. only, and but remotely of the Seals, inasmuch as that Seal is a full owning of the Instrument of Conveyance. Yet such a thing as a Conditional sealing may be imagined, seeing sealing is a Moral Civil action, and so dependeth quoad formam on the will of the Agent after the matter is put; the Agent may if he please put the matter now, and introduce the form upon a future Condition (or a present, or a past) as if he should set the wax and material seal to a Deed of Gift, with this addition, I hereby seal to this; or own it as my deed, if such a man be now living in France; or if such a Ship be safe arrived: or if such a man shall do such a thing; otherwise this shall be no seal. But such exceptions or conditions being always added to the Instrument or Principal obligation or conveyance, and being of no use as to the seals only, I never heard of such, nor I think ever shall do. For if all these or any of these Conditions be in the Deed or Obligation, the Seal doth but confirm that Conditional Obligation, though it be absolutely and actually a Seal: and therefore doth not oblige the Author actually, but conditionally: and therefore to seign a Conditional sealing, besides the conditional Covenanting or Granting, seems very useless and vain, to say no more.

2. I confess that neither Promise nor Seal binde absolutely, till the Condition be performed (which I pray you remember hereafter, if you be tempted to think any person in Covenant with God (the mutual Covenant where both stand obliged) before they perform the Condition of the first benefits or right). But when you say that the Conditional Promise is not any absolute undoubted Truth, but upon supposal of the Condition put, you make me see still the necessity of mutual forbearance, and that all our writings must have an allowance, as it were, in respect to some inconsiderateness; and the Authors not to be charged with holding all the Doctrines which they write. I dare not say it is Mr. Blakes judgment, that Gods conditional Promises be not absolute undoubted Truth, till men perform the condition. 1. Though they are not Absolute Promises, yet they are Absolutely and not Conditionally true: Otherwhise either it must be said, that till the condition be performed, they are Actually false, and Conditionally true, or else that they are neither capable of Truth or Falshood. The former I will not dare to suppose from you; nor yet the latter. For whether you put it in this form, Whoever will believe, shall be Justified: or in this, If thou wilt believe, thou shalt be Justified: there is no question that both must be either true or false; and not like an Interrogation that is capable of neither.

2. And then as it is an Absolute Truth, so it is an undoubted Truth: For Veracitas Divina est forma object num fidei: and if Gods Truth be not undoubted, then our Faith hath an uncertain Foundation, and Christianity is not undoubtedby a true Religion: But I charge none of these on you, as not doubting but it is an oversight.
When Caleb had engaged himself, he that smiteth Kiriath-Sepher and taketh it, to him will I give Achsah my daughter to wife; Othniel the son of Kenaz taking it, there was an absolute eye upon him for performance, Josh. 15, 16, 17. When Saul promised his Daughter to David on this condition, that he would bring him an hundred of the foreskins of the Philistines, 1 Sam. 18. 25, David having made it good with advantage, now there is an absolute eye upon him.

This is nothing but what is granted. I yield that God is not as it were obliged till men perform the condition. But the question is whether he absolutely sealeth before, and not whether that seal oblige before.

Even the Arminians Conditional incomprehensive Election, upon condition of faith and perseverance, they confess is absolute and compleat, upon supposal of faith and perseverance. This I take to be Mr. Baxters meaning, that upon supposal of faith it absolutely sealeth, which I willingly grant; but it is administered to many who never put in that condition, nor come up to the terms of God, that believing they may be saved, and so in our sense it sealeth conditionally.

Have better expressed my own meaning. It is pity that the Reader should be troubled with so much, about so low a question; which of us two doth best express our meaning? but that I hope he may gather some things more useful on the by. In your sense, if it be according to your terms, God doth not actually seal at all to any but the Godly, which is my maine Argument against you. A Conditional seal, is not a seal till the Condition be performed.

And I can make nothing else of Mr. Tombes his Aptitudinal and Actual seal, but that the Sacrament hath an Aptitude to seal in an Absolute way to all that communicate: it doth Actually seal to Believers and Penitent ones.
§ 80.

Mr. Bl. Neither let any thing that here I seek a starting hole to recede from any thing that heretofore I have published on this subject. In my answer to Mr. Tombes, pag. 99. I explain my self no otherwise, having quoted Dr. Ames and Mr. Rutherford, in the words now recited, I there add, The Conditional Seal of the Sacraments is made Absolute, by our putting in the Condition of believing, &c.; I cast my answer had been in Mr. Baxters hand, when his Appendix came out, as he saies it was not, that he might have seen how I explained my self: I suppose he would have seen that in the result of the whole, I little differ from him, so that I can scarce see, that when the matter is brought home, that I have any adversary.

§ 81.

It is so rare a thing for men to manifeft so much ingenuity and self denial and impartial love to the Truth, as freely to recant what they have once assevered when they finde it a mistaake, that if this had been your case, I would not have been one that should have blamed you for it, or charged you with unconstancy or levity. To err, is common to all men; but freely to recant it, is not so. I never write, but with a supposition that I shall manifeft the weaknes of my Intellecf, and do that which needs reformation. 2. I did not so much as pretend you to be my Adversary; I did defend you, and not argue against you; and therefore you have little need to perswade me to have lower thoughts of our differences then I did express, or that you and I were no adversaries.

But though I make light of our seeming difference about sealing, I must intreat you to remember, that I not only maintain my former Affertion, that the Conclusion, A. B. am Justified, is not de fide, but that I account it a matter of far greater moment.

It hath been too common Doctrine among the most renowned Divines, that it is not only de fide, but every mans duty also, yea a part of the Creed, and so a fundamental, for to Believe that our sins are remitted, (for so they expound the Article of Remission of sins). I will not name the Authors, because I honor them,
them, and would not seem to disparage them; and the Learned know them already: yea they earnestly press men to believe the pardon of their own sins in particular, and tell them that they have but the Faith of Devils else. By which dangerous Doctrine, 1. most men are persuaded to believe a falsehood: for most are not forgiven. 2. The careless world is driven on faster to presumption, to which they are so prone of themselves. 3. Painful Ministers are hindered, and their labors frustrated, whose business is first to break men's false hopes and peace; which they find so hard a work, that they need not resistance. The ungodly that I deal with, are so confident that their sin is forgiven, and God will not damn them for it, that all that I can say is too little to shake their confidence, which is the nefte of their sin. 4. Gods word, yea the Articles of our Creed, must be abused to do Satan this service, and men's Souls this wrong. All the world cannot finde so strong a prop to the Kingdom of the Devil, nor so powerful an encouragement to presumption or any sin, as mistaken Scripture (either misinterpreted or misapplied). 5. When wicked men, that have but the Faith of Devils, are immediately required to believe the pardon of their own particular sins, and this made to be de fide, God is dishonored with the charge of such untruths, as if falsehoods were de fide, and God commanded men to believe them.

And for the Godly themselves, it hath in a lower degree many of the same inconveniences. If there be any one that hath as good Evidence of his soundness in Faith, Love and Repentance, as that the Word of God is true, and all sound Believers are justified; what is such a man to many a thousand that have no such Evidence? yea and for that man, it is impossible that his Evidence should be as constant, as Scripture Evidence, though it were as full. Scripture Evidence varieth not, as the Evidence of Grace doth in our mutable unconstant Souls; But for my part I never yet saw the face of that sober man (to my knowledge) who durst say, That he was as sure or as confident of his own sincerity, as of the Truth of Gods Word, and particularly of that Promise, He that believeth shall not perish, but have Everlasting life. And as I have oft said already, The Conclusion may not be said to be de fide, unless the other Proposition be as evident as that which is de fide: because conclusio sequitur partem deterioram. Yea let me be bold to grow a little higher, and to tell you that it seems to me impossible and a contradiction that any man should be more certain that he believeth sincerely, then he is that Gods Word is true, or that the Promise is Gods Word, which he doth Believe. For the truth of God in his Word, is the formal object of Faith, without which there can be no Faith. No man therefore can be more certain that he believes truly, then he is that Gods Word is true: For to Believe, is to apprehend the certain Truth of the Word. And none can be more certain that he apprehends the word as certain, then he is that the word is certain. If you say, I am certain that I believe the certainty of the word, but weakly: I answer, At least then the saving sincerity of your Faith will be as uncertain to you, as the word is, if not the being of that Faith. And then there is no more certainty, I think, rationally and ordinarily, than there is Evidence.

So much for that Controversie, and so of all, so far as I have observed, which Mr. Blake hath with me; or hath called me to give an account of my Judgment.

whether
Whether the Covenant of Grace require perfection, and accept sincerity.

Though I have done with what Mr. Blake saith to me, and have no desire to do any thing unnecessary in a way of Controversie: yet because it is of the like nature with a subject formerly handled, or tends to clear up some things about it, I will very briefly touch on his Arguments, pag. 107, 108, upon this Question.

§ 82.

Mr. Bl. A Second opinion is, that the Covenant of Grace requires perfection in the exactest way, without help of these mens distinctions, in an equal degree with the Covenant of Works, but with this difference; in the Covenant of Works, there is no indulgence or dispensation in case of failing; but the penalty takes hold, the Curse follows upon it: But the Covenant of Grace, though it call for perfection, such is the exactness of it, yet it accepts of sincerity, such is the qualification of it through Grace, or the mercy in it. If I should take up any opinion in the world for the Authors sake, or those that have appeared as Patrons of it, then I should embrace this: The Reverence deservedly due to him that I suppose first manifested himself in it, hath carried it to finde great entertainement. But upon more then twenty years thoughts about it, I finde it labouring under manifold inconveniences.

§ 82.

R. B. 1. It may seem audaciousness in a young Divine to question that which you shall now so considerately deliver, after more then twenty years thoughts. But no prejudice must hinder us from a further enquiry after the Truth.

2. I began to conjecture that the Reverend person that you mean is Mr. Ball; and yet methinks, you should not suppose him the Author: It is therefore sure some one much elder.

3. For the thing it self, if I may shoot my bolt, upon a shorter deliberation, I conceive, that all your difference with the men of that Judgement, is occasioned by the Ambiguity and various acceptance of the word Covenant of Grace, which in my judgement, you ought to have removed; by distinguishing, before you had argued against their opinion. The term Covenant of Grace, is sometime taken strictly for the Contract alone; either 1. for the full Contract, which is mutual or by both parties, which is most properly called a Covenant: Or 2. for the engagement of one part only: 1. either for God's Promise, 2. or mans. Here-in the Condition is implied, not as commanded, but as tendered. Now it is certain that taking the Covenant in this restrained sense, it doth not command Perfection of obedience, for it commands nothing at all: nor doth it propound it as the Condition, for then we were undone. But then it must be known that
that this is too restrained a sense for us ordinarily to use the word covenant in; God hath made no such Covenant with us, which is not a Law in one respect, as well as a Covenant in another: He layes not by his Soveraignty in Covenanting. Nay they are all more properly called Laws then Covenants: Even the Promise it self is most properly Lex Gratiae Remediann, Like an act of Oblivion or Pardon to a Nation of Rebels. Yet comparatively, the Law of Grace is far more justly called a Covenant then the Law of Nature (which perhaps is never so called in Scripture), because the Promissory part is the predominant part in the Law of Grace, the precept being but subservient to that; but the preceptive part is most predominant in the Law of nature; the Promiss being not so much as expressed by Moses, and obscure in nature itself, so that it will hold great dispute, whether God were obliged at all to Reward man with heavenly Glory, yea or any proper Reward (besides non-punishment which is improperly a Reward). The Lutherans are the leaders of that evil custom and conceit of denying the Gospel to be a Law. 2. In the next place therefore the word Covenant of Grace is taken for the New Law, containing Precept, Prohibition, Promise and Threatning. And here it is taken, so narrowly as to comprize only the Precept of Believing, with the Promise and Threatning annexed, as being indeed the principal parts. 2. Sometime more largely, as containing also the Precepts that Christ hath given the Church since his coming, that were not before given: Principally that of Believing Jesus to be the Christ, and also those of Ministry, Ordinances, Church-Assemblies, &c. together with the Doctrines or Articles of Faith which he since revealed. 3. Sometime it is more largely taken for that whole Systeme of Doctrines, Histories and Laws (Precepts, Promises, and Threats) which directly concern the Recovery of fallen mankind. 4. Sometime for as much of these as was delivered before Christ's coming, in Promises, Prophesies and Types, &c. 5. Sometime for as much of these as yet remains in force, whether delivered to the Church before the Incarnation or since, (for many Covenants or Evangelical Promises and Precepts, are ceased now that were in force before: as that Christ should be born, and they should accept his birth, &c.) This last sense, containeth the Doctrine of Redemption by Christ, and the History of his birth, life and Death and Resurrection (as Narrations of the occasion, end and matter are usual appurtenances of a Law) as also the Precepts of Repenting and Believing; Loving God for our Redemption, and Christ as Redeemer; Loving men as Redeemed ones, and as Members of Christ; Ministry, Sacraments, Church-Assemblies, proper to the Gospel, with the means to be used for getting, keeping or improving this Grace as such; the command of Hope, or looking for Christ's second coming, &c. and of sincere obedience. I conceive the first (as containing the summe of all) and specially this last (as containing the whole Systeme of the Doctrine and Laws of our Redemption and Restoration) are the fittest senses for us ordinarily to use the word Covenant of Grace in (vide Grotii dissertationem de nomine Dei Bene temptante Annotat, in Novum Testament.) Now if the question be whether in any of these senses the New Covenant doth command perfect obedience; I answer, All the doubt is of the 3 latter: But I rather think negatively, that in none of these Acceptions can the New Covenant be said to require perfect obedience. 6. But then some take the New Law or Covenant for the whole Law that now stands unrepealed, and obligeth the Subjects of the Mediator, supposing the Moral Law to be now the Law or Covenant of Grace, i.e. the matter of it, as it was formerly the
matter of the Law of Works: and that the Covenant of Works being totally and absolutely Abrogated, the Moral Law must be the material part of the Covenant or Law of Grace, or of none: and of some it must be: For God gives no precepts but upon some terms, or with some sanction of Reward or Punishment: And hereupon they say, that it is now the Moral Law which is the matter of the new Covenant, which commands perfect obedience. This is maintained by an acquaintance and friend of Mr. Blakes, a man of extraordinary Learning and Judgement, especially as thoroughly studied in these things as any that ever I was acquainted with. For my part, (though I think, the difference is most in notions and terms, yet) I still judge, that the Law of Works, that is, the Precepts and Threatening, are not abrogated, though the Promises of that Law be ceased, and so it is not so fitly now called a Covenant; and some particular Precepts are abrogated or ceased; and so I think it is this remaining Law of nature which Commandeth perfect obedience, and still pronounces Death, the due punishment of our disobedience. But I acknowledge even this Law of Nature to be now the Law of Christ, who as Redeemer of all mankind, hath Nature and its Law and all things else delivered unto him, to dispose of to the advantage of his Redemption ends: But still I suppose this Law of Nature to be so far from being the same with the Law of Grace, that it is this which the Law of Grace Replaces, and whose obligation it dissolves, when our sins are forgiven. So that the difference is but in the Notion of Unity or Diversity, whether (seeing all is Now the Redeemers Law) it be fitter to say, It is one Law; or that, They are two distinct Laws. For in the matter we are agreed, viz.: that the Promise of the first Law is ceased, (because God cannot be obliged to a Subject made incapable) and some particular Precepts are ceased Cessante materia, and Moses' Jewish Law is partly ceased, and partly abrogate; and that there is now in force as the Redeemers Law, the Precept of perfect obedience, and the Threatening of Death to every sin, with a Grant of Remission and salvation to all that sincerely Repent and Believe, and a threatening of fiercer punishment to the Impenitent and Unbelievers. Thus far the Agreement. The dis-agreement is but this; I think that though these are both the Redeemers Laws, yet they are to be taken as two: One in this forme, Perfect Obedience is thy Duty (or obey perfectly): Death is thy Due for every sin. The other in this forme, Repent and Believe, and thou shalt be saved (from the former curse): Or else damned. Others think, that it is fitter to say, that these two are but one Law, quoad formam; running thus, I command thee to be a perfect man, perfect obedience, and oblige thee to Punishment for every sin; Yet not remedially; but so as that if thou Believe and Repent, this obligation shall be dissolved, and thou saved; else not. To this purpose the foresaid learned, judicious, and much honored Brother, explains his opinion to me. Now as long as we agree that the former Law, or part of the Law, (call it which you will) doth actually oblige to perfect obedience, or future Death; and the latter Law, or part of the Law, doth upon the performance of the condition, dissolve this obligation; and gives us justi cum paenitentiam et salutem; what great matter is it, whether we call it One Law or Two? For we are agreed against them that look on the Moral Law as to the mere preceptive part, as standing by itself, being not the matter of any Covenant, or connected to any sanction to specify it.

To apply this now to Mr. Blakes Question; It is most likely that those Divines that affirm that the Covenant of Grace doth require perfect obedience, and Accept sincere, do take that Covenant in this last and largest sense; and as containing the Moral Law as part of its matter; and so no doubt it is true, if you understand it of perfection for the future, as speaking to a creature already made imperfect. Now seeing the
the whole difference is but about the Restriction or Extension of the terms Covenant; I conceive, after twentie yeares study, Mr. Bl. shou'd not make it so material, nor charge it so heavily. And though I am not of that partie and opinion my self which he chargeth, yet seeing it may tend to reconciliation, and let those men more right in his thoughts, to whom he protesteth such exceeding reverence, I will briefly examine his Reasons ab absurdis which he here bringeth in against them.

§. 83.
Mr. Bl. 1. It establisheth the former opinion opposed by Protestants, and but now refused as to the Obedience and the Degree of it called for in Covenant: and if I should be indulgent to my affections, to cause my Judgement to swoop, dislike of the one would make me as overjoyd from it, as an opinion of the other would make me prone to receive it. Judgement therefore must lead, and Affections be waved.

§. 83.
K. B. If you interpret the Papists, as meaning that the Law requires true Perfection, but Accepts of sincere, then if it be spoken of the Law of Works or Nature, it is sallie, and not the same with theirs whom you oppose, who suppose it is the Covenant of Grace that so accepts of sincerity. If you take them (as no doubt you do) as meaning it of the Law of Christ (as the Trent Council expresseth themselves) then, no doubt, but they take the Law of Christ in the same extended sense as was before expressed; and then they differ from us, but in the forementioned Notion: But then I suppose you wrong them by making them lighter then they are: For the very passages which you before expressed out of some of the chief of their writers, do intimate that they do not indeed take the Covenant or Law itself to command true Perfection: but that which they call Perfection, is but (as you say) No other then the Grace of Sanctification in the very sense as the Orthodox hold it out; But it is true perfection that those mean whom you now write against. So that I see not the least ground for this first charge.

§. 84.
Mr. Bl. 2. If this opinion stand, then God Accepts of Covenant-breakers; of those that deal falsely in it; whereas Scripture charges it upon the wicked; those of whom God complains as Rebellions, Deut. 29-35. Jer. 7. 15. Jer. 11. 10. and 23. 8. 9. Yet it may be charged upon the best, the most holy in the world lying under the guilt of it.
R. B. This charge proceedeth merely from the confounding of the Duty as such, and the Condition as such. A Covenant which is also a Law as well as a Covenant, may by the preceptive part constitute much more Duty then shall be made the Condition of the Promises. Properly it is only the non-performance of the Condition that is Covenant-breaking; and so the Divines whom you oppose are not chargeable with your Consequent: For they say not that The Covenant of Grace doth make perfect Obedience the Condition of its Promise, and Accept Imperfect. That were a flat contradiction: for the Condition is Causa sine quam non, &c. But only they say, It Requireth or Commandeth perfect obedience, and Accepteth imperfect. And if you will speak so largely, as to say, that all who break the preceptive part of the Covenant, are Covenant-breakers, then no doubt but God Accepteth of many such, and of none but such. And as the word Covenant is not taken for the mutual contract, but for God's new Law, called his Covenant, his Testament, his Disposition, Constitution, Ordination, &c, so no doubt, we all are Covenant-breakers. For whether we say that the new Law commandeth perfect obedience, or not; yet unless you take it exceeding restrainedly, it must be acknowledged that the Precept is of larger extent than the Condition, having appointed some Duties which it hath not made sine qua non to salvation: If you send your childe a mile of an errand, and say I charge you play not by the way, but make haste, and do not go in the dust, &c; and if you come back by such an house, I will give you such a Reward; if not, you shall be whipped, He that plays by the way and ditties himself, and yet comes back by the hour appointed, doth break the preceptive part, but not the condition. Or if you suppose a re-engagement by Promise to do both these: he breaketh his own Covenant in the first respect (which was not the condition of Reward or Punishment) but not in the second. And so do true Christians both break the preceptive part of the Covenant, and also some of their own particular covenants with God: as when a man promiseth, I will commit this sin no more, or I will perform such a duty such a day. But these are not the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace, which God hath made the Causa sine quam non of Justification or Salvation. So that I conceive this charge unjust, to say no more.

§ 85.

Mr. Bl. 3. Then it will follow that as none can say that they have so answered the Command of the Law that they have never failed, they have not (if put to answer in the greatest vigor) once transgressed; so neither can they with the Church make appeal to God, That they have not dealt falsely in the Covenant, nor wickedly departed from their God. Psal. 44. 17. Every sin. (according to this opinion) being a breach of it, and a dealing falsely in it.
§. 85.

Mr. Bl. 4. *Then the great promise of mercy from everlasting to everlasting, upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children’s children to such as keep his Covenant, and to those that remember his Commandments to do them, Psal. 103. 17, 18.* only appertains to those that so keep the Law that they sin not at all against it.

§. 86.

Mr. Bl. 5. *Then our Baptism-Vow is never to sin against God; and as often as we renew our Covenant, we do not only humble our selves that we have sinned, but we refresh bind our selves never more to admit the least infirmity, and so live and dye in the breach of it.*

§. 87.

Mr. Bl. 6. *We do not promise in Baptism to do all that the Precept of the Covenant requireth, but all that is made the Condition of Life, and to Endeavor the rest. Much less as the Covenant is taken in the largest sense, as those seem to do whom you oppose, may it be said that we promise to keep all its Precepts.*
§. 88.

Mr. Bl. 6. Then the distinction between those that entered Covenant and brake it, as Jer. 31, 32, 33, and those that have the Law written in their hearts, and put into their inward parts to observe it, falls, all standing equally Guilty of the breach of it: no help of Grace being of power to enable to keep Covenant.

§. 88.

R. B. When sincere obedience and perfect obedience are all one, and when the Precept and the Condition of the Covenant are proved to be of equal extent, then there will be ground for the charging of this Consequence. In the first Covenant of Nature the Precept and the Condition were of equal extent; for perfect obedience was the Condition; but it is not so in the Covenant of Grace.

§. 89.

Mr. Bl. 7. Then it follows that sincerity is never called for as a Duty, or required as a Grace; but only dispensed with as a failing, indulged as a want. It is not so much a Christian's honor or Character, as his blemish or failing; rather his defect than praise. But we finde the contrary in Noah, Job, Afa, Hezekiah, Zachary and Elizabeth, Nathaniel an Israelite indeed that entered Covenant and kept Covenant.

§. 89.

R. B. I will not say, it is past the wit of man to finde the Ground of this charge, i.e. to see how this should follow; but I dare say, it is past my wit. If it had been said, The Covenant commandeth perfection and not sincerity; or The Covenant Accepteth sincerity, but not Commandeth it; there had been some reason for this charge. But do you think that sincerity is no part of Perfection? Can the Covenant require perfection, and not require sincerity, when sincerity is contained in perfection? If you take sincerity, exclusive only, as excluding perfection, and not at all formaliter; then its true that it is not commanded, nor is a duty, but a failing: For I hope the Gospel doth not command Imperfection, but tender us a Remedy for it. You might with more colour have argued, that then Repentance is no Duty, because inconsistent with commanded perfection. But that will not hold neither: For they suppose, Repentance commanded by the same Law, in case (and upon certain supposal) of Imperfection, or sin.

§. 90.
§. 90.  

Mr. Bl. **And therefore I conclude that as in the Law there was pure Justice, as well in the command given, as punishment threatened, without any condescension or indulgence: So in the Covenant there is mercy and condescension, as well in the Condition required, as in the Penalty that is annexed to it. The Covenant requires no more then it accepts.**

§. 90.  

R. B. **All this will be easily granted you by those of the contrary part, as nothing to the purpose. It follows not, that because there is condescension in the Condition, that therefore there is such an abatement in the Precept, or that the Covenant hath no Precept but de praestanda Conditione. But if you would have said, as your arguing requires, that the Covenant accepteth no less then the whole which it commandeth or requireth, then not only your Antagonists, but my self and many another will deny it, and demand your proof. But here I take this as granted by you, that you take not the word covenant at least so restraine'd as excluding all Precept; for I suppose you mean Commanding, in the terms requiring, and calling for as duty.**

§. 91.  

Mr. Bl. **The only Argument, so far as every I could learn, that hath brought some of Reverend [sic] seem into this opinion is, That if the Covenant requires not exact perfection in the same height as the Law calls for it, then a Christian may fall short of the Law in his obedience, and not sin; perfection being not called for from him, nor any more called for from him than through Grace he doth perform; he rifies as high as his Rule, and sinneth not through any Imperfection, therefore to make it out that a Believers Imperfections are his sins, it must needs be that the Covenant requires perfection, as to make good that he may be saved in his Imperfections, it must be maintained that he accepts sincerity. But this Argument is not of weight: Christ enthrone a Gospel-Covenant with man, sunde him under the command of the Law, which command the Law itself holds; the Gospel being a confirmation, not a destruction of it. All Imperfection is a sin upon that account, that it is a Transgression of the Law, though (being done against heart, and labor'd against) it is no breach of Covenant: we are under the Law as men; we are taken into Covenant as Christians; retaining the humane nature, the Law still commandeth us; though the covenant in Christ through the abundant Grace of it, upon the terms that it requires and accepts, frees us from the sentence of it.**

§. 91.
R. B. I. I was at first doubtful, left by the Law you had meant (as the Lutherans) a Law of God in general, as opposed to the Gospel as being no Law: and that you had meant by the Law, only the Moral Precepts, which is but the matter of the Law of Nature or of Works, or of the Law of Grace (in some respect). But I perceive that you mean the entire Law, both Precept and Sanction, by your mentioning the Sentence of it. If therefore you do by the Law mean but one Species, viz. the Law of Nature, acknowledging the new Law of Grace (commonly called the New Covenant, from the Promise which is the most eminent part) to be a Law too, then I agree with you in this solution as to the matter of Perfection; or else not. And yet I dare not hold that the New Law commandeth no more then its Condition. But for them that use the word covenant for nothing but the bare Promise, I must tell them, that it is but a piece of God's Law or Instrument, separated from the body which they fasten a Name upon: and if they will signify so much, that it is but part of the Redeemers Law of Grace, which they call a Covenant, and will give another name to the whole, so we may understand them, I would not willingly quarrel with them about words. But if it be the thing as well as the name that they err in, affirming that the Gospel is a mere Promise, and that God hath no Law but one, and that one the Law of Works; or else that all his Precepts Natural and Positive, are one Law by themselves as distinct from the Sanctions, when Precepts are but part of Gods Laws, which by their Sanctions are specified and distinguished (as most think into two sorts, of Nature and of Grace; but as Camero thinks into three sorts, of Nature, & of Jewish Works, & of Grace) then I not only profess my dissent, but do esteem the former error very dangerous and intolerable; and the latter, such as tendeth to great confusion in the body of Theologie.

2. This very Argument which you recite and answer, doth undeniable prove, that the Divines whom you oppose, do by the Covenant of Grace, understand all the Law that is now in force under the Government of the Redeemer. Otherwise they would never imagine that there is no sin but what is against the Covenant of Grace; and that there is no other Rule but this Covenant for a Christians obedience. It is therefore out of doubt, that this difference is but about words, (or little more) they taking that Covenant of Grace in a larger sense then you and I think meet to take it. If you should reply, that it is an unreasonable thing of them to take it so largely: I say that I do not think meet to imitate them in it, but I could shew you so much laid that way by the forementioned Reverend Learned man, your friend and mine, as would convince you that they have more to say for what they do, then every one that is against them is able to answer.

§ 92.

The Conclusion.

Having thus taken the boldness to examine your Exceptions, and deliver my Reasons against some of your opinions, I do crave your favorable accept-
And for Non and help.ILcil a, whether when itik'o. CoKtra or my am
believing felf-revealing nature of Light; or from the common unhappy fate of the deluded; I must leave you and others to judge by the Evidence that is in my arguments, whatever further evidence I may have of myself within; doublets the various state of Intellec,5, both cause a strange variety of apprehensions, of those objects which are in themselves the same. And words be but defective signs: There is something in Sen-
tation and Intellcllection, which words cannot fully shew to another. It is but the Spe-
cies and not the thing itself which you see in this Glass. My most exquisite descrip-
tion of my own Tast, and the sweetness of what I tast, will not cause another to taste
that sweetness. And there is somewhat like this in Intellcllection it self; for though I
confes my self ignorant what manner of thing our Intellcllection will be, when we are
out of the flesh; yet now me thinks I perceive that it doth in some sort participate of
sense, and that vid. Augus. de Trinit. li. 5. e. 1. initio. Sentio mi Intelligere, is a speech
not wholly void of Truth. I confes also that I should have little modesty or humili-
ty, if I should not think more highly of the understanding of your self and so
many Reverend and Learned Brethren who differ from me in several points here de-
bated, then of mine own. But yet we must prove all things, and not so trust to other mens
eyes as to shut our own, or refuse to give credit to our light. They may far excell me
in many other things, though they mistake in this. I remember Pauls, If we or an
Angel from heaven, &c. And I remember Tertullianus, Non ex perfomnis probo,
medium, sed ex fide per sonas (li. Precept. adv. her. c. 3.) And ienew his, Presby-
ters adhcrere oparque qui & Apostolorum doctissimorum suadent, & cum Presbyterii
Ordine fermentum suarn suadent. &c. (ib. 4. c. 44.) And Cyprius, Que ista oblinATIO
et, tui presumptio, humanam traditionem Divina dispositioni antiplayer, nec animadver-
tere, indignat & ira facit Deum, justitia Divina praecedit abolit & praeest humana traditio.
Epift. 74. ad Fabiani. p. 229. And many a one of Anabaptists yet plainer then these, to
the same purpose are commonly known. Paul himself could do nothing against the Truth,
but for the Truth, as having no Authority given him to destruction but to Edifica-
tion. I am willing to stoop to the judgment of my betters as far as is Reasonable,
Confessionable and Possible; and if no further, I hope I may be excused: when I
see plain Reason against them, it is unreasonable to subscribe to the opinions of the
most learned: when Scripture is against them, it were dishonest and unconscionable:
And when they are one against another, to attest to all is impossible. In such a case,
I must needs bear the Accusations of one party, who think me Arrogant, proud
and Self conceited, as supposing my self to be wiser than they. But I have long been
studying and Preaching, (and I think practicing) that necessary and excellent Duty of
being so contented with Gods sole approbation, as those that know they stand or fall
at his bar: and therefore must esteem it a very small thing to be judged by men. I
have long valued and believed that saying of Anabaptists (commonly cited, and found,
lib. 3. de Trinit. exp. 6. the very last words) Contra Rationem nemo habet; Contra
Scripturas nemo Christianus; Contra Ecclesiam nemo pacificus. In the point of Faiths
Instrumentality, and the nature of the Justifying act, which I differ from you in, I
am constrained upon all these three grounds to my dissent. 1. Left by renouncing
my Reason, I should cease to be sober. (Though yet I think sober men may be con-
cerned minded, not seeing these Reasons). 2. Left by forsaking the Scripture, I should

k

cede
cease to be a Christian, (Though Christians that observe not, or understand not that the Scripture is against you in this, may judge as you) 3. Left by contradicting the Church, I should cease to be peaceable (Though men otherwise peaceable may be drawn to it through prejudice). If you will bring one found Reasong one word of Scripture, or one approved writer of the Church (yea or one Heretick, or any man whatsoever) for many hundred years after Christ (I think I may say 1300 at least) to prove that Christ as Lord or King is not the object of the Justifying act of Faith, or that Faith justiseth properly as an Instrument, I am contented so far to lose the Reputation of my Reason, Understanding, Reading, and Memory. For though I have not read all that hath been written for so many hundred years, yet I have read most of the Writers of great note, (except the most Voluminous, which I took but part of) and by that much, I see so far into the sense and language of those times, that I dare stand to the hazard of this adventure. I speak this because you tell me, that there was scarce a dissenting voice among our Divines that are against me about the Instrumentality of Faith. And if there cannot be brought one man that can entreat with them for 1200, or 1400 years after Christ, I pray you tell me whom a humble, modest, peaceable man should follow, were he never so much ready to deny his own understanding? Because a word or an opinion that is unsound, hath got possession of a little corner of the world for about 150 years; therefore I am suspected as singular and as a Novelist, for forfaking it. Whereas it is to avoid singularity, and notorious Novelty, that I assent not to your way. The same I say about the Interest of mans Obedience, in his Justification as continued and consummated in Judgment. If either Clemens Roman, Polycarp, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Clem. Alexander, Minutius Felix, Arnobius, Latinaus, Cyriani, Athanasius, Eusebius, Greg. Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Cyril, Hierotheus, Syncius, Cyril, Cyril, Alexander, Macarius, Hierome, Salvian, Vincentius Livin. Vigilius, or any Council were of your minde in any one of these points, and against mine, then I will confess, at least my supine negligence in reading, or my very faulty memory in retaining their words. And for Austin, Chrysost. and others, of whom I have read but the leafer part, I do strongly conjecture by that part at their sense, and that they concur with the rest. If you say that the Fathers had their errors, and all this is but humane Judgement, and all men are fallible, I confess all this to be true: But as I still say, that contra Ecclesiam non pacifiques, so I desire leave to Judge those Brethren that oppose me, as fallible, and subject to error, as all the Primitive Fathers were: and therefore that I may be no more blamed or thought singular for contradicting them, then they are for contradicting the Primitive Church; I know as Austin faith de Civitate Dei, lib. 22. c. 30, Servianti gradus crantis Divini munemur; ut primum daretur liberum arbitrium, quo non-peccare posset homo; nunisimum, quo posse non posset atque illud ad comparandum meriti; hoc ad recipiendum premium pertinent. And the case of the Intellectual being the same, we must say if this time of Reward be come, before we shall receive our non posse errare. I know no Brother that opposes me, doth pretend to Infallibility. All that I desire by my far greater advantage of humane Testimony, is but to expugn prejudice, that I may stand on even ground with them that contend with me: And could I but prevail for this, that the cause might be decided by meet Scripture-reason, and humane Authority wholly stand by, and the Reader could but impartially consider things, without being by ased to any side or party, as if he knew not what any man else doth.
doth judge of it, I should then make little doubt of the good issue of the Controverse. The most that I meet with, that explain against my judgement, are they that confess that they know not what it is, or else apprehend it to be what it is not: but whatever it is, some that they value are against it, and that is it that satisfies them that I am in an error. I do unfeignedly desire that in dark Controversies beyond their reach, the unlearned people would more regard the generality of sober Godly Divines, then any single and singular Teacher; yea though it fall out that he be in the Truth, as long as the Evidence of that Truth is out of their reach. But this may not encourage any to shut their eyes, or to neglect to search after the Evidence which they might discern, much less may it excuse such unfaithfulness in Divines themselves; nor yet may it encourage any to captivate their judgement to a party, against the general judgement of the Church: For if I were on one side, and all the Divines in England on the other, there is yet the same reason to prefer all the first Churches, before all them, as there is to prefer all them before me. In a word, I shall ever think him more culpably singular, who differeth from Christ, and his Apostles, and all his Church for 1200 or 1400 years, then he that differeth from any party now living, and differeth not from them forementioned. And how the case stands in this between me, and those Reverend Divines that oppose me, in the forefaid points of difference, I am heartily content to refer to any sober, impartial Reader, that takes not things on trust from others, nor judge of the Doctrine of antient writers, by any imperfect dismembered parcels.


I Nterrogati quae siles nostrae, qua doctrina, respondimus eam esse fidelem & doctrinam nostram, quam Complicuitur Symbolum Apostolicum, Symbolum Nicenum, Constantinopolitanum, & Athanasianum, Anathematismi Epheсинi: Confesio Chalcedonensis: Quae Nestorianorum & Eutychianorum reliquis, quinta & sexta synodi opposuerunt: Qua item Pelagianis Africani plenaria; five ut vocari solet milites vita synodus & Araucana secunda synodus opposuerunt. Hae symbola he confessiones & declarations continent, non modo quae crederent, fine quibus fidelem & aliens praebere hominem Christi num apostel, & sine quibus creditis etiam fidelium salvati necessitatem; sed illius, etiam qui hac ipsa doceundo tradant, & alius non potest, etiam si praebent, etiam si praebet, & non potest praebere hominem Christi num apostel.

Lutherus, referente Hopffnero Saxo. Evangel. p. 110.

Notitiam psilentius in Ecclesia doceri potest, quam si ea quae necessaria non sunt, necessaria sint. Hac enim tyrannide conscientia illaqueantur, & Libertas fidei extinguitur; mendacis pro veritate, Idolum pro Deo, Abominatio pro sanctitate colitur.


FINIS.
THE REDUCTION OF A DIGRESSOR:
OR
Rich. Baxter's
REPLY TO
Mr. George Kendall's DIGRESSION
in his Book against
Mr. GOODWIN.

Job 42.3. Who is he that hideth Counsel without Knowledge? Therefore have I uttered that I understood not, things too wonderful for me, Which I knew not.

Rom. 11.33. O the depth of the riches both of the Wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgements, and his ways past finding out!

Nam quomodo intellectu Deum capie homo, qui ipsum intellectum luum, quo Eum vult capere, nondum capit? Augustin.de Trinitate.1.5.c.1.

LONDON,
Printed by A.M. for Thomas Underhill, at the Anchor and Bible in Pauls Church-yard near the little North-door, and Francis Tyton, at the three Daggers in Fleetstreet near Dunfants Church. 1654.

'Et se piulnumerovitis unde gennar qui verum est legebatur, &c.

Ved si in filii generatione & Spiritus processione pervestigandà curiosum te prebes, ego quo; pari curiositate tuam anima corporisq; conjunctionem & temperamentum inquiram: Quomodo pulvis es, & Dei Imago? Quid est quod te moveat? aut quid quod moveatur? Quomodo idem movet & movetur? Quomodo sensus in eodem manet, & externa attracting? Quomodo mens in te manet, & in alia mente sermonem dignit? Quo modo cogitatio per sermonem impartitur? Nondum majora profero; Quae celi conversione quisfyderum mortis, & ordo? aut modus? quae conjunctione ae distantia? qui maris termini? unde venti proveniant? unde partim anni revolutiones, aut pluviorum effusiones? Sine nihil horum intellectu percepisti, & homo, (percies antem fortasse aliquando cum perfectionem consecutus fueris & ut conjicere possimus ea quae annex cernimus, non veritatem ipsam esse, sed quaedam duxi cvitatis simulachra) si teipsum non nosci, quisquis es qui de bis rebus disputas, si hoc nondum intellectu comprehendisti, quorum sensus ipsi testis est, quo tandem modo Quid, & Quan tus sit Deus, te certo tenere ac scire arbitraris? Magna profecto id nullitiae est. Quocirca siquid mihi obtemperas, hoc est Theologo minimi audaci, ut nonnulla jam perceptisti, ita ea quae super sunt ut perceptias, roga, precibusq; contende. Ea parte quae in te manet contentus esto: reliqua in supernis thesauris recondita maneat. Pervita probitatem ascende: per purgationem, cum qui purus est ad piscere. Vis Theologus aliquando fieri, ac divinitate dignus? Mandata serva: per Dei precepta incede (actio enim gradus est ad contemplationem) ex corpore operam animae nava. An quisquam est mortalium qui ad eam sublimitatem efferri posset, ut ad Pauli mensuram perveniat? At illa tamen videre se per speculum & enigma dicit, tempusque assore, quo facie ad faciem visurus sit; sis tu licet aliis in Disputando sublimior: at Deo hand dubie inferior es. Sis licet aliis fortasse acutior & perspicacior: at certe veritate tanto posterior es, quanta essentia Dei essentiam tuam antecellit. See the rest to the end.
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Idem
Idem Naz. Orat. 34. pag. 538, 539.

Odei voce, ut χαλετόν θέτων ἐκδοσὶ ἐκδωδολον, &c. Demit intellectum per-
cipere difficile est, eloqui autem impossibile, ut prophanorum Theologorum * quidam docuit, meo
quidem judicio non inalvide; nempe ut ex eo quod
intellectu difficilem affirmat, opinionem hominibus
afferat, se cum cognitione percepsi. Ex eo autem
quod nullus verbi sum explicari posse ait, hoc aut
ne inscitia sua prodi atque convincit quaeat. Ego
verò ex potius dicendum censo ex Dei naturam nullis quidem verbis ex-
splicari posse; animo autem atque intellectu comprehendi multo minus
posse. Nam quod quis animo atque ratione complexus fuerit, id quoque
fortasse sermoni declarare quaeat, si non satis dilucide atque perspicue, ut
saltem obscurae, modo auditorem nactus sit non omnino furdas, tardis,
& stupidis ingenii. At rem tantam animo comprehendere omnino impos-
sibile est, non modo ignavis & languidis, deorsumque vergentibus, sed
magnis etiam & excelsis viris, Deique amore priditis, ac mortalibus
perque omnibus, quibus ad veri cognitionem, caligo hac & carnis
vassitis tenebras offundit. Atque haud scio an hoc quoque sublimiori-
bus illis & intelligentibus naturis negatum sit, quae quia Deo propius
juncte sunt, ac totum suo splendorco collucet, cernere utiq; fortasse queant,
si non prospus, at certe plenius quam nos & solidus, atq; alio aliis, pro
enjusq; ordine, vel uberius, vel parcias.

Nec vero hoc verba ita accipi velim, quasi percipi non posse dicam.
Quod sit Deus; sed Quid & Quale sit. Nego; enim inanis est predicatio
nuestra, nec vanæ sidis nostra; nec id est quod astra annus (neusrus id
quod proba candideque diximus, in impictatis & calumnii argumento-
trahas, ac nobis ut ignorantiam consistentibus, arroganter insultes.)
Plurimum namque interesse, certò tibi persuadeatis, aliquid esse, an quid
tandum ille sit competentium habens. Etenim Quod Deus sit, ac Principis
quedam causa, quæ res omnes procreavit, atq; conservet, tum oculi ipsi,
tum Lex naturalis docet, &c. Ac nimirum profecto hebes ac solidus est,
quisquis non buncq; sponsum sua progradit, naturaliumq; demonstrati-
onum vestigis insitit, atq; adeo hoc fite persuadet, Ne id quidem De-
um esse, quod vel imagine quasdam animi concepimus, vel informavi-
numq; vel orationis penicillo utcunq; descripsumus. Quod quisqu quam
coagitatio Deum quoquo modo comprehendit, quonam obscurum argumento
id probabis? &c.
I cite these passages 1. If it were possible to perswade poor mortals that we are no Gods, nor should aspire as did the father of sinners; and therefore that we have less knowledge of Gods Essence and nature, then the vain Disputers called Schoolmen have long pretended to. 2. That hereby the matter of the Churches contentions being removed, our wounds may close again. For who knoweth not, how many curious and vain, though much applauded Volumes, are all built upon the sands of some presumptuous supposition of the Nature of God? If they did not take it for granted that God doth properly Understand and Will, and properly Intendere finem, with many the like, what matter could they have for their Voluminous contentions? If but only those two suppositions were known to be (at least) uncertain, what should we do with all those Learned Writings that so subtilly Dispute of the order and number of Gods Decrees? and how should we esteem them? He that will reade the Augustane Confession, may see what thoughts the first Protestants had of the Controversies about Predestination, and how little of that doctrine did enter their Religion.

Vide Eusebium Preparat. Evangelic. lib. undecimo, cap.12...

Where he affirms that Moses and all the Prophets teach that Gods Nature cannot be explicated by words, and that his Name is ineffable, and how Plato agreeth with them.

As also cap.9. where he makes the very Name Ens proper to God, and alledgedeth Plato’s consent, and cap.10.the consent of Numenius, and cap.11. the consent of Plutarch.

Also lib.8.cap.8. pag. (miki) 365. out of Josephus he citeth this, [That God is the Beginning, the Middle, the End of all things, and]
as he is in Works and Benefits conspicuous, yea of all things by far the most notable (or known) so is he both in Nature and Greatness most obscure: Nothing that is like him (or no likenes of him) can be seen of us, or imagined by us; nay it is not lawfull so much as lightly to frame it (such a resemblance) in our mindes.]

Novatianus (nondum lapsus) lib. 1. de Trinitate inter opera Tertulliani, cap. 7.

Sed tamen & ipse (Christus) sic adhuc de Deo loquitur hominibus quomodo possunt adhuc audire, vel capere: licet in agnitionem Dei religiosam jam facere incrementa sitatur: Invenimus enim scriptum esse quod Deus charitas dicitus sit; nec ex hoc tamen Dei substantia charitas expressa est. Et quod Lux dicitus est, nec tamen in hoc substantia Dei est; Sed totum hoc de Deo dicitum est quantus dicitus potest; ut merito & quando spiritus dicitus est, non omne id quod est dicitus est, sed ut dum mens hominum intelligendo sejq; ad ipsum proficit spiritum, conversa jam ipse in spiritu alius quid amplius per spiritum conjicere, Deum esse posset. Id enim quod est, secundum id quod est, nec humano sermone edici, nec humanis auribus percipi, nec humanis sentibus colligi potest. Nam si qua preparavit Deus his qui diligunt illum, nec oculus vidit, nec auris audivit, nec cor hominis, aut mens ipsa percepit, qualis & quantus est ille ipse, qui hoc repromittit, ad quae intelligenda & mens hominis & natura defect.

This is one note by which it is known not to be Tertullian's writing, because Tertullian grossly erred in making God too like the creature, as is well known.

The like passages you may reade, in Ruffini Exposit. in Symbolum Apostolor, Sect. 4, 5, 6, 8. with several difficulties proposed in things about our selves, to convince us of our ignorance.

Author de Cardinalibus operibus Christi inter opera Cypriani

Prolog. § 3. p. 482.

Nec patitur ad liquidum se videri Divinitas, quam utiq; investigatio, fidelis aliquo modo adorat vel sentit: sed puram ejus essentiam nec conscipit, nec comprehendit: Affirmatio quippe de Dei essentia in promptu haberit non potest; neq; enim divisibilis est Divinitas; sed verius
De veris sinceris, remotio indicat, negando quid non sit, quam Afferendum quod quid sit. Quoam quicquid sensui subjacet, illud esse non potest quod omnem superat intellectum. Quicquid audiri, vel videri vel leciri potest, non convenit majestati; hebes est in hac consideratione omnium sensuum & caligat aspectus. — p. 483. § 8. Et utinam me ipsum cognoscam & sciam! Quod si anima mea quae corporis mei obtinet principatum, nec originem scio, nec metier quantitatem, nec quails sit intueri sufficio, si ignota est mihi ratio quare ipsa deceleratur in corpore persecutore suo, &c. Patienter me ferre operet si operatorum universitaris non intelligo, qui in minimis operationum suarum particulis mean profiteor cacitatem.

Reade the rest of that Prologue excellently shewing how far God is known, and how far not.

---

Syrus, Hierof. Catechet. 6, pag. 46, 47, 48. is large on this.

Dicitur non quae operet de Deo; nem ei soli hac nota sunt: Sed quae profano modo capere natura humana potest, & que imbecillitas nostra ferre valet. Non enim Quid sit Deus expenimus: Nam candide nos accurraram de eo cognitionem non habere constemur. Quam ignorantiam agnoscentes, magnum de Deo cognitionem profitemur. — At dictis quistiam, Si comprehendi nequit essentia Divina, quid est quod tu de his enarras? &c. Laude Dominum decorare, nem exprimere verbis agredior, &c. Quid igitur, dicit aliquis, numne scriptum est quod Angeli.
Angeli celorum vident semper faciem patris mei qui in calidis est? At vident Angeli non sicut Deus est, sed quatenus ipsi capere possunt, &c. Cum igitur Angeli nesciant, nullus homo sciam erubescent inscitiam, & ignorantiam confiteri, tum ego qui nunc loquor, tum omnes omnium temporum homines. Quin etiam quomodo enunciare non possumus: Nam quomodo possem eum verbis exprimere, qui ipse dedit ut vera promam? Ego qui Animam habeo nec ejus formam lineamentave possum exprimere, quomodo conservatorem animae enunciare potero?

Cyrillus Alexandr. To.1 Thesaur. li. ii. c. i. Especially near the end, is full for the same as the former cited Authors, as he doth in divers other places. And in Commentary on John among Cyril's Works, but indeed Clitoris, it is frequent. As li. i. c. 13. Nam quemadmodum quamvis nullus novit quidnam secundum naturam Deus sit, Justificatur tamem per fidem quam credat premia illum redditorum quarentibus eum: sic eti operandum ejus rationem ignorat, quam tamem sive omnia illum possi non dabit, non contemnenda tamem probitatis hujus premia consequet.

And li. 9. c. 34. Sed nullus natura Deitatis capax intellectus est. Ac ideo furiosus est qui audet temeraria speculatio rimari quidam Deus secundum naturam est. Umbris tamem & enigmatibus ut in speculo, &c.

Augustin. de Trinitat. reproves three sorts of Errors about God, in the entrance, lib. i. cap. 1. Tho's that judge of spiritual things by corporeal. The second is tho's Qui secundum humani animi naturam vel affectum de Deo sentiant, quidam sentiant.

3. Tho's that do indeed endeavour to transcend the mutable creature that they may raise their intention to God, sed mortalitatis onere pregravati, eum & videri volunt scire, quod nesciunt, & quod volunt scire non possum, presumptione opinionum. Sinarum audacios affirmando, intercludunt sibimet intelligentia vias, magis eligentes sententiam suam non corrigere perversam, quam mutare defensionem, &c.

Quo vero proprie de Deo dicuntur, quamquam in nulla creatura inveniuntur, raro ponit Scriptura Divina, &c.
Clemens Alexandr. Stromat. l. 5. commends Plato for saying that God cannot be expressed by words, as agreeing with Scripture; and himself addeth that he is neither Genus, Species, differentia, individuum, numerus, accident, nec cui aliquid accidit, toto, pars, &c. Et ideo est figura expers, & quod nominari non potest. Et si aliquando eum nominemus, non proprie vocantes aut Unum, aut Bonum, aut Mentem, aut ipsum id quod est, aut Patrem, aut Deum, aut Creatorum, aut Dominum: non id dicimus tanquam nomen ejus preferentes, sed propter ejus potestatem pulchris nominibus, ut in alio non aberrans, his ininiti possit cogitatio, &c. I us Hervetus translation.

Irenæus li. 2. cap. 16.

Est autem & super hæc & propter hæc inenarrabilis: sensus enim eapax omnium bene & recte dicitur, sed non similis hominum sensui: Et lumine rectissime dicitur; sed nihil simile ei, quod est secundum nos lumin. Si autem est in reliquis hominibus, nulli similis erit omnium pater hominum pusillitiati: & dicitur quidem secundum hæc propter dilectionem, sentitur autem super hæc secundum magnitudinem.

Justin Martyr Serm. ad Gent. exhort.


I conclude from all this, that either it is certain that Intelligere, Velle, Amare, Intendere, &c. are not spoken of God Properly, or by Analogy of Attribution (as they speak) or at least, that it is utterly uncertain to us, whether it be so or not: But that we must
use both these and lower notions of God, from the glass of mans nature and actions, still confessing the Impropriety in all, and that we have no positive formal certain apprehension of the thing expressed (viz. God and his acts) but only a general apprehension that it is somewhat which is best represented to us in the glass of these metaphorical Notions, which contain as great a likeness to the thing itself as we are now capable of reaching; and upon these considerations we must stick close to the Scripture phrase which condescendeth so low in speaking of God; and not hearken to the unproved fancies of Schoolmen, that tell us This act is properly in God, as implying no imperfection, and That is not seeing all humane acts do contain imperfection in their very formal nature.

As Salvian de Provid. li. 3, p. 62, 63. faith, so, à fortiori, do I: Nescio secretum, & consilium Divinitatis ignoro. Sufficit mihi ad causa hujus probationem dicti cælestis oraculum. Si scire vis quid tenendum sit, habes literas sacras: perfecta ratio est hoc tenere quod legesis. Qua causa autem Deus hoc de quibus loquimur, ita faciat, nole a me requiras. Homo sum, non intelligo secretâ Dei; investigare non andeo, & ideo etiam attentare formido: quia hoc ipsum genus quasi sacrilega temeritatis est. si plus scire cupias, quam sinneris, &c. Sicut enim plus est Deus quam omnis ratio humana, sic plus mihi debet esse quam ratio, quod a Deo agi cuncta cognosco.

O'it, τα τούτων τῷ τεθν. ὁ θεϊν ἡ λογική, &c. faith Macarius Homil. I. Neq; enim Nature Divina est Animâ (therefore Intellecction and Volition are not the Divine Nature) neq; Natura tenebrarum malitie; sed est quid creatum sensibile, visibile, insigne et admirandum, atque elegans similitudo & Imago Dei. [Intellecction and Volition are in their natures comprehensible, but that which in God we call Intellecction and Volition is incomprehensible, and not to be formally understood. Quis enim potest capere quantus sit Deus? (faith Theophylact in Luc. 12.) & manifestum est ex Seraphin, qui se obtengunt propter excellentiam Divini luminis. Which is as true of Gods Essence as his Greatness: and as true is it of formal proper interellecction, as Minutius Felix faith of Vision, Deum oculis carnalibus vis videre, cum ipsum animam tuam qua vivificaris & loqueris, nec aspiceris possis, nec tueri?

Epipha-
Epiphanius disputing against those honest Hereticks, called the Andians (cast out of the Church by the Bishops for their honesty, and at last banished.) Hæres. 70. pag. 815, 816. Speaking against those that placed the Image of God in the Soul only (as the Andians did place it in the Body) because, say they, the soul is Invisible, and hath the Power of Acting, Moving, Understanding, Reasoning, and therefore contains the Image of God, he Anfwcrs, That [If therefore the soul be said to be made to (God's) Image, it cannot be said to be made after his Image at all: sed dicit ipsa èptem a multitudine, &c. Deus enim Infinitus præ animis partibus eog; amplius, comprehendens omnes ac cogitationem effugit, &c. Ipse enim cum omnia comprehendit, tum a nullo comprehenditur.] And after [Spiritus enim Deus est qui omnem Spiritum exuperat, & lux lucem omni pra-stantior. Quicquid enim ab ipso conditum est, infra illius decus & glori-um est. Sola vero Trinitas comprehendi non potest, & infinitam quandam gloriam obtinet, qua nec conjecturâ capitur, nec Intelligen- 
tia percipitur.

I conclude with the words of Colvius in Beverovic. de Termino Vita, pag. 160, 163, 164. [Non Intelligitis quomodo Intelligatis, centum Syllogismos facitis & nescitis quomodo: & vultis Intelligere quomodo illæ Intelligit qui est supra omnem intellectum ? &c.] [Quod si exigua bæc & contemptibilia naturæ penetrare non potest humani ingenii acies, annos est extreme imprudentia nos velle pertingere ad ipsam Di-vinam essentiam ? Quæ est æternâ Thaumatou, æterna & in seipse, nobis vero æterna, æterna, æterna, æterna, &c. Non terminatur visu, non tenetur teeta, non sentitur incessu, non comprehendidur Intellettu; Major omni corde, major omni laude.—Novi homines, bulle nascentes & evanescentes, &c. exhaureire vultis mare vacuolo ? terram metiri palmo ? &c. Furor est cogitare homunculorum videre Dei fines, qui sus non videt, Deum velle metiri qui suam mensuram ignorat, ut capiat Divinâtiâ terminos quos non capiet ipse mundus; cujus vix Imago est spiritus, cujus umbra mundus, judicia abyssus.—Deum laudare omnes possimus & debemus, definire nemo potest: Non potest Deus quærimi- 
nis; inveniri nonquam potest, digne ipsum estimamus cum inassima- 
mabilem confitemur: digne laudamus cum praestupore animi in silentio ipsum adoramus; apprehendi potest voluntate, comprehendi non potest.
intellectu. Major est ipsius Incomprehensibilitas quam comprehendere possumus: Non ita capit eum arguta scientia, quam illum sentit & gustat mundi conscientia: Melius nos, docet eum Unatio quam eruditio. Hoc est illud manna absconditum, quod ipse dat timentibus ipsum, non antem iis qui in arcana illius temere involant. Et idcirco veniunt indolenti & qui Deum summum cum reverentia colunt, & rapiunt regnum calorum; interim acutissima & superbissima ingenia evanescunt, in propriis subtilitatis & merguntur in infernum: logui volentes de profundis mersi sunt in profundis. Quocirca optime bonas horas collocant, qui veritatem summam studio querunt: Sed pessime judicant quise illam invenisse putant. Desino, & dico cum Hilario, quod non per difficiles quaestiones ad vitam beatam nos ducat Deus.

The Lord repair by Love, Humility and Holy Obedience, the ruines that have long been made in his Church, by Contention, Pride, and unsanctified-presumptuous ignorant-Learning, and reduce men to the Scripture simplicity of Doctrine, and convince them that their overmuch Wisdom is but Folly, and all their over-doing but undoing.
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The Prologue to Mr. K.

Sir,

Though I would not have you restrained from revealing Truth, yet: if I had been worthy to have been of your counsell, I should have adviced you, to have avoided this quarrelsome way. Our world hath Contention enough already; and it comes not from so good a root (Prov. 13.10.) nor is it so good a symptom, nor doth it produce such lovely effects (Prov. 22.10. & 17.19. & 29.21.) nor doth it bring to good a name (Prov. 21.24.) as may make it seem desirable in my eyes.

Had you consulted Solomon himself, he would have bid you [Strive not with a man without a cause, if he have done thee no harm, Prov. 3.30.] and [Go not forth hastily to strive, lest thou know not what to do in the end thereof, when thy neighbour hath put thee to shame. 25.8.] for [The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water: therefore leave off contention before it be madded with, 17.14.] It seems a strange thing to me, that you could finde no man to deal with in the main Controversie here chosen out, that was indeed against you, but that you must make to your self, an adversary of one that you confessest doth not once deny your Conclusion. Unlesst it be because you are likely with such a one to have the easiest conflict. But then you should have remembred, that the Victory will be as small, I pretend not to such a piercing knowledge, nor to such acquaintance in the invisible regions, as to determine infallibly of what Province or Degree, of what quality, albus am aler, that spirit was that raised the storm of your Passions, or to know exactly his name and surname, that animadverted these your lines: But seeing you are pleased to choose me for your adversary, I must desire you to bear with me if I speak sometime less pleasingly; and to use what patience you have left, as knowing you have drawn this trouble upon your self. And whereas you put me on a double imployment: one to defend the Truth; and the other to defend my self: so I perform the first successfully, I hope I may be excused if I be more negligent in the latter; yea it I give you the day, and freely confessest as much ignorance as you charge me with. It's true that I have not the Titles or Robes of Honour, and as little deserve them, as you here express. But might I be sure that I have right
to that faire better Title (of piety) which you are pleased to bestow on me, I could easily allow you the other. I remember the description of the old Christians by Minutius Felix, [Nos qui non habitu sapientiam, sed mente preterimus; non eloquentiam magna, sed vivimus: gloriamur nos consecutus quod illi summa conscientiae quaesturum, nec invente poterunt.] And that of Mirandula [Facilitatem philosophia quae, Theologia inventi, Religio posset.] And to contend for the reputation of being Learned, I shall scarce think is worth my labour, till I have higher thoughts of the prize. Mens thoughts and words are a poor felicity. Applause is such an aery nourishment, that I see few thrive by: (though I must confess that in me, as well as in others, the unreasonable sin of pride is daily stirring, and convincing me by experience that it is mortified but in part.) O that I may have the honour of being a member of Christ, and then I can spare the vain glory of the world! Vera est gloria erris, ubi laudantis nec errore quifquam, nec adulatione laudabilis: Verus honor qui nulli negabitur digno; nulli defecerit indigno: sed nec ad aum ambigues ullus indigimus, ubi nulla permixtur esse: non dignus: faith Austini, de Civit. Dei, lib. iiis. cap. iv. Only I must crave this of the Reader, that my confessed weakness be no prejudice to God's truth: and that he will not judge of the cause by the person, nor take the name or person for a fault; which is the thing that the ancient Christians did so deprecate of the Pagans, and therefore I hope every Christian will grant. And I must also desire that want of smooth and pleasing words may not be judged the want of truth. Enumero dissoluti est peitoris in rebus scribis quare rectum et verum, & cum eti rationis cum maleficio habebis aliquid agitis, nonas auribus insinuare dulciores, non medicinam vulneribus admoveres: inquit Arnobius T. i. adv. Gent. p. 49. I confess I do deeply compassionate ordinary Christians, when I think what a hard thing it is for them to discern the truth, among all the smooth words and plausible arguments of Learned contenders. Usually they think every man tells good, till they hear the other; and then they think it bad: and at last when they see what fair glosses a Learned man can put on the worst cause, they are ready to run into the other extreme, and to believe or regard nothing that they lay. As Minutius Felix saith, [Alius movetur de toto genere dissipans: quotplerumq; pro differentium viribus & eloquentia potestate, stiam permissa veritatis constiuit mutetur. Id accidere pernotum est auditorem facilis, qui duntum verborum levicino a verum intentionibus avoetamur, sine detecus afferentur discrimina omnibus, nec a rectis falsa fecernunt, nec sicere nescit & in incredibili verum, & in verificili mendacium. Itaque qua sapius aseverationibus credunt, eo frequenter a prioriibus argumentar: sic affide temeritatem decepi, culpam Iudicii transferunt ad incurti quercem, ut damnatoris omnibus malis universa suppenderit, quam de fallacia judicare.] But let such at least hold fast the Foundation, and remember, that we are all agreed in that.

The Reader that I expect should profit by these Writings, must neither be utterly unlearned, nor so learned as your self. For the former are not yet capable of it; and the latter are beyond it, and will hardly learn from any but the more learned. It is the younger sort of Students whose edification I intend: who are neither quite above, nor below my instructions; nor so engaged to a Party or Opinion, but that their minds lie open to any evidence of Truth. Prevent ar enim falsa opinionis errore humanus auditus ad veritatem perciundam, ducen &a peridiculis inventor, quantusque testimibus urgetur. Maxulum enim pravi dogmati sententiam, qua semel infectus est, persuerit vindicare, quam hunc rancor tantis divinarum humanarum; legum auctoritatibus resutatam salubrius immittere: inquit Vigilius contra Euthych. i. initio.

Lastly,
Lastly, If you should be in the right and I in the wrong in any one philosophical Controversie, I must expect that the Reader do not thence conclude, that you are right in your Theology. And I could wish that you had so mean thoughts of your Philosophy, as that you might not build your Theology on it too much; nor think much the better of your Writings, or of yourself. For doubtless when the Canon of a Council forbad the reading of Heathens Books, these things were not so highly valued as now. I approve not of that extremity neither: but shall conclude with that serious exclamation of Athenagoras (Legat. per Christian. p. 13, 14.) Thus he, yet so supremely, and absolutely, and thus equally, and absolutely, and thus equally. If this were the opinion, and this were the opinion, and this were the opinion, and this were the opinion, and this were the opinion. Lastly, this were the opinion.

§ 2.

Pag. 133. Mr K.

For the fuller opening of this particular, I will be content to make some Digression from your Book, and to shew 1. That there can be no new immanent act in God, against Mr Baxter. 2. That there is somewhat like Justification in that immanent act of God, whereby he decrees from eternity, to justify and condemn men. And 3. That yet that immanent act cannot be stiled Justification; nor is it meant so by Dr. Twiele or Mr. Pembel that I know; and so that Justification is not from eternity: and then I shall return to you, &c.

§ 2.

R. B. Your Digression, methinks, is very sudden, and the occasion to a stranger hardly discernable: Its like it was the uncouth apparition of some ruling weight of another Orb, which made upon your intellect that strange impression, which caused you to reel thus out of your way, and lead you unhappily into this private path, or rather bewildred you in this Maze where we now finde you. But whoever led you in, charity commands me to do my part to help you out, or at least to warn others that they do not follow you.

1. As to your first undertaking, I confess it was very ingenuously done, to say, You will do it [against Mr. Baxter] and not [against his doctrine or opinion.] acknowledging afterwards that I deny not your Conclusion. But I am used to Diquire against Doctrines, and not Persons: and therefore will give you the better in this.

2. Your second undertaking is more admirable then the first. For I have met with some besides you that dare adventure on the former, but never man that durft attempt the later. Is it not enough for you to prove Gods Decree of justifying to have somewhat like Justification? but you must also prove, that the Decree both to justify and condemn, hath somewhat like Justification? If the Decree to condemn a man have somewhat like justifying him, then the Decree to torment him in hell hath somewhat like glorifying him: and the Decree to kill, hath something in it like quickening him. You must fly to some general point of similitude, or to the Lord Brookes doctrine, that all things are One, to make this good. But if it were but your oversight, then I hope hereafter you will be more com-
compassionate to your Brethren, and no more so solemnly call men to [see the hand of heaven, in the pompous display of their folly, to appear most ridiculous; and to adore the hand of God in infatuating their parts, &c.] as you do by Mr. Goodwin for a smaller mistake then yours. As what man so Learned and accurate, as to be free from all oversights.

3. But indeed Sir I cannot so easily excuse your next error, annexed to the third part of your undertaken-task; where you say [Nor is it so meant by Dr. Twis or Mr. Pembie that I know.] What is it that is not so meant by them? Why that this Immanence act can be stiled Justification. You have boldly ventured to write thus: and I will be bold to try how well. Either is true, or not true that they so meant: If true, and undeniably apparent in the Writings of one of them, if not both, and oft repeated by him, and yet Mr. K. knoweth it not, why then he doth not only write before he knows, and Vindicate men before he understand whether they are guilty or innocent, but makes it the great motive of his undertaking, as [not having the patience to see so worthy Divines so unworthily handled.] If in the midst of his impatience he knew not this, then it seems I am not alone ignorant of the business that I meddle with. But I will lay it open to the Judgement of the Reader, whether the thing be true or false? and whether you might not with less learning have known this if you would? and ought not to have known the cause before so zealous a Vindication.

Dr. Twis Vind. Grat. li. i. part 2. §. 25. p. (vol. min) 272, 273. Sic scribit [Omnis actualiis justificatio est justificatio; & omnis justificatio simpliciter dicta congruenunda est de justificatione actuali: Nam Analogum per se postquam si pro famosiori significato.] Sed libet his paullisper immorari. Quamvis crit illa peccatorum Remissio quae fidei confecutur, & quam oporteat Spiritus sancto acceptam referre? Remissio eum peccatorum, si quiddatam injusticia, nisi atid est quam aut Punitionis Negatio, aut Votitionis puniendi negatio. Sic ergo peccata Remittere, nisi alium quam nole punire. At hoc nobe punire, ut alius immannens in Deo, sicut ab exercito, nec fidei confecutur, &c. Quod vero operatione Spiritus sancti nobis ex hac parte, per fidei contingit, alium esse non potest quam sensus gratiae Dei, &c. Quare siquid morte sua nobis imputaret Christus, quod ad peccatorum inforunm Remissione animat, senum & istum amoris Divini peccata nostra remittingis, nobis imputat necesse est. Et pag. 279. c. 1. [Nam justitia Christi dictatur nobis imputari, & merita ipsius nobis applicari per fidei, non coram Deo, sed apud conscientias nostras: quatenus per fidei generatur in cordibus nostris sensus & agnitiu biaus salutaris applicationis ex amore Dei quem cx fide substantia, & Spiritu inventum nos justificantem, &c in filiis ejus adoptantem, ex quos sustinetur pac conscientia. Quare ante fidei hanc Christi justitiam nostra sustituit, quatenus ex inventione Dei patris & Christi mediatoris pro nobis praebita, &c. Sic adeunt fide sic quae in cordibus nostri & fidebus accidunt, sum demum agoepistur & perspicitur hic amor Dei erga nos in Christo Jesu. Unde dicitur justitia Christi imputari nobis per fidei, quia non nisi per fidei dignifictur a Deo nobis imputari: & sum demum justificari disem evs generis justificatione, atq. absolutione a peccatis nofris, qui pacem ingenerat conscientiis nofris. Hoc antem duodec argumentis confirmo. 1. Quia per justitiam Christi non modo asequimur remissixonem peccatorum, sed & fidei ipsam, atq. repenitentiam, hoc est, cordis circumcisioem, Eph. i. 3. ergo citam ante fidein & repententiam applicatur nobis justitia Christi, ut potest propers quam gratiam asequimur efficacem ad credendum in Christum & agentum punitium. Alterum est, quia justificatio & absolution, prout significant actum divum voluntatis immanentem, sunt ab aeterno.
[5]

Nun autem voluntatis notificatio externa, per modum absolutionis eunum dandum judiciali & forensi, quae sit per verbum & spiritum, pro tribunali conscientia munus obiuncti, hoc est illa justicia Christi imputatio, item, justificatio & remissio aequi absolutionis quae fidem sequitur.] Et contr. prafat. p. 18b. Extra controversiam est remissio peccatorum prout est actus in Deo immancens antecedere nostram fidem & requisissionem: Nobis vero non nisi per fidem innotescit, cujus estiam sisutum multis adhuc confirmatione causarit per remissionem.

Lib. 1. Part. 2. p. 272. [Justificationem voco & Reconciliationem pro eodem habere ab Arminio (quod & verum est) &c. And ne oft maintaine the eternity of Reconciliation.

Lib. 2. P. 2. pag. 434. [Ergo etiam ante fidem Deus nobis reconciliatus est: neque enim nisi jam reconciliatus est propriis gratissime nobis fidem. Quod quidem remissio peccatorum & acceptationis nostra, Non nisi actus internus & immanentes in Deo non tal: cujus generis actiones non subordinatur Deo de novo. Legenti & posse [Juxta ista distinguere poterimus de reconciliatione dupliciter dicta: Nam & Deus reconciliat nos sibi in Christo quod rei veritatem: & in ministris suis posse in verbum reconciliationis, quod judicium pratisae veritatem cenditiam & manifestationem. Sic cum immixit eumesse dicimur reconciliati sub Deo quod rei veritatem: quod non est per Evangelii praelectionem sit quod ejusdem veritatis patefactio & salutarem communicationem.] Et p. 433. [At Arminius applicationem remissionis peccatorum, ita interpretari videtur, ut per applicationem fiat, & jam quod de novo esse incipiat: quos vero non requiritur, ut jam antea existat quod applicandum est. Nobis vero sit insinuendum videtur. Christus morte sua nobis procuravit redemptionem a peccatis, cum Deo reconciliacionem, & peccatorum eminim remissionem: quae quidem per praelectionem Evangelii & per fidem, nobis applicantur, non ut sint, sed ut nobis imposcant. Nam rationem eumque superius quomodo applicari possis illud quod non erit, &c.] Pag. 434. [Nos vero interpretatio proceedit: Christus nobis aequissim morte sua redemptionem efficat & actualem, ut est, actualem peccatorum remissionem, & reconciliationem cum Deo. Applicatur autem ista per praelectionem Evangelii, non ut de novo sint, sed ut nobis imposcant, &c. At iniquus, actualis Remissio peccatorum est ipsa Justification: Justificationis (equum fidelitatem sit) &c. Nam fide justiciumur: ergo nemine peccata remissimur autique eam crede. Respondeo, Cum doce Apostolus nos fide iustificari, nihil aliud ex instituto doce, quam nos justificari per sanguinum Christi, fere proper Christi crucifixum.] And in the Index he owns it, that Remissio actualis est Justification, & therefore we may take what he faith of remission as meant of justification.

The like Lib. 3, pag. 18, & lib. 1. p. 2. pag. 272. which we before cited part of [Nec sanc occurrit specie aliquar rationem, ear reconciliatio egatur in ordinem cum imperatione remissionis, Justificationis & redemptionis, specie quam cum actuali Remissione, Justificatione & Redemptionem.] So that he puts actual Justification with Remission and Reconciliation.

So contra Corvinum pag. 48. Et quid quapro Adeptio est quam consequiur per fidem? Diicis esse Acceptacionem Dei. Quid autem est Acceptatio? An non actus in Deo immancens? An vero actus Deo immancens superverax de novo?

Its undeniable in this that Tryffe both not only affirm Remission and Reconciliation and Adoption to be before we are born, immediately on Christs death; but also to be immanent Actas, and from Eternity: and though he be more seldom in thus ussing the word [justification] yet he affirm Remission and Remission (which he faith are from Eternity) to be the same thing with Justification: yea he expressly entitleth that eternal immanet act [justification].

C 3 And
And did he only affirm Remission and Adoption and Reconciliation and Acceptation to be immanent acts and from eternity, I believe few sober men will think it any better, then to affirm the same of Justification. Yea he plainly intimates a distinction of Justification: one from eternity or from Christ's death, and the other upon our believing: and therefore when he speaks of Justification by faith, he calls it [that sort of Justification] intimating the other sort.

Now for Mr. Pembile, as he expressly maintains Justification in foro Dei to be long before we are born, even on Christ's dying, so that is all one to our purpose, as if he maintained it to be from eternity. And it were meet that some of you should have shewed before now, what Transient act it is by which particular sinners not yet born (and therefore not yet sinners) are justified at Christ's death? If it were (as Mr. Twis intimates, I think) God's accepting the Price, its worth the while to shew that to be Temporal and Transient, when Dr. Twis will have his accepting of man in Adoption to be immanent and eternal: But if you maintain God's justifying act at Christ's death (whether undertaken or suffered) to be an immanent act, then it must be before Christ's death, even eternal too. Mr. Pembile's words are, Vind. Gras. p. 21. [But with a distinction of Justification. 1. In foro Divino, in God's sight; and this goeth before all our satisfaction. For even whilst the Elect are unconverted, they are then actually justified and freed from all sin by the death of Christ: and God so esteemeth of them as free, and having accepted of that satisfaction, is actually reconciled to them. By this Justification we are freed from the guilt of our sinners: and because that is done away, God in due time proceeds to give us the grace of satisfaction to free us from sinners corruption, still inherent in our persons. 2. In foro conscientie, in our own sense: which is but the Revelation and certain Declaration of God's former secret act of accepting Christ's Righteousness to our Justification.] So pag. 23, he speaks again of the same Justification in foro Dei, and saith, that all the sinners of the Elect are actually pardoned, the Debt-Book crossed, the hand-writing cancelled, &c. and that this grand transaction between God and the Mediator Jesus Christ was concluded on and dispatched in heaven long before we had any being either in nature or grace.] This phrase of [dispatching it in heaven] makes me conjecture that it will prove some immanent act which they call Justification at Christ's death. Lay all this together, and judge whether it be true that neither Dr. Twis nor Mr. Pembile, do mean that the immanent act can be titled Justification. Or if it were true, whether Justification before we are born, is not an error fit to be resisted. Indeed it is true that Mr. K. saith, that neither Dr. Twis nor Mr. Pembile did ever mean, that [the Decree of God from eternity to justify and condemn men, is to be called Justification:] For the Decree to condemn men cannot well be called Justification: But I believe this being but Mr. K. oversight, he will not make use of it to justify his third Proposition.

§. 3.

Mr. K. Digression. P. 1.

Whether there may be a new immanent Act in God? To the first, By an immanent act, we mean such as is terminated in the Agent; and not in any thing without it. Now that there can be any new immanent act in God, Mr. Baxter doth not
adventure to affirm. Only he is pleasing to say this: [That all immanent acts in God are
eternal], he thinks is quite beyond our understanding to know. Aphor. pag. 174.] and he casts it out somewhat to render it suspected, p. 173. which I shall examine by
and-by.

§. 3.
R. B. They say of those that are bred soldiers and used to bloodshed and Vic-
tory, that the state must make them fresh work and finde them con-
stant employment, or else they will make work and finde employment for them-
selves. A Polemical Divine much used to Disputations, and thereby to the glory
and Triumph of Victory, is, as it seems by this Learned man, in the same case.
Mr. Goodwin found him not so much, and rather then he would want more,
he makes to himself an adversary [for he faith, it is against Mr. Baxter] which
here in the beginning he confeffeth, makes not himself one, fo much as by a de-
nial of his Proposition, or an affirming the contrary. Could you finde never a man
in the world to deal with, that affirmed that there may be new immanent acts in
God? If you could, they had been fitter for you to take in hand: For its like,
they would purposely have maintained that afection with some fhew of reason:
If you could not: then your doctrine is fo unfolutely received, that I should
think it should not need your Arguments now to support it: And then you may
well conclude, as you do, that you have done little by this Dispute: if you have
but laboriously maintained that which no man denies. But it seems to me it was
some reasons ab homine, from the person of your chosen-feigned adversary, rather
then from the caufe that allured or impelled you to this encounter.

As you will well begin with some explication of your fene, so will I also: and
the rather seeing I have little else to do. I desire the Reader therefore to under-
stand this much of my thoughts about the subje& in hand, before I proceed
further.

1. In general, I am very strongly persuaded that it is one of the greatest sins
that a great part of Pious Learned Divines are guilty of, that they audaciously
adventure to dispute and determine unrevealed things; and above all others, about
the Nature and Actions of the Incomprehensible God. And that this is The very
thing that hath divided, weaken and ruined the Church, more then any one
thing, except plain contempt of God: And that it is under the wounds of these
overwise mens Learning, that the poor Church hath lain bleeding many hundred
years. Our Contentions, Envyings, Heart-burnings, by perverse zeal, and much
of all our wars and calamities, are long of this sinne in these men: That as the
Romish Clergy are justly esteemed the greatest Schifmaticks on earth, for their
audacious and unmercifull additions to the Creed, making such a number of new
Keys which heaven must be opened and shut by, which God never made: So are
those zealous Learned men, the cruel dividers of the Church, by occasioning our
contentions, that will with boldness pry into things unrevealed, and with confi-
dence and peremptoriness determine them, and then with long and subtil and ter-
rent arguings maintain them, and make them seem necessary to the peace of the
Church, or the soundness of our faith. Scarce any one thing hath more fully disco-
cered to me the frailty and fearfull pravity of man, then this: To think, that so
fily a worm should be no more acquainted with his own weaknesses, and the infinite
distance between God and man; and should so confindently think that he knows
what
what he doth not know! yea and what he cannot know? yea and be angry with all the world that will not say, It’s true; and will not believe that he knows what he pretends to know! If a man should persuade me that I know how many Angels are in heaven, or how many daies it will be till Christ comes to Judgement, one would think it were no hard matter for me to know that I do not know any such thing. But if I should persuade my self that I know it, and should expect that all others should believe that I know it, and would write Volumes to prove it, and count all those ignorant or erroneous that will not believe me, or that will not say they know it when they do not, as well as I, whether this were the part of a man awake and in his wits; let others judge. How much more beyond our reach is the unsearchable nature of God, further then he hath revealed himself in his Works and Word, which, alas, afford us but a glimpse of his backpart. Yea the wonder is yet greater that these same Learned Divines, when they are at a nonplus in their arguing, will plead mens ignorance and incapacity to put off their adversary, and blame others for too bold enquiries and intrusions into Gods secrets: and most of our Reformers do speak hardly of the Schoolmen for it (and very well deservedly) and yet will not see the guilt in themselves. No man speaks more against his own natural inclination in this then I do: I feel as great a desire to know, and to pry into any thing that others have disputed, and as much natural delight in the reading of the most audacious subtil Disputers, as others do. I was wont to say, I could get more out of Aquinas, Scotus, Durandus, and such like in a day, then out of many Ancient Fathers, and later Treatisers in a month. But I finde that as desire to know was the beginning of our misery, so is it the continuance. Why do men fear themselves no more, in that which innocent Adam was undone by? I finde that this bait of knowing things unrevelled, doth but entice men into vain hopes, and labours, and self-deluding promises, and flatter men into a pleasant lois of time (and worse:) and in the end fail eth all their expectations: and the Learned Disputers come off as Adam did, with Gods acknowledgment that he was like God in knowing good and evil (Ironically, as some Divines think; or expressing his unhappiness plainly, as others:) Those leaves of Bradwardine and Twis Vind, and de scient. Med. &c. which I was wont to read with longing and delight, I confess I look on now with fear; and many Learned Schoolmen (especially on the first Book of the Sentences) I read, as I hear men swear or take Gods name lightly in their common talk; even seldom, unwillingly (looking for other matter) and with horror. Yet how oft doth Dr. Twisfe tell Arminius and Dr. Jackson of the sinfulness, unsafenes and uncertainty of departing from the Scriptures in these high things, about the Nature and Decrees of God? And what Bradwardine excellently saith, I desire the Reader to see in him, de Cause Dei, l. l.c. corol. 32. But especially I desire the Reader to peruse that excellent Epistle of Cottius in Beucrioc. de Termin. Vita; which contains what I have a minde further to have said of this: with Gibbys first Chap. de Libertate Dei (bb. 2. de bb.) which shews how far God is above all our highest names and notions: and that Deus ab illis Liber est: with much more against the Doctrine that I oppose: See also Card. Cont. archius de officio Episcopi, operaum p. 110, 111. and what he saith out of Lyonsius. And I intreat you to read seriously that notable passage, 1 Tim. 6. 3, 4, 5. where pride is shewed to be the root, and supposd knowledge said to be but Doting, and they are said to know nothing, that thought they knew most, and the last effects of all are manifest.
2. I do think that most of our profound Disputes, wherewith the Dominicans and Jesuites, the Arminians and Antiarminians have Learnedly troubled the world, are guilty in part, of this hainous Sinne before mentioned: and that these great Doctors do dispute for the most part of they know not what. I confess its usual with men that know little themselves, to think that others know as little, and to measure the knowledge of other men by their own: and so its possible I may undervalue the Learning of these men, because having none myself, I cannot understand the largeness of their capacities, and sublimity of their speculations. However I am sure I am wiser and righter in one point then I was: For when I steeped my thoughts in their speculations, and was my self of the same express opinion with one of the parties, I thought that I begun to grow somewhat wise my self; but now I know I was deceived, and it was my folly, and that I knew not what I thought I knew. And though I will be bolder to befool such a one as myself, then men of such sublime incomprehensible knowledge; yet its my opinion that they are but men; and what a man is though I do not yet fully know, yet I am daily both studying and trying: and experience which i: the teacher of fools, hath taught me this much of him; that he is no Deity; nor one of the Intelligences that moveth or comprehended the orbs; that the wisest are not so wise as they would seem, or as they imagine themselves; that all their conceptions which they judge so comprehensive are comprehended in the compass of a narrow skull, and there lodged in a puddle of such brains, and humours, that a little knock if it hit right may make the wisest man an Idiot, and drive out all that profound Learning which Mr. K. thinks is so near kin to the knowledge of God. I confess of late I have accustomed my self to such mean thoughts of man and his imaginations, and such high thoughts of God, that I reade many of the profoundest School Divines (whom yet in some respects I honour) as I hear children dis coursing of State matters, or Theology; or as if I heard two disputing in their sleep. The Serpent hath beguiled us as he did Eve, by drawing us from the simplicity that is in Christ. Vain Philosophy hath been the bait to deceive the Church: And so we are judiciously broken in pieces and ruined; and have learned to our cost to know good and evil. I think there is no hope of the Churches recovery but by returning to the primitive Christian simplicity; and using Aristotle as a help in Natural, but not preferring him before Christ in the teaching of the highest speculations of Theology, as if we must go learn Gods nature of Aristotle, where Christ leaveth us at a loss. When those Learned men, who professing themselves wise became—shall become fools that they may be wise, and come quite back again to their cognosce te ipsum; then they may know more of God then they yet do, and yet perceive that they know less then they thought they had known: and then their knowledge will edifie which now puffeth up.

3. I think that man can have no positive proper conception of God, at least besides cus (which the Scotisls think proper) and that there is no word in humane language that can express Gods nature in this propriety, but all our notions of him are so exceeding imperfect, that they express more of our ignorance then of our knowledge. White is bold to say (Institut. Peripatet. l.4. lef. 9, 10.) that none of the Names that we attribute to God, hath a notion which hath in God a formall object: and that that science is of all other the most sublime and proper, which inquirith into the impropriety of the names that are spoken of God, and denieth them all as to him.
4. I think that there is no such thing in God as Understanding, Knowledge, Will, Intention, Decree, Election, Love, &c. as these are by men conceived of, and expressed: And that man knows not what it is in God formally which these terms are used by him to express. And that it is a farre less improper speech to say, that the Firmament is a nutshell, or the Sun is a glow-worm, or to denominate the reason of men from the apprehensions of a fly or a worm, then to attribute Understanding, Will, &c. to God. What the impropriety is, we shall speak to more anon.

5. Therefore all those reasonings concerning God's Nature or Acts, which are drawn merely from the nature and acts of man, as concluding from a supposed Analogy of attribution (much more a formal Identity) is a vain deceitful reasoning.

6. Yet as Scripture speaks of God in terms improper, according to man's capacity, and fetcht from mans nature and acts, so must we both conceive and speak: that is, not believing that those are proper expressions or conceptions of God, but that there is in God which we cannot now more fully conceive of then under these notions, or so farre express then in these terms. God hath nothing properly called Knowledge or Will: but he hath or is that which man cannot further express or conceive of then under the notion of Knowledge and Will: But what it is, God knows. We must say, God knows, and God willeth; and God must say so to us: For else man could not hear or speak of God, if God condescended not to the language and capacity of man. Camero faith, even of our most perfect state of glory, that From Deo nihil aliud est quam potestas, sapientia, bontas divine fructum percipere, quem creature modus & ratio ferre potest, &c. Et videntur Dei experientia quae ille (t. 10, 3.) Et qualem se erga nos praefert, ceterum (quid-gu-quit) diutissimae scholasticis, homines acuti quidem, sed in hoc argumento nimii acuti, invisibilis est vel Angelis, quibus ad Dei conspectum nulla peccati labes, sola natura imbecillis (creaturae enim tantum) adiam -inconstitut. Praefert de Ver. Dei. Gloss. c. 7. p. 455. I am more certain that even the eye of our understanding hath no direct and proper sight: of God, while we are in the flesh.

7. Yet these attributions of Knowledge and Will, to God, are not falsehoods, for there is really somewhat in God which these are made the improper expressions of. Equivocals and Analogies are not to denominate false expressions.

8. I am so farre from thinking that it is by Analogy of Attribution (as the Schoolmen call it) that Knowledge, Will, &c. are attributed to God and the creature; that I think these ascribed to God by an exceeding farre fetcht metaphor, further then (as I said) if I should call Heaven a nutshell; there being a thousand fold more likenesses between these, then between Gods Knowledge and Will, and mans: For between finite and Infinite there is no proportion. Yea I will not undertake to prove that the Ratio homonymie is not in Us, only, and not at all in the Things.

9. Yet no doubt, the thing meant by Knowledge and Will when attributed to God, is not only, as many say, most eminently in God, but is solely in God; that which is called knowledge and will in man being not the same thing, but genera diversum. But yet the conception that we have of Gods Knowledge and Will is but improper derived from the supposed simile, viz. our own understanding and will, which representeth it with exceeding imperfection. So that the terms of Knowledge, Will, Decree, &c. are spoken first and properly of
of the creature, and thence improperly of God.

10. Yet I acknowledge that though all these terms of Attribution, as to God, are exceeding improper, yet there are degrees of impropriety; some being more improper than others are: And so I doubt not but that the terms that are taken from humane passions and imperfections are more improperly applied to God, than these forementioned of Understanding and Will, &c.

And thus I have told you some of my thoughts, that Mr. K. may know on what terms to deal with me, and not contend with one whole minde he understandth not.

And as to his description of Immanent Acts, I deny that there is any such thing as an Act in God terminated in himself, supposing that you speak not of a mere objective termination (as I know you do not; for else you would call many of these transient acts, as having an extrinseck object.) As I acknowledge no certainty of a proper Act in God, so I acknowledge no positive termination of that which in him we call an Act; and we call it immanent but in that negative sense which the later clause of your description doth express. We are like to make a good dispute of it, when I am forced to deny the subject, as being a Chymara.

§ 4.

Mr. K. IN the mean time, out of the respect I bear to the memory of Dr. Twifte, I cannot forbear to say, that Mr. Baxter had better consulted his own honour if he had said nothing so to the disparagement of that Reverend and Renowned Doctor, of whom he speaks very slightingly more than once in his otherwise excellent Treatise of Infant-Baptism, and in all his other Books: In which I could wish there were not something of the Doctrinal part not answering that of the Devotional. What Dr. Twifte hath said of Justification from eternity, upon this ground, that there can be no new immanent act in God, and how much some in the Synod said against him, and how little he replied for himself matters not; he was now grown old,

Et videas felios Rhadamanthon & Æacon annis,

Et Minos queri—

Like enough, Multum mutatus ab illo

Hecfore quis credit exuvias indurat Achillis.

When he beat Arminius, Corvinus, Tilenum, Penotus, Bellarmine, Dr. Jackson, and I know not how many more out of the field; & solus vacua dominatus arena left them all bleeding, as Mr. Goodwin would have said, at the feet of his Writings. It may be he was now at last, but magni nominis umbra, but whose very name really did most of the service, and I am sure was that formidable thing to the learned Adversary: But as old as he was, I question not but he could have easily made this good, there is no new immanent act in God] against all that opposed him in the Synod, and Mr. Baxter to boot: and I would fain hear any of them all that opposed him, to give a satisfactory answer but to this one Argument.
§ 4.

R. B. 1. You need not argue me to a higher respect to Dr. Twiffel then I have ever manifested, except you would have me say, He was a God, or an Angel, or an Infallible man.

2. If you cannot forbear, as you say, its pity you should be hindered: Men and women must speak when their lift is so great. Who can hold that which will away?

3. I confess, that I did not much confult mine Honour in that writing. Else you had not found your self work as you have done in these leaves. If you mean the Honour of my Honesty, your proof must do more to the determination then your affection: If you mean the Honour of my Learning, do not you know well enough, how little I have to confult? He that hath nothing, hath nothing to lose.

4. [Sleightly] is a word that will stretch, and therefore I will not charge you with untruth. In one mans sense, he sleights a man that calls him [that famous excellent Divine:] but in another mans, sleighting signifies the esteeming of a man below his worth, and expressing so much, or setting light by a man. I am miserably troubled with those kindes of people that cannot endure [sleighting] as they call it, above all folks in the world. (I use to call them plainly, Proud people, here in the Country; but, if I were to talk to Learned men I would use more manners.) They think I sleight them, if I do not applaud them, or compliment with them, or if I commend their not with so loud a voice as they expect (and they are a people that are neverflow in their expectations:) or if I do but praise another above them, or speak to another before them, or be short with them (when I am busie) when they look for a longer more respectfull discourse; yea if my Hat should be over mine eyes that I see them not, or my memory so fail me as that I forget them; these and abundance more I am guilte of sleighting every day, that I am now grown accusitome to the Vice, and shameles in hearing it charged upon me. But I suspect that my sleighting Dr. Twiffe consistseth in my supposing him to erre, and telling the world to: that is, in taking him to be a man: for humanum est errare: and for saying he knew but in part, that is, that he was not glorified on earth by perfection. If you could have charged me with any more then this, would you not have done it? I say, would you not? when the Vindication of this Reverend man was the end of your encountering me? and it boyled so hot on your stomack, that [you could not forbear: you had not the patience to see so Worthy men so unworthily handled.] Yea your self affirm that which is his doctrine to be untrue, and yet I sleight him for saying so! Lay this with the commanded Adoration of the footsteps, and it seems, it is high matters indeed that you expect. I doubt, by this, that you will say, I flíght you before I have done, either because I praise you not enough, or because I take you not for infallible and indefeáible, or because I value Dr. Twiffe or Mr. Pembel so very, very, very farre before you; when yet I am accused of flíghting them. Sir, these Reverend men, I doubt not, are perfected Saints in heaven, and have pride so much, that if they know it, they will give little thanks to him that will contend for the honour of their Infallibility, yea or for the guiding over any of their errours; much les, if their honour should be made a snare to the entangling of the godly, and a means to the promoting the King-
Kingdom of darkness, and opposing that Truth which they love better than their Honours, and the dishonouring of that God whose glory is their felicity.

Yea let me tell you that I take myself bound in conscience to say more then ever I have yet said, and that is this [ All young Students that will deigne to take advice from so mean a man as I, as ever you would preserve your graces and conversations, preserve your Judgments; and as ever you would maintain the Doctrine of Chrift, take heed of the Errors of the Antinomians; and as ever you would escape the snare of Antinomianism, take heed of these principal Articles of it following: [That Christ's satisfaction is ours quà praestita, before the Application; and that so far, as that we are actually Pardoned, Justified, Reconciled and Adopted by it before we were born, much more before we believe: yea that Adoption and Remission of Sin are immanent acts in God, and so are from eternity, even before any death of Christ, or efficacy of it: That pardon of Sin is nothing but Δε' non Punire: That Justification by faith is nothing but Justification in foro conscientia, or the sense of that in our hearts, which was really ours from eternity, or from Christ's death, or both: That justifying faith is the feeling or apprehension of God's eternal Love, Remission and Adoption.] I say, take heed of these master Points of Antinomianism: And as ever you would avoid these, take heed how you receive them on the reputation and plausible words of any Writer: and especially of Dr. Twiffl, who is full of such passages, and being of greater learning and esteem then others is liker to mislead you. For you know, if you receive these then you must receive the rest, if you discern the concatenation. For if all your sins were pardoned as soon as Christ died, then what need you pray for pardon, or Repent or Believe or be Baptized for pardon? then God loved you as well when you were his enemies, as since; and then how can you be restrained from Sin by fear? &c. And that you may know I speak not this in slighting of the Doctor, as Mr. K. chargeth me. 1. I profess to do it mainly for God's glory and Truth, and for the love of souls. 2. I take myself the rather bound to it, because I was once drawn my self to some of these opinions by the most high estimation of Mr. Pembie and Dr. Twiffl. 3. I profess still most highly to love and reverence the names of these two blessed excellent men, as formerly I never honoured any two men more. For Dr. Twiffl, I am more beholden to his Writings for that little knowledge I have then almost any one mans, besides: and for Mr. Pembie, for ought I can see in his Book of Justification, he revokd this same error which in his Vindici Grat. he hath delivered: sure I am, no two mens Writings have been more in my hands, and few mens names are yet so highly honoured in my heart.

This much I take myself bound to publish for a common warning. And I would further advise all to take heed how they entertain Dr. Twiffl's doctrine about the cause of Sin; of which I shall be ready to give my reason when I have a call; but will not now digress so far.

5. For your good wish [that my Book had not something in the Doctrinal part not anwering the devotional] I thank you. But, alas, ignorance and error will not be healed with a wish: Many a year have I studied and praised against them, and yet they stuck by me still. But had I erred in the Foundation, it would have spoiled my Devotion: for non recte vivitur, ubi de Deo non bene creditur: And I had rather be defective in lesser doctrinals, then in Devotion. And though I am as confident that you err in some of your Doctrinals (as I shall anon manife-
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that were to make them a contemptible AlTembly indeed, if a mans Name, yea
,inigni nomtnk umbrj, did moft of their lervice : And it were to think as balely of
It were not worth
tftcir fervice as the worft Sedary doth, that! have met with.
fo much colt, and fo many years pains, nor worthy the Acceptation of Parliament
or People, if ic were bu: the oftspring of Dr. rw/l/c's Name. But Sir we hava
received fruits that (liew they came from another caufe then a name or the (hadow
I confefs I valuetheir leaft Catechifm for children above all Mr.
of a name.
!(,cniaU's learned Labours, were they twenty times more of the fame quality. I
never heard but oie Learned man fpcak contemptuoufly of the Allembly, and his
friends fay it was becaufc he was not thought Worthy to be one of them ( I except thofe that wereagainft them in the Warrc J where heat of oppofition might
occauon
8.

fpeak of [his very


occassion disesteem : But if this were Mr. K's case, yet methinks when he changed his Court and Party, he should withall have changed his esteem of the Assembly.) But its likely that Mr. K. means that it was the Doctors Name that did most of the service of a Moderator; most of his own part in the Assembly: It may be so: But if he had nothing to work by but his Name, yet had his cause been good, it would in that Assembly have found some friends. But what you mean then by the following words, I do not well know, that his Name you are sure [ was that formidable thing to the Learned adversary.] Perhaps you mean your self, by the Learned adversary, of whose fears I confess you might be sure, and so might know the Name or Word that did affright you: else I cannot imagine who you mean, except it were the Kings party or the Episcopal Divines together: But for Episcopacy, I know of no Disputes that ever the Assembly had upon it, and so had no adversaries in a disputing way; at least during Dr. Twisse's time. And for disputing the Kings Cause, I think they did as little in it. Some chosen men in the Treatises indeed disputed against Episcopacy, but with other weapons then Dr. Twisse's Name. If you should mean that it was Dr. Twisse's Name that made the Learned Episcopal Divines have Reverend thoughts of the Assembly, I must tell you that there were in that Assembly no small number of Divines of that excellency for Learning, Piety and Miniflerial Ability, which might command Reverence from the Learnedest adversaries of you all.

9. But though his Name did all the service; yet you [ question not but he could have easily made it good, That there is no new immament act in God, against, &c.] It seems by this that you think this the easier to prove of the two: And indeed I am acquainted with none that are minded to oppose it.

10. Nor is it reasonable for you to say, that you [ would fain have any of them all that opposed him, to give a satisfactory answer to your Argument,] when you know it was not in that Point that they opposed him. Would you make more your adversaries against their will as well as me? or do you long for more honourable Antagonists to cope with? And what's your Argument?

§ 5.

Mr. K. If there be any new immament Act in God, it must be either of his Understanding or his Will: Of his Understanding there can be none: else must he know somewhat a new, which infers he was not Omniscient, know not all before this new Act of Knowledge: If of his Will, then either this new Act is for the better or worse or indifferent: If for the better, he was not absolutely perfect before, as being capable of bettering: If for the worse, he was not so perfect since this Act as he was before; which is to make him less perfect by his new Act: If neither, then is this Act such as might as well have been put in; and then it is an imperfection so Act so impropertly. This same Argument as I take it made use of by Mr. Goodwin himself in a like case, and therefore he will not be offended how highly lower I value it as an irrefragable Demonstration.
R. B. Remember that I say not that your Doctrine is Untrue, but Uncertain. It may be possibly as you say; but whether you can tell that it is so, or prove it to be so, I doubt. To your great Argument, I expect better proof of your major Proposition, which indeed hath none at all. Two things I expected you should have proved: 1. That God hath an Understanding and Will which act; properly so called: or that you know what it is that is improperly called Gods Understanding and Will? 2. That God hath no immanent Act but of his Understanding or Will. To begin with the last: I will not say, datur sertium. For I dare not say properly datur duo: But I will desire you to prove your major: and I think that in the same sense as God is said to have an Understanding and Will, for ought you know he may have other acts, which those two notions will not express. For 1. You are uncertain whether Angels may not have other faculties or acts immanent, besides Understanding and Will: (If you say, you are sure they have not, prove it:) and so others may be ascribed to God by Analogy from them, as these be by Analogy from man. You know perhaps how many senses you have of your self: but how can you prove that no other creature hath a sixth sense, which you are incapable of knowing the name or nature of? So how know you but Angels may have powers or immanent acts beside Understanding and Willing, which you know nothing of for name or nature? Must all Gods superior creatures be needs measured by poor man? How much more noble creatures hath God, then these below that dwell in dust! 2. But if you were acquainted with all the Angels in heaven, and were at a certainty about the number or nature of their powers or acts, how prove you that God hath no other act than what Understanding and Willing doth express? That one unconceivable perfect act in God, which Eminenter (by an unconceivable transcendent eminence) is Understanding and Willing, (yet but Analogically so called) but properly and formally is neither, but somewhat more excellent; is in all likelihood very restrainedly or defectively expressed by these two words; even as to the objective extent. How know we that in some of Gods creatures, or at least in God himself there may be something found besides Entity, Verity, Goodness; or any thing that is the object of Intelligence or Volition, whereof no man had ever any conception. However, is it not unlikely, yea a dangerous imagination, That the powers or acts of such wretched worms as we, should be so farre commensurable with the Infinite Majesty, that as we have no immanent act but of Understanding or Will (or subordinate to these) so God hath no other? or none but what are expressed in these two notions! Alas, that silly worms should so unreasonably presume! and pretend to that knowledge of God which they have not! and might so easily know that they have not!

And for the former, How farre God hath an Understanding or Will, I will peruse your words to Mather Goodwin when I have done with this Section.

This were enough to your Argument and Challenge: but I proceed to the confirmation of your implied minor. And 1. I easil'y grant you, that it is certain there is no Addition to, or mutation of Gods Essence. 2. I think all the Acts ascribed to God are his Essence, and are one in themselves considered. Pardon that I do but say [I think:] For though principles of reason and Metaphysical Axioms seem
seem to lead plainly to this Conclusion; yet I am afraid of pretending to any greater Certainty then I have; or of building too much on the doubtfull conclusions of mans slippery Reasonings, about the nature of the Invisible Incomprehensible God. I think it most suitable to Gods Unity and Simplicity, that all his immanent acts (so called by us) are Himself and are One. But I dare not say I am certain that God cannot be Simple and Perfect, except this be true: both because He is beyond my knowledge, and because the doctrine of the Trinity assur'd us that there is in God a true diversity consisting with Unity, Simplicity and Perfection of Essence. 3. You know not what the subject of your Proposition is, (Gods acts of Understanding and Will :) and therefore you are incapable of such peremptory concluding de Modis, knowingly and certainly, as here you pretend to. 4. You cannot prove that there's any such thing in God as an Immanent Act, or an Understanding or a Will in proper sense: but something there is which we cannot fitler or more profitably conceive or express then under such notions, drawn Analogically from mans acts of Understanding and Willing. Now if we will speak of Gods Incomprehensible nature by such Analogy, and put the names of Understanding and Willing on God, as borrowed from mans understanding and willing, then must we accordingly conceive of Gods understanding and willing, as like to mans in the form of these acts (for we can reach to no higher conceptions, though these be utterly improper.) Now mans actual intellectual doth connote, and suppose an intelligible object, and his Will doth connote and suppose an appetible object: and consequently it cannot be expected according to the utmost imaginable natural perfection of them, that either should go beyond the extent of their objects, or be such acts without their proper objects: * These things thus premised, some will perhaps think you sufficiently answered (when you say, it inferres that God was not Omniscient, knew not all, &c.) by telling you 1. That as Omniscience signifies a Power of Knowing all things, Analogically ascribed to God ad captum humannum as distinct from the act of knowing; so God was yet Omniscient. 2. As Omniscience signifies the actual Knowledge of all intelligible objects, so God was Omniscient. And no more is requisite to the perfection of his Knowledge. 3. But an Object may have not only its real but its * intelligible Being de Novo which it had not before; and therefore as Omniscience signifies the Knowledge of all things that will be intelligible, as well as those that now are intelligible, so (say they) it belongs not to Gods perfection to be Omniscient; for it is unnaturally and improperly called Science (and so Omniscience) which hath not an Object. Their foundation (which may seem absurd to you) viz. That some things may de novo become the objects of Knowledge, they declare thus: 1. They suppose, that though God be Indivisible, and so his Eternity be Indivisible, and have neither in it, Præteritum nor Futurum, nor Nyne neither, as we understand it, as expressing a present instant of time: yet as God knoweth not Himself only, but the creature also, so he knoweth not Eternity only but Time: He knoweth how things are ordered and take place in mans Divisible measure of motions: and therefore he knowes things as Past, Present and Future, quoad hominem & tempus, which are so past, present and future. And he doth not know a thing Past to be Present (quoad tempus & hominem) nor a thing Futureto
be Past: but knows things truly as they be. 2. This being premised, they will then assume, that Peter and Paul did not actually exist from eternity: Christ did not actually suffer from eternity: and so the actual existence of Peter in nunc temporis, was not an intelligible object from Eternity: and therefore they think they may conclude, that it could not be known from Eternity. They will urge their reason thus: 1. There was no Time from Eternity (that is, before time:) therefore it could not be intelligible, that Peter did actually then exist in Time. 2. Else you will confound Futurition and Present existence: God did know from Eternity, that Peter would exist in Time, i.e. futuritionem Petri: therefore it was not Peter's present actual existence that he knew. 3. The nature of foreknowledge is to know things as future, and therefore must not be confounded with knowledge of things as existent. 4. This proposition before the creation was not true [Peter doth actually exist:] therefore God could not know it to be then true. But after Peter's birth it did de novo become a true proposition: and therefore must be de novo known to be then true. Before that, it was only true that [Hac Proposito vera futura est:] but not [vera est:] therefore no more but the futurition of the Truth could be known, and not the actual present existence (as referring to time:) It is not all one to say [Petrua cri] and [Petrua est:] nor all one to know it. 5. The contradictory Proposition was then true [Peter doth not exist:] But both contradictory Propositions could not be known to be true together, that is from Eternity. Therefore God did then know the Negative Proposition as then true [Petrua non existit:] and the Affirmative de futuro to be true [Petrua futurus est, vel existit:] but he did not know the Affirmative de existentia presenti to be true from Eternity [Petrua in nunc temporis existit:] nor nor [Petrua in nunc & Eternitas existit:] for they were then false Propositions: nor yet was it then true that [Tempus aeterno existit:] If you say, That there were no Propositions from Eternity, and therefore they could not be true or false: this alters not the case: for 1. We speak on Supposition that there had been creatures to have framed these Propositions. 2. If we conceive not of God's Understanding as knowing the truth of Propositions, concerning things, we shall scarce have any conception of it as an Understanding at all. 3. The Schools commonly speak of the Eternal truth of Propositions, e.g. de futuris contingentiis. 4. There are Propositions in Time, and these God knows: and thus all one to the present case. At Noah's flood God knew not this Proposition to be then true [Petrua existit:] for it was not then true. Nor did he know then that [it is true in nunc temporis quo existit Petrus] but only, that it will be true: For Futura and not things presently existent are the objects of Foreknowledge: and that [Nunc temporis] itself did not then exist. 6. Otherwise it would be true that All things do coexist with God from Eternity: (which is disclaimed by those that are now opposed:) and so that they do exist from Eternity. For if this Proposition were known to be true from Eternity [Petrua existit, vel Deo coexistit:] then the thing expressed is true, Peter did so exist and coexist. For that which is false cannot be known to be at the same time true. If it be granted therefore that Peter did not exist from Eternity, and consequently that that Proposition was not then true, nor intelligible as then true, but only as of future Verity, then when God in time knows it to be of present existent Verity, he knows more then when he knows it to be only of future Verity and of present falsity: And so about the creatures, When he knows that they do exist and knows them as existing, he knows more then when he knew them only to be future and as future. For if it be
not more to know a thing as existent then as future, and so knowledge be not diversified from the object, then it is no more to know something then nothing; For the reason is the same: and future is a term of diminution as to existent. And then it will be all one to know [Judas is damned] and [Peter is saved:] [Jacob is loved] and [Esau is hated.] Yea then it would be all one it (per possibile vel impossible) it were known [Peter is damned] and [Judas is saved] or [Peter is saved and damned:] and so it would be all one to know falsity and truth.

Many such reasonings as these will be used against you. Of which if you would know my own opinion, I think they are de ignorant, dreams, fightings in the dark, yet much like your own. And though I know several things that you may say against this reasoning, so do I know much that may be said against yours: and, I think, both sides would do better to profess that ignorance which they can neither overcome nor hide. How constantly do the Schools distinguish between Gods Abstractive and Intuitive Knowledge? Scientiam simplicis intelligentiam & pure Visionis? and tell us that the former in order of nature goes before the other? If this be so, then God hath a Priors and Possibilities in the acts of his knowledge. The like we may lay between Gods Knowledge of Himself and the creature. If they think it is absurd that etiam in mente Divina there should be a transition of things è numero possibilitium in numerum futurorum, and this sine mutatione; why may they not admit a knowledge of things as existent only when they are existent, and of things as future when they are future? and this sine mutatione too? For the distinction quaod momenta temporis, will make but a gradual difference, in point of mutation, from that quaod ordinem nature, vel momenta Rationis. All distinctions, that hath real ground, denotes imperfection, according to our highest speculators, and must all be denied of God. I refuse not to lay (if I must say any thing) of both as Mr. Barlow doth Exercit. 5. (think him not pedaniick, because he is bound with Schibler:) Mutatio illa est solum in objeclo cognito, non in cogno- scente, seu cognitio; cum cognitio divina ab objeclo non dependet, nec ad mutatuum objecti mutationem ordinem patitur, &c. Cum vero admitter Altezer res primo esse possibi- biles solum in ordine ad potentiam & futuras in ordine ad voluntatem, necessitie est ut prius cognoscat cognitione abstractus (quia ut possibiles ca futurorum cognitione cogno- scunt) & possum per voluntatem futurum, & etiam actus existentem, ita cognitionem intuitor cognitione Diva. Ad hinc nullas in Deo mutationes sequentes, sed solum in objecto (ut fateatur necessitie est) Et per consequens hoc dico, quod scientia Dei ab abstractus in intuitum mutatur, tamen non sequetur Dcum esse mutabilem, vel cognitionem futurum ex parte rei: sed solum quod objecto variatur, intellectus noiffer, varias ci denominatoris attribuit: ut quod sit intuitus, quod abstractus, quae solum sint denominations variae cognitioni divina ab intellectu nostro impositae, pro diverso respectu ad creaturam, cum in sio omnino simplex & invaria.

But then I would fain know whether there be not the same necessity that the difference between objects [only future] and [presently existent] should cause our understandings to put the forementioned various denominations on Gods Knowledge, as the difference inter Possibilitas & Futura, doth so cause us to put on it? And also whether in the same impropriety and imperfection, the very notions of [Understanding, Willing, Acting, Immanently, &c.] be not Deno- minations ab intellectu nostro impositae, or assumed by God in condescension to humane weakness, expressing but some little, very little, of that Divine —— I know not what. For that same thing which man hath a true formal conception of under the notion of [Knowing, Willing] is varied according to the variety of objects;
objects: But if it be not so with God (as I must think and say, It is not, if I presume to think and say any thing of it,) that is because Knowledge and Willing in Him are not the things that we by those terms use to express; nor yet any thing that we can have formal proper conceptions of: And by the same necessity and warrant as we do bring down the Divine nature low, as to apply to it the notions of Acting, Understanding, Willing; may we also apply to it the notions of Acting, Knowing and Willing de novo; conferring a further addition to the impropriety of speech. And therefore as God himself doth in Scripture accommodate himself to our capacity, by assuming the terms and notions of Understanding and Willing, so doth he also of loving where he before hated, with divers the like, which in man would imply an innocent mutation.

I have here given you some reason of several passages of mine, which your following Pages carp at, before you discerned my meaning, as I shall shew you further anon.

So much to your proof that there is no new immanent act in God's Understanding. One word to what follows about his Will.

Where you argue thus: [If of his Will, then this new act is either for the Better, or Worse, or Indifferent, &c.] Ans. In strict propriety, it is taken as unproved, that he liath Will, or Immanent acts. But ad captum humanum as we are necessitated to ascribe Willing and Acting to him, so they that think they may on the same grounds ascribe New acts of Will to him (as the Scripture undoubtedly doth,) will think that your Argument is sufficiently answered thus:

1. This arguing supposeth mans silly intellect capable of comprehending the Reasons of the Acts of the Almighty; as if it cannot be, except we can apprehend the reason of it, and whether it be for the better or worse or indifferent; or what it produceth, or to what end it is: which is a most bold arrogant presumption in such moles as we are. As I said before, you know not whether there may not be more Affections or Modi cœtium open to the Divine Intellect and Will, or Nature, then we have any name for or conception of: And though man will look only at the goodness or apprehensibility or convenience of objects, yet you know not what God's will is; and therefore know not what is its adequate object. Many other reasons also of the obscurity of this might be given.

2. It will be answered you, that the said New act of God's will, is for the Better: But then they will distinguish of [Better.] 1. They will say, It is Better quad rerum ordinem: and it is Better to the creature: (as for God to love him that before he hated: or approve of him, whom before he disapproved.) 2. They distinguish also between that which may be said to be Better to God himself: Either Really, by a real addition to his perfection; and so nothing can be Better to God: Or 2. Relatively and Reputatively; as God is said to be Blesed, Glorified, Honoured, Well pleased, Exalted, Magnified, &c. And thus it may be Better to God, though he receive no real addition of felicity; and so not Vain or Indifferent.

3. They will desire you to Answer your own Argument as to transient Acts, and they think it may serve as to immanent acts. (Remembering that they suppose that there be new acts in God without mutation; because they suppose that those very things that we call immanent: Acts in him are but denominations of his simple Essence, according to the various aspects or respects of the objects, which make no more mutation then relations do.) Was God's act of Creation, of raising
fing Christ from death, &c. for the Better, or Worse, or Indifferent? I think you will say as before, that it was not Better as to God in the adding of any real felicity to him: But to God Reparatively and Relatively, and to the creature really, it was Better. So will they say about immanent acts, which may perfect the whole (as the Honour of the Prince is the good of the Commonwealth) and may be necessary to the Good of particular persons; and the repurative Good of God himself. Its said, God made All things for himself, Was it for Better to himself, or Worse, or Indifferent?

4. Is it: Better or Worse for a looking Glass that it receive a hundred various species de novo? You will perhaps say, It is no disparagement to the Glass to be receptive of new species without being made Better or Worse: as also that its reception is passive, and so is not God’s Understanding or Willing. I know not what it is: but I confess it must needs be a very improper conception to conceive of God as passive in knowing. And yet man hath no true apprehension of a knowledge which is wholly sine passione: But how prove you that God cannot, if he pleases, by his active Knowledge, Know de novo, without becoming Better or Worse? or doing it in vain? Are you sure that every new act of intellect (even in a dream) doth make man’s understanding better or worse? or else is vain? I confess more may be here said.

5. Having done with your Argument, they will further tell you, that, If God may have new relations without any real change, then, for ought you know, he may have new immanent acts without a real change: But the Antecedent is unquestionably true: (God was not a Creator before he had creations: nor is he our Father before we are his children: nor our King, Master, &c. before we are his subjects, servants, &c. except de jure only:) The Consequence they prove thus: Relations have as true an Entity, as, for ought you know, these which we call Immanent Acts in God, may have: Therefore the Novation of them will make as great a change. Here they suppose that Actio and Relatio are both accidents (taken properly) and neither of them mere Entia Rationis (for in so thinking they go in the more beaten road) much less nothing: Or if you will say, that Relatio is but Modus entis, they will say so of action too: Or however they tell you, that it may be so for ought you know, with that which we call an Act in God. And here they suppose that his Acts are not his Essence absolutely and in itself considered; and that it signifies not all one to say, God is God, and to say, God willeth the existence of this worm: And therefore they will say, that those which we call Acts, may be, if not Relations, yet some of Scotus his formalities, or something to us unknown, which have either no more Being then Relations, or at least no so much as to make a real change in God. And that there is in his simple, indivisible Essence, a Trinity of persons, without any imperfection: so there may be in his Essence, distinct formalities (or somewhat that we cannot name or conceive of) of a lower nature, then Personality, without any inconvenience: and as these may be superadded to the meer absolute Essence of God (as Agere, Intelligere, Velle, are added) without dividing, or multiplying it: so may they on the same grounds be New, or renewed, without any Mutation of Gods Essence; but only of the formality of intellect or Volition, which is added to his Essence.

6. They further think that the nature of transient acts, doth prove that immanent acts may be renewed: But this will be more spoke to anon, when we come to your doctrine of transient Acts. They say, A transient act is not a meer Relation.
luation or Passion or Effect: But there is in it that which may be called action ab agene, as well as passion a patiene. Now if actio be efficientis actio here, and God in creating the world did ruere agere, then either the world was created from eternity, or else God did create it from Eternity, and yet it was created only in Time, and the Caufation or Caufing creating Act was infinitely before the Effect; or else there was a new act really performed by God in Time. The first none will maintain, that I deal with. The second, say they, is against common reason: For God's act is the causa proxima creature; and omnis causa proxima reciprocitur cum suo effectu: i.e. Posita causa proxima in actu, necesse est effectum ponere: If it be causationis, yea and requires nothing else to the effect so much as by preparation, or disposition, no nor a subject matter, then the act of creation must needs immediately produce the creature; and the Creare and Creati must needs be inseparable: Its answered that God's creating act was from eternity, but the effect, or creature, was not till its Time. But it will be replied, That either God did more for the creatures production or creation at the time of its passive creation, then he did from Eternity, or he did no more: If more, then he did something de novo: If no more, then either the creature would have had its Being from Eternity, quia posita causa ponitur effectus; or else if you ask what the reason that the creature was not in Being sooner or later, no cause can be assigned: and so God should not be the cause. This holds equally (say they) whether you make the creating act to be only God's Velle, or a superadded execution of that will, as being the effect of power. For either God willed the creatures present existence from eternity, as much as at the time of its creation, or as at this day; or he did not. If he did not, then he will have de novo: If he did, then the creature would have existed, as soon as it was willed. To say, that God willed from Eternity that the creature should be in Time, is true: But is it as much to Will that it shall be, as to Will its present existence? If it be answered, That there is no Past or Future with God; I answer: 1. That this was prevented before; when it was said, that God understandeth Time, and propositions concerning time, though time be only mens measure, and propositions mens instruments. 2. The men that I speak to, maintain that all things coexist not with God from Eternity (though indeed the term from as here used, contradistingeth Eternity:) and they distinguish between Gods willing rerum futurionem & existentiam presentem: and therefore this fecmeth to make against their answer. (But indeed none of all this arguing is solid, because of the different manner of producing effects per voluntatem, & per potentiam exequement voluntatis superadditionem.) Perhaps it will be said, that if all this be granted, yet it followeth not that immanent acts may be de novo without a change in God, because the Creating act, or any transient act is so: For the former is God himself, but the latter is not. To which it may be replied, 1. We speak not now of a product or effect, called the Creation, but of the creating act, and then why should not that be God himself, as well as an immanent act? If you say it is a being, then it is God or distinct from God: If distinct from God, it is a substance or accident, or some modus, or who knows what? Accidents God hath none: Substance it cannot be; except it be God. If you say it is any modus, you know what School contradiction you must expect: Or if you say it is a Reality or a Formality, tho' that you deal with will tell you, that they can as well prove the immanent acts to be formalities, or such like, as you can the transient. For 2. they say (with others) that these acts are not called Immanent, Positively, as if they had any effect or terminus in God himself;
but Negatively, because they have no effect, ad extra; and do nihil ponere in objecto. So that as to the nature of the act itself, they say, it is the same, or at least, the later as much essential to God, as the former (though not their effects.) And I have paper converse with a Divine, if I mistake not, full as Learned as Mr. K. (to speak sparingly) who maintains, that those which you call immanant acts (viz. Gods Knowing and Willing other things besides himself) are transient, and so to be called; as having as much an extrinsec object, as those that you and I call Transient; though they make no real change on them: and that those only are to be called Gods immanent acts, whose object is himself. 3. Moreover you will acknowledge that Gods Velle is an immanent act: But how many and how great are they that maintain that Gods Creating act, was but his Velle that things should be! I need not tell you of Schoolmen that are for this: but when you (doubtless) know that D' Twisfe himself affirms it, in his Vindic, you must either be of his minde, or handle him unworthily by your Differ, as I did in another cafe. Now if the act by which God produced the creatures be but his Velle, then it is an act which you call immanent. And you well know how commonly it is maintained that Deus operatur per essentiam: and that there is no act but his essence it self, requisite to any effect, which he produceth, as it is the effect of the first Cause. But this is but ad hominem; for these are not their principles whose arguings I now recite. They suppose that creation and other transient acts, are not mere Volitions, but acts of power, in execution of Gods will. To which purpose how largely many famous Schoolmen have argued, is obvious to them that are conversant in them. Aucroclus hath fifteen Arguments to this end. Gregor. Arminienus hath many Arguments to proove that how ever Creation or Conservation be taken, neither of them is God himself. Caproclus I know and other Thomists answere these Arguments: and much may be replied and is, to those answers: so that in so dark and unsearchable a Controversie, strong wits may finde something to say, against each other; longer then the patience of the wisest of their Readers will hold out to know the issue of their disputes. Aegidius Thom. de Argent. Occam, and others plead also for a necessity of an executive act of power, distinct from the meer act of willing, or that Creation is not God. So do Jacob. Martini, Suarez, Schieler, and other later Authors. And if (as Aquinas faith) transient acts be formaliter in agente, as well as immanent, then the inception of new immanent acts seems to have no other inconveniences, then the inception of transient acts as to the form. But indeed the Thomists say the same of both, that they are only Gods essence, and that God hath no transient act at all, but only that his Essence or Will or Understanding may be so denominatet for the rational Relation of the Object thereto. And therefore Aquinas (I. q. 25. a. 1.) maintaining that there is in God Potentia activa (though not passiva) withall maintains it to be the same thing, as the action, and as his Will and Understanding. (And yet sometime he calleth Gods actions transient: but in this he speaks unconstantly or doubtfully, as Suarez noteth Met. disp. 20. § 5.) And the substance of all Caproclus answer to Aucroclus fifteen Arguments is this same distinction, between Gods act of Creation it self (which is his Will and Essence, immanent and eternal) and the Relatio rationis between God and the object; from which Gods will is denominatet a transient act. But yet in this transient act, it is only the relation, and not the act it self (which is God himself) which may be diversifeyd or renewet. Now if this meer Relatio rationis be sufficient ground for our denomination of Gods act to be [Transient] and these transient acts to be
be new, then it may seem that the relation of the same to some extrinsec
terminative objects (as of God's knowledge to the present existence of things in
nunc tempore) doth give the same ground to call those acts new, though not so
properly transient. For if one may be denominated from its respect to its object,
why not the other? Nay why the same relation may not as well denominate
those acts transient also, which we now call immanent, is not easy to discern:
For both have respect to an extrinsec object, if that suffice. Nay doth not that
act which is called immanent, produce or effect? Seeing it is only Velentum without
any other executive action in God to effect all things that are effected: and
this Velentum from eternity is (say they) cedula materia of those things that are produced
in time. And therefore many say, that God hath no Will as to extrinsec, but
what is effective: and in that his Will hath no extrinsec object properly so called,
but only produces or effects. That none vel et operativum et efficax corum que
velis, and that therefore he may not be said to will any thing but what he doth ef-
fec. See Gibert de Libert. lib. 2. c. 24. & 1.

So that in Conclusion, according to the Doctrine of the most Learned Thom-
ists, there is in God neither immanent nor transient act in M.K.'s sense. (Ex-
cept those that are terminated, as they call it, in himself as the object.) Not im-
manent; for they are not terminated in the Agent, as M.K. faith, such are; nay
they have respect to things extrinsec; nay, say many, they are productive of
these extrinsec things. Not transient; for God's essence doth not transire in ob-
jectum extraneum, but only cause it without any other executive action; and so
respecteth it. In the same sense therefore, and on the same grounds as you will
maintain the transient act to be in time, and not eternal, will these men think to
prove it also of the immanent. For even the transient acts of God (so called) are
not in the creature, but only respect and effect them. As Capellus faith (lib. 2.
det. 1. q. 2. art. 3.) Talis actio predicamentalis quae est motus, est subjectiva in
passo: Divina autem actio non est motus, nec mutatio, tice causet motum & muta-
tionem.

7. But they much insist on that before intimated, that if it be no wrong to
Gods simplicity to have diversity or multiplicity of immanent acts ascribed to him,
then it is not any wrong to his immutability to have such acts ascribed to him de
novo: For the reason will prove alike. But that it is no wrong to God to have
diversity of immanent acts ascribed to him, is evident by 1. The use of Scripture.
2. The use of all Divines. 3. And the necessity of the thing. 1. I need not
tell any man that hath read the Bible, that Scripture distinguisheth of God's at-
tributes: that it ascribed to him Understanding, Will, Memory, &c. that it
spakeeth not of his Love and Hatred, his Approbation and Disallowance, his
Justice and Mercy, as being one, nor to be distinguished. 2. And what Divines
speak otherwise? even of them that make the boldest enquiries into Gods nature,
and pass of it the most confident conclusions, as if they had seen the invisible
Majesty: I mean the Schoolmen of all forts: To how little purpose were many
a Volume in Sent. for the most part, if it were enough to apprehend in God
undivisible Unity? How easily on these grounds might we answer all Bradward-
dines, all Twis's subtle disputes, about Gods willing sin, his order of invention,
and of his Decrees, his Election and Reprobation, whether absolute or condi-
tional, definite or indefinite, and de rerum possibilisate & futurisne ab aeterno,
with many the like? Its easy to say, that all these are one and the same thing:
and the same is not before or after it self, &c. Yet this is not taken for a satisfactory
way
way of disputing. 3. Yea is it not apparent, that there is a necessity of such disting\nishing language? How many souls would you be likely to convert, and save? How many sins to prevent, by telling your Auditory, that in deed and truth it is all one thing in God to Decree a man to salvation, or to decree him to damnation? It's all one to Will that you shall sin, and that you shall not sin: that you shall die this day, and that your Neighbour shall live forty years longer: Its the same thing, without any true difference, for God to Love you now you believe, and to hate you while you were a worker of iniquity; to be pleased and displeased, to Approve and dislike; His Love to Peter, to Jacob, and his Hatred to Judas, to Esau was the same thing, only the effects are not the same. I say, how favoury and profitable would this doctrine be?

And are there not the same Reasons for our ascribing to God, the beginning and ending of Immanent Acts, as the Diversity of them? Is not one as confinient with his Immutability, as the other with his Simplicity? Doth not Scripture ascribe to God the Inception and ending of Immanent Acts, as well as the Diversity of them? And is there not as great a necessity of our using that language as the other? How many souls were you like to save by telling them [God Loved you as well before you believed, yea before Christ died for you, as he doth since! God doth hate you now as much as he did when you were a worker of iniquity, and is as much offended with you since you believed as he was when you were a child of wrath! He had the same thoughts of you when you were blaspheming, murdering and committing adultery, as when you repent and pray. God is now decreeing to create the world; he is now decreeing to give the Law by Moses, to save Noah by the Ark, Lot out of Sodom: he is now decreeing that Christ shall suffer for us; he now knows all these as future: he is no more Reconciled to the world by Christ, or pleased in or by his Sufferings and Merits then he was before: God knows now that [Christ is now on the Cross] or [Christ is not Risen] is a true Proposition, because he did once know that it is a true Proposition: and he ceaseth not to know it:] would this kind of doctrine seem sound and edifying? Do you use to preach thus?

But you're say, That God's Knowledge, Will, Power, Goodness, Justice, Infinite, his Willing the End and the Means, the futurition of things, and their present existence, mens salvation or damnation are all diversifyed only as to extrinsec denomination, and not really: from the variety of objects it is, that one act of God is variously denominated.

Answ. 1. But Scotus with his followers, Stoeclus, Basilis, Trombeta le Roy, Go- thaticus, Mayro, Faverinus, and the like, tell us of more then extrinsec denominations: And if there be in God a Diversity of Formalities; it may as well be said, that there is an inception and ending of these Formalities in him. This doth no more derogate from the Immutability of God; then the other from his Simplicity.

2. Have these extrinsec Denominations any true Ground in the things deno- minated, or not? If not, it seems they are all false; and therefore not to be used. If they have, then what is it? The difference of names should suppose an equal difference in the Things. A meer Relative difference, some are loth to grant. If they should, as they plead for a diversity of Relations, others may as well plead for an Inception and Cessation of Relations: (Could they prove Immanent acts to be but Relations.) If they say they are Modi or Entia rationis, or what ever title rash adventurous wits may impose on them, still others will say as much for their Beginnig
Beginning and Ending, as they do for their Diversity, and that one implicates no more a Change in God, than the other denieth his simplicity. The describers of Extrinsick Denomination that place it between Ens and Nihil, make it to signify the order of a thing to the subject which yet it is not in. But then it is a Meet Relation which is Denominated; or if any more, it should be ex parte objecti only in our case.

3. But suppose that it be but a meer extrinsick Denomination, and have no Reall Ground in the thing denominated; see what follows: But this much: That Gods Knowledge, and Will, and Power, and Justice, and Mercy, his Knowing me to be Godly or ungodly, his decrecing Peter to life, and Judas to death; his loving Jacob and hating Esau, are all one; his knowing one thing to be future, and another not future, is all one: But yet because of the Diversity of objects it is meet and needfull, that we Denominate extrinsically Gods acts to be divers: and so to distinguish his Intention of the End, from his Election of the Means: his Election from his Reprobation, his Approbation from his dislike, &c. Even so, these acts in God have in themselves no Beginning or End: God did never Begin to Love, to Will this or that, to Know &c. But yet because of the Beginning and Ending of objects it is meet and needfull to Denominate Gods acts extrinsically as Beginning and Ending, as the objects do, and changing with them. For here the case is the same as to Gods Immutability, as in the other to his simplicity. And if this hold, then those men that should write Voluminous Disputes, about the Beginning and Ending of Immanent acts, would do as warrantably as Dr. Twis and others do in writing so of their diversity, priority and posteriority in nature. Nay is it not much more justifiable then many of their Volumes? For from Eternity there was no real diversity of objects to denominate Gods Immanent acts from. For that est cognitum vel voluitum, which they'll flie to, could be no where, but in mente & voluntate Divina: and if there were no Diversity in mente Divina at all, then what ground can be imagined of the extrinsick Denominations? For example, Possibilia & futura being nothing, could not in themselves differ from eternity: Yet how great a fabrick doth Dr. Twis build upon this Proposition, that [the transition of things future & numero possibilia in numerum futurorum, being from Eternity, it must needs have an eternal Caute which can be no other then Gods Will.] Now if there were no such transition, but in mente divina, and if there were no such notion from Eternity any where else, as is. [Future and Possible] and so it must be imagined to be an Ens rationes Divina, then it plainly follows that there was no such thing as Future, distinct from Possible: for in God is no distinct Immanent acts, (as knowing Possibles, and Knowing things futures) and in the things was no distinction, for they are nothing.

It seems therefore that upon your own Grounds it is as justifiable and necessary, to Denominate extrinsecally Gods Immanent acts, as having Beginning and End, when the objects have so, as it is to Denominate them divers from the diversity of the object: and that if we made this our ordinary speech in voluminous Disputes, you could no more blame us for it, then all the exact School-Divines are to be blamed for the other.

Moreover, some may think, that you do teach Infidels to destroy the Christian Faith, or teach a man to prove or disprove what he will, because Contradictories may consift, e.g. If they would prove that [Christ is not Risen] thus: That which God knoweth to be true, is true: But God Knoweth this Proposition to be false [Christ is not Risen] Therefore. The minor they prove thus: God did
once know this Proposition to be true: Therefore he doth so still: for there is no Ending of any Immanent act of God. It will be answered, That this only shews a difference in the object, that it was once true, which now is not: but Gods act is the same by which he knoweth these mutable objects. Be it so: (yet whether it be certain and can be proved still, is by them doubted:) but is it fit for us to speak of this act as one only? It seems then, it is all one, in God to know a Proposition to be True, and to know it to be false. For the fore-said Proposition [Christ is not Risen] was True one day, and Fals the next; and God knew both. You'le say, It is all one in God to know that to be True which is True, and that to be False which is False: but in both he knows æternum, etf non verum. But then you must tell us further, what it is for God to Know [Truly:] Is it the Conceruation of his Knowledge to the Object, which we call the Truth of it? I think you will say so: And if so, then it is not obvious to show how there was such a Concoration from Eternity, when there was Nothing but God; and no other object for his knowledge to agree to: For in God they were all but one, either in esse cognito, or esse volito; for in him is no real diversity: and out of him, or in themselves they were not at all; and therefore if God knew all things as many or divers, when they were not at all, and as exsistent, when they did not exist, where is the Consoruation of the act with the object? But all this arguing is but light.

But they further argue thus: Gods Immanent acts, which we are speaking of, are not Himself: and therefore as they may be either diversifié or multiplied without his Division or Composition, so they may begin or end without his Mutation. The antecedent they prove by that common Argument: These Immanent acts about the Creature, are Free; God Freely Willeth the existence of this worm or pile of grals: he fo Willed it that he could have not willed it, or nilled it. But his own Being is necessary, and cannot but be: Therefore, &c. It seems hard to say, that God did as necessarily Will the pardoning of your sins, as he is necessarily God: Or that he could no more have Willed one pile of gras more or less on the earth, or one land more or less on the Sea-shore, or one day more or less to any mans life, then he could cease to be God. This is a short way of answering Breviarios question, and of answering the presumptuous enquiry, Whether God could have made anything better, and a thousand more? Item est omnium Numerum suo confiventur: Is it a good Argument? Deus est ergo unum esse et Creaturas esse, nec plures, nec pauciores, nec prius, nec posterius, &c? One of my Rabbi's (by whose name I have acquainted Mr.K, with my ignorance) answered that Gods Decrees are Free, Solum per terminacionem ad extranum, seu in quantum Volitio Dei, circa objectum aliquod extrinsecum practicé est. But this is as much as to say, No Immanent act is Free: For Immanent acts (at least if Mr.K know) are not terminated in any thing without: Or if a man should say, that those that have an extrinsec object, are objectively terminated in some extrinsec; yet this seems none of the Authors sence (as the word practicé shews;) and if it were (as perhaps it is) his words would run thus: [Gods Decrees are free, only as they are such and such Decrees about such objects:] which would but yield the cause, that as such Decrees they are not the same formally with the divine Essence. And were it not for the Connotation of the object, it were no Decree, nor so be called, but simply Gods Essence. I am sure Dr. Twisse will be fully and earnestly enough for those that maintain the liberty of the Divine Decrees which we now mention: and therefore I suppose Mr.K will be of the same minde.
And that there is not such clear Evidence in this case, as to embolden men to such confident Conclusions, or to build so much on them, as some do, let Suarez perplexed Disputes Metaph. Diss. 30. Scit. 9. tell us, "Quomodo cum divina liberius sett Immunitatis? Where after the producing of many opinions, and the Arguments and Answers, he concludes, Ex his quae circa has opiniones diffus sunt, satis (ut opinor) declaratum est quias sit hujus opinionis difficulter; facilissime effer quamlibet ejus partem impugnare, quam aliquam probe defendere, aut explicare. Quaspropter non vereor Consistern nihil me inventire quod mibi satisfactis, nisi hoc solutum, in quibusmodi rebus id de Deo esse credendum, quod ineffabilis ejus perfectionis magis sit conscientiam, quodque ab omni imperfectione alienum sit, &c.] And how uncertain are men, that some of those things may not consist with the Divine Perfection, which yet they confidently affirm to be inconsistent with it? If it be a point that is so farre past the reach of Suarez and many other such subtil Disputers, I think Mr. K. should not pretend to so full an insight into it, which may raise him to that confidence which is here expressed, much lesse should he think it so obvious to the understandings of his inferiors.

How light so ever Dr. Twis make of them, certainly they are accounted no children among the most learned of their sides, who do teach, That there may be so far a Beginning and Cessing of Gods Immanent acts, which have a mutable object, without any change in God himself, as that they may have a new transition to the object, and so God may Will that before he Willed nor, though yet it be all by one simple act. Of this minde is Penottus, Lychetus, Fr. a Sancta Clara; And the said Sancta Clara citeth others as countenancing his Doctrine. But though there are but few for this opinion, yet for the formal distinction of Gods Immanent acts (which as is said, seems to be as inconsistent with his simplicity, as this with his Immutability) there are many and that of the most Learned: Vid. qua habet Scotus in sent. 4. 11. dis. 8. Qu. 3. & dist. 2. Qu. 4. & 7. & dist. 34. & passim. And Rada saith, that Scoti sententiam ab ejus diebus universa Pareri cinis Schola temporam amplexata fuerit, nec non Lounienfs atque Bononienfs Academi, Et in universa Italia apud omnes vivos doctos est celebris & famos. In contr. 4. And their Reasons are not contemptible, which may be seen in their several Writers: Especially in those that have wrote whole books of the Formalities. Or Rada (a man of a clear understanding and expression) will afford you many in that one contr. 4. which are worthy consideration. And if Th. Faber Faventins his reconciling Interpretation of their Distinction Rationis Ratiocinatis, will prove their sense, then many of the Thomists are also of the same minde. Vid. Faventin. Tract. de formalitate. cap. 3.

I do not mean by this Argument to conclude that there must be (or in all cases may be) an Inception or Cessation of those Acts which admit of a formal Distinction: But only thus, that if a formal Distinction be consistent with the Divine simplicity, then an Inception and Cessation of some such formalities (or acts, quos formales differentias) may seem consistent with Gods Immutability: (And I know no other Argument of moment then left, if that be solved.) What these formalities are, I do not wonder, if they give but a dark account: Yet that they are different objective conceptions they agree. And as Rada saith, ad Distinctionem formalen duo requiruntur. Alterum est, quod utrumque distinctionis extremum dicat aliquid Posterior in re, secunda operatione Intellestis: Alterum est, quod utrumque extremum dicat proprium formalitatem, secundum quam sit in rerum natura extra ipsum sacram. And Scotus himself faith of this as applied to God 3. Quod Forma in creaturis
turis habet aliquid imperfectionis, scilicet quod est Forma informans aliquid, & Pars compositi: aliquid eftiam habet quod non est imperfectionis, sed consequitur eam secundum suam rationem esse formalis, scilicet, quod ipfis quod aliquid est tale, c. e. sapientia in nobis est Accidens, hoc est imperfectionis: sed quod ipfis quod aliquid est sapientis, hoc non est imperfectionis, sed essentialis rationis sapientia. In division autem nihil est forma, secundum illam duplicem rationem imperfectionis, quia nec Informans, nec Pars: et tamen ibi sapientis in quantum est illud in quo ipfis est, eft sapientis, & hoc non per aliquam compositionem, &c. Sent. 1. dist. 8. 2. 3.

Some think yet clearer Arguments might be fetched from the Hypostatical Union, from the Acts of generation and spiration, or Love, whereby the Son is begotten of the Father, and the holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, and from the distinction of Persons in the Trinity. But I will stop here (as having run further then I intended) lest you should mis-interpret me, and think, that I own all these Arguments that I touch upon. I know what D. Tris against Pennus hath said to one or two of them, and what the Schoolmen commonly say to the same. I mention these only to shew that a full or clear solution of these doubts is not so easy and obvious, as you seem to imagine.

I must again intreat you, and every ingenious Reader, to fall on no opinion on me, but what I own, at least one which I disclaim. If I must be of one side in this Controversie, I will be of Mr. Kendals side, and say, that God hath but one act immanent, and that is Eternal. But my thoughts are, that we know not what we talk of when we speak thus, and therefore I will not be of any side in this.

I think, 1. That God hath no Act at all in proper speech: but both Acting, and Understanding, and Willing are by a very, very, very low remote Analogy ascribed to him.

2. Yet I am ready to think, that as we are fain for our own understanding, to speak of God as Acting, Understanding, Willing, Loving, &c. and also for our own understanding to distinguish his Perfections, Properties, Acts, &c. which are but one, so may and must we as much speak of some of his Acts, as beginning and ending (which yet perhaps do not in themselves:). For the Reason and Necessity seems to be the same. For because the word [Knowledge or Understanding] is first used and applied to man's act of Knowledge, and signifies first only such a Knowledge as is diversify'd by objects; yea and man can have no proper positive Conception of a Knowledge which is not diversify'd by the diversity of Objects (but only a Negative Conception:); therefore it is that we are forced to speak of God's Knowledge (and so of his Will and other Acts) as divers or distinct: as Divines generally do. And on the same Grounds, as man hath no positive Conception of any Knowledge or Will, about mutable objects, which is not varied with these objects, as to the Being, Beginning and Ending, therefore we must as necessarily denominate Gods acts about such objects, as Beginning and Ending, as we must denominate them Divers. And so we may well say, God willed from Eternity the futurition of the worlds Creation, and Christ's Death, &c. But now he doth not will their futurition, but their preterition: and that he Loveth now (as believers in Christ) those whom he before Hated as Workers of Iniquity; and that he is satisfied and well-pleased in his Son, and his Sacrifice, who was not so before. Methinks Mr. K. should think this language as fit for the mouths and pens of Divines, as the former, and not to be blamed or accused as erroneous,
erroneous, because improper, as long as we must speak improperly of God, or not at all. And I am sure that Scripture speaks of God in this language, assigning to him Immanent acts, as new or as ceasing, and as moved by exterior causes: Therefore this way of speaking is not unfair or intolerable.

The Summe of all that I say therefore is this: That we cannot conceive of God's Immanent acts, as in themselves they are (not are they truely the same things that we conceive of, when we apply the several denominations to them:) and therefore we must conceive of them by Resemblance to the Acts of Man so denominated, still acknowledging the Impropriety of the terms, and disclaiming all those Imperfections which in man they do express.

But because Mr. K. hath spoken so much to this point already, its like he will. take it ill if I take no notice of it. I will therefore a little insist on the consideration of what he faith on it, to Mr. Goodwin, pag. 93, 94. (but briefly, as being not to me.)

---

§ 6.

Mr. K. This is such a Reason as most of your Disciples needed your favour to redae a Logick Lecture to them, that they might be in a Capacity to give their Judgements on it: You not having been pleased to do it, I will for once gratifie them with a Gift of my old Office, and now supposing myself again in my Deans Chair, I gravely begin this. That Univocum is that which is attributed to several things according to the same Name, and Nature signified by that name; as Animal to a Man and an Ass, to which are opposed on the one hand the same Name, and Nature signified by that name, but not signifying the same Nature, as Canis which is said of a Starre, a Beast, and a Fish: either hath the same name Canis, but their natures are as different as Heaven, Earth and Water. On the other hand Analogum, which is attributed according to the same Name, and as signifying the same Nature; but not in the like manner. Now this same Analogum is of two sorts: The terms are promiscuously jumbled together by the Logickmongers, but let us be, 1. Proportionis; when the same Name is given to things of the Like, but not the same Nature; as Laughing, &c. 2. Attributionis; where the same Name is given to divers things, according to the same Nature: but this same Nature doth not agree to them alike; but to the one first, to the other afterwards, secundum prius & potius; yes to the latter dependantly on the first: as Substance and Accident are each of them Ens, a thing, &c.

---

§ 6.

B. O'd a little. 1. The first part of your task, you have competently performed, viz. to acquaint us of the lower O:bs of your ancient Dignity: Our distance is so great from the Superior Planets, that we might never have heard of your Deans Chair, had you not happily here informed us: But I hope you had a more noble Imploiment in your Deans Chair, then this poor, common, Inferior work, to tell men of uni: vocum, equivocum, & Analogum; and to distinguish Analogum Propriovis & Attributionis: But though I had not the happiness to be educated at your feet, yet in this your Learned, Elaborate, Polemical writing, I may, no doubt, expect the best of your Judgement; and may conjecture what you were wont to redae to your Pupils by that which you here so gravely read to Mr. Goodwin. First, you will not, it seems jumble the terms so promiscuously
miscuously as the Logickmongers do;) But, when these words had raised my expectations of some more exquisite distribution than ordinary, or at least of more apt terms, I am put off with the old distinction, not only common in the Schoolmen, but in the multitudes of Logick and Metaphysick Writers, which I had thought you had disdained: Not the smallest Sensus but hath it; (only he, with many others term it, but Barbarous;) whereas Keckerman terms it Insipid, and Bursen/micus inept: And Rutgers fainth, that Analogorum nomine solum ea discernere qua secundum proportionem apud Aristotelem vocantur, prout notant interpretes ex cap. 16. pet 1. 5. maxime verò ex c. 6. 1. Ethic. &c. Usus tamen Latinae Seboli & Philosophorum obtinuit, ut eiam ca qua secundum attributionem vocantur analogorum nomine censatur.

But though your Distinction be very ordinary, I confess there is more then ordinary in your Explication of the members: But it is of such a nature, as makes me begin to abate the apprehensions of my infelicity, in that I had never the happiness to be your Auditor, and to have Learned Logick at your feet. Your Analogum in genero, is that [which is attributed according to the same name, and as signifying the same Nature, but not in the like manner.] Your Analogum proportionis, is [when the same name is given to things of the like, but not the same nature.] Analogum in Genero, is of the same nature, as well as Name. Analogum Proportionis, is not the same Nature, but the Like. And so the nature of the Genus is not in the Species: Nay they are contrary one to the other: and only the later member (Analogum Attributionis) remains an Analogum, and each Species receives not the definition of the Genus. If this be the Doctrine which you so [Gravely deliver from your Deans Chair, I will lay as you do [I cannot persuade my self to leave my old Doctors to follow You.] I will even turn to poor Keckerman, Bursen/micus, Suarex again; yea to a Rutgers, Facchus, Gorlaus, Serueurduis, Alstedius, or any body that's near me of this generation, before I will swallow what I cannot digest.

§. 7.

Mr. K. N ow if Substance and Accident be Analoga, because of the dependance of Accidents on the Subject, then whatever is predicated of God and the Creature, must be predicated Analogically, because the creature hath it not but by dependance on God, but God independently from the Creature: And as the Being of the Creature, is derived from God in herti, and depends on him in etcelesse; so questionless the Knowledge of the Creature, is but a beam from the fountain of light, which is in God, and cannot longer subsist, then he toucheth to preserve it by a continued irradiation, &c.

§. 7.

R. B. 1. I Would rather say that Substance and Accident are Analoga, than Analoga; but you may use your Liberty, and call the Analoga, Analoga. 2. I should think that it is not directly, but strictly [Because of the dependence of Accidents on the Subject, that Substance and Accident are Analoga: but because of the Imperfect Entity which through this dependance the Accidents have in the more perfect Entity of the Subject. 3. It is not that most General.
nearly Analogon, as applicable to God and the Creature, that we are now in question of. But it is those inferior of (Foreknowledge, Knowledge, Will, Election, &c.) 1. Your [Because] is unsound, and I conceive your Consequence is false, viz. [then whatever is predicated of God and the Creature must be predicated Analogically] Do you think that nothing may be spoken equivocally of God and the Creature? If you do, you are a singular man. 5. I hope you do not think that our knowledge depends on God, as Accidents on the Subject: If you do, then God hath many Accidents indeed, were that true: I had rather say plainly, that God effecteth our knowledge (by way of natural Causation in some respects, and by moral Causation in other respects) as that which had no Being before, then to talk of Emanation as a Beam from the fountain of Light; 5 considering what ill use many in these times have made of the doctrine of Emanation. 6. I: seems by your former Conclusion [whatever is predicated of God and the Creature, must be predicated Analogically] and by your present predication of [The fountain of Light which is in God] that you judge [Light] or [the fountain of Light] to be predicated Analogically of God too. Which if you do, and this also must be by Analogy of Attribution, then it seems Heat, Cold, Gravity, Levity, Density, Rarity, Composition, or whatever is in the Creature may be thus attributed to God. 7. As to the point itself in question, 1. I will not meddle with that old Controversie, Whether be spoken of God and the Creature Univocally, Aequivocally or Analogically. I have seen what Socrates faith for his opinion in Sent. 2, dif. 12. & alibi. &c. &c. &c. And what Anth. Andreas 4, Metaph. q. 1. Meuriffe Metaph. Scot. 1. Ly. 8. p. 108. &c. And Phil. Faber. Faveni. Phys. sc. Theor. 95. p. 654, &c. Rata, and others say for it: And what Ochom in 1. Sent. dif. 2. q. 8. And Guil. Rubio, say for the Nominals opinion: And what Cajetan faith against the Scofields. (By which Scofields the sense of Univocation, Aequivocation, and Analogy, is a little more subtly opened, then Mr. K. doth out of his Deans Chair.) But the Question that: I speak to, is only how farre Intelligere, Velle and Agere, may be attributed to God. 2. And for the distribution of Analogas, and the sense of Analogy, I think, it will be long ere the Chair-men are agreed. Meuriffe out of Rubio faith, Univocum opponi soit aequivoce, non vero Analogo, & denominativo: quis Univocum se habet ad aequivocum sicur Unum ad Multa: Unum autem proprium solum multis opponit: se habet autem ad Analogum & denominativum, tanquam veluti superius ad sua inferior: Quis Univocum alium est purum, alium est non purum: Non purum est aut Analogum, aut Denominativum. Nullum superius autem opponitur suis inferioribus: Itaque Univocum non opponitur Analogo & denominativi, sed ab Analogo distinctius tanquam Univocum purum, & ad Denominativo Univocum quiddativum, seu illud quod est & predicatum Univocum & Univoce predicatur. Others innumerate Analogas with the Homonyma, distinct from Synonima.

Geellenius (who speaks largely of it) gives this distribution, Lexic. Philof. p. 100. I think in fitter terms then Mr. Kendal.

Propria: ut ens, bonum, principium, natura, morum, &c.

Analoga sunt Propriionae

Impropriæ

Attributionestantum: ut sanum ad animal & medicamentum.

Tranflationproportiones: Risus, comparatione hominis & præt.
But I think poor contemptible Kekermann and Burgraufius have better explained and distributed Homonyma and Analogia, then all that ever I had the hap to be acquainted with, not excepting the subtilest Scotists. 3. As for the application hereof to our Question, I still affirm, That the thing which the word [Knowledge] is spoken of, in God, is not only more eminently and perfectly in him than the Creature, but is only in him, and not in the creature at all: And the thing which the word Knowledge is spoken of, or doth signify in man, is not at all formaliter in God, but is in some thing of an Infinite, transcendent Excellency above it, which makes it useless; and in God it would be Imperfection: And therefore it may be said to be in God eminenter non formaliter: The word [Knowledge] is first used to signify the knowledge of man: It is translated to refer to us that Incomprehensible perfection of God, which we cannot otherwise conceive of or express. Yet when ever we make use of the term, we cannot by it our selves attain to a conception, positive and true, of any higher thing then such knowledge as our own, with some negative additions, for removal of the Imperfections; as that it is Infinite, &c. so that man can have no true positive Conception of the Nature of that which in God we call Knowledge: Only he apprehendeth it to be somewhat like that which in man is called Knowledge. But Like is not the same. As Godemus out of τιτιφοις διενεργεται ην αναλογια, non sunt ejusdem. similis Analogia non sunt ejusdem generis: non sunt eadem genera. It is therefore a proper speech to say [Knowledge is not in God] and proper to say, it is in man: But yet it is a necessary speech to say [God knows] because we have no fitter expression for that perfection of God, which we so call. Aquin de Veritate Mater. quia locum. Et qua nulla Ratio significata per ipsum nomen definist ipsum Deum, nullum nomen ad nobis imposimus est proprium nomen ejus: sed est proprium creaturae ut definitor ratione significata per nomen: Est amennis in omnibus, nam fit in Creaturam unam Deo attributum secundum quod in Creaturis aliqve similitudine eius perieatur. The third Opinion which he there rejecteth is, That Knowledge is attributed to God Metaphorically, as Anger is; against which he opposeth his fourth, Et idcirco dicendum est, quod scientia Deo attributum significat aliquid quod in Deo est.] As if these might not well consist! Even a Metaphorical expression doth express something that is in God, though it express it but Metaphorically. And in quindecima, he hath no better answer to the fifth Objection, which is drawn from the greater distance between God and us, then between Ens Creatum & non Ens, then this, Ad 5° dicendum, quod Enti & non Enti aliquid secundum analogiam convenit: quod ipsum non ens analogiae dicatur Ens: ut dictum in 4° Metaph. Unde nec disamina quae est inter creaturam & Deum communitatem analogiæ impedit potest. If the Analogy between Gods Acts, Knowledge, Will, and ours, be no nearer then between Ens & non ens, sure it is not such as you imagine, and here expresses. And contra Gentil. 1. c. 31. he confesseth, that in omnino nominis motis dicto, quantum ad medium signali imperfectionis in eum quod Deo non comparit, quando est signatur aliquo modo omnino Deo conveniit. Now if there were, there were, a terms properly fitted only to mans imperfect Mode of Knowing, Willing, Acting, and do afford us a positive Conception of any other, so that we could devise some gens which did comprehend Gods acts, and mans imperfection, as Ens doth substance and Accident, yet this must not be Knowledge or Will: For these are the proper names of the Gens Imperf. As if you should say, Substantia est Accidents, A certain kind of Comprehension of the Creature God hath, whose Nature being to us unknown, the proper names is unknown too, and therefore we are fain to call it by the proper name of mans comprehen-
yon, i.e. Intelllection and Science. And all Divines confess, that as to the order of knowing, and so as to the name we must first begin with the creature, to whom the name is first applicable. So Aquinis contra Gentili. i.e 35. Quia ex rebus alius in Dei cognitionem pervenimus, non nominatio de Deo & aliis rebus distinctum, per primas in Deo secundum suum modum; sed ratio nominis per posterioris: unde & nominari dicitur etius causas. So Godscius Lexic. Philosop. de Analog. Duo sunt distincta: nimirum, res ipsa per nomina significata, & nomen imperficio. Ad res ipsas quod mistus, prius ex Deo praedicatur, quam de creaturis. Atque hic propriis ordo est & conveniunt, quam habent creaturar al Deam; cuius ordinis causa dicuntur nominum analogice de Deo & de creaturis praedicari. Quod vero attinet ad nomen Rationem & Impotentem prius is nominibus appellate fuerunt res create quam Deus. Quare quod dicitur analogice praedicuris nominis de Deo & de creaturis, quia prius de Deo quam de creaturis: de Analogia reali secundum rem, non autem secundum nominis rationem intelligendum est. Zephy hath the same words, whole they are first I know not. How fit a speech this is, de Analogia reali, I leave to others to judge: but all grant that the Name is first applied to the Creature, and thence to God. Now all this holds of meer Metaphorical expressions.

To use Burger's division distribution, I yield that these names applied to God and the creature, are not Homonyma a cause, (such as quinnes cont Gentili, ut simplicefeth his meer equivocals to be) but a cause. But whether the Ratio Homonymie be in Rebus, or in nobis, is not esse certainly to determine. Keckerman laith, Ambigua ex similitudine conceptus est, cum rebus tota generatione diversis, ut Deo & Creaturis, idem nomen tribuitur ex cognitione quam mens format. Nimirum intellectus no-

stier ut essentia & operationes finitas est, ita infinita Dei naturae & attributis cognitibuss non est proportionatus: atque idcirco in Deo nihil concept directe, sed oblique ex simili-
tudine quadam, & imagine rei finita sequar objecti sibi congruentis. Hinc a nobis Deo & attributis ejus voce certa, proprii ac directe imponi nequeuerunt, sed indirecte sunt, homonimae, & ex similitudine e contrario Dea nobis representatur in creaturis tantum effectus, qua represento ut in de imperfecta est. Nomen Iehova, i.e existentis, sibi ipsa impofuit Deus, at nos ne id quidem directe conceptum: reliqua autem que Deus tribuitum, ut mifericordiam, Juititiam, &c. ejusmodi vocibus exprimimus, quae directe imposit in virtutibus hominum significandos, indirecte autem ad Deum pertinent, quatenus nos tales in Deo virtutes similitudine carum que in hominibus sunt virtutum significat. Unde non minimim pie quam feitate Cyrillus, in his que de Deo dictantur, Maxima scientia est Ignorantiam conficiet: & Augustinus, Lex, inquit, magna est, sed fine quantitate, Bonus, sed sine qualitate: ut vero ad nobis magnus sine quantitate, bonum sine qualitate directe & pleno concepti, est impossibile, &c. Et Julius Scaliger, Nullos, ait, vocibus tam plen Deum significamus, quam is que Ignorantiam nostrum pre-
tendunt.

But suppose it be granted, that the Ratio Homonymie is not only in nobis, sed in rebus, the question will remain, Whether it be ob inaequalen generis attributionem, or only ob similitudinem, vel maxuam rerum ad se invicem habitudinem? and fo be Tri-

poical? Mr. K, ascerteth the former (under the name of Anatomy of Attribution.) The Scotists have long defended their Doctors Assertion, that Deus non est in generi. Vid. Fab. Favitenn. Phy. Scot. Theorem. 96. his Vindication against Greg. Ariminensis & Baconius: and many others of them have done this at large. So doth Wickeen in his Trialog.

And if this hold, then nothing can be attributed to God and the Creature by this Analogy, per inaequalen generis attributionem. Yea Aquinas himself oft faith,
Deus non est in genere (as Sarmatus notes) in i.p.3.3. & 1.d.8. q.4.a.2.3a. & 1.cont.Gen. c.25. though after in q.de Potentiis q.7.3. adult. Concede Deus esse Genere substantiae reductivë: which Scotus refuted. So Estius in i.m. Sent. d.8. q.10. denieth God to be in ullo genere. And Sarmatus hath no more to say for it in his Conciliatn (pag.15) then this, Est in genere fiat dupliciter: primo modo ut pars subjectiva contenta in illo genere: Et sic negat Deus esse in genere. Secundo modo, ut principium Continuum ipsum Genus: Et hoc modo Deus per appropriationem est in Genere substantiae. Vid. Gab.Biel. 1.Sent.dist.8.q.1. But this is not for God to be in genere, but for that Genus to be in God.

As Burgerdicius faïth, Omnium longissime a synonymis absint homonyma a Casu, quae causam homonymiae habent in nobis; prœprœi ad synonymorum naturam accedunt. Tropica, ac imprimis Analogia: at omnium proxime qua ambigua sunt ob inequalcem attributionem. That these words are not spoken of God and the creature univocally all of us agree; and the Schoolmen have fully evinced. Alfo that they are not spoken purœ aequoe, we are also agreed, and the said Schoolmen have evinced (as particularly Aquin.in summ. de Verit. ubi sup. by many Reasons: And Zanchius de Natura Dei borrows many of them.) But which of the other kinds of homonymy they belong to, is the doubt. Mr.K. thinks that which of all other is the nearest to synonymy: I think not so: but rather to the Tropical or Analogical, stricly fo called, that is, vel proper similitudinem simplicem, vel proportionem (if it not some of them, to those that have the Rationem homonymiae in nobis.) Fachius's faith (Metaph.1.106.) Ego vero mallem ifiam Analogiam riferre ad proportionis sibi Analogiam, non Metaphoricae illam (quomodo videre attribuitur oculto & mente) sed propriam, quomodo principium dicitur de corde, & fundamento domus. So he declaims Mr. K's Analogy of Attribution: If the thing be not utterly uncertain to us, who know so little of God's nature. But that we may venture on a conjecture, I should rather set the Creature at a greater distance from God then they do: and think that these Attributes are all Tropical, somewhat Metonymical, but mostly Metaphorical. I never saw (in Aquinas or any other Schoolman that spoke for it) any cogent Reason to prove, that Intelligere, Velle, Agere, Amare, are attributed to God in any other kind of them. Reminiucli, Gaudere, Odio habere, Tracti, &c. Only a gradual difference, I easily acknowledge, viz. That Intelligere & Velle having lèse Imperfection, have therefore lèse impropiety. And who knows not that there is a wide difference of this sort among Metaphors, some being very near, and some farre færec, as to be Catachrestical Durandus's faith (in 1.sent dist. 34. q.4.) Nullum nomin attribuimus Deo nisi ex Creaturis: non enim potissimum nomen nisi rel quam intelligimus; & quia non intelligimus sicut, nisi ex creaturis, & tantum quantum concludimus ex creaturis, iode nullum nomen imponimus Deo nisi ex creaturis, & quantum ad illa, quae concludimus convenire Deo ex creaturis: constat autem quod non omnibus nomen quod attribuimus Deo dicuntur de eo translatus & metaphorice, &c. Solum autem illa nomina dicuntur de Deo translatus & metaphorice quae significat speciales quod distantes rerum creaturarum: vel perfectiones secundum modum creaturis convenientiam, ut Leo, Agnus, Sentire, &c. Quia res significata per bae nominatio non est in Deo, sed aliqua eis simulatitude, ut fortitudine, manubat, & cognitio singularium, quae in nobis pertinet ad sensum. But I would fain see it proved, That Intelligere, Velle, Agere, do not as properly signify perfectiones secundum modum Creaturis convenientiam, as sentire doth. And when we say vegetus fluidum, fluctuation is no more proper to the motion of the waters, then Intelligere, Velle, Agere, are to the perfecions and action of man, or other rational creatures. And whereas they say that the terms are applied to God.
God, with a Remotion of the Imperfections which they imply in us, I answer, So they may say of those lower terms, which they confesse to be Metaphorical, only allowing a gradual difference of impropriety. Nor doth it follow therefore that there is no truth in their expressions of God, or that they are no helps to our knowledge of him, or means of demonstration. For Metaphors are not as pure equivocals: There's some common reason in the similitude, though in the first and proper sense the name be proper to one. When we say, Segetes fluat, we express not only Motion, wherein both agree, but a motion of the Corn like that of the Water. I think, as I said before, that it is no more proper to call God Scientem, Volentem, Agentem, than to call the Firmament a Nutshell, because both seem to have a convexity or concavity, or contain something else within, &c. Or to call the Sunne a Reptile, or a creeping thing, because it moves, and so do creeping things: or then it is proper to call Knowledge, Light, or to put Video for Inteligio (as Mr. K. calls God the fountain of Light before.) The Scripture faith, God is Light: yet I think this will be easily confedered a Metaphor: and I think it is but Metaphora propriiorum, to say, Deus Inteligit, Vult, Agit, &c. And this I judge after long consideration of what Aquinas hath said, 1. q. 14. a. I. & q. 19. a. 1. & ubi: and many other Schoolmen to the like purpose.

Shall I add one Argument for the Negative (that it is not: by Analogy of Attribution, that Knowledge, Will, Power, &c. are attributed to God and the Creature, as Est is to Substance and Accident) ad hominem specially? That Knowledge which is the same thing with Will and Power, cannot be the one of the Analogates with our Knowledge which is not the same; in this kind of Analogy ob inaequali generis distributionem: (supposing Knowledge to be the Genus Analogum.) But Gods Knowledge is maintained by those that I dispute with, to be the same with his Will and Power) many say, they differ but denomination extrinseca: Therefore, &c. For the proof of the major, consider: Else on the same grounds [Power] might be thus analogically spoken of Gods Knowledge and mans Power: For where there is no difference in the Thing, there needs to be none in the Name, as requisite from the Nature of the Thing (but only from some extrinseca respect et usc.) But Power may not Analogically be spoken de Potestate humana, &c. Scientia divina Ergo, &c. Common reason and use of speech confirms the minor. It seems therefore to be evident truth, that as it is from similitude, or some Tropical respect, that Gods Immanent acts, have divers names, rather than one alone: so is it from the same reason that they have these particular names, rather than other: And consequently that these names are not Analogia inaequalis Attributionis natura communis: but Analogia Proportionis, or Tropical. Durandus (in sentent. i. dist. 2 q. 2.) saith, Alius est opinio, quà quoti videtur verior, quod diffinitio attributorum, secundum rationem non potest solum, nisi per comparationem s. aliquam realem diversitatem actu existentem in creaturis, vel possibilem. Quod prob. i. sc. Differentia Rationis, nisi sit falsa & vana, licet sit completae ad intellectus, operit sames qua celebrat fundamentum in re: sed differentia attributorum secundum rationem non potest habere sufficientes fundamentum in natura divina absoluto accepta, nisi comparatur ad realam diversitatem que in creaturis est, vel esse potest, ergo differentia attributorum divinorum secundum rationem, non potest vade solum nisi potest per comparationem ad creaturam. Major prob. ratio enim, quam intellectus format, nisi fundetur alicujus in re, si alia est, &c. Parv general. Vide retq.

I will only add the words of Burger's dictioni Metaphys. 1. 2. 8. § 1. sequitur ea (attributa) que creaturis communicari posse diximus, saltem ne analogice: quae...
§ 8.

If I were to give an answer to the question of whether knowledge in God and the creature be not univocally the same, as surely they are not, then is this fore-knowledge attributed to God and the creature, either Equivocally or Analogically: If Equivocally, then hath the fore-knowledge of God and the creature only the same Name: But that is not so; for God, I hope, fore-knew as truly as the creature, and the creature may sometimes truly fore-know. So that here is more then a nominal agreement between Gods and the creatures fore-knowledge. It remains therefore that this fore-knowledge be attributed to God and the creature Analogically: but is this Analogic either of Proportion or Attribution? If of Proportion, then either God or the creature is said to fore-know, but either Metaphorically or Metonymically. If only Metaphorically; I pray which of them is but Metaphorically said to fore-know? Not the creature, &c. And surely much less may God be only Metaphorically said to fore-know these, and all other things that shall come to pass in all Ages. If only Metonymically, as some things are said to be healthy, because they have the signs of sanity in them, (I am bold to use the Boys instance in this case) is either God or the creature only Metonymically said to fore-know? Not the creature, &c. Not God, for he is the Author of our fore-knowledge: and therefore though his essence be not the subject of his fore-knowledge, nor his fore-knowledge an Accident of his Nature, yet is he said to fore-know without being beholden to any such poor Trope for it. It rests therefore that fore-knowledge is attributed to God by more then this Analogie of Proportion, and consequently by that of Attribution. Now I demand which is the famelius Analogatum: Gods fore-knowledge, or the creatures? Questionless Gods: there being infinitely greater Cause to set the Crown on Gods fore-knowledge, then on that of the creatures, then there is to set it on substance rather then accident. If so, &c. then onward, as Analogatum perfcptum flat pro fameliori Analogato, so true fore-knowledge mentioned by itself, must always be construed of the fore-knowledge of God; and therfore fore-knowledge is most properly attributable to God. And thus being now willing to resign my place, Hac sufficient pro nunc.

§ 8.

If I had once done with you, I would take heed of dealing with a Chairman again in haste; for your sake: for I finde I run upon a great disadvantage. For the credit of such mens understandings is so great with themselves at least, that they need no Argument, but their bare affirmation to carry the Cause. Your sole Argument [sic dico] doth put me harder to it, then if you had many: For what to say to this, I do not well know. Dispute against it, I cannot: and to set my Negation against your affirmation, will not do, till we stand on even ground.

1. Aquinas de veris. and many another Schoolman (and Zanchy out of them) might have help you to more cogent Arguments, against meer Xequivocal denomination. When you speak of Gods fore-knowing, as [truly] that word[truly]
is either opposed to 

fore-knowledge'] doth denote, is truly in him, and him alone, but that which the word [fore-knowledge'] doth properly and primarily signify, is not in God.

2. Our Rabbi's (as you call them ab alto with a smile) do seem to us punies, to make a fuller distribution then you; as I have before shewed: and therefore we take yours to be defective, and consequently your reasoning void: I have told you of divers that please me better.

3. How greedily did I reade on, and follow you at the heels to see how you proved that it is not spoken of God Metaphorically? and when I come to the business, What's the proof? Why you say [surely much less may God be only metaphorically said to fore-know.] You pass your word on it: And this is the knotty Argument that I cannot answer, because I am not of your standing in the University: A little more of the University would have done me no harm (as you say) when I am to deal with this kinde of Argument.

4. Our Tutor Burgersdteius told us, I remember, that in eberis tropis non minus est homonymia locis, quam in Metaphora. And therefore Metaphorical and Metonymical, are not a sufficient enumeration.

5. Do not think ever the worse of your self for using the Boyes instance: for (as you have partly falved your credit by intimating that you are above it, so) Aquinas, Scours, and most of the Schoolmen that I have read, besides Zambius, and many another of our great Divines, do make use of the same instance: And to play with this bigger sort of Boyes, is no such disgrace to you.

6. Here I meet with a thing that runs in the form of a Reason: [for he is the Author of our fore-knowledge] therefore he fore-kneweth not only Metonymically. I confess the Conclusion is true; but I see not the reason of the consequence. As I remember a Metonymy of the effect is, when the efficient is signified by the name of the effect, either by a Verb, as paller pro metu, or an Adjective, as mars pallida; or a Substantive, as feclus pro fecleto (I purposely choose the Boyes examples, as being becomming.) And I have heard men often call Mr. Nath. Ward, Difcolлимinum, and the simple Cobler: And the Author of that Comedy, by the name of Ignoramus. I confess it is a good Argument [He is the Author of our fore-knowledge, therefore he hath fore-knowledge eminenter, or somewhat that is more excellent then fore-knowledge.) But I dare not say, that God hath formally in himself whatsoever he is the Author of. For he is the Author of Nutrition, Augmentation, Composition, of Sorrow, of Fear, of Hell, of Worms, Toads and Vipers. But it was the former (the Metaphorical Denomination, and also that of strict proportion, which some distinguish from the Metaphorical) which I had hoped you would have disproved. But I must take what will be had.

7. You think you plead for the Glory of the Divine Majesty, when you tell us he need not be beholden to a poor Tropo. As if we should dispute, whether the Sunne do creep as reptilia do? and I say, ‘Yes, Metaphorically’ : and you will stand up for the honour of the Sun, and say, we debase it; and that it doth creep without being beholden to a poor Tropo for it: Or if the Question were, Whether the Sunne be a Vegetative, or sensitive creature? and I say, ‘Yes, Metonymically’ : for it causeth Vegetation and sense. And you will say, ‘It is Vegetative without being beholden to a Tropo. What a Patron is he of the honour of mankind, that will prove that he is a Worm, a Beast, Nothing, and his life a shadow,
dow, a dream, a Weavers shuttle, without being beholden to a poor Trope! Yet are these unspeakably nearer, then the names of man and his acts, to God; for inter finitum & infinitum nulla est proportio.

8. You conclude that the famosius Analogatum, is Gods fore-knowledge, your proof is [Questionless it is so:] As strong as the rest. But, when I look further I finde somewhat like a Reason: [there being Infinitely greater cause to set the Crown on Gods fore-knowledge, &c.] My dread of Gods most sacred Majesty, forbiddeth me to set on him such a Crown of Vanity. As if the Sun must be the famosius Analogatum inter Reptilias, because the Crown of [Creeping] must be set on its head! What if we should yield to you, that the term [Knowledge, Will, Action, &c.] being first Metaphorically applied to God, that yet it is partly Analogical quod inaequalmen Generis attributionem, the term expressing (though improperly as to one) a Nature common to both? It would not yet follow, that here the more noble sort, even Divine Knowledge, &c. were the famosius Analogatum: For though it be most excellent and unexpressibly glorious in itself, yet the term agreeing first with the lower, even humane Knowledge, therefore that is the famosius Analogatum, as being the thing most famously and notoriously meant by that term. If you ask, Whether the Sunne do glisten (as Glowers, or rotten wood) or do Rutilar or Candere? If you say, Yea; yet I think the Sunne here is not the famosius Analogatum, though the light which this word intendeth be more eminently in the Sun, then in the other things.

You conclude, that [true fore-knowledge mentioned by it self, must always be understood of the fore-knowledge of God.] Is that so indeed?

1. Why then do the Schoolmen generally acknowledge, that the names are all first applicable to the Creature, though the thing be most excellently in God?

2. Then, it seems, it is not a strictly proper speech to say [Man knows, or fore-knows, or Wills, or acts]: for none of the Homonyma, are spoken of both, in strict propriety. But if you would undertake to prove, that God may in as strict propriety be said to Know, Will or Act, as man is, there are many that would undertake to prove the terms Univocal: which in most Divines Judgment, would be to prove, that man is God: an opinion, which our new world in the Moon (in Anglia lunatica) have very confidently imbraced of late years.

In a word, Sir, my thoughts of man, and his Acts, Knowing, Willing, are so low, and my thoughts of the Infinite God, so high, or at a lofte, when I go about to have any positive, true apprehensions of his Nature, that I conceive you and I can no more tell what that is in God which we call Knowing, Willing, Acting, then my Horse can tell what Reasoning or Discourse is in me, or thereabouts. And yet I believe that the Knowledge of God is eternal Life too, viz. Now (as to the beginning) to know that there is a God, and that there is somewhat in Him which mans Knowledge, Will, Goodness, Justice, &c. have some exceeding, low, distant resemblance of, and which we cannot better apprehend or express then under such notions, and by such terms; it being yet in it self of more unconceivable excellency. And though I know the Schoolmen are confident (without proof) that Scire, Velle, &c. do express no Imperfection, but only Modal, and therefore may be applied to God (which I conjecture will also be your Argument) yet I do not believe that Assertion. Comparatively to lower or equal Creatures, it may be said, that it is not Imperfection, which they express. But absolutely,
absolutely or comparatively as to God, it is Imperfection: Not only some accident or Modus, but the very thing express by these terms, is Imperfect: Else the Creature shall have something equal to God, and so be God. And if it were but a Modal Imperfection; yet when the term doth strictly and properly express that Imperfect Modus itself, as well as the Thing, then that term cannot be applied to God any nearer than Tropically. Knowledge, Will, Action, and all the terms fitted to man, are to strictly fitted to express the humane Modus, as well as that which you separate in your Intellect, and call perfect, that it cannot be applied to one without the other, but abusively or tropically; No more then [creeping] is applicable to the swift motion of the Sun, when the term doth intimately signify the slowness and Mode of the motion, with the motion itself.

God forbid that I should doubt, whether that in God be Perfect, which we call Knowledge, Will, Action: But what is it that under these names of infinitely remote similitude we do express, what earthly man can tell? Because I believe God's Immanency acts to be perfect, therefore I believe them not to be the same thing that man apprehendeth under these terms.

Oh that frail man were more acquainted with his Nothingness! then would he not dare to lift up himself in comparison with his Maker! Then would not the Christian world for so many hundred years have been filled with quarrels about unfathomable Mysteries; and the great Divines of the Church, be the great Dividers of the Church by voluminous contentions, and censorious, uncharitable, zealous emulations about God's secrets: They would not have fattened upon utter uncertainties, and things unrevealed, and then have filed their fantasies [the Orthodox Doctrine] and reproached or quarrelled with thosethat were differers. The world would not have been altogether by the ears about things that they know no more then a beast knows what is the soul of man; such as many of the Schoolmens writings are, and most of those points in which the Controversies between the Arminians and anti-Arminians, the Jesuites and Dominicans, are ultimately resolved: Yea, and your Academical Chairs would have been better employed: and then God would not have been so provoked against them: Nor should I have needed to fear that your Chair is coming down, while I read here that you are coming down; nor have cause to salute you so sadly at your descent, as fearing a future vacancy of your resigned place.

§ 9.
Mr. K. Pag. I shall now see what Mr. Baxter saith, though not to answer this Argument, or any other, yet to detract somewhat from the Reputation of the Conclusion, that there can be no new Immanent act in God, but all are Eternal.

§ 9.
K. B. To feign a wrong end to a mans speeches, is usually the way to falter on them a false and alien tense. I therefore who am better acquainted with my own End and meaning then Mr. K. is (as well as he knows me, by looking through his Prospective Glass from Cornwell to Kidderminster) shall better acquaint others what was my meaning in the words, which he faltereth on. And this is the true and plain Analysis of my words.

Having affirmed Justification to be a transient act, and that therefore the Incarnation
ception of it argueth no mutation in God, I was forc'd to meet with the opinion of Dr. Twis, who takes it to be an Immanent Act, and therefore if it should begin de novo, it would argue a change in God. (Not speaking of that in foro Conscientiae.)

These two Conclusions therefore I took as certain, and necessary to be held of every knowing Christian.

1. That God doth not change.
2. That God doth not pardon or justify men from Eternity; (no nor from the time of Christ's death) and therefore that he doth in time justify and forgive men, even when they believe. These two Conclusions being Certain and necessary, I take the latter as assaulted by D. Twis; who thereby would make them seem inconsistent.

His Argument is, Justification and Remission are Immanent Acts, therefore from Eternity. To this I answer, 1. By denying the Antecedent: For I had before shewed, that they are Transient acts, and what Transient acts they are.

2. Having premised, that no acts are Immanent in God Positively but only Negatively (as Schiller speaks;) I answered, That many doubt whether Immanent acts are any further Eternal than Transient acts (which I will open anon when we come to it;) and therefore that this is not a matter of such Certainty as the Proposition opposed is; and therefore Uncertainties must be reduced to Certainties, and not Certainties to Uncertainties: q. d. I am sure God doth not pardon and Justifie from Eternity from plain Texts of Scripture: But you are not sure that all Immanent acts are Eternal any more than Transient are; Therefore if these two Propositions were as inconsistent as you imagine; yet I would rather hold the former, and let go the latter, then hold the latter and let go the former. Here I supposed it objected, that it is not to be endured that any should argue God of mutability: but the forefaid Doctrine doth so: Therefore, &c. To which I answered, that there is no change in God: and they that do hold this opinion, do yet hold it is consistent with Gods Immutability: and I gave two or three short touches of their reasoning: If you ask me, whom I mean, I answer, I mean Lycheus, Penestus, Franciscus a Sancta Clara, and in part Suarez and Bursers, in the words which I shall anon cite in his Metaphysicks. And mark that I do not say, that these plead for the Inception or Cessation of Immanent acts: but that Immanent acts are new as Transient are; that is, not quasi substantiam actus, but transitionem in objectum extraneum. For here it is supposed, that it is not those Immanent acts, whose object is God himself, which is spoke of, but only those that are about the Creature; Note also, that I never thought of owning this opinion; but had ever owned the opinion of the Eternity of all Immanent acts; and so farre as the matter is discernable, do hold to it still: but I take the point in Question to be past our reach; and therefore not of such Certainty, as to encourage us to erect a plainly revealed truth, upon supposition of their inconstancy.

After this I returned to my first Position, and made it my full, final Answer, that Remission and Justification are Transient acts, and not Immanent, and that in this I had most Divines on my side, though they did not ordinarily explain the Nature of this Transient Act: which thereupon I more fully explain'd.

Thus, Reader, I have given the true Analysis of all these words about Immanent acts, which Mr. K. makes the occasion of his quarrel with me; and which
he layeth such a heavy charge on. And, I think, if I had said no more to him, but only given you this true Analysis, it had been enough to satisfy the impartial, and Judicious; and to free my words from that sandy incoherence and senselessnes, which (not understanding them) he doth fasten on them in his charge; and to vindicate my self from those corrupt Intentions and errors which he intimates.

§ 10.

Mr. K. First, saith he, Acts have not the respect of the Adjunct to its Subject, but an effect to its cause: Therefore new Immanent Acts will not inferre an alteration in God: Therefor, &c.

To this antecedent, I answer, that no Act is properly an effect, or relates as such to the Cause: the Act is rather the Causality then the effect, as Mr. Baxter may please to learn from his great Doctors in the Metaphysicks, whom I think enough to name in general, though he useth to quote them so exactly, as it were the Chapter and verse.

§ 10.

R. B. If I have learning enough to understand your meaning, you endeavour in these words to prove two Conclusions. The first and principal (and I think, the whole scope of your writing) is, that I am Ignorant and unlearned. The second and subordinate is, that Immanent Acts are certainly Eternal, or that the change of them will inferre a change in God. The first you prove by my Pedantick citing of Schibler and Burger dicianus, the Boyes companions, and that as if they were Doctors in the Metaphysicks, and that so exactly, &c. which you think it enough to name. To this I answer, 1. Your Argument labours of two diseases, 1. Obscurity: which may make some, that know you not, conjecture that your design was scarce honest, which you so carry under hand by intimations, when yet it seems the great Cause of this your undertaking: For my part, I think you would never have mentioned my name here, but to this end. 2. Of Needleless: If you had stooped so low as to consult me in this business, and opened to me your design, I could by three lines have saved you the writing of these leaves: but that’s too late: But yet I may prevent your voluminous labour perhaps for the future, if I do it yet. Be it known therefore to all men by these presents that I R. B. do confess my self ignorant and unlearned, especially compared with such as Mr. K. and his Genius. Habets consensum renum. What need you any more Witnesses? I hope now you may save the main labour of your next writing.

Yet, let me tell you the reason of my crime, a little more fully. I take the common good to be the best. I have about thirty Tracts of Metaphysicks by me (an ill workman, that needs so many tools) and I value these two or three Common ones which I cited before all the rest: and I think so do the Schools that use them most commonly. Nor do I see any great reason hitherto to take Mr. K. for a more learned, authentick, unquestionable Doctor in the Metaphysicks, then Suarez, Schibler or Burger dicianus, as highly as I value him above my self. Nor indeed did I ever before this, hear of his name (to my remembrance) much less of his Metaphysical writings. But as soon as ever Mr. K’s Metaphysicks came
to my hands, if I do not bow to them, & vestibis aut philosophiarum, then let him call me an unrevént fellow.

Now to your second business: Where, 1. I might better have been understood, if you had not left out the fore-going words; [by Immanent, they must needs mean Negatively, not Positively.] For by this they that see all might have understood that, 2. It is Gods acts that I speak of, 3. And you do out of your own brain, affix the Ergo, as if it were mine, making that an Argument, which I there take as presupposed. The rest we will come to anon.

§. 11.

Mr. K. Thus when the fire warms my hands, the heating is not the effect; but the Heat produced in my hand by the fire. This heat now is considerable three manner of ways. I shall not honour my Papers with the name of Suarez for this, but referre my Reader, if he be a young Scholar, and not satisfied in it, to his Smith and Brevewood.

§. 11.

R. B. Yet again! You will make men believe that I am grown to some Reputation of Learning, when you think it necessary to use so many words, to prove me a freshman. Is not one word of your mouth enough to blait the reputation of such a puny?

§. 12.

Mr. K. Either, 1. As it encreaseth, and in order to the highest degree of heat, and so it is called Motion, which is nothing else but the Terminus in ficti. Or 2. As it is received into the subject, and so it is called Passion, heating like heating being as well taken in a Passive sense as an active. Or, 3. As it is derived from the Agent, and so it is called Action: but this action again is considerable two manner of ways; Either Physically or Logically. Physically, and so the Patient is the subject of it: the heat which undergoes these several denominations, being in my hand, as was supposed. 2. Logically, and so this action is but an extrinsical denomination, and the Agent is the subject of it: Now take it how you will, Action is an Adjunct, as denomiating the agent, no way an effect as an action, &c.

§. 12.

R.B. 1. The word [Effect] is sometime taken for every thing that hath a Being and a Cause, and so every Action is an Effect, as having a Being dependant on its Cause: sometime it is taken more restrainedly, for that only which is permanent after the Action, or is Effected by it, and so Action is not an Effect. 2. The use of your distribution or distinctions to our business seems to me so small, as that I know not well to what end you bring them forth. 3. The order of your distinguishing I have no great minde to learn. 1 should rather have distinguished Logical and Physical Action, in the first place, had there been any use for it. 4. But your Logical action we have nothing to say to: Nor did I speak de subjecto predicationis. 5. Yet I have no great deire of imitating you,
you, in calling the Agent, the subject of the extrinsecal denomination [viz. Action.] It is your Physical Action, which is so denominated: Though of the verbal predication [agit] I would willingly say, that the Agent is the subject. 6. But it is your Physical Action which we have now to do with: and that not as it is in Patient, for so it is Passion, and not formally Action. Whether Scotus opinion of a Real difference be true or not (which yet may have more said for it then some superficial answerers do take notice of) yet formally its like it will be granted, that they are not the same: And therefore you should speak of Action as Action, hic dicit egregiosis & dependentiam ab agente, and not as it signifieth Passion, that is, Reception of Action, and the effect of it: and so the Patient is not the subject of Action; Nor do I believe it a fit speech to say, that Calefaction is in your hand, though Color be. But we must hear you farther; to how great purpose we shall see.

§ 13.

Mr K. Now take it how you will, Action is an adjunct, as denoting the Agent, no way an Effect, as an Action. 2. Nor do it carry that style in any of these learned Sophies, commonly quoted by Mr Baxter with so much reverence.

§ 13.

R.B. Ay you so! is it an adjunct as denoting the Agent, take it how I will? What if I take it, as it is received into the Subject, and called Passion] which is your second sense? Why said you that your Logical Action was an extrinsecal denomination of the Agent, if your Physical Action be so too? When you seemed by this to difference them? 2. I marvel that my Reverence to these Sophies should be the matter of so many of your lines, and you should think it necessary to rehearse it so oft: Sure you are jealous that your Reader will be very unobservant of your weighty observations. But, Sir, is not Reverence a sign of Lowliness? Why then are you offended at it? You should rather applaud me, and say, If R. B. do so much Reverence a Suarez, a Schibler, a Burger/dicius, if he knew me, how much more would he reverence me! But, to deal more plainly with you, the further I go in perusal of your learned Labours, the more I perceive my Reverence to abate. Let any man except your self judge by the next passage, whether you deferre more reverence then these Rabbies and Sophies (as you have honourably be-Titled them,) You boldly and flatly affirm, That Action [is no way an Effect, as an action, nor doth it carry those that style in any of these learned Sophies, &c.] Either this Assertion is True or False. If True, Mr K. hath got little; but I am false, if this be true. If it be false, either Mr K. knew it to be so, or he did not. If he did, and yet spoke it, and so confidently, then he must pardon me for Reverencing these childish Authors before him. If it be false and he knew it not, then, 1. He is one that will speak boldly what he knows not, and accordingly to be believed. 2. And then it seems he knows not what he supposeth his Boyes to know, and he looks at as his A.B.C. I will finde our a Tertium to save his credit as soon as I can. If there be no other, I'l lay it on a defect of memory, conjunct with a certain audacity, to tell the world in print, that those things are not written which he read when he was a boy, and hath since forgotten.
Let us try the truth of his Assertion. I must not tell him of some Schoolmen or any other Philosophical Writers, that call [action] an effect, for then he will say, Those are not the Sophies in Question: It must therefore be the very same men. Let Schibler speak first Met. i. 2. c. 10. Tit. i. Punc. p. 54. Quod ad actionem immanentem attinet... dicitur et Immanens ab irradiando, quod scilicet in agente maneat. Exstimo tamen eam non esse intelligendam Positivum sed Negativum. Nam action Immanens quia talis est, est in agente, hoc scilicet, quia non transit ad Patientes. Si ipso autem agente non est per modum Adjecti, sed simpliciter ad ipsum comparatur ut ad Cauesam. Unde hac Proposito, Hemo intelligit, vel disputat, non est in adjuncti de subiecto, sed ut Effeci de Causa: Et patet: Nam Action transiens nullum habet subiectum, neque ipsum patiens, ut visum est. Ergo eiam action Immanens est fortiori non potest subiectam. Consequentia firma est, qua action transiens magis est subiecto, & magis postular subiectum, quam action Immanens. Sed action Transiens in esse Actionis, nullum habuit subiectum, &c. Ergo & confirmatum, quod Action ut sic, non dicit nisi egressum a virtute activa alicuius agentis. Egressum autem opponitur rei esse in. Et hinc relictur generatio logiundo de actione ut sic, cam non potustur subiectum. Nec enim Genuin debet habere Naturam repugnantium sub speciebus, &c.


And Metaph. l. 2. c. 3. Tit. 17. n. 630. he saith, Resp. Ese ambiquestatem in voce creati ensis: Creatum enim Ens quandoque dicitur id solum quod per Actionem creativam incipit esse, quodque est quasi Creationis terminus: Et sic Creatio non est aliquum creaturam: Quandoque vero Creatur Ens dicitur omne illud quod dependere est ab Ens increato: Sic id sit per modum Actionis, sic per modum re fatet per actionem. Et hoc modo Creatio est qua Creatum. Calvdddd Metaphys. Divin.

Simile quid est in voce Effectus vel Effectus: Dicitur enim quandoque effectum pro co quod est quasi Actionis Terminus, quando domus, & c. est effectum. Aliquando vel effeuno & cve et cve.
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... having communis ndicatur effectum, quod quidem in Causa est, sive id sit per modum Actiones seu motus, sive per modum rei per motum facti; et hinc ipse Actiones dicuntur effecta, &c. Atque etsi noster Actiones sunt effecti, ipsa raimen non postulant, ut per alias actiones confuetur, &c.

... lib. 2. cap. 10. Tit. 3. Art. 3. n. 31, 32. Nam & ipse Actiones dicuntur effectus praevis, & in se quis habent esse dependens sitiunt, &c. Vid. n. 41, 42. & n. 49, 50, 1. Et confirmatur per Aristot. L. 3. Phys. T. 20. Obvisa, eundem Actum esse Agens tamquam in quo, & patientis tamquam in quo, hoc est, ibi habeat respectum effecti, ibi vero habeat respectum adjuncti.

... tit. 14. n. 41. 18. Potentia ad sum Actum comparatur ut effectum illius, unde intellectus, v. g. effectus rationis intellectus, &c.

... let Mr. K.'s auditors consider the next time he ascended his Chair, how farre their great Master is to be credited, and with what Caution his most confident Assertions must be received. Let a man speak never so many Doctrinal untruths, we may modestly and handomly confute them without offensive language: but when men speak such palpable untruths in matter of fact, I love not to dispute with them, seeing a man hath no answer for them, beseasoning their errors, but a plain defiderat veritas, which seems so unhandsome language that it is usually ill taken what ever be the cause.

... but let us hear another of the Sophies, viz. Suarez, Metaph. disp. 18. Sec. io. n. 8. Quod si nomine Effectus comprehensum non solum rem producant, sed quod quidem et virtutem agentis maneat, sic concilemus Actiones esse aliquo modo effectum agentis, cum sit dependens vel potius ipsius dependentia ab illo: Effectum hanc modo, non repenstat causalitati: quin potius in omnibus causis quas habet us trahsimus, Causalitas est effectus causa, &c.

... it were no hard matter to produce more Reverend Sophies for Mr. K. who use the same language and call Actions Effects; but being about so small a matter, I think it is not worth the labour. In this much the Reader may perceive, at what a lost of time he may be lead in reading such Controversies, where men leave the Things, and fall upon Persons and Words, out of an earnest desire to finde out some way to call Contemn: upon their Brethren.

§ 14.

Mr. K. VVhat was wont to be more common in horse-fair then an Actio in Agente, which with the knack of this hackney distinction, every dull Jade could turn as their pleasure, and hold sometimes affirmatively, sometimes negatively. So then thus farre little is said to the prejudice of that truth, that there is no now Immanent act in God?

§ 14.

R. B. You horse-fair, and hackney distinction, and dull Jade, are passages so profound that I must pass them as unanswerable by any that hath not attained to your Degrees. But doubtless you knew also how common it is to maintain the Negative on other grounds, and to say, that Actio est Agentis, non in Agente: and this is the language that I have hitherto thought fittest: and your contrary judgement alone will scarce move me to change. As for the safety of your
Conclusion, I must tell you, it is no such glorious Achievement for you to vindicate it against one that never opposed or denied it.

§ 15.

Mr. K. But 2. Though this should be granted to Mr. Baxter to be true in acts transient, yet an immanent act is questionless an Adjunct, and not onely denominate the Agent, but where in it. For I ask, Is Knowing or Willing a Substance or Accident an Accident questionless? If an Accident; In what Subject? Out of the Agent, you will finde no place where it may set the sole of its foot. Therefore it is in the Agent, and so an Adjunct: and if so, sure Immanents acts in God must needs inferre an alteration. For

§ 15.

R. B. I confess your first on-set (so sudden, so cauless against a feigned Adversary) made me suspect you to be some pignacissimum animal (as Dr. Twifc calls his Adversary) but your prosecution puts me out of doubt. 1. Had you confined these speeches of yours only to the Creatures Acts, you had said but as many others have done before you: But it is God's acts that you speak of, as you ascerain us in your application [and if so, sure Immanent acts in God must needs inferre an alteration.] But indeed do you believe that God is compounded of Substance and Accident? Yea doth the contentious disposition so potently carry you on, that you dare speak in such confident language, as to say that it is [an accident questionless] which you attribute to God? What could Vorius have said more? I thought you had concurred in opinion with your Brethren, that use to call God's Immanent Acts, as diversified and as distinct from his Essence, only Extrinsic Denominations: But it seems you think otherwise (for a little time, while your haste hurry you that way per modum naturae.) 2. If you say, That you meant only this much [Immanents acts are Accidents inherent in man: Therefore they inferre an alteration in God.] You might so easily foreknow that I would deny your Consequence, that me thinks so great a Disputant should not so drily have passed over the proof. I do not stick on the strangeness of the Conclusion itself, that [Immanents acts in God must needs inferre an alteration] which is against your self and all Divines, who maintain that there are Immanent acts in God. For I doubt not but your haste which the disputing itch provoked you to, caused you to put [Immanents acts] for new Immanent acts.] 3. But its strange, that you could bethink you of no answer that might be made to your Question [If an Accident, in what Subject?] when you know it is so common to deny that Inhesion is necessary to every Accident; And when you know that in this case an esse ab, or a dependant Egress, is assum'd sufficient by so many. I cited the words of Schibler to that sense even now, where he purposely opposeth that which you asserred, lib. 2. cap. 10. Tit. 3. n. 54, 55. I will not trouble you to rehearse them, it being a Book so farre below you. Now to your Proof.

§ 16. Mr. K.
§ 16.

Mr. K. For, 3. Though Action as action logically considered, be but an extrinsical Denomination, and so only denominate the Agent, not inhering in it, as much of reality as there is in all transient Actions being in the Patient, even physically, or rather metaphysically considered; yet these immanent actions have their terms too, say the said Sages, and these in the Agent; but this hath a minute to look it, may soon finde it in Suarez, or his Scapula Schibler, in the predicament of Action. Thus then the first bolt hath done little execution against this truth, that there can be no new immanent acts in God.

§ 16.

R. B. If this all the proof that we have waited for [Immanent actions have their terms too?] 1. Either you mean it of all immanent acts, or but of some, if but of some; then it is a learned Argument: [Some immanent acts have their terms: Therefore there can be no new immanent acts in God.] But I suppose you mean it of all. But then by [terms] do you mean [objects] which sometime are called termini? Or do you mean, the form to which the action tendeth, and which by it is produced or induced? If the first, then the Terminus of these Divine acts which we are speaking of, is oft Without, (as we use to say;) as when God knoweth, Approveth, Willeth, Loveth the creature. And therefore some few will not call these immanent acts, but only those whole object is God himself. But I suppose you mean the later, and then, 3. You might easily foresee, that though I had yielded all that you say of the creatures acts, yet I would deny it of God: And blame me not for it, if I be less bold then you: and if I dare not imagine that there is in God either Motus or Terminus ad quern, or effect, or form acquired, when he knows, Willeth, Approveth or Loveth the creature. I am in hope that you believe no such thing yourself, when the disputing itch is a little allayed. But however, could you possibly think it so obvious and easy a point as to need no proof? Why have we never a word here to that end, who need so many? I love not these Happy Disputers, that can prove that by silence, which neither themselves nor any other can prove by Argument. If you will flie to your Analogy, and say [There are termini actionum immanentium in man: Therefore there are so in God.] I should tell you that you may as wisely say [There are accidents, effects and mutations in man: Therefore there are such in God.] At least I should importune you for the proof of your consequence. 4. But for the terms of immanent actions you say [The said Sages say it] and [he that hath a minute to look it, may soon finde it in Suarez, and his Scapula Schibler.] Truly, Sir, I have hitherto hinted your faults in ironies: but I think it fit to ask you now (seeing it is not once or twice, nor a slip of your pen,) how you dare put such things in print, and let so light by honest Truth-telling, and leave such things on record against your self? You that do unto others as you would be done unto, therefore, do unto others as you would be done unto. Surely, then, if you know it not, you should not take on you to know it, and say, we may soon finde that in him, which he so largely and purposely disputes against. He faith indeed, that some immanent acts have terms, as sylllogizing, but that cannot be your meaning: for you well know it will do nothing to inferre your Conclusion: But doth not Schibler (l. 2. c. 10. Tit. 3. art. 3.)
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punct. 1, 2.) largely dispute it, that many Immanent acts have no terms, no not Vision or Intellection! and answen the Objections against him; and conclude that Actis ut sic non dicit respectum ad terminum? And if Intellection have no Term, then Decree, and theret that we were mentioning in the beginning, can have none in agenti. 5. Nay what a great part of the great Philosophers and School-Divines do deny, that Immanent acts are true acts? Scotus takes them to be qualities, and not in the predicament of Action. Soremnus, Ferrarinus (and laith Schibler Thomistae frequenter) in docent) deny them to be true acts. And it so, then have they not the terminus of true acts.

And I before told you at the beginning of your Discourse, that we do not all agree with you in your Description of an Immanent act, if you mean that it is such as is not only negatively, but Positively terminated in the Agent, as your words import: You may see Schibler denying it (when you shall condescend to look it in him) in Met. II. 2. c. 10. Tit. 3. n. 54. & Tit. 3. art. 1. n. 64. But let this be how it will in man, I do very confidently deny that there is any such act in God, either of Knowledge or Will, as is either in the predicament of Action, or hath any Terminus in himself, further then as himself is the object of any act. And therefore you should first prove, that such Acts are in God at all, before you dispute whether they may be in him de novo.

§. 17.

Mr. K. Consider that what follows: [Whether all such Immanent acts are any more eternal than transient acts, is much questioned.] saith Mr. Baxter. By whom I pray? A clear difference between them as between heaven and earth: transient acts as I told you but now, being in the Patient, Immanent in the Agent.

§. 17.

R. B. 1. Happy, too happy wit! that hath not only with Moses seen the back parts of God, but hath taken so full a Survey of his Nature, that it can discern as clear a difference between his several acts, as between heaven and earth! I dare not attempt the like Survey: but I may receive instruction from you that have Survey’d it. And what is the difference? Why [transient acts are in the Patient, and Immanent in the Agent.] What’s the proof? Why it is this [It told you so but even now.] This may be a Demonstration to those that are capable of it: but recipitur ad modum recipiens: with me you have lost your Authority, so farre, that I need another kind of proof. I will rather call it Passion then Action when it is in Patient. Forma dat nomen: and Passion and Action are not the same formaliter, whatsoever they may be materially. Use the names promiscuously, if there be no difference in the things.

You know the subtil Scotists say, That Action and Passion are not the same, and that Action is in the Agent. And I have yet seen no reason to preferre you before Scotus. But I rather say, that Transient Acts are ab agenti, but neither in agenti nec patienti; as having a Cause but no Subject, as I have before expressed. And you may finde in his Scapula, Met. I. 2. c. 10. Tit. 3. n. 51. That Omne accidens est in alio sensu Negativo, &c. alias loquendo de generali essentia accidentis, non est ca in Inharento, est rigorosoe loquamur, sed in eo quaert id qua sit accidents est afficit substitution extra essentia, sine extra essentiam, at rationum ejus existendo. Proinde est a 2

rigrorose
rigorously looking not inharum, samus satis habet de ratione accidentis. quia substantiam efficit & denominat extra essentialiter. Unde poter resp. ad asump. profylog. admittendo quod Actio Transiens non sit in Patiente, looking de actione ut sit, & sub ece Actionis. Quod igitur Actione transiens distirr-esse in patiente, id non est intelligentiosus formaliter. sed materialiter: nempe illa res quae est Actio est in Patiente: non tamen sub formalis Actionis, sed sub formalis passionis: Eadem enim res quae Actio est, est etiam Passio. Now I hope you are more accurate in your speeches then to use to denominate from the matter, rather then the form: and therefore I hope hereafter you will forbear saying, that Actio est in Patiente, how common forever it may be. At least remember that you humbled your self but even now, to use a Hackney distinction, with which every dull Jade could maintain the Negative at their pleasure. And what if I adventured to use one Argument, Actio est efficientis causalis: At efficientis Causalitas non est in Patiente: Ergo, Actio non est in Patiente. The major I prove by Infallible Authority, vit. Mr.K's, pag. 136. For the minor, if the Causality of the Agent were in the Patient, then we might fully call it Patientis Causalitas. (For the name should be fitted to the thing) But that were absurd, Therefore, &c. Further, That which is in the Patient is a Causa, or effect of the Agent per Actionem vel Causalitatem. But Causality or Action is not a Causa or effect of the Agent per actionem vel causalitatem: Therefore that which is in the Patient is not Action or Causality. The major needs no proof; and its meant of every received form. The minor hath a full demonstration, vit. Mr.K's Authority; who denieth Action to be an effect. And those that be not moved with his authority, may observe that I here take the word [effect] in the more restrained sense as it exculdeeth Causality or Action; and therefore that I say [it is not an Effect per Actionem] and that is proved fully, in that otherwise, there must be another Action to effect this Action, and so in infinitum. But I did not think to have said anything on this. All that Mr.K. can expect we should grant him is, that Actio qua Passio est in Patiente: but still Actio transiens qua Actio non est in Patiente, no more then is an Immanent action. Or if it were, yet the Authority of so many learned gain-sayers, makes the difference seem scarce so clear as that between heaven and earth.

Moreover, that which in God we call a Transient Act, is by the Schoolmen in greatest credit, affirmed to be Gods Essence only connoting the creature-Relatio to us: so that besides the creature itself (which though Scotus calls Creation, yet is sure the effect and not the act) and besides the Relation (which can be no proper act) there remains nothing but Gods essence, to be the substance of the Act which we call both Immanent and Transient. (capreolus faith, Nulla Divina operatio aut actio qua formaliter agit aut operatur, est transiens in passum, sic quod in passo formaliter recipitur, cum ejus agere fit ejus Velle & Intelligere, quae sunt aiones Immanentes. Sed concedi potest quod divina actio dicitur quandoque transiens proprius refectioni rationis ad realem effectum in Creatura, ut Creatio, Conservatio, &c. l.2. diff. 1. q. 2. art. 3.) And the Thomists (laith Swarz, Met. diff. 20. §. 5.) say, That Non solum Creatio, verum neque ulsa actio refectioni illius potest effe Transiens. Where then is Mr.K's clear difference as between heaven and earth?

And though I am loth to put my finger into the fire, by medling with Mr.K. any further then he invites me, yet perhaps he may expect I should somewhat take notice what he faith of this point to Mr.Goodwin, pag. 150, 154.

1. When he faith, [There are so many Immutations in Gods Essence] if transient operations be the same with his Essence, &c. I deny the consequence: because
because the *Terminus* or effect is not the same with his Essence, though the act be. The Effect only is Many; the Act but one. 2. To his solution of the first Question, where he faith, *It is a mystery passing all understanding, that God should incline the heart to believe and not act anew,* &c.] I say, I believe him for the mysteriousness. But as all multiplicity comes from Unity, so do all temporals from that act which is Eternal. To all Mr. K's Instances the Schoolmen say, It is the effect only that is New: In giving the spirit, faith, raising Christ, &c. God had no new act: Yet God did it by *Velle,* which is his eternal act and essence. To his answer to the second Question, I Reply, M.K's Questions are insipid and fallacious. [Did he Plant faith by making Plants? Did he make me to differ by making the world?] For though it was by the same act, yet that act hath divers denominations from its respect to divers objects. To [make the world] connotes a particular object, viz. the world: and therefore the act which causeth you to believe, cannot be called [Creating the world] not because the act is not the same, but because it respecteth not the same object. The third Question belongs not to me. To the fourth I say as before: the act is God's *Velle:* his *Velle* is his Essence: Therefore Eternal. His Questions [Whether the world were drowned by the same Act by which it was made? &c.] are answered as before: It was by the same Act, viz. *Velle Divinum*; but to be denominated variously according to the Variety of objects which it doth respect and connote. Even as it is the same Act which is Immanent and Eternal, which in Time is denominated Transient from its respect to the effect.

But Pag.154. I finde him citing Mr. G. as saying [Learned men Generally acknowledge, that (the act) is really and formally one and the same thing with his Essence.] And Mr. K. faith contrary, that [No man ever asserted Transient acts to be the same with the Agent] and that [all Transient acts be the same with the term, say all men that meddle with Metaphysicks] and he appeals to any Reader that hath but tasted the first principles of Logick. Truly these two Divines are very contrary: and have bewrayed both of them that which they might have concealed with much more credit to their Reading. Yet Mr. G. may interpret [Generally] with such limitations as may bring him off in part: but Mr. K's presumption and boldness is intolerable. When a man of so small Reading as I am, know so well, 'that the Metaphysical Doctors do some speak one way, and some another: as I undertake by quotations now to manifest when I shall understand it worth any time and labour. I remember Mr K's words in his third Epistle of the sufficiency of [a pair of Sheers and a met-yard.] But it is not so farre sufficient without more Reading, as to encourage a tender conscience man, to averse untruths so confidently, that [No man ever asserted, &c.] And where he saith [The Question is not of the acts of his Will, but of his Power, &c.] Know-eth he not that Dr. T. and the highly honoured Thomists do make God to work *per effentiam,* and say, that his Power is but his Will, called Power in respect to the effect which it doth produce? *Vid. A.quin. 1. q. 15. art. 1. 4.* Truly me thinks that Mr. K. doth even to the meanly learned, expost himself to great disgrace, to say so boldly, that [all men that meddle with Metaphysicks say, that all Transient acts be the same with the term.] Did he never at least reade *Scotus* so oft asserting and arguing for the contrary? Nor any one of his followers, nor one of all the other parties that deny this? If he had not, yet he should have blushed so peremptorily to affirm what he did not know. At least he should have known that Schibler hath this Conclusion, which he largely argues for [3o Affiores qua tendunt](#)
tendunt ad terminum non sunt realiter idem cum termino] and saith, Calvisationem a Calore specie distinguishing. And he there tells you of Vescius, Aureolus, Suarez & Collec. Conimbrice. that say as he: At least he that so derides me for citing these puerile Authors, should not have dared to say All men [that meddle with Metaph.] say as he in this, when both common School-books, and the two most famous Sects of Schoolmen, Scotists and Thomists are against him (as Suarez will tell him, disp. 48. fer. s. n. 2. of Cajet, Hispalens. Flandr. & communiter Scotist. &c.) And for the fuller answering of Mr. K.'s Questions before mentioned, I desire the learned Reader among others to peruse the foresaid Answer of Capreolus to Aureolus 15. arguments in l. sec. disp. 1 q. 2 a. 3. But I must intreat you still to remember that my own opinion is, That action is not properly ascribed to God at all; nay farre more Improperly then men will easily believe: Suarez himself Metaph. disp. 48. §. s. n. 11. maintaineth Gods Immanent acts, Intelligere & Volle are properly not acts, nor to be so called. But of this before.


And that the Action is not the same with the Terminum, see the Arguments of Ludovic. a Dola de Concurr. s. 1. cap. 2. §. 6. Aquin. is cited by Capreolus in 2. sent. disp. 1 q. 2 a. 3. as laying thus, de pot. Dei q. 3. a. 17. ad 12m. Dei Actio est externa cum ejus substantia: dicitur autem necipere agere ratione noni effectus, qui ab externa actione consequitur dispositionem voluntatis qui intelligitur quasi actionis principium in ordine ad effectum.

2. But the other part of the assigned difference goes down with me no better, but much worse. 1. In that he knows, I think, that it is not such a commonly received opinion [that Immanent actions are in the Agent] in a Positive sense, and not merely negative, as that he should think it needed no more proof then his mentioning. I gave him the opposition of one Sophie, as he calls him, even now. 2. And if it were so in man, I again tell him, that I will not take his bare word, no nor his oath, that it is so in God.

But Mr. K. must needs know who they be that make question of this. What if it were but some private familiars of mine? Must Mr. K. needs know their names? But I had thought he had been well acquainted with the doctrine of Lychites, Penumbratom and Sancta Claris in this Point, Who affirm, That though the act in it self be God himself, and so eternal, yet the transition of it to several objects, and so the denomination may be new; and so that God may, to day predetermine him that before was not predestinated, or Love him that before was not Loved, and this without any change in God. Indeed these are the men that I mean. I thought with these men of the higher form you had designd to be familiar: but because you speak of the matter so strangely, I will come down again to our own form, and rehearse a few words of Burgerficiae familiarly known to those at your foot. Metaph. l. 2. §. 16. Efst enim in Deco concipiendo usus actus, qui nihil aliud est quam effecta divina. Hic actus respicit potest diversa objecta creata, seu, quod eodem redit: Deus per ipsum actum tendere potest in diversa objecta, vel eum non tendere: & cum in illid tendere, revera cur null: Dixi in objecta creata: Nam fentientium Deus non potest non amare. Decreto ergo Dei duo involvens: actum scilicet, & illius actus tendentiam.

fine.
fine applicatione ad diversa objecta creati. Ac tamen quis Dei vel Immensitas, vel Eternitas: sed libera est illius actus applicatione ad objecta: quae tamen qua nihil Deo addit exitis, sed solum denominazioni quem ex sublima componuntio objecti creati, tantum termini sui, neque compositionem effecto, neque mutationem. Quod adeo verum est, ut existimem, si Deus decreta velinderent posset, illud imperfectum allaturam Deo, non propter mutationem Decretorum, sed propter causam mutationis, quae aut imprudencia semper est aut impotencia.

Suarez hath such a like passage, which Fr.a Sancta Clara reciting, answers this Objection about Imprudence or Impotency, as Posnaniensis before him: Problem. quart. pag. 31. sed hac ratio ejus est debilis, ut recte nominavit Posnaniensis: Nam imprudentia vel inconstantia vitium non est, figuris prepositis duolus bonis, primo eligat minus bonum postea magis: nisi forte ex passione vel more difficiliori, vel alieno ordinatoria affectione id proveniat; ut patres dec. bono calibatur et conjugu. Deus autem vello modo obligatur, nec passionibus laborat, sed ex mera liberalitate hoc non illud eligit: Ergo potest eligeri sine nota inconstantia. Haec ille. Unde August. Si non est praeditus, facit praeconditionis. Et Ambrofius (in c.f. Luc.) Novii Dominus mutare sementiam, si tu noveris emendare decitum. Subtilissimus etiam Bradwardinus dicit
dlace sententiam suam aliquando pulsasse animam, &c.

Thus I have given you some answer to your incredulous Question [By whom I pray?] But another kind of answer might be given, concerning another sort of men, who deny the Act itself to be Gods Essence, but somewhat that hath no more Being then a Relation, or a Formality, or En rationis ratiocinata, or at least then a modus Entis: and consequently that this may be without any composition in God (which they prove by the confession of our own Doctors) so may it begin and end without Mutation in God. But I'le not offend Mr. K's ears with the names of these men.

§ 13.

Mr. K. Surely transient Acts there could be none before the Creation, there being no term of such Acts, no subject for them, unless there were either somewhat that was not made, or somewhat made before there was a Creation: but as for Immanent Acts, as Knowing and Willing in God, they were before the foundation of the world was laid. It is a very crude passage thus to say [It is much questioned whether all such Immanent Acts are any more eternal than transient Acts:] For if the meaning be that any transient Act be eternal, that is a mystery beyond all that hath been heard: then somewhat was made from eternity: If the meaning be, that no Immanent Act is eternal, that's after the same rate. The first made the Creature eternal: the second denies God to be eternal: Did he not know from Eternity, yeasore-know all that hath been since the Creation, or shall be to the dissolution of the world, he were not perfect, and therefore not God from eternity. So then whether can it be affirmed, that there was any transient act eternal, nor can it be denied but that some Immanent acts are eternal: and if some, then all, or els a change in God must of necessity be granted. So that if the meaning be [Its questioned Whether some immanent Acts be no more eternal than transient Acts] that is, some immanent Acts be not eternal, the Argument returns with the old charge, that an alteration must be yielded in God, immanent Acts being not to be reckoned with any colour among effects, but adjures, and no ground of putting any such new immanent Act in God in time, which I demonstrate further thus.
§ 18.

R. B. The meaning of my words is not hid, but according to the proper literal sense, and I had some respect to the two sorts of men before-mentioned, but chiefly to one. And what I say in Reply to your words, you must be so just as to take to be according to their grounds, and not mine own: For it is but the unsearchableness of these things that I am all this while maintaining.

And first to your Argumentation against the Eternity of transient acts; it may be replied, that in transient acts you must distinguish between the Act itself, which is called transient, and the Passion or Reception of that act in the subject or the product, or effect of that act. The denomination of Transient is given to that act in the later respect as it doth connote the Product, Effect, Passion and Subject: yea is properly taken so from them, as that is significeth nothing essential to the Act itself as an Act: So that all that same Act which is in Time denominated Transient, because in time it did produce its effect, was really from eternity itself, though the effect were not; and so differs not quoad rationem formalem actus, from an Immanent act. Proved, 1. The Act by which God created the world, was his simple Velle: But God's simple Velle was from Eternity: Therefore &c. The major is indeed denied by such Panics as Schibler, and many more of his mind: but it needs no proof with Mr. K. for it is the opinion (I am sure the saying) of Dr. Twiss: And indeed it comes all to one, as to our business, if you go on the others grounds. The major, Mr. K. maintains. 2. Deus operatur per immutatim immediate: sive bemutatia divina est aeterna: Ergo, &c. The major is spoken exclusively as to all acts which are not God's Essence; and is so common with many Schoolmen, that I will spare the proof (for I perceive it easier taking it for granted then proving it) The minor none denyeth that confesseth God. So that it is granted Mr. K. that these acts were not to be called Transient from Eternity, because they were not received, or rather did not produce the effect but in time: But yet the Act which in Time received the denomination of Transient, was itself Eternal: God Willed from Eternity that the Creature should be in time, and produced it in that time by that Will which was Eternal, So much on that side.

Now to your Argumentation for the Eternity of Immanent acts, you would receive two several kindes of Answer from the several men that I before told you of.

One sort of them think that the Thing it self which we call an Act, is nothing but God's Essence, and so Eternal: but that the transition of this Act to several objects (as Santa Clara calls it) or the Application of it to these objects (as Burger dicibus speaks) and so the connotation of, and respect to these objects, is not Eternal, where the object is not Eternal: and withall they think that the denomination specifical of the several Acts, yea and the diversification of them, is taken from these temporal transitions, or applications and respects to the objects; and therefore that they must be used as temporal denominations, and it is fittest to say, God Knew, Loved, &c. Peter as existing, not from Eternity, but when he did exist: Yea they think the very name of an Act, is most fit to be used in this later sense; rather then applied to the pure Essence of God: however some call him in another sense, a simple Act.

The
The other sort of men do think, that the very Act it self is some Medusa or Serpency distinct from Gods Eflence, and may begin without his Mutation, as it may be his without his Composition, as I have before said. Now both these sorts will Reply, that your Charge of [making God not Eternal] and of [making alteration in God] which you oft repeat, are but your bare word without any proof, and therefore not by them to be regarded. That God fore-knew all things that should come to pass they easily grant you: but if he knew not that to be existent, which is but future, or that to be future which is wholly past, they say, this makes not God to be imperfect, or not eternal.

But I marvel that you still call Gods Immanent Acts [Adjuncts in God] which before you also called Accidents; not fearing hereby to be guilty of making a Compounded God, while you maintain him Eternal: Or not discerning that you give advantage to your Adversary to maintain, that those Accidents or Adjuncts which may be in God without Composition, may as well Beginne or End notwithstanding his Immutability, if their Object be such as both Beginne or End. Now to your New Demonstration.

§ 19.

Mr. K. If there be a ground of putting a New immanent Act in God; Ergo, This ground must be either in God or the Creature. If a Ground in God which was not before, then an alteration in him beyond reply: a ground in the Creature there can be none to put a new immanent Act in God, for that immanent Act hath nothing to do with any thing without the Agent, it being herein contradistinguished from transient Acts, that transient Acts terminate in passio, immanent Acts in agent. I confess somewhat without the Agent, is many times, yea commonly the object of immanent Acts: but if ever either the Subject or Term, I will publicly burn my Books, as Mr. Baxter escribes his may be, when he goes one note beyond Dr. I wis. I am confident he needs not fear coming so high: I am sure he fals infinitely short in this Argument, as will appear more fully by what he subjoins.

§ 19.

R. B. His is the Demonstration. I shall understand that word, in your mouth, better hereafter. Your horned Argument will be thus answered. The word [Ground] is ambiguous. If you take it largely for any sufficient Reason of the attribution, then there is Ground both in the Creature and in God: But if you take it more strictly for some one sort of Reason, then it may be in one and not in the other. The ground may be in the Creature as the Object; and in God as the efficient: and in one as the relate, and the other as the correlate. But you say [if in God, then an alteration in him, beyond reply:] that's a pretty way to prevent a Reply: But your confident Assertions shall hereafter be annumerated with the weakest of your Arguments, though called Demonstrations.

1. Some will take it for a sufficient Reply to deny your Consequence, and think you had dealt fainlier to have proved it. For they will think that there may be in God an Eternal Ground of a New Immanent Act, as well as there is of a New Transient Act: The newness of the Act, will not prove the newness of the Ground. And therefore you easily suppose that it must be [a ground in God which was not before]
before] if the act be such as was not before. But this you should have foreseen would be denied. And if you say, that the newness or change in the effect doth argue something changed or new in the cause; they will deny it; and tell you that then every transient act would argue something new in God.

2. Those (of whom I spoke before) that maintain that immanent acts as acts need no subject, will think they reply sufficiently by telling you, that the novity of immanent acts, having a ground in God, will only prove that *aliquid in Deo* is altered, but not that *aliquid in Deo* is altered: because that act speaks but a dependant egress, and not an inbetion. The like they will say as to any form introduced in the subject by immanent acts, who deny to many and most immanent acts, a terminus; and particularly to intellection. And if you think that there can be no action without some effect within or without, I refer you for an answer to my Scapula, as you conceive it.

3. However many of us will hardly be brought to believe that God’s immanent acts have in proper sense a terminus: though many may.

4. Some will think they Reply sufficiently, by telling you that by [alteration in God] you mean, either [an alteration of his essence] and then they deny your consequence: or [an alteration of some modus, or relation, or formality] and such they will grant: and say, as oft before, that it is no more against God’s immutability, then the existence of that modus, relation, or formality is against his simplicity.

5. If when God created the world, he had a *new* relation (of Creator) which he had not before, and this without change, then he may have a new immanent act without change, for ought you know.

6. For God’s acts are not so well known to such Moles and Bats as you and I are, that we should be able, so peremptory to conclude that the novity of them must needs argue himself to be mutable: we know not so well how much Being, or of what kind, those acts have.

So much for Reply to that which is past Reply. Now to the next horn of your Dilemma.

You say [A ground in the creature there can be none to put a new immanent act in God.] And why? Because [an immanent act hath nothing to do with anything without the Agent.] 1. How? nothing! neither as an occasion, nor an object? do not you confess within a few lines that something without may be its object? It is ordinarily said, and by some of your friends, that the Attributes and Immanent acts of God are diversified only by extrinsic denomination; as an immovable rock in the sea that is washes sometime with one wave and sometime with another, without its own change: (It seems they take the passion or reception of these motions of the waves, to be no change.) So do diversity of objects, say they, diversifie God’s acts and attributes *quod denominationem extrinsecam*. If that be so, then objects specific those acts *quod denominationem extrinsecam*, which in themselves are but one: and then the said objects may as well cause a novity as a diversity of immanent acts *quod denominationem extrinsecam*. And then there is no more impropriety in saying, God doth de Nono Will or Nill; then in saying, that it is not all one, for God to Will my Salvation, and to Nill it: see what you have brought your cause to. 2. There are men in the world that
that conceive of God, as we do of the sun, that is still shining, but not still shining on this or that creature: it may begin or cease to shine on this place or that, without any change in it self or its actual shining: and so they think it is with God as to some of his acts, which have the creature for their objects: and for your objection, that this is a transient act of the sun, I shall reply to it anon, where you mention it.

But you are again harping on your old string; viz. [That immanent acts are terminated in the Agent.] And I again tell you, that God's acts and means are not so near kin, as that you may conclude of the termination of his acts from the termination of ours: yea I tell you, that I will not believe you that God's willing or knowing the creature hath any terminus in himself (further then as you may say the creature is in himself;) that is no terminus strictly ascribed to actions distinct from a meet objective termination. A word of proof. 1. Where there is neither muta or mutation there is no terminus? But in God acting immanently there is neither muta vel mutation: Therefore, &c. I think I need not confirm either part. 2. Where there is no effect or form acquired or introduced, there is no terminus (in the sense in question:) But in God there is no effect or form acquired or introduced (by such immanent acts) Therefore, &c. The major is plain from the common definition of a terminus. The minor is past question.

But here you confess that the objects of immanent acts may be extrinsic (Yet I could tell you, that Viguius Institute, and others conclude, that Voluntas Divina non habet objectum extrinsecum:) but if subject or term you will burn your Books, &c. But hold your hand a little. Before I dare be guilty of that, I would fain know what Books they are. But you speak caustically: for you tell us not who shall be Judge in this business: and if I should shew you never so many that are against you, you may keep your word by saying they all mistake, and by being the Judge your self. But, alas Sir, what cause have you thus to threaten your books? Who can riddle the occasion of it? I tell you, that as good Philosophers (for ought I yet finde by you) as you, do think that such acts have no subject nor term: and you say, that if any thing extrinsic be the subject or term you will burn your Books! which if you do, let all bear witness that I was no occasion of it: If they have no subject or term at all, then they can have none without. Sure if you were not very quarrellsome you would not in such high words feign him to be your adversary, that faith more against the opposed Point, then your self.

As for that out-leap wherewith you recreate your self, of my coming so high as Dr. Twis, in the sense I spake I yet desire it not; in the sense you speak (ludorily) I expect it not: nor do I know any man so simple as to compare me with him, or that needed this learned Diggession. Yet I confess I thought my self somewhat neerer both Dr. Twis and your self then you suppose me to be: For though I was ready to obey your conclusive command, of adoring the footsteps of such, yet I thought not that I had come infinitely short, as you here inform me, I do. I thought only God had infinitely excelled the meanest creature. Nay then, if you will be needs our Gods, Numina Academica, I am afraid you will shortly be lower then men; and lest I shall hear that news which I equally fear and abhorre, that you and such like will ere long be call out of that Academical Paradise. But let that go: I suppose [infinitely] was but a high word, by a high spirit, quasi ab alto, from a high place. I have stood my self ere now on a mountain, and every thing in the valley seemed small to me.
But I forgot to tell you one thing: that (though I suppose I know what kind of termination you mean, yet) you should have spoken more cauhtely, and distinguished, and told your Reader more plainly what you deny; and not have resolved to burn your Books, if we prove things without the Agent to be a term in general. For you know that we distinguish of Objects into Motive and Terminative; and ordinarily say that the creatures are terminative objects of God's Will, though not moving objects. Mæurisse saith (Metaphys. Soc. l. i. Q. 19. pag. 1. 27.) "Objectum secundarium non potest movere intellectum divinum ad cognitionem sui, liceat possit illum terminare, ut docent Theologi. And Schibler li. 2. c. 3. tit. 15. n. 507. Non quis putemus esse aliquid quod actu quae voluntatem divinam, (quo officium alias sols esse objectorum, in ordine ad habi tum & potentias,) sed quia apprehendimus voluntatem Divinam Terminari ad aliquid quod hanc habet rationem objecti. Est enim ad rationem objecti sat, si terminet actu aliqum. And Punk. 2. n. 510. the assertion is, "Dei voluntas terminatur etiam ad res creatas. But enough of that. Now let's see the proof of our infinite distance."

§ 20.

Mr. K. [A S for God to know that the world doth now exist is such a man is sanctified, &c. God's foreknowledge is not a knowing that such a thing is which is not, but that such a thing will be which is not; yet doth this make no change in God, no more when the sun is changed by the variety of creatures which it doth enlighten and warm; or the glads by the variety of faces which it representeth, or the eye by the variety of colours which it beholdeth: (For, whatsoever some say, I do not think) that every variation of the object makes a real change in the eye, or that the beholding of ten distinct colours as one view doth make ten distinct acts of the sight, or alterations on it: Apb. p. 173, 174.] I cannot tell what to make of this rope, but find it is, and nothing else, as shall first appear; and how ill a match this Asbour was, thus to descend in arenam with Twisse, Pemb, and I dare say all the sober Divines that ever were worthy to speak to a School Point.

§ 20.

R. B. Anguish liberal men do dream of fighting and killing: It seems you have accustomed your minde so to contending, that through the error of your phantasie, all words seem chidings, and all actions seem fightings to you: And if you dreamed not only that I was in arena, but 2. that Dr. Twisse and Mr. P. were there with me. 3. Yea and all Divines worthy to speak to a School Point. 4. And that we were there coping for masteries: and in the end of your dream you rise up as Judge and give them the better, and proclaim me an ill match. But 1. he that reads my Book will finde that I argue not as from my self, but only shew how other mens argumentations do manifest such a difficulty in the Point, that we should not lay too great of stress on it; as I have shewed you before in the explication of my own words. Nay I do not once deny the Point (that immanent acts are eternal) but only say, It is much questioned (by others) whether they are any more eternal than transient acts: and annex a touch of some mens arguings for it: concluding only in a parenthesis, that the Point is, as I think, beyond our reach. So much to the first fiction. 2. And if I contended not with any then nor with Dr. Twisse and Mr. P. on this Point: it being plain that it is
on another Point that I deal with them. Thats for the second fiction. 3. The third is mounted with great confidence; you [dare say:] What dare you say? Why that I [thus descend in areum with all the sober Divines that ever were worthy to speak to a School Point.] You are a daring man, that dare say this. But I have tasted so much of your temper before, that I perceive your veracity is of least where your audacity is greatest: I thought I had contended with no man in those words; and you dare say, I contend with all men, worthy to speak to a School Point. What if it had been true that I had been here contending, and that against a Point which all these hold? dath it indeed follow that I do in areum descendere with them all? and seek to match them? And what reason have we that know you not, to take you for Judge of all the Divines in the world, who shall be accounted sober, and who not; and who is worthy to speak to a School Point, and who not? Or why should I think you more worthy then the Learned men that I have before named, Lyobetus, Ponnottus, Burgersdictius, &c?

§. 21.

Mr. K. To know that the world doth now exist when once it did not, and that such a man now is sanctified which before he was not, makes no change in God, but only shows a change in the object: but to know now that the world doth exist which before God did not know, or to know now that such a man is sanctified, who before was not, which before God did not know, makes a change in God, as well as in the object.

§. 21.

R. B. W. Who would look for such answers from you, that had heard you judge of School Divines with such Authority? The first part of your Answer is not against any thing that I said: The second is a mere begging of the Question. Some think that quod substantiam actus God's knowledge is the same whatever the object be; but yet because [Knowing this or that] connoteth the object with the act, therefore the eternal essence of God simply in it self considered is not to be called [Knowledge] much less [the knowledge of this or that creature]; and that without the object it neither is Knowledge, nor ought to be so called; and so as from the object we distinguish God's Knowledge and Willing, so must we the several acts of his knowledge; and though the act quod substantiam, which we call [Knowledge] in God be but one, yet the ratio formalis which must give the denomination, being in respect of that one act to its object, it is most fit to say that God's knowledge of Peter's salvation and Judas's damnation, is not the same knowledge, though it be the same substantial act: the like is said of his Will: And as this must be said without wrong to his simplicity, so the like must be said of his beginning or ceasing to know, without wrong to his immutability: and that as it is not all one for God to know the Futurity and the present existence of a thing, so we must say, that he began to know the present existence when the thing began to exist, and that God did not know before the creation, that this proposition was true, Petrus existit: and that he ceased to know the Futurity of a thing that ceaseth to be future; and that God doth not now know, that Christ will be born and dye and rise: and that therefore immanent acts in God are not
to be said to be all eternal; but only those that have an eternal object; because
the act is to be denominated from its respect to the object: and therefore it being
Gods Knowing and Willing which we call immanent acts here, where it is un-
meet to say that act of Knowledge or Will is eternall, then it is unmeet to say,
Gods immanent acts are eternal: but when you will express Gods immutability,
it is fitter to say [God is unchangeable, or Gods essence or nature is eternall;]
then to say, his knowledge, will, or immanent acts (in this sense) are so: because
when we connote not the object, we are to call it Gods Essence, and not Gods
Knowledge, Will, or such acts: so that here is no real change in God himself,
but only a respective, or modal, or formal (as the Scotists speak) or such as we can-
not now apprehend, affording new objective conceptions; all the change being in
the creature.

Now how doth Mr. K. prove that this doctrine must [make a change in God
as well as the object?] why he learnedly affirmeth it. He that can finde a word
more, let him make his best of it. But in this case, all the proof lieth on the af-
sider; which we might well have expected from him.

§ 22.

Mr. K. And therefore all sober Divines use to be wary in their expressions in this kinde;
acknowledging no difference between Gods knowledge and foreknowledge,
but this, that his foreknowledge is in order to the object only, and not of any act of
Gods: so that it is not opposed to post-science, but it signifieth only a futurity of
the object, as was shew'd at large in the third chapter: God knows that that
is to day which was not yesterday; but God as perfectly knew it yesterday as to day,
and know at once, all the various successions in time; or did he otherwise, a change
cannot possibly be avoided, notwithstanding all Master Baxter alledgeth to the con-
trary.

§ 22.

R. B. If your first sentence be true, I must lament the paucity of sober Di-
vines; for sure I am, that of those which have written on these Points,
too few have been wary in their expressions: and no wonder when they are no
more wary in their conceptions; and when men dare maintain themselves to have
that capacity which they have not; and to know certainly that which they do not,
and might easily know they do not: When even such learned men as you will not
be perswaded that these things are above your reach, but do with such haughty con-
tention oppose one poor sentence in a Parenthesis (which is all my sentence)
wherein I say, it is beyond our reach.

2. You lift up your self too high, in taking on you to judge all those Divines to
be unsober, that are not in this of your opinion.

3. If the word [pre-science] signifieth only a futurity of the object, then these are
equipollent expressions [Deus hoc praefcit] and [Hoc est futurum:] but that is
not true.

4. The same humane frailty and distance from God, which makes it necessary
to us to ascribe Acting, Knowing and Willing to God, and to conceive of him
under these notions, doth equally necessitate us to conceive of his Knowledge and
Will, as distinct, and not altogether the same: else we should ascribe a meer name,
without.
without any conception of the thing named: For we cannot conceive of any such Knowledge as is the same with Willing, nor of any such Willing which is the same with Nilling; and yet we believe the simplicity of God. And the same necessity that compelleth us to conceive of God's Knowing, Willing and Nilling, as divers, ab objectorum diversitate, doth compell us to conceive of his Knowledge of things as Future, and his Knowledge of things existent, as divers; yet still we deny a Mutation of God himself; only we conceive as the Scoffers, that there is a diversity of the objective conceptions, and that our various denominations have fundamentum in re: but what it is, let him tell that knows.

5. Against all this that which you oppose is but your naked assertion, which I regard less then perhaps you expected. I affirm the uncertainty, and you the certainty; and therefore it is you that should prove that certainty which you affirm to have: For no man hath a certainty without some evidence or other to force assent; and therefore that evidence should be produced, if you are indeed a man of as Angelicall intellectual as you seem to conceit your self.

6. God did yesterday know that the sun is not risen to day, i.e. that to day is not come: You will say, he did at the same time yesterday know that to day is come and the sun is risen? Some will think to make this true, you must verifie contradictories, and say, [It is] and [It is not] at once, may both be absolutely true (and then farewell our first Metaphysicall certainty in composition.) Or else you must asser the coexistence of all things with God in eternity; which how loath you will be to admit, I conjecture partly from the tendency of your tenets, and partly from your adhesion to Dr. Twisse, and others of his minde.

7. For your third Chapter I have said as much to it already as I finde either need or lift, being loath you should call on me Master Goodwins task.

§. 23.

Mr. K. And to the first illustration the case is strangely different; yet I confess, if it did hold, it would prove the point a fortiori: Thus the sun, saith he, enlightens and warms variety of creatures, yet is not changed: therefore nor need God be said to be changed, though he know to day a variation in the creature: I yield all the conclusion: but all that is nothing to the purpose: for the question is not whether to know a variation in the creature prove a change in God? but whether a variation of the acts of his knowledge, according to the variation in the creatures do not prove a change in him? nor the putting of a new immanent act, as a new knowing, is a putting of variation upon him.

§. 23.

R. B. 1. Were my advice of any weight with you, I should perswade you never to expect any illustration of God's immanent acts by the creature, without a great difference in the case; and therefore that you would no more take such difference as strange. 2. Your concession that it will prove the point a fortiori, if it hold, is as much as I could desire or expect. 3. A man would think, that the argument you here lay down, as mine, were mine indeed, who.
who finds so Learned a Divine saying so, that should abhorre falshood: when you put the words in a distinct character, with a [faith he] as if they had been my express terms: but I desire the Reader not to judge of all your Writings by such passages as this: He may speak true at one time, that yet takes liberty to speak falsely at another. You did take the easiest course imaginable, to gain a conclusion which you could grant, and then to grant it and say it is nothing to the business. 4. I will not content to your stating the question in new terms of your own, in the midst of a dispute. Do not feign me to dispute any question which you make many years after my Writing, and which is not to be found in my Writing in terms. 5. The word [A] may signify: the Divine essence; and so he that feigns a new act feigns a new God: 2. Or that mode, formality, respect (or whatever else it is to be called,) of God, arising from the nature or state of extrinsic objects; which [Burger] calls, the Application to the Object. The question is only of this now, which some think may most fitly be called, Gods acts. Your naked repeated affirmation that a variation is put on God, when you prove it not, I take no more for a Demonstration.

§ 24.

Mr. K. Secondly, When we are speaking of immanent acts, what have we to do with the suns enlightening or warming? I had thought those had been transient acts, and so not proper in this case! Yet

§ 24.

R. B. Remember you not the crude question that we were on? [Whether such immanent acts are any more eternall then transient acts?] The Questionists mean it quad formam naturam actus; for they take the dominations of [immanent] and [transient] to be but from the effect or terminus: And that you may see what they imagined, when they mention the similitude of the sun, let me intreat you to suppoze for disputaion sake (per possibile vel impossibile) that God had made at first no creature but the sun: I would fain know whether that sun in shining and casting out its rays and emanation, did act immanently or transiently? I conceive not transiently: because there were no subjects existing into which its act should pass, or which should as its extrinsic terminus receive from it any new form. It seems then it must be immanently: but that is but in sensu Negativo, because it is not transient: suppoze next that the rest of the creatures were afterwards made, and placed as they are under the influence of this sun, and so were the receptive subjects of its action: Is it not the same sort of action, without any change in it itself, which before was immanent, and now is become transient?

But I need say no more to this; for you are pleased to confess.

§ 25.

Mr. K. Thirdly, Did it hold, I yield it were Argumentum a majority ad minus: If the sun be not changed notwithstanding all its warmth and enlightening, then neither were God. But sure the sun is changed, and changeth perpetually, and could not all as a universal cause upon the great variety of creatures in the world, did it not rejoice like
like a Gyrant to run its course; did it stand still, but one year together at one point, yea or but walk within one Hemisphere for a year. What should we do for that variety of seasons we need? All Summer would be as bad as all Winter. In opposition to this change of the Sun, is the Father of Lights said to be without shadow of turning. He hath no such Solstices or Tropicks; no motions, but a perpetual permanency. There is a great difference between Immanent acts and transient: that supposing the Sun to stand still as in Joshua’s time, and so act without motion; here were no alteration to be acknowledged in the Sun, notwithstanding all the variety of objects, yea and variety of operations upon those objects, all which might proceed from the same act as to the Sun, the difference being, nearly in the Patient: As for instance, the same live-coal doth at once by its heat melt the wax, and harden the clay; here are different transient acts, but no change or difference at all in the fire; but only in the disposition of the matter on which it works. But in Immanent acts the Case is contrary; for they being in the Subject, the variation of them makes an alteration in that, and not the object: as the same man unchanged may be the object sometimes of mens Love, sometimes of their hatred: the variety of these acts makes a difference in the Agent, doth not always suppose any in the Object; and so here, God knowing now that this is, God not knowing yesterday, that it is now, makes a change in God, but indeed God cannot be said now to know that such a thing is, but to know that now such a thing is [which was not before] and this he did know, what ever is now even from all eternity, his pre-sence being a Knowledge in presenti to him, though not de presenti, as to the object; against whose being in eternity more shall be said hereafter against Mr Goodwin, but now I attend Mr Baxter, who proceeds.

§ 25.

R. B. 1. You seem rather to answer in jest then in earnest, when you tell us of the Sun’s local motion, when our Question was, Whether [the Sun be changed by the variety of Creatures which it doth enlighten and warm] that is, Whether it self receive any change from the terminus or objects of its acts? Do you intend the information of your Reader: or the discovery of Truth, when you shuffle in such an alien Answer? 2. All that is good for, that I know of, is to acquaint us, that you have some full Demonstration against Copernicus, which hath given you a Certainty that he errees; And if one should hear it, perhaps it would prove like your Ordinary Demonstrations: for that which is hinted in your words, seems of kin to them. 3. You yield all that I say concerning the Sun, acknowledging that it is not changed by the variety of Objects: And in the first words you say [Did it hold, I yield it were Argumentum ad majori ad minus.] Lay both these together, and judge whether you yield not the whole Caue which you opposed. 4. You still harp on the old string, affirming, Immanent Acts to be in the Subject, and that their variation alters it, when as good Philosophers say they have no Subject and that Vision, Intellecction, &c. have no Termini: Your naked affirmations so oft repeated, rather weary then convince. 5. However you cannot from mans Immanent Acts, argue to Gods, unless they were more like. 6. I am unsatisfied whether a Transient Act (though not qua Transient) make not as much alteration on the Agent as an Immanent? Whether a Transient act be not the same with the Immanent, containing in it all that it contains, with the superaddition of its Reception in, and efiect upon a Passive Subject? As in the fore-mentioned instance: If the Sun had been created first alone, its action whereby it now lighteth and heareth, would have been imman-
nent; and yet when the same action shall afterwards become transient by the addition of other creatures to be its Object, who will imagine that it is ever the less in the Subject (as you say) or that the alteration of it would make ever the less change of the Agent? I confess, I conceive not yet why there should in this point of changing the Agent be any difference between Immanent acts and Transient: though I easily conceive that one only doth change the object. 7. Your friend Mr. Bence, pag. 236, useth the similitude of a Rock in a River standing immovable, notwithstanding the succession in the waters that glide by it: which I think is as defective a similitude, as these here used: yet it is plain, that you cannot truly say, This Rock toucheth the water that is an hundred miles from it. Suppose the Sun were an eye, and could see all the world at once, and that pure acte activitate sine receptione specierum ab objectis: Suppose one man be born, or one flower spring up this day, which was not in being or visible yesterday: This Sun would see that to day which it did not see yesterday without any mutation in itself; And yet seeing is an Immanent act. Now I would know, whether it be fit to say, This Sun sees that as in being which is not in being: Or, Whether it be not fitter to say [It begins to day to see that Creature which begun this day to exist] though by so beginning it be not changed? Its true, God fore-knew all things that shall be: but that is not to know that they be, but that they shall be. 8. Mr. Jesus ibid. saith [Yet this is no hinderance but that there may be and is a change in the extrinsic Denominations of God's knowledge from the variation of the objects hereof, &c.] so others commonly: And may I not hence conclude, 1. That then I may denominate God's knowledge of the present existence of things, as Beginning with its object: and his knowledge of the existence or futurity of things, as Ending with its object; that is, when the thing ceaseth to be future or to exist? 2. And may I not conclude, that this Denomination is fitter, and so those that thus speak, do speak more truly then they that speak otherwise? 3. And that there is some fundamentum in re for such a denomination: or else it were an unfit denomination, seeing names and words should be fitted to the things signified as near as may be? 9. Do not you imply as much your self, when you say his Preascience is a Knowledge in praesens to him, though not de praesenti? You confess then that God doth not know de praesenti, the things that now are not: but when they exist he knoweth them de praesenti; I confess the doctrine of the co-existence of all things with God in Eternity, would save many of these things: but that you here disclaim. 10. Where you say, that [Indeed God cannot be said Now to know that such a thing is, but to know that now such a thing is (which was not before, as is the Error, you adde)] it is a saying which I understand not; and conjecture it is still maimed of some necessary limb which should make it speak your sense: For I hope you do not believe what ever you say, Thus indeed God cannot be said Now to know that those things are, which are indeed: If he know it not Now, when will he know it?
might have remembered what his great Logick and Metaphysick Masters say, concerning
Ens intentionale, that it is opposed to Reale and materiale: The species in the glass is
indeed Ens intentionale, in opposition to Materiale, it is not so in opposition to Reale:
But their putting and non-putting, or the presence and absence of the species, makes a
real change, though not a material one in the glass; so real a one as that it may be seen,
though not a material one that the childe that catches it is ever like to take hold of it;
Plainly thus, That is a Real Accident which is in the subject really, and so is that species,
for we see it in the glass; that is a Material Accident which is so in the subject as to de-
pend on it alone for its support, without influence of the efficient; heat or cold have such
dependance on the subject, as that that alone can maintain them; as the heat will stick a
while in the water, though taken off from the fire, and cold in my hand, though taken
out of the water: But these Intentional Accidents though really in the subject, yet are so
little supported by it, as that if the efficient do not continue its influence, they immediately
perish as light in the air, these species, whether in my glass or my eye; who hath so much
Logick and Metaphysicks to spill upon all occasions as Mr. Baxter, would have betrayed, I
will not say ignorance, but incogitancy in so trivial a punctillo? Onwards, the cafe is the
same for the species in the eye and the glass, and a change is made by the presence or absence
of the species.

§. 26.

R. B. D
isputare nium satici nihil infelicissi; & nimium sapience quis minus sani-
piens? If I spill as much Logick upon all occasions, as you do words,
sure I am a voluminous Logician, and make up in number what I want in weight.
You wanted an opportunity to multiply words, for ought I know to no purpose,
unless to acquaint the unoblivious world with your well-furnished Intellect, that
they may be assured, that you have all those things at your fingers end, as trivial
punctillo's, which I am so ignorant of; and these few words of mine have occa-
sioned the opening of your pack, and the expansion of your wares.

But, 1. You are fain to use the old artifice of putting my words but as the
ground of your paraphrase, and then dealing with that paraphrase of your own.
This is not so innocent as common a trick. I speak of a change [of the glass]
and you put a change in it? Had not you newly riven up as the final sender, I
should have said, it is yet sub judice, whether the Intentional or Spiritual Being,
in question, be indeed Res or not? And so whether it make any Real change in
the glas. I confefs you easily dispatch the business, which makes me think of
Gorlæus words, Exercit. Philos. 7. §. 2, p. 108. Quod species sunt visibiles inquirerum
esse: Tam enim carum natura intellectus est ignota, quam ex sensoribus notae. Peripateti-
cis tamen & hic, seu alibi facilis expeditio. Qualitates aequae esse spirituales, &
corporis esse objectivum, quod habet in speculo vel simili corpori. Nobis hoc non est sa-
tiss: qui quierimus porro, quid qualitas spiritalis, aut quomodo corpus objective po-
sit esse in speculo? Nam haec voidatur contradistinctionem quantum implicare, corporis
dari qualitatem spiritalem, extra speculum existentem esse in speculo, &c.

2. But see what un Reverent thoughts such Ignorants as I, are apt to have of
learned men! I am confidently persuaded, that you, who are so fully acquainted
with Gods Nature and Immanent Acts, as to be at a certainty where I am at a
loss, for all that do not know what that is that you see with your eyes; nor whether
it be in the glas or not! And therefore the Lecture that you have read me of Ens
intentionale hath been lost labour as to me!

L 3. And
3. And you had done but your part if you had observed, that I speak, not of the mere Reception of the agents action, but of the Representation to us of the species; which should not be confounded.

4. Are you sure that it is from the object, that the glass receives that variati- on that you imagine? If it be, Rocks and stones are more active creatures than some dull souls will easily believe; when at the same time the same Rock or mountain may perform 10000 actions upon so many eyes or glasses. Yea if in the midst of the Action of this stone or Rock, you do but give your glass a knock, and break it into a hundred pieces, it will multiply the action of the Rock an hundred fold; and that without touching or coming near the Agent. Is it not pretty sport to see the activity of these nimble Rocks and Mountains? I am one of those Hereticks, that think these works of God must be the matter of our admiration; but cannot be comprehended by us here: and that is no good consequence, that because you and your fellows nakedly affirm the contrary (yea notwithstanding all your proofs) therefore Des Cartes, St. K. Digby, White, Hobbes, besides all the old Adversaries, are certainly in error. I shall acknowledge more action of the Light, or air on the glass, then of the object, which seems but sine qua non. But withall I suspect, that the same Light or air doth perform the same action in the glafs when you stand not before it; or when the object is absent; and yet no species is then seen; no nor visible. And I think that there is the same action on every glass-window, yea on every wall, or stone, or other body, as is on your spectulum; and yet you see nothing on them as you do on it. And Hobbes saith, That it is in the eye and not in the glafs, which you think you see in the glafs (his reproaching of our Doctrinch of visible species, I preterm it:), and if so, then there is not so much alteration in the glafs, as you imagine. And indeed, you lay little to prove it. If your Argument from light would prove any thing, it would prove that the face is a foot or a yard (or more if you draw back) behind the glafs, and not in the glafs: And yet if you go behind you, shall see nothing; Will you believe your eyes that things change into such various colours, and shapes, and quantities as some glasses by small mutations of posture do represent them? Will you believe your eyes that a straight staff is crooked in the water? I cant tell you by my observa- tion when I was a Boy, that if you will kill a Fish in a River with a Gun, you must allow much to the fallacy of your medium. If then either it be the action of the light or air, or something else, and not the object, then it is nothing to me, who spake only against a change by variation of objects: Or if the forementioned action being supposed to be the same on the glasses, when several objects, or no ob- jects are before it, that which is superadded from the object is nihil reale, this is nothing against me: Or if the species, which seems a foot behind the glasses be not in the glasses, but in the eye or some where else, and so the glasses be more truly an Agent by Reflection, then a Recipient of that species which I see, Still this is noth- ing against what I said. So that laying aside all that Reception of the action of light, or any thing else, which the glasses receive when there is no object pre- sent, and laying aside all that which is Received into the eye and air, and not in the glasses, and whereof the glass is but a Causa sine qua non; then call the rest an Ens intentionale or spiritualis; or what you will; but prove it to be quid reale altering the glasses, and do not nakedly affirm it.

You say, that my great Logick and Metaphysick Masters say, That Ens intentionale is opposed to Reale & Materialis: and yet you say that the species in the glasses is not opposed to Ens reale. It is, and it is not, seem reconcilable to you then without a di-
a distinction. Indeed as Real is opposed to [seigned] I doubt not it is Real, but as it is opposed to Modes and Relations, and such like, that some place between Ens and Nihil, it must better be known what it is, then the name of Ens intentionale or spiritual will acquaint us; before we can conclude for certain that it is Real.

As for your Material Accident, it will require more ado to prove, that there is any such thing in the world, as an Accident depending on the Subject alone for support, especially a quality, as you instance in: Sure you intend not the withdrawing of the influence of every efficient, but of some lower or instrumental: I think, at least, Gods efficiency is necessary to be continued, for the Continuation of the being of every Accident, and ordinarily some lower efficiency too.

As for the Logick and Metaphysics which on all occasions I spue, I take the charge as unfit to be answered, as not coming from your head or heart, but from your Naturals, your spleen and gal.

My Ignorance in comparison of you, I am so easily brought to acknowledge, that I wonder you should think so many words necessary to convince it: (yet you should have done it in intelligible language, and not abrupt expressions, defective of sense, almost such as Hierom describeth in his lib. i. cont. Foulin. initio.) But how did you prove my Ignorance or Intoligency of Ens intentionale? Deep silence! Because I did not mention it, or else who knows why? By that reason I am ignorant that Mr. K. is an honest man, because I do not mention it; but by what is said, you may see its possible to have heard talk of Ens intentionale, and yet to think this similitude tolerable.

And what if you obtain all that you contend for a vit. That the similitude is faulty! Alas, I shall easily grant it of any similitude whereby we illustrate the Nature of Acts of God. Suppose then, that this glass did make the same Representations sine receptione specierum: Or because these inanimates are more remote, use the similitude of the Oeulus Universalis, which I mentioned even now. I am troubled that you force me to weary the poor Reader with so many words on so poor and unprofitable a business: But there's no remedy.

§ 27.

Mr. K. Now whereas Mr. Baxter addes, That whatsoever some say, he doth not think, that the beholding of ten distinct colours at one view, doth make ten distinct acts of the sight, or alterations on it; I do not think that ever rational man said they do, for it were strange there should be but one view, and yet ten distinct acts of sight; but the question is, Whether the change of one of these objects doth not change the species in the eyes, and yet occasion another view or sight? Or rather it is beyond all question that they do; and yet whether they do not need not be questioned neither; the point that lies before us, is, Whether distinct or new acts do not Cause an alteration? Which is that that we have just Cause to affirm with confidence, can have no place in God; and consequently no new immanent Act; so then there being nothing produced by Mr. Baxter which may suggest a suspicion that there may new Immanent Acts be admitted in God, or any but such as are Eternal. Come we to the

§ 27.

R. B. You are minded to play with the ambiguity of the word [View] which I take for all that Reception in the eye, or activity of it which is performed
formeth in one Instant; and so for that natural Act whereby I fix my eye on one place at once, seeing as many things as at once I am capable of seeing: You take it, it seems for your intentional Action, or also the Act which the visible power performeth, as in reception of that alone. I think the sense I use it in, is more common. And I say again, that it is none of our question, what light, air, &c. do on the eye: for they do no more when I behold one Rock, then when I behold the lands on the shore: But the Question is, What the objects do over and above on the eye? And whether if I see many millions of millions of sands at one instant, there be so many Real Actions of my eye at that instant? And whether every distinct sand that is added or taken away, there be one Act added or taken away, so a real alteration in my eye? The rest which you add is over and over answered before; and therefore being ashamed that I have said so much on so unprofitable a point (though constrained) I surcease: Onely adding this brief rehearsal of what is said before.

1. Remember that we speak not of those Immanent acts whose object is Eternal: but of those that have a temporary object, as the actual existence of things, &c.

2. These kinds of Immanent Acts may be called Transient after a sort, in that they do quad Terminacionem objectivam, pass to an extrinsic object.

3. Agere, in the sense now taken, when applied to God, signifies something more then merely Eisto.

4. The whole Generical Essence of Action, is found in the species of Action.

5. Intelligere, Velle, Amare, relate to some Objects: Quia Intelligis, aliquod Intelligis: quia Amas, aliquid Amas. These terms therefore do always (when affirmed as being in God) connote their Objects.

6. There is a necessity therefore that the Acts be variously denominated from the diversity of objects. It is no way fit to say, That God doth Nill Good, or Will sin, or that his Velle & Nolle is all one: Or that his Intelligere & Velle is all one. For, as it is said, the Act connotes the Object: and therefore we are not so much as to ascribe the Act to God when there is not an object for it; or as to an alien Object. Else we might say, Dei Intelligere & Velle sunt idem: Deus Intellegens Peccata: Ergo Deus Vult peccata: And that God Nilleth Good, because he Willeth Good, seeing in God Velle and Nolle are all one.

7. This necessity of various extrinsic denominations is ordinarily confessed by the most rigid Divines. I shall cite one more anon.

8. This Denomination hath fundamentum in re, or else it were delusory and abusive; these being the fittest names that most agree to the Things (of which see Meuris. Metaph. Scoti, li.2.c.3. Concil.3. & Durand. l.1. dist. 19. q. 5. s. 13, 14. & Aquin. de Periâre, Mat. 7.q.1.2., &c.) Notions and Names are true or false, as they agree or disagree to the things.

9. On the same ground as God may thus be said to Understand, Will, Nill, Love, &c. and these may be said to be not the same, he may also be said to have divers acts of Intelleâtion, Willing, Nilling, and these not to be the same: e.g. That it is not all one to elect Peter, and to elect John.

10. Whatever this diversity of names implieth, as its foundation in God, (whether a bare Relative diversity, or also a Modal, or what ever the like) it is certain that it implieth no Composition in him, but it is only what is consistent with his simplicity.

11. Some of the objects of Gods Knowledge and Love, are not from Eternity. The
The Existence is more then the meer Ese Volitum, or Will that they shall exist: And it is not all one to know the Thing it self in it self, and to know it in its Cause. Though God therefore did from Eternity intuitively know the Ese Volitum, and know the Creature in himself its Cause, and know its futurity, and so fore-know all things: yet it follows not that he intuitively knew the Creature in it self, as existing, (Unlesse we assert the co-existence of all things in Eternity with God.

12. There is therefore the same reason to Denominate Gods Intellecction, Love, &c. as beginning and Ending with its Objects, as there is to denominate them as divers from the diversity of objects. And therefore this is a fit and necessary way of speech. It is not fit to say, God is now Creating the world quod actionis formaliter, though you over-look the effect: it is not fit to say, That God now knows that the world will be Created (unlesse you respect some new Creation) or that Abraham, Moses, David, shall Die, or that Christ shall rise again, &c.

13. This Denomination of Gods acts as beginning and ending, hath as much foundation in the thing, and is as true as the Denomination of his acts as various. And this may as well confess with Gods Immutability, as the other with his Sinplicity. The reason is evidently the same.

Now for the one, hear what others say. Schibler Het. I.2. c. 3. Tit. 6. n. 247.

248. Quaestio est de Accidentibus quae in Deo sunt. Hoc enim solum possum compositiorem in Deo facere, &c. Unde specialiter relinquitur quod in Deo non fiat compositiones ex subjecto & accidente, si maxime ei concinnat Agere, talis actionis quam pradicanterns dici posset. Nam actiones non comparantur ad agentem, pers modum essendi in, sed solum per modum essendi ab alio us infra, &c. Atque in actiones tantum apprehenduntur ut egredientes hab esse etiuiorum. Quod autem egreditur ab effentia principis, hoc est, opus, non possi cum effentia facere compositionem, quam extremonium unionem requirit. And n. 97. Nam Actiones Divine transientes, non sunt subcribed in Deo, sed solum a Deo procedunt, unde nullam compositionem cum Deo faciunt, &c. Quanquam id estiam (verum) est de actionibus Immanentibus: Hoc enim non dicantur Immanentes positiva, quasi in agentem rigidem que subjicitur, sed Negative solum, quia in exteriorem materiam non transiunt. Unde ad rationem actionum simpliciter & Immanentes & transientes, non requiritur esse in, sed solum esse ab: Ideoque nullum factum cum agenti Compositionem. Est sic anima nostra, si incipiat intelligere aut Velle, non tamen compositur, tum ex suo esse & Intellecctionis & Volitione quia tales sunt: sed in utroque statu aque est Animam simplex. Dixi, quae tales sunt, Quia ad Intellecctionem potest sequi aliqua compositioni, si fiat per speciem Intelligibalem.

Keckerman in System. Theol. I. c. 3. maintainseth, that the Persons in the Trinity, differ from the Divine Essence, as Moduare, and from each other as Modum a Mado, and that En as and Modus make no Composition. Much more may it be so laid to Relations to things external.

Allingius Problem. 7. theol. Par. I. pag. 55. distinguishes Gods actions, 1. Sunt actioni inveniuntur in marianum qui ne transtunt in objeas externum & nullum pressus respectum aut aequa ad nisi. Tales sunt actiones quos scholastici notantur vocant, gignere, spire, &c. Horum absoluta est necessitas ab qua potentia ad oppositum, & sunt aterni. 2. Sunt exteriusque qui non sunt in Deo, sed a Deo, sique quia a Deo sunt aequae, in creaturis autem subjectae: veluti erant gubernare, redimere, &c. Deus enim exteriusque solum ab in denominationi. 3. Sunt Altera Instrinsec quidem in Deo, sed Contiennantes respectum aequa ad extra, ut scire, velle. Sei enim
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Deus non solum sc., sed etiam omnino quicquid est seipse, sine ut possibile, sine ut futurum. Vult etiam non solum sc., sed etiam alia extra se, &c. Hujusmodi autem sunt Decreta, relative nimirum ad extra, & prae ter voluntatem nostram visum rerum exteriorum. Compositio autem hinc male inferior, &c. Matthis alt. se habui, ab eo nomen the fist fore only Immanent act.

And for the fitness and necessity of the Denominations, hear what Estius confesseth in Sent. I. dist. 39. § 3. De hac igitur scientia Dei (viz. ad unisonibilii) quamvis & ipsa sine dubio sit en se invariabili, variis natura quinque sive hinc, sunt variarum propositionum ecumand temporum. Quod enim nullum propositionem esse quis dicitur, hoc est, ut sibi modo, nisi verum, eademque propositioni prae ter mutationem rerum ac temporum, modo vera sit, modo falsa; consequens est, Deum nunc soire propositionem aliquid quam postea uersat, & contra. Quod per singulas temporum differentias facile est declarare. Nam propositionem veram de praecristo, ut, Christus natus est, aut bis millie annos non sciebat, sed Christo nato soire caper; eademtamen nunquam soire definere, dicat nec scilicet aliam quae fit praecristi temporis, quia propositioni de praecristo vera, semper est vera. Quod intellige de propositions in genere. Nam si verum tempus defingat, ut Hennis natus est Christus, soire cassa est, & de futuro simplicier, ut, Post biduum pascha soiet. Ruptum propositionem de futuro veram, ut Omnem refurgissent, scivit quidem ab aeterno, nec tamen potest ut talcum aliquando incipiat soire, quia propositioni de futuro versum proponit, lo quidem simillimar de futuro in genere. Sed eam aliquando soire defince: semper potest resurrectio futura, quia semper cf. soire ipsa proposition. Denique propositionem de praecristi veram, sed tantisper dum es vera maneat, velut istam, Ecclesiæ militis. At talcum incipiat aliquando soire, & aliquando soire definere, nisi forte venitas propositionum sit perpetua, &c. Porro omnis hoc locum uarietatis non inde nasceatur, quod circa Dei scientiam accidat aliqua Mutation, sed quia mutatur res subjecta. Unde necessit esse & ipsa mutans propositionum, &c. Manifestum est autem rebus mutatis non necessario scientiam mutari, nec eodem quidem, nisi quia alius concursat, velut Composition aut diuinio, aut certidum major per experienciam rei praemunire accepta. Quae in Deo locum non habent, sic ergo senex, Medici invarians permane dum cedem homini ob varium ejus affectionem, modo hoc pharma, modo atia diversa prescribunt, &c.]

14. Lastly, I again desire the Reader to remember, that if I seem in all this to speak skeptically, it is no wonder, when all that I intend is but to convince these self-conceived learned men, that these things are indeed beyond their reach, and that they know not what they think they know: it being my own opinion, That Action, Intellecction and Will, are but Metaphorically ascribed to God, and that we cannot know what that is in propriety, which these expressions do shadow out in God. The White faith; Intius, Subarit, i. Lect. I. pag. 136, 137. Quiro dicimus abstrahkan o non hab by concebimus, cf. Deum omnem simplicissimum simplicissimam, quae neque fit Deus, neque ens, neque alius, neque tam bo, neque totiis causis, sed neque illis cogitationes, non neque abstantibus limitibus, sed neque habentes. Quod neque ex pluribus quae sit. Alii enim, sed accipiendo participantes quodam inferiores, ad quod ipsum est, & diffinitiones quam salutem velpediculis ostentat, &c. Where this hold or not of the notions, Deus & Ens: I doubt not but it holds of Intellecction and Volution: at least that we men are uncertain what these are for God. And the strange confidence of men in this, that they know that which none man knows indeed, hath made them unreservedly vent their conceits; and fill the Church with perplexing controversies about things that none can determine. As Mr. Burges faith of Jusfic. Lect. 20. [Only you must take notice that we are in
In what darkness, and not able to comprehend how God is said to a\& or work, &c. Therefore it is a true truth, De Deo estiam vera dicere periculo sum est, & tunc dignem Deum aetiamus, cum inaetimabilen dicimus; then do we rightly esteem of him, when we Judge him above our thoughts or esteem. Math. Paris speaking of the Dominicans teaching, which caused that great dilution and confusion in the University of Paris, writes thus (ad annum Dom.1243, as he is cited by the Prefacer to Guiliel. de Sancto Amore) Incipiebant disputare & disserere subtilium & celsior quam decuit aud expeditur: Qui nunc verentes tangere montes & a gloria Dei oppositum, non benebamur secreta Dei investigabilia semet per sepercitur, & judicia Dei que sunt absitus multa, nimis praestumque indagar. Deo enim plus placeat firma sed simplicier, quam nimis transiendens in Thesologia subtilitas.] Dr. Twis Vinidie. Grat.1.2. Crim: 3. § 15. Sed quid fact si hec humana ratio non ferer? An nihil credendum nobis incumbit nisi quod quod modo fiat, humana ratione explicare posset? Mysterium hoc forsan aderum potius quam ferandum, &c. Et li.2. Crim. 3. § 20. pag. (mibi) 405. Etiam ei cruber si fateri, licet nunquam dubitarerem de sancta Dei natura, tantum in omnis sectis est prae aliissima, hoc santon dit mi fissum senis: (forte, Jam bodie non nauseos suppens tento) quamam seicet sit illa vera ratio, qui modus operationis Divinae quo stat ut fect in omni actione tamquam Caufa efficacissima immimmis, extra samum omnem vitam contagionem, citra juftiam culpa suppicionem. Et an bodie per omnium fatis explicatam habeamus, Deus novit, &c. Significat enim Calvina, multis hinc nodum visum esse necessitabilen, &c. Hoc modo itinis confultandum confiti nosfri pictari, si fectemur habitudinem (fensus nosfri mysterium hoc non capere.) And why should not the same Confession extend to the present case also? Though we do not use to confess our Ignorance till we are utterly at a loss (and then we say as Cajetan when he was fall'd, It doth not givitare intellectum) yet we have oft as great cause to confess it where we are confident sometimes; as perhaps Aribis that blames Cajetan for his Confession of Ignorance, might know as little as Alvarez that commends it for a most holy and pious speech.

I had thought to have said more to this point, but finding a most Learned, * Orthodox, Judicious Divine Robert Baronius (Camero secundus, vel Cameroni secundus) to speak so fully in this point, in his excellent Treatise de Peccato Mortali & Venial, I have adventured to transcribe the whole Chapter, it being not long, both that the Reader may see the Reasons of the like passages in my fore-going Replies more clearly, and that Mr. K. may be yet better satisfied that I am not so singular in these things, as he seems to think me. I know Mr. Rutherford hath some jarring with him, and I do not undertake to justify all that any man hath said, when I call them Orthodox, but I confess I think that for solidity in

the controverted points that they meddle with, Davenant, Camero and Baronius are the glory of Britain, as having happily hit on that mean, which many others have mist of, which I would not have understood as disarranging any others: for even in this, they have many excellent Companions, and others have their excellencies, that were not in this so happy as they. Our Renowned B. Usher, D. Preffenz, D. Field, and many another famous light in England, have not only deserved the honour of eminent Learning and Piety, but even in this judicious Discovery of the truth, between the extremities which others have run into, they have helped to reduce the violent to Moderation, and to their men a surer way to overcome the adversary, then their disadvantageous extremities.
Disp. Parte 1a sect. 6. Deum posse eos amore quos prius odit, & odisse eos quos prius amavit, absq; ulla vel physica, vel morali voluntatis sua mutatione, obiter Declaratur.

Ex doctrina precedent,, summoned de justificatorum ad certain tempus exclusione ab eo favoris Divini gratu, quos prius diligebat, nequaquam sequitur Deus, aut voluntarem Dei in se mutabilem esse, sive loquumur de mutabilitate physica, sive de mutabilitate morali.

Nam quod ad divinum amorem executionis attinet, Deus non amare justificatos peccati mortalil ei reatu in voluntos amore executionis, nihil aliud est, quae non consequeretur in illa ejus bona spiritualia, seu media salutis, quae prius in eos conferebatur nulla igitur est hic mutatio quod actua immanentes, qui in ipso Deo existunt, sed tantum quod actus transfectus, qui sunt extra Deum & in hominius recipintur. & proinde in mutatur non mutatur Deus, sed illi in quibus hi actu, & eorum effecta recipiuntur. Dicta aliquid: Deus non solutum non confert illa beneficia in eos, sed etiam durante eo statu non vult ea conferre: prius autem voluit ca conferre: & proinde mutatur est. Post Voluit prima illa beneficia communicare illi existentibus in alio statu. Sed illi existentibus in hoc statu impedita, & impedita, ne jam vult, neque unquam voluit, tunc ab eum illud beneficia communicare. Quamvis igitur durante hoc statu benevolentiam Dei quasi ligata & impedita sit; ut supra monus, binc tamen non sequitur eam in se mutatam esse: sed tantum mutatum esse ejus objectum, quia vis. objectum ejus, hoc est, homines electi, prius erant capaces istorum beneficiorum. nunc vero eorum capaces non sunt.

3. Major & gravior difficultates est de amore complacencia. & odio disflicentia ei opposito. Cum enim bi alia sunt immutantes, hoc est, in ipso Deo existentes, illud mutari videtur ipse Deus in se mutari. Responderi soleat primo, non mutari hos actus realiter, & a parte rei: quia eterne hic actus in Deo sunt ab eterno, & in aeternum in eo durabir, cum respectu ad diversos isti hominius status, quorum alter alteri in tempore successit. Ita respondet Bonleca tom. 3. Metaph. lib. 7. cap. 8. quae 5. sect. 7. Quod si (equiv) qui obiectat cunlum posset prius odio haberi a Deo, si sit in ius, posset vero diligit, si sit iustus, & vice versa, finn nulla divina voluntatis mutatione, ergo nihil repugnare quo minus divina voluntas nullo modo mutata transseit aositione in volitionem ejusdem, ex diffia patet solutio. Deus enim non cunctum odio habet, ac diligit pro eodem tempore, sed pro diversis. Addo, quod est in eodem homine iustitia succedit peccato, aut peccatum justitiae, tamen odio, quo Deus illum prosequitur ut peccatorum, non succedit amor, quo illum diligit ut iustum, tamen contra; sed eterque afficitus divinus aeternum est repiciens diversius hominius status, quorum alteri succedit in tempore.

4. Secundo respondre: quanvis concederemus esse aliquam mutationem & succedentem in actibus immutabilibus amoris & odio divini formaliter considerando, quaternus per rationem dixissentur ab effecta divina & inter se, hoc est, quanvis dicemus aliquum amoris complacencia erga eleffum in hoc causa non amplius esse in Deo, eis succedere atum obdi disflicentia, non tamen inde sequeretur esse mutationem aliquan realem in ipso Deo. Nam actus Dei libere nihil superaddunt voluntatem aut effecta divina, prout respectua sua relationem rationis, aut extirpem aliquum connotationem, quod tamen ad realem eorum entitatem non pertinent: nam tota eorum entitas realis est ipso Dei effentia, nihilque intrinsecum includunt prout eam. Quanvis igitur
igitur Deus definere amare eos quos prius amabat, non mutauerit mutatione reali, quia nihil reale amittere, siq inciperet eos amare quos prius odit, non mutauerit, quia nihil reale ei accederet, mutatione autem reali non est, sine aliqua additione aut ablatione reali.

5. Non necessae est ut hic probem actus illus multum realem entitatem (sive ea voluntatem, sive extensione actus divini ad objecta) superaddere essentia divina. Nam Evangelici omnes hoc unanime tenent: & quod ad Pontificentios attinet, quamvis Constantin in 1. partem Thome quaest. 19. art. 2 & 3 Fonfica tom. 3. Metaph. lib. 7. cap. 8. quaest. 5. & fil. 4. & Salas 13. quaest. 6. art. 3. traét. 3. difp. 3. quaest. 8. docent actus liberos Dei, seu decretae ejus, superaddere essentia divina realem quando entitatem, que ab aeterno potuit non esse in Deo, quae revera in eo non fuisset, si ab aeterno alter decreeisset, & hos actus non habuisse, major tamen & melior eorum pars in contraria est sententia vixitate. Suarez. tom. 2. Metaph. difp. 30. fil. 9. Valquez. in 1. partem Thome, difp. 80. cap. 1. & 2. Valent. tom. 1. dispt. 1. quaest. 19. pauf. 4. Artubal in primam partem Thome, difp. 54. cap. 2. & se sequentibus. Becanus in summa, Parte 1. Traét. 1. cap. 11. quaest. 4. Trigolus in summa Theologica Bonaventura quaest. 13. art. 2. dub. 3. conclius. 1. Francisco Cumel variarum disputationum in 3. de praescientia Dei dub. 3. p. 57. &c. Horum sententiae procul dubio est verior illa altera, quia si in Deo est realis aliqua entitas, quae ab aeterno potuit in eo non esse, arg. adeo potuit non omnis esse, seu esse merum nibil, necessario sequitur aliquid esse in Deo quod non est Deus.


7 Ex huius patern Deum, cum odio disdicilenta prosequitur elestum, quem prius amabat amore complacentiae, non mutari; quamvisque nunc minimis sit in eo actus complacentiae, consideratu us rectum ratione ad tale objectum divina essentia superaddit: Primis enim ablati tali actus, Deus physicus & realiter non mutatur, quia nihil ei decedere per merum rectum rationem ut irreparabilibus argumentis demonstrat Suarez. & Valquez, loco citatia. Secundum, neque mutatur moraliter, quia non mutatur propositum, sed centra, permanet in suo proposito, aut potius in naturali sua inclinatione, qua ab aeterno futurum, nunc est, & semper eadem, propensus ad amandam virtutem, & ad defensione vitium, seu peccata. Permanet etiam in suo proposito perducendi eos quos elegit & justificant ad aeternam gloriam, nam solidum est at Dei fundamentum, habens figuram hoc, Novit Dominus eos qui sunt suis, 2 Tim. 2. 19.
Mark here that the reason which Baronius, Burgersdicius and others give against God's change of his Decrees, viz. he should be morally mutable, holds not of the immanent acts which presuppose their objects, and whose objects are really mutable: as Baronius here manifesteth, It is certain that things are sometime future, sometime present or existent, and sometime past: and that they are so is of God, but without moral mutation: therefore his Knowing them so, and his Willing and Approving them so, is without moral mutation too. So the same is good or holy to day that was bad and unholy yesterday: therefore God may love him to day with complacency and approbation, whom he disliked before; and may know him to be as he is, which before he did not, because he was not as he is. 2. Note the reason why God cannot change his Decrees: Both because they do effect or produce their own objects (as commonly called) viz. Rerum futuritionem, when as God's Approbation, his Knowledge, pure visionis, his Complacency, &c. do presuppose their objects. 2. And it would be a contradiction for the same event, to be future and not future, e.g. man's salvation: therefore if God absolutely Decree that Peter shall be saved, and after Decree the contrary, the first Decree must be changed caustically, and for want of power not be executed; and also as it is verbum mentis, it must be false: which cannot be.

I had thought to have said nothing of particular Scriptures that speak of God's acts which we call immanent as beginning or ending, because they are so commonly known: But lest any should think I slight Scripture Argument, which I principally esteem, or lest they take it for granted that there is none such, because none are produced, I will add some texts in confirmation of the minor of this following Argument.

If God himself in his Word do ordinarily speak of his own acts, which we call immanent, as beginning or ending, then is it not unfit for us to do so to.

(God knows best how to express his own acts.)

But God himself in his Word doth ordinarily speak of his own acts, which we call immanent, as beginning or ending:

Therefore.

Luk. 2. 52. Jesus increased in favour with God and man.] God's [favouring] Christ is an immanent act: and yet Christ increased in God's favour: Increase signifies mutation, by an inception of further degrees.

Rom. 9. 25. I will call them my people which were not my people, and her Beloved which was not beloved.] Love is an immanent act.

Joh. 16. 27. The Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me and believed, &c.] Therefore it was when they believed and loved Christ, that the Father in this sense began to love them.

Joh. 14. 21, 23. He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, &c. And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, &c.]

Pro. 8. 17. I love them that love me, &c.] Therefore with this same love, they were not before beloved, though with another sort of love they were.

Joh. 10. 17. Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, &c.

Hos. 11. 1. When Israel was a child, then I loved him.
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Deut. 7. 12, 13. If ye hearken, &c. the Lord thy God will keep unto thee the Covenant &c. And he will love thee, &c.

Hos. 9. 15. I will love them no more: All their Princes are revolters.

Ps. 15. Thou hatest all the workers of iniquity.] Such are the Elect before conversion.

Gen. 4. 7. If thou do well shalt thou not be Accepted, &c?
So all those texts that speak of Gods being reconciled, which properly signifies an Immanent act.

Acts 10. 35. He that feareth God and worketh righteousness is Accepted of him.

Matt. 3. 17. This is my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.

Heb. 13. 16. With such sacrifice God is well pleased.

Heb. 11. 5. He had this testimony that he pleased God.

1 Kings 3. 10. And the Speech pleased the Lord that Solomon asked, &c.

Heb. 11. 6. Without faith it is impossible to please God.

1 Thess. 4. 1. How ye ought to walk and please God.

1 Cor. 7. 32. He that is unmarried careth, &c. how he may please the Lord.

Rom. 8. 8. They that are in the flesh cannot please God.

Prov. 15. 8. The prayer of the upright is his delight.

2 Sam. 15. 26. If be thus say, I have no delight in thee, &c.

Jer. 9. 24. For in these things do I delight saith the Lord.

Zeph. 3. 17. He will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee, &c.

Deut. 28. 63. And it shall come to passe, as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good, &c. so the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, &c.

Deut. 30. 9. For the Lord will again rejoice over thee for good.

Psal. 104. 31. The Lord shall rejoice in his works.

Isa. 62. 5. As the bridegroom Rejoycesth over the bride, so shall thy God Rejoyce over thee.

2 Tim. 2. 15. Study to shew thyself approved unto God.

Deut. 32. 19. When the Lord saw it, he abhorred them.

Gen. 1. 4, 10, 1. 31. God saw the light that it was good.

Isa. 59. 15, 16. And the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment: And he saw that there was no man, and wondered, &c.

Gen. 29. 31. When the Lord saw that Leah was hated, he, &c.

Jer. 26. 2, 3. Diminish not a word. If so be they will hearken and turn every man from his evil way, that I may repent me of the evil, which I purpose to do unto them, because of the evil of their doings.

Jer. 36. 3. It may be the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I purpose to do unto them, that they may return every man from his evil way, that I may forgive, &c.

Gen. 6. 6. It repented the Lord that he had made man.] So the 7th verse.

Exod. 32. 14. And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people.

1 Sam. 15. 35. The Lord Repented he had made Saul King] So the eleventh verse.

2 Sam. 24. 16. The Lord Repented him of the evil, and said to the Angel, &c.

Psal. 106. 46. He remembered for them his Covenant, and Repented according to the multitude of his mercies.

Jer. 26. 19. And the Lord Repented him of the evil, &c.
Amos 7. 3. *The Lord Repented for this: It shall not be faith the Lord.*] So verse 6.

Jonah 4. 2. I knew that thou art a gracious God, and mercifull, slow to anger and of great kindness, and Repentest thee of the evil.

Jon.3.10. And *God saw their works that they turned from their evil way, and God Repented of the evil that he had said he would do unto them, and did it not.*

Joel 2. 13. He is gracious, &c. slow to anger, and Repenteth him of the evil.

Jer. 15. 6. *I am weary with Repenting.*

Hos.11.8. *My heart is turned within me: my repentings are kindled together.*

Psal. 30. 5. For *his Anger endureth but for a moment.*

Psal. 103. 8,9. *The Lord is mercifull and gracious, slow to Anger, &c.* Neither will be *keep his Anger for ever.*

{1} 63, 10. Therefore be was *Turned to be their enemy,* &c.

Psal. 85. 3. Thou hast taken away all thy wrath, thou hast turned thy self from the fierceness of thy anger.

2 Chron. 12. 12. And when he humbled himself the wrath of the Lord turned from him that he would not destroy him.

Josh. 7. 26. *So the Lord turned from the fierceness of his wrath.*

So a Chron. 29. 10, & 30. 8,9. & Psal. 166. 33. Jer. 18. 20. and so frequently.

Also very many places that mention the kindling or arising of Gods wrath.

Psal. 78. 38. *Many a time turned he his anger away and did not stirre up all his wrath.*

Prov. 24. 18. *Left the Lord see it, and it displeasse him, and turn away his wrath from him.* There are three several immanent acts mentioned together.

So all those Texts where Remembering and Forgetting are spoken of God, So many more Texts that mention Gods being displeased; Gen. 38. 10. Num.

11. 24. 17. Psal. 60. 1. Zech. 1. 2. 15.

So many Texts that speak of Gods seeing, as Gen 18. 21, &c.

Psal. 34. 17. *The righteous cry and the Lord heareth and delivereth,* &c.

Psal. 69. 33. *For the Lord heareth the poor and defpiseth not his prisoners.*

With many more places that speak of Gods Hearing and Heartening.

So many Texts that mention his Regarding, and his Considering, and Pondering.

And many that mention his Abhorring, and his despising.

And many Texts that speak of Gods Pity and Compassion to the miserable.

And many that speak of his Favour as beginning or ending, and mans finding favour in his eyes.

And many that speak of his Grace when it signifieth favour, and is expressed as beginning or changing. With many more to the same purpose.

Judg. 10. 13. 16. *They put away the strange Gods and served the Lord, and his soul was grieved for the misery of Israel,* &c. And he did deliver them by Jephthah. Yet here God seemeth to revoke a peremptory sentence.

If any shall say, that all these later are but figurative speeches applied to God from the manner of men: I as easily grant it as any man: But withall remember these two things. 1. That I suppose it is as true of Gods Knowing and Willing, his Elected, Decreasing, Purposing, &c. only differing in the degree of impropriety: Till the contrary be better proved then I have seen it, I think this will be
my opinion. 2. It is only the fineness or unfitness of these ways of speech concerning God, that I am now enquiring into; and not of the propriety. If it be the Scripture-way so ordinarily to speak of God's Immanent acts as New, as Beginning or Sealing, then is it not unlawful or unfit for us so to speak, in imitation of the holy Ghost: still acknowledging the unavoidable Impurity of our expressions, and the Incomprehensibleness of that in God, which by such expressions is hinted out unto us.

I remember what Zambhis faith in Epist. Joh. Cratoni, in the third Vol. of his Works, pag. (mihi) 135. Quod aut, Precibus moveri Decem ad 3° apudd memores est, quam si tollamus e Scripturis, que impictates & quot pugnania non e Scripturis colligentur?

## The Second Point.

**§ 28.**

Mr. K. Second: That there is somewhat like to Justification in the Eternal Decrees of God to Justifie men.

**§ 28.**

KB. If this also be intended against me, then, Whether this Learned man did not want work, when he undertook this, I leave the indifferent Reader to judge. The former Question which he propounded to dispute, he knew and confessed that I denied not: (Yet he hath forced me to spend many words on it, and to say more then I thought to have done.) This which he makes his second Labour, he will not say that I was ever his adversary in; or that ever I debated the Proposition, much less denied it: And yet all this seems intended against me, and by name anon he brings me in. If this man had not somewhat ab homine more forcible then any thing in the matter disputed, which infliged his pugnacious soul to this conflict, then must I confess my self quite mistaken in the Motives of his undertaking. The former part of his Dispute hath convinced me of this. I remember we had much sparks among us when I was a School-boy, that were wont (for maintaining the reputation of their valour) to appoint fighting matches, and to the field they must go, before ever they thought what should be the matter of quarrel, and when they came to the place, they must be dared by a third, to spit in another's face to make the quarrel; and he that refused was the Coward, and he that spit first, and struck first, had the first glory, though sometime not the last.

What I should do with all these following words of Mr. K's that concern me not, I do not well know. I hope none will expect that I should engage my self against him to prove, that [there is nothing like to Justification in the Eternal Decrees of God to Justifie] nor that I should answer to all that he brings to prove it!
it. Yet, because I take his Discourse to be very feeble, and to small purpose, I shall take a brief notice of it in this way, whether it were intended against me directly, or but Collaterally.

S. 29.

Mr. K. And I make it good, not from this, that by reason of this Decree, God is said to have justified whom he predestinat, Rom. 8. For indeed he is said to have glorified them also; though glorifying of many of them be not till the end of the world, yet that full glorifying of none of them be till then, and the Decree to glorise all whom be will glorifie at the end of the world, was before the beginning of the world: and yet this expression shows the Certainty of their justificacn and glorifying, who are predestinat; the Prover sense being used only to express the Certainty of the future. But this I will not insist on; but run another course, and that is this: Justification is by the Confess of all men (I mean Protestants) a Remission of our sins, and Accepting of us as righteous: Now this is either a meer immament, or a meer transtent Act, or both. I know no man will say it is a meer transtent Act: there being no transtent Act of God which doth not suppose an Immanent one; for that he asks nothing upon the Creature, but what he first purposed in himself to act: so then an Immanent Act there must be confessed, if there be a transtent one; and a transtent one I shall acknowledge as well as an Immanent, and what it is we shall enquire by and by: But first I contend that Immanent Act there can be another the Decree of God to pass this transtent Act, and that this Decree of God to pass the transtent Act of justificacn, carries in it as much as concerns Gods Remission of sins, and Accepting of us as righteous; and therefore hath much in it like to Justification; and may be stifled so without Blasphemy, as Mr. Goodwin is pleased to brand it in his Rhetorick. And that this Decree to justify us, carries as much as concerns Remission of sins, and accepting of us as righteous, I prove thus: If it do not, then the Remission of sins, and Accepting of us as righteous, are other Immanent Acts. But that cannot be, for then, either in the Understanding or Will: but neither can be said with Sobriety, for sure God cannot be said to Decree to know any thing, or to decree to will any thing: not to know any thing: for though he know things in his Decree, yet doth he not decree to know, his Knowledge being necessary, his Decree arbitrary: and if he did decree to know any thing, we must conclude he might have not known it; for decrees are only of things which may be or not be: Therefore whatsoever it be, it is no such distinct Immanent Act in Gods Understanding; and though we use to say, Now a man is justified in Gods Right, yet doth not this put any new Act of Knowledge in God, but signifies only a Testimony given by God, whereby he makes us know that we are justified before God, or in his Right; and I am sure that Mr. Baxter, who quotes Suarez, Schiller, and Keckerman at every bow, cannot be ignorant that the word of Right, though it be for the form Actus, is for the substance of it rather Passive, and therefore is not attributable to God as it is to us; but in him it signifies a making of us to see, and we are said to be justified in his sight, when he makes it as it were evident to our sight that we are justified: as when God is said to know what was in Hezekiah’s heart, the meaning is, he made known to Hezekiah what was in his heart.

2. To Decree so will God cannot be said; for that is as much as to Will to Will, which was never heard of, the object of the Will being at best but the imperative Act, not his own eliciting Act; for what need of Willing to will a thing, when one willing is enough? And be that will to will, will no more than he doth already, which is to will, one of these Acts must needs be superfluous; and there is no ground to put any such in God, yes or no. 1 ac-
I acknowledge a man in some cases may be said so Will to be more willing, as when the flesh interposes and draws him off from willing fully, or at least from executing his will; but this is rather to will a freedom from a disturbance of the sensitive appetite, then to will the exercise of the rational will; now such an incumbrance of the will of God, there can be none, and consequently no ground whereon to raise such an assertion as this, that he may be said to Will, or decree to Will, which is equivalent, And thus it appears in general, that there is no new immanent Act in God required, yeas possible, so the Justifying of a man, besides his decree to Justifie him.

§. 29.

R. B. I Confess I had some rather be impleyed in debating the point of Justification, then of Gods Immanent Acts, which you before insisted on. But to deal freely with you, I never read from a Learned, Orthodox man, a more superficial, unprofitable Discourse on that Subject, or that less expresseth a competent understanding of the point, if my Judgement fail not, as probably it may.

1. To what purpose you tell us what Arguments you will not use (viz. from Rom. 8. 30.) I know not.

2. Though I little know to what good use it would be, to acquaint us what is like Justification, yet, methinks, were it useful, it should have been better proved. And first me thinks your Memory fails you (which you had need to take extraordinary care of.) The last Discourse was much spent in shewing that [there is a great difference between Immanent Acts and Transient] and that [there is a clear difference between them as between heaven and earth: Transient Acts being in the Patient, and Immanent in the Agent] So that to equal them in Eternity [is either to make the Creature eternal, or to deny God to be Eternal.] And now the second Discourse must be to prove them to be like: For the Decree which is an Immanent Act hath somewhat like Justification, which you confess a Transient Act. But yet I doubt not but your Learning can make this good: For you that can prove that Gods Immanent Acts which are his Essence, do differ no more from poor men, then as you have expressed, may well prove, that Gods Immanent Acts are like Transient Acts; much more that Heaven and Earth are like. And doubtless your undertaking is very feasible: For you may well prove, that there is a similitude between Gods Immanent acts, and a stone, or a tree, or a worm, or any thing in the world: For you will say, that Gods Immanent acts are God himself, and that these Creatures are all Good: and then all things that are Good, are somewhat Like to God: Therefore every thing in the world (having some Good) is somewhat Like God: Also they have a Being, and therefore have some likeness to the first Being. But then what Likeness this is, or in what Degree, you have more Wit then to undertake to tell.

4. The Reason that you give for your not arguing from Rom. 8. 30. is because [indeed he is said to have Glorified them also.] But how fell it out that you observed not, that on the same Reason, you should have rejected the Argument which you here use? Because indeed it saith as much (for ought I knew) to prove Gods Decree to be like Glorification, as to be like Justification.

5. Should you not have told us in what sense you take Justification before you define.
6. Why would you tell the world what *all Protestants* take Justification to be as if you knew them all?

7. At least, how comes it to pass that so Learned a man hath read so little, and would bewray it so easily as to say that [All Protestants consent that Justification is the Remission of sin, and Accepting of us as Righteous.] Would you be believed in such notorious untruths which you fear not to utter even in a matter of fact, where there is so much visible evidence against you? How many of our English Divines (besides all others) affirm Remission of sin to be a fruit or consequent, and no part of Justification? had you read but Mr. Bradshaw and Mr. Gartler, you would have known some. How many on the other side make Remission of sin antecedent to Justification in order of nature? and Justification to be its immediate consequent? How many take Remission of sin to be the whole of our Justification? yea what full Disputes and Treatises are written only or principally, or at least very much to prove this? and what famous Divines are they that maintain it? How many be there that take Justification to consist partly in Remission of sin, and partly in the imputation of Christ's own Righteousness? and these with the former say, that Accepting us as Righteous is a consequent of Justification: Sin must first be remitted, lay the former, and Christ's Righteousness imputed ours, lay the latter, before God can Accept any man as Righteous: For man must first be Righteous, before he can be accepted as such. Yea Mr. Arthur Dent in his Catechism, defines justification to be, A cleaning and renewing of our nature by the Spirit of God.

The number that are of these several opinions are so great, and the men so eminent, and well known to Divines that have been much versed in this Controversie, or are of any considerable reading in our Modern Writers, that I shall think it needless to cite any of them. Hath Mr. K: read none of these, or will he blot out their Names from the number of Protestants?

8. Yet more grossly doth he affirm, that he [knows no man that will say it is a meer transient act.] I think then you have either read little of this Controversie, or little remember what you have read: at least, are an unfit man to tell us what All men hold, or all Protestants, when you profess to know so little. You might have seen this in some plain English books, that are in the hands of the multitude of those below you. Mr. Tho. Hooker maintains it, That Justification is not an Immanent but a Transient act. But what need I name any, when it is known to be the common Judgement of our Divines, and those few that have maintained Justification to be an Immanent act (and consequently eternal) have been taken for Erroneous therein, and as militating so farre for the Antinomians. See Mr. Burges' of Justification, Lea. 20. p.167,168,169.

9. If Justification be a Transient act, and yet not a meer Transient act, then is it both an Immanent and a Transient act. And if so, then either it is two acts, or else the Immanent and Transient act are one. If Justification (Active) be two acts, then it seems it is divisible; yea and one part of it is Eternal, and the other in Time only: And then we must not enquire, What the justifying act is? but What each of these justifying acts are? Of this if I knew your minde, perhaps I might say more. If the Immanent and Transient act be but one, diversly considered (1. As in the meer form of an Act, having not yet effected any thing; 2. And as the same act is received into the subject Passive, and so is the Passion) then.
then the same act is no more immanent, when it is once transient; and then we
must say, that the act of Justification was eternal, but the passion or effect in time
only. But this sense seems so much to contradict, both your foregoing discourse
of the difference of Immanent and Transient acts, and your after hint of the
Transient act which justifieth, that I will not imagine it to be the sense you
intend.

10. But your reason why no man will say it is a meer transient act, is very
darkly vilcovered: It is because [there is no transient act of God, which doth
not suppose an immanent one.] But doth it follow that therefore Justification is
not a meer transient act, because it supposeth an immanent act? Why did you not
tell us whether it supposeth it as an antecedent, or as a part of Justification, or as
what else? But you know that all that is supposed is not therefore a part. Or if
it were never so necessary a foregoing cause, yet it follows not that the nearer
cause may not be causis totaliss in suo genere, and so be denominate. May not you
on these grounds as well say, that there is nothing in the world is a meer transient
act, because it supposeth an immanent? The building of a house I think is a
transient act; and yet it supposeth divers immanent acts in the builder, and an
immanent act of God that willed it.

11. But what is this immanent act? You add, [For that he acts nothing up-
on the creature, but what he first purposed in himself to act.] I doubt not but
you easily see, that if this reason prove any thing, it will as well prove that Cre-
ation, Redemption, Sanctification, Resurrection, Glorification, are none of
them meer transient acts: For God acts these in Time; and therefore he first
purposed to act them. Yet it will do as much to prove that God never did, nor
can perform a meer transient act: because he can do nothing but what he pur-
poseth. What need you then apply this to Justification any more then to any thing
else? as if Justification had any peculiar participation in this honour, above
some other acts! By your reason, the dividing the red sea, the sending of Manna
and Quails, the writing of the ten Commandments, were none of them meer tran-
sient acts.

12. Immanent acts pass not into the extrinseck objects and make no change
on them, and therefore are not causall: and therefore cannot well as causall
be denominate from their effects: therefore no immanent act of God can
be called Justification, or part of Justification, or a justifying act: For it must
be so denominate from the effect of justifying: But it is the transient act only
that effecteth Justification (Passive:) therefore it is the transient act only that is
to be called Justification.

13. I have oft times asked the Antinomians, what text of Scripture they could
shew that calleth any Immanent Eternal act of God by the name of Justification,
or of part of Justification? and I could never yet see any that they produced:
and I suppose that you are also unable to shew any such; or else you would not
like, have done it.

14. When you say [God decreed to Justifie] do not you plainly make [Dec-
reeing] and [Justifying] two things? and denominate only the transient act
which is in time [Justification?] So of other acts; as when we say [God de-
reed to create:] you do not say, His Decreeing was Creating.

15. You conclude that [an Immanent act must be confess if there be a Tran-
sient one.] Ans. It is easily confess that an Immanent act (so called, for our
understanding) there is from Eternity concerning every thing that is in Time.
produced: but that proves not that the producing act in Time, is not meerly transient. I all this while suppose that you mean by denying Justification to be [a mere transient act] to include some other act justifying, or as part of Justification, and not only to prove an antecedency or concomitancy of such an Immanent act. Else your reasoning would be absurd or against your self.

16. Having thus proved that there must be an Immanent act, you next say, that [There can be no other then the Decree of God to pass this transient act.] Your contention for this is bold, your proof of it weak. As Gods immanent acts are the same with his Essence, so he hath but One, that is, he is but One: Understanding, Willing, Nilling, is all One; and so there is but one Immanent act in Justification, Condemnation, or what you will else, because there is but One God: Or rather God hath nothing properly called an act, because he is God. But as we describe One act to God Analogically speaking of him according to our capacity, so must we on the same necessity ascribe to him more than One, and that is by denomiating them from the variety of objects which they respect and connote. And so as truly as you can distinguish between the Divine Intellec- tion and Volition, so truly may we distinguish the Volitions of God, according to the divers state of the objects. And so if we could yield to you that there is any Immanent act a part of Justification, or that carrieth in it as much as concerneth acceptance of us as Righteous, we might fairly say as much, at least, for another act, as you can do for the Decree: For the Decree that you speak of, is only [a Decree to pass a transient act] and so hath for its object something future: But the Will of God de praeventi, by which he willeth the relation of the justified person, is yet nearer the effect. So is his mental approbation, and his receivance of the person as Righteous (Willingly and Approvingly judging him Just) some call his estimation of us to be Just [sententiam conceptionis] as distinct from sententia fata, but nearer to it then the Immanent Decree to pass an act de fii- turo.

17. You add [That this Decree of God to pass the transient act of justifying, carrieth in it as much as concerneth Gods remission of sins, and acceptance of us as Righteous.] By which words you may 'mean almost what your lift; but how any man should understand your meaning that knows not your minds by some better discovery, I do not know. 1. Whether do you mean by [as much as concerns] an essential constitutive concernment, e. d. [as much as constitueth?] But if so, then you should exclude your transient act, and the immanent alone should be [somewhat like justification] but justification itself. For if this imma- nent be as much as constituteth remission of sin, and acceptance of us as Righteous, and justification consisteth of these two only, then the immanent act is the whole of justification. Or if you mean [as much as concerneth it antecedently ex parte Dei] that were manifestly false: For the giving of Christ, the accepting his Satisfaction and Intercession, and many other acts concerning Remission and Acceptance, are antecedent to Justification. Or if you should mean it in the full latitude, as your words import, viz. That nothing concerneth our Remission and Acceptance but only Gods Decree, then it is yet more palpably false: but this is so gross that I may not suppose you guilty of it, though your unlimited words do seem to express it. Or do you mean [as much of Gods immanent acti- on as concerns Remission and Acceptance is found in this Decree to pass the transient act.] supposing this to be part of our Justification, and the transient act the other
other part? But 1. your next words before and after seem to contradict that. For you say it is [a Decree to justify] which therefore cannot be part of the thing Decreed. 2. And what mean you then to plead that it is [somewhat Like justification] if it be a part, and such a part. Is it worthy a Divine laboriously to prove that a mans soul is Like a man? Or that [laying the Foundation] is somewhat Like to Building? The truth is, your terms persuade me either that you hold that Antinomian eternal justification, which you are ashamed plainly to reveal, or else that you know not what you hold yourself.

18. Yet do you repeat these ambiguous words again, as thofe, it seems, which best fit your design: and you prove them thus: [If it do not, then the Remission of sins, and Accepting of us as Righteous, are other immanent acts: but that cannot be:] Here you seem to explain your meaning of the former words, that it is [a constitutive concernment] that you spoke of: (but whether as the whole or as a part only I cannot tell.) For you say, that else these [are other immanent acts] viz. [Remission and Acceptance are either Gods Decree, or other immanent acts.] But 1. why then do you make it your design to prove Gods immanent act to be somewhat like justification? Remission and acceptance of us as Righteous, are more then like it. Did not you say before [Justification is, by the consent of all Protestants, a Remission of sin and an acceptance of us as Righteous? 2. Why did you before lay your proof no higher then this, [that every transient act supposed an immanent, viz. Gods Decree.] 3. It seems to me here that you affect eternal justification in the definition, while you disclaim it as to name. 4. At least, you seem (if I can understand you) to maintain that Remission of sin and Acceptation of us as Righteous are from eternity. For you here import that thofe [are] Gods Decree, and you elsewhere lay enough for the eternity of the Decrees. But you knew, its like, that this is such gross Antinomism, as that it was not for your credit openly to own it in the plainest terms. You give me not sufficient occasion here to stay long in confusion of this Error: yet briefly this I shall oppose. 1. He that was not a sinner from eternity, was not a pardoned sinner from eternity: (or, he that had no sin, had none remitted.) But you were not a sinner from eternity: Therefore, &c. For the minor: He that was not from eternity, was not a sinner from eternity: but you were not from eternity: Therefore, &c. If you lay to the major, that it is enough to make us capable of Remission, that we were sinners in esse cognito: I answer, either you speak de esse futuritionis, or de esse existentiae cogito: If of the former, the aflertion is false: for [Future] is a term of Diminution, as to any true Being. An innocent man is not a subject capable of Remission of sin, co nomine, because he will sin hereafter. If of the latter, I say, God knows no man to be a sinner quod existensiam praesum, that is not a sinner: Else he should know untruly. 2. Where there is no obligation to punishment there is no remission of sin. But on you or me there was no obligation to punishment from eternity: Therefore, &c. The major is proved from the definition of Remission: which is A dissolution of an obligation to punishment. Where there's no obligation, there's none to be dissolved. The minor is proved thus: He that is not a sinner is not obliged to punishment: But you were not a sinner from eternity: Therefore, &c. Alfo Qui non Est, non est obligatus ad penam: At su ab aeterno non fuisti: Therefore, &c. 3. That which is undone in Time was not done from Eternity. But sin is unpardoned in Time, (viz. till we be united to Christ by faith, as Scripture abundantly witnesseth:) Therefore it was not pardoned from Eternity. 4. God ac-
cepteth no man as Righteous: that is not Righteous (yea that is not) (for he accepteth men as they are, and not as they are not.) But no man was Righteous from Eternity; 'Therefore God accepted none as Righteous from Eternity: But enough of that, till you speak more openly.

19. Your proof (that Remission and Acceptance are no other acts immanent but the Decree) is this: [For then either in the Understanding or the Will: but neither, &c.] And: 1. I easily yield that Remission is no other immanent act; because it is none at all 2. But your proof seems none to me. You say, [Surely God cannot be said to Decrees to know any thing, or to Decrees to will any thing.] Your argument I think lies thus: [If God cannot be said to Decrees to know or will any thing; then he hath no other immanent act but his Decrees:] But, &c. Therefore, &c.] But here's no proof of the Consequence; which needs proof, God cannot be said to Decrees to know himself (according to you; for I profess I am ignorant of these high mysteries:) Doth it follow that therefore he doth not know himself? I think not. Nor doth it follow that the knowledge of himself is only his Decrees, as I hope you will easily confess. Moreover (according to you) God cannot be said to Decrees to know things to be Past. (For you say, he cannot be said to Decrees to know.) Yet I think God doth know, as his own Eternity, so our Time, and the Futurities, Presence, and Preteritions of things in our Time; and therefore it doth not follow that he hath no knowledge of things, but his Decrees: For his Decrees (as now taken) is de futuris; but besides that God hath 1. a knowledge de Preteritis; and 2. de Presentibus. You argue, from the Necessity of Gods knowledge and the Arbitrariness of his Decrees: and many words you use which shew that confidence which I admire at: that you should pretend to be so far acquainted with the Divine Nature, as not only to ascribe to God the acts of man so far as you do, but to determine which acts are necessary, and which arbitrary, and that he cannot Decrees to Know or to Will. I confess I am ready to tremble instead of replying, to think into what Mysteries you lead me so boldly. But I resolve no further to follow you, then to manifest your presumption; and to shew you that they are things unsearchable which you vainly pretend so well to know. Gods Knowledge is commonly distinguished into simplicis Intelligentiae, &c. Visions: The former is said to be in order before the Decree, and the later in order after it: therefore neither of them are taken for the Decree itself: and will you overthrow both by reducing all to the Decree? The knowledge of Visions is taken not to be necessary simply, but only on supposition of the Decree, which antecedent in order of Nature doth cause the Intelligible objects. For, say they, it is by this Decree that things pass from the number of Possibles, into the number of things Future: and they cannot be known as future, till they are Future; and they are made Future Freely and not Necessarly: therefore in the knowledge of Futures there is a freedom radicaliter & participative. And so it is no such hard or absurd concession, to say, God might not have known what he knows: as long as he might not have made it an intelligible object.

20. You next proceed to an objection, which you cast in your own way: and though I conceive you would not have made yourself any work, but what you were confident you could honourably and easily dispatch, yet here I think it falls out otherwise. The objection is from your use of saying [Now we are justified in Gods sight.] Here 1. you say [This puts not a new act of knowledge in God] of which I have said enough before. 2. You tell us the sense of it: viz. that
that [It signifies only a Testimony given by God, whereby he makes us know that we are justified before God] and you say [Sight in God signifies a making us to see: and we are said to be justified in his sight, when he makes it, as it were, evident to our sight that we are justified.] This interpretation is to me something strange, and not easily received, both because of its Error, and because you say so little to cover that Error, but thrust so gross a conceit upon us upon your own authority. I rather think that the ascribing of such New acts to God, is 1. From the Moral Act of his Law, God being said to do that which his Law doth: and so he is said to judge us Righteous, when his Law of grace doth so judge us: and we are said to be Righteous in iptimation Divina, when we are so intersu Legis. 2. From the change of the object: For as the variety of objects denominates Gods acts as divers, so on the same reason the Novity of the objects must denominate them as new, though they be immanent acts. 3. And by an Anthropopathie, Sight is oft put for Gods Remembrance or Observation.

But you thrust upon us pure Antinomian fancies. 1. If your conceits be true, then none is to be accounted [Justified in Gods sight] that do not see themselves to be justified; for you think [Sight in God signifies a making us see.] Then why to all these honest souls that see not themselves justified, nay rather think themselves condemned: But yet if I discourse with such, I will venture to give them better encouragement, for all your doctrine; and to tell them [You may be justified in Gods sight, when you are condemned in your own.] 2. Shall we peruse the Scriptures that use that phrase, and see whether all or any one of them can be understood as Mr. K. expoundeth them in the Antinomian way of Manifestation. Psal. 143.2. For in thy sight shall no man be justified. Doth it mean, no man shall see himself justified? Jer. 18.23. Forgive not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight. Is that only meant of hiding the remission from their sight? or letting them know the non-forgiveness? Where the Scripture speaks so oft of doing that which is good in the sight of God, or that which is evil in his sight, Doth it mean Gods making us to see that it is good or evil? What is so good in the sight of sinners as that which is evil in the sight of God? Job 15.15. The heavens are not clean in his sight. Job 25.5. The stars are not pure in his sight. Is this sight of God a making the creature see? Heb. 13.21. Working in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight. Is this making us see? It were too long to recite all: if the Reader will peruse the rest, 1 Joh. 3.22. Exod. 15.26. 2 Sam. 12.9. 1 Chron. 9.13. Psal. 72.14. Hos. 6.2. Rom. 3.20. Mat. 11.26. Luk. 10.21. & 15.21. Psal. 19.14. & 51.4. & 9.19. & 55 Gen. 18.3. & 19.19. or any other where this phrase is used concerning God. I leave it to his own judgement whether any one of them be taken in Mr. K's sense: That of 2 Chron. 3.31. which he brings, is neither the same phrase, nor hath the same sense, and therefore is nothing to the matter. Yet is not Mr. K's explication of that satisfactory neither: For he cannot prove that it is meant merely of discovering Hezekiah's heart to himself. It may be as much the discovery of it by the effects to others for their warning, and so shew the frailty of man: But the plain sense of the text referrers that knowledge to God himself and not to any man; even by such an Anthropopathie which is ordinary in Scripture, as in Ezek. 12.3. It may be they will consider, though they are a rebellious house, as if God had been in an uncertain hope of it. So Luk. 20.13. Jer. 36.3. So where God is said to repent. If God speak of himself to man, after the manner of his own infirmity, must we therefore say, he means [our knowledge] when he mentioneth his own?

N 3 21. That
21. That I may know whom he speaks to, he addeth [I am sure Mr. Baxter who quotes us, Schiller and Keckerman at every bout cannot be ignorant, &c.] The matter which he mentioneth is nothing to his Cause. But, see what an overcharged torment this Learned man hath! How many cants hath he had already in vomiting up the choler of his scorn? And yet it comes up still as fresh and as bitter as if he felt no levity by all that evacuation. Truly his oft scornful repeating my quotation of these childish Authors, caused me at last to turn over all my Book to see how oft it is that I quote them. And I can finde Sueret but once named, and no place of him cited. Keckerman but once cited, and there twice named; and Schiller thrrice. Yet doth this man tell the world I quote them at every turn; so well may we believe his confident Assertions about the unsearchable nature and mysteries of God, who hath the face to speak thus in a visible matter of fact, where any man that will but try it may finde him — Nay, see the modesty of the man! I cited two of them once, and the third thrice in a whole Book; and in these five or six leaves he tells me of it, or scorns me for it twelve times!

22. He next addeth [To Decree to Will, cannot be said: for that is as much as to Will to Will, which was never heard of; the object of the Will being at best, but her imperative act, not her own elicite act.] Reply. 1. I still abhor your presumptuous pretence of knowing more of God then you do know, and of so measuring him by man. 2. Still desiderantur modestia & veritas. Who would think that a man pretending so much to Learning, should never have met with Schoolman, or Philosopher that speaks that which he here saith [was never heard of] or having read it (yea or not having read it) durst so boldly speak thus? At least he might have seen it in the most ordinary and obvious Writings of our own Divines. In Amstis his Cales of Confed. i. cap. 7. these are the last words: Hinc vero dicimus & ex omnium gentium consensu, Volo Velle. Believe which thou wilt, Reader; but I am sure there's a wide difference between these two men: when one faith, Dicimus omnium gentium consensu; and the other faith [It was never heard of.] Yes Ferrarius in Scholasticus, Orthodox. cap. 29. (a Chapter worth the reading of praedetermination & causas poeciss). affirms it of God himself [Ideo videtur quod cum Deus praejudicet lexam, non habet mere Negative, sed cum aliquo actu posite: & ideo non solum non vult, sed etiam vult non Velle, i.e. Volumus reflexitur supra se non volentem: Dum situm non Vult etiam Adamum pectoris, suspendendo actum Positionis meru negationem, sed etiam Vult se non Velle: & haec est actualis & positionis permisso. Ita tam en ut in primo signis sec Natio pura, &c. Proinde cum Deus Voluit ab externo non Velle lexam, habuit actu reflexionum super negationem, &c. At Determinavit fore inquietis. Minime: absit hoc.] This is approved by Churches of France. And yet this Learned man dare tell the world in print, that it was never heard of; which that he might have safely done, he had need of more ears than two. And it seems this Learned man hath read little of the contentions of the Jesuits and Dominicans about the nature of free-will, where he might have seen many of them touch this Question, as Petavius doth against Vincentius Lewis, aliis, Fromondus, and others frequently. Nay it seems he is a stranger to the Schoolmen too: Perhaps in stead of reading them, he contemns them as he doth Schiller, Suarez and Keckerman. Scotus in 4. sent. dist. 49. q. 3. fol. (mibi) 266. B. faith, Emera extra est similitier optimum & summe voluuentum: Ergo inter ca quae sunt ad finem quod est sibi immediatus est magis voluuentum: sed Velle est sibi immediatus, quia is immediatius secutius ut in finem ultimum, cum finis ultimus ut hujusmodi est proprium objectum ipsius Velle. Probo majorum: Illud est magis Voluuentum vide libera
libera quod appetitus naturalis naturaliter est magis appetendum: buxusmodi est quod prætorique est ultimo, quod simpliciter maxime appetitur naturaliter. Praetera Voluntas potest Velle suum actum, sequitur: Intellig autem suum actum; aut ergo Vuls suum Velle proper Intelligere, aut e converso, aut neutrum proper alterum: quod autem de Velle ordinato.

Nicol. d' Orbello's faith, in sent. 1. 2. dist. 25. dub. 2. [Omne quod Vult, appetit ad sui ipsum imperium: quia sic Vult equivalent re Velle se Velle illud: Et idem in actu Velle vide (seipsum movet, et siti dominatur, & pro tante dicitur liberum (arbitrium) quamuis immutabiliter ordinetur ad illud.] And Gibichou shews, that God hath Actus voluntatis posticum circa suum permissionem i. 2. de Libert. cap. 24. & cap. 22. § 7, 8, &c. And why not as well then about his act. And Gods Will is his Essence: Therefore he willeth it. For that Deus vult seipsum hath hitherto been unquestioned, for ought I know (to fare as he may be said, at all to Will.) Aquinas 2. 25. a. 25. § 2. a. 2. c. faith, Quia exuim voluntatis objectum est Bonum Universale, quicquid sub ratione boni consistet, potest cadere sub actu Voluntatis. Et quia ipsum Velle est quodam Bonum, potest Velle se Velle, sicut & intellectus ejus objectum est Verum, Intelligit se Intelligere, quia hoc etiam est quodam Verum.] Videt & 1. q. 87. 3. 2. If I thought it necessary, it were easy to heap up many more that are of the same minde. But I shall only in brotherly duty admonish Mr. K. to make more Conscience hereafter of false speaking: and seeing he hath read so very little, or left it again, rather humbly to acknowledge his Inperfection (as we that are guilty of the like must also do) then to make a confident vain-gloryfull contension of that which it seems by this, and many the like passages, he hath not.

Let us add some Reasons, that the Elicite acts may be the objects of other Elicite acts of the Will, and not the Imperare only, as Mr. K. faith.

1. As Socrates argueth from the proportion with the Intellect. A man may understand that he doth understand, by a reflex act: Therefore he may Will that he Will.

2. That which is an apprehended Good may be Willed: But an Elicite Act of the Will may be an apprehended Good: Therefore, &c.

3. A man may Will his everlastingly Happines. (For if the End may not be Willed, what may?) But his everlastingly Happines consists partly in the Elicite Acts of his own Will, everlastingly to be exercised on God: (God being Objectively our Happines) Therefore, &c. Velle, Amare, Frui, are Acts that must be perpetuated, and either may be Willed, or no man may will his own Happines.

4. Whatsoever is apprehended to be a fit means to this End or Happines, may be Willed: But the Elicit acts of the Will may be apprehended a fit means hereeto: Therefore, &c. They are commanded, and they are made Conditions of Happines: and therefore are a means.

5. The Effects of Gods special saving Grace on the soul may be Willed: But the Elicit Acts of the sanctified Will, are the Effects (and principal effects) of Gods special saving Grace on the soul: Therefore, &c.

6. That which a Christian may pray for, that he may and must Will: But he may pray for the Elicit Acts of a sanctified Will: Therefore, &c. As he may pray, Lord, I Believe, help my Unbelief: So he may pray [Lord I am Willing, make me more Willing, and hereafter Willing, &c.

7. Experience is in stead of a thousand arguments, I feel that my Willingness is the object of my unwillingness; and that in these several ways. 1. I feel that upon
upon the review of my past Willingness, and the sight of my present Willingness (in any Good) my Will hath a Complacency in it, which is a true Velle, ye the first and principal Elicit of the Will. 2. I finde that by a less perfect and intense Act, I do Will a more perfect Act. I am somewhat Willing; but I would fain be more Willing. Nay to procure the Amendment of my own heart by this increase of my Willingness (which is indeed the Increase of most of my Graces) is the main business of my life, committed to me by God, and to be intended by myself. And if I should cast off this great business, and neither desire more Willingness or Grace, nor pray for more, not labour for more, because Mr. K. of his subtlety tells me, that the Elicit Act is not the Wils object, I should be beat out of my Christianity and Salvation by a trivial trick of vain Philosophy. 3. I finde that by a present Act of Will, I do Will a future Act. I do Will now that I may also Will to morrow, and to my lives end, and for ever in glory, and that better then now I do. 4. I feel that I do Will a more sincere Willingness. I do Will Salvation with too much respect to myself in it, and too little to God's honour. Now I would fain Will this more for God then I do. 5. I would fain till many things which through my corruption I now Will. 6. I would fain oft suspend a vicious act of my Will, at least. In all these respects, the Elicit Act of my Will is the object of my Will.

But Mr. K. will be Learned in despight of Natural and Gracious Experience (for I hope, for all his Learning, that he Would Love God more, as Love is taken for an Act of the Rational part, and that he Wils a greater and a persevering, yea a perpetual Willingness of God and obedience; and a fruition of God, and fruit is an act of the Will:) He will therefore prove what he once faith, and that's thus. [For what need of Willing to Will a thing, when one Willing is enough? And he that Wils to Wils, Wils no more then he doth already, which is to Will: one of these acts must needs be superfluous, &c.] To which I Reply; You may see in the several Instances which I gave before, that it is needfull, and that it is not superfluous, as you say, and that it is more then he did before; A more perfect act, a future act, a perpetuated act, are more then he did before. Yea its a doubt, Whether a very graceless man may not Velle intendere Deum, vel frui Deo, yea utterly Will to Will God as his happiness, or to Will Holiness before Voluntarys, which yet doth it not already. And me thinks to acute a man might see that this is not the same act which he performeth already, for it hath not the same object. The man is Willing to be saved from Hell, but Unwilling to be Holy: He is convinced that he shall not be saved, unlese he become Willing to be Holy: Therefore he wisheth he were Willing to be Holy: If this were but with a Velleity, it is yet an Elicit Act of the Will, but it may be called a Volition, though uneffectual, because there is a stronger contrary Will: So that it is Volitio quod actum Absolutum, but quod actum Comparatum, he is unwilling. The Object of that Will which he hath, is his Velle sanctitatem: the Object of that Will which he would have, is Holiness itself; if that Velle & sanctitas be not all one, then these two Acts be not all one.

But Mr. K. confesseth at last that a man may be said to Will to be more Willing, but he faith [this is rather to Will a freedom from a disturbance of the sensitive appetite, then to Will the exercise of the rational Will.] But why is it that this man would not be disturbed by the sensitive appetite? Is it not because he would Will freely? Doth not he that Willeth the means, much more Will the End? And
And is not the Removal of the Impediment, a Means to your freer and more Intense Willing? And do not you yourself Will the increase of your Willingness upon the quieting of that Appetite? Besides, I hope you do not think that the disturbance of the sensitive Appetite, is the only Cause of our Imperfection in actual Willing: Or that our own Habitual Corruption and distemper of the Will, is not a greater Cause.

After all this you conclude, that it appears there is no new Immanent act in God required yeas possible to the justifying of a man, besides his Decree to justify.

To which I say, Though it little appear to me from any of your arguing, yet I easily yield to the Negative part of your Conclusion; and I say, that the Decree itself is no part of Justification, but an Antecedent.

Again, Let it be observed, that all this arguing will as much prove that God's Immanent act is like to Creation, Sanctification, Glorification, Damnation, or any thing that ever God did, as to Justification: For of all his Works it is as true, that he doth nothing but what he decreed to do. And so it may as well be said that our Glorification is an Immanent act from Eternity, as our Justification.

Mr. K. More particularly, it will be as Evident that his Decreeing to Remit our sins, carries a Remission of them tantamount: For who shall charge them on us, where God decreed to remit them? The Conscience I confess may; so may the Devil joynig with our conscience: but all this while their charge is of no greater danger to us, when God hath decreed to remit them to us; and though they may trouble us; they cannot damn us, for that their charge is to be brought in God's Name, as for sins committed against his Crown and Dignity: Now where he hath decreed to remit those sins, there is no danger of suffering for them, let what ever accusers manage the Evidence against us, all that they can do is thus, to bring us to cry Guilty, and thereupon to appeal to God for Mercy; who upon our appeal to him for Mercy, he is graciously pleased to pronounce pardon to us.

God himself I acknowledge also may charge them on us; and proceed in severity against us, for a while; but this charge is not any way obstrucive to his Decree to remit sin, but rather subservient to it, and to bring us to see and confess our sins, and call our selves wholly on his Mercy in Christ, in which respect I might better say, that God doth shew love even in punishing unregenerate men that are Elect, then you did crewhites, that he may be said to hate Godly men, when he punisheth or rather correcteth them: Punishment aiming chiefly at the satisfaction of Justice, Correction at the amendment of the offender. So then his Decree of Remitting carries in it as much as is required for any Immanent Act in him to our Remission, and so much as necessarily procures the transient Act in the time that he hath appointed for it. His Decrees are like Mount Zion, and stand fast for ever: The Counsel of the Lord standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations, Psalm 33.11.

R. B. Your [tantamount] is a word made for your use; Causes that dare not see the light, use to go covered with such terms as will stretch. But if you mean plainly, that the Decree doth amount to as much as a remission of sin; then I must needs say, that your Doctrine is tantamount Animism. Let the
the conscientious Reader that loves God's truth and his own Peace, consider by these few particulars following, what a Theology, nay what a Christianity this Learned man would introduce.

1. Doth not this lead men to flight Christ and his sufferings, and to look on his Death as that which did them no great good? For when all our sins were tantamount forgiven from Eternity, there was little left for Christ to do by his Death, Merit, Intercession, &c. as to our Remission.

2. How small a matter is left for the Regenerate to receive upon their Repenting and Believing in Christ, as to Remission of sins, when they are tantamount (I must use Mr. K's School-term) remitted already? Is this the Repenting and Believing for Remission of sin which Scripture mentioneth?

3. How small a matter is left for Baptism to seal and exhibit, as to Remission, when all sin was tantamount Remitted from Eternity?

4. Where is the Excellency and Glory of the Gospel, either as to the Narrative, Preceptive, or Promissory part? For the Narrative, it makes a large Declaration how Christ was Promised, Incarnate, Born, how he Obeyed, Suffered, Satisfied, Merited, Rose, Intercedeth to procure a Remission which was tantamount done already from Eternity. For the Preceptive, it precepteth man a way to obtain Remission by coming to Christ, and to maintain that Remission by abiding in Christ, when our sins were tantamount remitted from Eternity. The Promise seemeth to hold forth an excellent benefit; and all men are invited to Receive it; and when all's done, it offereth and promiseth to do that which is done tantamount already from Eternity. If you say, that yet Christ and the Gospel have their Excellency as they respect other benefits, viz. our Sanctification and Glorification: I answer according to Mr. K's grounds; it must be said that these also were done tantamount from Eternity, in that they were Decreed.

5. How small a matter have Christians daily to pray for, in that Petition [Forgive us our trespasses] when they were tantamount forgiven from Eternity? And what a spur is this to prayer?

6. How small a matter have they to Give Thanks for, as received through Christ from the promise, upon prayer, &c.

7. How small a matter as to Remission of sin, do we receive in the Lords Supper, when it was done tantamount before?

8. How great a help doth this Doctrine give to Obedience, when men are told that all their sins are tantamount forgiven from Eternity?

9. How small a Difference between the state of the Regenerate and unregenerate, supposing them Elect? The sins of one are forgiven, and the other tantamount.

10. How unfoundly do we persuade wicked men of their misery, and tell them that God hateth all the workers of iniquity, and that they are by nature children of wrath, &c. when for ought we know all their sins were tantamount forgiven from Eternity? And how hard to convince them of any such misery, when they have this Reply? Lay all this together, and see how much of our Religion and Christianity is left!

But he proves all this by a Question [Who shall charge them on us where God decreeth to remit them?] I Reply, The same persons, and as many as might have charg'd them on us, if God had not decreed it. His Decree takes off no charge, nor disables any from charging us. It were not an Immanent Act, if it did poner aliquid in objecto. 3. We are as much under the Charge, Curse, or Condemnation
Condemnation of the Law, till we believe, as if no such Decree had passed.

2. What the Law doth, God doth by it; for it is his Instrument. 3. Satan may charge us. 4. And so may conscience. 5. And men. But you confess your self that Conscience, Satan, and God may charge us: But you say [there is no danger] Reply. 1. What if you were to live all your life in torment with the stone or gout, and yet were sure that you should die never the sooner, and so there were no danger? Would you think your self tantamount a sound man? Is it so small a matter in your eyes for an elect man to lie under the guilt of sin, and as an enemy to God till near his death, so be it he be not in danger of damnation? 2. If you mean that their damnation is non-sequent, I confess it: And so it would be if God should but fore-know it, and not decree it (supposing it might be the object of such a fore-knowledge.) 3. But yet I think it is not the language to say [there is no danger of suffering for sins that God hath decreed to remit.] I see still whither Antinomianism tends. 1. If Christ did die to deliver us from danger of suffering, then we were in danger of suffering: But Christ did die to deliver us from it: Therefore, &c. Would you make us believe that Christ saved us from no danger by his death? 2. The actual Conversion and Justification of the Elect, is a saving them from danger: Therefore they were in danger. 3. If the Elect unconverted are in no danger, then you must preach no danger to them, nor persuade them to avoid any, nor to repeat the incurring of any: or if, because you know not the Elect, you speak to all of danger, you must tell them that you mean it not of the Elect: But what success such preaching would have, is easy to conjecture. 4. Where men are bound to Fear and Apprehend danger, there is danger: But God bindeth the Elect (even after Conversion, much more before) to Fear and Apprehend danger: Therefore, &c. There can be no Fear, where there is no Apprehension of danger; no more then there can be love without the Apprehension of Good to be loved. Christ bids his Disciples, Fear him that is able to destroy both body and soul in hell fire: And so Heb. 4.1. Fear lest a promise being left of entering into his rest, any of you should come short of it. God bids us fear: Mr. K. tantamount bids us, fear not, by telling us there is no danger. 5. Where men are bound to labour, run, strive, and use much means to escape danger, there is danger: But to God hath bound the Elect: Therefore, &c. How many Texts might be cited, that bind us to save our selves, and seek our deliverance, and that speak of our escaping, our deliverance and salvation, which all imply a danger from which we escape, are saved and delivered? 6. Matth. 5.21, 22. He that calleth his brother fool, is in danger of hell fire: But an Elect man hath called his brother fool: Therefore, &c. 7. Nay if this be true, then God never saved his people from any Danger. For he that never was in danger cannot be saved out of it. And he that was from Eternity Decreed to be pardoned, according to your Doctrine, was never in danger. 8. And then we ought to give no thanks to God the Father, or to Christ the Redeemer, or to the holy Ghost the Sanctifier, nor to any Preacher or other Instrument, for saving us from any danger of punishment. I think these are no matters to be made light of: nor that Doctrine of Libertinism to be cherished, which plainly leadeth to such unhappy fruits.

But let us peruse your Reasons: You say [the charge is to be brought in God's name.] Reply. So it may be nevertheless for the Decree; for that takes off none of the charge. You add [All they can do is but this, to bring us to cry Guilty, and thereupon appeal to God for Mercy, &c.] Reply. 1. Must they cry Guill-
ty, and look for Mercy and Remission, that were tantamount forgiven from Eternity? 2. Either you speak of an unconverted elect person in this life; or else as supposing he were at Judgement in that estate. If the later be your meaning, then their Accusation might and would do more then you speak of, and would tend to condemnation (if such a case might be supposed.) If the former be your meaning, then these Elect persons do [Cry Guilty, and appeal to Mercy] with true Faith, or without it. If with Faith, then their sins are remitted further then by Decree, and these are not the persons now in question. If without faith then they are not Forgiven for all this. As long as the Elect remain unregenerate, though that Law, and Satan, and Conscience accuse them, yet they do not Believingly seek mercy: and if they were in that state at Judgement, it were too late to seek Mercy.

Next you [acknowledge that God himself also may charge sin on us, and proceed in severity against us for a while; but this charge is not any way obstructive to his Decree to Remit sin, &c.] Reply. God may be said to charge sin on the Elect before faith. 1. By obliging them by his Law to punishment. 2. By inflicting some small part of the punishment on them. You seem to me to take notice notice only of the later. But every Christian must acknowledge that for all Gods Decree, we are all Obligati ad penam sempiternam, till we are united to Christ by faith. To say this is not obstructive to Gods Decree, is nothing to the question. The worlds being uncreated from Eternity, did not obstruct Gods Decree of making it, and the Elect's being unsanctified or unglorified doth not obstruct Gods Decree of Sanctifying and Glorifying them: and yet this proves not persecuting Saul was tantamount sanctified and Glorified. And what if God make the knowledge of our Damnable state, or our non-remission, a means to Remission? That doth not prove that we are before remitted in whole or in part, or tantamount.

Whether you speak to Mr. Goodwin or me, about the phrase of [hating the Godly] I know not: but if to me, I do not believe that ever I so spoke.

Your distinction of Punishment from chastisement, is perverse: so learned a man should know, that Punishment is the Genus and Chastisement is a Species of it. All Punishment is for the Demonstration of Justice; but not all for the satisfaction of Justice, Correction is as well for a Demonstration of Justice, as for Amending the Offender: Else it were mere Affliction, and no Correction.

Your Conclusion next laid down, much differs from the divers, formerly laid down, and which you should have proved; and yet I have shewed, for part of this, how ill you have proved it; though, for my part, I know no Cause that I am engaged in that will be any what prejudiced by yielding you all; as I easily yield you, that the Transient Act will certainly follow.

---

S. 31.

Mr. K. Next his Decree to Accept us, carrieth as much too; and there needs nothing but a Transient Act to prove his Acceptance, and evidence it to us: for to decree to look upon us as righteous, is not to look upon us as righteous in ourselves, but his son; and to this looking on us, there needs no new immanent Act, beyond his electing us to faith in his Son, and perseverance in that faith: Thus he may be said to give us to his Son before.
before, and so then there is no new immanent act. God's Remitting our sins, and accepting us as Righteous, though they found like Immanente acts, are to be fixed as Transient, and how shall be shewed next: in the interim this which hath been said is sufficient to show, That in the Decree of God to justify us, there is somewhat that looks like Justification, and no other immanent act in God is required to our Justification besides his Decree from Eternity to justify us in time.

§. 31.

R. B. Shall never think the highest pretenders to exact explications to be the best performers, for your sake. You treat of Acceptance; but who can finde by all that you say, what you mean by [Acceptance.] You say, [Though it found like an Immanente act it is to be fixed as Transient,] but what that Transient act is, for all your promises, I can hardly finde you discovering. Surely [to Accept] in our ordinary speech signifies an Immanente act of the Will; but so you take it not; else must you yield that Immanente acts may be Decreed. Besides this, it may signify the Moral action of the Law of Grace, which virtually judgeth the person Righteous, and its action is God's action. But this you can least digest; and therefore what your [Acceptance] means, let him tell that knows. All that I can finde is, either that it is [the Giving of faith] or [the Making us know our Acceptance] of which more anon.

You say [There needs nothing but a Transient act to prove his Acceptance, and evidence it to us.] Rep. Here is then but two Acts needful: the one is [Decreeing to Accept us as Righteous:.] This is not Accepting, as the word and your own confession witness: The other is [a Transient act to prove and evidence his Acceptance.] This cannot be acceptance neither: For what man will say, that the evidence and proof is formally the same with the thing proved and evidenced? Is it all one [to Accept] and [to evidence and prove Acceptance?] What a maze do you run your self into under pretence of discovering the truth? You have fairly disputed [Acceptance] into Nothing.

You add [For to Decree to look upon us as Righteous, is not to look upon us as Righteous in our selves but in his Son.] Rep. To Decree to look, is not to Look: else you may say, it is a Decree to Decree. Your phrases of [in our selves] and [in his Son] may be so interpreted as to make your sense true; but if you mean that it is Christ only and not we, who is the subject of that relative Righteousness, which formally makes us Just; then it is false.

You say [And to this looking on us, there needs no new Immanente act besides electing to Faith and Perseverance.] Rep. I pray you then tell us what you mean by [Looking on us: ] an Immanente act. it is not, you think: And is Gods [Looking on us as Just] a transient act? What act then is it?. Did you say, That God is said to Look on us as Just, when his Law call us Just, I should not disagree with you: but you disclaim that. But I forgot that you did expound your meaning before upon [Gods seeing: ] as Gods seeing is a making us to see, so its like you mean [Gods Decree to look on us as Just] is a Decree to make us Look on our selves as Just: and to the person is changed. But if this be your meaning, I had as lieve you said nothing.

But I will tell you again, that if you will take [an Immanente act] formaliter for Gods essence, so there is none new, nor is there any more then one; Knowing, Willing and Nilling, Love and Hatred are all one. But if you will condescend
to us of the simpler sort, and speak of Immanent acts as applied to God after the manner of men, and as his acts are formaliter, or modaliter, or relative, or denominative; or however else (in a way unknown to us) distinct from his essence, as they may be diversified among themselves without disparagement to Gods simplicity, they may all begin and end without disparagement to his Immutability, for anything that you have yet said to the contrary. And so as they are diversified or said to begin denominative, ex commutatione objecti, they may as well be said to be the objects of Gods eternal Decree. And thus I conceive, Decrees respecting the future, and [Accepting and Approving] being acts that connote a present object, and so may not be said [to be such acts] till the object exist, therefore God may well be said to Decree to Accept us, and Approve us, and Love us, and Delight in us, etc. though all be Immanent acts. And so my conclusion shall be contrary to yours, that you have not proved that there is no other Immanent act in God required to our justifications, besides his Decree; and if you had, yet you had done little to the business: And that you have no more proved [that in the Decree is something that looks like justifications] then that it looks like Creation, Salvation, Damnation; And had you proved it never so strongly, I know not to what purpose it is. It is somewhat like God that is called his Image in his Saints: and yet he that calls the Saints, God, may blaspheme for all that.

§ 32.

Mr. K. 3. That this Immanent act cannot be called justification, appears hence, that no Immanent act makes a real change in the subject, as justification doth: That a Will so justifies us, is as Mr. Baxter rightly saith, terminus diminiuens, and cannot be the act whereby we are justified, That justification is on all hands confessed to be pronouncing or declaring of us Righteous, which cannot be done by an Immanent act alone: What then is the transient act? Before I can speak punctually on this, it is fit to lay down that Remission of sins, and effecting us in the condition and privileges of Righteousness, are the two main parts distinguished ratione ratiocinata at least, all grant, I must needs say, I think Really. Remission of sins being the first, and which of course draws the other after it, enquire we 1. Whether there be a transient act of God whereby he remits our sins? 2. What this is?

§ 32.

R. B. I am loath to speak against you where you are pleased to plead my cause; yet I must give you these brief Animadversions. 1. That justification makes on the subject a real change, as opposed to Feigned, Nominal, Potential, etc. I yield: but not as opposed to Relative: Wherefore our Divines ordinarily call justification a real change, as opposed to the Relative change of justification. 2. It is but one sort of justification which is [on all hands confessed to be a pronouncing or declaring us Righteous]; you say do afterwards speak of justification in a sense that will not agree with this. Who doth not yield that Constitutive justification goes before Sentential? Doth not God make us just before he judge and pronounce us so? Yet in this confusion do you go on still; and such affirms do you make with [Immanent and Transient] as if you would wear these words thredbare, or never have done with them? So Immanent are these
these Notions in your Phantastie, that when they will be Transient: I cannot tell.

So often do you promise us over and over to enquire what is the Transient act in Justification, and talk of (speaking punctually to it) that you raised my expectation to such a height, that I looked for much more than ordinary: But when I had read to the end, and could scarce perceive certainly, whether ever you spake to the Point at all, or at least in so few syllables and so obscurely, that I am uncertain whether I understand what you mean, I confess you left me between admiration and indignation! that after all your preludes and premises, and our greatest hopes, you should drop asleep when you should come to the work, or cease before you remembered the performance, made me resolve to set lighter by such promises hereafter.

§. 33.

Mr. K. To prove that there is a Transient act, they tell us no more (saith Mr. Baxter) but this, that it doth transfere in subjectum extraneous, by making a moral change on our Relations, though not a real upon our persons.] I confess every transitory, to use that word, in subjectum extraneous making a moral change, is not necessarily a Transient act: For if it be only as upon an Object, whereby is given but an extraneous denomination, not as upon the subject of a Real change, made by the act, the act hath no title to Transient: for knowledge doth this much: but wherever is a Moral or a Legal change made, there is of necessity a Transient act: for that the Law of men take no notice of Immanent acts; and the Law of God takes no notice of any change made in the subject of bare Immanent acts: A man by justifying after a woman commits Adultery punishable by the Law of God, the woman is nothing the more defiled: So a man that covets his neighbours goods, is looked on by God as a thief; the goods notwithstanding remain in the same place, and possession of the owner, nor doth God challenge them as Felons goods; no change made on them; Wherever then there is a Moral, i.e. a Legal change, there is a Transient act, and this being in Justification a Transient act is necessarily required to this change. Now I yield Mr. Baxter that [no Transient act is immediately terminated in a Relation, and the immediate effect of God's Justification or Remission of sins, must be somewhat Really wrought, either upon the sinner, or somewhat else for him.

§. 33.

R. B. I will not stand to open any weaknesses or impertinencies in this Section, as long as the scope is found, lest I show myself as quarrelsome as you.

§. 34.

Mr. K. The second Question is, What is this? and so what the Transient act is?

Mr. Baxter saith, [1. That the passing the grant of the New Covenant, or the promulgation of it, is a Transient act. 2. So may the continuance of it also be. 3. This Law or Grant hath a Moral improper action, whereby it may be said to pardon or justify, which properly is but virtual justifying. 4. By this grant 1. God doth give us the Righteousness of Christ to be ours when we believe. 2. And disestablish the Law to oblige
§. 34.

Who your old Doctors are is utterly unknown to me; for I remember not that I have ever read any Doctor before you that goeth your way (if I know it) and am in hope that I never shall read any such hereafter. For your not following me, as I have not been very eager to obtrude my opinions on any, so if it be no more for your own advantage than mine, I am not so desirous of your company, but that I can be without it. Now to the matter.

I am very glad I am come to a Controversie more safe and more useful, and that which you made and stuck in so long before. As for my opinion about the nature of Remission of sin, I have had occasion to view and review it since the writing of my Aphorisms, and have received Animadversions on this very point of another nature then are these of Mr. K.'s, both for Learning, Sobriety, and Exactness of Judgement; and upon my most faithful and impartial perusal of all, I must needs profess my self much more satisfied in my first opinion, and confident of its verity, then I was before: And some Learned men (as most England hath) do fully consent to it, and confirm it in their Animadversions; and I remember none of the rest (save the first-intimated Reverend Learned Brother) that doth contradict it, of all those Judicious excellent men that have vouchsafed me their private Animadversions. And even he doth confess all that action of the Law and change made by it, which I mention, as being a known truth beyond Controversie; only he thinketh that the name of Justification is to be given to no act but a Judicial Sentence, which I call, the most perfect fruit of Justification. Indeed I am ashamed that I spake so strangely of so safe and familiar a Truth, as if it had been some new discovery, when all that are versed in Politicks and Laws may discern it to be so obvious: but the reason was, that I had not read any thing of it in Divines as to our present case.

Before I come to Mr. K., let me tell the Reader my thoughts of Remission more fully. Pardon actively taken is an act of God. Passive pardon is the terminus or effect of that act. Pardon Active, is 1. Mentall, in a more imperfect, diminutive, and less proper sense called Pardon: As when a Prince doth pardon a traitor secretly in his own thoughts and resolution only. This is applied to God speaking after the manner of men (in which manner we are necessitated to speak of God:) and it is not (as Mr. K. imagineth) to be conceived of by us as being the same with his Decretum de futuro (so far as we may conceive of Gods Immanent acts as divers:) though it be but the same act that receiveth these divers denominations.
nations from the diversity of the objects. 2. The second Active Pardon is Signal, Legal and Constitutive; which by signifying God's Will, doth Legally constitute us pardoned, by causing our *Fas ad Impunitatem vel Liberationem*, i.e. by dissolving the Obligation to punishment, or by taking away guilt. The action or causation of this pardon, is but such as is that of every *Fundamentum* in causing its Relation. 3. Pardon taken actively also may signify the very Grant of the act of Pardon (whether particular or general, absolute or conditional) that is, the act of Legislation (in our case) whereby the Law of Grace is formed, as the remitting Instrument. This goes before that forementioned; as being the causation of that *Fundamentum*, which in time causeth the Relation aforesaid. 4. The Promulgation or Proclamation of this Law of Grace, or Act of Oblivion, may also be called Pardon. This Legal pardon is an Act of God as *Restor supra Leges* in respect to the old Law whose Obligation it dissolveth; and it is the Act of God as Legislator in respect of the Law of Grace which dissolveth the Obligation of the Law of Works.

Accordingly Pardon in a Passive sense, is taken as many ways. 1. With men for the effects of mental pardon in the heart and mind. 2. For the *Fas ad Impunitatem*, or the Dissolution of the Obligation to punishment, caused by the second act. 3. For the Law of Grace, or the promise itself. And so the pardoning Instrument of a King, is commonly called a Pardon. 4. For the hopeful Relation or state that he is in that hath pardoned offered him on very easy and reasonable terms (as for the Acceptance with thanks.) I think all these senses the word is used in the Scriptures; I am sure in Writers and common speech it is so. Now it is easy to discern that all the rest are but imperfect pardons, and so called in a diminutive sense, except only the second, which is the full and proper pardon. 2. All this I speak of Pardon in Law sense, the same with that which I call Justification constitutive (or but notionally differing:) But besides all this there is Pardon and Justification *per sententiam Judicis*, which these are but the means to, and which is the most perfect of all. But note that as the word Justification is most proper to [the sentence:] So the word [Pardon] is most proper to the Civil or Legal act that goes before Judgement. 3. And as God pardoneth, 1. as *Restor supra Leges* by Donation and a new Law, 2. and as Judge by sentence: so 3. also as the executor of Law and sentence or his Will: And so pardoning is but Not-punishing. Where note 1. That this sometime may be before and without the first, by mere providence: and so wicked men are pardoned without a promise, in such measure as God abateth and forbeareth punishing them. 2. That in our case this executive pardon *quod initium* presupposeth the first Legal pardon, and *quod complementum* it presupposeth the sentential absolution. 3. Note that this sort of pardon hath divers degrees, according to the degrees of any due penalty which is remitted: and so may alter. So that in a word, all pardon is of one of these three sorts. 1. By God as Author of the New Covenant, giving Right to Impunity. 2. By God as Judge absolving. 3. By God as executing.

All this being premised our question is, which of these it is that Scripture ascribeth to Faith, and is called Remission, or Believing, or Justification by Faith? Some say, It is only God's mental pardon: Some say, It is none of these, but a Declaration to the Angels in heaven, who is Just. Some say, It is none of these, but a Manifestation to our consciences (as some speak) or a sentence of God in our hearts (as others speak.) Some say, It is *ipsa Impunitas*, or non Punire (as
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Twice sometime, or nole punire, as other times.) I think it is the Dissolving of
the obligation to punishment, or the giving us a jus ad liberationem vel ad imputa-
tatem, or God's remitting his juss punendi: Where the immediate terminus is the
Dissolution of the obligation, or our Debitum liberationis, vel juss ad imputatatem,
and the remote terminus (which is yet connoted in the term Pardon, as essentially
necessary) is Impunity itself, or actual liberation from punishment, or non-
punire. And withall, as in man a mental Remission goes before the actual Sig-
nal, Legal Remission, so there is in God, a Nolle punire, and after the manner
of men, it may be ascribed to God, as when beginning when the Law remitteth,
and the sinner is a capable subject, because it cannot be denominated Remission,
but by connotation of the object, and that must be, when there is an object it:
And so after the manner of men, we attribute it to God, as an act which in time
he is moved to by an Impulsive cause, viz. the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ:
though strictly we use to say, there is nothing ab extra can be an impulsive cause
to God: Much more then this I have said for explication of this Point in pri-
ivate Papers to some Learned Friends; but this may suffice for the right under-
standing of what here passeth between Mr. K. and me. And now I proceed to his
words.

1. He acknowledgeth the Promulgation of the New Covenant to be a Tran-
sient act: It is the same Instrument of God that is called his Covenant and his
Law here. And as it is a Law, the term [Promulgation] doth most fitly agree
to it. And I doubt not but either Mr. K. implicit Legislation (perhaps he mis-
stakes the terms for equipollent) or at least he will as freely acknowledge that a
Transient act. But he faith, 1. That [this Covenant hath an odde empty mor-
all action.] Let any man that reads these words of this Learned man, judge
whether I be not excusable for that censure in the Preface to the Appendix of my
Book of Baptism! A School Divine and a Chair man, and know no more the
nature of a Law, Covenant, or any Legal Instrument! A Divine, and an Ari-
starchus, and yet dare to speak such words of all the holy Laws and Covenants of
God! Why what doth this man study and preach, that thinks so basely of Gods
Laws? The Moral action of the Law of Grace or Testament of Christ he calleth
[an odde empty Moral action:] Yet it is like he knows that Commonwealths are
chiefly upheld and ordered by Laws, Contracts, Conveyances, &c. and conse-
quently by actions of the same nature. The whole body of the Commonwealth
and each member of it, do hold their Estates, Liberties and Lives by such odde:
empty actions. Take away the odde empty Moral action of Laws, Testaments,
Obligations, Deeds of Sale, Leafes, &c. and what is a Commonwealth, and
what a Rector, and what security have you of any thing you possess? or what or-
derly commerce among men? His next assertion is as desperate as the former,
that [by the promulgation of this Covenant, God doth as improperly give us
the Righteou[s] of Christ, or disable the Law to condemn us.] Could any
words (not certainly destructive to Christianity it self) have fallen from this
Learned man more unworthy a Divine? Doth not the Testament of the Lord
Jesus properly convey the Legacy? Doth not Gods Deed of Gift of Christ and his
Righteou[s] to us, properly convey? and doth not God properly Give thereby?
Why can a more proper way of Giving be imagnable? 1. If a man do prop-
perly give, by a Testament or Deed of Gift, then so doth God: But a man doth,
&c. Therefore, &c. 2. Where there is a plain signification of the Will of the
Donor to confer thereby the benefit on the Receiver, there is a proper Giving:
But
But in the Gospel-promise or Testament of Christ there is such a signification of the Donors Will: Therefore, Doth not an Act of Oblivion or Pardon properly give pardon to all that it pardoneth? Doth not any Act of Grace give the favours expressed?

2. And where he saith, that [God doth hereby as improperly disable the Law to condemn us.] I reply. 1. Nothing in the world can more properly disable the Law from effectual condemning us, that is, so as to procure sentence and execution, then a general Act of pardon, or then the new Law doth, which is in its very nature Lex Remedia, & obligationem ad penam priori dissolvit. Though still the Law as to its sense is the same, and therefore doth virtually condemn till the said dissolution. How can the Law of the Land be more disabled from effectual condemning all Traytors, for what is past, then by an Act of Oblivion, or a particular pardon under the Sovereigns Hand and Seal? 2. Yea this Learned man disputes against the very formal nature and definition of a pardon; which is to be an Act of the Rector freeing the guilty from punishment by dissolving the obligation. And certainly as the obligation itself is one of these [odde, empty Moral actions,] so must the dissolution of it needs be. Indeed Theologus est Jurisconsultus Christianus, a Christian Lawyer: and what a Lawyer he is that knows not the nature, use and force of Laws, is easy to be judged. I could wish men would lay by their over-bold enquiries into Gods Decrees and other Immanent acts, or at least, their vain preceedings to a knowledge which they never had of them, and study this intelligible and necessary part of Theology a little more.

But Mr. K. tells us that he will make all this strange doctrine [appear:] and how? Why [by considering that all here spoken of actions, is but of actions improperly so called, and such as cannot suffice to make a real effect.] Rep. Do you oppose [Real] to [Seignor nominal] or to [Relative?] If the former, it is such doctrine as I dare lay, no Divine will believe, no Lawyer, no understanding member of a Commonwealth, and I think, no Christian, that understands what you say. Think not the words rash, for I think him not fit to be accounted a Divine, no nor a Christian (supposing him to understand the matter) that will or dare maintain, That neither the curse of the Law, or threatening of the new Law, whereby so many are adjudged to Hell, nor yet the Testament, Covenant, Promise of the Gospel, whereby Christ and his Benefits, Justification, Adoption, Salvation (quod fas) are given, do any of them make a true change? But if you oppose [Real] to [Relative,] then I must tell you, that [Remission and Justification Passive] are no Real effects, but Relative; which I had thought you need not have told. The Act of Legislation and Promulgation makes a real effect; but the Fundamentum once laid, causeth but a relation. Do not you know that the very formal nature of all morality is Relative? What else is Equum, Justum, Moritum, Debitum, Fas, ets bonum morale, & malum, &c?

Again I must tell you, that you do not well to mention Promulgation alone, when I spoke of Enacting, or Granting, or Legislation, before Promulgation. I hope you take not both these for one. Nay indeed Promulgation is proper to a Law as it is obligatory to the subject, and so is necessary after Legislation, ad actualem obligationem: but a Law of Grace which doth conferre benefits, and whereby the Legislator doth, as it were, oblige himself, may be in force in some degree, without a Promulgation: because a man may be made capable of Right to Benefit without his knowledge, though he cannot be obliged to duty without his knowledge, except when he is Ignorant through his own fault.
Mr. K. For first, The Covenant justifies us, not by any act, but merely by the tenour of it, as a Law, not Agent, and many things in this kind are said to do. When there, I wis, is no action at all: Quantitas facit quantum: I hope no action; it doth is formaliter, not efficienter: Paternitas facit patrem: I know no action that ever was ascribed to Relation, it doth it formaliter, not efficienter: and so doth the Covenant not justify a Believer by any Act, let Mr. Baxter mince it as he will, a moral improper Action, but as his great Metaphysical Rabbies would speak aptitudinaliter, and this but extrinsice too; for we must not facit Jus tum of itself, but it must be behelden to many intervienient Causes.

R. B. 1. Thanks to inadvertency (as I suppose) it is here acknowledged that the Covenant doth justify, and that as a Law, which it doth, we shall see anon whether it can be any other way then that which I affirm. 2. But little thanks is due to this Author from the friends of Truth, for his discovery of the way of the Covenants justifying. [It is (after he) by the Tenour of its, as a Law:] True: How else should it be? [but not Agent] Not by a physical proper Action: that's true: But have laws, Testaments, Covenants, Grants, Pardons, &c. no Moral Action? Or is this moral so contemnable a matter, that a learned Divine should make Nothing of it? When all men's estates and lives depend on it here, and all men's Salvation or Damnation hereafter. But how is it then that the New Covenant justifies? Why he thus proceeds [Quantitas facit quantum]. I hope no Action: it doth is formaliter, not efficienter: Paternitas facit patrem, I know no Action that ever was ascribed to Relation, it doth it formaliter, not efficienter.] Reply. 1. I thought that [as] had been as improperly applied to a formal Cautelion, as [Aere] and that I may, at least, as fairly do the later, as you the former. 2. If this learned man do indeed think that the Covenant doth formaliter justify, as Quantitas facit quantum, Paternitas patrem, I shall the less repent that I was not his pupil: And if I knew who be his old Doctors: he here speaks of, I would never read them, if they be no better in the rest: nay, I would take heed of looking into them, lest they had a power of fascination: What is the matter that the Covenant doth inform? Gods Act, or man's Quality, Act, or what? What matter doth it concurre with to constitute the Compositum? Is not justizia that which formally maketh just? Is the Covenant the relation of Jus in the abstract? Why then doth not the denomination follow the form? Is it the Covenant quod explicat, quid sit justificatus? Or by which justus est id quod est? But let us make the best construction imaginable of Mr. K's words, and suppose that he only would prove the negative [what way it is by which the Covenant justifieth not, viz. not efficienter] and not [what way it doth justifie, viz. formaliter] yet I should demand, 1. What is then the use or purpose of his instances, or fore-going words? 2. What the better are we for his discourse, if he tell us not what way it is? 3. What cause will he make it if not an efficient? Will he say it is either Material or Final? I think not. But he saith, that [the Covenant doth not justify a Believer by any Act, let Mr. B. mince it as he will, a moral improper Action, but as his great Metaphysical Rabbies would speak, aptitudinaliter, and this but extrinsice too.] Reply. What reader is much the wiser for.
for this answer? Would you know whether _Feudis facit jusstum, ut forma, vel ut efficient?_ Why Mr. K. tells you, it doth it but _aptitudinaliter._ If so, then certainly, not _ut forma;_ for _forma aptitudinalis faciens informatum_, is a strange creature. It must then be matter or efficient. I would not think so hardly of Mr. K. as to imagine that he takes it for a Material cause; much less that he takes it for _Materia aptitudinalis_ _justificacionis actualis._ I hope such doctrine never drop from his Chair. What is left then, but that it be an efficient. And if so, is not all efficiency by _Actio_ of one sort or other? And moreover, how comes _Efficiens tam ut sum Aptitudinalis,_ to be _Efficiens Actualis?_ And if not _Actualis,_ how comes the effect to be produced, _vix._ The Believer to be Justified? But I dare not impose this _non-sence_ to Mr. K. Perhaps he takes the _Covenant_ to be no cause at all of _Justification?_ But that will not hold neither? For he plainly faith, that _[the Covenant justifieth]_ twice here together. And sure _justifieth_ signifies some _Cauation._

Yet he amuseth me more by adding _[and this but extrinsice too.]_ Why, who is it that hath found out another _Justifying_ efficient, but onely the extrinsical? By this I see he takes it not for matter or _form;_ for they are not extrinsical. But is not the _Law_, the _Jury,_ the _Advocate,_ the _Judge,_ each of them an extrinsical efficient in justifying every man that is justifieth in _foro humano?_ It may be Mr. K. hath respect to the justification of _Conscience:_ But doth he think that there are not extrinsical efficienters, that do more properly and more nobly justify then our consciences do? Then let man be his own _pardoner_ and _justifier,_ and be preferred before the _blood of Christ,_ the _Law,_ the _Advocate,_ and the _Judge_ of _Believers._ I think it is no disparagement to our _Glorious Judge,_ that he will justify us extrinsically. _Conscience_ which justifieth (in some _sense_ intrinsically, doth it by so low an _Act,_ by so small _Authority,_ that it is very doubtfull whether it be fit to call that _Act_ either _Constituitive_ or _sentential_ _justifying;_ so great is the _Impropriety:_ _Of which I have spoke more fully elsewhere._

If Mr. K. had named some of those _Metaphysical Rabbies,_ and been guilty of naming as it were the _Chapter_ and _Verse_ (of which crime he accuseth me) I should the better have known whether he say true or false, when he tells us that they would say the _Covenant justifieth_ _aptitudinaliter,_ and not by any _act._ Its true that the _Covenant justifieth,_ _ut signum voluntatis Divinae per hoc Pecessit remissit._ And had he said that it is _signum Aptitudinale_ to men before they believe, and _signum Actualis_ after, there had been some _sense_ in his words, though yet they had been defective of _Truth_ or _Fitness:_ For they are _signum actualis_ to millions of the unjustified, though not _signum actualiter justificans._ But it is _Believers_ that are actually justifieth, of whom he speaks expressly: and therefore he hath some other meaning, what ever it is.

Yet if Mr. K. had denied to the _Covenant_ in _justifying,_ a proper _Physical act_ only, we were agreed; But he denieth _[an improper moral act]_ as he tells me, I mince it: when if I should do, I should expect to be told, that I were a very singular man indeed: For I doubt not but this _Learned man_ hath read many a _large volume_ of _Politics,_ and particularly _de Legibus,_ and there read their _Discourses de Legum actionibus,_ viz. _pretendere,_ _probibere,_ _praemiere,_ _punire._ I doubt not but he had read many a _large volume_ of the _Civil Law_ in _special,_ and therein of the _Nature_ of _Obligations_ of all sorts: (For I would not suppose him defective in his reading of any thing.) And after all this for _Orthodox a man_ to deny _[a Moral improper act]_ to _Gods Laws,_ and to _all Laws,_ and
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therein differ from all the Lawyers and Divines that ever the world knew (so farre as I can learn) is singularity indeed! Yea and never yet to write one Volume of his Reasons against all the world, that we might be undeceived? Seriously I wonder what he thinks of Gods Laws, Covenants, Promises, Testament, and how he preache them, yea or believeth them, or what work they have on his soul, who takes them to have no Moral improper Action? I should think such a manus Physicus were a strange man to make a Divine. But let us hear his reason:

[For Factum non facit jutum of it self, but it must be beholden to many interventient Causes] 1. It seems to be here granted that Factum non facit jutum internervientibus aliis Causis: And if so, it is an efficient; and if so hath some kind of Action.

2. Negatur sequela: What if the Covenant justifie not nisi internervientibus aliis quibusdam Causas? Doth it thence follow that it hath no moral Action? And we must speak non sene to say, that it justifieth but Apudinalia tert 3. I deny that there is any other Cause doth interne between the Covenant, and the Effect. A Condition on mans part must be performed before the Law or Covenant of Grace will Actu Causae, i. c. Justificare. And this Condition hath its Causes: But Remission and Justification have no intervening Causes.

I have in Answer to other Reverend Brethren so fully and distinctly laid down my own thoughts of this whole business, viz. of the several forts of Righteousness, and of the nature of each, and the Causes, that I will suppose I may be excused that I do it not here. Only I may tell Mr. K. that I take Righteousness as now in Question, to be a Relation (whether predicamental or Transcendental, we will not now dispute; but I suppose it is the later) And as Relation is so small or low a Being, that it is by some reckoned between Ens & Nihil, so the way of its production must be answerable; and must be by as low a kind of Action. Yet if it have any kind of Being at all, it must have some Cause, and that must have some Action. And therefore Rabbi Keckerman saith, Fundamentum idem significat quod Efficiens; Terminus idem quod finis. I suppose Mr. K. will acknowledge the Caution of procatarckick Causes, objectum, occasio, meritum: and yet will finde these efficient to have but an improper Action (at least some of them) as well the Fundamentum hath in causing a Relation. Besides all this, it is found no easie matter to reduce all Politicall Notions to the Notions of Logick or Metaphysicks; and some think that when we speak of Politicks, we must speak in the terms of Politicks, and that it is an unfruit or imposible attempt to speak there in the strict language of Logicians, though I am not of their minde in the later.

But suppose that I had granted all that Mr. K. hath hitherto said: What is it to that which he shou'd prove? He undertakes to prove, 1. That the Covenants Action (as I call it) is [an odd, empty, Moral Action] and so cannot make this Effect: But he hath not yet proved, that the Relation of our Righteousness may not result from the Covenant, as its Fundamentum, though without a proper Action; as soon as the Condition is performed on our parts to make us fit Subjects. 2. He undertakes to prove, that [by the Promulgation of this Covenant God doth as improperly give us the Righteousness of Christ, and disable the Law to condemn us, because all here spoken of Actions, is but of Actions improperly so called] But dont he indeed think that Legistation, or Promulgation, or Covenant making is but Improperly called Action? If he do, I will not waste time in such a work as the Confuting him is.

Lastly,
Lastly, If his Argument be good [We are not properly justified by an Action improperly called Action: But the Action of the Covenant is Improperly called Action: Therefore, &c.] then it will follow that we are not properly Justified by any Action of God. For it is generally held, that [Action] is not properly applied to God, but Analogically, and after the manner of the creature. I think this first Argument of Mr.K. deserves no more answer.

§. 36.

Mr.K. 2. God is not properly said to Justify us by this transient Act of the Covenant: For either he Justifies all, or only some. Not all: for all I hope are not justified: not some more than others: for the New Covenant makes no difference of itself: and so God justifieth none by it.

§. 36.

R.B. 1. Either you mean, that [it is not by the Transient Act Alone that God Justifies] or [not by it at all.] If the former, I confess it, because the Moral Act which followeth doth intervene to the production of the Effect. It is not by the transient Act of Generation alone, that Parent causeth filiation. But it seems you take it in the later sense, and so it is false. Though the Fundamentum do non modo causare Relationem, idque immediate, yet that Act which causeth the Fundamentum, doth properly Cause the Relation too.

2. I seriously profess that it seems to me a very sad Case, that any man that is called a Divine, or a Christian should argue, and that so weakly, and so wilfully against all the efficacy of God's Testament, Law or Covenant in conveying to us the saving Relative benefits of Christ! If it were only (as some Divines that I deal with) that he acknowledged the thing, and denied only the use of the Name of Justifying to the Act of the Covenant, it were a smaller matter: But it is Remission of Sin itself; the giving us Christs Righteousness, the disabling the Law to condemn us, that he speaks of, as you may see before: and so he here dares to conclude, That God justifies none by it. To this lamentable Dilemma here brought for proof, I say, 1. Conditionally God Justifieth All by his Covenant, at least All to whom it is Revealed. Actually he Justifieth only them that have the Condition. I oppose Actually to Conditionally, because that while it is but Conditional, it is not Actual in Law sense, that is, Effectual, though it is in Actus, so farre done as it is: And indeed it is not in strict sense that a man is called, Justified, while it is but Conditional: though yet it is a common phrase, because the Agent hath done it quantum in se, when the Condition is but Acceptance. 2. God doth Justifie some more than others by his Covenant, viz. Believers, more then Unbelievers: This methinks a Divine should not have denied. But he hath reason for his denial: and what's that? Why, he saith [for the New Covenant makes no difference of itself.] A strong Reason: It doth it not of itself: Therefore it doth it not at all. But I Reply: There is a two-fold difference made between men in these spiritual changes. The first is Real, when one that was an Infidel is made a Believer: and this is done by the Spirit and Word ordinarily; and it is but to prepare men to be fit objects for the Justifying Act: The second is Relative, when we are Pardoned, Justified, Adopted, and have a Right given
given us to other Benefits: This difference the Covenant makes of it self, the former preparatory difference being before made. To say, the Covenant makes not the first Real difference; Therefore it makes no difference, is ill arguing.

I would desire the Reader to try how Mr. K's argument will fit the Laws or Conveyances of men. If a Parent bequeath to each of his children an hundred pound on Condition they marry, to become due at the day of Marriage; according to Mr. K. you may argue thus: Either this Testament Giveth the Legacy to All, or to None: Not to All, if All marry not: Not to Some above others: for the Testament of itself makes no difference: Therefore it Giveth it to none. Or if a King give out a Pardon, or passe an Act of Pardon or Oblivion for all Traitors that are up in arms against him, on Condition they lay down arms, and Accept the pardon: Mr. K. would argue, it seems thus: Either this Act pardonneth All, or Some: Not All: All will not lay down Arms, and Accept it: Not Some only; for the Act makes no difference of it self: Therefore it pardonneth none. See what an Interpreters hand the Gospel is fallen into at Bitland!

§ 37.

Mr. K. 3. Man shall properly be said to justify himself (as being which Mr. Baxter looks on, as well he may, as Monstrum horeendum) For where there is a promise of a reward made to All, upon a Condition of performing such a service, he that obtains the reward, gets it by his own service: without which the promise would have brought him never the nearer to the reward: and thus a man visibly justifieth himself by Believing, and more a great deal then God doth justifieth him by his Promulgation of the New Covenant, which would have left him in his old Condition had he not better provided for himself by Believing, then the Covenant did by Promising.

R. B. How much have I been too blame, in my indignation against poor ignorant Christians, for taking up the abjur'dest Antinomian fancies so easily! When even such Divines as this shall use such reasoning as I here finde!

1. I deny the Consequence, as being verba somniatoris.

2. I think, I shall anon shew, that himself is undeniably guilty of this Consequence, which here is called Monstrum horeendum.

3. For his reason, 1. Its pity that he cannot distinguish between a Cause and a meer Condition: Where he faith [he that obtains the reward gets it by his service]: I say, it is here By it, as by a Condition sine qua non, but not By it, as by a Cause. 2. And its pity that any Divine should not distinguish between service and service. There is a service which is operari, or some way profitable to him that we perform it to; which therefore may oblige by commutative Justice to reward us: and here the Reward is not of Grace, but Debt: and the Work is a Meritorious Cause, properly so called. There is a Work which is a Means of Moral-natural Necessity (on terms of Reason and common honesty) to our orderly participation of a Benefit freely Given: As if a Traitor shall have a pardon
don on Condition he will Accept it, and come in: Or as if a Woman-Traitor should not only have pardon and life, but also be Princes, on condition she will marry the Kings son, that hath Ransomed her. Here the act may improperly be called service, because Commanded: but properly and in its principal Consideration, it is a necessary reasonable means, to her own happiness: And this act is but a meer Condition fine quia non, of her Pardon and Dignity, and no proper Meritorious, or efficient Caufe.

4. What a dangerous reasoning is this, to teach men proudly to thank themselves for their pardon and happiness, and deny God the thanks! To say [God's promise would have brought me never the nearer the reward, had not I believed: and I did a great deal more to Justifie myself by Believing then God did by his Covenant.]

5. Nay, I would desire the Reader to observe, what shift Mr. K. hath left for himself to disclaim this wicked Conclusion: Is there any of the Premises which he doth not own? 1. I hope he will not deny but the Promise of pardon and salvation is made to all that hear it, on Condition, they will Repent and Believe: 2. If he regard not better proof, I hope he will believe Dr. Twis (to oft repeating it) that salvation is given per modum promiss. 3. I hope he believes, that without believing, the Covenant would not have brought him to salvation. Must not this man then conclude on his own principles, that [he wisely justifies himself by believing?] and more a great deal then God doth justify him by his promulgation of the new Covenant, which would have left him in his old Condition, had he not better provided for himself by Believing, then the Covenant did by promising.] I am loth to give these words to bad an Epithete as is their due. Why not any Traitor say the like that Receives a free pardon? Or a beggar that Receives a free alms, when Receiving or Accepting is the Condition fine quia non of their attaining and possessing it?

6. The Gospel hath a promise of Faith itself to some: and this Faith is Caused by the holy Ghost: Therefore it is still God that provideth for the Elect, better then they provide for themselves, howsoever such disputers may talk. But we must not therefore confound the nature of God's Gifts, nor their Causes or way of production. The Spirit gives us Faith first, which is our Condition, and makes us capable objects or subjects of Justification: which being done, the new Law of Grace doth immediately Pardon, Justifie and Adopt us: which way then doth Mr. K.'s desperate consequence follow? Or what shew of ground hath it? It seems if this man had forfeited his life, if a pardon were offered him but on Condition that he would Take it, and say, I thank you; he would say, he did a great deal more to his own pardon by Thanks and Acceptance, than the King that granted it, did by his Grant; because the Grant would have left him in the old Condition, had he not better provided for himself by Thankfull Acceptance, then the King did by his Pardon.] Yea and in our Case the Acceptance is Given too, though another way. I confess my decessation of this disputing, is beyond my expression.

Zwicky in 1 Joh. 1 loc. de Remiss. p. 41. 42. faith, Baptism is not perpetually a visible Instrument by which Remission is offered [Verbum autem perpetuum est tale Instrumentum. Verbum or non Bapstismus, et illud proprium & perpetuum instrumentum per quod perpeuo pecatorum remissio nobis offeriur & donatur (io multitudes more) And in compend. Thol. p. 764. Per Evangelium Deus gratias Justifica.

§. 33.
§ 38.

Mr. K. It's clear in this case of the New Covenant, as in that of the Old: The Covenant ran. In the day thou earest thereof, thou shalt die: This was Gods Threat: I pray who brought death into the world, God or Adam? Just so in the New Covenant, Believe and be Justified: Who justifies the Believer, God or himself?

Turpe est doctori cum culpa redarguit ipsum.

§ 38.

R. B. Never let any cause be thought so bad, but that it may have the greatest confidence to credit it with the world. [Its clear] faith Mr. K. in the beginning, and with his proverbial Poetry, he triumphantly concludes. But if ever man met with weaker grounds of such triumph and confidence, in a man of such learning, he is of larger experience then I am.

1. To his first Question, I Reply: Adam brought death into the world as the Deliverer, God as the Legislator, making it Due to him, if he sinned, and as the Judge, sentencing him to it for sin; and as the principal Cause of the Execution. But Adam was the culpable Cause.

2. To his second Question, I say, God justifieth the Believer, as Legislator, and as Judge, and as Reform supra Leges; and as Donor or Benefactor. And the Believer is not so much as the Merit of his own Justification, as Adam was of his Condemnation. Did I think that any Learned Protestant had not known this? That he hath his Condemnation by his Merit, and his Justification without his Merit, upon the performance of that Condition which is the Acceptance of Christ that hath Merited it for us? That Death is the wages of sin, and Eternal Life the Gift of God through Jesus Christ?

3. But again, I admire what the man means! Whether he own the wicked Conclusion [Man justifieth himself] or not? For he makes it to be the Consequence of this tenor of the Covenant [Believe and be Justified] And dare he say, that the Covenant doth not say, Believer, and be Justified? Yea nevertheless, though it also give faith.

§ 39.

Mr. K. That first born of Abominations in Mr. Goodwins phrase is unluckily laid at Mr. Baxters own door; and it may appear it is not wrongfully fathered upon him, by that very argument which he undertakes to answer, and doth well enough for so much as is express, but there is more implied in it.

§ 39.

R. B. 1. [Unluckily] must be interpreted [by false accusation] I expect to have such unlucky hands lay more such abominations at my door.

2. Mr. K. confesseth, that I well enough answer the Argument for so much as.
§ 40.

Mr. K. That the Promulgation of the New Covenant was from the beginning:

Many men shall not be justified till towards the end of the World.

No man till a long time after the Promulgation: Therefore not so much by God's Promulgation of the Covenant, as the man covenant that performing the Condition, which is the Immediate Cause of it, and therefore he justifies himself, and that more then God in the New Covenant.

§ 40.

R. B. I. What is here added as implied to that which he confeffeth, that I well enough answered? Let him tell that can.

2. How can he prove that Adam was not justified till a long time after the Promulgation of the New Covenant? A bold affirmation, me thinks.

3. The Consequence is a putid non sequitur: What shew doth the man bring to make any man believe his Consequence, but the bare Credit of his own word?

4. What a strait doth this Disputer bring himself into? He must either say, that the Gospel or New Covenant doth not promise Pardon and Justification on Condition of Believing. (And is he fit to preach the Gospel that would deny so great a part of it.) Or else he must hold his wicked Conclusion, That man justifies himself, and that more then God in the Covenant. And for ought I can understand by him he means to own one of these.

5. The ground of all this rotten doctrine, is another notorious errour here expressed, N. That [men performing the Condition is the Immediate Cause of his Justification:] when it is properly no Cause at all. A Condition may sometime be also a Moral Cause, i.e. when there is somewhat in the excellency or nature of the thing Conformed, to move the principal Causer: But such a Condition as is purposely chosen for the abasing of man: and the honour of free Grace, and confifteth but either in Accepting a free Gift, or in not rejecting it again, or not spitting in the face of the Giver, this is no Cause, but sine qua non. It seems, this Learned man hath too arrogant thoughts of his own faith, as if it were the Immediate Cause of his Justification, and so he justified himself more then God by his Covenant.

§ 41.

Mr. K. As for instance: There was a Law made in Queen Elizabeth's time, That every English man having taken Orders in the Romish Church, coming into England, shall suffer as a Traitor: That English man, which having taken Orders in the Romish Church, comes now into England, and is condemned, hath not so much reason to charge his condemnation on the Queen, as himself.
§ 41.

R. B. That is because he is the culpable meriting Cause. Are we the Deservers of pardon?

§ 42.

Mr. K. The Law condemns him; but she doth not who made the Law, who died many years since: yea the Judge who pronounced the sentence doth not so properly do it as the Seminary himself: No nor the Law, as the Priest himself; who had been minded to have secured himself, might have done it at his pleasure, stayed at Rheines or Doway, and condemned the Law of Tyranny; yea and avouchs all those that suffered by it as Traitors to be really Martyrs. The case is the same, though in a different matter.

§ 42.

R. B. 1. You confess here that the Law condemneth: and then no doubt it justifieth too.

2. Where you say, [Shee doth not that made the Law] I say, that is because the Law doth operate or cause, as it is a sign of the Will of the Rector, to constitute that she had power to constitute. Now when the Queen and Parliament were dead, they had no power to oblige them that should live after them, much less if contrary to the Will of their successors: Nor yet had they power while they were alive, so to bind posterity. The Laws therefore were divolv'd into other hands, and now bindes as *signum volumatis Rectoris jam existentis: For it is his will that it should continue;* and that will animates it: Yet where any hath power, the signs of their will may be effectual when they are dead: Or else Testaments were little worth, and Legataries were in an ill case. But what's this to our case? God dieth not, and the Laws of his Kingdom lose not their force, nor change their Master, by the change of Governours. But if you had dealt ingenuously, you should rather have enquired, whether the present Rector and Master of the Law, may be said to condemn him that the Law condemns. And that methinks you should not deny. Yea, and it may be said that dead Lycurgus was a cause of the condemnation of surviving offenders, for all your bare denial.

3. Where you say that [the Judge who pronouncest the sentence doth not so properly condemn him, as the Seminary himself.] Seeing you yield that both condemn him, the Judge Sententially, and himself Meritoriously, and the question is but of the greater or less propriety in the word [Condemn.] I think it not worth the contending about. Yet *Appello jurisconsultos,* and if they say not that it is a more proper speech to say [The Judge condemneth him] then to say [He condemned himself by breaking the Law] then I am content the next time its acted to take *Ignoramus* his part, and confess that I know little of the Lawyers language. Indeed I still say it is the offender that is the culpable cause. Where you say that the case is here the same: I answer, then it seems you think you deserve a Pardon, as a thief deserves the Gallows. I durst not have called these cases the same.

§ 43. Mr. K.
§ 43.

Mr. K. IN a like matter take it thus. A man is found guilty of a felony; the Law saith, 

He shall be saved if he shall read: he reads and is saved: Gramercy, faith he, 

so my reading more then to the curtesie of the Law: and though he acknowledge pro 

forma that it is the curtesie and grace of the State to him, yet as the bad English 

man, God bless her Father and Mother that taught her to reade, else the Law would 

have been severe enough; he may be said to have saved himself.

§ 43.

R. B. 1. You say, [ It is a like matter.] But you say so much and prove so 

little, that you lose much of your labour, as to me. It is not a like 

matter. The Law for saving him that reads ut Clericus, was made partly to spare 

Learned men, because the Prince or Commonwealth hath need of them, and fu-

taineth a greater loss in the death of such then of the unlearned; and partly in a 

respect to the worth of their Learning, if not with some special indulgence to 

the Clergy for their Office, and to please the Pope. But God's Law of Grace 

pardonning a penitent, gracefull Believer, hath no such intent: God needs not us, 

as the Commonwealth needs the Learned. Besides the Law hath laid the con-

dition of escape in intellectual Abilities, without any Moral respect to the virtue 

of the party: but God hath laid it more in the mere consent of the Will.

2. But if you will interpret the Law of the Land otherwise, as if it were an 

act of purest grace, then I say, your Client with his Gramercy is an ungrate-

ful fellow, and your bad Englishman, is the picture of a bad Christian, indeed 

no Christian: But by your speeches I perceive that about these matters experience 

is a great advantage to the right understanding of the Truth; by the means 

whereof many an unlearned Christian knows more then some Learned Disputers. 

He that hath felt what it is to be condemned by the Law, and afterward pardon-

ed by the Gospel, and put into a state of salvation by Christ, doth not say as 

Mr. K. that he is more beholden to his believing then to God's promise, but heart-

ily ascribeth all to God. Faith is the act of an humbled soul accepting of Christ 

as he is offered in the Gospel. And can any humbled soul give thanks to his own 

Acceptance, more then to God's Gift? yea when the power and act of Accepting 

is his Gift also? If Mr. K. have an imagination that in every conditional Dona-

tion, there is more thanks due to the performer of the condition then to the giver, 

I dare say, he is an ungrateful person to God and men. If his father leave him 

all his Estate on condition he give a younger Brother 6d out of it, or that he give 

6d to the poor; it seems he will more thank himself then his father. If he had 

forfeited his life, and a pardon were given him, on condition he would Accept it 

thankfully and humbly on his knees, and that he would not spit in the face of him 

that giveth it, nor seek his death, he would give the chiefest thanks to himself. 

As for the phrase of [saving himself] he knows it is the Scripture phrase, 1 Tim. 

4. last. though pardoning ourselves be not.
Mr. K. Ye Mr. Baxter expresseth somewhat in his answer which makes up full measure of evidence against him. He saith, The condition being performed, the Conditional grant becomes absolute. Ergo, say I, He that performs the condition, makes the grant to be absolute, and so doth more to his justification than God, who made only a Conditional grant, and which notwithstanding he might have perished, yea more without his own act of believing. And truly whoever makes faith the Condition of the New Covenant in such a sense as full obedience was the Condition of the Old, cannot avoid it, but that man is justified chiefly by himself, his own acts, not so much by God's grace in imputing Christ's Righteousness, but more by his own faith, which I hope is his own act, though God's work.

§. 44.

R. E. 1. All's clear against me, if you be judge; but the whole charge depends on the credit of your bare word. That [Ergo, say I] is the strong proof. Your consequence is none, but a mere fiction. By [Abolure] I mean, it actually conferreth without any further Condition, when all the condition is performed. Its a hard case that a man so learned in his own eyes should be ignorant what a Condition is, in senju civili, vel legali. Were you not so, you would not still make it a cause; when (unless somewhat beyond the mere nature of a Condition be added) it is no cause at all. It is false therefore that the performer in our case makes the grant to be Absolute, if by making, you mean causing, as you before express your self, it is only a performing that, *fine qua Donatio non crit Actualis vel Absoluta.* It is the Donor (yec though he were dead before) that makes the Conditional grant become Actual or Absolute when the Condition is performed. And if it still lye in your stomach, that he performeth no new act to do this; I answer, it needs not: the first act of making his Testament, Deed of gift, Contract, Law, &c. doth all this. The Law or other instrument, is but the signer of his Will, and therefore conveyeth when and on what terms he will (in a case within his power.) If it be his will that this Instrument shall *usu conferret* presently and absolutely, it doth it: If *in dieu* and absolutely, it doth it: If *sub conditione,* it doth it: and in both the last cases, it is his will that the Instrument shall give no Actual Right till the day come, or till the Condition be performed: so that a Condition is no true cause of the effect: the non-performance of it suspendeth the act of the grant, but the performance doth not cause it; unless you mean it of a causa *futura,* which doth but *removere impedimentum,* so that if the day be twenty years after the Testators death, that the Legacy becomes due, or if the Condition be so long after performed, it is the will of the Donor that maketh that Instrument then convey Right, which did not before; because it works only *significando voluntatem Donatoris,* (and so when and how he expressed his will it should work. Would one think such trivial obvious points should be unknown to Mr. K.?

2. Where you talk of [faith being a condition of the New Covenant in the same sense as full Obedience of the Old.] I say your words [in the same sense] are ambiguous: *Quo ad rationem formalem Conditionis in generis, it is in the same sense a Condition.* But: it is not a Condition of the same species. It differs in the matter;
[III]

matter; one being the humble thankful Acceptance of Christ and Life freely restored and given; the other being a perfect fulfilling of a perfect Law: the ends are different: One is to obtain part in Life purchased by Christ, when we were undone by sin: the other to maintain continued interest in the felicity first given by the Creator: One is to abase the sinner by self-denial, and to extoll Free-grace; the other was to obtain the Reward in a way as honourable to man, as he was capable of. More differences might easily be added.

3. Let the Reader mark what our Question was [Whether God Pardon or Justifie us by the Covenant grant?] and whether Mr. K. hath now carried it? It was all this while maintained, that the performer of the Condition, is not Justified so much by the Covenant as by himself: Now it is come to these terms: [Not so much by God's Grace in imputing Christ's Righteousness, but more by his own faith.] He seems to me to yield, that we are as surely justified by the Covenant, as by God's Grace imputing Christ's Righteousness.

§ 45.

Mr. K. Yet say I against Mr. Baxter 2. That faith is the Real effect which God works, by a Transient act on a person whom he justifies.

§ 45.

R. B. You are resolved, it seems, it shall be against Mr. Baxter whatever you say. But what Rational Animal besides your self can tell how this is against me? If it be against me, is either Directly or Consequentially. If Directly, then I have somewhere denied it, or spoke the contrary: Shew where and shame me. If Consequentially, why is there no hint given us which way it makes against me? or against what opinion or words of mine? It seems it was intentionally against me, nor against my Doctrine but me: Your minde may be against me, but Truth is not against me.

§ 46.

Mr. K. That faith is a Real effect, others will admit without proving: Mr. Baxter who denies faculties and habits distinct from the soul, may be forced to yield it by this Argument. If faith be not a Real effect on the soul, then neither is any other grace, for all flow from faith, and consequently no real alteration wrought in Sanctification, and consequently no Sanctified soul Really differs from her self when unsanctified, nor nor more then numero from unsanctified worldlings; they are all alike. Taking it then that faith is a Real effect: 2. It is acknowledged it is wrought by God, and that not of our selves, it is the gift of God. And 3. that it is wrought by a transient act, as being a Real effect by God in Subject to extraneo. Let us see now how by this transient act whereby God works faith, he may truly be said to justifie us in time as he decreed from eternity?

§ 46.
§ 46.

Mr. K. 

Mr. Baxter objects against faiths being an instrument of our Justification; and that it is neither man's nor God's instrument. I shall make it appear to be both God's and man's in some sense, though in different respects, notwithstanding all he hath said to the contrary. Say he, If faith be an Instrument of our Justification, it is the Instrument of God or man: not of man; for man is not the principal efficient, he doth not justifie himself. I answer 1. According to his doctrine, man doth justifie himself, ut lupca. 2. That man is not the principal efficient of his faith, more than of his justification: it is God who must have this honour. 3. That man doth receive his Justification by faith as an Instrument, as shall be shewed hereafter.

§ 47.

R. B. 

His quarrelsome man wanting work, had a mind to take in this Controversie also, about faiths Instrumentality in Justifying: but what an unhandsome Transition he makes to draw it in, may be easily discerned. Let the Reader remember, that the thing which I deny is, that faith is an Instrument in
in the strict Logical sense, that is, an Instrumental efficient cause of our Justification: and that I expressly disclaim contending de nomine, or contradicting any that only use the word Instrument in an improper larger sense, as Mechanicks and Rhetoricians doe: so that the Question is de re, whether it efficiently cause our Justification as an Instrument? This I deny. And to his triple Answer I reply.

1. The first is of the old stamp; a gross untruth, needing no other reply then a denial. 2. The second if it be senfe, implieth the denial of this maxime, that [Instrumentum est efficientis principalis Instrumentum] and thence inferreth, that [as man may be his own Instrument in effecting faith, though he be not the principal cause, so may he be in Justification of himself.] If this be not the senfe of it (if contradictions may be called senfe) then I cannot understand it. But the denied maxime needs no proof: that man is his own Instrument in effecting his faith, needs no more then a denial to disprove it (speaking thus de homine, and not de parte aliqua hominis organica.) That man is not causa principalis in believing, is untrue; though God be Causaprima: May none but the causaprima be called causa principalis? then no creature is capable of using an Instrument. 3. His third must be considered when we come to the fuller proof which he referres us to.

§ 48.

Mr. K. But when he faith, Faith is not Gods Instrument, 1. I do not say it is properly, but it is his work, and by giving us faith he justifies us, as shall be shewed anon, he giving us that which is our Instrument, whereby we receive the Righteousness of Christ.

§ 48.

R. B. 1. Enow he undertook to prove it Gods Instrument, but now, he doth not say it is properly: and I will not contend against an improper term, when the thing is disclaimed. 2. Here is another touch upon the mystery, that [by giving us faith he justifies us] but we shall be shewed it anon: therefore I must not overhaftily anticipate it.

§ 49.

Mr. K. But it is as much his Instrument as the new Covenant is: for faith working in my heart, is that whereby God pronounceth the New Covenant to be of benefit to me for my Justification.

§ 49.

R. B. 1. If the New Covenant be properly Gods Instrument, and faith be not, then faith is not as much his Instrument as the New Covenant: But the Antecedent is true: Therefore, &c. The second member of the Antecedent Mr. K. now yielded. For the first I will appeal to all Lawyers and Politicians, or any that understands what an Instrument is, what Civil commerce is, and what a Law or any Contra豪宅 is, whether a Deed of gift, a Testament, or a Law be not as proper Instrumenta conferendi jus, constitendi Debitum, as is imaginable.
or as the nature of the thing constituted or conferred (Debitum) is capable of. In the mean time, I leave Mr. K. to examine it, by the common Canons and properties of an Instrument. 2. Faith is not [Gods pronouncing,] but your belief of what he pronounceth, and Acceptance of what he offers: Will you confound faith with its object? Divine Testimony is the object of faith, and you make it faith itself. 3. I know the Antinomians take faith to be [the belief of our Justification: or the perfection or apprehension of Gods love to me in special,] but so do not our modern Protestants. 4. If this be true doctrine, then wo to poor Christians that have no Assurance of their Justification: and then, how few have faith? For I think it is comparatively but a small number that have felt God pronouncing in their hearts, that the Covenant is of benefit to their own particular Justification: except by the term [of benefit] be meant, a conditional Justification, or a tendency or means towards their Justification; and so even ungodly men may know that it's [of benefit] to them for Justification (as Mr. K. phra-
secth it.) 5. Doth not Mr. K. shew here that the Truth sticks in his minde, and that he is fain to hide it in ambiguous terms. What can be mean by this saying [God pronounceth the New Covenant: to be of benefit to me for my Justification] but this [That the New Covenant justifieth me?] He would not openly tell us which way it benefiteth him to Justification, and yet be no efficient instrumentall cause of it.

§ 50.

Mr. K. And 3. it may be Gods Instrument notwithstanding his Argument: whereas the first is [for it is not God that believeth] nor needs it, say I: it is en-
ough that God maketh me believe, and so receive the Righteousness of Christ: yes God by making me believe gives me an hand wherewith to receive, opens my hand whereby I receive it: I alone receive, but these are Gods acts, and though God be not said to be-
ieve, be truly may be said to be the Author of my belief; my belief is an immanent act in me, and so denominates me the believer, a transept act, as from God, and denominates him only the Author of my believing: in me it is an adjunct, it hath to him only the re-
lation of an effect. For example, I throw a bowl: the motion of this bowl is more from me then the bowl, and I accordingly am said to have bowled well or ill: but the motion doth not denominate me otherwise then in the Agent, not the subject; and though I be said to bowl well, the bowl in this case is only said to run, not I. So the chief Author of my Believing is God, and he must have the glory of turning and framing and upholding and working all in my heart, as being the Author, Preferver and Finisher of my faith: yet I alon am said to believe, not God; though my faith be more properly Gods work, then it is my own: had not he begun it in me, I had no more believed in Christ, then the bowl would have run to the mark of it self, all the progress of my faith is from him, and to him be all the glory.

§ 50.

R.B. 1. One of all this is brought against my Conclusion, for he yieldeth that; (that our faith is not properly Gods Instrument in justifying) but it is to shew the strength of his wit against my mediums. If he yield it to be the truth which I maintain, the matter is the less if I fail in proving it: Or if one medium be defective, it is little matter, if the rest, or any one suffice. 2. What hath
MR. BAXTER'S SECOND ARGUMENT TO PROVE IT, NOT GOD'S INSTRUMENT THAT MAN IS CAUSA SECUNDA BETWEEN GOD AND THE ACTION, AND SO ASLID TO JUSTIFY HIMSELF. I ANSWER, 1. MAN IS INDEED CAUSA SECUNDA, BUT NOT BETWEEN GOD AND THE ACTION, FOR GOD DOETH IMMEDIATELY CONCURRE TO IT, AND MAN IS IN REGARD OF THE HABIT OF FAITH PURELY PASSIVE, NOT ACTIVE AT ALL, FOR THAT THOUGH OTHER HABITS MAY BE ACQUIRED, FAITH IS INFUSED BOTH FOR THE ESSENCE AND DEGREE. 2. MAN MAY NOT BE SAID BY HIS BELIEVING TO JUSTIFY HIMSELF, BUT TO BELIEVE TO HIS JUSTIFICATION, AND TO RECEIVE JUSTIFICATION BY BELIEVING, FOR THAT BY FAITH, AS IT IS GOD'S WORK, GOD DOETH JUSTIFY HIM, VIZ. DECLARES HERBY THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST TO BE HIS OWN; HE DOETH APPREHEND OR RECEIVE THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST BY BELIEVING, AS IT IS HIS OWN ACT, WHEREOF STILL BE IS THE SUBJECT, NOT THE AUTHOR, AS THE BOWL IS OF IT RUNNING.

R. B. 1. WHETHER GOD CONCURRE IMMEDIATELY TO ALL HUMANE ACTIONS, I HAVE NO MINDE TO DISPUTE: IF MR. K. WANT WORK ON THAT SUBJECT, HE MAY ANSWER LAUD. A DOM. BUT IT SUFFICETH ME THAT MAN ALSO IS AN IMMEDIATE CAUSE OF HIS BELIEVING. 2. WHETHER MAN BE PASSIVE OR NOT IN RECEIVING THE HABIT, IS NOTHING, THAT I KNOW OF, TO THE MATTER; AS LONG AS THE ACT WHICH JUSTIFIETH IS IMMEDIATELY BY HIM. 3. IT IS A GREAT UNCERTAINTY WHICH YOU AFFIRM SO CONFIDENTLY. YOU KNOW NOT BUT THAT THE SPIRIT OF GOD BY THE WORD, MAY EXCITE AN ACT OF FAITH BEFORE HE INFUSE A HABIT, AND BY THAT ACT (OR MORE) PRODUCE A HABIT. 4. AND SO THE HABIT MAY BE SAID TO BE INFUSED AS FROM GOD, AND ACQUIRED BY MAN TOO: AND IT IS COMMONLY GRANTED, THAT INFUSED HABITS ARE ATTAINED SECUNDUM MODUM ACQUISTITORUM.

TO THE SECOND ANSWER, I SAY, 1. FOR YOUR RECEIVING INSTRUMENT, WE SHALL SPEAK TO IT ANON. 2. SI SIDES EFFICIAT JUSTIFICATIONEM, TUNA CREDENS PER SIDEM EFFICIAT JUSTIFICATIONEM: AT SIES SI MODÔ INSTRUMENTUM JUSTIFICATIONIS CST, JUSTIFICATIONEM EFFICIAT: ERGO, &C. THE MAJOR IS EVIDENT, IN THAT MAN IS THE IMMEDIATE PROPER CAUSE OF THE ACT, THEREFORE IF THE ACT DOETH IT, THE AGENT BY THAT ACT DOETH IT. THE INSTRUMENT IS HIS THAT IMMEDIATELY AND PROPERLY INFEST IT. THE MINOR IS UNDENIABLE, SPEAKING OF A TRUE INSTRUMENTAL CAUSE: FOR THERE IS NO INSTRUMENTAL CAUSE IN ANY KINDE, BUT OF EFFICIENTS.

A HINT I PERCEIVE MORE HERE OF YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS GOD'S JUSTIFYING ACT, VIZ. WORKING FAITH IN US: BUT I WILL WAIT TILL THIS OPINION DARE COME INTO THE LIGHT.

3. I PERCEIVE ALSO HERE WHAT YOU TAKE JUSTIFICATION TO BE, VIZ. [DECLARING CHRIST'S
Righteousness to be his own] Right Antinomianism. 1. Will you tell us whether [Declaring Christ's Righteousness to be mine] do not suppose it to be first mine? Else it is the Declaring of an untruth. And if it were mine before, was not I just before? and so constitutivē justificat? 2. Why did you not tell us when and how that was done? And what was the act whereby God did constitute me just? Which is first to be known, and which you knew that I was speaking of. 3. Where, and to whom is it that [God declares this] you speak of? Only in Conscience, and not to others, no doubt. But I doubt not fully to shame (in due place) this Antinomian fancy, that Justification by faith (in Scripture sense) is but Justification in Conscience. 4. Many a soul hath justifying faith (of Assent and Consent) who yet doth not believe that Christ's Righteousness is their own. 5. May not other Graces declare Christ's Righteousness to be ours? (I know not whether it be supposed that you speak of Christ's Righteousness being made ours, but I will not digress to enquire further into it now.) 6. You do strangely affirm, that man is not the author of his own act (whether be the Subject, I refer to what is said): If by the Author, you mean, not the performs, but the Agent, the vital, voluntary self-determiner, then he is the Author; or else I could tell you of such unavoidable consequences, as you will be ashamed to own. If you be indeed one of those that think man a free Agent, is no more the author of his own acts, then your Bowl is, I shall fear, left you will think your self very excusable for all the evil you do, and therefore little care what you do: I shall be loath to trust a man of such principles, if his carnal interest carry him to do me a mischief. How many Philosophers or Divines are of your minde in this, that man is but the Subject and not the Author of his own act of Believing?

§. 52.

Mr. K. To his third Argument, that the Action of the principal Cause, and of the Instrument is the same, is true, and when he asks, Who dare say that faith is so Gods Instrument? I understand not any great danger in affirming, that God giving me faith, the habit and thereby the act of believing, concurs with my faith which he hath given in enabling me to receive Christ; he gives me an hand, stretcheth it out, and opens it, and puts Christ's Righteousnesse into it: Why is not my hand here his Instrument whereby he conveys Christ's Righteousnesse to me, as well or more than my own whereby I apprehend it?

§. 52.

R. B. If it be true, that the Action of the Principal and Instrumental Cause be the same, then it unavoidably follows, that man justifieth and pardonneh himself, when God doth it. For then when God effecteth our Justification, Faith, which is his Instrument doth effect it too: When God forgiveth us effactive, faith forgiveth us effactive: and consequently the immediate agent man, doth it too. 2. Again, I tell you, the place to examine your Receiving Instrumentality is anon where your self hath designed it. I may not anticipate you.

§. 53.
§ 53.

Mr. K. And whereas he saith, Fourthly, The Instrument hath an Influx on the effect, by a proper Caufality, which who dare say of faith? I answer, 1. That it hath a proper Caufality upon our Jufification paffively taken, that is, upon our Receiving the Righteousnefs of Christ. And no more need: for we make it an Instrument not to work, but to receive. But feventhly, according to him it hath more then the Influx of an Instrumental, that of the principal efficient upon our Jufification, as being that which makes this Conditional Grant in the Covenant to become Absolute: And all the benefits we receive by the Covenant is more to be ascribed to our faith, then Gods grace in the Covenant, which would have been of no advantage to us at all, had it not been that our faith came in and rendered it of use to us. Thus then we do not deprive God of his Glory in juftifying us by faith, though we ascribe Jufification to faith: for we ascribe our faith to God, and make our believing his work, which as it comes from him is an activie declaration, as in us a Passive refenting of his favour to us in Christ, of which we always may though we not actually assure ourselves.

§ 53.

R. B. 1. Receiving is either Properly, which is always Paffive: Or improperly, morally, impuritively, which is the Consent of the will when a thing is offered, and it is active, called Receiving, because it is neceffary to the Paffive proper Receiving.

In the former fentence, to Receive pardon and Jufification is nothing but to be pardoned and juftified: it is a mere Relative Reception. In the later fentence, faith itself is our [Receiving] If Mr. K. mean the former, when he faith, that [faith hath a proper Caufality upon it] I fay, His words are fcarce fentence. To have [Caufality upon] implicit a subject upon which there may be such Caufality: But the Reception of a Relation is no fuch capable Subject. If he mean only [a Caufality of that Reception] I fay, There is no natural proper Caufe of the Reception of a Relation, but that which caufeth the Relation it felf, by Caufing its foundation: though there may be other Caufes of the fitness of the Subject, yet that fitness effecteth not the Reception. Moral Caufes there may be besides; but this is not pleaded fuch. An efficient Instrument of the Reception of a Relation, (that is, Jufitia, vel juris ad impunitatem) we fhall believe it to be when we firft finde fentence, and then truth in that affertion. 2. And for the second kind of Receiving Chrifts Righteousneffe, it is Faith it felf. And to fay, that faith hath a proper Caufality on it felf, is a hard faying.

Your second Anfwfer is the meer repetition of a notorious flander, not onely unproved, but bewraying the groffe miifake of the Nature of a Legal Condition, as I have sufficiently fhewed, and will not waste time to recite.

I conclude therefore contrary to your Conclusion, that if you make faith the proper Instrument of juftifying, you make man his own pardoner, and rob God of his Sovereignty. Your reafon to the contrary is fuch as the Papifts bring to ex crude their doctrine of Merit: they fay, Chrif hath Merited for them a power of Meriting, and fo the glory redounds to him: fo you fay, [We ascribe our faith to God, though we ascribe Jufification to faith.] But you must needs ascribe it alfo immediatly to your felf, if you be the man that believes.

R 3

Again,
Again, you touch the way of God's justifying darkly: [As it comes from him (you say) it is an active declaration, as in a Passive referring his favour to us in Christ.] But, 1, do you mean, it is a Declaration Enunciative? Or merely signal? If the former, it is very false. To speak a Truth, and to Cause one to believe it, are not all one. If the later, then it seems you think God justifies a man, every time he gives him any Evidence of his Grace. And if so, then other Graces justify as well as faith; and then Justification is increased upon every increase of every Grace: But more of this when you come to it of purpose.

And Passive Refencing God's Love or Favour is an ill description of justifying faith, and not a little dangerous.

§ 54.
Mr. K. Mr. Baxter proceeds to take off an Objection. [But some would evade it thus: Faith, say they, is a Passive Instrument, not an Active.] I know not who say it, nor matters it much, yea it is needless to say so: But Mr. Baxter answer to this I conceive to be very unsatisfactory: For where he saith [i. Even Passive instruments are said to help the Action of the principal Agent, Kecker, log. p. 31. and he that faith faith doth so, in my judgment gives too much to it] I answer, That without offence it may be said, that Faith doth help the Action of the principal Agent, i.e. God in our Justification, God doing nothing in it without faith; I speak of such as are adults, or of years. 2. That Mr. Baxter must say so, for that according to him, faith makes God's Conditional Grant in the New Covenant to become absolute, and therefore doth the main of God's work.

§ 54.
R. B. 1. Let it be observed that Mr. K. takes it for needless, to say, Faith is a Passive Instrument; and therefore he must maintain it to be an Active Instrument, or none.

2. I doubt Mr. K. would have thought me near to a Blasphemer (supposing the interest of his Cause to have carried him another way) if I had said and maintained that mans Faith doth help the Action of God: 1. If God's Action were taken to be causa partialis (which I think Mr. K. doth not believe it to be) yet mans Action would help to produce the Effect, only by concurring with God's Action, but not properly, help God's Action; for it would have no influx into it. 2. If God's Action be causa totalis in suo genere, and mans Action subordinate to it, much less can mans Action be said properly to help God's Action. 3. But the truth is in pardoning sin, and justifying us, Mans action of believing is no Cause at all, and therefore no proper Help to God's Action. God hath no need of our help to pardon our sin. The performing of our Condition by Thankfull Accepting Christ and Life, is no Helping God's Action. But its strange to see how Mr. K. teels too and fro! Sometime he dare say it over and over, that if the New Covenant say [Believe and be Justified] and make our faith the Condition of our Justification, then a man justifies himself by believing, and more a great deal then God doth by the promulgation of his Covenant, and that he is justified chiefly by himself and his own acts, and not so much by God's Grace in imputing Christ's Righteousness, but by his own faith.] And yet now he dare
dare say, that man Believing doth help God in Pardoning or Justifying him.

3. And what's his proof? Why [God doth nothing without faith.] A strange proof! So every Matter, Object, Diffusio Materiei, or Condition fine quæ non, should help the Action of the Efficient. Sure Helping is acting, and therefore Effecting. So he may as well say, that the preparation of the soul for Receiving Regenerating, Sanctifying Grace, doth help the Spirits Action of infusing it.

4. As for his second Answer, that [I must say so too, for that according to me, faith makes Gods Conditional Grant to become absolute] I Reply, that this is an oft repeated slander of a hard fore-head, without shew of proof. If this be mine, it is either directly or consequentially. If directly, let him produce my words. If consequentially, let him prove it if he can. If he attempt it, it must be by this Syllogism, [He that faith, Upon the performance of the Condition, the Covenant becomes absolute, doth say in senfe, that the performance of the Condition, makes the Covenant become Absolutely, i.e. effects it: But M.B. faith the former: Therefore, &c.] Let him that knows no difference between an efficient Cause, and a meer Condition fine quæ non, believe the major. I know so much difference, that I dare say, it is false.

§. 55.

Mr.K. VV Hereas he faith [2. It is past my Capacity to conceive of a Passive Moral Instrument.] I answer, whatsoever Mr. Baxter may conceive, nothing is more obvious that many men at least are used by others meerly for blindness, to bring about their designs, and so do very much towards them, by doing nothing but standing still.

§ 55.

R. B. I Knew before I heard of your name, that the same thing which in senfe Physico is a Passion or Privation, may in senfe Moral, i.e. reputative, be Action or an Instrument. But I ever supposed that as it is Moraliter vel reputative Instrumentum, so hath it Moralium vel reputativum actionem. 2. That [some men are used by others meerly for blinds about their designs] this blinde work of Mr.K. doth partly perwade me.

§. 56.

Mr. K. VV Hen he faith [how can the act of believing (which hath no other being, but to be an Act) be possibly a Passive Instrument? Doth this act effect by suffering? Or can wise men have a greater conceit then this?] I answer that this Act is equivalent to suffering, as consisting chiefly in a reliance on Christs righteousness, without exciting our thoughts against it, captivating our thoughts to it, renouncing all thoughts of our own righteousness, yet all thoughts that are too apt to rise against it from the consideration of our own righteousness: having for the form it be an act, yet virtually this act is a suffering ourselves to be led by the Spirit of God, and by his Authority against the suggestions of our own reason.

§. 56
§. 56.

R. B. 1. Two things you have here to prove: 1. That the Act of faith is a suffering. 2. That by suffering it effecteth our pardon or Justification as an Instrumental Cause. For the former, you say [it is equivalent to suffering.] Reply 1. It seems then it is not equivalent. 2. Wherein it is equivalent? 1. As to its nature? That were a strange act. 2. Or in excellency? So it is more then equivalent to suffering. 3. Or is it as to its use and end? I easily grant you that the use of this Action is to make us capable subjects of pardon, or fit ob,acts for God's act, and disposed matter to receive Justification as Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge hath plainly and truly, though briefly taught you in his Sermon of Justification (think not much to learn of him in that, and other points there touched.) If you have a mind to call this Passio Reputativa vel Moralis, I will not contend with you: it being Condicio afficia ad Recepcionem prorsim requisitae. Doubtless the Reliance and Renunciation which you mention, are actions. 3. And where you say, that it is [Virtually a suffering our selves to be led by the Spirit, though it be an action for the form] I never heard before of an Action immanent which was virtually suffering; and that from such a Cause as Authority is: Sure it is somewhat more then such a suffering; and therefore it is with Logick to say, that it is Virtually suffering. Though as I said, if you have a mind to call it a Moral or Reputative Passion, I will not contend. 4. But then what a suffering is that you imagine it? I thought you would have come nearer the matter, and have said that it is Receptio Christi, vel Justitia donati: but you say, It is a suffering our selves to be led by Gods Spirit and authority.

2. But now I come to the great business, I finde you as much as a fifth: You had another Assertion to prove, [that this Act doth by suffering effect our pardon:] On this lay all the controversy: and of this I finde not a word. I pray you remember by the next to satisfie your Reader, that [this Act which is Virtually a suffering our selves to be led by Gods Spirit, and by his Authority against the suggeftion of our own Reason, doth by that suffering effect our pardon or Justification.] Nay, I thought if you had made it but a Receiving instrument, as you phrase it, that it had been the Receiving Christ or Righteousnes, and not the suffering our selves to be led by Gods Spirit and Authority against the suggeftions of reason, which (qua talis) would have been affirmed the instrument of our Justification? But you saw not what Roman doctrine this implieth.

§. 57.

Mr. K. VV Hereas he adds [4. And lastly, I believe with Schiller, that there is no such thing as a Passiue Instrument] I believe he hath seen a man often hold up a fire-flyovel to receive coles, which fire-flyovel is an Instrument, but in that case merely passive, and he hath seen questionles boys at trap hold up their bats to receive the ball, here their bats are Instruments, but merely Passive. What examples Burgerdicius or Keckermann's, is not considerable; What is it they mistook in their instances of Passive Instruments? Follows it there are none?
§. 57.
R. B. 1. THe Smith may call his fire-shovel, a Passive Instrument, and so your boy may do his hat. I will allow them both that name among Mechanicks, Rhetoricians, &c. but I shall not believe that Logicians should so call them, or that either of them is an instrumental efficient Cause, or do effect by suffering, till you have better proved it, then this put-off comes to. 2. I have found no reason yet in all the reading of your labours, to judge your Logick more considerable than Burgersticius and Kecckermans; or that you are likely to finde out fit instances, where they could finde none. 3. Callovius and many more are of the same opinion as Schibler in this.

§. 58.
Mr. K. BUt say you [the Instrument is an Efficient Cause; all efficiency is by action; and that which doth not act, doth not effect.] You have forgotten that the great Instruments of the Roman State, did all by doing Nothing. Unus homo nobis cum-stando restituit rem. Their strength, faith the Prophet, is to sit still.

§. 58.
R. B. 1. Such a thing I now perceive may be: for I think when you have here done all, you had done more if you had done nothing.
2. I answered enough to this before. What is the Consequences of doing nothing prove better, then if there had been Action, and thereupon you do call [doing nothing] by the name of [Action]? Is it therefore Action indeed? Or if you therefore ascribe a Causality to it, is it therefore a Cause indeed? I say again, as such are Moraller vel Reputative instrumenta, i.e. Cause efficientis instrumentales, sum Physic et revera non sunt 1 so morally and reputatively they are Agents, and therefore not to be called Passive instruments.
3. Let it be observed what a superficial kinde of answers Mr. K's Chair doth vouchsafe us? He durst neither plainly deny, that an instrument is an efficient Cause; nor yet that all efficiency is by Action; and yet satisfies himself with the touch of an alien instance, implying the denial of the later.

§. 59.
Mr. K. [I N deed (saith Mr. Baxter in the close) as some extend the use of the word Instrument, you may call almost anything an Instrument, which is any way conducive to the production of the effect under the first Cause, and so you may call faith an Instrument.] Belike it is Instrumentum quoddam vocatum, what you will in the Lawyers Latin, and you must be beholden to that to make the Novum Covenant God's Instrument in Justification. Instrumentum Novum for Testamentum Novum, say the Critics.
R.B. 1. These words I spoke, to signify my resolution, not to contend about words; and if any man will use the term Instrument improperly, and tell us his meaning, and not make it the efficient Cause of our pardon and justification, much less make the Papists believe, that in that notion lieth the very kernel of the Protestant doctrine about justification by faith alone, I am content such a man speak as he thinks meet, allowing others the like liberty. To this Mr. K. gives this learned answer [Belike its Instrumentum quodam vocatum, what you will in the Lawyers Latin]: Out of which words, or any yet spoken by him, if the Reader can pick an argument to prove faith the instrumental Cause of forgiveness or justification, let him make his best of it. A jest is readier than a good Argument.

2. It ill becomes any Preacher of it, to deny or jest at the instrumentality of God's Law, Covenant or Testament. It bewrayes that which you might with more credit have concealed. If God's Deed of Gift of Christ, Life, Pardon, &c. be any Cause of our Right to Christ, Life, Pardon, &c. then is it an instrumental efficient Cause, constituting that Right: (Let Mr. K. tell me what other cause it is, if not this.) But some Cause it is: Therefore, &c. Only as Relations have an imperfect Being, so the Causing of them is answerable to it. If God's Deed of Gift, Law, Covenant, Testament, be no proper instrument, then there is no such thing as a proper Instrument known in Laws, Politics, Morality, for the conveying of any Right. As say not faith, elev. Regiæ li. 6. cap. 6. n. 20. p. 330. Natura instituit voces & signa quasque Instrumenta & medias sine quibus non modo homo alteri non possit obligari. Not only are they certain instruments when used, but is commonly held that they are so necessary instruments, that by a mental Conception without words a man is not obliged to another. So faith Aleman, in 4. d. 15. q. 2. Jof. Angles in flor. 4. sent. q. de voce art. 1. difficult. 4. Armil. ver. promissio. Pær. de Arragon. 2. q. 38, art. 3, dub. 4. Mich. Salot. in 2. 10. q. 3. de domini art. 2. dub. 1. Lud. Lopez. p. 2. instr. conf. cap. 30. Emanuel Rodriguez part. 2. Sum. c. 27. Coeli. And its certain that conceptions give no Right to men, though the conceiver of a promise may coram Deo be obliged.

§. 59.

Mr. K. This were not worth the insisting on, but to show with what tools Mr. Baxter endeavours to break the works of so many eminent Master-builders, and with what formidable weapons he valiantly sets himself against those great Champions.

Sic dama Leonem

Infrequitur, auderque Viro concurre Nis Viro.

The miserable fate of poor Divinity! that must be put to scholl to Burger dictatorius and Keckermanns Logick! and be so beaten for greasy Jack Seaton! Had not Mr. Baxter been as they say he was dudumque, he had not set so high a price on these beggarly elements, as to let them make utramque paginant in this noble controversy.
R. B. Wether this merry Rhetorical Triumph were grounded on such a real victory as the man dreams of, or whether premises and Conclusion be any other then a meer Rapsody of windy ostentation, I must leave to the judgement of the impartial, understanding Reader. I confess they shew that he is not only unreasonable; for ridere is proper to a Reasonable Creature. I had thought to have given a particular answer to each passage in this Paragraph, but upon review I finde that the Replying to such like, hath occasioned more ironies and sharp passages then I dare approve; and therefore I think it belt to lay nothing to it, only to reminge him of these few things:

1. That I will be none of his adversary, where he argues only to prove me ignorant. It never came into my head to make it the Question, whether Mr. K. or I were the more wise or learned man? I have much more ignorance then he is aware of.

2. That yet I dare contend with him in point of veracity, if he use to do with others, as he doth with me, particularly to talk of [making utramque paginem] and to scorn at it no less then twelve times in five or six leaves, for my citing these Authors once or twice, and Scholler thrice in a whole book.

3. That all is not Divinity that such Theologues maintain: For I think he is not Theology in the Abstract: and therefore its possible to finde an error in such a man as Mr. K. without Schooling or bearing Divinity: Nor do I think that sound Theology would feel it, though he had a knock or two more.

4. That he proves out of Keckermann, or others such like, that two and two is four, doth not much abuse Divinity by it: Not he that cites them to shew that all efficiency is by Action, though as learned a man as Mr. K. deny it. Nor do I finde Mr. K. having recourse to the Bible to prove the contrary, viz. that there is efficiency without Action. And I think the Scripture Texts may be soon numbered by which he attempts to prove Faith to be the instrumental Cause of Justification.

§. 61.

Mr. K. He hath one Question more [But though Faith be not the Instrument of Justification, may it not be called the Instrument of Receiving Christ who justifies us? I do not (faith he) stick so much at this speech as at the former (we are beholden to you: some indulgence yet in this particular) Yet is it no proper or his expression neither. For, 1. the Act of Faith which is it that justifies us our Actual Receiving of Christ, and therefore cannot be the Instrument of Receiving. To say our Receiving is the Instrument of our Receiving, is a hard saying.] Be the Act of Faith the actual Receiving of Christ: Why I wonder may not faith be said to be the Instrument of Receiving Christ? Is faith only an Act? I had thought it had been an Habit? And though the Receiving be not the Instrument of Receiving Christ, as being the actual receiving of him; yet faith may very well be so called: as though my receiving of a book be not the Instrument of receiving it, yet the hand may without any great absurdity be allowed that name.

§. 61.
Argued, that if faith be the Instrument of Receiving Christ, then either the Act of faith, or the Habit: but neither the Act nor Habit. Therefore, &c. To prove that the Act of faith is not the instrument of Receiving Christ, I used the words that he here cites. What doth this Learned man but confute this by saying, that the Habit is the Instrument? [I had thought (faith he) faith had been a Habit.] Thus he confutes me, who argue that the Act is not the Instrument, by saying that the Habit is. I think he that is autodidact's need no much lament that he lost the benefit of such a disputant's terrors, if he be never in a more waking mood then here.

2. His Rhetorick is the best part of his answer. But when he prove that the Habit of faith so farre differs from the act, and both from the soul, as that the Habit may as truly or fitly be called the instrument of Believing or Receiving, as the Hand is of its Act or the effect? If his similitude would prove any thing it would rather be that the Faculty is the Instrument, then that the Habit is: which yet I finde him not here attempt: I think that the Habit of faith, and the act are not of so different natures as is the Hand and its act.

3. Let it still be remembred, that I do not much regard how this Question is determined (for which Mr. K. doth so humbly tell me, he is beholden,) it being much different from the former Question. For in the former, the term Instrument] is taken properly for an instrumental efficient Cause, in which sense I deny that faith justifieth: But here it is taken Metaphorically or Vulgarly, and not properly: For that which effecteth not is not an instrumental efficient Cause. And that which they call an Instrument of Receiving, is in Naturals but Dispositio materia, and in Morals, but Dispositio Moralis, vel Reputativum, vel Actus ad Receptionem passivum, proprium, verum necessarium; and in our present case, strictly nothing but a Condition. Now if any will be pleased to speak so vulgarly and improperly, as to call such a Condition, or Aptitude Moral or Natural [an Instrument of Receiving] so he do not build any unfound Doctrine upon it, I do again protest that I will not contend with him. But the Reasons why I thought it necessary for all that, to contradict the common Doctrine of faiths being the Instrument of Justification, I have fully manifested in answer to other Brethren.

But secondly, faith Mr. Baxter [The seed or Habit of faith cannot fitly be called an Instrument. 1. The sanctified faculty itself cannot be the Instrument, it being the soul itself, and not any thing really distinct from it, as Scotus, D. Obeliss, Scaliger, &c. Dr. Jackson, Mr. Pembell think, and Mr. Ball questions. 2. The Holiness of the faculties, is not their Instrument: For, 1. it is nothing but themselves rectified, and not a Being so distinct as may be called their Instrument. 2. Who ever called Habits or Dispositions the souls Instruments? The aptitude of a Cause to produce its effect, cannot be called, the Instrument of it. You may as well call a mans Life the Instrument of Acting, or the sharpness of the knife, the knives Instrument, as to call our Holiness or Habitual faith, the Instrument of Receiving Christ.] I answer, you proceed by certain steps, and to deny the Habit of faith to be the Instrument of Receiving Christ,
Christ, you say, 1. The sanctified faculty is itself cannot be the Instrument. And
2. What if it cannot? Whereupon the Habit of faith for a sanctified faculty? This is
that which sanctifies the faculties: The faculty is of one Species of quality, potentia
naturalis; faith which sanctifies of another, habitus. You are, it seems, now and then
out in your Logick, as much as you trouble us with it, and had need review your Burger-
dicius and Kekkerman. 2. How prove you that the sanctified faculty is the soul itself,
instead of the few Names you must use, I may bring you thousands that are against
it: and yet a few Reasons weigh more than all these great Names. If the faculty be
the same with the soul, then the Holiness of the faculty cannot be really distinct
from the soul, for that this Holiness is to be received into the faculties; and if no faculty be
really distinct from the soul, then there is no receiving into it anything really distinct from
the soul, and if Holiness be not really distinct from the soul, a holy soul, and an unholy one,
are not really distinct, and so you seem to imply in your second, when you say —

§. 62.

R.B. 1. Mr.K. yieldeth, if I am able to understand him, that the Act of faith
is not the Instrument of Receiving Christ: and he lays it on
the Habit. Before we proceed here observe,
1. That the Generality of Divines that plead for faiths instrumentality, say,
that it is not the Habit, but the Act of faith that justifieth: (I said so too when
I wrote my Aphorisms, taking it on trust, but I now recant it.) If that be so,
then they cannot (as they do) argue thus: [Faith is the Instrument of Re-
ceiving Christ and his Righteousness: Therefore faith justifieth as an Instru-
ment] because they speak of the Habit in the Antecedent, and of the act in the
Consequent; and so by [faith] mean not in both the same thing: and so there
are quatuor termini.
2. Observe, that it is commonly granted, that the Habit of faith is not al-
ways in act: as in sleep, and when we are wholly taken up with thoughts of an ali-
cene subject, and all the time of Infancy (according to them that think Infants
have the Habit of faith.) This being so, it must needs follow, that faith is not
always the Instrument of Receiving Christ, and of Justifying: (say perhaps,
but seldom comparatively) For the Causality of the Instrument is in Actio,
and faith is not always acting. If therefore faith justifieth as an Instrument, and
we are always justified, and yet faith be not always an Instrument, then either we
are not justified by faith, but some other way, at those times when faith acteth
not, or else cessante Causa non cessat effectus: which though in some cases it may be
true, yet here it cannot: because the effect being but a fii ad rem, a transcen-
dental Relation, it hath no nearest Cause, but its Foundation and Subject: and
when thofe ceased the Relation ceased: And none affirmeth that faith is a Re-
more cause of Receiving Christ, that is, Right to Christ (with his benefits.)
And if it were, yet the Fundamentum Relations must have the sustentation of a
continued Cause. But in the way that I affirm faith to justifieth, as a moral Con-
dition only (having no Causality) all these inconveniences, or rather contradic-
tions are avoided: For it being the meer will of the Donor, that createth the
nearest necessity of the Condition, and requires the Condition to such an end,
he may make either act or Habit the Condition, and may make the act the Con-
dition of Beginning our Right to Christ and Life, and the Habit continued, to
be the Condition of continuing that Right, even when the act is interrupted:
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and yet the effect may still continue, because the Will of the Donor, and the Law or Covenant which is his Instrument, do both continue; and it is they that are the efficient Causes.

3. Observe also, that both the man for whom Mr. K. is here so zealous, viz. Mr. Penwile, and many more, do make the Habit of faith to be nothing else, but our New Life, our Holiness of the renewed faculties, the Spirit of God in us, and that all Graces are in the Habit and seed but ones, and so accordingly it follows, that it is our internal Sanctification or Holiness that is the Instrument of our Justification: A Doctrine that I think these men will scarce own upon consideration.

4. Observe also, that hence it will follow, that it is other graces that justify instrumentally as well as faith: because they say, it is the Habit that is the Instrument: and this Habit is but one: not one Habit of faith, and another of Love, Hope, &c. but all one: and this one Habit justifies, even when men are Infants, or asleep, and do not act.

5. That which is now commonly called, the Habit of Grace, is in Scripture called, [the Spirit in us: ] and so the holy Ghost is made our Instrument of Justification.

Now to Mr. K.'s words here. In the words of mine which he cites, I do both indirectly, or in transtitu confuse a third opinion, viz. that the sanctified faculties are the Instrument, though the sanctity of the faculties be not: and directly I argue a fortiori, that if the sanctified faculties themselves may not properly be called the Instrument of Receiving Christ, much less can the sanctity of the faculties be so called: But, &c. Therefore, &c. Hereupon this learned man feigns me to think, or say, or imply, the Habit of faith to be a sanctified faculty; and with seeming seriousness falls a schooling me, and tells me, that the faculty is of one species of quality, and faith of another: yet proceeds in his dream as confidently as if he were waking, to tell me, that I [am now and then out of my Logick, and had need to review my Burgersdicius and Keckerman.] But would be a little rub his eyes, I would desire him to tell his Reader, where I did directly or indirectly say, that Faith is a sanctified faculty? And I would know of him, whether a man should not understand a matter before he make an answer to it!

Next, it seems, he expected I should have proved, that the faculty is the soul itself: And would not that have been as wise a Digression, and as Necessary, as is this of his? The Scope of my words was but this, q. d. [It is a controverted, doubtful point, Whether the Faculties are distinct from the soul, as Res & Res, and therefore not fit to bear such a weight as those that I oppose do lay upon the affirmative] (and my own opinion inclineth to the Negative: yet so as I dare not be so preposterous as confidently to interpose among so many learned men, and maintain my own opinion as certain truth.) As wise a man as Mr. K. (and in my opinion an eight at least above him) thought the like answer to be good in another case. Davenant, Determin. Qu. 37. pag. 166. Quid philosophantur voluntatem & intellectum esse duos potestatis, scil. d. dogma Philosophicum est, ab omnibus haud receptum, & Theologicus dogmatum firmamentum, ut firmamentum minimi idoneum. And he knows, that the two Questions, 1. Whether the faculties be realiter inter se distinctas? And, 2. Whether they be realiter ab anima distinctas? Use to stand and fall together in the Determination.

For the few names that he tells me I must: up, its like he may know that it were easy
case to give him a farre large ruster-roll, especially of the Scotifs. And as for
the thousands that he saith he may bring against it (no doubt he means Writers)
I confess plainly, that he hath so farre loft his credit with me, that I do not believe
him. For though I know they are many; yet I do not think he hath read many
thousands on all sides of that Subject. But if he have indeed read so many thou-
sand books of that one point, alas, how many hath he read in all? No wonder
if poor Burgerlaciua, Schibler or Suarez be despised by him. It may be that's the
reason that both the margin and Text of his book are so naked of quotations; he
having read so many thousands that he knew not which to preferre, or where
to beginne; or else would have few mens names to his Works but his
own (except as Adversaries) left they should share of the honour. Nay,
if he should have said or meant, that there are thousands that so write,
which others have read though he have not, I doubt he cannot prove
it true.

For his great weighing Reasons, I will honour them as soon as I can see them,
but he had little Reason to expect me to Reason that Case. If this be next
addes be one of his few Reasons, that weigh so much, I must tell him, Every man
to his minde. I doubt he overvalues his own Reasons: For my part, one thou-
sand great Names, yea one, will weigh as much with me, as this his Reason.
For, 1. I deny his Consequence, and say, that the Holiness may be Really di-
 stint from the soul, though the faculties are not; and that Holiness may im-
mediately inher in the soul without the mediation of faculties really distinct from
it. It had been case to have seen the necessity of giving some answer to this de-
nial. As wise a man as most I have (if I conjecture not amiss) and a publck
Professor in Oxford, and now resident where Mr. K. had his Chair, I mean
Mr. Wallis, saith thus: [And so, however it may be true, that a faculty or natural
Power may be so far the same with the soul, as that it differ only ratione ratioinatæ,
yet in a Habit we must of necessity grant a distinction ex parte rei: For where
there may be a real separation, and not only mental, there must needs be granted a
distinction in re.]

But what if I grant Mr. K's hardest Conclusion that Holiness is not Really di-
 stint from the soul, nor a holy soul from an unholy as [Really] is taken for a di-
 stinction inter Rem & Rem. We shall see anon what danger would be in it.
But then Mr. K. must be so honest, as not to persuade any that I therefore deny a
Real distinction, as [Real] is opposed to seigny, mental, called Rationis, Rela-
tive, or Denominative.

§ 63.

Mr. K. You say [The Holiness of the faculties is not their Instrument, for it is
nothing but themselves rectified, and not a Being so distinct as may be
called their Instrument.] But is it nothing but themselves rectified? I had thought it
had been the Rectifying of them, which Irest adesse & abesse line subjicii interitu?
and consequently it is not the faculties themselves. As well you may say, that the rightnesse
of a stick is nothing but the stick made right; and the whitenesse of the wall, nothing but
the wall made white. Quis tulerit Gracchos sye Graculos.
R.B. I. All that I assert is, that Holiness differs not from the faculties, as Res & Re; but as Res & modus. 2. I think the abstract hath no existence, but as in the Concrete, but is a mere Notion. Seeing therefore that is so, I think the proper Notion of a thing denominate, is to speak of it as in Concrete. 3. You did therefore too suddenly start up into your wondering interrogation, as if there were any contradiction between those two sayings! As if he that faith [a Rectified faculty: a white wall] did not as truly express the Rectitude, and the whiteness, as you that express them in Concrete! It is too grosse a fiction, if (as you seem) you would make men believe that I intend to prove the Rectitude to be Formaliter the same with the Faculty or soul! My meaning is plainly, that Holiness is nothing but the souls Rectitude, and though I expressed it in the Concrete, I say not, that it is the Faculty as a Faculty, but as Rectified; shewing in the next words what it is that I exclude, viz. [A Being so distinct, &c. ] 4. May not a Relation or Modus be present or absent in the subject intirius? though it be not a distinct Thing?

For your Quis tulerit? I Reply: Pride makes men impatient. Did you think no more highly of your own Note, then some wise observers do, you would instead of your impatient Quis tulerit, have compassionated your self and me, and sit down by me, with a Nos Graculis. However, why should you be so impatient with one so farre below you? Will you set your wit to the wit of a Graculus?

But I will make bold to try your Patience further. Will you hear the voice of the afore-said Learned and Judicious man Mr Wallis, who is now in the same Nest that you were bred in? See his Truth Tried, chap. 3, pag. 44, 45. [A Habit therefore whether Infused or Acquired, being but a facilitation of the faculty, cannot be a Thing distinct from that faculty, but only a Modus of it, which hath not in it self a Positive Absolute Being of its own, but is a Modification of another Being: And its Physical Being, Existentia Rei, must be the same with the Being of the: which is thus Modified: For it is not ipsum existens, but Modus existendi: And this Manner of Existing, hath not an Existence of its own, distinct from the Existence of that which doth Exist in this Manner. Yet its Formal and Metaphysical Being is distinct. Yea and its Physical Existence, such as it is capable of, that is, Existentia modi; for not being Res, but Modus Rei, we must not expect that it should have any Existence of its own, besides the Existence of a Modus: and this Existentia modi is the actual modifying of the Thing Existing after this Manner: The which Existence, though it be not Existentia Rei, yet is a real Existence (Existentia in re) and not Mental: For the thing Existent is not only supposed to exist in this manner, but indeed doth so, thus ordered, this modified: And therefore the Modus doth actually and really modify, and not only supposed so to do. But if you will not admit with Scotus, &c. And thus it is true which his Lordship speaks, that Habitual Knowledge, is Nothing but Light: more or less Glorious. It is Reason cleared: It's only Facultas Facilitas, or Facultatis facilitas: And to this Faculty or Readiness to operate, I cannot allow a Physical Existence of its own, as neither to any Habit whatsoever, as being but Modi, and not Entia: It's not a Being, but a Manner of Being: Not Ens,
Ent, but Aliquid Entis. And I should easily be persuaded to grant the same concerning all accidents whatsoever, which have long since been called Entis entia: And however an Accident hath been accounted to be Res, and so to have existenti- 

tam Rei, yet not substantiwm Rei.] So far Mr Wallis.

§ 64.
Mr. K. Say you [Whoever called Habits or Dispositions the souls Instruments? The Aptitude of a Cause to produce its effect, cannot be called its Instrument.] I Answer and yield you, that ordinarily it is not so: In all Acquired Habits, there is merely an Aptitude gotten: but by faith which is an infused Habit, there is an Ability gotten; this being indeed a Habit, but a Habit equivalent to a new Faculty; and so we hear of a new heart and new spirit, and without faith a man can no more receive Christ nor do ought towards it, then a dead man can walk or speak, and so it gives life to the soul in regard of all spiritual operations: and though life cannot be said to be an Instrument, yet I hope that which gives life may; as doth faith, which is as the soul to the soul in all its holy and heavenly thoughts and desires: Life cannot be said to be an Instrument: for Life as Life is no cause at all, but an Union of those causes which are required to the making up of the Animatum.

§ 64.
R. B. 1. If Habits were never so properly to be called the souls instruments, yet this reacheth not the Question, whether they may properly be called (Logico-quaendo) instruments of Receiving when they are not instruments Effecting. I did therefore give them too much advantage in this arguing.

2. If you grant that acquired Habits are not to be called the souls instruments, and yet maintain that infused are, you must give some good reason from the difference.

Your reason is that [This is a Habit, but equivalent to a new faculty.] To which I Reply, 1. What reason is this? When I even now said, That [the sanctified faculty it self cannot be the Instrument] you never did gainsay it: therefore if faith were a faculty or Potentia, it were not therefore the Instrument of Reception.

2. The term [equivalence] is so ambiguous, that you may yet make your words true or false by an interpretation. 1. If you mean that infused Habits are of the same nature, and of the same species of quality, as the Potentia naturalis is, that should have been well proved, and not nakedly asserted. 2. If you mean that it performeth the same kind of operations, and quoad formam is equivalent, though not of the same nature or kind; that also needs great proof, seeing it contradiceth common principles: The operation of things is such as the Being. 3. If you mean but that it is of equal necessity to the Act, that nothing to the purpose; for the necessity proves it not an instrument.

But I conceive the first of the three is your sense, or else I cannot make sense of it; for the two latter do no way tend to prove it an Instrument; and your words do most plainly import that sense. But, if so 1. Sure you forgot your own words but a little before, where you were pleased so farre to School me, as to tell me that [the faculty is of one species of quality, Potentia naturalis, faith which sanctifies of another, habitus.] And you gravely told me, I was now and then out in
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my Logick, and demanded of me, Who reckons the Habit of faith for a sancti-
fied Faculty? 2. How can you say still that it is a Habit? For if it be truly a
Habit, it must be of the same species of quality, as Habit; and admit the de
definition of a Habit, and therefore not admit the definition of Potentia or Facultas, nor
be of that species: and I suppose you will not say it is of both, and be but one
Quality: And I suppose allo that you will not say, it is Potentia supernaturalis, and
therefore may be of another species then Potentia naturalis, seeing it is not the way
of efficiency, but the nature of the Effect or Thing produced, which diversifieh
the species of Quality.

But because I have great reason to think, that you will honour the same thing
from Dr Twisse, which you contemn from me, will you be pleased to hear him
speak to you a few words: Contra Corvinum pag. 361. [ Sed quia deventum est ad
genus distinctionis Philosophicum, agendum secundum principia Philosophiae, sive natu-
rales, sive morales, sive mixta, cum distributus illis congradiamur. Itaque juxta Philo-
 sophiam quid aliud est voluntas, quam Potentia volendi? rursus quid aliud est objectum
quam bonum? unacig: verò quod appareat non-Sybilla folium recito, sed Aristotelis
magni illustri naturae myfre. Ergo non modo secundum Augustinum, sed & secundum A-
ristotelum, natura est hominum posse Velle quod ei appareat esse bonum, posse autem Velle
quod vere bonum sit, ac Corvinus quidem hoc loco attribuit gratias sua communi. Ego vero
ultra fijam, & ex Augustino disputo, etiam posse credere, posse Dicem amare, natura effe
hominum, juxta argumentationem superiorem: quod & hoc argumento contento. Si
potentia credendi, vel quidvis boni faciendi, nobis accedere cxt gratia, sum potentia sub-
jectum effet potentia; naturalis gratiœ, quod quidem hæstenus proflus est inauditum; nempe ut potentia volendi subjectum effet potentia volendi. Voluntas fator est subiectum
habitum; etiam omnis potentia rationalis, sive intellectus quaum volumas capax est ba-
habitum, sive naturalium, quibus magis idonea fias ad res naturales, tam intelligendas, quam
agendas; sive supernaturalium, quibus elevetur ad objecta supernaturalia: At ut po-
tentia aliqua capax sit potentiarum novarum, ne fando quidem hæstenus accepi, præsquam
mysteria fumundo communicarum Arminiani.] Many more places to the fame pur-
pofe might be cited out of Dr Twisse. Boehius de Trinit. faith, Forma simplex sub-
jectum esse nequit: I leave you to gather the consequent. What if I add a Nove-
lift or two (they shall not be unlearned) that Mr K. may see that a Gracilis is not
so folitary as a Phænix?

esse aliud quam ipsum actum debilium manentem, omnino confat, e.g. in quod impressio fa-
Cia in subjectum, abf: aliquo contrario destituere, interire non potest: quia est modus
ipsius subjecti; & quod alio modo imbu requirit novam actionem. Pertinet itaq: actus
donec a contrario destitun. In anima vero non est alia contrariedades quam contradi-
tonis. Donec itaque retrahitur, ex necessitate semper manet actus, & dicitur Habitum.
Objecies, esse contra manifestam experienciam quod actus manent, &c. Respondeor, ma-
ufactum esse post actum intellectus velphantasia, potentiam manere in actu ilius objecti
quod cognovit. Experientia enim docet, eam posse iterum cogitare quod vult; quod ante
primam cognitionem non potuit, &c. Manet itaque impressio; id est actus substantia,
quatenus ens, & non tamum motum eff: Unde cum in anima non potest esse motus, ubi
adequate manet impressio; id est actus. Quod autem non apparet manere, est quia ani-
ma in corpore non agit e fce: sed præfacia quamvis movetur a corpore, sec per corpus; &
per consequens non facit eumen su, nisi in effectu corpore. Et igitur sit ut rursus adi-
mus, senantium actum faciliorem, vel forisorem, vel directum & modificatione ab anima,
ratione prioris actus vel actus impressionem manere: Sed modum ipsius impressio
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in se; videre non possumus; & ideo credimus ipsum actu non manufac.] And pag. 94. [Ex quibus fatis clarum est, non esse habitus supernaturales, nisi primis actibus preaequisitos; neque esse per modum potentiarum, sed omnia sicus habitus naturales; nisi quod circa alias objecta verfentur; & discurrerem esse prorsus de is, ad modum quo philosophorum de naturalibus, observat specialistibus differentiam.

Ye there are some that think Habits are in the body. Taurellus in Philosoph. Triumph. pag. 52. faith, [Vere tamen rem figuis intueare, nil habitus aliquid factum, quam aquitit quaem intelligendis; vel aliqujsus expetendi promptitude, non anima, sed corpore adscribenda, cum per se animae impeditatur, nec aptior fieri possit; et excedendas actiones, sed quoniam corpore, eum instrumentum utitur, fuit ejus respectu, vel habitores, vel inceptores ad aliquid efficientum firma.] This he afterward thus correceth, [Non corpore solum, sed animae etiam, videatur esse ascribendi (habitus) Eundem intellectum & agentem esse dicimus & patiinem: Per se quidem actio non causa est, nec pati, nec impediri dicatur; sed respectu ejus cui conjungitur corpore patitum, asque impeditur quo minus probo posset intelligere. Hae habitus accidentis ratione, non mens, sed corporis primo posse attribui; vel si vice verfa menti primo actiones, sed corporis secundarid adscribuntur. Eadem voluntatis est ratio.]

I cite not these, as owning them; but to show Mr. K. that as learned men as he, have not the same thoughts of Habits, and therefore he should not be too hastily confident: And I confess, as highly as I think of Mr. K's learning, I do not think he truly and clearly knows what a Habit of the soul is, nor wherein it is distant from the soul, the faculties, and the act, and the intelligible species: no nor a wiser man than himself neither. Every man knows not so much as he boafteth of, or thinks he knoweth. (And how likely then he is to know so much of God as he here pretendeth to, we may easily judge.) It was as wise a man as he that said [Nam quomodo intellectus Deam capit homo, qui ipsum intellectum suum, quo cum vult capere, nonum capit? August. de Trinitat. l. s. cap. 1.]

3. I easily acknowledge that grace giveth such a power as is commonly called Morals, distinct from the natural faculties, as our corrupt estate contains an opposite impotency. But this is but an applying of the terms [Can] and [Cannot] [Power] and [Impotency] to Dispositions and Undisposedness, to Habits and their Privations.

4. A new heart and spirit, I easily confess necessary. But those words do commonly signify in Scripture, only new Inclinations, Dispositions, Qualifications. It is a new heart, though only the old faculties and substance. I hope you will not follow Ilyricus,

5. Where you say that [without faith a man can no more Receive Christ, nor do ought towards it, then a dead man can walk or speak.] I Reply 1. That proves not faith to be equivalent to a Potestas vel facultas, any otherwise then that it is of as absolute necessity, but not that it is of the same nature. If you teach an illiterate man a Greek or Hebrew book, he cannot more read in it then a dead man, that is, both are truly in sensu composito impossible: But yet it is but a habit that is wanting to one, and a power or faculty natural, to the other. And so it may truly be said that a sinner cannot do well that hath accustomed to do evil, no more then a Leopard can change his spots, or a Blackmore his skin. Yet if you mean truly, such are equally distant from an actual change as a dead man, it is but a dead comparison. A dead man wants both natural faculties, and an inclination or moral power. An unbeliever wants but one.

6. That [without faith, such can no more do ought towards the receiving of Christ,]
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Christ, then a dead man can walk or speak] is a dead doctrine, like the rest of Antinomianism, tending to licentiousness, and to subvert the precepts of the Gospel, and the salvation of men, and unfit for any man that shall use the Name of Christ, much more unfit for a Divine. The Ranting sect hath got the word too: and when they are reproved for wickedness, or persuaded to duty, they say, [What can the creature do?] To go out of an Alehouse or Whorehouse, and to go to hear the Gospel preached, is somewhat towards receiving Christ: for faith comes by hearing; and can no man do this without faith? Cannot the Bunch reade a Chapter and ask help of an Interpreter without faith? Cannot men Fast and Pray, if not as Cornelius, yet as Ahab, without faith? Is there not a common Grace of the Spirit, drawing men towards Christ that were farre from him, which goes before the special Grace (at least sometimes) whereby they are drawn to Christ? This that you maintain is not the doctrine of Mr. Tho. Hooker, Mr. Job. Rogers, Mr. Bolton, Perkins, or any of our experimental practical Divines; no nor of any Protestants that I know; I am sure not of the Synod of Dort; but of the Libertines and Antinomists. To what end do you preach to any unbelievers? Do you persuade to any means or duty towards the getting of faith? or do you not? If not, its like you Preach as you Dispute; and then I doubt whether you live at Bliffand: If you do, sure that duty tends to faith, and may be performed before faith.

3. I think you do more boldly assert, then you can solidly prove that [without faith a man can no more receive Christ, then a dead man walk] if you mean it of the Habit of faith, as, no doubt, you do. If you should mean it of the Act, it were a merry arguing: q.d. [We cannot Receive Christ without Receiving him: therefore Receiving him is a Power, and so an Instrument] Actual faith, is actual moral Receiving Christ. But I suppose you mean it of the Habit, in conformity to your former Dispute; And then you suppose that God cannot cause the Act of faith by his Spirit, before the Habit, and by the first act cause a habit (as Camero taught, and his followers do still teach.) I suppose if the question were put but de facto, Whether God do ordinarily thus cause faith? it is past Mr. K's power to prove the Negative: Much more if the question be de potentia divina, whether God can do it.

4. Where you say [It gives life to the soul in regard of all spiritual operations.] I Reply, 1. How industriously doth Mr. Pembble prove that faith is not the Mother grace? nor properly the root of all other graces, nor the first degree of our sanctification and spiritual life, either in the Habit or the Act: Vindic. Grat. pag. 12, 13, 14. Yet Mr. K. that is so zealous in defending him, sticks not to gain-say it.

2. Knowledge and Love may be said to give life to the soul, if the exciting and asfisting other graces, be giving life.

3. It is in effecting or receiving a relation (sim ad Christum, impunitatem, satium) that we are enquiring after faiths Instrumentality. And you do turn the business to [giving Life to the soul in regard of spiritual operations] whereby you seem to mean that faith is no otherwise an Instrument of receiving Christ, then as it is an Instrument of every other operation which it performeth; and as every other habit of grace (Love, Fear, &c.) are Instruments of their acts.

4. You play with the ambiguity of the term [Life.] You take it for the Union of Causes. You know how commonly it is used for the Forma Jesus.
§ 65.

Mr. K. Whereas you add lastly, [The sharpness of the knife cannot be called the knives Instrument.] I must without disparagement to your confess acumen in other things, tell you, that this is but a dull instance: for faith is not as the sharpness, but as the knife; and faith admits sometimes a greater sharpness, sometimes a less, which qualifies it in its acting better or worse, more or less. And 2. The sharpness of the knife, may be called an instrument in a larger sense, as first qualities in the elements. The fire is said to act by its heat, the water by its cold; by the heat instrumentaliter, by its form principaliter. And thus 3. may the soul be said to act by its faith in receiving Christ, without which it were as impossible to receive benefit by Christ, as to return service to him.

§ 65.

R. B. 1. I acknowledge the instance of little use to the main question, because it pertains but to the act of faith, and not the following passion or effect.

2. The sharpness of your answer, serves but to cut your own fingers. That faith is as the knife, is feigned, and not proved. The knife is the substance, and the keenness is the accident or modus. Faith is not a substance, but a modus or accident of the soul.

3. In your large sense, you may say quid vis ferè de quo vis, and so I told you I did not contradict you.

4. I am so censorious as to imagine that you speak more by rote, then on true knowledge in your Physicks, about fire; but that's no matter.

5. Who doubts but the soul may, in the sense you mention, be said to act by faith in receiving? But once more distinguish of receiving: which is 1. The act of consenting to, or accepting of the offer of Christ and Life; which is reception ethica, metaphorically called Reception. 2. The true passive reception of right to Christ and Life, which follows on the former. The first is but the
Condition, and not the Cause of the later, and is in Morality to the later, as in Naturals the Disposition materiae is to the Reception of the form: but the efficient Cause of the later Reception is God's Will, signified by his Law; and his Law signifying his Will, and Constituting the Dunes. Now if you will say, that Faith in the Habit is the instrumental efficient Cause of the first Receiving Christ, that is no more than to say, the Habit is the instrumental Cause of the Act, viz. its own Assent and Consent: as Love may be said of its Act. And whether this Speech be proper or improper, I leave it to your self; I will not meddle with it. But for all Faith might be called the Instrument of Believing (supposing it may) and that Believing is tropically called Receiving, yet I deny that it can therefore be properly called the Instrument of consequent, proper, Passive Reception of Right to Christ. (The Relation is such as Relations in their Reception are capable of.) Yet improperly, vulgarly, as an Instrument is not taken for an Efficient Cause, I did profess and still do, that I will contend with none that will call Faith the Instrument of Receiving (or any Consent of the Will, call it Love, or what you will, as well as Belief in Christ, may be call'd an Instrument.) But that Faith is no true Instrumental Cause of forgiving our Sins, or Justifying us, I shall yet maintain till I see stronger Reasons then Mr. K. hath here produced; and to that I am moved upon Reasons of great weight, which I have elsewhere manifested.

Lastly, Mr. K. speaks too unlimitedly [of the Impossibility of Receiving Benefit by Christ without Faith.] I dare say, that many a thousand (if not all men) have received Benefit by Christ before faith. What say you by the Gospel? What say you by Faith itself? I hope it is not the Instrument of our Receiving it itself? Yea, and it is more then Mr. K. can prove. That God could not if he would, have given pardon it self to some without faith, upon Christ's meer Satisfaction. But what need I talk of this, to a man that thinks we have so much of, or towards Remission, Justification, Acceptation before faith, as he before disputeth for, i.e. to be tantamount Justified? Though he takes them to be from Eternity, and so no fruits of Christ's Death, yet he cannot deny, but as to us, we are as capable of Receiving such Benefits, without faith, from Christ, as without Christ.

§. 66.

Mr. K. And I acknowledge I have done very little by this Dispute; only I had not the patience to see so worthy Divinities so unworthily bindled, as if they had need to be taught a Logick lesson by Mr. Baxter, who (as I have heard to the disparagement of both Universities) was scarce bred in either, but as much as I esteem his excellent parts, and I doubt not singular policy; yet may I be bold to say, somewhat more of the University would have done him no harm: And I conclude all with this Item to my self, though Mr. Baxter need not take notice of it,

Netu Divinam Iliada censes,
Sed longa sequere, & Vestigia semper adora.

§. 66.
§. 66.

R.B. 1. Think your first Conclusion (that you have done little by this Dispute) hath as cogent Evidence, as most that you have maintained in these six leaves. But it had been more wisdom to have foreseen your loss of time, and to have prevented it, rather than to confess it to your disgrace.

2. Where you say, you [had not patience] I say, If you cannot forbear, there's no remedy: who can hold that which will away? The tongue is an unruly member. Perhaps your case is as his Did/cehmin. p. 54.

3. I dare not excuse, much less justify my tongue or Pen, from too sharp and unmannerly speeches of my betters: Even where I discern no fault, I do suspect some, as knowing so much evil in that heart which is the fountain: And I hope all those pious Brethren whom I shall injure by my rashness, will heartily forgive it; which I earnestly request, and by God's assistance, shall do the like by others. But yet I must needs say, that my Confidence doth not accuse me of [handling unworthily] Dr. Twi/ or Mr. P. of any men. For as I have excessively honoured them, so do I very highly honour them still; and their mistakes I had not mentioned, but I. That I had been by them ensnared in some of them, and thought my self bound to warn others of the danger. 2. The name of such worthy men may do more in propagating an error, than a thousand unlearned Antinomians can do, and therefore should their mistakes be more diligently disclosed. 3. It is pity Gods gifts and Saints should be a Defensive to error, and a snare to the Church. 4. I am confident the souls of these two Saints of God, if they know these things below, will give Mr. K. no thanks for his Vindication, nor be offended with me for disclosing their mistakes, which they now do farre more detest than I. 5. It was no such Crime in the late Reverend Assembly to question one of these mistakes, or in Learned Bishop Downame to write a hundred times more then I against the other: And why then is it a Crime in me? 6. Reverend Mr. Owen, who approves your book, doth say farre more against Dr. Twi/ than ever I did, in his late excellent, learned Diatrib. de Jus't. Vindicat. and yet I hear none accuse him for unworthy handling him: Yea he ingeniously confesseth his own former error, and writes against it; and why then may not a man for Truths sake be allowed to do by another, what he doth by himself? Had I been my self the Author of Dr. Twi/ses Works (pardon the presumption of the supposition) I should say ten times more against several things in them, then I ever yet did. 7. Mr. K. himself here confesseth the opinions that I mention of theirs to be erroneous: And is not that an unworthy handling them as mine? I intreat the impartial Reader to peruse my words themselves, and then let him judge as he seeth Caufe. They are but these [A great Question it is, Whether Remission and Justification be Immanent or Transfent Acts of God: The mistake of this one point was it that led those two most excellent famous Divines Dr. Twi/ and Mr. Pemble to that error and Pillar of Antinomianism, viz. Justification from Eternity. For faith Dr. Twi/ often, All Acts Immanent in God are from Eternity: But Justification and Remission of sins are Immanent Acts: Therefore.] Is this such unworthy handling? Mr. K. does not once say that I falsely accused them; or that it was not their error. And could I give them a higher Elogy, than to call them [most Excellent, Famous Divines.] I am confident the greatest Archbishops or Cardinals, yea the Pope himself would think such Titles no way
way injurious to them. The Lord General will be content with lower Titles, then [most Excellent and Famous] Do not such as Mr. K. go about to confirm the vile reproaches of the times, as if Ministers were the most intolerably proud men on earth, when this is taken for unworthy handling! And when they that expect that their hearers should bear their sharper and frequent reproofs, cannot bear such an honourable mention of their mistakes?

4. Whether there be one true word in Mr. K. his particular accusation [as if they had need to be taught a Logick lesson of Mr. Baxter] I am content my very enemies should Judge. Did I ever contend about any point of Logick with them? It was not, what an immanent Act is? But surely, Whether Justification be an immanent Act, and so Eternal, that I enquired, and in which I opposed them? I do therefore take it as my duty to Admonish my learned Brother of his great sin, who hath not once, twice, or thrice, but so oft in six leaves spoken such palpable untruths in matter of fact, and made so little Conscience of the ninth Commandment.

5. If in this Paragraph Mr. K. do discover the very end of his undertaking, not to be so much the Vindicating of any truth of God, but of Worthy Divines, and Academical Honour (of which I leave the Reader to Judge) then may we hence conjecture at the Reason of several Passages through the whole: for the Means may not be better then the End; and no wonder if they be suited to it.

6. As for all that follows concerning my [being scarce bred in either University, &c.] I have nothing to say. Did Mr. K. ever hear me contend for the Reputation of being Learned? He easily carries the Cause here, having no contradiction.

7. And where he saith, that [somewhat more of the University would have done me no harm] I do not believe him: For though I have been as sensible of my want of such happy opportunities, and my defects thereupon, as ever Mr. K. was, yet I believe that all things work together for Good to them that love God; and that by that three-fold Cord (on my Friends, Body, and Scrupulous Conscience) by which God restrained me from such advantages, and confined me to a more private course of studies, he did also restrain me from some evil that I might else have run upon, or prevent some that he saw would befall me: (and indeed he hath satisfied me now of the particulars.)

8. What men or other creatures were that Mr. K. did [hear boast of me to the disparagement of both Universities] I cannot conjecture. But this J will promise Mr. K. that how little ever J have received from the Universities, they shall have my frequent and earnest prayers to God, and my best endeavours with men, for their Prosperity. The Lord purge them from Pride, Sensuality, Man-pleasing and Self-seeking, and cause them humbly to study Christ above all, and zealously to lay out themselves for His Glory, and with considerate, resolved Self-denial and Unreservedness, wholly to resign themselves to His Service, and make it their main business to win souls to that true Felicity which they have first taAled of themselves; and then J should not so much fear any policy or power of their Enemies.

9. And for Mr. K. s concluding Poetical injunction; J heartily confess my utter unworthiness to beenumerated to the Ambassadors of the Lord Jesus, or ever to have been permitted to speak in His Name; much more with any such success and encouragement as he hath vouchsafed me: And the Lord forbid that ever I should
I should be so arrogant, as to equal my self with the Worthies of the Church, much lesse to envy the honour of their preheminence. Yet in regard of the Churches present necessities, I dare not give over, for all my imperfections. Though I have ever been of a spirit too easily discouraged, and have many a time been under Jonah's temptation, and ready to say as Jeremy, I will speach no more in his Name; yet God hath fo fitted his providences to my infirmities and necessities, as not only to cure my backwardneffe and defpondency, but also to convince me of the pleasantness of his work. I am assured that it was the Lord that sent me into his Vineyard, and without him none shall force me out. He that gave me fewer Talents then others, will expect but an answerable improvement at my hands: but be they never s small, I dare not hide them. He that calleth for twomites will accept them: He despiseth not the day of small things. He sometime revealeth that to babes which he hideth from the wise and prudent: For the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God, and the foolishness of God is wisest then men: and no flesh shall Glory in his sight. How many learned men have lost the main end of their Learning, and engaged God so farre against them, as to lay both them and their honour in the dust, because they would not devote it more faithfully to his service! The Lord grant that I may so use the small abilities that I have, that I be not condemned as an unprofitable and unfaithfull servant; and then I do not fear being condemned for their smallness. There are many learrnerd men then Mr.K. in hell, and many more unlearned then I in heaven.

But should I deny my self to be Vile against the Accusations of Mr.K. when I daily confess my self Vile to God, I should but prove the hypocritic of my prayers. And therefore Dispute for Reputation that will for me. When I am tempted to such a work by Accusers, or by my own heart, I desire God to save me from the Temptation. He that works principally for himself, must be his own Pay master.

§ 67.

Mr.K. The summe of all that hath been hitherto said in this Paragraph, is this, That to Justification there is required a transient act of Gods, or the working of Faith in our hearts, which shews, That albeit Gods Decree so Justifie us have much in it that looks so well like Justification, that it may be called so without Blasphemy, yet that indeed Justification is intime, not from Eternity: And it appears farther shews: That Justification being the Absolving us from our sins, and the Accepting us as righteous, albeit God the Father Decreed it, the Son Purchased it, a Grant of it were made, and under Seal; yet till it be pleased there is no Pardoning; as appears by comparing Gods pardon with that of Princes, which is not of Value till Pleased, and not pleased till after the fury hath found the Offender Guilty: So this Justification which begins at our Believing in foro Conscientiae, a more private Sessions is again made more Publick in Heaven at our death, and this at Gods Bar before Angels and Saints deceas'd; and yet more publick before all the world at the General Judgement. This pardon was Purchased, Resolved, or Issued out, Sealed, Received, Pleased at first: but as new sins are committed we plead it again, and so may be said to be particularly Justified from particular sins, toties quoties, but always by virtue of our General Pardon.
§ 67.

R. B. We are now past the End, and yet new to begin. If in this Recollection he had not stumbled on a word or two, that come from the Core of his Error, I should scarce have understood any of his minde about the Controversie in hand, save only negatively, and that he is against Me. And yet it is not much that I can discern of it. Among all the Discours of all Sects that ever I had to do with, that pretended to Learning, I have seldom met with the like slippery dealing, as in Mr. K., who pretending to make some notable discovery of the Truth, did so lose himself in the eager pursue of a contemptible Adversary, that he seems to have quite forgot his undertaking, and leave his errand behind him. But to deal truly, it is my opinion, that though the man were drawn to engage himself, yet when he had emptied his bilious stomack, he found his work done, and therefore was willing to drop asleep when he should have performed his Promise. He doth over and over again promise us to open to us what is the Transient Justifying Act, yea, pag. 139, to speak candidly to it; and when all’s done, the business is so farre undone, that for my part, I cannot certainly tell whether he once name it, or what his opinion about it is. Pag. 141. He saith [by Giving us faith, he Justifies us, as shall be shewed anon, he giving us that which is our Instrument, whereby we receive the Righteousnes of Christ.] That, [anon] is not yet come; for I finde no fuller discovery of his minde, but only a little glance in this Recollection, wherewith he doth conclude. In those former words he seems to make the Immediate Justifying Act to be the Giving of Faith; and yet contradicts it in the next words; for that Faith he makes to be Given, that it may be our Instrument of Receiving. Now

1. We are enquiring after God’s Act, and not mans Instrument.

2. We are enquiring after the Immediate effecting Act, and not a Receiving, which is no effecting.

Let us see whether these words under consideration will any better discover his sense.

1. He saith [that to Justification there is required a Transient Act of God; or the working of faith in our heart.] This is all the transient Act I can learn he intends from first to last. But though before he said [by Giving us faith, he Justifies us] yet here he thought it rather to speak more ambiguously, and only faith, that [this is required to Justification.] But there are many things required to it, besides that Act which doth immediately Effect it: Antecedents, Conditions, the Causes of those Conditions, are all Required to it; when yet none of them is the Justifying Act. But if indeed he do mean that Fidem dare, is Justificare, I will speak to that anon. Next he saith, that [Gods Decree to justify, looks well like Justification] but that is not it. Next he saith, that [Justification is the Ablolving us from our sins, and Accepting us as Righteous] that he may come to shew us what is not, and what is, the Ablolving and Accepting Act. And first again he excludes Decreeing from being the Act enquired after; then he excludes Chrifts Purchase; then he excludes the Grant made and sealed; then he saith [Till it be pleaded there is no pardoning, as appears by comparing Gods pardon with that of Princes.] Perhaps then he means that [Pleading] is Pardoning, or the JustifyingAct. No, not so neither: For he only saith, that [till it be Plead] there is no Pardoning, which plainly expresseth, That Plead-
ing is but a prerequisite Condition, the want whereof suspendeth the act of Pardon, but is not the Pardoning act itself. In the Conclusion he gives us a little more light to see part of his meaning, where he faith [so this Justification which begins at our Believing in foro Conscientiae, a more private Sessions, is again made more publick in Heaven at our death, and this at Gods Bar before Angels, &c.] Here he tells us more then yet I could gather from him, in quo foro justificamur side, that it is but in foro Conscientiae, a more private Sessions, that we are left to search for the justifying act; which though he vouchsafe not expressly to mention, yet we may possibly conjecture at this last passage. If the Reader would see the whole mystery which is thus darkly lapt up, as being somewhat afraid of the light, as far as I can gather, it is this,

Mr. K. being of the Antinomian faith, That Remission and Justification are Immanent Acts, and from Eternity (and consequently not purchased by Christs bloud) and that Justification by faith, which the Scripture speaks of, is only Justification in foro Conscientiae, or the apprehension of the former; he thought, in these times, when Antinomianism hath an ill favour with the best, that it is the wisest way to appropriate the name of Remission and Justification by faith (in this life) to this Justification in foro Conscientiae, and to give to the Immanent Eternal Act, the description without the name. And therefore he thought it fittest to say, that [Gods decreeing to Remit our sins, carries in it a Remission of them tantamount; for who shall charge them on us, where God decrees to Remit them?] Pag. 138. That [Gods Decree to pass the transient Act of justifying, carries in it as much as concerns Gods Remission of sins, and Acceptance of us as Righteous.] But the change that is made in time by the transient Act, is in our Feeling or Knowledge, and therefore he faith, that when we say [Now a man is justified in Gods sight] it [signifies only a testimony given by God, whereby he makes us know that we are justified before God, or in his sight] and that [in God it signifies, A making us to see: and we are said to be justified in his sight, when he makes it, as it were evident to our sight, that we are justified] p. 138. (Here before he was aware, he gives it the name of justification before we see it.) Now being Resolved to appropriate the name of Remission and Justification (in this life) to that which is in foro Conscientiae, he is hard put to it, to deliver his meaning of the transient justifying Act, without opening the name of his opinion. And therefore sometimes he faith: It is the Giving of faith to be our Instrument: Sometime that this faith is necessary to it: but concludes, that it is in foro Conscientiae, a private Sessions, that we are justified before death: So that the Summe is this: That Justification, and Remission, and Acceptation do consist in our Conscience apprehension or feeling of that which God did from Eternity (which must not be called Remission, but Tantamount Remission:) and because Conscience cannot know or feel this, but by Believing, and because we cannot believe till God give us the Grace of faith, therefore God justifies or pardons us by Giving us that Grace: that is, We by Believing or being Conscious of our Eternal Acceptance, do immediately justify and forgive our selves; but mediatly God forgiveth and justifieth us by Causing us to Believe, and Causing our Consciences to justify us immediately.

I will not say, that I am certain I have hit of Mr. K.s minde in this explication: for who can be certain in such a mist? And therefore I leave every Reader that thinks I mistake it, to gather it better, if he can.

Whatever it is, I am sure he oft contradicts himself. He that here tells us it is in foro
foro Conscientiae, and talkt before of evidencing it to our selves, doth lay Pag. 139. l. u. [Wherever there is a Moral, i.e. a Legal change, there is a transient act, and this being in justification, a transient act is necessarily required to this change] Now a meet Legal change is de jure, and not in the feeling of Conscience: and it is in foro nullo actuatis, sed virtualiter in foro divino, being actuatis Legis quae est Norma Jusdictiæ: and therefore not in foro Conscientiae, vel aliquo privato. And if it be contest to be a Moral, i.e. a Legal change, what man sees not that it must be a change per Legem? i.e. novam, remediam, or per actum moralcm? Nay, mark how in the very words of this Conclusion, he yields the Cause and doth not see it. He confesseth that we are pardoned as Offenders are by a Prince's pardon, which is not of Value till pleaded. Now let any man of understanding judge, whether the Princes Pardon Granted and Sealed, be not the immediate, efficient Cause of this Delinquents absolution or passive pardon, when he doth plead it: And whether it be not first a fias impunitatis that is hereby Given him, which (whatever is here said) is of Value upon the Accepting, before the pleading, though the pleading is also necessary to Stop judgement, or prevent Execution, and so to have the full benefit. And what though the Pardon Granted and Sealed be not Effectual till Accepted or Plead. ? Doth it follow, that it is not the immediate Cause afterwards? Let it not seem unmannerly if I speak my thoughts; that all this proceeds from this Learned man's great mistake or inconsideratenefs of the Nature of Laws and their Actions, and of the nature and use of Conditions, whose non-performance doth suspend the action of the Law or Grant, (because the Will of the Legislator or Donor was, that it should so be) but the performance doth not cause its action, much less immediately cause the Effect; unless there be something in it that may work as a procuratorick efficient Cause, by way of Merit, or the like, over and above its meer Office of a Condition. If a man by his Testament leave his Son a thousand pound per annum on Condition that he do voluntarily Register his Thankful Acceptance of it: It is not the performance of this Condition that doth at all causally constitute the fias ad rem legatum, or conferre Debitum, or Donare; though the non-performance may suspend the Collation of Right: but it is the Testament that doth immediately constitute this Right, when the suspension is removed, which before it did not, because the Testator would not have it so. Grosiss in Cæsandr. art. 4.p. 280. Promissi non est, si Conditionem implenti fias conferat. Vid. de Jus. Beli. l. i.c. 1. §. 4. & l. ii. i. §. 1. &c. If then it were true, as M.K. here affirmeth, that it is at this private Sessions in foro Conscientiae, that we are first justified on our Believing, then the immediate justifying Act (which Mr.K. hath talked so oft of) can be no other then either our own Apprehension, or belief that we are Pardoned and Righteous, or some such like Apprehension or Conclusion of our own hearts. For if it be in foro Conscientiae, it must be By Conscience as the Agent, that is, By the understandings Concluding us to be what we are. But this both suppofeth us to be Pardoned and Righteous before (for the Being of a thing goeth before the true Knowledge that it is in Being: None can be truly Conscious of a Righteousness or Pardon which he hath not:) and also it makes us to pardon and justify our selves; and the transient justifying Act of God, so long enquired after, should be only Gods cooperating with us in our Believing, or Causing us to Believe. Yea rather, the Act of justifying faith (which is the Acceptance of an offered Christ and Life, 2 J oh. 5. 11, 12.) goes before this Act now mention'd, and this is but Assurance or a Consciousness of the State that by Believing we are in. Let any man that is willing to know the truth, but examine every Text
of Scripture that speak of justification by faith, and he may easily see that they do not (no not one of them) speak of justification in foro conscience, or of any consciousness of our righteousness, but of justification before God.

And that God's giving faith is not the immediate justifying act, appears 1. From the very name. [To give faith] is one thing, and [to justify] is another. 2. From the real difference. Faith is given by a physical act immediately: righteousness, immediately by a legal or moral act. Faith is a real Quality (in the habit) or act: righteousness is a relation, and is immediately by the receivency. Nay the very matter or meritorious cause of the righteousness now in question, is not faith, but Christ's satisfaction and merits. The terminus therefore of the justifying act (I speak now of our constitutive justification) is righteousness, a relation: but the terminus of God's act in giving faith, is the faith so given. The object also of the justifying act, and the subject of justification, is credeus, a man already believing: but the object of that act which giveth faith, is an unbeliever. 3. Is not this flat popery? to make justification to lie in a real change, and not a relative? and to make it the same with vocation, conversion, regeneration, or sanctification? Whereas the holy Ghost faith, [Whom he called them he justified, Rom. 8. 30.] for to give faith is vocation (as those divines say, that make faith to go before other graces in habit and act:) or it is vocation, regeneration and sanctification, as Mr. Pemble thinks; who supposed all infused in one sense. So that if fidem darse, and justificare be all one, then to justify and to call or sanctifie is all one.

I had once thought to have heaped up divers arguments here in the conclusion on these two last points. 1. To prove that our first justification by faith, which Scripture speaks of, is not in foro conscience. 2. To prove that to give faith is not the proper or immediate justifying act of God. But I shall forbear it. Because Mr. K. gives me so little invitation to it, seeing he gives but a few dark hints of his own minde. 2. In that I finde upon review that almost all this paper is unavoidably taken up with a more defence of my words against his injury, and he hath not given me occasion for many further profitable explications or disputes: and therefore I will reserve these for a fitter place. 3. Because I have larglier already argued against both these in private answers to the animadversions of learned friends: and though these are not for publicke view, yet I have a backwardness to the doing of one thing oft. 4. Because this little that I have here said, seems enough, and proportionable to his brevity which doth occasion it.

This one thing seems necessary, in the conclusion, that I add a few reasons to prove that it is in law-sense that we are first justified by faith, and so that the moral act of the law is the immediate justifying act (and consequenter the enacting of that law of grace, or granting that deed of gift, is the next foregoing efficient act.) There are reasons enough in my aphorisms, but Mr. K. thought it easiest to take no notice of them.

Arg. 1. A termino.

The thing that is given by Remission is tua ad impunitatem: but it is only by laws, contras, deeds of gift, or the like moral acts, that Right is immediately conveyed: Therefore it is by these immediately that we are forgiven: (and so justified constitutively.)

I suppose it will not be denied that Remission is a giving. Qui condonat, donat. So Lawyers generally lay of remitting a wrong, and it will hold in cases of crimes, especially in our case, against God. Fragesus de Regimine Christi, part. 7. li. 6.
l. 6. Disp. 17. n. 25. p. 344. faith, Remittere injuriwm est Donare, &c Donare est justum suum.

Arg. 2. A malo remoto, contrario, &c. Termino a quo. The Disolution of a Legal obligation, must be by a Moral act of the Rector, of the same kind as with the obliging act. But Remission of sin is a Dissolution of such an Obligation. Therefore, &c.

The major is proved by that common maxime, Eodem modo dissolvitur obligatio, quo contrahitur. The minor is proved by the true definition of Pardon: Which is in criminals, The Act of a Rector disolving an Obligation to punishment. Remissio est proxima Reatus Remissio; remotius Pena: Reatus est Obligatio ad Pann.

Arg. 3. Ab officio Legis. If it be the rule of the Law to be Norma Judicii, then he that is justified per sententiam Judicii, must be first justified in Law: But the Antecedent is true: Therefore, &c.

When I say [Justified in Law] I do not mean [by the Law] strictly taken as most do, for one only species of Law: But I mean [by Law] in general, as it is truly defined to be Cons titutiva Determinatio Rectoris de Debito. Vel signum Voluntatis Rectoris Debitum Constituem. For many Lawyers do call only written and standing Laws, by the name of Laws, and do exclude verball precepts of a Rector: In this limited sense, as it is taken for [Law by an Excellency] I do not now ufe it.

Arg. 4. A natura Sententiae. Declarative sentential Justification or Pardon, presupposeth Justification Constitutive. Therefore Justification Constitutive goes before sentential Justification.

Here I suppose 1. That Constitutive is per Legem, and not per Sententiam, which is palt dispute. 2. That it is by faith (as the condition) that we are justified Constitutivé, it being only Believers that are Morally qualified to be fit subjects for this Justification, and whom alone the new Law pronounceth Righteous, and to whom alone it effectually giveth Christ and Life. The Antecedent is plain, in that the Judge must sentence a man to be as he is, and according to his Cause. A man must be just, before he justly be pronounced Just. He that condemneth the Righteous, and he that justifieth the wicked, they both are abomination to the Lord, Prov. 17. 15. He that faith to the wicked, Thou art Righteous, him shall Nations curse, people shall abhorre him, Prov. 24. 24. So that whether the sentence be in conscience or Heaven, it must presuppose Justification Constitutive.

Arg. 5. A natura fidei Justificantis. If the nature of that act of faith which justifieth, be only such as may be the condition of the Laws constitutive Justification, and not such as may be the Instrument of sentencing us Just, then Justification by faith (which Scripture mentioneth so oft) is Justification in Law sense, and not Sentential: But the Antecedent is true; as is proved from the Act, which I have elsewhere proved to be [the Accepting of an offered Christ and Life] (including Assent) and not the Antinomian, especial Belief that we are pardoned, or a performation of Gods special Love to us, or a consciousness of our Righteousness, or Assurance of it, which are said to justifie sententially in foro Conscientiae.

Arg. 6. A communi consenfu, &c. ufu loquendi. • It is the common judgement of men to think, and common custom to say, that
that [A King pardoneth by his written, or verbal Pardon, as his Instrument]
and to distinguish [Justificationem Legis] a Justificatione Judicis, the former be-
ing presupposed: therefore we must do so here, unless any special reason can be
brought against it: For God's Law hath the common nature of a Law, and his
Judgement the common nature of judgement.

To prove the Antecedent I need but to appeal to the common use of men ac-
quainted with Legal and Judicial affairs. Yea even Mr. K. himself cannot for-
bear acknowledging it: Yea besides the forementioned acknowledgments, he is
strangely guided to conclude with it, as the very left word of his Digression, a-
against me [We may be said to be particularly justified from particular sins
quotes quotations, but alwaies by virtue of our general pardon.] This general pardon is that
which God issued out and sealed as he faith, which becoming effectual when re-
ceived, and pleaded, doth by its virtue justify us from particular sins: that is, by
its moral or civil action.

ARG. 7. When the Scripture so oft denieth Justification by the Law, it plainly
implieth that there is such a thing in rerum natura, as Justification by a Law, and
that it is no improper unfit speech: For else God would not use it, Gal. 5. 4. &
3. 11. Yea it opposeth Justification by grace in Christ, to Justification by the
Law, 1st 13. 39. By him all that believe are justified from all things from which they
could not be justified by the Law of Moses: Where note the opposition that [by
Christ and grace] is opposed to [by works] and so [by the Law of Christ and
Grace] is opposed to [by the Law of Moses and Works.] That therefore is af-
irmed of the Law of Grace, which is denied of the Law of Works: viz. to jus-
tifie. And the reason why the Law of Works could not justify, was for that it was
weak through the flesh, and not that it was an action or effect disagreeable to the
nature of a Law.

Many other actions of Law to the same purpose, I recited out of several
Scriptures, in my Aphorismes, pag. 178, 79, which I will not trouble the Reader
to repeat.

§ 68.

And thus I have done that ungrateful work which Mr. K. was pleased by
Digressing to put me upon: which I confess appears not lovely to me on the
review. For I finde though I have easly borne the charges of this Learned man,
yet it is no very usefull work to the Reader that he hath here called me to; and
I thought it not fit to go beyond my call. In the first part I have little to do,
but to obtrude his confidence, and to shew that he meerly feigned me his adver-
sary, forgetting that of Seneca, Victoria sine adversario brevis est Law: In the rest I
have not much to do, but to open the vanity and fallacy of many words, and to
shew what a windy Triumph it is which followeth such a windy Opposition, and
what his Reader oweth him, who doth importare verba & forum pro mercibus: And
what can the Reader gain also by such a discovery. I finde also, that though I
resolved to forbear all harsh language when I began, that I have not satisfied my
self in the performance. For when I came to his most injurious words, I could
not tell how to answer them but by shewing plainly what they are, and calling a
Spade, a Spade; which cannot be done in smooth and pleasing words; and I
 finde that I have used more Ironies then I dare approve of. My resolution there-
fore is, to stifle this work till I have a call to publish it, and then to commit it to
some
some moderate hand, to correct all that shall seem too unmannerly. For though I think I have spoken nothing but what Mr. K. ought to hear, yet I doubt whether it be not more then was fit for me to speak. It is my purpose therefore to deal with him no more, lest I be drawn again to the same inconvenience. For I finde I cannot Reply to such a man in such terms as I do to the Moderate Candide. Till his breath be sweeter or sounder I think it safest to stand further from him. When he disgorgeth his stomack on me, I have not the skill of shaking it off so mannerly, and cleaning my self without his disgrace, as I could wish I had. And if a man stirre them not very tenderly, Plus favis (tercoram voc. I finde also that it is a very hard thing against the guilty to speak both truly and pleasingly: For nonini blanditor veritas; and I have a natural inclination to speak nakedly and plainly; which being seconded with some degree of opinion, that qui loquitur planè, loquitur fane, may quickly occasion me to step too farre. But the principal cause is, that I am truly aweary of the Wars of Divines: Many an opportunity and importunity have I put by, as finding here also, that Impedientia belli sunt præmis majora; and especially in this civil uncivil Warre of Brethren, the gainer usually loseth: unless men could be brought to deal more with the Matter, and less with Words and Men. Contentions are both to the Daughter and the Mother of Pride. They are (as foot) the fuel of that flame that caufed them. If the contender be overcome, he glorifieth not: as a Christian in the Victory of Truth, but repineth as a man at his own overthrow; and pro plumeis noxis plumbos Ira gerit: If he seem to conquer superficialis erritis, and it doth puff him up, and so increase his vice, and hasten hisruine: for Vindicat elatos jusruina gradus.

However it sets men usually on two eager a studying for their own Reputation & which is the way that god resolveth shall ruine it: For he that will be great must be the servant of all, and he that will be wise must become a fool, and he that will save his honour must lose it: qui propagat nomen, perdit nomen. My soule refleth an admirable sweetness in Peace: The Churches Peace, the Concord of Brethren is my daily study, prayer and endeavour; which Q that I were able any right way to promote! What I do that way, I do with pleasure: my greatest zeal doth carry me to it. But what I do in way of Controversie, yea even when necessitated, so that I dare not forbear, lest I should betray or wrong the Truth, yet is it grievous and ungratefull to me: I have little pleasure in it. I am resolued therefore to draw back from this work, as much as I finde consistent with my Fidelity to the Truth of Christ; and to do nothing in it till I am satisfied of a Call that must not be refisted. And when I follow God, I may safely commit to him my Way and Labours: for I have found that he draweth forth nothing, which he knows not how to ule for good. And the more any Brother is persuaded that I transgresse my bounds in writing too sharply, I intreat him the more to pray for the pardon of my fault, and the more watchfully to shun the like himself; and to joyn with me, and all the Churches friends, in daily and importunate requests to God, that he would guide our feet into the way of Truth and Peace; even of that Truth, which lying between extremes, is the only way to steadfast Peace; and of that Peace, which is the Means and End of Truth. Amen.

Kedemminster, August 10, 1653.
POSTSCRIPT.

Christian Reader, I have been willing to hope that my work of this kind, and with this kind of men, was almost at an end, and that God would in mercy grant me some little vacancy for more profitable labors (of practical Theology) which I have long affected, and earnestly desired an opportunity to perform: But the unceasing assaults of contentious men do make me begin to lay aside such hopes; The enemy of truth is too subtle for me; It's like he doth conjecture at the shortness of my time, and therefore contriveth to force me upon other works till my glass is run. I have long foreseen his plot, and yet I am not able to disappoint him: To quiet the spirits of the contentious is beyond my power; To bear in silence their Reproaches of myself, and to spend but little time or none in vindicating of any interest of mine own, this I have purposed and promised to my Brethren. But when I see apparently that it is an interest higher than mine that is assaulted, and that God's Truth and the souls of men do command my endeavours for their defence, I have no power to forbear. Since the printing of this Book, there is come to my hands a second Volume of Mr. G. Kendalls against Mr. John Goodwin on the point of perseverance; wherein he hath assaulted my Directions for Peace of Conscience in a large Preface; and my Book of Rest, in a Digression: Had he fallen on my Aphorisms again, I think I should have silently yeelded them up as a sacrifice to his scorn; But those other Practical Writings, I suppose it my duty justly to defend. 1. Because I know it is the Serpents malicious design to make my Labours unprofitable to the Church. And seeing God in great mercy hath satisfied me by experience, that how weak soever, they have been hitherto successful, I take it for no proud over-valuing them, but for a judgement upon experience, to conclude that it will be some wrong to the Church of God and souls of men if I silently give way to this serpentine design. 2. I have heard such Jealousies and terrible accusations spread abroad by this sort of Divines against my Writings, and especially my Directions for Peace, as caused me much to admire what the cause of the offence should be. Never could I hear but one particular accusation of it, which is the nameless falsehood, that I was against the doctrine of the Saints Perseverance; to which I annexed an Apology to the second Edition. But I found it was further buz'd into the heads of the people, that there were many other dangerous errors in it; But all was in general, and I could never learn any of the particulars till now: Nay the people that were deterred from reading it, knew none of the particulars themselves, but took on trust from jealous fame that such there were. And I learned, that there is among some Brethren of this strain, a Combination,
tion, by raising such reports to deterre the people from the reading of my writings. I confess, upon all this I was not much sorry for the event, that Mr. K. had in this book brought forth his accusations, that at last I might know my errors that I could never hear of before, & that I was at last put into a capacity of making my defence; when if it had not been for this man I might have still been judged erroneous, & neither I nor those that believed and reported it, could with all our diligence have learned wherein; I understand that the same spirit doth sometime carry this learned man into the Pulpit, and there inquitigate him to the like employment; wherewith he once tickled or netted the ears of the Auditory at Aldermansbury. Truly I never thought my name, or description, worthy to be brought into a Pulpit, though in a way of opposition. I thought none had thus over-honoured me but Mr. Tombs, nor durst I think my name capable of being the matter of so honorable a triumph to Mr. K. as by the diligence he useth for a victory he seemeth to expect. But seeing he hath so much advantage of the ground (and sometime the winde, though not the Sun) when he manfully preacheth against me at a hundred miles distance, I must give him the better there, and take him when he comes within my reach. And though I shall be as brief as I can, yet so much I intend, if God vouchsafe me time and ability, as shall shew you reason to pity this Learned man, that ever his corruptions should lay him open to the prevalency of those temptations which have ingaged him in so unhappy a design as to serve the enemy of truth in employing his excellent parts in false accusing and unjust defaming his brother that would fain live in peace, endeavouring to deprive mens souls of the benefit of his labors, and that in his mercenary serving the lusts of another, for a little vain-glory of applause he should so wound his Reputation with the sober and godly, and make such work for an accusing conscience, as he hath once and again done; yea, that he should still so much neglect the 9th Command. as to become Mr. Eyres second, and Mr. Crandon third. And for those Reverend Brethren, who have (from several parts) solicited me to forbear further Controversial debates, lest I be deprived of opportunity for more profitable works (where to they importune me.) I profess to them that I take it for the greatest affliction of my life, that I am necessitated to this defensive controversial way of writing, & most gladly would I be at peace, if men would give me leave; and if they will but convince me, that I may lawfully be silent where the Truth of God, the success of all my former labors, and the good of men is so nearly concerned, I shall resolve on silence; (For my own interest I hope I can subject it to Christ's;) But till then I must crave their pardon, yea, and their compassion of me, who am to my great trouble detained from a more pleasing kind of work.

May 23. 1654.
Reader, To prevent the mistake of my sense, I desire thee to correct these faults before thou readest; many smaller there are which may be easily discerned.

Errata in the Epistle to C. G. Whaly.

Page 4. line 23. read To where end, I. pens. r. your self. p.5. l. 19. for their r. your p.6. l. 7. for undeservedly r. unreferredly.

Against Blake.

Pag. r. 1. 32. for r. i.e. l. 5. for Cor. r. Sen. p. 6. l. 45. for our faith r. one faith. p. 7. l. 30. for former r. formal. p. 25. l. 33. for recipiscitur r. recipiscitur. l. 38. r. for receiveth. p. 38. l. 22. non contingat. p. 46. l. 11. for Ne. r. to. p. 62. l. 15. for man r. an unregenerate man. p. 85. l. 5. for Justification r. Impedion or Institution. p. 89. l. 15. r. expect order. p. 91. l. 33. r.recepitive. p. 92. l. 14. for dari r. pura and for subconditions r. sub conditions. p. 97. l. 22. though it was. p. 99. l. 25. r. The Apostle speaking. p. 100. l. 32. for particular r. peculiar. p. 104. l. 22. but so come. p. 117. r. your self. p. 118. l. 36. r. to many. p. 120. l. 41. blot out to. p. 133. l. 30. for distinguishing: diminishing. p. 134. l. 41. blot out that. p. 136. l. 5. for q. r. quatuor. l. 6. for this r. his. p. 138. l. 2. for seal r. state. p. 145. l. 11. r. by Moses Gen. 2.

Against Mr K.

Pag. 4. l. 25. r. spiritus. p. 5. l. 3. r. nemini. p. 29. l. antepenult. r. be so called. p. 28. l. 30. for vivos r. viros. p. 31. l. 42. for their r. them. p. 51. l. 34. for now r. enough. p. 97. l. 45. r. on believing. p. 109. l. 17. for gracefull r. gratefull. p. 110. l. 31. r. in dem. p. 111. l. 9. r. whether. p. 121. l. 25. r. efficiencies. p. 123. l. 6. for only r. wholly. l. 24. r. be that proves. p. 143. l. 37. for obtuseness. obtunde.

In the Epistle before that against L. Colvin.

Pag. 3. l. 24. for fear r. bear. ibid Pref. Apol. p. 3. l. 18. for meer r. meer. p. 4. l. 13. r. reverse. In the Contents p. 3. l. 6. for Decree r. Degree.

Against L. C.


Against Crandon.

Pag. 12. l. 36. for parties r. parts. p. 5. l. 28. for endlesse r. ended. p. 28. l. 2. for No. r. Note r. 35. l. 6. for wherein r. without. p. 37. l. 14. for solid r. solid. p. 55. l. 8. for that r. the. l. 14. r. obtrude.

Whatsoever hath escaped me in these Writings that is against Meekness, Peace, and Brotherly Love, let it be all unsaid, and hereby revoked, and I desire the pardon of it from God and Man.

Richard Baxter.
Richard Baxter's

CONFESSION
OF A
DISSERTATION

For the Justification of Infidels:
Written by Ludiomaeus Colvinus,
alias Ludovicus Molinaeus, Dr. of Physick
and History-Professor in Oxford,
against his Brother Cyrus Molinaeus.

Heb. xi. 6.
But without Faith it is impossible to please God.
Joh. 3. 16, 17, 18.
For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believeth in him, should not perish but have Everlasting Life.

For God sent not his Son into the world, to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

LONDON,
Printed, by R. W. Anno Dom. 1654.

C. 7. Item Placuit ut quicunque dicerit in Oratione Dominica ideo dicere sanetos Dimitte nobis Debita nostra; ut non pro seipss hoc dicant, quia non est eis jam necessaria ista Petition, sed pro aliis, qui sunt in suo populo peccatores; & ideo non dicere unumquamque Sanctorum; Dimitte mihi debita mea; sed, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, ut hoc pro alius potius quam pro se ipsius petere intelligatur, Anathema sit.

C. 8. Item placuit ut quicunque Verba ipsa Dominica Orationis, ubi dicimus, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, ista volunt a Sanctis dici ut humiliter, non veraciter hoc dictatur, Anathema sit. Quia enim ferat oratorem, & non hominibus sed ipsi Domino mentientem, qui labiis sibi dicit dimittsi velle, & Corde dicit, que sibi dimittantur Debita non habere.
I having perused these papers since the printing of them, that the n.5 th S. 11. p. 25. against Mr. Blake, is through too great brevity like to be misunderstood, I thought meet to add this Explication.

I distinguish between the Real Operations and Mutations on man's soul, by objects; and the Conveyance of Right to several Benefits by the Covenant of God. It is not the former that I speak of in that place. I confess that as the Apprehension of one of Gods Attributes, makes one effect on the soul, and the apprehension of another makes another effect, so the apprehension of Christ's Kingdom; Righteousness, Death, Obedience, Intercession, Judgement, &c. do make also their several Impressions according to the Nature of the thing apprehended. But I utterly deny that it is so in Conveying Right to these, as much as I deny that Justification is Sanctification, or a Real Change of our Qualities as it is. This therefore is my Argument: If the Apprehension of Christ's Righteousness, and no other Act, should strictly be the Justifying Act of Faith, and that eNomine, because it is the object of that apprehension which is the matter of our Justification, then it would follow, 1. That the Apprehension of nothing else is the Justifying Act. 2. And that we have Right to every other particular Mercy eNomine, because we apprehend that Mercy, and so our Right to every particular Benefit of Christ, were Received by a distinct Act of Faith, But the Consequent is false. Therefore so is the Antecedent.
The minor only requires proof: which is proved by the tenour of the Covenant of Grace, which Giveth us Christ, and with him all things: He that hath the Son hath Life: He that believeth on him shall not perish, nor come into Condemnation. As many as Received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God. So that one entire faith, which is the Receiving of Christ as he is offered, that is, as our Saviour and King, is the Condition of our Right to all particular Benefits. Godliness hath the promise of this life, and that to come. It is a woman, taking such a man for her Husband that Giveth her first Interest in him, and then in all that he hath: It is not accepting this house, and that Land, and that Servant, &c. that gives her a distinct right in them. There is not a marrying to all these, and a particular Acceptance of every of his Goods and Chattels requisite to a right in them, though there be a use of them. 2. And the Opinion being utterly unproved, is sufficiently confuted. In what Book that ever was written have these nice distinguishers proved their Doctrine by Scripture or sound reason? Lex non distinguetur, ergo, &c.

3. And it discovers its own absurdity: For if this be true, then to apprehend Christ's death is the only act that gives right to that, and to apprehend his obedience to that, and to apprehend Adoption is the only act that gives right to that, and so of all other benefits: So that there should be one act of Faith giving right to Christ himself, and another giving right to pardon, another to Sentential Justification, another to Adoption, another to the Spirit and Sanctification, another to Perseverance, another to Glory: I.e. one to every particular gift or part of Sanctification; one to the pardon of every particular sin that is pardoned: One to the Gospel written, another to the Ministry, one to heal; another to life; and one to every blessing. And so that act of faith which Receives Adoption should not Justifie, nor that which Receives Christ himself neither directly: but only that which receives the San- clification. Whereas it is one Reception, or Act of faith morally taken (Apprehending the entire object) that God hath made the Condition of his Promise. So that to apprehend Christ as the Do-
nor of Glory, doth as much towards our Justification, as apprehending him as Justifier: And to Believe in him as our Sanctifier and King, doth as Really conduce to our Justification, and as much, as the apprehending him as one that will pardon our sins. He that believeth shall be saved, is the simple Scripture doctrine.

4. And if all this were not so, yet it is the apprehending of Christ as King according to them, then, that must be the Pardoning and Justifying act, more then as a Sacrifice: For as Satisfier and a Ransome, he only merites our Pardon and Justification. But to pardon by Grant, is unquestionably an act of Sovereignty as such: It being not the pardon of a private injury, but a publick Crime, that we have to speak of. And to Justifie by Plea is Christ's act as an Advocate, and not as a Sacrifice. And to Justifie by sentence is Christ's act as Judge: So that if their own Doctrine did hold (of the diversifying of our Right by the diversity of the formal reason of the object apprehended) then would it but infallibly prove against them, that it is the Receiving of Christ as King and Judge that is the Act of Pardoning and Justifying faith, more then the Receiving him as a Sacrifice or Ransome.

FINIS.
To my dearly Beloved, and much Honored and valued friend, Colonel Sylvanus Taylor.

Dear Friend,

Hough Providence hath long kept me from the sight of your face, yet hath it maintained in me that unfeigned Love to you, which many years ago it kindled. Our Union in Christ, and similitude of Spirit continuing; Local distance is no Division. As iniquity in these latter days hath abounded, so hath the love of many waxed cold; And when they grow strange, and cold to Christ the Center of Union, no wonder if they do so one to another. Yet as there is in true Saints a Perseverance of all other Graces, so is there of Love to the Brethren. That I am yet no Apostate as to my due affections to your self, I would willingly acquaint you in part by this Compellation, and by directing to you, and to the world with your name, this writing. That I speak to you so openly in the hearing of the world, Custom and Affection are my best excuse. And that yet you may know I do not forget you, I remember about 16 or 17 years ago, as you were wont to express your great dislike of the people called Antinomians, (in London and New England then making head) so you were wont to profess for your self, that you could not hearken or incline to those opinions which take
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take men off from Duty to God, or which open a Gap to Licentiousness. And indeed you may be sure that cannot be of God which is against God: and that which is against Duty is against the Law; and that which is against the Law, is against the King and Law-giver. Take down Law and Obedience, and you take down God from his Government of the World, as much as in man lies. But though Obedience is nowhere it is denied, yet those men will find that Law is Law still for all their denial: and though they can hinder the fulfilling of the precept, because Obedience is Voluntary or none; yet can they not hinder the fulfilling of the Threatning, because the Penalty is suffered involuntarily. The name of this party was first taken up from their opposition to the Law; but in my judgement they do more dangerously oppose the Gospel or Law of Grace, than the pure Moral Law. For it is but a few of the wilder and more ignorant sort that do deny all Law, even as to the Regenerate: For that is, as I said, plainly to deny God to be our Governor, that is, to be our God, and is so brutish a conceit against the Light of nature, that we need not much fear the prevalency of it very far, while men keep in their wits: But it is only the Law of Moses, or the Law of Works, or the Moral Law, as given to Adam or by Moses, which the more sober sort denied: but the same Moral Law, as the Law of Christ, they do allow. And this our most Learned opposers of them, think tolerable. For indeed though the Law of nature be still Gods Law, and Christ destroyed it not, but confirmed it, yet it stands not to the same ends, nor on the same terms altogether now as at first it did; that first Promise ceasing upon our first sin, and the remaining threatning (annexed to the Precept) being no longer Remediless, when by the Promise of Grace a Remedy was provided. And it is no great danger to say, that even the Moral Law was abrogated as it was part of the matter of Moses Law, (the parts falling with the whole, and the matter with the form; not in themselves and absolutely, but As parts, and As that Matter,)
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as long as the same Law is confessed to be still in force, as part of the Redeemers Law. I doubt another opinion of theirs, where-in many better men have by incautelous speeches encouraged them, will do more then this against the Law; I mean, the root, the heart of all Antinomianism, from whence all the rest doth unavoidably follow: and that is the misunderstanding of the nature and use of Christ's Death and Obedience, and thinking that Christ obeyed or satisfied by suffering, or both, as in our Persons, so that the Law takes it, to all ends and uses, as done by us our selves, as when a man payeth a debt by his Delegace. This opinion, if I understand it, blots out Law and Gospel at one dash. The Gospel, for it is the use of that to be God's instrument of conveying Pardon and Grace in Christ, and bringing us into a Right to the benefits of his suffering, and so to the possession. But if in Law sense it was we our selves, that either fully satisfied or obeyed in Christ, then there needs none of all this, nor is it possible: For the benefit was all ours ipso facto, upon the payment. What Justice can require more then the Idem in obligatione, the very Debt; or can refuse to give a present Acquittance upon such a payment? It overthrows the Law too; for if we have perfectly fulfilled it already in Christ, it cannot possibly oblige us still to one act of obedience, pro eo tempore, for that time which we are supposed to have fulfilled it for; and that is to the end of this life. Nay, if we did but perfectly fear the penalty of the Law in Christ, as some suppose, and that for all the sins of our lives absolutely without exception, then the Law cannot possibly oblige us in this life to Duty, any more then to Punishment: because it doth naturally oblige but disjunctively, either to Obedience or to Punishment, and not to both, for the same time: Nay it would be a contradiction so to fulfill the Penalty of the Law before the Violation, unless that fulfilling be taken in its esse morale to come after each particular sin, as it is the penalty of that sin; and if so, we must not be supposed to have done it before. It's the bottom of all our Peace that the
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Lord Jesus suffered for our sins, yea in our stead, as a ransom by sacrifice, and hath made satisfaction to God's Justice: But the misunderstanding of the nature and effects of that satisfaction, hath been the breeder of this unhappy Sect, and almost all the Monsters that they have hitched. The best things corrupted, or abused, are oft worst. Hence is this opinion which I oppose in this Book, that We are Justified before we believe, nay before we sin, nay before we are born, nay that it is an Immanent act in God, (and therefore eternal) and that Infidels are Justified as Infidels. I hope you need not much argumentation against such opinions as these, the very nature of saving Grace being so flat against them, that a practical experienced Christian doth hear the very mention of them, as nature seeth a dead Corps, or tasteth Gall, or smelleth a stink. The Spirit of Sanctification helpeth more against such unholy Doctrines, then much Learning without it would do. Yet how necessary a clear judgement is in conjunction with Sanctification, and how far some men have been carried this way, that once were the wonder of the world for their Zeal and Diligence, the sad examples of some of our old friends, now leading men in the Propagation of these Anti-Gospel-fancies, do too fully witness. England hath seen within these few last years, the Antinomian Doctrine as effectually brought into practice, and that which seemed but a tolerable speculation, bringeth forth as real doleful effects, as most ever Nation did on earth: It hath appeared among us, what a power the judgement hath on the Heart and Life, and that bad opinions are not so innocent as some men suppose them: when it bringeth men, and such men, even to be Ranters, Shakers, and I think, possessed with Devils. It was misbelief that made the Papists attempt the blowing up of the Parliament, and that made the Jews kill the Lord of Glory. And indeed our Nations sins are legible judgements; God hath given in his Testimony against the Pride and Error of Professors in Old England as well as New, and that so visibly, that he that runs may read it. For my part I profess the hand of God is so con-
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Spacious in both, that it much strengthens my Faith in the main cause of Christianity, by revealing the workings of a special Governing Providence thereabout. I think the Ages to come will be as ready to doubt of the Truth of our Reports of the Monsters in New England, and the multitude of Professors turned Ranters here, and of their carriages and lives, their Extasies and unnatural shakings, and other motions of the body, the plain effects of a Diabolical Power, to which they are given up, as men are now ready to doubt of the former Miracles of Christ and his Disciples: And though the beginning of these men's misery, be usually Pride of their supposed Graces, leading them first to separation from their Brethren, and Contempt of their Guides, and next to Anabaptistry, (and even these have been sadly given up to miscarriages) yet seldom are men thus evidently given over to a Spirit of madness, till they turn Antinomians and Libertines. When men will so horribly abuse the Son of God, as to make him a friend to sin, that hath done and suffered so much to destroy it, and to make his blood to be the chiefest defensive of transgression, and the price of a Lawless and Licentious life, which was shed to demonstrate Gods hatred of sin, and to purge the souls of men from its Power and Pollution; when men do make these Sacraments which should seal up our Abnegation of sin, and our strongest engagement to the Lord in a Covenant of new Obedience, to be Seals of an indulgence, more freely to transgress: when they make the Spirit of Holiness to be an unclean Spirit, to take men off from Humiliation, Confession, Praying for Pardon, Laboring for Salvation, &c. In a word, when they turn Gods Grace into meer wantonness and wickedness, and put God in the Likeness of Satan, the Spirit of disobedience and uncleanness; Its no wonder then if God bear no longer, but do appear against them from Heaven, excommunicate them, and deliver them up to Satan, the Spirit of Delusion.

Though the Lord Brooke's book of the Union of the Soul and Truth, contained the spawn of the worst of these abomina-
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teions, yet he hath left it on Record in his Book against Episcopacy,
pag. 88, 89, 90, 91. that that baseful people prophesied of,
1 Tim. 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. are not Papists, Socinians, Arminians,
or the like, but saith he, But if I be not much mistaken, some-
what beyond and within all these, that I suppose which
seems to them to be the Spirit. This I conceive is the Basis of
all their Vanity, Pride and Insolence. They have the Spiri-
tit, and so know more then all the Learned, Pious, Godly
men in the World. They have the Spirit, they cannot sin,
they cannot err: They will not pray but when that Spirit
moves. Adultery is but an act of the flesh, but they are all
Spirit and no flesh; what should these men do with Natural
Affections, they are all Spirit: In this case, if they be
Traitors, High-minded, Heady, &c. who will wonder?
what may they not be carried up to by the imagination of
the Spirit? But let them take heed if they have any thing
of God in them: let them be wise in this their day, for the
time may come when it will be too late. In the mean time,
I will say as Peter did to Simon, Pray that (if it be possible) this
wickedness of heart may be forgiven. If we look on the other
part of their character, Having a form of Godliness, but de-
ning the power thereof, creeping into the houses of silly women
laden with divers lusts, &c. How can these be spoken of Ar-
minians, Socinians, or our Prelates? &c. It seems very pro-
bable to me, that the Holy-Ghost in this text points out
some such as the Family of Love, the Antinomians, and
Grindletonians are, if (at least) they are not much bely-
ed. And to these I think every piece of this Character
will most properly belong: Yea, and the close of it also, or
the issue of that Sect; They shall proceed no further, for
their folly shall be made manifest to all men, which can
hardly be understood of Arminianism, or Prelacy, since
that in several names, this in several dressses hath been in
the world above 1000 years. So far the Lord Brook, who
saith
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faith pag. 88. that This one Herefie the Scripture foretelled of, which is not yet (perhaps) come; it may be it is now in the birth; sure it is not far off.

Dear Sir, As I bless God that hath confirmed you in his Truth, and kept you fast in these shaking times, and manifested you approved when Herefies did arise; so I must confess my self your debtor for the utmost of my endeavors, for your stability and progress; and if these Papers may be any helps to it, I shall be glad. But see that it be your daily business to live upon that Truth which you have owned: Many thousands are of the true Religion, that are not true to that Religion. Orthodoxy is one of the deluders of hypocrites: As if God would save men marryly because they know their masters will! They must receive the Love of the Truth that would be saved, 2 Thes. 2. 10, 11. For want of this we have seen so many given up to strong delusions. They that will not let Truth into the Heart, do soonest lose it out of the Head: it likes not a Lodging in the Porch. The great and glorious things of Eternal life, deserve better entertainment than they find with the best. Truth enlighteneth in the Head: but in the heart only doth it enliven, comfort and confirm. To be Religious no further then the brain and tongue, is but to look on the Light, and play with it, which God set them up to work by, and to guide them unto Glory. I am but commending to you that which I have long loved and honored in you, A working Faith, A Practical Religiousness, and a Detestation of those Errors that are destructive to this. That God that hath brought you into this way, and upheld you therein, I doubt not will establish you and preserve you to the end: which is the prayer of him who is,

An unfeigned friend to you,

Kedermister, March 8. 1653.

Reader, when my Animadversions were in the Press, I received this following Letter, which therefore annex, though my Papers being gone out of my hand, I cannot review them, to see whether this require any alteration or addition.

R. B.

Reverend Sir,

Being told to the Author of the tract de fidei partibus in Justificatione, that you were pleased to take notice of it, he writ earnestly that you would likewise take notice of some errors committed in the Printing, and of one notable omission by the Author.


The omission is pag. 90. line 5. after desertorem, add this Clause;

Quinimo Arminianorum dogma Deus elegit credentes magis rationi consonat, quam illud, quod vulgo orthodoxum existimatur Deus Justificat fidelem: namque rationi congruit ut ex pluribus promiscue in medio positis optima quaque eligantur: ac absque videtur ut qui jam justus est justitiam Christi, justificetur, & operiatur vesti, qui jam a calce ad caput communitus & convexitus est; nam eo quod quis est fidelis jam est justificatus.

This is from your humble Servant,

London, March 6. 1654

L. Col.
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If any suspect me as addicted to Contending, because I have confuted this Learned mans Dissertation, who medled not with me; or because I have used a language somewhat sharp, and unpleasant to the guilty, I give them this true account of my doings, both for the work, and for the manner. 1. I must not write for myself, but for Christ and his Truth, and therefore must do more for their vindication, then if it had been for my own. 2. I should hope it will be rather taken the better, because it is no personal quarrel that doth instigate me, and no honor of my own is concerned in the thing. 3. I had newly written a Reply to Mr. G. Kendal, by whom the Justification of Infidels tantamount (as he speaks) is maintained; and about the very day that I had finished it, this Dissertation was sent me; which coming in such a season, and with equal Confidence and Learning, endeavoring the promotion of the same Cause that I had been refuting, and carrying it in some points higher than Mr. Kendal had done, I thought it not unnecessary for me to annex a brief Confutation of this also. And indeed my thoughts were impelled to present action, and I suddenly set upon it, with an intent of doing no more, but only to cull out the strength of his chief arguments, and let pass the rest. Whereupon I did at first pass over the beginning of his book, and began about the discovery of his judgement in the main point. But when I had begun, I perceived that it would not be convenient to leave out any part of it: for he might possibly say, I left out his strength, or that which was necessary to the clearing of the rest: Whereupon I resolved to take him word by word. 4. My apprehensions of the danger of that Doctrine, commonly known by the name of Antinomian, or Libertine, are such as will not suffer me to make light of it, or patiently sit still in silence whilst the Gospel is subverted by it, and the souls of poor people enticed to perdition. I confidently think that the main substance of the Gospel
is by too necessary consequence overthrown by their mistakes, and that our difference with most of them about the Law, is but the smaller part. 5. We were never so much called out to contradict this way as now. Formerly it was only a few giddy ignorant souls that went this way; that had scarce parts or interest, or plausible pretence to do any great harm: and most of their lives were a shame to their Doctrine. The Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian faction did get many learned abettors; but the main body of this party consisted of the illiterate: But now (to the grief of the sober and Godly) men are risen up to defend this way of darkness, who have something more of Learning and Piety to Credit and Countenance the Cause that they engage in: And too far hath it already taken with many well-meaning less judicious men. 6. This Cause hath ever tended to worse, and led men into such ways, as have made them the grief of their friends, and the great scourge of the Church of God: New England can give you a sad Testimony of this; See Mr. Welds Book of the rise and fall of Antinomianism in New England. 7. In which Book, (and by full Testimony from men of Godliness, Credit, and Authority in that Land) I understand so much of Gods strange Judgements from heaven against that Party, that I dare not over-look or forget it; nor make light of those Errors which God makes not light of. My wit and learning may be much less than some of theirs; and therefore men may say, Why should we not sooner believe them then you? But as they dispute against the Sun, even the most express Word of God; so when the God of Heaven shall set in and determine the Cause by such a miraculous Testimony, or do so much, towards the determination as there was done, it must be a Pharaoh that must shut his eyes and go on. No wonder if the strain of the New-England Preachers, (as Hooker, Shephard, &c.) be so contrary to the Antinomian strain, when the hand of heaven hath so interposed in their Controversie! But of this I have spoken in my Book of Baptism, as noting Gods Judgements on both these Sects: But for the dangerous tendency of their Doctrine, there is no comparison between them: (I mean such as only deny the Baptism of Infants, and these:) I speak not all this, as putting the Title of Libertine or Antinomian on this Learned man: For seeing it is but some of their Doctrine which he maintaineth here, for ought I know he may not see the Concatenation, and so may be innocent in all the rest: But this part is of the nature of the rest,
8. I hope this Learned man cannot be offended with my writing for the thing, considering that I do no more against him, than he hath first done against his own Brother. If Brother write against Brother, a stranger may interpose, with less appearance of any defect or breach of Christian Moderation or Love.

9. Yea he confuted his Brothers Private Letters, and I confute but his Publick writings, which endanger the safety of the Church and Truth: I confess, if I had been of his minde, I would rather have made some writing already publick (of which he might have had enough) the subject of my confutation, then the private Letters of my own brother. 10. Yea, he knew that it was his brothers; but I knew not that this was his. 11. Yea, I hope this Learned man will rather give me thanks, then be offended: For I wrote for him intentionally, when I wrote against him actually. Little did I know that Ludomarus Colvinus, was Ludovicus Molinæus. The very name of Cyrus Molinaus, as being the Son of that man (Peter Molinus) whose name must still be venerable to us all, did instigate me to his Vindication. Besides his meer relation to the late learned Rivet: The names of these two men will be honorable while Christ hath a Reformed Church in Europe.

12. Laftly, I saw more said for the Justification of unbelievers, and against Justification by Faith, in this Book which I confute, then I had before seen in such order, and in so narrow a room; and therefore I thought that the confutation of it might not be unuseful, but might serve instead of the confutation of many, especially it being written in such modest language, which would occasion no wordy altercations or contentions. Thus I have given you my Apology for this undertaking.

Next for the manner of it, I have two questions to satisfie:

1. Why I answered not more tenderly. 2. Why I answered a Latine Book, in English. 1. For the former, the very truth is, in these two answers; I apprehend great evil and dangerous tendency in the Doctrine which I reft; and therefore durst not speak of it too easily or favorably. 2. As I have said, I knew not the Author till it was too late: but rather by my zeal, for the name of Molinaus, was more sharpened against any adversary of that name. An Englishman, I quickly perceived he was not; and I suspected Colvinus was a counterfeit name: but this was fitter matter to raise jealousies of a stranger then Reverence;
especially in these times. No reason therefore can accuse my sharpest passages as guilty of any disrespect to the learned Author of this Dissertation, when I knew not who he was. And indeed I have yet no such certainty, as flatly to conclude that he is the undoubtedly Author: but left any think I feign it, and so wrong him, I shall only give them my (too late) Intelligence, which was in two Letters: The one was in these words, "Dum Londini itinerans diversarum, occurrerunt mihi obviam Ludovicus Colvinus, simulque Oedipus additis qui nomen illud Angrammaticus, obscuratum luce donavit, accet certorem fecit in propria formam resolvendo literas, Ludovicum Molinum in re Historiâ apud Oxoniam professorem significare. Nec sine causa certe nominis suo consulium in studuit, ad tam fædi Erroris? Macula: bodie domum, cum Deo reversas raptim perlegi: Et quantum mihi sapit palatum, plus Veritatis & Theologie sanioris sentio, in Molinæ fragmentis, quam inter omnes Colvini apparatua. The other was in these words, Ludovicus Colvinus is only (transversis Literis) Ludovicus Molinaus, who is the very Author——I think I need not add, that he is a Frenchman, Petri Molinæ filius, &c. the rest contained a Commendation of the Author, and his former writings against Episcopacy (against Bishop Hall), and that this de Justificatione was against his own Brother Cirus Molinaus, living in York-shire. And I think he that wrote this, did well know it to be true.

The second thing: de modo, that some may demand, is why I confute him in English? The true answer is this: I verily thought when I began to have written but two or three sheets against him, and annexed them to that against Mr. Kendall then going to the Press; and it being to be bound with an English Book, it would not have been tolerable to do it in Latin: Besides, it is the benefit of Englishmen that I intend: and I hear not of any part of the world so much tainted with the Doctrines which I gainsay, as England is. That none may blame me for unfaithfulness in Translating him: I desire them that understand the Latin tongue, to take his own words in his book, and then they need not trust to my translation: Yet, though I did it very hastily, I suppose I have not done it unfaithfully. I have translated it all, except the Epistle to Mr. Sadler.

I intended to have added in the end, several Arguments more then he answereth here, against the Justification of Unbelievers, and as many to prove that it is not in foro Conscientiae that we are said so oft in Scripture, to be Justified by Faith, but being called to another writing,
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where I must perform that, I will omit it here. I desire the Reader also to understand, that the difference betwixt us, and those that are for Jutification before Faith, doth not lie about Gods Decrees, or Immanent acts: but we prove that Jutification is none such. We do maintain as well as they that God Decreed from eternity to Call, Jutificie, Sanctifie and Save all his Chosen: and thus far he loved them before they believed: Had he not loved them before, he had not given Christ for them, nor given them Faith. But as there is very great difference between this Love, and that wherewith he Loveth them, when they are in Christ by Faith, so this is not Jutification, but a Purpose of Jutifying hereafter, which plainly intimates that men were not then Jutified. As the world was not created really, when it was but created in Gods Decree, nor is it actually now burnt with fire, because it is burnt in Gods Decree: for to be Created, or burnt in Decree, is but this much: God hath Decreed to create, or burn the world; and so it is the object of that Decree, but not of the act decreed: but contrarily it is a certain argument that the thing Decreed is not yet done; so is it in the present case. It is certain that man is neither Pardoned, Jutified, Sanctified or Glorified, who is but yet Decreed to be so; for how can God be said to Decree to do that hereafter, which is done already? It is not therefore Gods Nolle Pnire simply that we enquire after, but his actual pardon or discharge as Legislator and Judge. This much I thought meet to add, because some that are against us, do bear their Reader in hand, as if we denied Gods Eternal Decrees and Love to his Elect; and as if there were no mean between their way, and the way of the Pelagians.

Reader, though I meddle with no Controversie but with great reluctance and diftaste, and am so weary of it, that I was once resolving never to meddle in that way more, yet I am forced to suspend such Resolutions, and so I suppose thou wilt approve my thoughts upon these two Considerations. 1. As mans Intellect naturally abhorreth error, and a sanctified man doth doubly abhor error in things Divine, so doth he most of all abhor the Corruption of the Vitals. and those errors which have a potent influence upon the heart and Life, as these which I oppose most evidently have. Mistakes we all have, and shall have: but the more they stop the motions of heart and hand, the more dangerous are they. 2. As I have been long grieved at the great Error of almost all the Churches, in extending too far those necessary Doctrines in which all Believers may have brotherly Communion and Concord,
Concord, and making controverted points of lower moment to seem undoubted Truths, of so great necessity, that we must defame and cast off those that own them not, and so every one must needs reduce all others to his opinion, as if his judgement were the infallible standard of verity, and so we have proved too proud and uncharitable, while we would be Orthodox Overmuch; so I am much afraid we are now like to fall into the other extream (perhaps God intends it for the cure of the former); and that the gap of Liberty will be for a while (and but a while) too wide: And I doubt the suppression of error will be so far cast upon the Ministers alone, as if it did not belong to the Magistrate, that it will be necessary for us to do the more. And if it so fall out, I hope the Lord will raise up Divines of accurate judgement, and able to defend his Truth against all gainers, and will give them Resolution with boldness and diligence to go through the work: Especially I advise my Brethren, to prepare their weapons against the Papists, and Socinians, and Antinomians, above all other Sects: and to Associate speedily, and carry on all their work in Unity, if ever they will succeed. But the great thing that I foresee and lament, is this: while necessity compels Ministers to study, preach and write against errors, the practical part will be neglected; and let them do what they can, experience will soon tell them, that Controversie will lamentably cool their better zeal, and hinder the exercise of Faith and Love, and keep their hearts much out of Heaven, and from the study of themselves; and such preaching will starve up the power of Godliness in their hearers: and then ungodliness will again draw in errors, while we were laboring to keep them out. The Lord teach us therefore to take his Work together, and so to do the lesser, as never to neglect the greater; but still to regard the Heart and Life.
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Chap. 1. The Epistle of Cyrus Molinaus.
§. 1. L. Colvinus charge against Papists, Arminians, Amyraldus and the Fathers, and our Divines, that make Faith a necessary cause of Justification. The necessity of Faith is not from any insufficiency of Christ's merits. L. Colvinus judgement laid down: after Molinaus his judgement. My own judgement about this matter of Justification at large in 20 Conclusions. — Wherein is showed the several sorts of Justification, and of Remission, with the causes: the difference between Remission and Justification: the nature and sorts of Imputation. How Christ's satisfaction is ours. Of our twofold Righteousness. Of the office of Faith in each sort of Justification, which is the Justification by Faith which Scripture means.
§. 3. If to be Justified by Faith, were but to be manifested Justified, then we might be said to be Elect by Faith, because we are manifested by it to be Elect and redeemed. 2 Thes. 2. 13. armed by the Dissenter. Redemption and Election have divers significations.
§. 4. Faith how put for Christ the object: Calvin vindicated.
§. 5. Our Divines call not Faith Justification.
§. 6. They confound not Gods Act with the Satisfaction to conscience.
§. 7. We are as properly pardoned by Faith, as Justified by Faith.
§. 8. Whether Faith enter the definition of Justification?
§. 9. Faith necessary to our participation of Christ's righteousness.
§. 10. Faith and Obedience, conditions and means of salvation, and not only signs. The dangerous tendency of the contrary Doctrine.
§. 11. To be made Sons, is not only to know that we were Sons before.
§. 12. 2 Thes. 2. 13. Vindicated.
§. 13. 1 Pet. 1. 2. 1 Thes. 1. 3. Vindicated.
§. 15. Regeneration what, and in what order wrought. Works what?
§. 16. The avoiding of Arminianism, so insufficient reason to deny Justification by faith. How many ways faith is not work. Of a twofold righteousness. How far faith is itself is imputed for righteousness. The Habit of faith, how far Justifying.
§. 18. The formal reason of Faith's interest in Justification.
§. 19. 2 Pet. 1. 3. Vindicated.
§. 20. Christ's death makes not means of our participation for pardon needful.

Chap. 2. §. 1. Its necessity to our first Assent, that Christ dyed for us in particular, that his satisfaction be for all as to the sufficiency. Faith not merely Passive.
§. 2. Of his second act of faith.
§. 3. Several misinterpreted texts vindicated.
§. 4. Faith pertains to remission. Works anted it.
§. 5. All Grace given through Christ, supposed not Justification. Gods Love, Hatred, Reconciliation, what?
§. 6. What Promises is fulfilled in the giving of faith.

Chap. 3. §. 1. The Dissenter will give the sense of Scripture, but not be an Interpreter.
§. 2.
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§ 1. Rom. 3. 22. Vindicated.
§ 7. Rom. 5. 18. Vindicated. Christ's formal Justification not ours. None actually sinners or Just before they exist. Calvin's Exposition of Rom. 5. 18. for common Grace.
§ 8. Christ satisfied not Legally in our person, nor have we right to his righteousness before Faith.
§ 9. Rom. 5. 1. Vindicated.
§ 11. Phil. 3. 9. with Calvin's Exposition vindicated.
§ 15. The Diversors false and immodest defence of Popery.
§ 16. Iam. 2. God hath chosen the rich in Faith, proves not Election upon foreseen Faith.

Chap. 4. § 1. Imputation, Remission, Justification, how far one.
§ 2. Christ's righteousness but the cause of ours.
§ 3. Whether Remission be the whole of our Justification? whether Christ give us any greater felicity than was promised to Adam? whether a further merit of Christ, beside satisfaction, were necessary to purchase us Justification or Salvation?
§ 4. Whether all Justified in one act? and when.
§ 5. How far God was reconciled immediately on Christ's satisfaction: and how far to all men?
§ 6. and 7. 2 Cor. 5. 21. and Heb. 10. 10. Vindicated.
§ 8. Col. 2. 13; 14. 2 Cor. 5. 18. Vindicated. More of immediate Reconciliation on Christ's death: and whether pardon have degrees.
§ 9. The Diversor proved not perfectly blessed. Pardon not perfect in this life, fully proc'd. Judgement is more then bare Declaration.
§ 10. Of Rom. 5. 19. All men not guilty at the time of Adams sin.
§ 11. Of Ioh. 3. 18.
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§ 16. The Diversors self-contradictions.
§ 17. Twifs for the Diversor.
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§ 22. If Union with Christ went before faith, it proves not that Justification doth so. Union with Christ of divers sorts. Union with Christ is not before Faith, proved by 8 arguments. All Grace is not from Christ, as from the Head to Members, but some to make them members. How our life is in Christ. Our life of Holiness did never exist in Christ. The Holy-Ghost, how given us; and how dwells in us. Ioh. 15. 5. Gal. 5. 22. Vindicated.
§ 23. Of Infants.
§ 24. How far other Graces, as well as Faith, go before Union with Christ.

§ 25.
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§. 25. Justification of Infidels, as ill way to confute Arminians. The Dissenter wrongly Christ in his Kingly, Prophetical office, and Priestly Intercession, by pretending to honor his sufferings: yea, wrongeth his death, if he deny that it procured sin to be Remissible. Full satisfaction pardoneth not immediately. The Dissenter ill makes Justification by Faith to be Arminianism.

§. 26. Giving Faith is a Decree of executive Remission, but not the full proper Gospel Remission, Luk. 1. 7. 7. abused by the Dissenter. Whether David were pardoned before Repentance.

§. 27. The false Doctrine, that all true Repentance proceeds from the knowledge of Remission, concludes all those impenitent that want this knowledge, and leaves their comfort by ordinary rational means Impossible. Luk. 7. 38. 1 Joh. 4. 9. vindicated.

§. 28. Absolute Justification not proved by Absolute Vocation. The Dissenter maintains that God Justifieth the ungodly, qua tales, and consequently All the ungodly, and only the ungodly. His great abuse of Gal. 3. 8. to prove that God Justifieth Heathens. His abuse of Rom. 5. 6. Col. 1. 21. Justification in Scripture is used more restrainedly then reconciliation or remission.

§. 29. The Dissenter makes dying for sinners, an Immanent act of God. Proved that Christ dyed to purchase us pardon and reconciliation, and not only conversion, that we may feel that we were before pardoned or reconciled. None reconciled before they fall out.

Chap. 5. §. 1. Reconciliation of God to man, and man to God, opened: some texts vindicated.

§ 2. Whether the Holy-Ghost and Sanctification, go before Faith? Our concord and discord in this.

The Dissenter faith we are Sons by grace, given in Christ before the world began.

§ 4. Of Joh. 3. 16. 1 Joh. 4. 10.

§ 6. Of Justification in conscience.

§ 7. Religion lyeth not all in Comfort.

§ 8. The necessity of Faith and Obedience. How much their description of a Christian place who place almost all in comfort and feeling, doth differ from the Scripture description.

§ 10. 12. How Sanetiication is put before Justification.

§ 11. what kind of Condition Faith is.

§ 14. Repentance a Condition of pardon as well as Faith.

§ 15. His mistake about Conditions.

§ 16. Remission nevertheless from Faith because from Union with Christ.

§ 17. The reward never the more of debt because Faith is the Condition, then if the gift had been Absolute.

§ 19. No ground of Assurance of pardon can by any man be produced, but on the performance of the Condition: No ground for the first act of Faith in the Dissenter's way.

Chap. 6. §. 1. Faith enters the definition of Justification.

§ 2. Faith a Legal, not natural Condition.

§ 3. Dr. Hammond vindicated from the Dissenter's mistakes. The desperate consequent of his Doctrine, but a wicked man and Infidel, qua tales, is Justified.

§ 4. The Dissenter's unhappy reconciliation of Paul and James: Neither Paul nor James do treat or mean Justification in conscience or before men, proved.

§ 6. A plain and brief explication of the reason of Faith's interest in Justification.
The Contents:

§ 7. 8. 9. His reasons against the common Doctrine of Eph. 2.
§ 11. The concomitance of the Covenant Conditions.
Chap. 7. § 1. The Dissenter's vain confidence.
§ 2. Rom. 8. 30. His exposition makes all to be damned that have not had Assurance that they are righteous.
§ 3. That Rom. 8. 30 neglecteth not the order of grace. 1 Cor. 6. 11. 2 Thes. 2. 13. 1 Tim. 1. 9. 2 Pet. 1. 10. explained.
§ 4. The text treating not of lesser life, or that to come, but how men, and how against the Dissenter.
§ 5. Many truths destructive to Antinomianism, here confounded by the Dissenter.
§ 6. Anewens no subject of Justification. Six as of God's understanding and will mentioned, none of which seems to be it that the Dissenter calls Justification. How far our sin was imputed to Christ before his Incarnation. How far Christ was guilty of our sin, and by what obligation.
§ 7. He undertakes the composition of Scharpius Arguments against the Papists for Justification by Faith alone.
§ 8. 9. 10. 11. Scharpius arguments defended.
§ 12. Calvin and River vindicated.
§ 16. Christ intercedeth for pardon and right to Life. None properly Heirs while In-viders or unborn, proved. Christ's Intercession vindicated.
Chap. 8. § 1. Zanchy vindicated, as being against the Justification of Infidels.
§ 2. 3. Altedius and Tollanius vindicated.
§ 4. Twills and Mackovius confessed to be for the Justification of Infidels. Their great Argument answered. Except God were reconciled to us, and had pardoned us, he would not give us Faith.
§ 5. Pemble proved in his Treat. of Justification, to be against the Justification of unbelievers, though before in his Vind. grant he was for it.
§ 6. Mr. Walker's testimony for Justification of unbelievers, backed with weak reason. Polanus, Chamer, &c. confessed to speak sometime the same way.

The
The Fragment of an Epistle, which was the cause of this Dissertation.

Had not as yet heard of this new Controversie about the nature of Justification: I may freely say, that it is not of so great moment, that for it your Churches ought to be dashed one against another: For if it be more neerly examined, it consisteth more in words then in Doctrine: some say, that Faith goes before Justification. Others on the contrary affert that Justification goes before Faith: In my judgement it is easie to agree the Dissenteres; for as there are divers acts and motions of faith, some go before, and some follow Justification. For the act of Faith which accompanyeth Repentance, and whereby we implore the mercy of God and the Remission of sins, and fly to the death and righteousness of Christ, doth without doubt, go before Justification: But that act of Faith, whereby we acquiese in the perswasion of forgiveness, doth follow Justification, and is an effect of the Holy Ghost, which sealeth up to the Believer the promises of the Gospel, and beareth witness that he is the Son of God, and that through Christ, his sins are pardoned to him; whence ariseth Peace and Tranquility of conscience, Rom. 5. Being Justified by Faith, we have peace with God. Moreover, that this controversie between you, may be composd, it were necessa-
ry to determine what is meant by Justification. Our Divines acknowledgment that this name of Justification, is forensick, and that in this que-
tion, it signifieth an act of God the Judge, whereby he pronounceth Righteous, and Absolveth from sin, one that is ungodly and a sinner in himself, and obnoxious to his wrath, of his meer grace, for the per-
fet obedience of Christ, received by Faith. This I think is a true de-

definition of Justification, as I have almost in the same words taken it out of Rom. 3. 22. &c. And this Justification is fitly considered in three dif-
firct seasons: 1. In Gods Decree: 2. When God doth actually par-
don the believer: 3. In the life to come, when the sentence of Justifica-
tion shall be pronounced in the last Judgement. God be mercifull to him in that day, 2 Tim. 1. 18. and Acts 3. 19. Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached to you. Of the first and third season, there can be no doubt, but that Justification in decree doth go before actual Faith, and Justification at the last day, follow it. But if you consider Justification as it is actually
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actually bestowed on the believing sinner, somewhat (as I said) of Faith goes before Justification, and somewhat follows after it.

But as far as I can gather by your words, you do, with Dr. Twiss, seem to acknowledge no other justification, than that in Decree; to wit, that free love of God, whereby he embraced us in Christ from eternity, and whereby he decreed to absolve us from sin, for his death and obedience; and you seem to disallow of the common distinction of the Decree, and the execution of the Decree. But to me this distinction seemeth very good, and speaking properly. The Decree of justifying is not justification; no more then the Decree of Calling is Vocation; and the free Love of God whereby he loved us in Christ before the foundations of the world, doth differ from justification and Vocation, as the cause from the effects, the spring head from the streams: and when the scripture doth so expressly distinguish them, Rom. 8, Whom he foreknew, &c. (v. 29, 30.) in that Golden Chain, it seems to me, they ought not to be confounded: And as oft as the Scripture speaks of actual Remission of sins, wherein, as you confess, consisteth our justification, it referreth only to two seasons, to this life, and to that to come, Mat. 12. It shall not be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come. And reason confirmeth this: for properly, sins are forgiven, when they may be punished, and the Penalty is Relaxed to him: but only in this life and that to come may they be punished: therefore only in these two seasons may they be remitted. But if sins must be considered only as forgiven, and not as to be forgiven, and Faith, as you say, should justify us only * relatively, and by revealing to us that our sins are forgiven, then in vain should Christ and his Apostles exhort us so frequently, to seek of God forgiveness of sin; and a believer who hath once had a true sense of his Reconciliation and Justification, should no more have need for the time to come to implore God's mercy even for his most grievous sins. Do you think that David before his adultery and murder was not justified, and had the true sense of God's Love? To what purpose then after those new sins were so many groans and tears? If any man then had been tainted with Twiss's Doctrine, might he not deservedly have suggested to him, Why groanest thou fool? Why beggest thou for mercy and the washing away of thy sins? Knowest thou not that all thy sins were blotted out long ago? And if your opinion were true, Repentance which follows Faith, that sorrow according to God, that trembling and fear, with which the Apostle Phil. 2. would have us to work out our salvation, should not be Dispositions to salva-

* I confess it is false Printed for revealative.
tion, saving, and acceptable to God, but rather the sins of Faith weakness, foolish doubts of Gods Love and our salvation. And if the Remission of sin were only the feeling of sin as remitted, why doth the Scripture never exhort us to ask this feeling, but to ask Remission? Certainly when Peter said to Simon Magus, (not despairing of his salvation) Repent of thys thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps, the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee; he did not speak of Justification as past, but as future.

I think therefore that we must believe, that God doth indeed and properly Justifie a believer and forgive him his sins, as often as after true Repentance and Faith in Christs merit, he giveth to his conscience assurance that such and such a sin is remitted, saying to him as Christs did to the Pharisee man, Be of good cheer, Son, thy sins are forgiven thee; and that the act of Justification is reiterated, as oft as the merciful God by his Spirit pronounceth this judgement to the conscience. For seeing, as we said, Justification is properly the judgement of God whereby he pronounceth righteous him that believeth in Christ, through Christs righteousness, why are you unwilling to call this private sentence of absolution, which God pronounceth to every believer, by the name of Justification? and when we have also the Devil and our consciences for Accusers, and Christ for our Advocate, is it not also necessary that we have God for our Judge, to absolve us from those accusations? as the Apostle faith, Rom. 8. Who shall lay any thing to the charge, &c. it is God that Justifieth; seeing therefore the Scripture speaketh of Justification as of a thing present; and which is still given us; and that God Justifieth us at present, why abhor we the name of Scripture?

You will say, that our sins were forgiven formerly in Christs death, and that God was reconciled to us in Christ-dying, and accepted his sacrifice for the payment of our debts. But the answer is easy: For we must not confound the Impetration of salvation and remission of sins, with the Application of it: And although we do not with the Armenians extend the Impetration to more than the application, yet is it certain that they are things different both in time and nature: The Impetration was made by Christ-dying sixteen hundred years ago, the application is made daily by the Holy-Ghost: the Impetration was made on the Cross, the Application in the heart of the Believer. And as the sacrifice was one thing, and the sprinkling of the blood another under the Law; so under the Gospel, Christs sacrifice whereby he obtained for us Reconciliation and Justification, is one thing, and actual Justification whereby God by his Spirit refresheth (or sprinkleteh) the consciences by Christs blood, is another thing. Moreover, if in Christs death
death our sins had been actually forgiven; and we actually justified, what should Christ's intercession, and the presentation of his sacrifice, now profit us? Is it only, that we might have the sense? the giving of the Spirit would have been sufficient (for that): But the Scripture speaks more excellently and efficaciously of Christ's Intercession, and refers it not only to 
giving, but to true and actual Justification, saying, that Christ's blood speaketh better things then the blood of Abel; and that this blood is still fresh and living; and that because Christ alway liveth and intercedeth for the faithful, he can therefore perfectly save all that come to God by him.

This difference of Impetration, from Application, and Justification, appeareth by the Scriptures diversity of speech: for when it speaks of Christ's death, it faith, that Christ dyed for enemies and sinners; but when (it speaks) of Justification, which is the Application of that death, it faith that God forgiveth sins to the penitent and Believer: Nor did I ever yet finde any place in Scripture, where it is said that any man's sins were forgiven before he believe, and that a sinner that is yet impenitent is Justified. Paul faith indeed, Rom. 4. that God justifieth the ungodly; but in the same verse, he tells us who the ungodly one is, that is, He that believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly; that is, one ungodly in himself, but righteous through justifiable. Christ's obedience, accepted by Faith. The Apostle also faith, Rom. 5. That when we were enemies, we were reconciled: but in the same place he manifestly distinguisith the Reconciliation which we obtained in the death of Christ, from saving from his wrath; whence it appeareth that the Apostle by Justification and Reconciliation doth mean the Impetration and Acquisition of Remission of sins. For to be saved from wrath, and to be absolved from sin, is altogether the same thing. If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life.

Hence it appeareth how in firm Dr. Twisse's Objection is, Faith is God's Gift, and proceedeth from God as propitious and appeased by Christ: therefore we were justified before Faith. For after the same manner might it be objected, Saving Vocation is the gift of God appeased by Christ, therefore we were justified before we were called: which yet the Apostle denyeth, Rom. 8. Whom he called, them he justified. But the answer is very easie: for God being appeased in Christ-dying, doth befall on his Elect the effects of that Reconciliation, after many Ages, calling them, and Justifying them in his own time.

This order therefore do I conceive in the Oeconomie of salvation, which the Apostle teacheth, Rom. 8. Whom he foreknew, &c. For God from
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from eternity, of his mere good pleasure, did choose certain persons to himself whom he would have; for them he sent Christ into the world: to them, being reconciled by the death of Christ, that he might bestow on them the salvation which decreed, in time he called them, touching their hearts with true Repentance; the penitent sinner flyeth to Christ by faith; he imploret God's mercy: Christ intercedeth for the sinner: he offereth the price of his sacrifice: God the Father heareth: he accepteth his Sons Intercession; and on the beholding of * him, he pardoneth the * or it. sins of the Penitent and Believer: and this Remission he sealeth to the heart by the Spirit, whence comes the Peace and Joy of Faith.

These things being thus determined, as it seemeth to me, according to Scripture, I cannot consent to your positions, that Justification absolutely goes before Faith; and that Faith is of not the definition of Justification, and that Faith doth only Justifie us, by revealing: for though we think not that we are Justified by Faith formally and meritoriously, as if by its own Virtue it did Justifie us before God, or merit absolution, or, as the Arminians teach that God did accept Faith, as an Evangelical and Imperfect obedience, for that rigorous and exact obedience of the Law: Yet doth it Justifie us, as the Evangelical Condition, without which we should not be Justified, and as an Instrument whereby we apply to our selves the death of Christ, by the vertue and merit whereof we are Justified. And that Faith and Repentance are prerequisite Conditions to Justification and Remission of sins, is most certain from Scripture: Act. 10. To him give all the Prophets witness, that whoever believeth, &c. Act. 13. Be it known to you, that by him whoever believeth is Justified from all things, from which, &c. Rom. 10. as he maketh this the Condition of the Law, He that doth these things shall live in them; on the other side he placeth this as the Condition of the Gospel, if thou believest, thou shalt be saved. Therefore even as man had been Justified, if he had fulfilled the former Condition, so also is it necessary that the Condition of the Gospel being fulfilled, the man be Justified; though not by the Virtue or Merit of that fulfilling. This being so determined, it is past doubt that Faith goes before Justification: for in every Covenant the Conditions must be performed, before the things promised in the Covenant be bestowed. Moreover, there is no true Repentance without Faith. But Repentance goes before Justification, and is a necessary Condition of the pardon of sins. Act. 3. Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out. Moreover, Faith doth necessarily accompany saving Vocation: but Vocation doth at least, in order of nature, go before Justification. Whom he called, them he justified, Rom. 8. therefore Faith, &c. Besides, the Apostle Rom. 3. doth expressly teach, that a believing man is the object of Justification: verse 20.

Justifying
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Justifying him that believeth in Jesus. And therefore the Righteousness by which we are Justified, is called, verse 22. The Righteousness by the Faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe. Whence it is plain, that you err from the truth, when you say that Faith is not of the Definition of Justification. I will say more: Though the Decree of Justifying do go before actual Justification, yet in the Decree, the Consideration of Faith goes first; because God hath decreed to pardon sin only to the penitent and believer: this the Apostle teacheth verse 25. saying, That God see forth Christ a propitiation through Faith. For God in the same order decreeth to execute things, in which he afterward executeth them: but according to the Apostle, he calleth before he Justifieth, Rom. 8. therefore in the Decree he first considered man as called and believing, before, as Justified. Add to this, that if Justification did go before Faith and Repentance, God should forgive sin to the unbeliever and impenitent, contrary to Scripture, He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life; he that believeth not in the Son, shall not see Life, but the wrath of God abideth on him: But the matter following so easily, carryeth me away too far.

R. B. I. Thought it necessary to translate this Epistle, and put it in the beginning (though the answerer puts it in the end.) 1. That the Answerer's words may be the better understood. 2. For the much excellent useful matter which it containeth. And indeed it sufficiently confuteth Justification from eternity (though it is so Antichristian a Doctrine, that much more may deservedly be said against it.) But yet, I must desire the Reader, not to suppose that I approve every word in it. 1. I think he speaks in the beginning (its like with a reconciling intent) too gently and favourably of this monstrous Doctrine, and makes the difference less then it is. 2. His great oversight, in my Judgement is, that he only takes notice of Sentential Justification, which is the act of God, as Judge, (besides the decree, which is no Justification,) and not at all of Legal or Testamentary Justification, which is the act of God as Legislator, and Covenantor, and free Donor. It is true, that sentential Justification is most briefly and fully so called: but its as true that Legal or Covenant Justification, is true Justification also, yet and always goes before the former; and is that which the Scripture most commonly means, when it speaks of Justification by faith. Divines call it, Conjunctive Justification. 3. And hence this learned man is driven to place Justification in the Spirits pronouncing a sentence in our Consciences, which I have elsewhere proved large to be a great mistake, and of ill tendency. 4. He takes notice of the Application of the imputed benefits, by the Spirit, but not of that Application, whereby the Gospel, as Gods dead gift, or Christ's Testament, doth confer right to the Believer: which is the Application by which Relative mercies are given. Yet after he distinguisheth between pardon, and the sense and sealing of it, which follows. 5. I conjecture that he is of the same mind as 1, about faiths interest in our Justification. For though he call it an Instrument, it seems he means by Instrument, but a fit receiving means or act; it being ordinary with Divines to use that term, many continue it, but in a Metaphorical or improper sense. For this learned man doth first place its conditional office, and then the instrumental seeming to make this but the material aptitude to the former: some other following expressions also intimate as much. 6. I consent not to what he addeth, about Gods decreeing things in the order that he executeth them, unless the meaning had been only this, He decreeth to execute them, in the order in which he doth execute them. But in the main the Epistle is such as shews the Author Judicious and Orthodox, and faith more then all the Libertines and Anabomians living will ever well answer.

L.C.
L. C. Of the Part of Faith in Justification.

CHAP. I.

The cause of erring in this matter.

§ 1.

Being the Doctrine of Justification is the summe of our salvation, and the chief consolation of our Souls; Satan hath bent his care with all his strength, to substitute instead of Christ's righteousness, another that is loose and unstable, that cannot stand before the tribunal of God; such as the Papists have forged; and moreover to finde out or make such as to the wrong of God's Righteousnes do give so much to Faith, in Justification, as to make it, both to be before Election, as the Arminians do, and assure it to be antecedent to Christ's satisfaction and death, as that Interpolator of Arminianism, Amyraldus, teacheth. And so case is it to slip into error in this point, that even some of the holy Fathers by occasion of the words Faith justifieth, misunderstood, did give too much to Faith, and inherens righteousness: Yea, and a great part of Godly and Learned men, at this day of right judgement in the other Articles of the Doctrine of Faith, do seem by writing and words, to joyn to Christ's Righteousnes another efficient Cause, though less principal, to wit, Faith; as though Christ's Righteousnes alone were not sufficient to justify a man at the Tribunal of God, unless Faith also came in to help it.

Among these is the most famous man Cyrus Molinaeus, whose sense may be gathered by the fragment of an Epifle, which he wrote to his Brother, a Professor in the University of Oxford; which controversy he yet calls a mere fighting of shadows, or rather a strife about words, and not a matter of such moment as that common Christians should be troubled for it. Truly though it were a far greater controversy, it were meet that a Christian man should judge of his brother in Christ, as that in the mean time he should pray to God, and hope to find him at last of the same minde, as St. Paul promiseth himself of the Philippians; and so to deal with him, as with his dearest natural brother, differing from his in judgement and opinion, whom he endeavorth with all moderation of minde, and words to draw to himself.

But the whole controversy thoroughly weighed, and examined by the touchstone of the holy Scripture, I could not persuade myself that the controversy is merily in words, but in Things, and of so great moment, that I think the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, such as the Author of the Epifle holdeth, doth either furnish the Papists and Arminians with weapons, or, if not so, and if it be not against sound Doctrine, at least it darkneith a chief Article of our Faith, and labors of sayings not consonant to right reason and consonant speech.

N n. The
The Author of the Epistle contends, that a man is said properly and without a
trope, to be justified by Faith, and that Faith is of the definition of justification, and
so that man hath Faith before he is justified.

But I do constantly affirm, that when to justify, is the same as to Absolve, to
impair Christ's Righteousness, to make righteous, and to forgive sins, to
declare or pronounce just without man's bar ; and whenever Scripture
speaks of that righteousness by which at God's Bar, and by God we are made
and acknowledged just and heirs of Eternal Life, then a man can in no wise be
said to be justified by Faith. According whereunto we judge, that a man is justi-
fied before he have Faith, and that a man faithful or believing is not the adequate
object of justification, and that Faith hath no part (or place) in the Definition of
justification, or of Remission of sins.

But when to justify, signifies to reveal Christ's Righteousness, to shew it, to
make it known, to bring it to the knowledge of the understanding and con-
cience, then I grant that by Faith, and through Faith a man is justified, in as much as
by Faith it is known to a man, that Christ's Righteousness belongs to him.

§ 1.

R. E. The Author of this Discourse, freely confesseth in his title page, that
the opinion which he opposes, and D. Molinæus in this Epistle de-
fendeth, is commonly accounted Orthodox ; and I shall shew that it is not with-
eout very great reason; and that he should have been tender of departing from
the part which is commonly judged Orthodox in so great a point, without stron-
ger reasons to move him, then any he produceth.

Pag. 1. 2. I willingly with him detest the substitution of any Righteousness
of our own, or any others instead of the Righteousness of Christ, though I know
we must have a personal Gospel-Righteousness, subordinate to that of Christ :
which yet Christ also must give us. I as freely reject the Arminians making
Faith (whether in itself, or God's consideration), to go before Election : And I
believe that we are elected ad fidem, as well as ad salutem per fidem.

And if his Accusation against Amyraldis be true, that he maketh Faith ante-
cedaneous to Christ's satisfaction and death, I as much dislike that at least as the for-
mer. I cannot say, he flanders him, because I have not read every word that
ever Amyraldis wrote. But I must say that I not only confidently believe that he
flanders him, but take it for my duty so to believe ; and I leave my reasons to
the censure of the equal. 1, I am bound to believe the best of my Brother,
till worse be made appear, and not to receive an accusation

"And he brings without proof." 2. Amyraldis deemed not only frequently con-
no proof.

And that Faith is the fruit of Christ's death, (when yet Cameroon
in Ep. ad. L. C. looked on it as flowing immediately from
Election, as the gift of Christ himself to the world, did from God's Love) but
also he doth in an Elaborate search disclose to the world the difference be-
tween Christ's procuring Faith, and his procuring Remission and Salvation :
which point well understood would do more to the opening of many difficulties,
and the composing of those controversies, than most consider. Its pitty that one
point is not more diligently enquired into.
It is not well that * this dealing is the beginning of
this Dissertation: to charge a man in print with that
which he writes against, and so diligently. And
I think with no less Verity, (though with far more
shew of Verity) doth he call Amyraldus an Interpo-
lator of Arminianism. He is as little and less a
friend to any error, who avoids the contrary ex-
tream, then he that runs into it. Were all our Brit-
ish Divines in the Synod of Dort Interpolators of
Arminianism > as also the Erastian Divines? who in
the main points went the same way? For my
part I differ from Amyraldus in his Exposition of Rom.
7. and in many other points: But I think that Mr.
Hoord doth take neither him nor Davenant for his most
contemptible adversaries: Nor do I think any Ar-
minian hath been more judiciously and strongly an-
swered (though not with such triumphing words)
than he hath been by them two. And Titus thought
Camero no friend to Arminianism. The middle terms
that these men go on, doth give a man such exceed-
ing advantage against the Arminians, that I think no
man else can solidly confute them. Pardon my confidence: I am sure I see the
vanity of my own arguings, when I was in the other extrem.

After the Papists, Arminians and Amyraldus, his next charge is against some of
the Fathers, for giving too much to Faith and inherent Righteousness. It he had said
so of almost all the Fathers, I would not have contradicted him, at least, mean-
ing it of their unmeet phrases. But I should think that those who give it too little,
and run into the other extrem, should be the less passionate for their way, when
they read what was the judgement of all former ages of the Church: at least
they should the less cenitre their Brethren, who go not so far as the Fathers
went.

His fifth charge is against A great part this day of the Godly and Learned, who
judge aright in the rest of the Articles of the Doctrine of Faith, that seem by writing
and by voice to join to Christ's Righteousness, another efficient cause, though less prin-
cipal, that is, Faith: as if Christ's Righteousness alone were not sufficient to justifie
a man at God's Tribunal, unless Faith be called in to help it. I confess I am of the
opinion which your words express, I mean, I do as well as you dislike the making
Faith an efficient, i.e., instrumental cause of Justification: and I say, as you,
Christ's Righteousness needeth no help from it. But though Christ's Righteous-
ness be sufficient in its own to do its own part, yet not in omni genere, and to
do every thing that belongs to Justification. And you know Molinus the Au-
uthor of the Epistle proves Faith to be the condition of justification; and I sup-
pose you will grant that a condition, as such, is no efficient cause; nor doth it in
the least derogate from the honor of the purchaser or donor: I pray you answer
me these few Questions. 1. Whether, if a King say to a Traytor, I will give
thee free pardon and honor withall, if thou wilt thankfully accept it and repent
of thy Treafon; yea, if his Son did purchase this grant of his Father for the
Traytor; is it now any diminution to the honor of the Kings pardon, or the
Princes purchase, if we say, that without the Traytors acceptance it shall nor be

* Vid. specim. Animadvers. Gener. part. 1, pag. 39, 40. 41. He makes Christ's
Death to procure us Faith,
as a small cause, and faith
that Christ's death is the
cause of Faith, and that,
Christus idem a Deo, no-
biscere imperavit. And
how he can make Faith
then which he calls the
means, antecedent to Christ's
death which he calls the
procuring end, I know not.
I confess I think that
point may be yet far clearer
ly opened then hath
been done; but I suppose that en-
deavor not vain, though
short.
effectual? Or would you say, that we call his acceptance in to help the King to pardon him, or the Prince to merit it? I put these Questions, because though you in terms argue against Faith's efficiency or Instrumental causation only, yet you after shew that you intend it against the necessity of Faith, as a Condition, fine quae
you: and you only drive against Molinaeus assertion, and yet silence the main part of it here. Indeed he mentioneth Faith's Instrumentality too: but it is after its office of a Condition, intimating, that by an Instrument he intends but that Receptive nature of Faith, whereby it is naturally apt to be the Condition of the free gift; and so takes the word Instrument improperly or vulgarly, and not Logically for an efficient cause; and takes the conditionality to be the Ratio pro-
xima of Faiths interest in Justification.

2. I further demand of you, whether if you be accused at Judgement of final Impenitency or Infidelity, it be a sufficient answer to say Christ's Righteousness is sufficient for me, without the help of my own Faith. Or if the Accuser, saith, its true, Christ's Righteousness is sufficient for those that have part in it; but thou hast no part in it, will you be justified against this charge, by recurring to the sufficiency of that will not be ad rem, when the question is of your interest in it. For if all may make that answer, then all may be justified. If only some, they must have some reason for it more then all; and they must shew their Title.

3. Doth not a rational justification at the bar of your own conscience now require the same method?

4. Do not your reproachful accusations fall as much on God and his Gospel, as on the Reformed Doctrine, or on Molinaeus: For its God that faith, He that Believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned: Mar. 16. 16. And all this shall be damned that obey not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness. 2 Thes. 2. 12. And except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish. Luke 13. 3, 5. Will you now reply to Christ, Lord, is not Thy Righteousness sufficient, unless my believing and Repenting be called in to help it?

Page 4. I do yield it to you, as an undoubted Truth, that the difference is not small, nor only in words. And where you say, that Molinaeus (that is, the Protestant, ye the Christian) Doctrine doth avow the Papists and Arminians. I reply: 1. Not against our selves, save only, as it is an occasion, which any wicked man may raise his abuse on; and as the world do make Christ himself and the Gospel, and as you do in this Differtation make Christ's Righteousness the occasion of your Licentious Doctrine: But I confess against you, and against all Jews, Turks and Infidels, our Doctrine doth avow the Papists and Arminians. For what you add, that at least it doth darken a chief Article of Faith: I say, it is but of the Libertines Faith: and that it labors of speeches not consonant to reason, I say, whether that Reason be found and Reason indeed, we shall see by the proof of what you affirm.

Page 5. You do not much fail in Reciting Molinaeus Doctrine, That man is said properly and without a trope, to be Justified by Faith; and that Faith is of the definition of Justification, as a Believing man is the adequate object of Justification, and so that man hath Faith before he is Justified. Only remember that you must distinguish between infants and adult, and between the persons Faith, and the parents Faith; and that as to personal Faith, this is affirmed only of the adult; but as to parents Faith, of Infants also.

Your own Doctrine (for that is the best title I can give it) you lay down thus,
But I do constantly assert, that when to justify signifies the same, as to absolve, to impart the Righteousness of Christ, to forgive sin, to declare or pronounce just without the Bar of man; and whenever Scripture * extra.

speaks of that Righteousness by which we are by God at his Tribunall constituted and acknowledged just, and Sons, and heirs of Eternal Life; then man can in no sort be said to be Justified by Faith: According to these we judge that a man is Justified before he have Faith, and that a man faithful or believing is not the adequate object of Justification, and that Faith hath no parts in the definition of Justification, or Remission of sin. But when to Justify, signifies to reveal Chris's Righteousness, to show it, to make it known, to bring it to the knowledge of the understanding and conscience; Then I grant that by Faith, and through Faith a man is Justified, as by Faith it is known to a man that Chris's Righteousness belongs to him. Add to this your larger explication afterward, wherein you assert Justification to be an immanent act, and we shall see more of the face of this Antichristian Doctrine.

It is not seasonable for me to fall upon your opinion here, while you do but barely name it, seeing I shall be called to it when you come to confirm it. I will next tell you also somewhat of my opinion, as you have laid down the Authors and your own, that the Reader may have all three together.

Justification active, is first Constitutive, which is a making just. 2. Judicial, which is either principal or subservient. The principal is by the sentence of the Judge, and that is 1. Improper, per sententiam conceptam; or 2. Properly so called: viz. Per sententiam proletam. The subservient Justification, is 1. Assertive, as by the witnesses. 2. Apological, which is 1. by denying false Accusations, either de facto, or de jure. 2. By Demonstrating, 1. the true Righteousness of the Cause first, and so of the person. 2. that therefore the person is to be sentenced just, or absolved by the Judge. These few senses of the term Justification, which are most pertinent to our business, I have taken from among many more. And now so much of my opinion as is of necessity to be discovered for the understanding of what follows, take in these Conclusions.

**Concl.** 1. Constitutive Justification goes before judicial; and is the first Justification by Faith, yea the first of all that Scripture mentioneth.

**Concl.** 2. The Principal efficient cause of this justification is God: the instrumental is the Promise or Grant of the new Law or Covenant, conveying Right to us, as Gods Deed of Gift, or Christ's Testament. 2. The satisfaction of Christ is the meritorious cause, and as it were, the material. 3. The Condition sine qua non, is 1. The sole Faith of the sinner, that is, his belief of the Gospel, and thankful, loving acceptance of Christ as he is there offered (in which Repentance is comprised); for the inception of his justification. 2. The continuance of this Faith, with the addition of external sincere obedience, is necessary to the confirmation and continuation of this justification in this life. 4. The form of it, is to make just by Donation, or Condonation.

**Concl.** 3. It is the same act of God that is called Constitutive Justification, and pardon of sin; for as Justification is taken as comprehending only the restoring of us to the happiness that we fell from: (but if you take it for the superadding of any degree or sort of blessing which we never lost, nor was given in the first Covenant, then Justification containeth so much more than Remission). Yet do they notionally or respectively differ, though not Really.

**Concl.** 4. Remission is taken in very many senses as well as Justification, as sometime for mere not-punishing, sometime for mere forbearance for a time;
sometime for remission of part of the penalty only: sometime for admitting to a treaty for full pardon, and delaying execution that while: sometime for a *nolle* *punire*, in him that before did intend to punish, or a mere mental Remission. In a word, all Rectorsal pardon (distinct from that of equals) is 1. the Rectors Civil, or Legal, or supralegal Remission, whereby he giveth *Jus ad Impunitatem*, viz., *ad totum, vel partinem, vel Conditionalem, vel Absolute, vel de praesenti, vel in distant. 2. The sentential pardon of the Judge, by which our Right to Impunity is not only declared, as some imagine, but Decisively determined, and thereby fully confirmed, as no more to be controverted. 3. Remissio executiva, whereby (before or after sentence) the penalty is remitted in whole or part. This is also called pardon in Scripture. But the first is that which is the full proper Remission of sin, viz. that Scripture mentioneth most, An Act of God as Rectors, by his Gospel Grant dissolving the Obligation to punishment (or giving right to impsniity) to a Believing sinner, for the sake of Christ's satisfaction. The principal efficient cause is God; not as Absolute Proprietary directly, but as Rectors. And by his derived power, Christ as man as well as God, doth forgive sins. 2. The Instrument is the Testament, Promise, or Gospel-Grant, which is really Gods Act of Grace or Oblivion, and a pardoning Law. 1. By an Act of Law are we obliged to punishment, and by an Act of Law (in the large sense) must we be disobliged. For *cadem modo dissolvitur obligatio quo contrabibatur*. 2. Legal, or Civil acts are the proper means of conveying Right, as such; Legal only, when it is from a Rectors, as such; and Donatory, when from a Benefactor, as such. And God doth it as both, as rectors beneficient. 3. We find an Act of Grace and Conditional pardon in the Gospel de facto, and therefore cannot doubt of it, when we read it there.

3. The object is a believing sinner: that is, being presupposed a sinner, Faith is the Condition, as in naturals the *Dispositio materiae*: if it be one at age, it must be his own Faith, if an infant, his parents, which reputatively and legally is his own: and therefore it is not absurd to call infants *fideles*, faithful, repuratively, no more then to call them Christians, or to call the Infidels children, Infidels, which we may well do. 4. The formal act of Remission is Dissolving the obligation; or Relaxing it, or Giving Right to impsniity: which are civil actions. 5. The Terminus Proximus of this act of dissolving, is *Obligatio ad Pena*, that is, Guilt; or, as it is a Donation, the Terminus proximus is *Jus ad impunitatem*; For to Dissolve the obligation to punishments, and to give a right to impsniity to a sinner, is all one act, containing two notions; 6. The remote Terminus is *Pena remissa*, which we were obliged to, or the impsniity given. For these are not as many dream, the nearest term. And therefore Dr. Twisse and you speak unfoundly when you say that Remission of sin is but non impune: Yea, or but *nolle* *punire*, if you speak it of Gods immanent Will of Purpose, and not of his Will *de Debito* expressed in his Covenant, or his Legislative Will, which Dr. Twisse took special notice of as in *praecptum*, and its pity he had not observed it as well in the Promise and Threatening, which constitute the *Debitum promissum et pena*, as the Precept doth the *Debitum officii*.

This therefore being the proper Act of pardon, which hath the *Obligatio ad penaliam*, or the *Jus ad impunitatem*, for its nearest Terminus, it is evident, that the name of a pardon is given to the other formentioned acts, less properly, for their participation in the nature of this proper pardon: especially from their respect to the penalty it self: which is here the ultimate term, and so non impune, and
and nullam punitionem, may be, and are called pardon, imperfect or participative, as containing part of the nature of full pardon in them.

Concl. 5. Though Remission and Justification be thus far one, yet the word Remission is more principally and emphatically spoken in respect to the penalty remitted, and left of its immediate term, viz. the obligation; but contrarily, Justification doth more expressly the respect to the obligation and right, and left the Penalty, or Impunity itself, yet each term expresseth or signifieth both.

Concl. 6. Also the term Justification is most properly used of the sentential Absolution at judgement, and somewhat less properly, of the justification in Law sense, or by present Imputation or Donation. (yet fitly both) But contrarily Pardon is most strictly and properly applied to Gods present act by the Law of Grace or Promise, and somewhat less properly, to the judicial sentential absolution (though fitly too of both, and Scripture useth them both ways.)

Concl. 7. The sentence as conceived in Gods own breast, that is his esteeming the sinner now just, or his willing him now just, is less properly called justifying.

Concl. 8. If it were this act that were meant in Scripture, yet must it be differenced from his Deeree, to justify, which was from eternity; and it must be denominated as beginning in time: For though Gods own essence, commonly called the substance of this act, be eternal, yet the superadded respect to a new object, gives it the Denomination. And therefore it must receive that Denomination de novo, when the object begins. For it is absurd, if you ask what is Gods Essence, to say, It is an Approbation, Acceptation, Love to Justification of a sinner. Though sancius futurus, & in esse voluit & cognito, might be said to be loved of God from eternity, yet not in esse existenti: But in time he is first hated *in esse existenti, and afterward loved in esse existenti, *Psalm 5. as a Saint: he is first esteemed by God unjuft, and after esteemed 4, 5. just, and accepted accordingly, and all this without any change in God: but the change of the object necessiteth us to denominate Gods acts as new and various.

Concl. 9. As Justification per sententiam Judicii is the most perfect proper justification, so we know of no such act of God (properly) but at the particular judgement after death, and the last General Judgement.

Concl. 10. When it is usually said that our Justification is the imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, we must distinguish of both terms, of act and object. 1. Christs Righteousness is taken either materially for that obedience, or satisfaction, wherein his Righteousness might partly be laid to consist; or else for the form of Righteousness itself, which is relative. 2. Also the matter, Christs satisfaction and merit is said to be Imputed or Given us, either immediately in itself, or else in its effect. 3. Imputation signifies either 1. Donation, 2. or Assumption, and that materiae sententia prolati. Hereupon I conclude as followeth, 1. Christs Righteousness formally is incommunicable to any other. Our Union with Christ makes us not the same person with him, to be the same subject of the same Accident, Righteousness. 2. God doth not untruly suppose or Judge us to be what we are not, or to have done what we did not, as to have satisfied, or perfectly obeyed, or both, in or by Christ. 3. Christs satisfaction and merit was given or tendered in itself to the Father, and not to us, 4. Remission and.
and Righteousness merited by Christ's satisfaction is given to us, and adjudged to us, and we judged righteous hereby. 5. This is the Righteousness of God, and of Christ, as given and as merited, as it is ours as the subject of it. 6. Christ's own Righteousness materially may well be said to be given, and adjudged to us, though not in itself immediately, yet because it is for our use and sake. As a father that gives 1000 l. to buy land for his Son, may be said to give him 1000 l. though it were in land, and not immediately in money; or as one that gives 1000 l. to redeem a Captive, may be said to give him 1000 l. in that he gave it for him; though the thing immediately given him be liberty. 7. So that both by Donation, and Atonement, Christ's Righteousness is impromptu to us, in the forementioned sense. Of which see Bradshaw de Justification.

Concl. 11. Christ Justifieth us Apologetically, as our Advocate, now and hereafter, but sentimentally as our Judge only.

Concl. 12. Apologetically, a man may justify himself, though yet he need a better Advocate.

Concl. 13. The Justification of conscience or any other per modum Testis, is not that which is ordinarily called God's justification, but a means to it.

Concl. 14. The Justification of conscience in this Life, as an internal Judge, is improper, low, fallible oftentimes; and is not that which Scripture means by Justification by Faith, or before God.

Concl. 15. There is no known way of God's passing a sentence within us, but by causing our own understanding or conscience to know and judge that we are just or justified; and this is not the Justification neither which Scripture treats of, as God's Justification of a sinner.

Concl. 16. The rightness of his cause is the reason why the person is justified in judgment; and therefore in order goes first.

Concl. 17. As God hath made two Covenants or Laws, and both are Regula actionum & Judicis, and the New Law of Grace is but Lex particularis, and the Law of Nature is Lex universale, and the Law of Grace is but subservient to the Law of Nature, being Lex Remedians, purposely ordained for the dissolving of its obligation to punishment; so also we have a twofold cause to make good at judgement against the Accuser: the one is, that though we are sinners, yet not to be condemned by the Law, because through Christ's satisfaction and the Gospels free Promise or Grant, the obligation of it is dissolvent. To prove this as Christ's blood and the Testaments Donation, must be produced and pleaded on one hand, so must our peculiar interest in this Grant be pleaded also, as the Condition. And here comes in the second Cause which is first to be determined, viz. seeing the Gospel gives pardon and Life to none but true Believers, whether we be such or not? (yea sincere obedience for the continuation, and final absolution, is part of the condition to be enquired after) And here in this cause, it is only the producing of our Faith, and Obedience, i.e. of our performance of the Conditions of the New Covenant, that will serve to justify us.

Concl. 18. Now to review all these, and shew what part Faith hath in our justification, I say 1. Faith is strictly and properly a Condition, as the word is used in a civil sense, of our Constitute justification by God's written pardon, or Gospel Grant. 2. As to God's internal Acceptation, or esteeming, or approving as just, Faith is a necessary qualification of the object, without which no Act of God's, (i.e. his Essence indeed) cannot have these denominations, because they are
are denominated ex connotatione objeci. So that here also Faith is Condicio sine qua non in sensu naturali, but not civil. 3. Faith primarily, and obedience secondarily, are proper Conditions without which God will not save us, nor justify us by sentence in publick judgement. 4. Sincere Faith, Repentance and Obedience (all that God hath made the Condition of our Justification at Judgement and salvation) is the very matter of consciences, or Gods Justification ad modum Tesis, asserting de fato, that we did perform the Condition. 5. When we are accused before God, or Conscience, of mere sin, as sin simply, or that the Law of works doth oblige us to punishment; we must plead the Gospel pardon in and for the blood of Christ: and this is our Justitia causa here. But when we are accused of final non-performance of the Conditions of the New Covenant, and so of final Impenitency, Infidelity and Rebellion against the Redeemer, here we must be justified by producing our performance of the Conditions, and denying the truth of the accusation; and not by pleading that Christ dyed for our final non-performance of these Conditions. So that here Faith and sincere Obedience is it self the very matter of our righteousness, to be pleaded. 6. At the inferior improper bar of conscience here in this life, Faith hath several parts in our Justification. In some respect it is a part of the efficient Cause: In some respect it is the Evidence: In some respect it is the matter of our Justification. So that these I think, are the offices of Faith.

Yet note, that when Faith or Obedience is said to be sometime our material righteousness it self, on which we must be Justified, that is not the least derogation to Christs satisfaction or righteousness: For our personal performance is not our Justitia Universalis, nor any part of that by which the Law must be answered, which condemneth all that perfectly obey not. But it is only our Justitia particularis, and that subordinate and subervient to Christ who is our Justitia Universalis; and first to be produced that our Title to Christ and Universal Righteousness may be made good. If men or Devils accuse me of killing a man in India, whom I never thought of; I may justify myself against that false Acquittal by denying it; and when this is the cause under trial, my own innocence is my righteousness: yet none will say that this is a wrong to the righteousness of Christ. Christs righteousness pardoneth my sins, and not my innocence or duty as such; nor will he pardon the final non-performance of the Conditions of the New Covenant in any, nor died for that end. Note also that though a wicked man may have Justitiam particulararem in foro Divino, that is, may be falsely accused; yet that will not save him, for it is this only thing, which the Gospel makes the Condition of Life, which is it that will be the great cause of the day, to be enquired after, and which Absolution or Condemnation will follow upon.

Concl. 19. Among all these, it is principally Constitutive Legal Justification, or Remission, and sentential Justification at judgement, which is meant in Scripture, where it is ascribed to Faith and Christs blood; though Apologetical by Christ as our Advocate may be also implied.

That Justification by the Covenant-Grant is first in order, is evident; and that it is by Faith as the Condition is as evident. Also that Justification which is said to be by faith ordinarily in Scripture, is the same with Remission of sin, But that it is most properly it which is by the Covenant: therefore, &c. The major shall be proved hereafter, where I finde this Author denying it.

Concl. 20. Gods mere Decree to pardon or justify, is no where in Scripture called
called Pardon or Justification, nor in reason so to be called: much less is it that Pardon or Justification which Scripture ordinarily treats of. Nor is any act of God upon Christ’s death, called our Justification, or pardon: but only that the general Grant of pardon to all that will believe, may well be said to be a general Conditional pardon and justification. But while it is but conditional, and the condition not performed, it is not actual. Nor doth the Scripture call any man Justified in any one place, before upon the condition of his own or his parents Faith, he be Justified. (I put in the latter, to put by their cavil about infants.)

And thus I have given my sense before I confute yours, and the rather, because in other Writers, I like not a more destructive arguing, though it be easiest, and may save much labor to the opponent, yet it is not the best to Edification: and because I hold nothing that I am ashamed should see the light; and with my brethren that dissent from me, I am so far from hiding my opinion, that I most fear, least I should not fully enough reveal it.

$\S$. 2.

Pag. 7. L. C. For in the former sense I conceive not how by Faith a man may be made righteous, or pronounced righteous at God’s Tribunal, and his sins pardoned: but in the second sense it is easy and of obvious understanding to say, that by Faith, sins are not remitted, but made known to be remitted.

$\S$. 2.

R. B. I have now told you that which you say you conceive not, how it may be, nay more, it is an easier intelligible Truth, how Faith should be the Condition of Gospel pardon, andsentential Justification, then how it should reveal them. For though it help to reveal them, yet the knowledge of Justification is that which we call Assurance, and not, as the Libertines conceive, Justifying-Faith.

$\S$. 3.

L. C. 1. For under other Divine Actions there lay the same ambiguity and homonymy, (as are Predestination, Election, Creation, Redemption, Adoption, &c.) as is in the action of Justification, it might as properly be said that we are Elected by Faith, or the world created by Faith, because by Faith we know our selves to be Elected by Faith, or by Faith we know that God created the world; for the Apostle also saith, 1 Thes. 2.13, That we are Elect through belief of the Truth. And yet from that place the Author of the Epistle would not assert that Faith is of the definition of Election, or that Election is by Faith. Therefore though to Justify did everywhere retain the same signification as to Create, Elect, Adopt, do not vary theirs; I see not, that when Paul faith, A man is Justified by Faith, thereby Faith is any more set before Justification or Remission of sins, then Faith is by him made the cause of Election, or that he had less unfitly said that our sins are pardoned by Faith, then that we are elected by Faith.
R. B. Here you had the wit to foresee an argument that would be used against you, but had not a cause that made you capable of a tolerable Answer. We argue thus; If it were but the knowledge of Remission and Justification that is ascribed to Faith, then we might as fitly be said to be elected by Faith, Redeemed by Faith, Created by Faith, as Justified by Faith: But the consequent is false: therefore so is the Antecedent.

The argument is unanswerable; But let us see the shifts of this Author to evade it. 1. That Election, Redemption, &c. vary not their sense, and are not used in divers senses, is a falsehood very notorious! How oft is Election taken for the Actual choosing some out of the world in time, by vocation, and at other times (Grotius thinks only Eph. i., but amiss) for the Eternal Decree? How oft is Redemption taken for the paying of the price of our deliverance? yet how oft also for actual Liberation, and that sometime as begin in this Life; sometime in perfection hereafter. Wilson, Martinius, Illecrus, Ravanelius, and all that open Scripture terms, will contradict this Dictator. 3. If he object, But Election and Redemption are never, or not usually taken for the knowledge of Election and Redemption, as Justification is usually taken for the knowledge of Justification; I answer, the latter is easier begged than proved or granted, that ever Justification or Remission is so taken, much less usually.

4. What reason is there why the knowledge of election or redemption may not be called election and redemption, as well as the knowledge of Justification may be called Justification. 5. Yea it would in us be somewhat more justifiable to use that language then this latter, Because election and redemption are truly pre-existent to our knowledge of them; and therefore we should borrow a name from something that truly is. But Justification pre-existent to our Faith, (in men at age) is a Chimaera, a Fiction, and therefore you borrow a name from that which never was. Scripture speaks of election and redemption before Faith; but never once of Justification before Faith. 6. Your arguing from 2 Thes. 2, 13. is so notorious an abuse of the text, as shews either great weakness or immodesty, to speak easily of it. Suppose that εὐαγγελισμὸς προφυσικὸς καὶ τίτις ἀλεθείας must be translated per sanctificationem spiritus & sidem veritatis. yet you know it is not simply elected through Faith, but elected to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the Truth. You should not have left out εἰς σωτηρίαν.

By signifying the nature of a means in order to some end. God hath elected us to be saved by the means of Faith. Here salvation is the end of Faith, but so is not Election. You might well have gathered hence that we are saved by faith, but what shew of a Conclusion that we are elected by Faith, as if Faith were a means to Election, which is plainly in the text made the Consequent of it. But when it is said we are Justified by Faith, the word Justified, plainly expressed the end to which Faith is a means. If you do indeed think that in this speech Justified stands in the same place as Elected did in the former, then Justified must signify no Effect, or Consequent of Faith at all, but a Cause or Antecedent; for so Elected doth: and then I pray you what doth by faith signify, you will make utter non-sense of it. Lastly, dare you interpret 2 Thes. 2, 13. Elected to salvation through sanctification, &c. i. e. We know our own Election through Sanctification. I confess Grotius and some Arminians will say that the text signifies a temporal Election following Faith; (yet never dream of your sense.)
But I hope you will not so interpret the Apostle, as if the Apostle means, from the beginning God hath made you know your Election. If you do, I shall doubt you will next so interpret from or before the foundations of the world, which is joined with Election in other Texts of Scripture.

§. 4.

L. C. 2. The cause of the error is not only in the homonymie of the word Justifying, but also of the word Faith, which is oft taken either for the Doctrine of the Gospel, or for the object of faith: So when the Scripture saith Abraham was Justified by faith, it is plain that it means, Abraham was Justified by Christ the object of Faith, as Calvin and Rivet interpret it.

R. B. A deep discovery you make of the cause of our error. Who knows not that Faith is sometime put for the Doctrine or object of Faith? But would you have us believe that it is so taken in the text you cite, or in all texts that speak of Justification by Faith? then must we first renounce our reason, & contra Rationem nemofabris; and we must renounce the plain evident sense of Scripture, & contra Scripturam nemo Christianus; and we must renounce the exposition of the Church in all ages; Et contra Ecclesiam nemo pacificus. We well know that others as well as Calvin and Rivet, suppose that Christ the object of Faith is implied in the word Faith, yea principally intended in the Apostles dispute. But do they think therefore that either Faith is not included, or that by Faith is meant not Faith, but Christ? nothing else. If the question be whether such a poor woman became rich and honorable by her own labor, or by marriage (supposing she marry a man of honor and riches) If I say not by her Labor or work, but by marriage: I do principally mean by her husband; but that is but as it is implied in the word Marriage. Sure I do not exclude marriage itself, nor put the word marriage simply for a husband: but by connotation only. So doth Faith connote Christ believed in, but doth not directly signify Christ. Do you think that when James disputes whether Faith only Justifieth, that he means whether Christ only Justifieth? Peruse his arguments, and think so if you can. Divines use to say, by Faith alone he means a dead Faith, and by Works a working Faith. Do you think he means a dead Christ and a working Christ. And would the mentioning of Abraham's Justification by Christ only, have done any thing to prove his conclusion? I pray peruse Rom. 4. and see what sense your Exposition puts upon it, ver. 3. Abraham believed God, and it was counted. Is Believed put for Christ here? then how is it an act? Christ is no act, then how is God made the object? ver. 5. To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that Justifieth the ungodly, &c. If believeth, here signifies Christ, then what is meant by on him: is Christ the object and act both? So ver. 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18. Against hope he believed in hope. Is believing here put for Christ, and not for Faith it self? So 19, 20, 21. I am ashamed to argue any more in so palpable a case: further then to intreat the Reader that is not satisfied, to peruse the Texts, and also the History in Genesis, and if he can believe after this,
this, that it is Christ only and not Faith that is meant by Faith, he is none of those that I write for, ver. 23, 24. the Apostle applies all thus. It was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him: but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus, &c. All things are here as plain against you as can be imagined. The Object Christ is here expressed: Believing is man's act, and therefore not Christ: Believing is it that is imputed. Believing is plainly made a Condition on man's part: Imputing is a thing to be done after Faith, and not done before; It shall be imputed, if we believe. And do you think those texts that promise Remission and Justification to men if they will believe, and that whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins, and be justified from all things, &c. do mean Christ only by believing? Believing is an act then. 2. a duty of man's. 3. his condition. Christ is not so. I refer you for this, to what is already written by Mr. Wotton, and Mr. Goodwin of Justification: which I would not have you think you have answered, by charging him with error in other things; which are nothing to the question. Nay observe the ingenuity of this Discourser, who mentioneth Calvin, as intimating him to expound this text as he: when as Calvin on Rom. 4.3. where the text is, hath not a word for him, (nay how little for the connotation of the object which I before allowed, directly and expressly in comparison of what he faith for the act) but on the contrary much. He faith, Locus qui citat ex Gen. 15. 6. sumptus est. Ubi Verbum credendi, non ad particularis aliquid dictum vestragi debet, sed ad tosum salutis fundamentum, &c. adoptionis gratiam quam dicitur Abraham sibi apprehendisse. Quare Abraham credendo nihil quam oblationem sibi gratiam ampletit, ne irrita sit. Si hoc illi imputatur, in Justitia, sequitur non aliter esse Justum, nisi quia Dei bonitate Confusus, omnia ab ipso sperave, An he profissionem & side relationem necessarium est ad Statum Justitiam, intelligere: quoniam eadem est hic inter Deum & nos ratio, quae apud jurisconsultos, inter Datorem & donatarium. Neque enim Justitiam aliter consequitur, nisi quia fienti Evangelii, Profissionem nobis defertur, ita ejus possessionem sibi quasi Cernimus.

But perhaps he means on Gen. 15. 6. that Calvin faith as he intimates. Not a word there neither, but much against him. Let these words witness, Deoque non minoris suspens quam impudentiae est, quam hoc illi imputatum sibi sit haec dicitur, in justitiam, salutum sibi commissum. quam sibi Abraham suisse pro Justitia apud Deum, &c. Nec sane aliqua de Causa nos Justificaret sibi, nisi quia nos Deo reconciliaverat: neque id movis, sed dum gratiam nobis in promissionibus oblatam recipimus, &c. Nay he faith more then I dare by much. Quam dicti Moses imputatam suisse Abrahae fidem pro Justitia, non significat idam fidem primam suisse Justicia causam, quae essentia dicitur, sed formalam duntaxat.

§ 5.

L. C. 3. A Another cause of the Error is, that they promiscuously make those to be * homonyma, which indeed are very divers: so when Justification is an individual act, without us, which pronounces us just for the sake of Christ, absolution and pardon eth sins, and is the imputation of Righteousness. Nevertheless, they also call by the name of Justification that internal act of man, whereby he believeth in God, and trusteth that Christ's obedience is imputed to him, and given him of God.

* The same words signifying divers things.
§ 5.

R. E. I. Will you do so much as fix your own Doctrine to this your own description of Justification, and to tell us by the next, what this extrinsick Pronunciation is? You say, that Justification is an immanent act: And is pronouncing us just an immanent act? I never heard of such a one till now. And seeing it must needs be a Transient act, will you describe that act whereby at Christ's death, or from Eternity, God did pronounce you just? The first that I know of, is the Covenant-Grant, which is a Conditional general Justification or pardon.

2. And will you do so much by the next, as give us a Catalogue of some of those men that call their believing, by the name of Justification. I never saw any such passage but one slip in a popular Sermon by a

*Except in those* Learned Dr. that know better. *I know that Confessions and of your own way,* Authors of all Countries speak otherwise. I mean, of those *of the Papists,* men who maintain the Doctrine which you oppose; and call Faith the Condition of Justification, and an instrument of Justification (that is, as I interpret the more judicious of them); A Receiving act, metaphorically called an instrument of receiving, not of effecting. Or till you have cited them, will you give us leave to take this for an injurious dealing against the Ninth Commandment.

§ 6.

Pag. 10. L. C. So when Justification is a gracious sentence of the Judge, absolving one obnoxious to wrath and guilty of eternal death; yet do they confound the patefaction of that gracious sentence made to the conscience of the guilty person by faith, with the Action of God performed without him; at least they refer it to Justification taken in the first sense.

§ 6.

R. E. I. Again, describe that immanent act, or any act from eternity, or from Christ's death, which may be called, A gracious sentence of the Judge absolving one guilty of eternal death, &c. 2. Some do indeed give the same name of Justification to that patefaction which you mention, and so do you, over and over. But who, or how many take it for the same thing? But that sure you mean not to charge them with when you say, They make those homonyma which are diversissima; I know not therefore what you charge them with, but what you do your self.

3. We do, and justly do refer Faith to Justification before God. But I pray you observe these 3 things, 1. that by Justification we mean not any eternal act of God, or any done before Faith. 2. that by Faith, we mean not any manifestation to our consciences that we are justified: that is the Antinomian Description of Faith, though it cannot be denied but many of
our Divines formerly have been carried too far to such like expressions, in their opposition to Popish doubting. But by Faith we mean The Assent to the Truth of the Gospel, and the accepting of an offered Christ. 3. observe in what sense we refer this Faith to justification before God. 1. Proxime & quoad rationem formalen, as a Condition of that justification, which is but Causa sine qua non: and remotely as apt to this office, being in its nature the acceptance of a free Gift, which is commonly called its Instrumentality. Do not confute us before you understand us.

§. 7.

Pag. 10. L. C. And it is worthy the noting, that Scripture faith indeed, that we are justified by Faith, and it never affirmed that sins are forgiven by Faith, which yet might as well be, if to justify, and to forgive sins, did always stand in equal signification. But seeing that one may be said properly, and the other improperly, it is plain that to justify by Faith (when so justified is the same as to forgive sins) is as improperly said as to forgive sins by Faith. And therefore that speech to justify by Faith, that it may be properly spoken, must signify something else than to remit sins by Faith; to wit, by the Grace of Faith, to make known to the sinner that by Christ's Righteousness he is justified, and so his sin forgiven.

§. 7.

R. B. 1. This is a notable argument, where the Consequent contradistinct the Antecedent; If these two speeches to justify by Faith, and to remit sin by Faith, be one of them used properly, and the other improperly (one being in Scripture and the other not) and yet to justify and Remit sin be all one; then the one is spoken improperly as well as the other: But the Antecedent is true; therefore, I think this is your argument, which I will not laugh at, as remembering what case such arguers have brought the Church into: nor will I confute it further, left I offend my Reader, and lose time. 2. But do not you read of Remitting sins, if we believe? and to do it on condition we believe, and to do it by Believing as a Condition is all one. Rom. 4. 6, 7. the Apostle makes justification by Faith, before mentioned, to be the same with forgiveness of sin. Act. 26. 18. That they may receive forgiveness of sins, &c. through Faith that is in me. Here is receiving remission (not the bare knowledge of Remission) through Faith, Act. 13. 38, 39. Through this man is preached to you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses. Here they are made all one. Act. 3. 38. Repent and be baptized for the Remission of sin; and doubtless Faith is principally intended in both these, baptism being the solemn profession of Faith on our parts, and unbelief being the sin that he persuades them to Repent of. Act. 10. 43. Through his name, whoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. Here is as much as we affirm. If you say, it faith not by believing, I say, when we say we are justified by Faith, we mean no more than this, nor doth Paul mean more, but that whoever believeth is justified. Rom. 3.15. Whom God hath
bath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood, to declare his Righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past, &c. Gal. 3. 22. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the Promise by Faith of Jesu Christ might be given to them that believe. By promise here, no doubt, is meant the good Promised, and that is Remission of sin, as being opposed to Concluding under sin, and this is given by Faith: And all are before concluded under sin; and therefore not justified or forgiven.

3. We maintain that it is a proper speech to say, We are forgiven by or through Faith, as well as that we are Justified by Faith. And if you had never read in Scripture of Receiving Remission of sin by faith, Act. 26. 18, or forgiving by faith; We doth not follow that it is therefore any les proper, then Justifying by Faith. Nor can your self give any reason after your own way, why one is not as proper as the other.

4. What if we were forced to confess an impropriety in the words, Justified by faith? Must it therefore needs be taken in your sense for manifestation? Nothing les. If it were les proper to say by faith, as seeming to express a Cause, yet we truly say; It means as by a Condition: Though indeed it is not improper.

§. 8.

Pag. 11. L. C. Another cause of the error is, that they would have the acts of Remitting sins, and of Apprehending the Remission of sins, to be done together, and perpetually to cohere: But those things that do alway cohere, are neither the same, nor is one always of the definition of the other: For the same men would have Justification and Sanctification always Companions, when they plainly differ in the definition, ye they no way agree in the parts of the definition: But it shall after appear that the Actions of God Remitting sins, and of the Believer apprehending Remission of sins, are not always Concomitant.

§. 8.

K. B. 1. If you will deal fairly, distinguish of Apprehending. We will easily prove that Apprehension, as it signifies but Affent and Consent; or Acceptance, always goes with, that is, before actual Remission (in the adult.) But apprehension as it signifies the knowledge that sin is already remitted, follows after it; God knows how long, sometime longer, sometime shorter time. 2. Whoever argued (as you seem to accuse them) from constant coherence, to a necessity of entering the definition; It is rather from the necessity of Faith to Justification, where to it so cohereth; and that as the immediate Condition qualifying the matter.

3. Your Controversy, whether it should enter the definition of Justification is of small moment: It must, or must not, according as you take the word Justification; If you intend to define ut Physicus, only the Justifying act, no doubt Faith must not come in. If you intend to restrain a definition so shall contain nothing but Causes, Faith is none such: But if you intend a more full definition, ut Fidei consilius Christianus, which may fully delineate to the understanding of your reader, the nature of the Justifying act, (which is, Donatio Conditionalis, &c. by Absoluta, before
before the Condition be performed; and is quas Absoluta only on the performance of that Condition) then it is fit you should put Faith into your Definition. I would you would mark whether Scripture use to leave it out of its descriptions.

4. The separability of Justification from Faith (in the adult) we shall believe you will indeed make appear, 1. Either when you have proved the justification of Infidels. 2. Or when by fascination, you have put on our noses your spectacles, which cause this strange apparition to your self.

§. 9.

Pag. 12, 13. L: C. This also is a cause of the error, that The cause why Christ's Righteousness is made known to us and applied, is made an efficient cause of Justification, at first, Instrumental and less principal. What is the Application of Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, and of Remission of sins, a cause of Remission of sins and of Christ's satisfaction, when Faith is not so much as required, that Christ may satisfy for us? Nor matters it that Faith is required that that satisfaction may be known to us. If a Prince absolve a condemned Malefactor by his written pardon, shall that pardon be the less valid, because when it was written, the Malefactor knew nothing of it? Or is it requisite to the validity of the sentence of the Judge, that the Defendant do believe the Judge?

§. 9.

R. B. 1. It cannot be denied but since, and too many have made the Doctrine of Justification a stumbling block, and given advantage to the Adversaries, by making Faith the proper instrumental cause of Justification, I defend them not, having sufficiently offended them. But yet remember, that for ought I can understand, you have no great reason to charge C. Molinus with that, nor many more of our Divines who use the word Instrument; because they mean but this much, that Faith justifieth not by disbursing, but Receiving a free Gift, and so I consent to them, supposing that it includeth the rationem Conditionem as its nearest interest. And so they take not the word Instrument properly, for an Instrumental Cause.

2. You still give us your own erroneous description of Faith, as ours, as if it were the making known, or the knowing of Christ's Righteousness, (to be ours; for so no doubt you mean: for I confess it is one act of Faith, to assent to the Testimony of God concerning Christ's Righteousness) indeed we call faith the Application of that Righteousness: but that is not for the mere knowledge that its ours, but first that it may be ours; It is a Receptive Application of a Gift, and not a Discovering of what we have already. Nay, how vainly do you take it for granted, and go away with it as undoubted, that, the Faith which we treat of, is The Application of Christ's Righteousness imputed, viz. already? When you know, (if you know almost any thing of this kind), that we make Faith An Application, i.e. Acceptation of that Righteousness, that it may be imputed, i.e. by Donation actual, and by adjudication. For that Imputation we make to be the same with Justification; viz. Imputation by the Gospel Donation, is Justification Constitutive,
tive, or makes us sin Righteous; and Imputation by adjudication, both Judicia-
ly absolve us, or determine us to be Righteous. And you know we make faith
to go both before the effects of justifying.

3. But what an injurious intimation is it to join together Remission and Christ's satis-
faction, and to intimate that we make faith, or the Application of Christ's righ-
teousness, a Cause of Christ's satisfaction? who is the Protestant Divine that
has done so? In what book and page do you find it? Tell us punctually if you can.
We believe that Christ's satisfaction is the meritorious Cause of our Remission, and
not Remission itself, but long before it.

4. For your intimation, as if we made it the use of faith, that Remission or satisfac-
tion may be known to us: I answer. 1. It is not that Remission may be known,
but that the conditional remission granted in the Act of Oblivion or Grace, which
is known, may become actual to us in particular by Acceptance: and so that it
may be ours. 2. And for satisfaction, faith believeth the truth of it, and ac-
cepteth the fruit of it, with him that performed it.

5. How lame is your similitude, fitted to your own maimed apprehensions of the
nature of the Gospel: the Princes pardon that you mention is either Absolute or
Conditional: if absolute, I confess to you, it is valid before it be known or be-
lieved. But if you would have speke as one that understandeth the Gospel, you
should have supposed your Princes pardon to be conditional, and the Condition to
be the Acceptance of the Prince himself, as your Redeemer and Lord, and pardon
but with him: and then you would eafily see that you could not have right either to
him or his pardon, but upon your Acceptance.

6. I confess your arguing may prove that God might, if he had pleased, have par-
doned men that never knew of it. (Though some Divines that I argue with main-
tain the contrary) and so that faith is not of absolute natural necessity to all that
should be pardoned. But then when God hath once made it
the Condition of his Gift, his Ordination hath made it neces-
sary. And where the Gospel is revealed, and Christ offered,
it is of natural moral necessity that he be accepted; so far as that
you may eaily discern it is fit that no man should be pardoned by
Christ while he despiseth him, and the means of pardon: no
more then a Phyfician should heal a man (well in his wits) that
will not believe but that he is a deceiver, and that will not trust
him, nor take him for his Physitian.

7. For your other similitude, it shows your mistake: You suppose it is be-
lieving our sentential justification by the Judge to be true, that is made the jus-
tifying act of faith. But that's false; it is the believing the Act of Grace,
the Remedying Law: And accepting the Redeemer and his benefits,
which is the Condition of final Abolition, as well as of constitutive justification.
For the Law is Norma Judicii: and therefore that which makes a man just in Law,
will cause the Judge to pronounce him just. For the Judge doth therefore pronounce
him just, because he is just in Law: hence forth.

---

S. 10.

L. C. Nor do they less err, in taking amis very many places of Scripture, and which
Ps. 13: as well favour the Papists and Arminians conceits; not unlike those
which the Author of the Epistle did lay before his foundation, such as are those.

1. With-
1. Without faith no man can please God, and no man can be justified without faith, which is a prerequisite condition of justification, with that weapon do the Arminians assault us, to prove election to be of foreseen faith: with the same strength as the words Gal. 2. 25. are cited. We are the sons of God by faith, therefore we are justified by faith: For sooth six hundred such places may be produced, in which seemingly faith, ye and holiness of life, and repentance seem to be made something antecedent to, and a cause of election, adoption, justification and salvation: when yet faith is only the manifestation and paternation, that we are the sons of God, that we are elected, and shall obtain salvation.

§ 10.

R. E. 1. N One reader to cry out of error, then the most desperately seduced and seducers, I shall never more take that for a note of the orthodox, for the sake of many in this age. 2. That these texts as well favour the papists and Arminians, as those that put faith before justification, is spoken more boldly then truly. Election is not God's love of complacency in the person as a present real object of love; and therefore though men be elected, it follows not that they please God: much less quad affection. Neither papists, Arminians, nor you therefore can gather the least advantage from that text.

3. Let it be observed that this dissortor doth confess, that six hundred such places may be produced: and if he can give any tolerable answer to any one of them, I am contented to forfeit the reputation of my reason.

4. It is false that ever holiness of life is made in scripture antecedent to adoption or justification constitutive, as begun: but it is true that they are secondary conditions of our justification and adoption, as continued and consummated at judgement; or as conrad. bergius and l. crocius say, they are conditions of our not losing the justification once freely given: and this jay means in part, by justification by works, I think.

5. Election is taken in scripture in many senses: But when it is taken for God's decree, yea or for his temporal choosing his people out of the world by vocation, let this dissortor shew me if he can one text of scripture that makes holiness, faith or repentance to be causes of it, yea or antecedent at all; till then I shall take this for another irregular practice, conform to the tendency of their doctrine. One would think that the man did under hand seek credit to the popish cause, which he seems to oppose by the contrary extremity. For truly here is such evident prevacation, that may make one a little jealous: but that I will not suspect a stranger without great cause.

6. His last conclusion hath two infirmities: the one is, that it is against the scope and manifest words of the gospel. The other is, that it hath nothing but his word to prove it. 1. That faith and obedience are not only a paterfacation and manifestation that we shall obtain salvation, but a means that is, a condition the whole church hath held till the flaccians and libertines did question it: and methinks no sober Christians should deny: and I came but lately from citing to many texts to prove it, that it leads me to do it again. Only these few I desire the Reader to peruse, if he be so blind as to doubt of it. Mat. 25. throughout. Gal. 6, 7, 8, 9. Rom. 6, 22. James 3, 18. and 4, 7, 8. 2 Cor. 9, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Heb. 6, 10. 2 Tim. 4, 8. and 4, 1. Rom. 8, 13. Mat. 5, 20. Rom. 2, 5, 6, 7, 10. Acts 10, 35. 1 Tim 4, 16. 1 Thes. 3, 7. Eph.
Eph. 6. 8.  Mat. 71 21, 22, 23, 24.  Heb. 16. 27.  2 Cor. 5. 10.  1 Pet. L 16, 17.
Phil 4. 17.  1 Tim. 4. 18, 19.  1 Cor. 9. 25, 26, 27.  Mat. 11. 12.  1 Jue 13, 24.  Phil.
2. 12.  Heb. 11. 6. and 10. 35.  Mat. 10, 41, 42.  1 Cor. 3, 8, 14. and 9, 17.  Col. 3.

Reader, I thought it would be tedious to thee as well as me to transcribe the words but of these many texts, much more to form arguments; but if thou wilt be at the pains to read them, if thou find not that Repentance and Obedience (much more evidently faith) do more to our salvation then to manifest it, then either thou or I are notoriously deluded. And if thou wilt but peruse these texts, where Christ promises salvation to men, if they will believe, and reprehend them for unbelieving, and faith, he will not come to me that ye may have life; Joh. 5, 40. Yea, condemns them to Hell for not believing; if yet thou canst think that it is but a manifesting sign that Christ so commands and calls men to, and promises life upon, and condemns men for want of, I must still profess that either thou or I are deplorably ignorant and that the Scripture to me is an unintelligible writing, if this mans doctrine be true.

7. I desire the Reader also to weigh with me the tendency and natural issue of this Antinomian doctrine: and then be offended with me, if thou canst, for being so much against thee. I am as tender of censuring dissenters in tolerable differences as another, but I am not indifferent to truth and falsehood, the Gospel, and the subverters of it. You find by this Dissenter, that he wonders at men for thinking that Gods pardon is not valid, unless we know or believe it! And he may as well say, that a man may have right to salvation though he know it not: and this true; for not knowing our right destroys it not. I pray thee, Reader, then tell me how this man is like to live, that thinks his faith doth only manifest his salvation, or right to it? doubtless he will not give more to Love or Works: so that if he be an Infidel, if he be an Adulterer, Drunkard, or what is worst, it is but his knowledge of his salvation that is diminished, but his Right is never the less; so that to get or keep such right, he hath no means to use, but signs to get. He hath nothing to do for salvation! If I know a man of these principles, I profess, I will neither trust my purse, my credit, my wife (if I had her) nor my throat to him, further then I must whether I will or not. It may be he will pretend, that though he have nothing to do as a means to his salvation, yet he hath a new nature that will not suffer him to do evil. But he that knows what mans foul and humane actions are, is more sober then to think that a right efficient may suffice without the end, knowing that they are educed and specified by the end. If he say, that Gods Glory is his end: I answer, Gods Glory hath as little need of his faith, as his own salvation hath. And he that knows 1. How near man is to himself, and how inseparable the principle of self-preservation, and the love of himself, and what is http bonum, is from him, and 2. How Christ himself in redeeming us, and God in all his merciful workings, respect our salvation, 3. And what directions he hath given man in working out his salvation, and what precepts to strive for it, fight for it, and seek it with violence; yea, that this is the main drift of all the Scriptures, I say he that knows but these, I warrant him will never more think of making Gods Glory his end, so as to exclude his salvation; or that one without the other is sufficient to make such imperfect men as we to live as Christians.

2. And Adoption itself is not only manifested by faith, but given on condition of faith, Job. 1. 17. 2. As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his Name. It is an interpretation of
too much liberty, to say that by Power to become his sons, is meant Manifestation that we are already sons. Pardon me Reader, If I be a little warm against these mortal doctrines. I dare say, it is for God and thee; and not above the Cause.

§ 11.

Pag. 14. L. C. For I pray you, what meaneth this phrase, We are the Sons of God by faith, but by faith we are certain of our Adoption to be sons?

§ 11.

R. B. 1. It meaneth as it speaketh. Is it all one to be Sons by faith, and to be sure by faith that we are Sons? He give us Power on our Believing, which is the Condition, to become Sons; Is becoming Sons, nothing but being sure that we were Sons before? So here: The man would make us Believe that to be Sons by faith, and to be sure we were Sons before faith, signifie one thing. I know not what Countreman he is; and therefore what this phrase may signifie in his language, I know not; but sure I am, in all languages that I understand, to be, or become, doth not signifie to be sure that we were before.

2. Note also that it is a notorious falsehood that he intimates, as if believing were to be certain we were Sons, whereas Assurance is a fruit of faith, and such a fruit as many a thousand Christians know not in this life; much less as soon as they are believers. He feigns also Paul to say to the Galatians (of whom he had before spoken so sharply and doubtfully) Ye are all the Sons of God, that is, you all know certainly that ye are the Sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus, whereas he will never prove either that they were all certain, or that faith is such a Certainty.

3. I desire the Reader to note how silly and silently he passeth over the first Text, which he mentioneth as objected against him, Heb. 11. 6. without faith it is impossible to please God; To which he hath nothing to say, but that Papists and Arminians use it against us.

§ 12.

Pag. 14, 15. L. C. And when the Apostle 2 Thes. 2. 13. faith, that We are elected through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the Truth, what else can be the meaning of the Holy man, then that the Regeneration and Illumination by which we believe the Gospel, are certain signs of our Election?

§ 12.

R. B. 1. See how he again is not afraid to leave out ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, as if it were simply elected through sanctification and faith, and not elected to salvation, through sanctification and faith. 2. The meaning is as plain as humane language can utter it, that, God hath chosen us to obtain salvation by the means of sanctification and faith. From which, its true, we may consequently conclude that we are elected, when we possess the fruits.
A

§ 13.

L. C. A

when Pet. 1. Ep. 1, 2. faith, that the faithful in Pontus, Galatia, &c.

were elected through the sanctification of the Spirit; what else doth he intimate, but that which Saint Paul doth? And when the same Paul 1 Thes. 1. 5. faith, that he was certain of the Election of the Thessalonians, because their faith & charity were manifest to him; how much rather * had the Thessalonians themselves

* or might have pronounced of themselves that they were elected by faith because they were conscious of the work of faith and charity kindled in their hearts? and in like manner, that by faith, their sins were forgiven, because their own faith gave them testimony of the Remission of their sins?

§ 13.

R. E. 1. A gain he uses another text as ill as the former: as if Peter had said simply, they were elected through sanctification of the Spirit, and so election had been the end, and sanctification the means, when he faith, elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: plainly making election the Principium and spring of all that follows, and that it was to obedience and Remission, through the Spirit's sanctification that they were elected: or In sanctification: or I sanctification: eis άγιαμο apotýmata. Whether you do, as some, take Foreknowledge for the eternal Decree, and election for temporal Actual Choosing by effectual Vocation; Or else take it for the eternal election, it varyeth not our present Case in debate.

2. Nay see how fully this text destroys his Cause! which plainly faith we are elected by, or through, or in sanctification of the Spirit to Obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Christ. Where sprinkling of Christ's blood, means Remission, Justification, or Purifying from Guilt by Christ's blood applied. (Though Grotes would have it otherwise understood, left it should prove that the Holy Ghost is given in order before Remission.) Now if this be so, then not only election, but the first sanctification of the Spirit, goes before Justification; And then it is neither from eternity, nor from Christ's death.

3. Whether you take election 1 Thes. 1. 4. for temporal or eternal election; your Argument is Irregular; you might well have argued, that if Paul knew their election by their faith and charity, that they might have known it themselves also by their faith and charity. But to argue thus, Paul knew by their faith that they were elected; therefore they might know that they are elected by faith, making faith in the Antecedent only the means of knowing, and in the Consequent, the means of election; this is absurd. And if this be not your meaning (as least to prove an appearance of such a thing, where indeed is none) then you say nothing to the purpose; we deny not but it may be said, that a man by faith may know his election. But doth Paul give you the least shew of any more?
§ 14.

Pag. 16. L. C. Lately, as Paul says, faith is of the elect, means not that faith is the Cause of Election, or that a Believer is the adequate object of election; so must we accordingly judge of faith in respect to Justification.

§ 14.

R. E. As if there were the least Appearance of likelihood in the several speeches! Is it at all one to say the faith of the elect, and to say we are elected by faith, as it is said we are justified by faith! When do you read in Scripture, God so loved the world that he gave his only son, that whoever believeth in him shall be elected? as we read, whoever believeth shall not perish? Or where read you, that whoever believeth shall not be reprobate, as we read, that they shall not come into Condemnation, we read of many promises of Remission if we will believe; you read no promise of election if you will believe. We are said to receive Remission of sins through faith: but not to receive election through faith. I seriously profess the evidence of Scripture is so full, that faith is a means to Justification, Remission and Salvation, and not only a manifestation of what is done already, that he that impartially peruseth it, and doth not believe this truth, I think he may do well to search whether he believe that Christ is God, or that the Gospel is true; if he be a man of competent intellectuals. And confident I am a learned man could not be so blinded, but his will must be deeply guilty of it.

§ 15.

Pag. 17. L. C. But the chief Cause of the Error is, that they make the faith which they call Justifying to be something different from Regeneration; when yet the faith of the elect is not only conjured with Holiness in one and the same subject, but is formally one Holiness, not indeed the whole, but a part; even as Hope and Charity which are equally the fruits of the Spirit, Gal. 5, 22. 2. Part of the Commandments. 3. which have increases and decreases, as it falls out with every good work. By this part of the Error Regeneration is made to go before Justification; it follows that Regeneration, whereas faith is the chief part, doth also go before Justification. On the contrary, this error being well discerned, faith will only hold the first place in the rank of the three graces, in which Company we must not think that Justification goes before good works and follows faith: For seeing faith hope and charity are inseparable, and Justification goes before good works, it follows that Justification must go before faith.
WHen a man is in the dark, no wonder if he grope and yet be lost: so is this Difcourfe even when he pretendeth to discover the chief cause of our error. All this discourse needs but these two eafe distinctions to discover its inflirmity. 1. Of Regeneration. 2. Of good Works. Regeneration is taken sometime for the whole new state of a Believer, which he enters upon in his first change, viz: His new nature, new relations to his Head, Husband, Lord: When he that is in Christ is a new Creature, old things are passed away; behold all things are become new. In this large fene, Justification, and Remifion, and Adoption are part of our Regeneration. I think in Scripture and in Fathers, the word is not feldom (comparatively to the other) taken in this fene. Some- time Regeneration signifies the work of the Spirit, working in the Soul the first special Grace. Concerning this, Divines are of three different judgements: 1. Most of ours fay that Faith (or Repentance only with it) are first given in the feed, which is a begun habit: then in the act, then we are united to Christ: then we are ftrified: then other habits of Hope, Love, &c. are given. See Bishop Downham againift Pembie. The first they call Vocation, the laft Sanctification: and some give the name of Regeneration to the first, and some to the laft, yet making all these go together. 2. Mr. Pembie (from whom I received it, and held it fast till lately) doth think, that the feed or habit of all Grace equally is given first at once, and the acts only go one before another. 3. Camero thinks that the Holy-Ghoft by the object (yet home more powerfully then man could do) and so by the word, doth first caufe the act and habit of Faith, but in order of nature the act firft, and by that act a habit, and hereby other sacred acts and habits in order; and Justification follows immediately on our believing, by force of the federal Donation. I think for my part, the precise order and manner of Gods Work on the Soul is unfearchable: (though this laft feem moft congruous to the nature of mans Soul). The firft and laft way answer your objection: that although Faith, Hope and Charity be inseparable, in time, yet not in order of nature: If you go Pembles way, I fay, that they are all in femine before Justification: but the queftion is of the act. Yea for my part, I grant it as undoubted Truth, that something of Love to Christ and Hope in him, are not only concomitant with Justifying Faith, but the modification, or parts of it: it is no one act that is called justifying Faith, as it is not in one fingle consideration that the object is presented and to be received. This Faith is, as an Affent to the Truth of the Gospel, fo a Thankful Loving Acceptance of Chrift as offered. Calvin makes fpere the act of justifying Faith: in the place I cited a few leaves before. When Paul speaks of Faith as living or justifying, he ever implyeth Hope and Love as to the fame object, Chrift and Life. But why it is named from the act of believing, I have elsewhere already given the reafon: When he distinguifheth Faith, Hope and Love, he taketh Faith in a more restrained fene: as James doth also where he makes it feparable from Justification and good Works.

And in this fene Regeneration doth still go before justification (in the adult.) 2. You muft distinguish of good Works. As working is taken in the fene re- jected by Paul, Rom. 4. 4. for works of proper merits, which make the reward
to be of Debt and not of Grace, so we must not on once dream that there is such a thing in the world. But as Works are taken for good actions, so they are either Inward or Outward. Faith, Hope and Love, are inward Good Works: and these do go before Justification. But neither Scripture nor Fathers use the word Good Works in that sense, at least often; but only for outward Works of obedience. And so Good Works sequentur Justification, non precedent Justification, as Austin faith, they follow Justification. Yea you must distinguish more exactly of Inward Works. As in every Army or Common-wealth, the first fundamental act of him that will be a Member, is, To consent to the Relation, and take such a man for his General or Sovereign; and then after he must Love, Honor and Obey him as such. The first is not formally Obedience; but the consequent to his Sovereignty that he may obey him, so is it here: The Faith that first justifieth us as a Condition, is the Taking Christ for our Saviour and Lord-Redeemer: and Justification followeth on this before any act of formal obedience to him as such, internal or external. So that the Love to Christ Accepted, which is a real part of that Acceptance (for Good cannot as Good be Accepted without Love), goes before Justification: but the Love that followeth that Acceptance, followeth our first Justification also: yet is it necessary as the Condition of the Continuance of that Justification.

As for your saying, It is part of the Commandments, that is no reason why it may not be the Condition of Justification. For it must be officium, Duty, in order of nature before it be a Condition.

And as to little the business that Faith hath increases and decreases: seeing it is not the further Degrees, but the mere sincerity, (or such a Degree as makes it sincere) which is the Condition of Justification.

§ 16.

Pag.17,18. L. C. Ethat thus judgest of Faith, shall more easily shift himself out of the hands of the Arminians; shall give more glory to the Justice of God, taking that from Faith, which he may give to the glorious Grace and the Gracious Glory of God. For I will willingly grant the Arminians, that Faith is a work, and part of our Obedience; yea and that by that Faith we are Justified; but declaratively, and as Faith is a Messenger to conscience, of Peace, and Remission of sins; but not that Faith is formally imputed to us for righteousness, or that we are Justified by the habit or inherent quality; which venoms and ulcer of the Arminians we touch not, but avoid as much as any.

§ 16.

A Careless Reader would not think what notorious great errors are in these smooth words. 1. To your first commodity I answer, sic vivant, &c. We have somewhat else to think of, than only to fly from Arminianism. Truth borders close to error, and therefore close to Arminianism. To be near to error is a sign of Truth. If you will fly further, and go to Antinomianism, to avoid Arminianism, you will go out of the ashes into the fire. The next way to decide all controversies about Scriptures, between us and the Papists, were
with the Infidels, to deny their Verity: But is that therefore the best way, because it avoids Popery? 2. You are quite mistaken in your own supposition too. Going on false principles, disables any man to deal with his adversary: and the discovering of our erronious extrems, hardens them in theirs. I am confident some few such mistakes in some Divines, hath multiplyed Arminians, or hardened them: and that if our disputers had gone no higher against them, then 

dissent, Contra, Lmd. Oeciasus, or then the Synod of Dort had done, we had more effectually confuted them.

3. To your second Commodity I say, when men will devise ways of their own to honor God's Grace and Justice, contrary to God's way and Word, it is a goodly honor they give him; even the greatest dishonor. God beft knows what is honorable to himself. If taking all from Faith and Works, and giving it to God, had been the way, none of all those texts which I before heaped up, had spoke as they do. What an honor were it to God to say, that our Faith accepts not Christ and Life, but Christ doth all himself? It were but conform to this conceit, to say, that it is best say, that Infidels, Pagans, Murderers, Adulterers, Liars, Perjured, that live and dye such, are the object of Justification and Salvation, for then nothing is given to man, but all to God.

4. But how prove you that it will Glorify his Justice: when man is no object of justice? if he have not some Conditions of Life or Death propounded to him, You dangerously err in making Faith a part of our obedience, if you mean it of Christian obedience, of our first Faith, as you must. For it is the Taking Christ for our Lord and Saviour, that for the future we may obey him: and so is an engagement to Obedience. All obedience is obedience to a Rector, so taken to be. He must therefore be so taken, before he can be obeyed. Though how much of obedience to God as Creator, the Taking him as Redeemer may have in it, I will not now stand to enquire: but sure it is no act of Christian obedience to God Redeemer, but the seed of all obedience following. And therefore you will overlook your self in granting this to the Arminians.

6. It hath troubled our Divines to shew how Faith is no Work, and yet Justifies. Some say, that it is a mere Passion, because it is improperly or morally at best called a Reception; this is fond. Some say, it is a work, but Justifies only as an Instrument. This is as vain: for that which they call its instrumentality, is its Acceptance, and that is an act: and every proper Instrument effecteth; and all efficiency is by Action. So that to say, It is the Instrument, is most plainly to say, It justifies by working or Acting, which is efficientis causalitas. So that this opinion of Faith's Instrumentality leads men into the same Conclusion which they use it to avoid: which is no new thing with ill chosen means. I say, Faith is no work in any of these senses. 1. As working is taken for perfect obeying, for salvation, according to the tenor of the Law of Nature, so Faith is no work. 2. As working is taken for performing the Ceremonial task of the abrogated Law of Moses, so Faith is not working. 3. As working is taken for works deserving a Reward by Commutative justice, as benefiting God, and so making the reward of Debt and not of Grace; so Faith is no work. But in none of these senses are our new obedience works neither. 4. But that which I further note is this, that works are often put for obediential works to God our Redeemer; and not in mere Physical sense for an Act; or for an act meerly good to our selves, or good because of the nature and the object, or in obedience to God as Creator only. Now our first Faith is no such work. It is command-
ed, but we do it not to nominate, because commanded by God as Redeemer; for it is the first acknowledgement of his Authority and Consent to it, and our first consent to be subjects; and the Relation must be tried before any office of Relation can be performed. As if you speak to a perfect Atheist (if there be such a thing) and perswade him to believe in God: his first belief is no act of obedience, but the Affent to God's soveraignty, and consent to obey hereafter. So is it with our first Faith in the Redeemer, as to Christian obedience. But now all after good actions are acts of obedience. 5. Also sometime the term works signifyeth those Actions which are done as our Duty (or on other accounts) to the good of some other principally; and so it is distinguished, from receiving that good that is freely given to our selves: in this sense also Faith is Receiving, and not Working; For it is but the Accepting Christ and Life with him, as offered to us in the Gospel. And though this Acceptance must be fitted to the object, and so Christ must be received in his most honorable titles, and on honorable terms, yet the work thus modified, is but the accepting of an offered Saviour, as that good which we most need for the healing and preventing of our misery. So much to acquaint you how far you may yield that Faith is a work, and how far not.

7. That Faith is the condition of our constitutive and sentential Iustification before God, and not only of the Declaration to conscience, I mean to prove yet more fully before I leave you.

8. When you say, Faith is not formally imputed to us for Righteousness, I do not understand you. Righteousness is two-fold, according to the two Covenants or Laws of God. The Righteousness of the first materially is Perfect Obedience. This we have not; nor doth God take our Faith to be such: But the satisfaction and merit of Christ is to us instead of it, by disolving the obligation to punishment (quaed meritum) which we for want of that Righteousness had contracted; and so is, as I may call it, our Justitia pro legalis. But because it pleased not God to give us this Righteousness immediately or absolutely, but by the means of another Covenant, as the instrument of conveyance; and that Covenant makes our Acceptance, its condition; therefore that Acceptance is our material particular subordinate Righteousness, so called by this new Covenant or Law of Grace: Though Christ's Righteousness may also be called the Righteousness of the New Covenant in another respect, viz., as the means of conveying and discovering it. So that as the performance of the condition of the New Covenant, may be called the Righteousness of that Covenant, so Faith is imputed, that is, truly esteemed and judged to be our Righteousness. But if you ask whether this Faith be now instead of the perfect obedience of the Law of nature? I answer, that obedience was considerable as a meritorious work, and quaed rival vocabrum; or else as our own personal Act. In the former respect, only Christ's satisfaction and merit is instead of our perfect obedience; as being only of value to Justifie us for it self. But because God will not make men partakers of that Righteousness of Christ, without some Act of his own, as a condition of his Right, therefore Faith hath now the formal nature of a condition in the new Covenant, as perfect obedience had in the old: that is, Faith is the condition of our interest in Christ's Righteousness freely given us, as perfect obedience was then the condition of continuing mans right in paradise, and of any further Reward that God would supperadd. And as God then required that perfect obedience, so he now requires of the Sinner himself, only the performance of the conditions of
the new Covenant: (which also he enableth his elect to perform). And
that Faith is instead of perfect obedience, and no further: and this is the true Do-
ctrine of imputing Faith for Righteousness.
9. For what you say of the Habit and Inherent quality; I say, (though I once
wrote otherwise upon trust) that, if not first, yet at least after, for our continued
Justification, the Habit of Faith is sufficient to be the condition of our Justifica-
tion, when the act is not performed (as when we sleep): yet not as an Habit and
quality (nor the act as an act) but as the condition formally, and as a Habitual
Reception or Acceptance of Christ and Life, Aptitudinally. And this is the
common Doctrine of Protestants (of whom many think infants so justified)
and no venemous ulcer of Arminianism.

S. 17.

Pag. 18. L. C. And that Scripture opposeth Faith to Good works, and layeth
them by in the business of Justification, is no wonder; in as
much as among good works, Faith only bringeth to our conscience the glad tidings of our
Reconciliation; 2. Appelleth the benefits procured by Christ; 3. Only resteth in Gods
Love; 4. Is the root of Good works. Also because Faith is often taken for the Gospel
itself, or the object of Faith; no wonder, however Faith and Justification be taken,
if Faith be included in Justification; and Good works shut out. Moreover, though
Faith it self be a good work; yet Faith and other good works are divided by contrary effects: for it raiseth the sinner into hope of Remission: but good works, even the
most exact, do cast the sinner into terror, when he revieweth himself and his works:
for then he despaireth of himself and them; it increaseth the opposition that Faith
doth give nothing to God, but Receive: but Good works are as it were Eucharistic
sacrifices.

S. 17.

A. B. 1. I. Shew'd in the former Section, how far Faith is distinct from Good
works. But I conceive that the Apostle in his frequent exclusion
of works, compared with Faith, doth mainly intend 1. The works of Moses Law:
2. Specially as the Pharisees and other Jews dreamed of Appeasing God by them
for sin committed; 3. And that the perfect obedience of the Law of nature, is
consequentially only excluded, as being in sinners a non-ens, there is no such thing:
and imperfect obedience is damning according to that Law: But it is
not a Justification, consisting in perfect innocency, that the Apostle disputes:
against, for the Jews never dreamt of that: But a Justification consisting in
Remission of sin, which they thought the bare sacrifices and other Works of the
Law would procure. But that the Apostle excludeth obedience to the Redeemer in subordination to his Righteousness, from being the Condition of our
Justification constitutive as continued, or of our final Justification at judgement, is utterly false. It is most evident in the whole scope of his arguing, that
it is works as opposed to Christ, or Coordinate with Chrisls Righteousness, that
he disputeth against; but not directly against the works that stand, in a necessa-
ry subordination to Christ, as such, and keeping that station.
2. The reason that you first give, is no reason, but an absurdity, unless you mean, the offer and condition of Grant of Reconciliation in the Gospel, through Christ's blood: for Faith cannot bring the report of Actual Reconciliation before it is: and it is not before Faith, as shall be fully proved. Besides many a thousand are reconciled that yet have not the knowledge of it in conscience; yet have they Faith in Christ, which is requisite to that reconciliation. Justifying Faith is another thing then the Assurance of Reconciliation, or Justification in conscience.

3. Love and Hope apply Christ's benefits in part, and yet you exclude them: therefore your second reason needs some limitation.

4. The like may be said to your third reason. Love is the Souls Complacency in God, and therefore rests in him. So doth Hope, and Trust.

5. Is Love no Root of Good Works? Or is it necessary that Faith Justifie us in conscience, and not Good Works, because Faith is the root of Good Works? Rather as the fruits are more discernable then the root; so Good Works should Justifie us more then (or as much as) Faith, if it were only in conscience that Faith justifie. You will never give a solid reason, why Love, Hope, Repentance, and any true part of sanctification should not Justifie us in as proper a sense as Faith, if it were only in conscience that Faith Justifie us.

6. Your next reason, because Faith is often taken for the Gospel and object, is no answer as to all those common texts where Faith is not taken for the Gospel or object.

7. For your next reason, that Faith raiseth the sinner into hope of Remission, but Good Works cast into terror and despair, &c. I answer, why may not sincere obedience as well as Faith, by way of manifestation, as signs, give us hope of Remission? Sure the Apostle faith, we know we are translated from death to life, because ye love the Brethren. And if ye by the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the body ye shall live.

8. Let the Reader but observe whether this Doctrine tends not. How well are those men like to obey Christ, that think works of obedience, even the best, do cast us into terror and despair? who then will not avoid them, that would avoid despair and terror? its true, if a man had no Christ to look to, not any remedying Covenant of Grace, but stood on the mere terms of the Law of Works, then his works would drive him to despair: He that hath no Saviour nor Promise to look at, may well despair by his imperfection and the sinfulness of his works: And so he might in his Faith too, because of its imperfection, if he looked at his Faith to be instead of Christ its object: But he that looks at his works in subordination to Christ only; and as accepted with God, who is well pleased with such sacrifices, Heb. 13. 10, and having all the imperfections pardoned in Christ, and as being God's Love-tokens, and the conditions of our salvation, I think, need not be cast by them into terror or despair, but may exceedingly rejoice in them, though he must be humbled for their imperfections. Paul could say, This is our rejoicing, the Testimony of our consciences, that in simplicity and Godly sincerity we have had our conversation among you.

9. Even now you put Hope among Good Works that follow Remission: and here you make it an act or effect of Faith, to Hope for Remission.

10. I pray you tell us which of your two sorts of remission is this? not the Eternal,
Eternal, or from Christ's dying: for that cannot be hoped for; not that in confidence upon our first believing; for that is already known; if justifying Faith be the knowledge of our Justification, then every one that hath that Faith, doth know that he is justified: And if so, how can Faith raise him into hope of that which he hath already; when the object of Hope is always future? And I think, this contrad( pedestrians; your former and after descriptions of Faith: For to know our past Justification, and to hope for it, do much differ. Yea if it be but that knowledge it self of it, which you mean we hope for: The act and the object are not the same thing.

§ 18.

Pug. 20. L. C. Hence it is that Divines will not have the first act of Faith; whereby it receiveth Christ, to Justifie as it is a Work, Action, or Virtue, because in that act, Faith is as a Patient or Recipient: But what is that (ratio entis) reason of being by which Faith is said to Justifie and to Remit sin, is not yet manifest.

§ 18.

R. B. Faith is an Action; but you may if you please call it a Patient or Recipient, in that it is such an action ad Receptionem Passivam necessaria, as that it is commonly called Receiving it self in a moral sense; because there is no receiving without it, in a Physical sense. It is the Dispositio moralis materie.

2. The reason of Faith's justifying interest, is manifest, and a most easy Truth, if vain disputes had not posset mens mindes with seducing Notions, to turn them from the Truth. The nearest formal reason of Faith's interest in our Justification is, that it is the condition on which God in the Covenant hath given remission of Justification to us: The meer will of the free Donor hath designed it to this office, to whom it belongeth to make over to men his benefits on what terms he pleaseth. The remote reason, is Faith's Aptitude to this assigned office. How should a Saviour sitlyer convey himself and his benefits, then on condition that men will acknowledge him to be their Saviour, and Accept of the Gift? I have purposely put the Question to some understanding, Learned Gentlemen, who I knew had never then heard or read of the Controversie among Divines, (but only had out of Scripture, and ordinary writers and Teachers gathered solid knowledge in the main body of Divinity); and I asked them, In what respect they thought Faith, rather then any thing else, did Justifie? And consulting the Scripture and the nature of the thing, having no foresetting notions one way or other, they still answered to the same effect, viz. That it was because God was pleased to give us pardon on these terms, and of his own good pleasure to appoint Faith to this dignity.

§ 19.
§ 19.

L. C. 

Or is it to be omitted, that Scripture, to excite in us the gift of Grace, doth oft ascribe so much to Good Works, Faith and our saving knowledge, that it makes them Causes, why God maketh us partakers of the Kingdom of Heaven: So when it is said, 2 Petr. 1. 3. that by the knowledge which we have of God, is granted to us, whatsoever pertains to Life and Godliness; its wonder is in that company Remission of sin have not a place: which knowledge of God doth yet no otherwise Remit sins, then Faith Justifieth or remitteth sins; to wit, when by the knowledge of God, or by Faith, Remission of sin is known to us.

§ 19.

R. B. 

This is not to prove, but still to beg the Question. 1. The knowledge of him that hath called us; in 2 Petr. 1. 3. is Faith itself, which is a true knowledge and acknowledgement of Christ, and God as reconciled by him, so far as to give conditional pardon to others, and the Condition also to his elect, in its season. 2. You can make the Scripture speak what you lift, by your violating conceits. God faith, He hath given us all these things by the knowledge of Christ, that is, by Faith. You say, It is but the knowledge of these things, and not the things themselves that he so giveth us. You expound Scripture by contradicting it, at pleasure. And indeed, do you think, that it is but the knowledge of our Good Works, or sanctity of Life, or of our growth in Grace, that is given us by faith, or this knowledge of God in Christ; and not the things themselves? If you dare not say so of them, say not so of Remission.

§ 20.

L. C. 

Ally, the Author of the Epistle, that he might avoid one extrem, doth run into another; and while he feareth to confound Justification with Election, doth commix Sanctification, of which Faith is a principal part, with Justification. For he will have Application, which properly is an act of Faith, to belong to Justification, as a part to the whole; making, if I mistake not, Impeachment to be Justification begun, and Application to be Justification Consummate. But if the reason be rightly considered, that Impeachment is coincident with Justification or Reconciliation, which he confesseth Christ obtained for us by the sacrifice of the Cross; if this be so, what need is there of another reason of sparing by Application, when once the pardon of his crime is impeached for the guilty?
S. 20.

3. Is this a fine world when men of such Doctrines cry out of extremities. But remember that here you confess the confounding Justification with Election is one extremity. Why then do you make it to be an immanent act? and Dr. Twist, to be eternal?

2. The word Sanctification, or Santrimony, is most commonly used in Scripture, for the holiness of our lives, or some progressive holiness of heart, following our first Faith. Whether you mistake the Author of the Epistle or no, I will leave to the Reader to enquire and judge; but sure I am, the reformed Churches generally, who maintain the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, which you oppose, do not make Faith any part of Justification, (that were a ridiculous fancy) but a prerequisite thereto.

3. I doubt not but you mistake Molin, in supposing him to make Impeachment to be begun Justification. It is indeed a Principium, that is, a meritorious cause of Justification. But the meritorious Cause is not the effect begun.

4. What though he confesses that Christ's sacrifice on the Cross, obtained our Reconciliation or Justification? doth it follow either that obtaining and the thing obtained, is all one? or that there needs no more? I answer therefore, to your last unworthy question: Though Christ did Impetrate then our Justification, yet not then pretently, nor absolutely after to be conferred: but to be given first, afterward in its season: 2. But conditionally in the tenor of the Deed of Gift: though God decreed, and the dying-redeemer willed, that all the Elect should be enabled (and caused) to perform the Condition. So that there was need afterward, that God should cause us to perform it; and that we should accordingly do it, that so we might be pardoned and justified in God's way and order, according to the terms of his Covenant or Law of Liberty or Grace, which we must be judged and justified by. It is utterly unbecoming not only a Divine, but any sober knowing Christian, that hath ever considered the scope of the Gospel, to put such a question as this, what need is there of another ratio parcendi by application, when once the pardon of sin is Impetrated? If God should let loose but horrors of conscience on you, yea or sickness of body, I hope your prayers would intimate, that there is another ratio parcendi necessary. Hath a persecuting Saul, a hater of God and goodness, a wicked wretch that is a stranger to the Covenant of Promise, without God in the world, and a child of wrath, supposing this man elect, hath he no need of further remission or reconciliation or Justification, but only to know it? nor should he pray for any more? This is so unlike the Doctrine of Christ, that I dare boldly call it Antichristian Doctrine.
CHAP. II.
Of the Acts of Faith.

§ 1.

Pag. 27. L. C. But that it may more clearly appear what part faith obtaineth in our justification, it will not be amis to rehearse and explicate the acts of a lively faith. There is therefore a threefold act of faith; The first is that whereby by means of the Holy Ghost, the believer seeth all righteousness fulfilled in Christ, and by Christ, that he dyed for sinners; and that there is no cause why he should exempt himself out of the number of those sinners: And this direct act is active in respect of God, and the Divine influx, or of God giving faith, but Passive in respect of man receiving.

§ 2.

A. B. This act of Assent to the Truth of the Gospel concerning Christ's satisfaction, is indeed the first, and of flat necessity, and part of justifying faith: But let me give you these two or three animadversions, 1. Though we must believe that Christ as Mediator did fulfill all righteousness, yet we are not to believe that he then justified us actually, or forgave our sins; but contrarily, that he did not: the Scripture making that plain to us, past doubt.

2. It is not enough to believe that Christ satisfied for sinners, as that I see no Cause to exclude my self. But I must see Cause to include my self, and that upon certain Grounds, which may be a sure support to faith; Otherwise it will only warrant me, not to believe my self excluded, or that it may be true for ought I know to the contrary, that I am included; but it will be no warrant to me to believe my self included, nor for any Action to which this is presupposed. And I think it is no saving faith to think and say, It may be Christ dyed for me, and it may be he did not; I do not, nor can possibly know at present. It must therefore be a general satisfaction, sufficient for All, that must warrant this first act of faith.

3. It is strange doctrine to say that our act of faith is Active as to God's giving, and passive in respect of man receiving. 1. An Active Power I have heard of, and so is an Act be taken for a power; or for a habit, or for the being which is their subject, you may call it active; but if you take it not pro Actu secundo, you so advocate, that few will understand you: and if you do, I think an Active act is but a Tautology at best. 2. But a Passive Act is yet stranger, and that in respect of us, who sure if I mistake not are the Agents. Do we persuade men only to suffer, when we persuade them to believe? Are unbelievers condemned for not suffering only, or at all? I pray you vouchsafe to tell us by the next, what it is that Faith suffers, and from whom? If you had said the person had been passive, I should have believed you; but that the Act should be passive is very new Logick to me. I know Acceptance of a Gift is commonly called Receiving, but not in sensu Physico, as Recipere est Parit.
but Morally and Metonymically, it being an act necessarily Antecedent to Passive Reception. But your doctrine here is conform enough to the rest.

§ 2.

Pag. 23 L. C. The second act, active and reflex in respect of man, is that whereby a sinner becomes conscious of his sin and misery, and also of so great a benefit offered, and thence by the operation of the same Spirit of Adoption, doth move himself toward Christ, with Love, Affiance and Hope. The third act is that whereby faith adheres by good works.

§ 2.

R. E. I. This second active act in my opinion is more then one, two, or three acts. To be conscious of sin, is one act; it may be many hundred, according to the many hundred sins that we are conscious of. To be conscious of misery is another act at least; To be conscious of the greatness of the benefit (If you will call it Conscioufness) is another; and to know that it is offered is another. To move toward Christ, you confess comprehends many, viz. Love, Affiance, and Hope. To move toward Christ, indeed is a general term; we usually call faith, a coming to Christ; and if mere moving toward him, contain all these, Love, Affiance and Hope, than blame not me, if faith or coming to Christ, be in sense said to comprehend these. Your third is but remotely an act of faith, in that faith causeth the will to command the other faculties to do those good works. But Sir, here is one act which is implied in Love and Affiance, but properly called the Acceptance of an offered Christ and life, or Content to the offer and terms of the Covenant, which is the great act of justifying faith, which you seem much to overlook. As many as received him, to them gave he power, &c. Is. 1. 11, 12. You seem not to be an Englishman, but if you understand English, if you will read Dr. Pufhon's works well, he will better acquaint you with the nature of faith; or in shorter room, if you will but read Mr. Scudder's Daily Walk on that subject, you shall see justifying faith most solidly described; and by our late reverend Assembly in their Catechism, well defined: as also by Mr. Norton of New England in his Catechism.

§ 3.

L. C. The first act of faith you have, Rom. 1. 17. and Gal. 1. 15. Eph. 1. 13, 14. In whom after ye believed (which words are followed with others belonging to the second act) ye were sealed with the holy Spirit of promise. To the same second act belong the words, Eph. 3. 17. and those Ephel. 3. 12. In whom we have freedom and access with confidence by the faith of him, which place is a Paraphrase of the words, to be justified by faith; To wit, it is the nature of true faith to move itself towards Christ. There is an express place Rom. 8. 16. which expresseth the second act. The Spirit it self witnesseth with our Spirit that we are the Sons of God. Where the Spirit of God acting in our hearts by faith, not only witnesseth that we are Sons of God, but causeth us firmly to adhere to God, to hope in him, delight in
him, rest upon him, and trust to him. Neither pertain the words Gal. 5. 5. and 4. 6. which place aptly exhibiteth both the second act of faith, and the whole reason of Justification by faith, as if he said, Because God hath adopted you for sons, forgiven your sins, and imputed the righteousness of Christ, he would make you certain of so great a benefit, by giving you precious faith, which the Spirit of God hath created in your hearts, by which ye rest in God the Father, and cast your cares on him, as into the bosom of a Father, and have access to him with confidence.

The third act is fulfilled, when (Tit. 3. 8.) we confirm our faith by good works, and faith worketh by love : Gal. 5. 6. Of the same act St. Paul, Rom. 8. 11. To wit, when the Spirit of Christ dwelling in us by faith, promoteth the work of Regeneration, quickeneth, sanctifieth us, and createth a new life, whose fruits are recited, Gal. 5. 22, 23.

In these acts and places true Justification by faith is set before our eyes: These are the acts of justifying faith, but not of Imputation or Imputation of Christ's righteousness, yet are these acts true effects of Justification, or the action of God whereby he absolveth the miserable sinner, and imputeth to him Christ's obedience.

S. 3.

R. B. All this is to little purpose, and much confused, and Scriptures conscientiously expounded, without reason, and against it. Rom. 1. 17. signifies more then bare Assent. Proved; The faith that the Just live by, is more then bare Assent; but the Apostle here expressly speaks of the faith which the Just shall live by, therefore Gal. 1. 16. God Revealing Christ in Paul, also signifies more then Assent. Eph. 1. 13, 14. is abused. The first words signifies more then Assent, for Believing in, or on Christ is more. Those that you say express the second act of faith, do not speak at all of faith, any more then other graces; but of the Spirit of promise, that is, the promised Spirit in general. Eph. 3. 17. doth indeed belong to your second act which is many acts. But by what license will you say, Christ's dwelling in our hearts, is our knowledge that he dwells there, or that we are justified? That Eph. 3. 12. is a paraphrase of Justification by faith, is your naked affirmation without any shew of proof; why are we bound to take your word? I doubt not but they are acts of faith, following Justification by faith. Many a soul is justified by faith that wants boldness and confidence, But if the Justifying act be here, it doth not follow that there is no more; or that these words are a paraphrase of Justification by faith. Seeing here is no mention of justification, or any thing of that nature. Yet it is true, that it is the nature of faith to move towards Christ, or rather to come to Christ, that is, properly to accept him as offered. You do but feign of your own brain, that Rom. 8. 16. expresseth your second Justifying act. The Spirits witness unobjectively, as a testimony, or efficiently, as shewing us our state, do come after Justifying faith. There is not a word of justification. You make here hope, delight, &c. Justifying acts too. Gal. 5. 5. speaks of Hope of the Reward which by faith we are excited to: I will not exclude that act from Justification, but you should not overlook the main act, Acceptance of Christ given, &c. Life in him, of which all the rest are but modification and attendents. That text Gal. 1. 6. which you say exhibits the whole reason of Justification, never speaks of it at all. Adoption is a concomitant Relation with Justification, received on the same condition of faith or acceptance, which is not here mentioned in the text, nor by you observed. The Spirits crying Abba father, is no
§ 4.

L. C. For these acts of recurring to Christ, resting on him, relying upon God, and placing all our confidence in him, quieting our selves in his love, do nothing pertain to the acts of absolving, pardoning sin, or justifying. But plainly these acts, yea all the acts of faith do justify, when justifying signifies the same as to make known, or give testimony; even the third act justifying, where good works are the witnesses of our faith, both at the bar of conscience, and in the eyes of our neighbors.

§ 5.

R. B. 1. The first Assertion is false. For faith pertaineth to God's act of Remitting, as the condition pertaineth to the act or moral efficacy of the Grant, Testament, or Deed of Gift. 2. You seem to equal works with faith in justifying. For no doubt, but love, hope, obedience, do by way of sign, directly and certainly discover our justification. But then what reason have you to say, that good works justify as witnesses of our faith? It seems somewhat of the truth sticks latent in your mind, which these words discover. Is it not because faith is the primary Condition of our right, that is, of our justification, and adoption, that therefore works must witness its sincerity, and prove it to be that current faith which is the condition; and so justify the person by justifying the faith? No doubt but sincere obedience might otherwise in your sense discover remission immediately as a sign, and not only by way of witnessing to the soundness of our faith.

§ 6.

L. C. Moreover all these acts, such as Incumbency, &c. seeing they are the work of grace, and are bestowed for the sake of Christ, do suppose precedent reconciliation, and therefore justification. And that we were received before we had the grace of these acts.
R. B. A very raw mistaken Arguing to uphold a pernicious Error! All works of Grace bestowed for Christ, do suppose Iustification. But such is this: therefore the major is false and unproved. 1. Works of common grace bestowed for Christ's merits, do not suppose Iustification: such as are, the giving of the Gospel, and other means: sanctifying men by the blood of the Covenant, so far as Apostles were, Heb. 10. 29. 2. Faith and Repentance are works of special grace bestowed for Christ's sake; and yet suppose not antecedent Iustification, nor Reconciliation full and actual, but only in tantum, secundum quid, and conditional. Your saying that we were received is ambiguous. 1. Its true we were from eternitie so far loved of God, as that he decreed to give us in time all that good which we afterward receive. 2. Its true, that before faith we are all redeemed from that necessity of perishing for want of an expiatory sacrifice, which before we lay under, or should have layen under without Christ. But what is this to Iustification? Nay its true, that a Conditional act of Remission was granted to all: but it is as true, that it did not actually remit, till the Condition was performed. So that all this Differtors other errors proceed from his meer ignorance of the nature of remission and Iustification, and of Iustifying faith; and from his confounding the acts of Gods eternal Decree and Purpose de rerum eventu, with his moral acts of Government, as Rectors of the rational creature, constituting Jes vel debitum Beneficii, Premiu, & Pacu. The strength of his argument must lye in this, that God would not give so great a mercy if he were not reconciled, To which I answer 1. It only follows, that he would not give it unless he loved us: and what is that Love, but his decreitve Will to save us? Which yet may stand with his Hatred. (Not that Hatred which is opposite, viz. A will and decreed to damn us, but he hath a rectoral love and hatred, as well as a decreitve: His Love as Recteur, secundum Leges, is his Will, that such and such benefits shall be our due according to that Law by which we must be Judged; and so he is quasi obligatum, so far as God can be obliged to the Creature) to confer them on us, and by his own Law or Promise. His Hatred as Recteur, is, when he willeth that such a Punishment as Damnation shall be our legal Due, according to that Law that we must be Judged by; and is, as it were, obliged as Judge to execute it, if we be judged in that State. His Reconciliation as Recteur, is, when upon the change of the finner, by his performance of the Conditions of the Covenant, his relation being changed, and God is now in Law sense related to him as a father, and is as it were, obgid by his own Law to remit and accept him: ye doth by the act of Grace or Law of Liberty, dissolve the obligation to punishment of the Law of Works, which is remission and Iustification, and so that wrath or punishment ceaseth to be due which was due before, and that salvation is due which before was not. Thus God hath made Laws that can do and undo, bind and loose, save and damn, Condemn and Iustifie, as the sinner changeth, and all this without any change in God. But for this Differtor, or any other, to dream of a reconciliation of God in respect of his decreetve will de eventu, is intolerable. Even Christ's Death made no change in Gods decree, but fulfilled them. I must diftre this Differtor that he will pardon me for presuming to speak thus in a reaching strain: for he leaves me no other work. To confute his arguings is so easy and short a work, that it requireth in most places but a bare denial of his crude affirmations; but I am loath to leave the Reader.
Reader at a non-plus, but would as well shew him which is the truth, as which is error. And if this learned man be humble enough to receive the Truth, he may in these few words see so much light as may shew him the vanity of his licentious conceits and arguings, though he may desire much more for the full clearing of the point.

§ 6.

L. C. 

As they, these Acts are the works and effects of our grace, or our Justification. For example, the first act of faith, and so our first Assiance doth not arise from Justification, nor from such a promise whereby Remission of Sin is promised to the Penitent, but from this Promise whereby Christ is promised to come into the world, that he might be propitious to the miserable, and to Sinners.

§ 6.

R. E. 1. That the Acts of faith are the effects of Grace, who but a Pelagian will deny? 2. But that they are all the effects of our Justification, who but they in the contrary extreme would affirm? And from such men who can expect proof? when yet there is a double necessity of proof; one from the invalidity of their affirming words, who are become of such suspected credit: the other from the novelty and improbability of the thing affirmed.

3. As Justification is taken for our progress in grace, or sanctity of life, so faith and assurance arise not (in the first act at least) from Justification: but as it is taken for the first principle of our new life, or the operation of the Spirit in causing that principle, so our faith ariseth from Justification, as Pembre useth the word.

4. What Reader can find out the force of your example? how your following words do any way conduce to shew that faith is the effect of Justification.

5. Your words are ambiguous about faiths arising from a promise. If you mean it objectively, that our first faith is not our Believing of the promise of Remission, &c. but of Christ's coming, &c. I say, It must believe both, though the latter first in order of nature. But if you mean it effectually, that when God giveth our first faith, it is not in fulfilling this promise, but the other, I must tell you, that you speak confusedly. For you should not contradict whilst the general promise of God's giving Christ to be merciful to Sinners, from the particular promise of giving remission only. Understand that the word Promise signifies; 1. A discovery of God's gracious Purpose, which yet giveth no man right to the thing promised: 2. A proper Gift or Grant conferring right either absolutely at present, or absolutely in diem, or conditionally. When God only faith, such a thing I will do in the world, or for some men whom I please to choose; this shews, as Prophecies do, that the thing shall come to pass; But no particular man hath any right to the benefit by this promise, nor can claim any. God's promise of a Saviour to the world to dye for their sins, and to Justifie and Glorifie some in time, gave no man right to Justification or Glory. Yet you may truly say that Faith, Justification, Glorification, and all, are the fulfilling of that general promise. But if you go to a particular promise, I say 1. It's true, that the giving of Faith is not the fulfilling of that Promise, Believe and be Justified; but the giving of Justification is. 2. The Promise to the elect in general, of taking the hard heart out of their bodies (as it is commonly interpreted) is fulfilled in God's giving us Faith; yet did that promise give no man right
to Faith before hand. 3. God is not in Covenant with any unbelievers, promising to give them Faith on any condition by them to be performed: for that would be plain Pelagianism to affirm. 4. I conclude therefore that God hath given to Christ his Elect in special, that by the Spirit Christ might draw them to believe, and so be saved: and he hath told us that his Elect shall be thus drawn and saved: and if you please you may call this a Covenant with Christ, giving him right to the Elect, and to do this work upon them, but it giveth no personal right to Faith, to any individual sinner, of which right himself shall be the subject: Nor is God in Covenant with any before they believe, as to be obliged to them to give them the blessing of Faith. So much for the dispelling of the misfits that you raise as you go, and to deliver the weaker Readers a little from your confusions and obscurities.

CHAP. III.

An Explication of some places that treat of Justification?

§ 1.

L. C. That it may more clearly appear what parts Faith holdeth in Justification, we must run through some places, which make mention of Justification; to which I bring not in my self an Interpreter, but I put that sense to them, which seem to me to be more conform to the Divine Intellect of the Scripture.

§ 2.

R. B. I know not whether this be contradictory nonsense, or Popery. If you mean that the part of an Interpreter is to Give a Judicial decisive Interpretation, whereas you give but a Teaching, Directive Interpretation, telling men your reasons of your sense; then I undertake to prove against you, that there is no such Interpreter on earth, whether Pope or General Council, or both together. But if you intend not your self any such Interpretation, then you contradict your self, and say in effect, I will not be an Interpreter, but I will interpret; But by your performance, I doubt the sense of your promise is; I will not give you any good reasons for what I hold, but I will tell you my own opinion; which indeed is so bad a way of Interpreting, especially for you, that you do not amiss to deny it the name.

§ 3.

L. C. Rom. 3:22. The Righteousness of God, by the Faith of Jesus Christ, upon all, and over all them that believe. The sense is, that the Righteousness of God flowing into Believers of what sort soever, is revealed by the Doctrine of the Gospel, or is known by the gift of Faith, given to every Believer.
The Apostle had in the former verse said, that God's Righteousness is manifested: and in this verse he comes to shew what Righteousness it is that is so manifested: and he faith it is, even the Righteousness of God, which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe. So that the Apostle faith, It is by Faith on Believers; and the Difciple faith, It is manifested by the Doctrine of the Gospel, or known by the Gift of Faith. But the man is yet much more overseen: For what if it were manifestation to Believers that is here spoken of? It is only God's Righteousness, (that is, the way of God for Justifying sinners, with the demonstration of his own Justice and mercy) witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, which is here said to be manifested. But it is not that you or I have part in this Righteousness. Do the Law and the Prophets witness that L. C. is righteous? God manifests Christ's Righteousness, or his righteousness provided for sinners, or the righteous way of pardoning the guilty, 1. By Christ's Life, Death, Resurrection, &c. 2. By his own and his Apostle's preaching. 3. By his Spirit's effectual internal Demonstration. And this manifesting is the very act whereby God giveth us our first true Faith. But it may be long after this that he will manifest that we have Faith, and are our selves truly righteous: However it is a different work.

Verse 24. Being Justified freely by his Grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, To wit, he makes Redemption or Remission of sin to be the formal cause of our Justification.

The preposition &d, signifieth not a formal Caufality, but an efficient, i.e. a meritorious. 2. Redemption is taken in Scripture sometime for paying the Price, sometime for our actual Liberation. It is here taken in the former sense, and so it goes before our Justification long, and is not the same with remission, as you faign. 3. In the latter sense you may as well say it is the same with our Glorification, and final absolution after the resurrection: for that is part of our Liberation I think, and oft called by the name of redemption. 4. We yield you, that remission of sin is the formal Cause of our Justification: and what is that to the advantage of your error?
§ 4.

L. C. V Erfe 25. Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for remission of sins that are past, &c. This place is cleared by this Paraphrase, The Doctrine of the Gospel, or the Gospel righteousness (which is sometime called by the name of Faith) declareth that the blood of Christ, shed for sinners, is the propitiation by which God is reconciled to them: or, Faith doth reveal, declare Jesus Christ to be righteous, and a propitiation for sins, even those committed before the publication of the Gospel by the Evangelists and Apostles.

§ 4.

R. B. 1. After this manner of expounding you may make Scripture speak what you please. I know not a readier way to set up Popery, and persuade men of the necessity of a Judge on earth to decide all differences about the meaning of Scripture, then thus to put on it an alien sense, and make people believe that the plainest passages of it are not to be understood.

2. Would this Dissentor have us receive his exposition, when he doth so ill agree with himself? and knows not himself yet what to believe? He here gives us three distinct senses of the word Faith, 1. He faith it is The Doctrine of the Gospel: 2. Or the Gospel righteousness: (yet he seems to put these two as synonymous, which is strange, as if Doctrine and Righteousness were all one. 3. And in his next Paraphrase he takes it properly for Faith itself.

3. How dark or partial an Expositor is this, (if I may so call him, that disclaimeth being an Interpreter) that when Scripture speaks of Faith in his Blood, and that with a preposition before it, which shews it to be a medium of a propitiation, doth yet make this to be spoken of Gospel Doctrine or Righteousness. He tells us in a parenthesis, that this is sometime called by the name of Faith. But mark, he durst not say, It is called Faith in his Blood, which is the phrase in the text. Let him shew us, if he be able, where Faith in his Blood is put for Gospel Doctrine, or Righteousness.

4. Who knows what he means by Gospel righteousness? If he means Christ's own Righteousness, that consisteth partly in his bloodshed: and so he would make the sense to be, the Righteousness of Christ's suffering declared that his suffering is a propitiation. Doth such expounding need contutation?

5. The text faith, God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood: plainly making Faith the means prerequisite to the actual propitiating or reconciling of God to us; and for the remission of sins past. But this Interpreter, (and no Interpreter) transplanteth Faith, joyns it with his manifestation as the means of that, when the text joins it with Propitiation and Remission, as the means to that. Yea he makes it go after remission, contrary to the express Text.

6. We doubt not but the Gospel declareth Christ to be the propitiation, and sacrifice. But will you by the next tell us, where in the Gospel it is declared,
that £. Col. is righteous, or hath any part in Christ; or doth belong to that number that you suppose Justified so long ago.

7. May not the Gospel declare that Christ is the propitiation to men that have not Faith in his blood?

8. Seeing you expound sins past of those that were committed before the preaching of the Apostles, and (I suppose) judge that it was at his death that Christ did propitiate; will you resolve us, whether no sins were pardoned before Christs death, since Adam? and whether you are of the Roman Faith, that the Fathers before Christ were in Limbo?

For I pray mark the next words, To declare, I say, at this time his Righteousness.

§ 5.

L. C. In the following verses it is plain that S. Paul by the Law of Faith, understood either the object of Faith, or that Evangelical Economie which is opposed to the Mosaical: The 27 and 31 verses teach that. The sense of this is plain. Do we make void the true use of the Law, when we declare the Gospel? God forbid: but we rather establish it.

§ 6.

R. B. 1. But what is this to the purpose? The Law of Faith, and Faith itself are not all one? What if the Law of Faith signify that object or Economie? doth it follow that Faith doth so too? But the Law of faith is plain language and as easie, at least, to be understood, as the Law of Works: so called, because one makes Faith, and the other Works the condition of Life. And yet it is scarce a sober Interpretation, to say, that by the Law of works is meant the object of works.

2. You feign Faith to be put for Gospel in the 31 verse, and say, Its plain. But that is no proof. It is true that the sense is the same, which ever were expresed, because one connoteth the other, and both are here intended, q.d. Do we make void the Law, by making Faith the way of Justification and Life? God forbid. This is as plain as yours: and then why must the words of the text be altered without need?

3. But you would have done something to purpose, if you had proved that in verse 26 and 28 and 30, it is the object of Faith that is meant by believing and by Faith.

§ 6.

L. C. The 26. verse doth no more, according to the Letter, make a Believer to be the object of Justification, then the fifth verse of the following Chapter (doth make) the ungodly.
R. E. Come hither, all that are not willing to be deceived, and see the way of Licentious expounding the Scriptures! when he meets with a Text that speaks so expressly against him, that he hath not a word to say against it, then he hath no way left but to attempt to let the Scripture by the ears (as we say) and say, The Letter of this Text is no plainier on one side, then another is on the other side. Thus do the Romanists to persuade the world of the necessity of a Reconciler of Scriptures.

2. But I shall prove the falseness of what he would have infinuate, by comparing both Texts. 1. Note that here is no possibility left him in this Text for evading in his ordinary ways. 1. He cannot say, that Faith is here put for the Gospel, both because Declaration is before distinctly expressed as antecedent, and because the Text suiteth not the term faith, but him that believeth in Jesus. 2. Nor can he say, that any other Declaration of Gods Righteousness is meant, for the same reasons. 3. Nor can he say that Gods Righteousness it self is meant by our Believing: for that also is distinctly mentioned before it. 4. Nor can he say that it is Christ the object of Faith that is meant by the word believing, otherwise then as connoted: for that object is distinctly expressed also, that he might be the Justifier of him that Believeth in Jesus. Both that man mean to make the word, the rule of his Faith, or his conceits the rule of the meaning of the word, that yet will deny that he that Believeth in Jesus, is the object of Justification? 2. Now let us see what the Text that he alledged, may say to the contrary; Rom. 4. 5. To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for Righteousness. Note here, 1. If both texts be plain, and both true: then certainly both must be joyned together, and not one set against another. If one Text say, Christ justifieth the ungodly, and the other say, he is the Justifier of him that Believeth in Jesus: then we must say, that those whom God justifieth are both ungodly and believers: for both are true: And therefore 2. the ungodliness here meant, is such an ungodliness as is found in true Believers, and not that which is in Infidels. 3. And the Text it self expressly faith so: and shews that by ungodly here is meant one that is unjust or unjustifiable according to the Law of works, and such are all the faithful to the death. And that this is the sense, appears, 1. In that it is made equipollent with him that worketh not. It is the ungodly that worketh not, that is justified: now it is past doubt, that by worketh not, is meant only Legal working for life; 1. Either in perfect obeying; 2. Or Mosaical tasks; 3. Or works conceited meritorious; and not that which Christ faith is the work of God, to believe in him whom the Father hath sent. Jofb. 6. 29, not that Faith which worketh by Love (Gal. 5. 6.) and by good works. Jam. 2. 4. 2. Note that the Text expressly faith, that the ungodly man here justified, is one that Believeth in him that Justifieth the ungodly; so that it is an ungodly Believer only, that is, a Legally-unjust Believer, that is here meant. 3. Note that the Text doth expressly say, His faith is counted to him for righteousness: to shew that it is not only undone before.
his Faith, but Faith itself hath a great end in it. What is meant by this, and
how far it is Faith itself, and how far it is Christ's righteousness
that is imputed, I have fully shewed elsewhere *, and Mr. Ga-
then against Salmafs hath shewed the caufefulness of the quar-
rel among Divines of late about this. 4. Note also, that the
Holy-Ghost, as if he had foreseen how the Libertines would abuse the Scripture,
doth so express the Ijufification of the ungodly here, as to leave no room for
their evasions: For as they cannot now say, with any modesty, that it is an un-
believer that is here meant, when God faith, 1. It is he that believeth, and that
his faith is counted for righteousness; so they cannot now with any modesty
say, that this is but Ijufification in and by conscience, or in our feeling only, or
the knowledge that we were before Ijufified, that is here meant: For the
Text faith, their faith is accounted or imputed to them for righteousness; And
surely to impute or count for righteousness, is not merely to make known that we
were before righteous: and it is God and not our selves by feeling and con-
science, that doth count or impute it tor righteousness. Nay verse 2. It ex-
pressly shews that it is Ijufification before God, that is here spoken of.
So that you see, this one Text which the Difturor brings as so express for his
turn, doth lay so much against him, as might put the case out of doubt, if there
were no other spoke to that end.

But yet further consider, if it were proved that the word ungodly, is taken
in opposition to Gospel obedience, and not to legal perfect obedience, yet it
makest nothing for his cause: for it is undeniable that ungodly is either the Terminus
a quo, or it is taken in usu divario & non composito, and faith implied in Ijufification
as conjunct. If a Phyfitian cure the sick, doth it follow that while they are
sick, they are cured? If you heal a wound, is it a wound when it is healed? Christ
came to be a Phyfitian to the sick, and to call, not the righteous, but sin-
ers; but it was from sin that he called them, and from sickness that he recovered
them. He came to set at liberty the Captives. Doth it follow that they were
Captives when they were set at liberty? This arguing is like the cause for which
it is used, very irregular.

S. 7.

L. C. Rom. 5. 18. As by one offence all men were condemned: (that
is as to guilt) so by one Ijufification all men have received Ijufi-
ification to Life.

Here all things are plain. Ijufification or the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness,
or that Ijufification by which all are judged just, is opposed to the Imputation of the
offence by which all men are condemned; Absolution is opposed to Condemnation: the
sin of Adam to the Righteousness of Christ. The gift or imputation of the Righteous-
ness of Christ, is made the cause why we are judged righteous before God, and our
sins are forgiven us, for the obtaining of eternal life, as the offence of Adam is made
the cause why all men are guilty of eternal death. Here is no account of Faith at all:
for faith is not the imputation of Christ's Righteousness; nor is it Remission of sin, and
so not Ijufification. Nor is faith Absolution, nor a cause or gift for which we are
judged righteous before God. But in the following verse the most formal reason of Ijufi-
ification is expressed without any regard to faith. As by the obedience of one man

many
many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one are many made Righteous.

In this opposition, Faith hath no place: For not faith, but the Righteousness of Christ is opposed to the offence: and as Scripture no where faith that we are made Righteous by faith, but by the obedience of death or blood of Christ; so when to justify, is the same as to make just and absolute, neither doth Scripture any where say, that we are Justified or Absolved by faith, but by Christ’s Obedience, Death or Blood.

§ 7.

R. B. 1. Whether you do thus interpret as Beza and the Claramontane copy Grecolor, which he mentions on verse 17, or whether you follow the vulgar and almost all other Translators that interpret d'érds παραπλησίαν per unius offensam vel delicium, rather then per quam offensam, the matter is little or nothing to our present business. But you must remember, that though you are pleased to translate both δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις by Jusificatio, yet the first signifies only those material performances for which we are justified, and the latter Jusification it self. And therefore the vulgar, Piscator and most others do rather choose to express the first by Jusititia then Jusificatio, as also our English Translators do by the name of Righteousness: And Beza that translates it by Jusificatio, doth it with a wish that he might have leave to call it Jusificamni or Jusificamentum; and will by no means admit that it is of the same significance with δικαίωμα in this place, but that δικαίωμα ipsum Jusificatianis nostro materiam hic declarat, ab effecto, nempe illum Christi obedientiam causam Imputationis nostros justos in ipso facti. If you ask to what purpose is this obvious note? I say, to let you know that though the same obedience and suffering of Christ may be, as it were, the matter both of Christ’s Righteousness and ours, as being the meritorious cause of ours, yet it is not the same δικαίωσις or Jusification formally, (whether you take it Actively or Passively) by which Christ and we are Justified: But that material Righteousness, δικαίωμα, by which Christ was Justified because he performed it, doth not eonominie justify us because Christ performed it, or quattuor performed by Christ, and so accepted as sufficient satisfaction or merit on his part; but eonominie because it is imputed to us, which is not till our Acceptance: or because for the sake of that satisfaction and merit, we are forgiven and justified when we perform the condition imposed by the free Donor upon us to that end. The ignorance of this one point, then which scarce any one thing is more frequently and expressly delivered in the Scripture, hath undone the Libertines.

2. What honest reason have you to translate εἰς πάντας ἀποθέωσιν εἰς δικαίωσιν omnes homines accipereum Jusificatationem ad vitam? Where is the Acceptamni in the Text, or any thing, that intimates any such thing? Adding to God’s Word, is not proving your opinions. Christ’s merits may be in omnes homines ad Jusificatamonem vitæ, in regard to the tendency, and use of them, as a plaister is for a sore, and an inward medicine for such as such a sickness, before the application: yea further, as God hath absolutely Decreed, that it shall be applied and effectual to this use in its season, viz. when he hath caused us to perform the condition of his gift. And yet it follows not that all men have received, yea, or all the Elect received this Righteousness or Jusification already.

§ 3

4. Nay
3. Nay, will you please to note, that the words in the next verse, which most expressly sets forth the comparison, are δικαιοεις κατασκηνότατοι τις μακραί: in the future tense, Justi constitutur illi multae: not constitutis sibi. So that Christ's righteousness is the matter or meritorious cause, by and for which the Elect shall be all justified in their season, but not by which they are justified upon the bare performance, or before they believe.

4. This being so, what honest reason had you to translate it Constitutur for Constat? I know that most Interpreters judge that the future-tense is put for a continued present tense, as Grotius speaks: but that is an exposition, not a translation; they dare not therefore put the present tense for the future, as you do; and besides it is but a conjecture. It seems plainly to express, that though Christ be justified by his righteousness on the performance, yet so are not all his Elect; but it is only said, They shall be, in their season. Beza faith, that he read κατασκηνότατοι in the future tense, in omnibus codicibus.

5. You that imagine all so plain for you in this Text, why cannot you shew us one word that doth express or intimate that it was at the time of Christ obeying or suffering, or any time before our Faith, that we are justified by his Righteousness? shew us if you can a word for this! The text tells us, to our un speakable comfort, that by one man's obedience, many shall be made Righteous: but what is that to prove that they are so already? It compares the causes of death and life; but it mentioneth not observably the season as a part of the comparison, yet intimates it to be future, as to most after Christ's coming.

6. Or if you will needs have the comparison extend to the time also, why do you not observe that it utterly destroys your cause? Was ever I, or any Reprobate Son of Adam actually guilty or condemned at the time of Adam's sinning; doubtless no: Qui non est, non est Reus, vel Condemnatus (unless you dream of a guilt and condemnation which adjectively is Terminus dominierts) Guilt is an Accident, and the subject must subsist, and therefore it must exist, and therefore it must be extra causas. But all Reprobates were not extra causas when Adam sinned: therefore they were not actually guilty. May it not be enough, that as the cause of themselves was then in Adam, so the cause of their future guilt was in him; and such a cause as would infallibly make them guilty as soon as they did exist? Seeing none can bring a clean thing out of an unclean. I argue therefore hence against your self. As Guilt was derived from Adam, so is Righteousness from Christ; (as to the season); But guilt was derived from Adam, to none of his posterity actually, till they did exist from him. Therefore Righteousness is derived from Christ to none of his Elect, till they do exist in him.

7. For ought I know you must on your terms, not only assert universal Redemption, but universal actual Justification and Salvation. For you interpret it, All have received Justification to Life; why then do not all men live, as being Justified to life? If you say that by All, is meant All the Elect only; I do not believe it: both because the express words, and the force of the comparison reach further; and in the 19. verse the article added shews it (οι πολλοὶ) which therefore Beza and others ordinary translate, Illi multii, that is, qui pec- catores constituuntur, de quibus ante. I conceive therefore, that the sense is this; As Adam's first sin was the matter or cause of the guilt of all mankind, supposing that they receive their nature from his loins, in the ordinary way of propagation, (which

Christ
Christ did not) so is Christ's satisfaction and merit, the matter or cause of the righteousness of all mankind, if they will be united unto him. Only here is the difference, that for the conveying of Adam's sin, there was no more requisite but a conveyance of that nature, which must be the subject of our guilt; and so our being propagated by him, is but condition naturalis: But justification comes by way of grace; and therefore our faith is condition naturalis, & moralis. And so it may well be said that Christ dyed for the justifying of all men conditionally; which indeed is so far out of doubt, and I have under his hand, an act of grace, which is a conditional pardon or justification of all. If any man's zeal for his novel opinion against this universal satisfaction, do make him angry with me, I intreat him to give me leave to be of Calvin's opinion in the exposition of this text, whose words are these, Commonem omnium gratiam facit, guia omnibus exposita est; non quid ad omnes extendatur recipit (that is, as to the actually possession of remission or salvation) nam est passus est Christus pro peccatis totius mundi, atque omnibus indifferenti Dei benevolentia efficientur, non tamen omnes apprehendunt. I. e. He makes grace common to all, because it is exposed to all: not that it is extended to all in the thing it self: For though Christ did suffer for the sins of the whole world, and is, by the benignity of God, offered to all men indifferently, yet all men do not apprehend (or receive) him. Mark, that Calvin takes not all men, and the whole world here, for the elect only.

8. When you have told us that all is plain, in the points that we do not deny, viz, that Adam's offence and Christ's righteousness, are opposed; that absolution and justification are opposed; you next come to your causer, and tell us that here is no mention of faith. But I give you these answers to that, 1. Is it excluded because not mentioned? that is wild arguing. 2. I can shew you many a text where our justification by faith is mentioned, without any express mention of Christ. Doth it follow therefore that Christ is there excluded? I shew not. 3. Faith connotes Christ where ever we are said to be justified by faith; and Christ connotes faith, where ever we are said to be justified by Christ. He that faith is, he is fed by eating; means by my meat also: and he that faith, I am fed by my meat, means by my meat eaten, and not lying by. Though I know in our case the necessity of faith is ex ordinatione divina positiva, and the necessity of eating is ex ordinatione naturali. 4. Here is no mention in the text of our propagation from Adam: and yet it-is plainly implied as the natural condition; without which we shall not derive guilt from him (as Christ did not). So is faith in Christ implied as the moral condition, without which we shall not receive justification from Christ. But yet for all this, I do not believe you, that believing is not mentioned or regarded in the text. Do you not finde the very next words, in the end of the 17. verse to be these, Titus diapæs, Titus divinæs manu-carvïves, &c. qui dominum gratiae recipient? And we take receiving the gift to be believing, as we are taught Job. 1, 11, 12. For though physical, proper reception is passion and not action, yet nuncatur signifieth first and properly that acte content to the offered gifts, which morally we call receiving, and so implyeth passive reception as its consequent: as Gratius truly expounds the word here, nuncatur, id est, qui domini accepere, &c. se acceperunt, se ipsi.

9. What need you tell the world that faith is not imputation of Christ's righteousness, nor remission of sin, nor absolution? who saith it is. Nor yet a cause (speaking logically) or gift for which (as the meritorious cause) we are judged righteous?
righteous? would you thence gather, that therefore Faith hath no place in the works? It is the condition sine qua non, which is as the Depositio materia; is that no place? Yea and when the question is at God's Tribunal, whether we were true Believers or no? the sincerity of our Faith will be the very Justitia causae materialiter, upon which the person must be Justified against that accusation; which, as it seems by the descriptions of the Judgement in Scripture, will be the great enquiry of that day.

10. When you again say, that the next verse gives us the formal reason of Justification, without any mention of Faith; I answer, Nor doth it mention our propagation from Adam, as having any place in our Guilt or Condemnation, and yet implies it certainly as the cause without which we shall not be guilty. But the thing I justly blame you for, is, that seeming a Learned man, and therefore knowing (or should have known) that our Divines do ordinarily give this answer, that yet it pleased you not so much as to take notice of it; but go on as smoothly as if none had ever answered your objections.

11. When you say last, that when to Justifie, signifies to make Just or Absolve, Scripture doth no where say that we are Justified by Faith; I answer, 1. This is a mere begging the question. 2. Our Divines against the Papists have so fully proved that justifying is taken for remitting sin and absolving, where we are said to be Justified by Faith, that it is needless for me to do that work again. Yet something I may perhaps do before I conclude, on a fit occasion: but in the mean time, let the Reader observe, how little this confident Assertor, did even now over-pafs Rom. 3, 28. 30, when he was purposely speaking of the sense of the next verses, and in the general of those, And let the more unprejudiced thence judge, whether his assertion here be true or false? v. 28. Therefore we conclude, that a man is Justified by Faith, without the deeds of the Law. 3. It is one God which shall Justifie the circumcision by Faith, and the uncircumcision through Faith: One would think those words should be plain enough to satisfy.

§ 8.

L. C. Astyl, Christ's obedience is our Justification, which consists in this, Not that we believe in Christ, but that Christ was made sin (or a sacrifice for sin) in our stead.

§ 8.

R. E. This is the very root and master vein of all Antinomianism, viz. that Christ did so obey or suffer in our stead, as that in sensu Legati vel Civili, it was our selves that did it by him; as if he had done it as our Delegate, and not as Mediator, and so the benefit of it were ours, because the obedience qua praesta is ours. Too many of our own Divines have spoke less cautiously of this point then was meet. I shall now say but this, I have more fully in other papers proved that this Doctrine overthrows the very Christian Religion, and is of more pernicious consequence, than most ever were introduced by any Heretics into the Church. In particular, it leaves no room for any pardon of sin at all, seeing no Law can require more than the debt, or the very penalty threatened.
If therefore we have paid the same debt, or suffered the same penalty, though not in \textit{sensu physico}, yet in \textit{sensu civilis}, no more can be required of us, nor is there any room for pardon. Be it known to you therefore, that Christ did obey and suffer in the person of a Mediator, and not \textit{in persona delinquentis}, though for the sins of the delinquent, (being obliged to suffer by his voluntary undertaking): and therefore his sufferings or obedience are none of ours, as performed by him; but God was pleased to make him our King on this Redemption Title, and by a new Act or Law of Grace, to convey right to Christ and his sufferings or merits, that is, as to the fruits of them, on certain conditions, \textit{i.e.}

Of grateful, penitent Acceptance; and of obediential Retention. The Gospel offers us Christ for our head and husband: and till we have Legal Right to him, on our Acceptance, we have none to Justification or Life.

\section*{9.}

\textbf{L. C.} \textbf{R}\textit{om. 5. 1. Being Justified by Faith (or of Faith) we have peace with God. The sense is, either After that it was known to us that Christ's Righteousness belonged to us, Peace of conscience did thence arise; or, The Doctrine of the Gospel, or Christ himself by the Doctrine of the Gospel, which is oft called in Scripture by the name of Faith, doth absolve us from all guilt: whence ariseth peace of conscience and tranquility of mind; and assurance whereby we rest upon him. Or is the meaning rather, Being Justified, we have Peace with God; that is, we are reconciled to God, \textit{as Twiss thinketh.}}

\section*{9.}

\textbf{R. B.} \textbf{T}\text{his Interpreter, who faith, he will be no Interpreter, doth interpret as if he interpreted not. 1. How many senses will he devise to make Light consist with Darkness, and to obscure, if possible, words as plain as we could with. What hard words are these, \textit{Being Justified by Faith, we have Peace with God,} that need all these devices to explain them? or rather, what clear expressions are these for Justification by Faith, that this Learned man hath so much ado to draw a curtain over them, or to shut his eyes to keep out their light? Here are three several ways, that he attempteth to make them fit his turn, and all to little purpose. For the first, the text faith, \textit{Being Justified by Faith,} and he faith, it means, \textit{when we knew that we were justified, or that Christ's Righteousness was ours.} As if doing a thing, and making us know that it is done already, were all one; or else if God had given him a Commission to change his word at his pleasure! Let him if he can, or any men living, shew us but one Text, where Justification is taken meekly for the making known to our selves that we were Justified before: I say, let him shew it, and prove it, if he can.

2. I suppose it is in vain to tell him, that \textit{Calvin, Beza, with the generality of Interpreters, are against his exposition;} It is like he knows that already.

3. What a strange thing is it, that he doth not see that both his two latter expositions do destroy his own cause. For the second, If it be the Doctrine of the Gospel,
Gospel, or Christ by that Doctrine that doth Justifie us, then his Righteoun
ness is not ours quaprofita, but as given us by the Gospel: And then it must be
on the Gospel terms; and let him show, if he be able, where the Gospel Jufti
feth any Infidel? If it be by the Doctrine of the Gospel that Christ doth Abs
olve us from all guilt, then it is not an immanent act in God, nor done before
the Gospel is published, or established at leaft: Nor can any lay, that he here
means a Juftification by meet manifeftation that we were Juftified for he express
eth himself to mean it of Absolving us from all guilt: The Doctrine that I main
tain, is no other then this, That Christ by the Gospel doth pardon us on condition of our Faith, and so when we believe (which also is his
Work).

And for his third Exposition which he ascribes to Dr. Twifls, what can be
more express against both Dr. Swifs and himself? For if it be Reconciliation
with God, that is meant by Peace with God, then it is not only the manifefta
tion of our Reconciliation: Nor can it be then said, that we are reconciled from
Eternity, as Twifs oft faith we are, seeing the text faith, Being Juftified by Faith,
we have Peace with God: And if they should mean, that God was before Recon
ciled to us, but we were not reconciled to him tell we believe; I answer, 1. If
they mean it of our Passive Relative Reconciliation, it is a contradiftion: For
God to Love me, and yet I not to be Loved of him; and so to be appeased or
reconciled to me, and yet I not to be one to whom he is reconciled, are contra
dictions. 2. If they mean it of our Active and Qualitative Reconciliation,
that is the habit and act of Love, Faith, &c. to God, then they cross the text,
which speaks of Reconciliation with God: vide, Bzam & Calvin, in loc. And then,
they make Juftification by faith to go before faith, which is contradictory. For the
Souls Reconciliation to God, in this sense, (as wrought on us by the Spirit) doth
consist in Faith as well as Love: And the Juftification her spoken of, is Juftifi
cation by Faith: And so there sense would be this, Being Juftified by Faith, our
Souls are inclin to God by Faith and Love. God is more mercifull in plain ex
pressing his minde to us, then some men would have him be.

L. C. G Al. 2. 16. We know that man is not Juftified by the Works of the
Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ; we I say have believed in
Jesus Christ, that we might be Juftified by the Faith of Christ, and not by the
Works of the Law, because that by the works of the Law shall no flesh be Jufti
fied. I do not think that any thing else is meant in this place, then that it is the nearest
and chiefest fruit of Faith, that Christ may be known to us, with all his benefis; and
that he is not revealed to our conffences by the Good Works of a new life, how exact
sorer, but only by the gift of Faith, by which as a Messenger be
+ Internuntium, taken 1, we are certain of Reconciliation, and of Remifion of sin.
Or is the Gospel meant by Faith, that it may be opposed to the works
of the Law and Ceremonies, which the false Apofles did require to be joined with the
Faith of Christ, or the Gospel?
§. 10.

R. B. If it were against the most dangerous errors that I were disputing, it would be unsavoury to some if I should give the fittest Epithets to such arguings. I shall therefore leave the Reader to give what Epithets he pleases, to such dealing with God's sacred Word, as he here finds. 1. You see still the man is to seek himself, what may be the meaning of the text: but any thing will serve except the truth. 2. It hath pleased the Holy-Ghost no less then three times in this one verse, to use the word justified; besides the next verse again. Yet doth this Diftertor make nothing of all, but that we are by Faith certain of Reconciliation and Remission; what language should God use to convince such men as these of his meaning?

3. I would intreat the Reader to note how much these men differ from the Jews in the point of Justification by Faith, or by Works? It is but meerly in manifesting that we are Justified, that they give Faith the precedence: when no man's salvation lyeth on that. If a man be Justified, though he cannot have the comfort of it till he know it, yet he may nevertheless be saved.

4. Yea, is it not true, that Works of a holy life reveal not our Justification by Christ? and did not himself confess as much before?

5. It is very true that the Work of Faith is, that Christ be known to us with his benefits; For to believe, is so to know Christ upon God's Revelation, as to accept him; But its one thing to know Christ and what he hath procured, and offereth us, and so to Accept him that he may be Justified by him: and another thing to know that he hath forgiven and Justified us already.

6. Observe what Libertinism is in the last shift (for I must remember, it must not be called an Interpretation): Three times doth the Holy Ghost use the word, Faith of Jesus Christ, and believing in Christ, in the beginning of this one verse: Yet doth he question, Is it not the Gospel that is meant by Faith? If it be, this is the Paraphrase, Knowing that as a man is not Justified by the works of the Law, but by the Gospel, even we have—(what shall I say?) Gospel, or Gospelized, in Jesus Christ, that we might be Justified by the Gospel. But, (if it be worth the while to use reasoning with this sort of men,) I intreat him by the next, to prove me out of Scripture, that the word Faith of Jesus, is ever taken for the Gospel; specially when Justifying is made the consequent, as here it is. 2. If it were the Gospel that were meant by Faith, it would connote the act of our Faith: For therefore it is that the Gospel is called Faith, because it is believed, and the name is transferred from the act to the object.

3. Doth this Diftertor in conscience really think, that the Faith which here we are said to be justified by, is not an act of mans? at least that these words, Even we have believed in Jesus Christ, doth not signify our act, but the Gospel? If he do, let him think so still for me: for words signify nothing to him, but what he imposes on them. 4. If he yield that believing in Jesus Christ, doth signify our Faith, and not the Gospel, then he must confess that our Justification by Faith here mentioned, follows our believing, seeing we therefore believe in Christ, that we might be Justified by the Faith of Christ?
L. C. 

Phil. 3. 9. That I may be found in him, not having my own Righteousness which is of the Law, but that which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ, even the Righteousness which is of God by Faith. 

S. Paul seemeth in this place, in these words, to assert that the act of believing is of Gospel Righteousness. But Calvin on the place faith, that the minde of the Apostle is to compare the two Righteousnesses together; One proper to man; the other which is of God, and is obtained by Faith; And a little after, that he asserteth the Righteousness of Faith to be of God, is not only because Faith is Gods gift, but because God justifieth us of his own goodness, or because by Faith we receive the Righteousness given us of God. To wit, both the Righteousness of God, and Faith, are equally Gods gifts; the one, which makes us Righteous, the other, by which we know that this Righteousness belongs to us.

§. 11.

R. B. I. When I see the man name Calvin, I should hope he hath some regard to his judgement, but he confuteth quickly such thoughts; but is it not strange that he did not want of words of Calvin but what make against him, that he would not rather silence them? You see here are two clauses of Calvin cited: in the first he faith, that the Righteousness which is of God, is obtained by Faith; (not made known to be already obtained by us) In the second he faith, it is given of God, and received by Faith, what more true and plain can be spoken? or what more pertinent against the Libertines that plead for the Iustification of Infidels?

2. Yet doth this man adde in the conclusion, that by Faith we do but know that this Righteousness belongs to us; and he seems to intimate as if Calvin and the text so meant. As if Obtaining and Receiving, were but to know that we have obtained and received.

3. Nay mark how he left out the end of Calvin's first sentence, (as faithfully as he deals with the Text). Calvin words are these, Insignis locus sibiis certam Iustitiae fidei definitionem habere cupidat, & tenere veram ejus naturam; And so he speaks what he is cited, laying of the latter sort of Righteousness, alteram ex Deo esse tradit, & per siderem obtinere (this much he citeth), ac infra Christi repositam (this he left out).

4. Mark also how plainly the Text is against his Doctrine: It faith, that Righteousness is by the Faith of Jesus Christ. The Dissenter faith, no: It is but the knowledge of Righteousness that is by Faith: Let him, if he can, prove that ever Righteousness is put for the meer knowledge of Righteousness, as he would pretend that Iustification is put for the knowledge or manifestation of Iustification. Nay twice doth this Text immediately together tell us, that this Righteousness is by Faith.
L. C. Acts 13. 38. Be it known to you, that by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses: He seems to make Faith a condition requisite to Justification: but what the sense of the place is, Calvin on the place teacheth; Paul declareth how men obtain the Righteousness of Christ, even when they Receive it by Faith.

A. B. Thought verily the man had been contradicting us, and he is pleading for us, and yieldeth all. Doth he not confess that Calvin teacheth us Paul's sense? and doth not he cite Calvin, saying the same as we, that Christ's Righteousness is obtained by Faith? I hope he doth not think that by Potius, Calvin means, that they may know they have obtained while they were Infidels, yea while they were not at all. Nay, Calvin on this text expressly faith, They remain under guilt who do not fly to Christ and seek expiation from sins in his death, and that till God pardon us we are all enemies to him by sin, and are all driven from the Kingdom of God, and addidted to eternal death; and that this is the Righteousness of faith, when God takes us for Righteous, in not imputing our sin to us; Yea the next words to those which he cite, are, quod autem impetrat fidcr, &c. So that Faith in his judgement obtaineth Righteousness, and not only knoweth that we had it before; would this man be of Calvin's minde, our Controversie with him were at an end.

Reader, I love as little as another to turn my speech to the moving of affections, from meer argumentation: yet do I think it my duty to tell thee, that as Gods Word is holy, and is part of his name, so he will not hold him guiltles that takes it in vain, and unreverently abuseth it: that the business of a Sinners Justification and Salvation is of greater moment then to left about; and that it meekly concerneth thee to take heed upon what reasonings thou buildest thy hopes. This man would periwade thee that God Justifies Infidels. I say, God justifieth none at age and of discretion, but Believers (for ought is revealed to any man in his Word). I would not have thee taken with any arguings of mine or his: but lay by both a while, and in the fear of God, with prayer, humility and impartiality, do but read these very texts that he himself hath here cited: and judge as in conscience thou seest cause, whether they deny not the Justification of Infidels? And when thou hast done, read his Comments, and judge but rationally, whether he say any thing to purpose, or do not talk like a dreamer, or much worse? I protest for my part, I never met with Papist that had neer such shameless expotions of Scripture, and so many together, and that if I could bring my confidence to such a liberty of expounding, I should be never the more of a Religion because of Scripture, but might for all the plainest passages of it, be as free to choose my Religion, as if there were no such word: Nay, I should take my self for one that believed not Gods Word to be true: For he that can believe that it is a word that will bend and yield to such handling as this, and bear
any sense, though contrary to its plainest importance, I should think doth scarce heartily believe it to be the the Word of God: Judge of this Difciftor, but by this one text expounded by him.

§ 13.

L. C. T

is place and such like, doth the Author of the Epiftle allude, to prove that Faith; yea Repentance and a holy Life do go before Juftification, and that a believer is the object of Juftification: such are Act. 16. 43. To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his death (Name it fould be) wh whomever believeth in him, shall receive remiffion of sins: And such as these, Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out; and, the Iuftifier of him, that is of the Faith of Iefus, Rom. 3. 26. But that force of Arguments drawn from these places, by which he thinks to bind us, we shall easily decline anon; as also what appertains to the object of Juftification, which they would have to be a Believer.

§ 13.

R. B. I. T

hat Faith and Repentance go before Juftification, we affirm: but that a Holy Life goeth before it, we deny, and I remember not that Cyr. Malherus hath any fuch word, for all your faying it: Indeed to our Juftification as continued, and as confummate at the judgement, Good Works are antecedent, if there be time to do them.

2. Reader, mark the texts that are here made fo light of; whether thou couldst with God to speak plainer, in affirming Faith to go before Remiffion, and to be the condition of it.

3. I believe you will easily decline all these, who have got that unhappy declining art. But take heed of declining too much against Light, and remember another day, that you were warned, You do it with more ease then honestly.

§ 14.

L. C. F

or in these places is denoted the quality of them whose sins are for-given.

§ 14.

R. B. I S this your beft declining? 1. The Scripture makes Remiffion con-sequential to Faith, faying, Believers shall receive Remiffion; and be con-verted that your fins may be forgiven, &c. And this man easily declines all these, by faying, that by shall, and may be, is meant are already forgiven, q. d. by faying the word is faile. Is not this with more ease then honestly? Nay the Scripture faith, That whoever believeth not, is condemned already, and the wrath of God abide-th on him, &c.

2. Who would think by his words here, but he did at least yield that all men that
that are already forgiven, are presently qualified with Faith? But its no such matter. How can you say Faith is the quality of the Justified, when, if your Doctrine be true, they may be many a year without Faith after Justification. Nay, when you say, that God justifieth always before Faith; and therefore you should rather say, Infidelity is the quality of those that are forgiven. Nay when you hold that we are all justified, when we had no existence: and can Faith be the quality of that which is not; what a conscience have you that can put by such plain and frequent Scripture testimony, with such shifts as these?

§. 15.

L. C. With six hundred such Paralogismus and Parallel places as these, do the Papists maintain the merit of Works, and Arminians Election from foreseen Faith.

§. 15.

R. E. My conscience forbids me raising jealousies without clear ground of any man: But what man would not be jealous that this man were a Papist under an Antinomian Vizor, finding him under a strange name, in these days in England; Yea did I know that he had formerly been an enemy to Popery, did I know him, I would watch him, lest he were since perverted. Let any sober Reader judge, whether that man (being of good intellectuals) who verily thinks the Papists have six hundred texts for merits (which is not once named in the Scripture) such as these are for Faith going before Justification, can choose but think the Papists in the right, if he believe the Scripture? And what he faith of the Arminians, (of Election on foreseen Faith) is a point of Popery too.

2. I am confident that this his assertion is so notorious a falsehood, and of so hard a forehead, that few modest Papists will dare to own it themselves: What man! six hundred such text for merits; and Scripture never once mention it? Either this practice is Antinomian, as is your Doctrine, or else there is no Law for—.

§. 16.

L. C. There is no less strength in the words, Iam. 2. God hath chosen Believers; to prove that Faith is prerequisite to Election; then in the words, Believers receive Remission of sins; to prove that Faith goes before Remission of sins.

§. 16.
§ 16.

Another very immodest falsehood, 1. Who knows not how frequently the word Elect is taken for Gods Temporal Election by the act of Vocation, by which he doth, as Christ faith of another temporal Election, Take one and forfake another in the same house, of the same blood, and bed, and employment. And so God is said by James 2. 5. To have chosen that is, by actual vocation the poor of the world (to be) rich in faith, and heirs of the Kingdom promised, &c. not as you unfaithfully read it, God hath chosen Believers; as if there were no mention to what he had chosen them, or what manner of Election it is.

2. Suppose it be granted you, that it is the eternal Election that is here meant; what shew of truth doth it put on your words, if you speak of the whole work of Election? Though Gods Decree be not one in itself, as to the act, which is himself; yet seeing it is denominado from the object which it respects, and to our capacity must be conceived of and expressed as several acts, so therefore Divines use to distinguish between the Decree of glorifying, and the Decree of Giving Faith and Renewing Grace: and they tell you that the first, viz. the Decree of glorifying hath for its object a believer persevering, that is, God Decreeeth to glorifie none but such, and those Individuals that he will glorifie are such, and rewarded as such: But the object of the former act, is an unbeliever; or else how could God be said to Decree to give him Faith? But this doth not intimate that foreseen Faith is the cause of the Decree of glorifying, but that Faith is Decreed to be the condition of glorification. So that Gods Decree of glorifying is about a Believer, i.e. to glorifie Believers; but his Decree of giving Faith, is about unbelievers. Now these being diversified but for our apprehension, and being in itself one Decree, when you speak of the Decree of Election, without such distinction, you cannot say, that it is ex side praevis, because it is ad fide, as well as ad salutem. And so much to your un reverence abuse of Gods Word.

CHAP. III.

Of the Acts of God Justifying.

§ 1.

L. C. Of these we must see what they are, when and whether they be done together and at once? Most of the sincerer Divines will have these acts to be two, Imputation of Christs Righteousness, and Remission of sin; and that they are divers parts of Justification: Yet some will have them distinct in word only,
only, and not in being; so that either of them taken alone may express the nature of 
justification; which they say is manifest in Rom. 4, 6, 7. Where the Apostle professedly 
handling this argument, useth remembering sin and imputing Christ's righteousness, as 
equivalent; and that the distinction respected not the integer parts of justification; 
but the two terms a quo & ad quem: which they thus illustrate, as by one and the same 
act the darkness is driven out of the air, and the light introduced into the air: so an un-
godly man is by one and the same act of justification absolved from guilt, and pronounced 
just.

§ 1.

R. B. 1. Firstly goes one and the same act of the law of grace, which pardonneth the 
acts, and constitutes us righteous; for all is but to make us non obligates 
and penam: And then followeth the act that you mention, absolving from guilt, viz. 
by sentence and pronouncing just: for what it is to pronounce just, but to pronounce 
not guilty quod penam? 2. That remission and justification are one thing, 
though under notions a little differing, taken from several respects, is so largely 
proved by Paruns and many other divines, that I shall say nothing to it. Those judi-
cious divines that do argue for a difference, do either prove but such a notional 
difference (one name more directly respecting the punishment, the other the accumu-
lation and obligation, as the terminus a quo; or else they take remission for 
the legal discharge or disobligeing; and justification for the sentential: whereas 
these are two sorts of remission and justification both.

§ 2.

L. C. I confess that I rather slide into the opinion of the former, yea am drawn in 
to it, though unwilling, (or whether I will or no) seeing in the business of 
salvation, it is safer to admit those things which may be believed without wrong to God's 
truth, then to seem any whist to detract from it; and the method which the author of the 
epistle giveth in his catechism, both must please me; for there he so conjuncteth the righteous-
ness of Christ with the remission of sin, as that this should be the effect of the former, 
or of the perfect obedience which Christ performed to the father, and which be chiefly 
attested in dying, offering himself a sacrifice propitiatory for the sins of men.

§ 2.

R. B. 1. Under pretence of giving more to this or that part of divine truth or opera-
tions, many recede from the truth, and breaking God's sacred frame of 
doctrine, they let in many errors which they never dreamt of. 2. I never saw the au-
thors catechism: but I like the order expressed as well as you can do; & with that one 
truth were but well received, that Christ's suffering and obedience is but the cause of our re-
mission, and so of our formal righteousness, & not remission or our formal righteousness 
it self, (though our material it may be called): and this is enough to overthrow your whole frame; as it supposed, Christ's righteousness is our righteousness causally, 
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not formally. But as this is the meritorious Cause, so the immediate efficient must intervene between the impulsive meritorious Cause and the Effect, and therefore Christ's righteousness doth not denominate Justifie us actually, because it is the meritorious Cause; or doth not presently Justifie us as soon as performed.

§ 3.

L. C. But* without this method, it is not to be denied; besides that Scripture placeth our Righteousness as to the most part, in remission of sins, that also the Divines who embrace two parts of Justification, are inconsiderately drawn to lean more to one of them.

In the Treatise of the true reason of Christian Pacification ascribed to John Calvin, c. 20 de Justif. p. 9. Who doubteth but the whole Righteousness of man, to which he must resort, is contained in the free remission of sins? and a little after, Devolvedly doth Paul include the righteousness of faith, simply in remission of sins, saying, that it is described by David, when he pronounced the man blessed to whom sin is not imputed: and certainly the blessedness that David mentioneth, flows from righteousness. It follows therefore that we are therefore just, because our sins are not imputed to us.

Rivet Dialyf, p. 88. speaking of the twofold Grace we receive from Christ, faith. These we have from Christ, who is made to us Righteousness through the remission of sin, and sanctification, by the working of his Spirit in us.

The same Rivet prayeth Calvin's words p. 90. It is said, and it is part controversy, that the righteousness by which we are justified consisteth in remission of sins: that is, when for the merit of Christ's suffering which he underwent for our sake, our sins are not imputed to us: which is nothing else then the very merit of Christ to be imputed to us to the remission of sins.

The same man in his Animadversi. on Grot. annot. p. 37. faith, that Melanchthon constantly taught, that Justification signifieth Remission of sins, or the Acceptation of the person to everlasting life.

The sixteenth Article of the Confession of the French Churches is express, We believe that our whole righteousness is founded in remission of sins; in which also our felicity consisteth, as David saith: Excellently Bernard term. 25. in Cantic. Mans righteousness is God's indulgence: the same man, God's righteousness is not to sin, the righteousness of man is, for Righteousness* not to be imputed.

*It should be sin sure. And indeed the holy Scripture doth for the most part, not only place our Righteousness and Blessedness in the Remission of sin; but also seteth most exhortations to sanctity from the consideration of Christ's death; when yet the Righteousness of Christ in fulfilling the Law might seem a far sharper spur to the study of a holy and new Life, which our Lord did perfectly accomplish. It is not light which St. Paul saith, Rom. 6:7. that he that is dead is Justified (or freed) from sin; as if he would teach us these two most weighty things. 1. That Christ's suffering and dying doth justifie and free us from the guilt of sin. 2. That we being dead in Christ and crucified with him, are so freed from sin, that it shall not reign in us: which two benefits in which all our righteousness doth consist, do flow from the one death of Christ.
§ 3.

R. B. 1. As to the question, whether Remission be the whole of our Justification; briefly and plainly, this seems to me the truth. First it must be known whether Christ give us any other or higher felicity; then Adam had in possession upon Condition of perseverance in perfect obedience. If this question be determined negatively, then Justification is wholly comprehended in remission of sin: for seeing Remission freeth us from the Penalty of loss, as well as of sense, it restores us to the same condition, not only as we were in (for it is not only Original sin that is forgiven) but as we should have been if we had persevered in our first Integrity, that is, if we had not sinned. But if the question be determined affirmatively, that Christ did procure us a higher felicity, then the first Covenant promised, then we must further consider this much: viz. That the word Justification is taken for Legal or Sentential Justification: and in both it is taken either more strictly, or more comprehensively. Justification in Law sense, or constitutive in the strictest sense, is only the making us righteous of unrighteous; and that is only the remission of our sin or guilt, and so putting us in the state we should be in if we had never sinned. Justification constitutive in the more comprehensive sense, contains the addition of all those higher benefits purchased by Christ; (supposing there are such,) that is, it is the putting us into a right to all that felicity which God will bestow on the just in Christ. So Justification at judgement is strictly taken, The Absolution of a sinner from the Accusation of Guilt, that is, Obligation to punishment of loss and sense; but largely taken, it is also the adjudging him to a greater Glory, or the absolving him from the false accusation of having no right to that greater Glory. If you ask my opinion of this, I am loath to determine so doubtful a Case; but it seems most probable to me, that the felicity that Adam should have had, and that which Christ will give us, are of the same nature; because the Nature and Capacity of man is the same. But what gradual or Accidental difference there is, God knows, for I do not. But I suppose that the term Justification in Scripture, is commonly taken in the former strict sense, for mere remission of sin, or making us relatively righteous of unrighteous; yet so as to connote, or imply the concurrence of some special Gospel privileges; which when particularly intended, are rather expressed by Adoption, Membership of Christ, &c. then by Justification.

By this also it may be discerned, whether there were any meritorious obedience of Christ necessary, besides that which was for satisfaction of Justice, and restoring us into the state that we should have been in, if we had not sinned. To our strict Justification and Restoration, no more but satisfaction was necessary: But if there be any degree of felicity superadded which the first Covenant gave not, then the question is yet more difficult, as to that part. But then first it must be known that God being well pleased with Christ's very satisfaction, as Glorifying him more then the sinners own sufferings would have done, might give power to his Son to glorify his Members with a higher then the first Glory, even for that his satisfaction: There is nothing to hinder God from a larger shewing of mercy, when his Justice is once satisfied. We must not feign God to be so backward to do good, as if he would or could do nothing for us, but what is bought with a price; when once the bar or impediment is removed. 2. And we must remember that it could not be the Law of Works that made Christ's further (supposed) merit, beyond that of satisfaction, necessary.
necessity for our Glorification. For mere remission, through the merit of mere satisfaction (which is by obeying to the death) was sufficient to restore us to our right of felicity which the Law could give: And if Christ give us any more, it being not the Law that gives it, or ever gave it, so the Law is not that requireth a new purchase of it to be made. 3. And therefore it is not by way of Legal Righteousness to be imputed to us that Christ's further obeying in our stead could be necessary, when the work of satisfaction was once performed: For what Law required such a righteousness? But these things deserve more punctual explication in season. I thought not to say this much, but I hope the judicious Reader will not think it in vain.

2. For your collections from Rom. 6, 7. 1. If you mean that Christ freed us from guilt at the time of his death, it is your groundless fancy. It was his will that the liberation then purchased, should be made ours by a new Law on certain conditions. 2. If sin shall not reign in us who are dead in Christ, then why make you those to be justified by Christ in whom sin reigneth? Are they justified by him, and yet not dead with him? 3. How falls it from your Pen that the not-reigning of sin in us, is one of those two benefits of Christ's death, in which all our righteousness doth consist? Sure that a righteousness that we had not while we were Infidels or unregenerate much less from the time of Christ's death? (otherwise then negatively, as sin reigneth not in a non-ens.) But Error is oblique; and oblivion self-contradicting.

§ 4.

L. C.  W When these acts are done, let us see, whether when we are elected? or then when we believe? or as soon as Christ was promised to be Mediator, which more agreeeth to the verity of faith.

But whenever these acts are done, if they be done in one act, it is hence sufficiently evinced, that the act of Justification precedeth faith in Christ; Otherwise we must suppose that the act of Justification is reiterated, and that Justification as well as faith, hath its increasing and declining, (or intermissions.)

§ 4.

R. E. 1. Wha hopes was I in, when I first saw this question started, that we should have? ad his opinion, and the proof of it in the answer: But the man seems indifferent what opinion he be of, so he be not of that which is commonly accounted orthodox. Let the time of Justification be either when we are elected (that is, before time), or when Christ was promised, so it be not when we believe, he is content. I pray the Reader not to forget hereafter, 1. That here he doth not make the time to be at Christ's death, but the first promise. 2. That he doth not mean by this promise Gods decree of giving Christ, which was from eternity; for he distinguishes it from the time of Election. It is therefore at the promise after Adams fall, that he supposest we were actually pardoned and justified. 3. But then is not this a new way, and disliked by his own party, to make this to be an immanent act? As if immanent acts were no elder than since Adams fall? which his Dr. Twist would have taught him are from eternity? But of this more anon.

2. To your saying they are done una acta, in one act, I say, that the conditionally general.
general pardon was indeed one act, and at the same season enacted as you imagine; when God made that act of grace. But this pardoneth and justifieth not actually, till the condition be performed; why did you say never a word to prove it one act, but nakedly affirm it? But do you mean that all men are justifieth by one act? or only each particular man? If the former, I acknowledge it, as to one physical act of justification, which doth but conditionally justifieth: But it is not by one civil or moral act: For this one law performeth many thousand legal acts, and produceth effects, according to the will of the legislator.

§ 5.

L. C. The words of St. Paul are plain: Col. 1. 20. It pleased the Father to reconcile all things to himself, both things in earth, and things in heaven, having made peace by the blood of his Cross. Then are the Elect justified together and at once, when Reconciled: and then Reconciled when he made peace by the blood of the Cross.

R. B. 1. Hence no talk in the text of justifying; and that we are then justifieth when Reconciled, you should have proved, and not nakedly affirmed: For without distinguishing of reconciliation, it is false. 2. Though God is never said to justifieth us from Christ's death, yet it may be well said, that he then reconciled all things to himself. For 1. The price of reconciliation was given and taken, and so quantum ad pretium, it was done. 2. God was so far actually reconciled, as to deliver all men from the legal necessity of performing they were in before, so that they are not under a remediable obligation for want of an expiatory sacrifice: and he hath put them that were helpless, on the use of means for recovery. 3. Yea he hath actually granted a full free conditional pardon to all: and the condition is but acceptance of his gift (Christ and Life); which is so reasonable, that among men such gifts do pass as absolute, supposing the Legatary, or delinquent will not be so mad as to refuse it. And thus Christ may be said to have reconciled all the world to God, in that he hath done it, Quam...
21 And God hath granted it quantum in {f} as Legiflator of the new Law. But mark my limitations. 1. I lay not that Chrift hath done it quantum in {f} as Redeemer absolutely. For the work of Redemption comprizeth also his special intent in dying for the infallible salvation of his chozen. 2. Nor do I lay, that God hath done it quantum in {f} absolutely, but only as Legiflator, or Donor of remifion by the Testament or Deed of gift to all that will accept it. For he doth more for his chozen; but in another respect; even as the eternal elector of them, and as intending the work of redemption to the infallible accomplishment of this election-ends. So that you see, God having as Covenant Donor or Legiflator, and as sending his Son to satisfi, and Chrift also as meer satisfi, done quantum in {f} to the work of Reconciliation, and Remifion, and Jufifikation, and so much as in reason there should be no stop left (in our Accepance), it is not unusual, nor unfit language, to call this by the name of reconciliation; yet or remifion: And I know men of singular Learning and Judgment that lay, This is the meaning of Eph. 1. 7. and other like texts; and that this is truly Remifio ineobata, in that fin is made remifible as to perfect pardon, and so much done towards it, as Chrift hath done.

2. But all it must be acknowledged, that it is not aqual reconciliation or remifion yet for all this, till the Condition be performed. This is a known cafe among men, If a company of Rebels be fallen under the ceniture of the Law and Condemned for Traytories, and the Prince undergo some publike shame, for Justice fake, for their redemption, upon consideration whereof, the King grants them a general a& of Oblivion, pardoning all that will return to their Allegiance, and accept of his pardon, and the Princes favour. It is here no unmeet speech, nor unusual to lay, The King hath pardoned them all: or the King is reconciled to them, because it is conditionally done, and quantum in {f}, in that regard. But yet no man is aually pardoned or reconciled till he perform the Condition. So if you will call the paying of the Price, and the general a& of pardon, a reconciling or pardoning, I will not contend with you, on condition 1. That you acknowledge this is yet no aual pardon, nor reconciliation (except in quantum & secondum quid).

2. And that this is common to the unbelieving and non-elect that perish; and 3. That this is not the Jufifikation by faith, which Scripture mentioneth; yet of this is meant that 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20. And so Heb. 1. 3. And so what if I should yield that this Text is col. 1. 20. I easily confess that Chrifts death and universal fatisfacion, and also the general Conditional a& of grace or pardon, do go before faith; but so doth not actual pardon.

2. But though this answer be enough, yet indeed there is nothing in the text that urgeth me to this much: For the text faith not, that either Peace was made, or reconciliation just at the time of Chrifts death: but only mentioneth the caufes of peace and reconciliation whenever attained; Chrift may do it by the blood of his Crofs, as the meritorious Caufe, though the a& follow not of long after.

3. But indeed, the former clause (having made peace) feemeth to intimate an immediate (viz., having paid the Price, and brought God into a Covenant of grace with man, which is a degree of peace and reconciliation) But the latter Clause seems to intimate a distant a&, viz., reconciliation upon actual application and reception of the benefits.

3. Many Expositors think, that it is but the bringing the Gentile world into the Church, or making peace between them and the Jews, and closing them in one body, that is here meant.
I have been the larger in explaining this text, especially in opening the doctrine of that degree of Reconciliation, which is the immediate and general fruit of Christ's death, because I mean not to repeat it oft, but to refer you hither when other texts of the like nature are discussed. And remember that here is no mention of Jusification or Remission.

§ 6.

L. C. The words are plain also, 2 Cor. 5. 21. He made him sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

§ 6.

R. B. Do these words make any mention of our being Justified when Christ suffered? It only tells us to what end he was made sin for us: but not when the end is attained. He dyed to Glorifie us, as well as Justifie us; and yet we are not glorified when he dyed.

§ 7.

L. C. To wit, he was made sin when he bore our diseases, Isa. 53; and then we were Justified together and at once, the sins of the blessed being cast upon him, and the oblation being performed, Heb. 10. 10. For one Sacrifice being offered for sins for ever, and so they being perfected; in like manner, for ever, whom he sanctified, he is set at the right hand of God. v. 12, 13, 14.

§ 7.

R. B. 1. That we were then Justified together, you do but affirm, and not prove. 2. Isa 53, hath not a word to that end; the laying our sins on him, is not the taking them off from us; as Dr. Crisp vainly imagined. 3. Heb. 10. 10, makes against you, and not for you. It is through Christ's death that we are sanctified; but whether at his death, many thousand years before, is the question. The 14. tell us 1. That Christ perfected them for ever by his offering; but not at the time of that offering, or presently after Adam's fall. 2. Nay it faith, It is them that are sanctified, that he perfected; Therefore not the unsanctified, nor till they are sanctified. Or if the sanctification here spoken of be a common sanctification, so named from the Legal Purifications; then the sense can be but this, Christ hath by once dying made a sufficient expiation for sin, whereby the world are so far cleansed as to be brought nearer to God, and under a new Covenant of Grace; and the expiation that he hath thus made is sufficient, and hath perfectly done for them the work of expiation, and thereof needeth no more. But if sanctifying and perfecting be meant either of justifying or renewing, then they may be by Christ's Sacrifice in their seasons, but not at the time of that sacrifice. You know we are not perfected till Glory, (at least not while we are Infidels or unborn), and yet you suppose us then perfected, if you suppose the effects mentioned in this text, to be immediately concomitant or consequent to Christ's Sacrifice.
Moreover it is proved, because the Scripture frequently speaking of Remission of sin, faith that they are pardoned to us together and at once. See Col. 13, 14. and 2 Cor. 5, 18, where be faith not that we are Reconciled in Christ, but that we were Reconciled in Christ heretofore. The next words are clear, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to them their sins.

§. 8.

Our Assertion is like the rest, bold as well as false. To say that Scripture frequently faith this, when it never once faith it, is not well done. Indeed it faith that our past sins and present are at once forgiven, and that is all that then is sin; but where is there one word of God that faith, that God pardoneth sin before it is committed? much less all future sins at once? which I know is your meaning.

2: Col. 2, 13. faith, God had forgiven them all trespasses; but doth it say, He had forgiven them what were no trespasses, as being not committed? There is no mention of forgiving all that will be a Trespass, but only all that is a Trespass.

3. 2 Cor. 5, 18. I have expounded before, 1. It is past all doubt, manifested in the very text, that it is not actual full reconciliation and remission that is here mentioned; the Apostle expressly affirming that the message of Reconciliation was committed to them, and that they were Embassadors in Christ's stead to beseech men to be reconciled; shewing that yet it was not done. 2. It is plain therefore that its Reconciliation ex parte Dei, on supposition of their Acceptance; that it is God's providing and accepting the price of Reconciliation, and giving a free pardon to All upon Condition of accepting the Gift (Christ and Life) this is the reconciling and not imputing sin: And though this be not actual reconciliation and remission, plenary and proper, yet I shewed you before that it is not unchristian so called: what man will think a King's Pardon to a Traitor on Condition of Acceptance, and Returning to his Allegiance, to be unworthy the name of a Pardon? would not any man say the King hath pardoned him? and yet it is not an actual effectual pardon till accepted, and the Condition performed. Yea had there been no Condition expressed; yet Acceptance is naturally implied among men, and the Refuser supposed to have violated a Condition so naturally reasonable, that he forfeits his hopes of the benefit.

Though Pardon in Law sense fully discharging us from Guilt, and giving us right to Impunity, be in its own kind compleat at once, as to all past sins; yet there are many steps towards that full Pardon, which may be well called Pardon too, which yet are common to the ungodly and non-elect. God may well be said not to impute sin to the world, when he is paying so dear a Price for their sin, & using such a means for reconciliation, and giving pardon on so free and reasonable terms. Besides, there is, as Gods Legal pardoning; and his Sentential pardoning, so a third sort, even his executive pardoning, which is but not punishing or remitting the Punishment, (though not the Obligation to punishment) This is very variable, and hath divers degrees; and thus God may punish one day, and forgive the next, that is not punish and punish the next again;
again; yea and punish one sin more, or less: But especially when God takes off, or remitteth the punishment as a means to Reconciliation, and holdeth still the rod, while he offers us full pardon, even his so doing is a degree of actual pardon; Though it be not the full legal pardon, which dissolveth the obligation to punishment, yet is it a true actual executive pardon, in some degree. The plain truth is, it hath done the Church much wrong; that Divines have not rightly understood the nature of pardon, (though an Article of the Creed); And have too crudely asserted that it hath no Degrees; and have laid the grounds of those fancies which the Antinomians have built up. Even that Legal pardon which I called plenary and compleat in its kind, is yet imperfect in regard to what follows, nor is it a fit speech without explication, to say that our pardon in this life is perfect.

§ 9.

L. C. And when David saith, that He is bleffed whose sins are forgiven; it is certain that he speaks of a perfect Blessedness; that is, when all sins are Remitted.

§ 9.

R. E. 1. Surely this man lives in some Paradise, where ever it is, that thinks he hath perfect blessedness already. If he lived my life, he would not think so, though I bless the Lord of my Comforts, I am not without some tastes of his Love: I had hoped he had not been so far tainted. But I am confident, (let a man but keep his senses, and in his wit) and it is as curable an error as most he could have lain upon: Nor do I think, if he be sober, that he will think he is perfectly blessed one seven years together; Except (which I almost forgot) he should be so unhappy as to think, that there is no Blessedness after this Life. But I will not suspect him of that In fidelity.

2. If you are perfectly Blessed, shew it by your perfect holiness, and perfect knowledge; or else they are more credulous than I that will believe you. Such darkness and f polished as this book is stuffed with, do convince me that you are not perfectly blessed.

3. Nor did it ever come into Davids minde, to imagine men perfectly blessed on earth. Cannot a man be called blessed, because of a Right to perfect Blessedness, (which yet is but a conditional Right, and in itself Losable, though God will see that we lose it not) but you must fondly thence gather, that he is perfectly blessed. Let the bunch of Grapes suffice, without dreaming of Heaven upon Earth.

4. No, nor is it perfect Remission that David speaks of, nor that any man enjoys in this life. For 1. Many sins are yet to be pardoned; which are not committed. 2. Our present pardon by Donation in Law senfe, is but conditional; as to the continuance and perfection of it: There are conditions non amittendi, conditions of not losing what we have; and conditions of actual pardon for particular sins when committed, that are yet to be performed. We must
to that end believe still Habitually, and again actually, and Repent, and Confess, and Pray for Pardon: And doubtless a conditional Pardon is not of a perfect kind, as an absolute one. 3. Our Pardon which gives us Right to Impunity, is as to some parts of the Punishments, but in diem, for the future, and not de praebenti. God never by any Pardon did discharge us from all Punishment in this life, nor give Right to immediate perfect Impunity, but only to immediate Impunity, as to the destroying Punishments, and to the Sanction and fruits of Castigatory Punishments, and to a perfect Impunity in the life to come. This is true, and plain in Scripture, as can be desired, however prejudgeted men may reject it: As Scripture calleth wicked men Punishments, and Godly mens sufferings Punishments, so that which we commonly call Paternal Sanction, is a Species of Punishment. 4. Our executive Pardon (which I so call, because God gives it as Executioner of Justice, remitting that Execution) is not perfect in this life, for much Punishment is yet to be suffered, and the last enemy Death, must yet do Execution on us; and our very lying in the dust till the Resurrection, is a punishment; and the sin itself that adhereth to us, is maintained to be a punishment of former sins, by many Divines that are not partial for me, in this case. 5. The final Absolution which we shall have at the great Judgement, is the most perfect pardon of all; and this is yet behind. And whereas some say, that this is properly no Pardon nor justification; but a Declaring that we were pardoned and justified before, I answer, 1. They contradict the Scripture, that calls it both blotting out sin, and justification. Act. 3. 19. That your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing cometh, &c. Rom. 3. 4. Mat. 12. 37. By thy words shalt thou be justified. 2. And though such a Declaring, may be called justification, yet what ignorance do these men shew of the nature of judgment; to think it doth but barely declare? Determining, is more then Declaring. By Law, i. e. the remedying Act of Grace we have our Justification & ad Gloriam in Domum & Constittuim: our constituted Right: and by Judgment Absolving us, we have our Justicium, & Determinationes habilitationis. Our right put out of all question and controversy for the future, notwithstanding the malice of all Accusers.

I do not heap up Scriptures to prove the Imperfection of Pardon in this life, when these five notorious defects may put it out of doubt with the impartial Reader; and when every man may turn to his Concordance and finde enough. Mark but that 2 Kms. 24. 4. which yet mentioneth another imperfect Pardon, viz, when God will have the Sinners, and yet retain some of the Punishment to be inflicted on Posterity, as he did by Manasseh; Surely at the Commandment of the Lord, came this upon Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he did, and also for the innocent Blood that he shed (for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood): which the Lord would not pardon: and mark another kind of imperfect Pardon in Tantum only, and not in Totaum. Num. 14. 19, 20, 21, 22, 33. Pardon! beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, &c. and the Lord said, I have pardoned according to thy word: But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the Glory of the Lord. Because all those men which have seen my Glory and my Miracles, which I did in Egypt, and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now these ten times, and have not harkened to my Voice, surely they shall not see the Land which I spake unto their Fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked me see it. Such plainly was Davids case, 2 Sam. 12. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. God forgiving the present death due to himself, and the eternal punishment...
ment, but not all the temporal punishment. However some in opposition to the Papists, have run into the contrary extremity in denying this, yet plain Scripture and experience will make men believe, when prejudice and partiality, which hot disputes have bred, is cured or allayed.

§ 10.

L. C. *There is no small weight in the words*, Rom. 5. 19. As by the contumacy of one man many are made sinners, so by the obedience of one, many are made righteous. As if he should say; As by the sin of Adam many are condemned, so by the obedience of Christ only, many are justified; that it may be spoke of forensick and judicial acts, in both cases, past and performed in one act; as the opposition teacheth between the justified by Christ's obedience, and the guilty of damnation for the sin of Adam: for as the sin of Adam doth by one act involve posterity in the same guilt, so the Righteousness of Christ hath by one act justified the sinners, for whom he dyed.

§ 10.

R. B. *All this I have answered already; what a fancy is it for this man to think, that all Adams posterity are guilty at once, even before they are his posterity or subjects capable of Guilt? They are all guilty of one act; but not all constituted so by one act of application. So are we all righteous through one satisfaction of Christ, (which yet was more then one act), but not all by one applicatory act. Cannot you distinguish both in Guilt and Remission the meritorious or material Cause, from the immediate Efficient? The former is one to us all, and at once caused in itself. The latter is as divers as the persons. Nor is there a word in the text to intimate your conceits. Yea again you boldly put constituuntur pecatores, for Constituuntur, and when you have done, tell us it speaks of acts past. If ever you deal in this kinde more, either speak to none but your Disciples that will take your word, be it true or false; or else affirm less, and prove more.*

§ II.

L. C. *By the like opposition as Joh. 3. 18, the believer is in like manner taken to be justified already, as the unbeliever is expressly said, for that reason, because he believeth not to be condemned already: For as he that believeth not is already condemned, so he that believeth is already justified: but if we believe the Author of the Epistle, then is a man first justified when he believeth in Christ.*
§. 11.

R. E. This Job. 3. speaks of the Time of Reception of Justification: but that Rom. 5. doth speak of the merituous Cause directly, and but imply the time of our participation.

2. Are not this man's eyes strangely shut, that he can neither see himself, nor the text so expressly speaking against himself? How can he believingly recite a text that saith, He that believeth not is condemned already, and yet maintain that thousands that believe not, are justified already? Yea and see that Justification and Condemnation are contraries? yea and gather hence that a man is justified already that believeth yea and gather hence that men are condemned to ipso quod non credant? But if he mean only, that he is condemned in conscience, as he means falsely, seeing many a wicked mans blinded conscience condemneth him not (ye are they that justify your selves, &c.) So poor unbelievers will finde to their cost, that it is another kinde of Condemnation then that of conscience, that they are obnoxious to, and lye under: for the wrath of God abideth on them: and the Defensor expresseth it by jam perditioni adjudicatum. But Oh what difference is there between the Libertines and the Gospel? the Gospel calls the unbelievers, men condemned already, Children of wrath, strangers to the Covenant of Promisfe, without hope, without God in the world, &c. And this man faith a little before, not only that they are pardoned, and justified, but Blessed; yea, have perfect Blessedness: If all the wicked that are elect, are perfectly Blessed, even in heaven, while they are whoring, perjured, killing the Saints, &c. how much have we been mistaken in the unhappiness of an unregenerate estate? and in persuading men out of it, or to be so humbled for it afterward? I cannot perceive by Pauls description of his former state, that he thought himself perfectly Blessed in it? nor were the Godly of my old acquaintance wont to think or speak so of their former state: whatever our Religious profane Libertines may now do. Bear with my sharpness, for I dare not repent it, so far short is it of the Cause.

§. 12.

L. C. Or is there less strength in the vision that is Zach. 3. where the all of Justification is skilfully expressed: The Angel answering, spoke to them that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy Garments from him: and to him he said, Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will cloath thee with changed rayment: Here in one all are taken away the filthy Garments, and clean rayment is put on.
§. 12.

R. B. Though I believe not that it is Jesuualis first Justification that is here expressed, much less an act done, when Adam was yet in Paradise; yet I marvel what the man means to talk of such strength in this text for him, and make such a flourish with it, when he could fasten no sense on it himself, (who yet goes as far that way as most) but what we grant as freely as he. Who denyeth that at once (whether at one act or no) our filthy garments are taken away, and clean garments put on? But doth this prove that we shall never more fall in the dirt, nor catch a spot, nor need Christ's blood any more to purge us from our sins? You have seen how the Diffidor did Luidionem agere, with the sacred Scripture, I think as bad as if he had made a Stage-play of it; we must next see how he dealeth with Divines. I confess he may finde more footing for an error in mens words then Gods; and men may well bear abuse from him, that dare abuse God himself.

§. 13.

I. C. Sound Divines accord with Scripture. Amesiis de Iustif. Thel. 5. Justification admits of no degrees, but is perfect in one act, together and at once, although as to the manifestation, sense and effects it hath divers degrees. Again Thel. 25. Not only the pass sins of the Justified are forgiven, but also in some sort the future. Num. 23. 25. He beholdeth not iniquity in Jacob, nor transgression in Israel. Again, Thel. 25. The Justified daily beg forgiveness of sin, that the sense and manifestation of it may be more and more perceived, as particular sins require.

§. 13.

R. B. 1. Some unhappy men pick up all the infirmities and mistakes of excellent Divines, and make a Religion of them, or rather make them a pretence to their errors: Our late Divines against the Antinomians, have particularly dealt with these passages of Doctor Ames, and have shewed the unfitness of his expressions.

2. But what is this to prove the Justification of Infidels? You know Amesius faith, and many a time faith, that we are not actually Justified till we believe. If therefore he do make Justification done at once, it is not before we believe.

3. Amesius in the first passage speaks of Justification from a sinful state, not from a sinful act; and faith it is perfect, as to all past sins; but if he mean as to future, he errreth.

4. Nay he shews that he doth not, for he only faith of future sins, that they are aliquo modo, remitted, and so say I too, as before at large. Aliquo modo, is a large word. This shews that he took them not to be codem modo, as fully for-
given as past sins were; and therefore that Remission was not perfect as to all sin. He saith, *Futura peccata virtualiter tanti, & in subjecto, not Formaliter & in se se, remittentur.*

5. You deal as you wish with the 25. *Thes.* mentioning one reason only of our asking pardon, as if that were all that *Amefius* mentioned, when he hath two more.

6. If you will learn of him, I pray you learn the 14, 16, 20, 12. *Thes.* *Et autem hoc Justificatio propter Christum, non absolute consideratum, quod fens Christi etiam est causa ipsius Vocationis: sed propter Christum fide apprehendimus, quæ fides vocationem sequitur tamquam effectum: unde & Justitia dicitur esse ex fide, Rom. 9. 30, 10, 6. & Justification per fidem, Rom. 3. 28, *Thes.* 16. Nique effi (propriè loquendo) speculis fiducia, qua Remissionem peccatorum & ipsam Justificationem apprehendimus: Fides enim Justificans precedit Justificationem ipsam. *Et ut Causa fum effectum: sed fides Justificationem apprehendens, necessario praesupponit ac sequitur Justificationem, ut alius objectum.* And I pray learn of him, *Thes.* 20. what pardon is; and then you will see that he includeth not perfect Remission of all temporal punishment in it, *Justificatio ab solvit a peccato & morte, non immediate tollendo culpam, aut maculam, aut omnia effe peccati: sed obligationem & Reatum ad mortem aeternam subeundam, Rom. 8. 1, 33, 34. And I could with those that think Chrifls Righteousness in formalization, is made ours by Imputation, would learn the *Thes.* 12. *Christi Justitia in Justificatione fideli bus Imputatur, quatenus ejus merito fide coram Deo reputatus, Phil. 3. 9.* So much for *Amefius.*

---

**§. 14.**

L. C. *Pifcator in Cap. 6. mas. in Orat. Domin. Hic potissimun perimus ut cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum persuadat quod nobis remiserit peccata nostra propter Chriftum.* Here we specially ask that he would by the Holy Ghost persuade our hearts that he hath forgiven our sins through Chrift.

---

**§. 14.**

A. B. *Pifcator* is as fairly dealt with as the former. These words which are put alone by you, as if they contained *Pifcator* s full sense, are but an addition to his former part of the explication, which is this, *Remitte: id est, Condona: noli posse: nobis per solutio: aut satisfactionem: denique nobis nos propter peccatum nostra punire; And in the Analysis, *Agitur in penultima (petitio) de peccatorum pretiorum, et ab nobis admissionem obligatione.* What a friend *Pifcator* is to the justification of Infidels, among a hundred places, I will shew you out of one in Rom. 3. 22, 23, &c. *Observanda hic sunt Causa Justificationis, &c. Justificationis illius ejus respectu coram Deo Justificatus. Causa efficiens principialis & agens est Deus. Causa efficiens ad agendum impellens interna est Gratia & Justitia fœc voce Dei. Causa efficiens ad agendum impellens externa (quæ etiam vocari potest Causa Instrumentalis extra nos) est Redemptionis facta per Christum, eor per sanguinem illius. Hæc a nonnullis vocatur Justitia nostra materia, &c.* Causa Instrumentalis in nobis est fides qua Redemptionem ipsam seu satisfactionem Christi apprehendimus.
§. 15.

L. C. **R** Hollock Tract. de Jufiificatione. When we ask Remission of sin, we do not ask the benefit itself, as not yet given, but we ask the increase of our confidence, and the application of the benefit which is by Faith, and the increase of Faith.

§. 16.

L. C. **G** od doth forgive Believers their sins, as a Father doth to his beloved son; a Father even offended is a Father: and a son, though certain of his Father's good will, doth not cease to ask him the forgiveness of his faults; but, if it were absurd for him when God hath forgiven his sin, to ask forgiveness of sin of God, it would likewise seem as absurd for one that hath Faith to ask the gift of Faith, as one that is wholly destitute of it. But when a Believer asketh that which he hath already, he asketh the sense of the Grace of God's presence, which God doth give more illustriously to the penitent. Certainly he that asketh Remission of sin, even thereby hath the marks of sin, being already forgiven; and yet ought not thereby to be the more remiss in seeking both Remission and Faith. And seeing it were in vain asked, which may not be expected, we must needs think that that is deservedly granted which we may lawfully ask; and that the Promises to the penitent and believers are not in vain, as Acts 3. 19, and such as the Author of the Epistle writeth, to prove that the act of faith goeth before Remission of sins.
§ 16.

R. E. 1. *The* man's mouth condemns himself against his will. He saith, *God doth forgive Believers, as a Father,* &c. when he is proving that God forgiveth Infidels, or no Believers, yea no men now but only men future.

2. For my part I ask not only for the sense of that Faith and Grace which I have; but also I, the increase of it, 2. the continuance and perseverance, 3. And the exercise of it. What kind of prayers doth this man make, that asketh only the feeling of Grace! Did not I tell you, that an Antinomian Faith will cause Antinomian Piety and practice?

3. I thought it had been past doubt that it is absurd for him that knows he hath Faith, to ask for it, as one that is plainly destitute of it. And so it is in case of pardon. I will ask for both, but not as one plainly destitute. I ask for the continuance of former justification, and for the addition of actual pardon for each particular following sin; but not as one that was never pardoned before.

4. He doth still Ludionem agere; and here most vainly: to tell us that a man should be never the more remiss in begging pardon and Grace, because he asketh but the feeling of that which he hath already: *q. d. You must not ask for pardon, yet you must ask for it never the more Remissly.* Perhaps he means, you must use the word Pardon, as much and as loud as if you did mean, Pardon indeed, as you speak; and so of Faith. Or else he means, you must ask the feeling of Grace and Pardon, as earnestly as if you were asking Grace and pardon itself. But who can do so? to ask as earnestly for a smaller mercy as for a greater?

§ 17.

L. C. *This is Erratius, Sect. 9. In our justification we receive of God, not only the Remission of sins past, but of future: that is, we are ascertained of the Remission of them. For the Internal act of God, whereby he willeth to remit sin, nor the act of remitting, that is, not Imputing, cannot be renovated in God: Nor is it probable that justification is oft renewed as before; otherwise how shall that be true, whom he justified, he glorified? I judge it must certain, that to whomsoever God once remitted sin, he forgiveth him always his sins, of what sort and how great soever; the pronouncement of which absolution, is oft repeated from God's Word to the penitent, and the feeling of this Divine favor is not ever alike strong in Believers, but is obscured and debilitated by reason of emergent sins, or is strengthened and revived again, as repentance is again renewed. And if the act of justification be not renewed; it is not credible, when we ask pardon of sins, that we ask, or are commanded to ask the reiteration of the act of Remission of sin, or reiterated justification.

The same man, ad Perk, Vindicias, Pref. It is beyond controversy that Remission of sin, as it is an immanent act in God, goeth before both our Faith and Repentance; but to us it is not known but by Faith; the confidence also where-
R. B. I will not do as you do, pretend those to be for me, who are against me: I confess Dr. Twiss is on your side in this point: and his reasons no better then yours. 2. I say as well as you, that justification from a state of guilt, is not reiterated; but particular remission, and justification from the guilt of particular sins, is frequently performed.

S. 18.

L. C. Reason consenteth with Testimony.
1. Christ was Mediator, as soon as he was promised to be Mediator. If Mediator, then a Surety: if a Surety, then did he take on himself the sins of all for whom he was a pledge.

R. B. Your Reason proceedeth from a sad ignorance of the very nature of Christ's suretyship and undertaking. This one point is (as I said before) the master vein of all Antinomianism. Christ's sufferings were for the sins of all for whom he was Surety; and so far he took their sins on him, as to bear a voluntary penalty to demonstrate God's justice for those sins. But he took them not off the sinner, by the act of taking them on himself: but suffered for them with this intent and resolution, that they should have no actual pardon by it, till they should believe in him, that is, assent to his word, and accept him for their Lord and Saviour: and on these terms was his satisfaction accepted by his Father. Disprove this Doctrine, and I will quickly and plainly prove that all men shall be saved, which is as false as yours. Ex intentione Dei & Christi pro nobis simpliciter & absolute profita est satisfactio autem quam credamus: at eam non imputatur nobis ut fructum inde consequamur priusquam credamus: Hinc sibi Conditio ad Remissionem peccatorum & vitam aeternam praecipitur. Esumus de satisfac. l. i, Sect. s. c. 3. p. 341.

S. 19.

L. C. 2. Justification is an immanent act of God, done in an instant, which puts nothing in the justified, though in the adult it necessarily createth faith, as faith doth good works: For remission of sins is an effect of Christ's death, as faith is of remission of sin.
§ 19.

R. B. Is this arguing and shall such words be called Reasons? what abundance of strange passages are here huddled up together? 1. That justification is an immanent act. 2. And yet done in an instant. 3. That it puts nothing in the Iustified. 4. Yet it createth Faith in the adult; and Faith is an effect of Remission of sin. All notoriously false, and of very dangerous consequence. Let us peruse them in order.

1. If justification be an immanent act, then your Dr. Twiss will tell you, it must needs be from eternity, and have no beginning. And if so, I would know of you at present, but these two things: 1. Why you say it is done when the Promise was first made? was the Promise made from eternity? 2. Whether you do not exclude the Death and all the merits and intercession of Christ, as well as Faith? surely Christ's death and merits were in time, and that which is in time, cannot or be the cause of that which was from eternity? Because they tell us, that God's immanent acts are his Essence, even God himself. And I think, Christ's merits were not the cause of God's Essence. Will you not be angry if I desire the Reader but to consider well, whether this be not consequentially insidiously itself? and whether Antinomians may not much fitter be called Anti-Christsians, or Anti-Gospelers? Can be be a Christian that denyeth all Christ's merits of obedience or suffering, and his Resurrection, Ascension, and Intercession, to be any causes of our Remission, or Justification, but only of our feeling of it? And can he take Christ's death or merits to be any cause, who takes Justification to be an immanent act from eternity? These are no jesting matters.

2. But what a strange immanent act is that which is done in an instant? But it may be you call eternity one instant, as some do.

3. It is most false that justification put nothing in the Iustified. It puts in him a right to Impunity, and to the blessings that belong to it: It puts on him a new Relation: It disobligeeth him as to punishment.

4. And what a strange immanent act is that which createth Faith? an immanent creating act: Yea expressly it is said, that it putteth nothing in the Iustified: and yet it createth Faith. Belike Faith is taken to be nothing: and then it is suitable to the Justification which they suppose it to know or make known; as that Justification is suitable to the sins by it remitted. Sin which is no sin, pardoned by a pardon which is no pardon, made known or perceived by a Faith which is nothing.

2. But that Faith is the effect (yea or the consequent either) of Remission of sin, is so fully contrary to the common language of the Gospel, that I think, this Differentor should not have judged his bare word a sufficient proof of it.
and followeth not Faith, nor is found to terminate in us the operation of the Holy-
Ghost: but that which by the operation of the Holy-Ghost doth come to us, is nothing 
but Faith or the feeling of God's favor.

§. 20.

R. E. N0 wonder if all your discourse of the season and way of Remission, 
be vain and erroneous, when you know not what Remission of sin is. 
I shall be bold therefore 1. to tell you better what it is, and 2. to shew you the 
error of your speeches. 1. The former having done before, I need only to re-
peat what is there said. God doth Remit sin, 1. As Rector, by his signal pard-
on, viz. The Law of Grace, or the Promise, per modum Donationis. 2. As Judge,
by his Sentence, 3. As Executioner, which is by not punishing. The first 
act doth dissolve the obligation to Punishment, and give us Right to Impuni-
ety. The 2. act doth determine finally our controverted Right, and put it past 
all further controversy: The third act doth take off, or keep off the punish-
ment itself: which hath various degrees, according to the variety of punish-
ments. Not one of these is an immanent act, but all three Rectoral. Faith is 
the Condition sine qua non, of the first and second, and of the third as to the 
Eternal destroying punishment, but not as to all punishment. God may give 
many mercies to Infidels, and so remit proportionably much penalty to them, 
in this third sense. Yea what ever mercy he gives them proportionably, doth 
he truly remit penalty: and so in giving them Faith itself and the Spirit, he 
doth really remit the penalty of infidelity and privation of the Spirit, which 
were the penalty of former sins. In this sense, Remission is not a meer Rela-
tive change, but a real: but in the two first senses, it is only Relative. So much 
in few words of the true nature of pardon. Only I add, that the pardon spoken 
so much of in the Gospel, proper to Believers, and the immediate consequent 
of Faith, is the first, viz, the giving Jus ad imputationem, dissolving the obliga-
tion to punishment, and the executive Liberation from destructive and eternal punish-
ment, annext thereto, though a suspension went before it. To which is 
added the publick sentence in its season at judgement, which is the perfection 
of our Relative pardon, and our most proper plenary Justification; and lastly is 
added our actual Liberation by Glorification, in execution of that sentence, 
which putting an end to all the lesser degrees of penalty, (death, rottenness, 
sin, &c. ) which were not till then fully remitted to Believers, is it self our 
most perfect final executive Remission. And so our sins shall be per-
fectly blotted out, when that blessed day of refreshing comes.

2. Now to your definitions. 1. You make nothing of contradicting your 
self even in definitions. 1. You tell us that the quiddity of pardon, is nothing 
but a Negation of punishment. 2. You tell us in the very next words, that to remit 
sin, is nothing but Nolle punire. But do you think that Nolle punire, and Nolle pu-

nire is all one? I know Dr. Twiss talks thus before you, so unhappy a thing is it 
for that man to have a mistaken guide, that is necessitated or disposed only to 
follow; and cannot see his own way. I suppose it drew Dr. Twiss into ma-

ny other mistakes about Justification, that he knew not the nature of it, or of 
pardon of sin.

But let us consider them severally. 1. Nolle punire, not to punish, is but the 
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Exe-
Executive pardon, and the other two are more principally called **pardon** : and the 2. **Non punire**, is such a pardon as Reprobates have in some degree for some season, past all doubt. The wicked should be pardoned the torments of hell, as well as the Godly, as long as they live in prosperity on earth. But who will question whether there be not a further pardon besides **Non punire**, that finds it written in God's Word. Will not God put it out of doubt? And that there is a *sentential* Absolution yet remaining, I hope for all this you shall know by experience.

2. Now to your second definition. I have shewed you already that there are two sorts of pardon besides **Non punire**, and three besides **Nolle punire**. I shall now further shew you that **Nolle punire**, is no pardon at all: and that thus, 1. pardon hath either guilt, punishment, or the guilty, for its object. There is a **Nolle punire** that hath none of these for its object. Therefore there is a **Nolle punire** which is not pardon of sin. The minor is proved, of God's eternal **Nolle punire**, when there was neither sin, guilt, nor inner, nor punishment.

2. Argument, Pardon is not an eternal act; **Nolle punire** is an eternal act; therefore **Nolle punire** is not pardon.

3. Argument, Pardon is the fruit of Christ's blood. **Nolle punire** (being eternal) is not the fruit of Christ's blood, therefore.

4. Argument, Pardon is not the same with Election, Predestination, the Decree of saving or not punishing. **Nolle punire** is the same with this Decree; therefore **Nolle punire** is not pardon.

And if no pardon at all, then judge how ingeniously the Dissenter faith that Pardon is nothing else.

Yet as I have said this much on grounds commonly owned; so let me concede somewhat on a further ground. My opinion is, that God's Essence should neither be named an Action (in our present sense) in generis, nor *Velle* or **Nolle in Specie**, but respectively to some object. Take **Nolle punire** then for **Nolle infigere penam jam debitam**, and so the object (pena debitata) being *quod esse realis* in Time, so Gods *Velle* or **Nolle** which do respect it, in esse reali, are to be denominated as in time, or as beginning: and thus his *Velle* or **Nolle** may be called a sort of Remission also, and a consequent of Christ's death and man's Faith; Though the Essence of God which we so denominate, is eternal.

2. But in the next passage you have one of the most monstrous suppositions in chafe, that ever I heard from the mouth of a Christian, viz. that this immanent act of God doth not terminate in us the operation of the Holy-Ghost; Did ever any of your adversaries say it did, or doth it follow any of their Doctrines? that man that should say, that the Holy-Ghost by his operation on us doth produce an immanent act of God, as his Terminus, would be thought to be besides himself (if he be taken for learned) by all that should hear and understand his words. I confess you have an eafe dispute of this.

3. That *Faith* (Justifying) is the feeling of God's favor (if you mean his special favor to the Believer himself) is but your conceit, and easier said then proved.
L. C. Hither pertaineth, that that action much differs from transient actions, which put a real mutation in the object, as are Conversion, Vivification, 
&c. which are effectuated within us: but by the act of Believing, Remission of sin is not 
effectuated, but received: not so of Vivification, and Sanctification, which by 
Faith are effectuated in us. But Justification is not done by Faith, but by Faith is 
revealed and known.

§. 21.

R. B. The last is a crude false assertion, oft repeated. The rest is true, but 
nothing to your advantage. For though Faith do not effect Justification, yet is it the Condition, sine quanun à Deo per Legem Gratiae efficitur. God 
pardoneth no man (adult) by the Gospel act of donation, or condonation, till they 
first believe.

§. 22.

L. C. 3. The reason of our Union with Christ, requireth that we be Justified be-
fore we do Believe, at least in priority of nature and order, if not of 
time. All Graces flow from the Union of the Members of Christ with Christ the head: 
and therefore Faith, Joh. 15. 5. Without me ye can do nothing: It is as if he had 
said; Unless ye are first united and ingrafted into me, ye cannot believe. For he 
that is not grafted into Christ, can perform no act or work: Hence it is that Faith, 
Gal. 5. 22. floweth from that Union. Nor do I conceive how 
the graft and the tree should grow into one* life, and bring * Vitam forte pro vitam 
forth leaves and fruits conjunct by a common life, unless 
they are first joined together by infusion. He that hath the Son, hath life; 
1 Joh. 5. 12.

§. 22.

R. B. 1. All this makes against your self. For if it were so that Union with 
Christ went before Faith; yet if they that have the Son have 
life, and the graft when it is in the tree hath the life of the tree, how then can 
they remain in the slavery of the Devil, whom you suppose to have been Justi-
ﬁed in Christ since Adams being in Paradise? And if you would yield that the 
difference is not in time but nature, your error were not so dangerous: as long 
as Justification and Faith begin in an instant together, you cannot plead for the 
Justification of Infidels so long before.

2. If we granted you that Union with Christ goeth before Faith, how do you 
therefore prove that Faith goes not before Justification? Forsooth, because all life 
flows
flows from Union with Christ; what is that to the question? If we yield that Faith and justification do both flow from Union with Christ, may not yet Faith be in order of nature the first? Why should you run away with such an unproved Conclusion, as if justification must needs be first, because both flow from one root, Union with Christ.

3. I utterly deny that Union goes before Faith. As you may know the stream of Protestant Divines goes against you, so doth Scripture plainly; and then I lefs value mens contradicting reasons. The greatest task here is to expound what Union with Christ is. There is a manifold Union that we have with Christ.

1. The first is a Relative Union, he being our Head, Husband, King, and we being his incorporate Members, his Spoufe and Subjects; and so both make one Mystical person, that is, one Corporation, Family, Common-wealth.

2. A Union intentional, such as is between every object and the intellect, or will of man that is exercised about it; by knowing, willing, &c. 3. A Union of similitude, (largely not properly called Union); so Christ being holy, and his people like him, may be said to be one with him. 4. A Union of Concord: when Christ and we do agree in judgements, and affection, and action. This is but imperfect here. Thus the Primitive Christians were of one heart and Soul, and had one Table, one Purse. This doth Christ very much intend in his prayer, John 17. That they may be one, &c., and one in me: that is, may agree in one and the same Doctrine that I have taught them (though this is not all); and so may have one heart, that what one Loveth the other Loveth, and what one hateth the other hateth: when Christ and man are at peace, and of one minde, they may be said to be all one. 5. A Union of Friendship or Internal affection: so we are said to be one with those that we strongly love, and they are said to dwell in our minds by cogitation, and in our hearts by Love and Delight: So Christ dwells in our hearts, Animat est ubi amat. 6. A Union of Familiarity, or as to the effects of Friendship: when men are still together, and communicate to one another, they are said to be one, because they shew the effects of that Internal Friendship before mentioned: so Christ and we are one. 7. A Union (in a large sense) through communication of the excellencies of his spiritual nature; giving us the Holy-Ghost; and so animating us with his own Life; Yet this makes us not one Person natural with Christ, nor one Divine Nature and Essence. The Father is a Conveyer of the same nature to his Son, and all creatures to their young, and yet are not the same person, or suppose. Yet we are not so near: for Christ doth not possess us in strict sense with Gods Essence or Nature; but 1. with a Nature called Divine, because it is eminently of God, and inclined to Divine things, and fitted for them. 2. With Right to Christ, who hath the Divine nature. The Sun doth generate all inferior Animates, and yet not make them Suns.

This last Union, by communication of Spirit, is not properly spoken of all that have the Works of that Spirit, in any kinde or measure, no nor of all the savory Work. The Spirit hath three operations: The first to convince and draw men nearer towards Christ who are far from him: This is a common Work, and thus many are made partakers of the Holy-Ghost, as also by miraculous Gifts, who yet may not fily be said to be united to Christ. The second is the drawing men to Christ; and causing them to Accept him; and this is giving them Faith: It is not the language of Scripture, to call this a state of Union.
Union with Christ, or to say that men before Believing in order of nature are one with Christ. The third is the Spirits indwelling, being given to the Believer as his Sanctifier and Guide, by relation and residence or operation: This is it that Scripture calls the giving us the Holy-Ghost; but whether it be the nearest reason why we are called one with Christ, I dare not determine. If there be any nearer Union yet then I have mentioned, (as I dare not say flatly there is none, so I must say) I know it not. Only I abhor that proud and blasphemous fancy of them that say, we are real beams, sparks, parts of the God-head, or of the Essence of God, or personally one with Christ.

Now of all these sorts of Union, I suppose the first is that which is chiefly hinted in Scripture; including the rest as consequents and effects of it. And this Union is after Faith, and so are all the rest, except the second (which is little to our business) and the last in the two first branches of it, or communications of Spirit; which are not fitly called Union. If any will needs say, that the Spirits working Faith in us, is a Union of the Soul to Christ; then 1. I shall yield, that is before Faith: 2. But I shall not agree with them of the fitness of the term Union applied to that state, nor do I know that ever Scripture so used it: 3. Much less that this is the Union which Scripture so frequently hinteth to us. I come now to prove that Union is after Faith.

Argument 1. We are United to Christ as to our Husband in marriage Covenant. But it is by Faith that we are so united, and not before it, therefore: Faith is but our Consent, which is part of the marriage-Union, Eph. 5. 30, 31, 32. 28, 29. We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. They two shall be one flesh. I speak of Christ and the Church. Now Marriage before mutual Consent here is none. I have espoused you, faith Paul, to one Husband; that is, by drawing them to Believe in Christ.

2. That which causeth the Dwelling of Christ in our hearts, causeth our uniting to him; and that which goes before one, goes before the other: (for Christ's dwelling in us is a term to express our Union by) But Christ doth dwell in our hearts by Faith. Eph. 3. 17. therefore we are united to him by Faith.

3. If the Life of Christ in us be by Faith, then so is our Union with him; But the former is true, Phil. 2. 9. Gal. 2. 20. Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the Faith of the Son of God.

4. If Faith be before our Adoption, then it is before our Union with Christ, (for being united to him who is the Son, we have by an immediate fulness the relation of sins and Cohereis) but Faith is before our Adoption, therefore; Job. 1. 12. As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe in his name. Gal. 3. 16. Ye are all the Sons of God by Faith in Christ Jesus.

5. If Faith follow not our receiving Christ, then it follows not our Union with him: But Faith (the beginning of it) is not after our receiving Christ, therefore; The major is plain, in that we receive Christ into Union; and Marriage-Covenant: and Scripture never speaks of Union before. The minor is plain, in that Faith is our Active Receiving it itself, prerequisite to our Passive, that is, to our Right in him, as our Husband and Head, Job. 1. 12. Col. 2. 6. As ye have Received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him.

6. Faith doth not follow our Coming to Christ that we may have life (for it is that Coming, in itself) therefore it follows not our Union.
with him: Job. 5. verf. 40. Ye will not come to me that ye may have life;
Job. 6. 44, 45. No man can come to me (that is, believe) except the Father that hath
sent me draw him; viz. by the Spirit; therefore the Spirit's drawing is in order before
our coming to Christ, and we are not in Scripture sense united to him, before
we come to him.

7. We are not united to Christ till we eat him as the bread of Life (for that signifi-
feth the Incorporation and Union) But it is by faith that we eat him, or feed on him.
John 6. 48, 49, 50, 51, 53. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood,
ye have no life in you. 56, 57. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth
in me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. So verf. 34, 35, 36, 37, 40. By faith
we joyn our selves to Christ and his Church, and so are members of his body; 1 Cor.
12. 27. and being joyned to him, are one Spirit. 1 Cor. 6. 17. If we are not joyned
or united to the Church before Faith, then not to Christ (for we are made members
of the body and head at one act) But we are not united to the Church not made mem-
bers of it before faith; therefore. The Minor is easy to be proved by very many Scrip-
tures. And Christ is head of none but the body, the Church; Col. 1. 18, and 2. 19.
Eph. 1. 22. and 4. 15, 16, and 5. 23.

Much more might be said to prove that faith goes before all that union with Christ
which Scripture doth ever mention. And it is enough, that no one text can be cited
to prove that any man is united to Christ before faith: and therefore it ought not
to be affirmed. But I come at length to your reasons.

1. You say All graces flow from Union of the Members with the Head; therefore faith;
I deny your Antecedent, and therefore your consequent. 1. The Grace of Predesti-
nation flowed not from Christ as Head. 2. Nor the Grace of Redemption. 3. Nor
the Gospel itself; nor the preaching of it. 4. Nor any of those common Graces of
the Spirit by which men are brought near Christ; some are made partsakers of the
Holy Ghost, and are enlightened, and taft of the Heavenly Gift, and the Powers of
the world to come, and are sanctified by the blood of the Covenant, and yet are not
united to Christ: Heb. 6. and 10. and some escape the pollutions of the world
through the knowledge of Christ, and yet are not united to him, as Peter tell us.
And faith itself is not that life that flows into us as Members (I mean still our first
faith) proved : That which makes us members, is not given us as already mem-
bers, but as to be made such: But faith make us members; Therefore. If you deny
the Minor, I ask you as Paul, what communion hath light with darkness, or Christ
with an Infidel? I still confefs that faith is a Grace of Christ, and a special Grace:
but not given to his Members, but to make them Members.

Nay I will convince you on your own principles. Tell me whether the Spirit which
Christ gives to work the first faith, be given as from the Head to Members, or not?
If it be, then men are united to him, not only before faith, but before the Spirit
be given to work faith; which I hope is against your own doctrine. If not, then
the Spirit to work faith is a gift that flows not from Christ as Head unto Members.
And if Christ can give the Spirit to men that are not yet his Members, why may he
not as well give faith to them? The truth is, as in the natural body: so in the
mythical, the noble parts (the head and heart) being first formed, do then form
the rest: Christ is our head and heart, our principle of being; and he makes
his own members by sending forth his Word and Spirit, and drawing and joy-
ning them to himself. Now that act whereby he makes members, is not from
him as the head to members already made, but as the head drawing to him and
forming his own members: we are then in seris, not in facio esse, members.
Nor is this any depressing of the nobility of faith: we do not say that any can come to Christ except the Father draw him: we acknowledge that all Grace is from Christ, but not all given to members; but 1. Some given to prepare men to be members. 2. And some to make them members. 3. And then the rest to them as members for continuance, growth and exercise. It be said, as Mr. Pembile doth, that faith is not the act of a dead soul, but of a living. I answer, 1. Faith is as Amensius faith, Primum actus vitae spiritualis: But there is a Life flows from Christ to draw men to him, and so naturally goes before Union with him. As there goes force from the Load-stone to the iron, first to draw it to itself, and then to detain it there: so that the iron receives of the forcible attractive operation of the Stone before it is joyned with the Stone; so doth the soul receive life from Christ to come to him for union, and then to be continued and nourished in him. 2. Faith is a vital act, but whether first from a habit of new life in our selves which may denominate us habitually living, no man living can tell, I think. Whether the Spirit do without infusing a habit first excite and cause a potent act of faith, and by that act, a habit (as camera thinks), himself being in stead of a habit to the first act; or whether he do give at once the habit and act, or the habit first, will never be known till the nature of habits and acts, and of the soul it self be better known, and the way of the Spirit be fully revealed, which now is as the wind, blowing where it list, but we know not whence it cometh, or whither it goeth, that is, its way of motion: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. Joh. 3.

If any say as Mr. Pembile, that there is a twofold union: one of the Spirit on Christ's part, and the other of faith on our part, and that the first is before faith, and the second is by faith; I answer, we agree with those men that say so in the matter, but we differ only in the word union. We agree that the work of the Spirit causing faith is before faith; but we think that it is not the phrase of Scripture to call that a union on Christ's part. The union that Scripture mentions, is a moral and mystical union, caused by mutual consent, such as is between man and wife, and the members and head of a Body Politick: and a real natural Communication of Spirit and Life there is also: yet I dare not say, such as is from a natural head to the members: For 1. Scripture metaphors must not be stretched beyond the intended points of similitude, lest we run into dangerous conceptions and expressions.

2. Though the holy Ghost be given to men to work life, and to be the preserver of it, yet those sacred habits and acts which are our real spiritual life, or the soul's Restitude, are such as never were formerly existing in Christ himself, as the spirits were in the natural body that are communicated from the heart and brain to the members: I know here are two weighty questions under hand, how our Life is in Christ? and how the Holy Ghost is said to be given to us? For the first, our Life is in Christ, 1. Caustally, as the effect in the Cause of it, Being and Conservation. 2. Objectively, seeing that our Life is exercised on him, and the welfare of it consisteth in the enjoyment of God in him. And so our life is hid with Christ in God both as the Cause (which is latent oft when the effect appeareth) and as the Glorious fruition of the blessed Object is yet unrevealed to us, that Glory being yet with Christ in God, but beyond our reach. And Christ is here said to live in us, 1. Caustally, in that his Spirit causeth our new Life, and so is said also to live in us; 2. Objectively, as we do by Faith and Love embrace him, 3. Civititer, as a man possesseth a house at a distance by his goods and servants, which is in Law. senfe to dwell in it. But I dare not say, that this very habitual or actual Grace or Life, which I now have was once existent in Christ; For if so, it was either his humane nature or his
Divine: but our Grace was neither God nor man before it came to us. As the soul was in God, but causally, and not formally existing before it was in us (whatever many in these days say, that think they are eternal, and Gods), so was our Life of Grace in Christ; for Grace in us, is a created quality or at, and therefore was not the Creator, nor a Creature before it was created. It had no being, but causal, before it was in us, and therefore was not first in Christ; Though there is in him a Life specifically (in a larger sense) the same; but not numerically.

And for the second Question, in a word, I conceive that the manner of the Holy Ghosts dwelling as well as his working in us, is incomprehensible to us now; Only this much we may conceive, 1. That the Holy Ghost is said to be given to us, when he is given to be the Cause of our first faith, and to draw our hearts to Christ, but I doubt whether in Scripture this be ever called the giving of the Holy Ghost.

2. The Holy Ghost is given us, when he is given in Relation to us, to be our Guide and Sanctifier, as a Guardian or Tutor is given to a Child, and may be said to be their Tutor or Guardian, even when he is not teaching or doing anything to him; so even when we feel not the Spirit work (yea should it cease to work, as it doth not wholly) yet by this Relation might the Holy Ghost be said to be given us, and we to have him; He hath taken charge of us as Christ's members, to guide, sanctify, preserve and excite us. Thus the Angels under the Holy Ghost also, take charge of us. Thus Dr. Orbells and some other Schoolmen expound the giving of the Holy Ghost. 2. The Holy Ghost is given us, when the effects of him are given us, viz. such effects as follow our engraving into Christ. And so the Graces of the Spirit are of called the Spirit. But I think the Spirit is commonly in Scripture said to be given us in the second sense, connoting the first, and especially the third. And so the Spirit is usually distinguished from the Gifts of the Spirit, especially in the matter of sanctification. But I digress too far.

2. You next alledge Job. 15. 9. to which I answer; we grant that without Christ we can do nothing: but it follows not that without union with him we can do nothing. 2. If those words are to be expounded (as some do, and as I think they ought) of continued union with Christ, yet mark that Christ speaks it only to those that were in him already, and the full sense of the words is but this, If ye depart, or be cut off from me, ye are dead and can do nothing, as the branch is when it is broken off from the tree. But yet this is no denial, that they that were never in him can by his Spirit come to him. They must come to him that they may have life, Job. 5. 40. They do come to Christ that are drawn by the Father, Job. 6. 44, 45. The Father draws them, and grafts them into Christ; though of themselves they cannot do that.

3. Therefore your paraphrase is unsound, unless ye are first united and engraven into me, ye cannot believe.

4. And too crudely do you say, that such can perform no act; what not go, or speak, yea or believe for a time, and receive the word with joy, and taste the powers of the world to come, and forsake and escape the pollutions of the world through lust, &c. these are acts. But if you speak of the special Grace, yet I have disproved it in the sense you intend.

5. Gal. 5. 22. faith not faith is a fruit of union with Christ, but a fruit of the Spirit; Now the Spirit first draws men to Christ, and then animates them as his members. 2. Nor is it said, that our first act of Believing is the faith meant in that Text; but the habitual fidelity of the soul to Christ. But we readily grant that all faith is the fruit of the Spirit (whether meant in that text or not): but not all,
all, a fruit of our union with Christ: the first act unites us to Christ, the rest flow from union.

6. To your similitude I say; Inflition by your confession goes before growth; and Faith is the souls ingrafting into Christ. Mr. Tho. Hooker speaks all this at large.

7. 1 Joh. 5. 11, 12. Is a most full place against your self. For the text shows that God doeth by a deed of Gift, give Christ and eternal life in him, to the world; and that they that believe not, that is, receive not this Gift, make God a Lyar: and so they that have the Son (that is, that do believe, and so come to Christ when the rest would not) have Life, viz. 1. Habitually. 2. Right to eternal life; so that it is not the first act of coming to Christ by faith that is here called Life, but the following Life, which in the context is plainly distinct from that. I have stood the longer on this, because all the appearance of your strength lyes in it, and it is of moment. Yet again remember, 1. That if all were granted, (that union is before faith) it is no proof that Justification is before faith. 2. If both were granted, it only proves that they differ in order of nature, being both in the same instant of time; and what is this to your Cause, of the Justification of men before they were born?

§ 23.

L. C. That I speak not of that Union which appeareth in elect Infants, which are members of Christ, and therefore united to Christ by the Spirit of Christ, though not yet fruitful in faith and good works.

§ 23.

R. E. The faith of the parent is the Condition of the Infants relative union to Christ as a member of him, and the Church his body. 2. Whether you are certain of any further union in Infants, I shall better know when I see your proofs. In the mean time, I have told you my thoughts in my Epistle Accomodatory to Mr. Bedford, in the end of the third Edition of my book of Baptism, whither I refer you.

§ 24.

L. C. Moreover faith cannot be called the Instrument of that Union, unless it be put before Union: and seeing faith cannot be instrumental unless it draw with it into the society of the work, the other Graces, it must be said that union with Christ is not only after faith, but after good works: For Good works cannot be separated from faith, and therefore all graces are called by the name of the sanctification of the Spirit, 1 Pet. 1. 2. as being in one instant together, and at once infused into the souls.
A. B. I answered this fully once before. Neither faith nor any grace go before the giving of the Spirit to work them. But faith modified with love and gratitude, and whatever else is necessary to the reception of the object, Christ and life according to its nature, do go before our union with Christ relative, and in Scripture-sense so called. For faith in the Gospel, when justification is ascribed to it, and when Christ himself is made the object, both comprehend some act of love. For Christ must be received as Christ, or he is not received to justification; and therefore as the object hath its necessary qualifications, so must the act, e.g. if Christ be not received as good, he is not truly received at all: But the soul cannot receive good as good, without love. But then you do ill to call those good works, if you intend to speak in the sense as Scripture doth, when it distinguishes faith from good works. For faith and love in their first reception of Christ are not so much as acts of Christian obedience: but only the acceptance of a Christ to be obeyed: as marriage consent in the woman is not an act of a wife, or of matrimonial fidelity or obedience; but the contract which obligeth to that for the future. It is the Spirit working by the advantage of our self love, desire of felicity, fear of misery, and discovery of sufficiency in Christ for our salvation, that first brings us to faith, but not by the authority of Christ commanding it; for we are but now acknowledging him our commander, and consenting to his government.

When you say, good works cannot be separated from faith, I say, in Scripture-sense they may for want of opportunity, as when one is asleep; however they are in order of nature after it. Lastly, all grace may be called the sanctification of the Spirit, though all be not wrought at once. Or if all be in uno femine called a Habit, yet Mr. Poole himself will confess, they act not all at once; so that the acts of other graces may follow whatever the seed do. And most expositors take sanctification, even in Pet. 1, 2. as well as in other scriptures, for the work of the Spirit following faith, and differing from vocation, and that in the theses once, where sanctification is put first, it is but a transposition of the words, but of that more anon. And in that place of Petey, it seems to be put after obedience and sprinkling of Christ's blood. And Beza judgeth that by foreknowledge there is meant predestination, by election is meant vocation, which is actual election; and by sanctification is meant, the separation of believers from the rest of the (perishing) world.

S. 25.

L. C. 4. We must needs admit remission of sins before faith; nor with a keener sword do we cut the throat of the Romanists, asserting both reconciliation and not reconciliation by Christ's death, and potential remission in Christ's death, and not actual. For Christ dyed not to make remission of sins possible; nor only to impetrate remission, but actually to remit the sins of the elect, and confer remission of sins: Did not our Lord Jesus when he died at least satisfy for all the elect, paying a full price for the sins of all the elect? Did he only obtain in his death, that the elect shall attain remission of sins when they should believe hereafter in Christ? What if they never come to age, shall their salvation and remission be suspended on faith which they shall never
never base? Forsooth when John Baptist said, Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; he should have said, Who will take them away if the world will believe; or when our Saviour himself said, This is my blood which is shed for the Remission of sins; In stead of sins, he should have substituted, of believers. Verily they that thus explicate these sayings, do voluntarily pass into the tents of the Arminians, with whom Actual Remission, and Justification, and Redemption do befall none but Believers, and such as have the Spirit of Christ.

§. 25.

R. B. STE VIVANT VITIA—1. If you had nothing else to do but cut the throats of Arminians, the next way were to deny Christ, his death, and grace altogether: and the subject being denied, their predications do vanish. 2. Reconciliation and Remission secundum quid and conditional, as I have told you, go before faith: Besides, moral and natural Possibility and Impossibility must be distinguished. Our Remission was always possible in the later sense (or else it could not be future) but not in the former. A moral Impossibility pro tempore, rebus sic stantibus, Christ removed by his death: Now what if the Arminians say, this is all? must we needs either say that this was none of the effect of Christ's death, or that there is as much to be ascribed to his death immediately as you do? Sin was pardonable before Christ's death, and might be pardoned upon supposition of satisfaction to Justice: Now Justice is satisfied, so far as to pardon it to all that will believe. It is now pardonable in sensu proximo, which before was so but in sensu re motivo. Nay now it is pardoned conditionally, and the Condition is nothing but the Acceptance of the full gift. The Arminians give too little to Christ's death, as well as they do to God's decree, while they make both the elected, and the redeemed to infallible pardon and salvation, to be no Individuals, but Believers in general, affirming that Christ's death may have its full end, though none were faved by it: (thus our Divines report them, and some say so) we affirm that as God in electing, so Christ in dying did intend the infallible pardoning and saving of all that are pardoned and saved; but yet that as he did not therefore pardon or save them at the time of his election, (I mean from eternity) so neither doth he pardon or save them at the time of Christ's death. It may be procured as a thing infallibly to be enjoyed in its season, that is sufficient against the Arminians, and yet it was not done: the death of Christ, that is your error on the other extreme. You think you honour Christ much by your doctrine; but indeed you much dishonour him; For what you ascribe to his death, you take from his Intercession, and from the continu ed exercise of his Kingly, Priestly and Prophetical office. The Scripture faith, he is now able to save to the utmost all that come to God by him; and makes it the great work of his office actually to save them. You will have all this done by Christ's death (I think all or more than Scripture speaks of), and nothing left for him to do now in the exercise of these offices, but manifestation. How can Christ's death any other way procure our pardon than by way of satisfaction and merit? And we acknowledge as much this way, as can be desired, that is, that Christ's satisfaction and merit is full and perfect, and have done all their part to the remission of sin. It seems then you give no more to Christ's merit then we, but only give all that which we ascribe to his intercession, as to no cause, or else to God's will alone; which you will.
will not hit right, In that we ascribe also to God's Will a perfection of Cauitation in its kind. It is Christ's office as King to grant upon his death, the act of Grace (obtusely upon his death undertaken, plainly upon his suffering and resurrection), and thereby to pardon men first conditionally, and then actually, and to be petitioned for Pardon from day to day; it is his office as Prophet, to teach us the way and means of obtaining pardon and salvation. It is his office as Priest, to make continual intercession and to appear before God for us; and as our advocate, he justifyeth us apologetically against all accusation; and at the last Judgment he will fully absolve us. Is it any honour to Christ, if you will pretend to give him the greater honour of his death, and rob him of almost all the rest? Nay, you wrong his very sufferings, when you say, Christ dyed not to make Remission of sin possible, though not to make it absolutely possible, (for so it was before) yet to make it remissible in a nearer sense, Christ did dye; though this was not all, will you say this was none of the ends of his death? If there were not some Impeiment of Remission, (viz. unsatisfied justice,) which Christ's death did remove, it will be hard for you to tell us how it was necessary at all, or how it should pardon us.

2. You deal not ingenuously nor honestly, to make that to be Arminianism, which the generality of the Antiarminians, except Antinomians, do hold as well as they; and which the Synod of Dort that condemned the Arminians doth profess, and with them the national or Church-confessions of all the reformed: viz. that sin is not pardoned, nor man justified before faith. This dealing doth but disable and indispose men to believe you hereafter.

3. To your questions I say, Christ hath made full satisfaction: But it is 1. Satisfaction strictly so called, which is but solutio tantidem, and not solutio ipsius debiti; or to speak properly, supplicium ipsius delinquentis: and therefore it was solutio recusabilis, a refusable payment or satisfaction; and therefore doth not ipso facto discharge us, but on what terms the Re$or please. 2. And it was never the will of the Redeemer or the offended Re$or, that by this satisfaction any should be actually pardoned or justified, (being at age) till they do believe. And beyond their wills the satisfaction cannot effect anything. The not understanding of Christ's satisfaction, its nature and effects, leadeth men into the Antinomian doctrines above any thing. The conceit that satisfaction as such, must needs absolve the sinner ipso facto upon the payment, is a desperate error, which you may see confuted in our Divines against the Socinians at large; Esenius in his defence of Grotius, Johan. Junius and others. But Grotius de satisfaction alone, well studied, without prejudice, might profit some Divines more then many years study of many large volumes hath hitherto done. (It was written before his defection.)

4. To your question of dying in Infancy, I answer, 1. The parents faith is the condition of the Infants interest in Christ. 2. If God had made personal faith necessary to all, he would have saved all Elect Infants from death, till they come to age and believe.

5. Your paraphrase on John Baptists words which you suppose unsound or absurd, is very common in many other Scriptures: Did you never read the like from Christ himself, that whoever believeth in him shall not perish, shall be saved, shall receive remission of sins? &c. For the sense of the Text, I suppose it speaks of taking away sin only, quantum ad pretium, Christ having done all that belonged to him as satisfier, for taking it away. But if you will needs understand it of actual proper remission, I may tell you that the text faith, not when Christ takes away the sins of the world,
world, but only that he takes them away. Now our question is, when, and whether absolutely, or on a condition.

6. As to the other text you cite, I answer, it is a vain thing to suppose that we are to substitute believers for sins, as if believers had no sins. And must every text that tells us why and for what Christ suffered, needs tell us the qualification of the persons who shall have the benefit? and the condition on which the effect is attained? Is it not enough that an hundred other texts tell us?

7. And its very hard dealing to make as plain a Truth as any is in God's word to be Arminianism, viz. that Christ had his blood for the remission of the sins of Believers, and that none but believers (at age) have Remission and Justification. Had I a design to credit Arminianism, I know not how to do it better then as you do, if men had so little wit as to believe me. Could you make the world believe once, that the doctrine of Justification by faith, or Remission of the sins of believers, is Arminianism or Popery, and that your doctrine of the Actual justification of Infidels, or of men that are no men, is the Protestant Doctrine, what man would not turn Papist or Arminian, and abhor the contrary, that ever well studied the Scripture?

§ 26.

L. C. Which Opinion if we must receive, we must place Remission of sins, both before and after faith, and the giving of the Holy Ghost: For seeing faith and the giving of the Holy Ghost are effects of Remission of sins, and the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, we must make another act of Remission of sins to be after faith, and the giving of the Holy Ghost: and so Justification and Remission of sins shall not be done together and at once. It is a wonder therefore what moved the Author of the Epistle to pronounce, That God decreed to pardon sins only to the believer and penitent. I thought hitherto that a man doth believe and repent, because God hath pardoned him through and for Christ. Zachary, Luke 1. 77 makes the knowledge of salvation, and so Faith and Repentance, to be the effect of Remission of sins: for therefore doth he undergo Repentance, because his sins were forgiven him: Davids Grand Crime of Adultery and Murder, was first forgiven, before he repented of the fault.

§ 26.

R. E. I have fully told you already what Remission goes before faith. If you will call unbelief, a Punishment, and will call the bare removal of that unbelief, a Remitting of that particular punishment, such an executive, improper, particular Remission we confess not going before faith, but being the very same thing with the giving of faith. But if you speak of a proper Remission by Covenant Grant, in the Gospel sense, whereby God disabligeth the sinner from the suffering of eternal death, and the sinner hath actual right to Impunity (as to that suffering), this follows faith; and you will never while you breath, prove that faith is the effect of this Remission.
2. This great Remission of a State of Sin, is done together and at once; but Remission of particular following sins, doth follow this, and the great Sentential Remission follows both. Nor is it any dangerous or needless thing to contradict your justification, simul & semel, if you otherwise understand it, and express it unlimitedly.

2. And (that we may wonder together) I do wonder, that you do not wonder as much at Scripture and Christianity itself, as at the Author of the Epistle, for the passage you mention. And the best proof that I finde of your contrary assertion, is that you hither thought it.

3. You do falsely abuse Luke 1. 77. as you do other Scripture, as much as most that ever I read. You say, Zachary makes the knowledge of Salvation, and so of Faith and Repentance, to be the effect of Remission of sins: not a true word. 1. It is not the knowledge of Salvation, but Salvation itself; which is there made the effect or end of Remission; To give knowledge of Salvation to his people by the Remission of their sin: that is, To reveal to them, that God by Christ will save them by Remitting their sins: and not to make them know by forgiving them, that God will save them. As Ezra in loc. faith, Remission of Sin is the very manner by which God the Father sauceth us in his Son, as Paul teacheth, Rom. 4. 7. 2. Nor is Faith or Repentance the same thing with the knowledge of Salvation: if by it you mean of our own being actually saved, or that we shall be saved: though Faith is the knowledge of Christ, who doth save us, and of what he hath done towards it; which may be both called Salvation.

4. David's case affords your opinion as little countenance: 'For 1. David was a Believer before, and repented of sin in general; and this was not his first faith or repentance: He totally lost not his Habitudinal Faith and Repentance by his sin. 2. Yet do you rashly and without any proof say even of his particular pardon, that it went before his Repentance of the fact. For 1. you are not sure that he repented not, till Nathan spoke to him: I make no question but he did, because it is the nature of true Habitual Repentance, to act more or less when the sin is known, and this could not be unknown to him; But it plain that his Repentance was not so great and evident as after, nor his heart so humbled as it was meet for such a sin. 2. When Nathan did speak to him, he never pronounced his forgiveness, till David first cried out, I have sinned against the Lord, 2 Sam. 12. 13. And how eminently that pardon respected the temporal punishment of David by death, is not obscure; so that the just season of the Remission of the eternal punishment, is not mentioned in that text; but must needs be upon the performance of the condition.

§. 27.

L. C. True Repentance ariseth from the conscience of God's mercy, forgiving many sins to the sinner; such as was the mournful condition of the woman, Luke 7. 38. who loved much, repented, wept much, because Jesus Christ had forgiven much. Our Love to God which we most manifest when we repent, doth fetch its original from the sense of God's Love to us, as John teacheth, 1 Epist. 4. 9.
K. B. 1. Either you mean, All true repentance, or only some. The first is fall; the latter nothing to the purpose. No doubt the sense of actual pardon may increase Repentance: But the first Gospel Repentance according to God's order, is from the knowledge of God's Love and Mercy in giving Christ to be a sufficient sacrifice for sins, and in giving pardon through Christ to him (as to all) on condition of Acceptance. This great, but general mercy mentioned Job. 3. 16. is the rise of the first Evangelical Repentance, if it proceed as it ought: with which is conjoin'd the sense of misery, and fear of God's wrath: When will you prove that all these, together with Conviction of the evil of sin, the worth and necessity of holiness, and the desirableness of Celestial happiness above sensual things, may not (by the Spirit's help) produce a true change of mind and sorrow for sin, without the sense of the actual Remission of my own sins?

2. How contrary go you to Scripture, which bids us Repent and be Baptized for Remission of sin, and promises Remission, if we repent; and you say, repentance must arise from the knowledge of remission; as if we could not truly repent till God have forgiven us, and we know it?

3. Both you and all that go your way, are sad Comforters to the most poor distressed consciences: For whereas most or many of them have not the feeling or knowledge of the pardon of their sins, you will conclude them all impenitent, and so to lye under all the curses that belong to the Impenitent. But it will be long before all the Libertines living will prove all those poor Christians Impenitent that have not the knowledge that their sins are forgiven.

4. You teach men to go the wrong way to Assurance, and consequently to be without it. For whereas God teacheth them to judge of their pardon by their repentance, telling them that the sins of the penitent are forgiven, you contrariely teach them to judge of their Repentance by the knowledge of pardon: and this is a thing that cannot be known by ordinary means, before Repentance be known; both because it is an act of God, which can be no otherwise known to us, then he reveal'd it, and because he hath reveal'd it to be the consequent of repentance, having given it in his Word on the Condition of repentance, and to no Impenitent ones. So that according to your method, no man shall ever have Assurance that his sins are pardoned, till God will reveal it to him from heaven by extraordinary Revelation: for he must know his Remission without any signs of it, (whereof Repentance and Faith are the first) and that is by no natural or ordinary means. It would puzzle you to give a sensible interpretation of those Scriptures that call people to the trial of their states, to examine whether Christ be in them, or whether they be Reprobates, if this be the way of trial? for though I can try and examine my own heart, to discover the acts of Repentance and Faith, and the knowledge of remission, yet I know not how to search or try immediately, whether God hath forgiven me, that I may know it, otherwise then in the word, which forgiveth me but on Condition of my Faith and repentance. Else I must examine God, and not my self. All trial is by some evidence: where the thing is such as is not the object of sense in self, or knowledge immediately, (sensum in sensu quam in intellectu) it must be discern'd
by somewhat that is known. Our pardon and righteousness are relations, and therefore not discernible immediately in themselves. Indeed it is evident, that the knowledge of pardon which you must to be necessary before true Repentance, is not a knowledge that comes by trial, examination, or any rational way of discovery, but by direct extraordinary Revelation from heaven.

5. And then see the fruits of this Doctrine. One part of the Godly (that have not Assurance) must remain in distress of minde; and must not have Assurance, *economine,* because they have it not already: Others will be looking for these revelations of pardon, and so deluded with every conceit and fancy of their own, or by those common suggestions of Satan, whereby he persuades the most of the world that they are forgiven. And all will be taken off the duty of examination, and the use of God’s means for a rational way of Assurance: now directly tendeth this Doctrine to Confusion, Delusion, and Perdition of Souls?

6. The woman *Levi, 7.* Loved and wept much, because much was forgiven: Doth it follow therefore she never repented truly till she knew much was forgiven? what show of such a consequence?

7. *1 John 4.9.* hath not a word to your purpose. 1. The Text speaks only of God’s general Love in giving his Son, mentioned *Job 3. 16.* and not at all of our actual forgiveness. 2. Much less of our knowledge of that forgiveness. 3. The next verse *indeed faith,* Herein is Love, not that we loved God, *but that he loved us;* but 1. It is only the Love of sending his Son to be the propitiation for our sins, that is mentioned, and not the actual pardon of them. 2. Though a further Love went before ours, viz, his Love of Election, and intent to give us Faith, and to Remission and Salvation, yet that is not known to us when we first repent, nor doth the Text intimate any such thing. That general Love of God, in giving his Son to be the Saviour of the world, which some elevate and make nothing of, hath enough in it, if well considered, to fill the heart with Repentance and Love; yea and is appointed to be the great means to that end, and therefore is not so vain as they make it.

**8. 28.**

L. C. 5. But the *art* of Believing is so far from going before the *act* of Remitting sins, that in the very acts of calling, sanctifying, quickening, *&c.* which are thought to make a real mutation in the Called, Sanctified, &c. God doth not act, but on a subje&ante definition; and God’s actions are convergent about an object void of a Condition or Virtue prerequisite. The Kingdom of God is received of Infants, innocent by the sole ignorance of evil, not by the knowledge of good, before they grow up to manhood. God raiseth and quickeneth the dead; he communica&cth the Spirit to unbelievers, that they may believe: And as Vocation is an act of God’s mercy exercised on the miserable, so be calleth the stupid and sluggish, who think of nothing less then going to Christ; he transferrth them from the Kingdom of Satan, and from darkness to light; There is at least the like reason, though much more strong in the act of Justification. God Justifieth the ungodly as ungodly, not in a divided, but a compound sense: *Rom. 4. 5.* For he cannot be called ungodly that hath Faith in the Lord Jesus.
Jesus. He also Justifieth Ethnics, Gal. 3, 8. Without strength; and ungodly; Rom. 5, 6. As yet sinners; ver. 8. Enemies; ver. 10. For then were we reconciled, when we were enemies, sinners, strangers and open enemies, col. 1, 21.

For what can be more absurdly spoken then to Reconcile friends. God by remitting sin, declareth to the sinner, that himself is just, and he unjust: But of the object of Justification in Species; we shall deal afterwards.

§ 28.

R. E. 1. There is no truth, nor likelihood of truth in your consequence, that there is the same Reason, and stronger, of Justification, as of Vocation; being without a prerequisite Condition. The deciding of this must be from the tenor of the Promise; Vocation is not given by a Conditional Promise (only means prescribed men to be used for it), but it flows from Election and Redemption, as joined with Election, revealed in an absolute Prediction or Promise, I will take the hard heart out of their bodies, and give them hearts of flesh, a new heart, &c. Contrariwise Remission is promised only on Condition of Faith and Repentance. And therefore to say the reason is like, when God hath made it so unlike in the tenor of his Covenant, is to exalt your fancies above the Law. God gives the first (though not always, nor usually without preparations of the heart, which are qualifications to fit the subject): yet without any prerequisite Condition (properly so called in Law-sense) on our part; But doth it follow that he gives the second Grace so too? Justification is not the first Grace.

2. You say, God Justifieth Impios quo Impios; the ungodly as such. If you mean but dum Impi, while such, you say true, taking the word ungodly, as the text doth, for unjust or sinners: but you say more: and a most ungodly Doctrine: it is that you deliver, as ever came, I think, from the mouth of a Christian: To justifie the ungodly as such, quia tales, is to justifie all that are ungodly: for doubtless a quatenus ad omne valet consequentia. And if God Justifieth all the ungodly, then he will save all the ungodly. A fair Doctrine to preach to the world! Nay add but the sense in which you take the word ungodly, viz, for one regenerate, and that hath not the true fear of God, and it will appear more monstrous; that God Justifieth all the ungodly, as such: And so the world must be taught, that as long as they are ungodly, there is no danger nor possibility of their damnation; for God Justifieth them quia impii, as ungodly: but if they turn Godly, what will become of them, when it is as ungodly only that God Justifieth men.

3. Where you say, it is not in a divided, but compound sense: I answer, It's true, because by ungodly, is meant unjust, or sinners: But prove that by ungodly, is meant unsanctified, and I will prove it to be in sensibus diversis.

4. Where you say, He cannot be called ungodly, that hath Faith; I answer, Nor in our common Evangelical sense, but in a legal sense, in which the Apostle there speaks, (according to the Law of works) he may, and is: ungodly being there, but a sinner and unjust. Besides, quoad aetatem vitæ externas proximè precedentes, as to his conversation next foregoing, he is ungodly in your sense when first Justified; but not as to his heart, nor present life: (for while he repented, he suspendeth his former exercise of such evils, though he must have time to pra-
Rise good. For all your naked denial, he is called ungodly, as a sinner, who is yet Evangelically Godly, and a Believer. And how grossly deal you with God, to say he cannot be so called, when God calls him so in the text cited? Are not the words, He that Believeth in him that Justifieth the ungodly? It is then an ungodly Believer, that is there mentioned, that is, one unjustifiable according to the Law of Works.

5. In gross abusing the text Gal. 3. 8, you disclose more of the meaning of your Doctrine. You say, God justifieth Heathens; you mean while Heathens, plainly. A comfortable Doctrine for Heathens, if the Author could prove it: But they shall have a Judge that is of another minde: and then it is not a Libertine Doctor that can save them, when God condemns them. What a vain thing make you all the Gospel to be, which calleth men to Faith and Repentance that they may be justified and what a small matter make you of Christianitv it self? when God justifieth Heathens: yea, and in this (as you said before) they are blessed with a perfect blessedness? Oh what difference between the Scripture language and yours? May you not as soberly say from Mat. 21. 31. That Publicans and Harlots shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; when its plain by the parable foregoing, that Christ means those that then were, or before had been Publicans and Harlots, but after repented and were converted. I know you not, nor know I of what Country or language you are, nor what world you inhabit; but if you live in this world, let them that know you, observe you but a few years, and I conjecture they shall finde you either recanting these conceits, or else forsaking the Scriptures as true or sufficient, so palpably are your Doctrines contrary to it.

2. But as to this text, could you be ignorant that it speaks in sine diviso? 1. It faith not that God doth Justifie the Heathens; but the Scripture foreseeing that God would Justifie them; that is, the heathen part of the world distinct from the Jews: 2. Why left you out that part of the sentence that confoundeth your interpretation? That God would Justifie the Heathen through Faith. If Faith be the means through which he will Justifie them, then they are Believers when he Justifieth them. Do you not love the Truth, that you will thus hide and wink at the express words of the text?

6. As bad almost do you use Rom. 5. 6, to speak an open untruth of the text, as if it said, that God Justifieth the ungodly without strength, when it only faith, when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ dyed for the ungodly. As if Christ's dying for them, and Justifying them were all one, or done at once. And perhaps ungodly, is there also taken for sinners.

7. And so it is expounded verse 8; which you unworthily again apply to Justification, when the Text speaks it only of Christ's dying for them. Yet we doubt not but all are sinners that are Justified; what therefore is that to your advantage?

8. For Col. 1. 21. (and so 2 Cor. 5. 18:) I have spoken enough before; how far we were reconciled before Faith.

9. Its cavalily granted you, that it is absurd to talk of Reconciling friends (so far as they are friends): Did ever any of us say or dream that men are friends to God, before they are reconciled or made friends? But what is this to prove that Believing, that is, Accepting the Reconciler and Reconciliation offered, is not the Condition, in order going before Reconciliation? To reconcile a Believer, is not so absurd a phrase, as to reconcile a friend. For though every Believer...
hiever be a friend, yet that is, because believing is made the Condition of Reconciliation, and to friendship relative resultis upon it, from the gift to the receiver.

10. Let me here on the by tell you once for all, (that you run not on a mistake) that Justification in the Scripture use of the word, is a stricter term then remission or reconciliation: reconciliation is sometime taken for so much as Christ did on the Cross, though it be not full actual reconciliation; But so is Justification never taken: remission is sometime taken, as is said, for partial executive remission, going before Justification; but Justification is never so taken. Yet remission is most usually taken for the Legal Condonation or Remission of the guilt of eternal punishment and so it is the same thing (notionally differing in some small respect) as Justification. But there is a remission in Scripture sense, that goes before Faith, yea, which those may have that perish, (or else they could have no mercy: for every mercy remiteth some degree of their punishment.) But Constitutive Justification is proper to Believers.

S. 29.

B. C. But the immanent acts of God, performed together and at once, as to Eating, to Justifie, to dye for sinners, are carried to their object in a divers respect. So Christ dyed as well for his friends as his enemies: for his friends, because God already loved them, and had already Justified them: but he dyed for his enemies, because they loved not God, nor were yet converted to the Faith, that they might have the sense of that Love. But in what respect soever the acts of Remission of Sin, yea Vocation, Sanctification, &c. are done, they are carried to an object destitute of a prerequisite condition, that the action may promote it self into act.

S. 29.

R. B. Woe to the Church or Soul that practically entertains this Doctrine. 1. It is untrue and Antichristian, that Justification is an immanent act of God: For then it is from eternity, and then Christ's death is no cause of it, nor any other work of Christ's Mediatorship whatsoever. Is not this good Christianity?

2. Did ever the ear of man before this time, hear, that to dye for sinners is an immanent act of God? If God dye, and dying be an act (both which may have a good sense) yet let it not be an immanent act.

3. He faith, God already loved, and had Justified them: before Christ dyed for them, and therefore they were his friends. If he mean it of Christ's undertaking to dye for them, and when he was promised in the Garden to Adam, viz. that before this they were so Justified, then you may see how much he set by Christ's death, while he pretends to extoll it to the detriment of the honor of all the rest of his mediatory actions that follow for the conferring of this fruit of his death. And by saying, It is an immanent act, he seems so to mean. And then I would know of him, whether this be not down-right Socinianism? But if he mean it of Christ's actual dying, then its true that he dyed for some that were reconciled by virtue of that death as undertaken. But yet in ordine Civili, A a 3.

Christ's
Christ's death goes before their reconciliation, and he dyed for none but enemies.

4. But his next words leave me no hopes of this latter being his sense. For all the enmity that he acknowledged in those that Christ dyed for, is this, that They loved not God, nor were yet converted to the Faith, that they might have the sense of that Love. See here all you that have favorable thoughts of the Antinomian Doctrine, and think verily that it extolleth Christ and Grace, what the true face of it is, and whether you are lead. Here is your honoring of the Mediatorship of Christ: All that you leave Christ to do, in coming into the world, Obeying, Dying, Rising, Interceding, Giving out the Spirit, &c. is not to reconcile God to us, nor to procure our Justification, for we had these before, but only to cause us to Love God, and be converted, that we may have the sense of that Love. Whether this Religion may be called Christianity or not, I will not now determine; but I would desire the owners of it, to answer me these two or three questions.

1. How it can with any truth be said that Christ dyed for our sins, and suffered for us, and was a sacrifice for us, and for our sins, and an atonement and propitiation for our sins, and bore our sins in his body on the tree, and was a ransom for us, with many the like, if he dyed not to procure us Reconciliation or Justification, but only the sense of what was done before? 2. What reason can you give why Christ should dye for us, if it were only to procure us to Love God, and feel his Love? Is it not the work of the Holy-Ghost to cause these in us? If there be no need of Christ's death for satisfaction, reconciliation of God to man, or Justification, what need is there of it for sanctification and comfort (on that supposition)? why might not God have as well caused us to love him, and feel his Love, without Christ's death, as with it? 3. Do you not feign God to be cruel and blood thirsty, that when Justice doth not at all require it for remission, will yet require the blood of the innocent, yea his own Son? 4. Yea do you not feign God to be lother to reveal his Love, then to Love us, and to reveal Justification, then to Justifie us; when he will Justifie us for nothing, but will not reveal it, unless his Son will purchase it with his innocent blood? 5. Is it not a Popish or far more ridiculous contradiction, to feign us to be pardoned or Justified before, and yet to have none of the punishment removed, but to lye under all the unholyness of our nature (which is in some respect a punishment, as left on us) and under the sense of God's wrath? what is Hell but a state of sin, and the sense of God's wrath? would it be any comfort to any of the damned to have such a Justification, as shall not remove sin or misery in the sense of God's wrath? What is it that hindreth man from the full sense of Love, and continueth sufferings on him, and keeps him so long out of heaven, if he were absolutely and perfectly pardoned from eternity? 6. What exposition give you of all those texts that describe the misery of an unregenerate estate? and express the necessity of holy-ness. But I will add no more of this now. A love of Election we acknowledge from eternity, but not of reconciliation, and Justification. It is as strange a thing for a man to be reconciled before ever he fell out with him, as you said it was to reconcile friends.

To your last clause I answered before. The first Grace of Vocation hath a prerequisite condition, though oft preparations, and always some means which the person is obliged to use for it; But Justification and right to Salvation are not the first Grace, but are given on condition of Faith and repentance.

CHAP.
CHAP. V.

Of the Concourse of the Acts.

§. 1.

L. C. This Concourse a twofold Reconciliation doth illustrate. The first, by which God is reconciled to us: The second, by which we are reconciled to God.

Of the first Reconciliation, Paul speaks, when he saith, that we were reconciled when we were enemies, Rom. §. 10, Col. 1, 21, 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19. But of the second he speaketh in the next verse, We beseech you, that ye will be reconciled to God; which is done when we apprehend the first Reconciliation, and know God Benevolent to us. By and for Christ's obedience God is reconciled to us, but by Faith are we reconciled to God. He that believeth on the Son, hath Life, yea, feeth Life, faith. 3, 36. and can cry Abba Father: he that is so reconciled hath peace with God. Rom. §. 1.

§. 1.

A. B. Reconciliation is a returning to friendship from enmity, or falling out: enmity is (as scientia adfectibile) either a disposition, and so a quality of the mind, or an act therefrom; or else it imports the Relation to the object. Reconciliation is first the removal of the act and disposition of the mind contrary to friendship; and 2. the removal hereupon of the relation from the object: when a man ceaseth to hate me, and be my enemy, I cease to be hated by him, and to be his enemy relatively and objectively. And then if I have a hatred or actual enmity to him, this requireth the like change.

The enmity that God hath to man and his reconciliation from this enmity, are not as in man, dispositions and mutations. But 1. There is somewhat in God, which we cannot better conceive of or express, then under these notions, though improper. 2. God's Essence hath various and mutable Denominations from the various and mutable respect of objects thereto. So that as mans nature is Lovely or Hateful, God is Denominated as Loving or Hating him. 3. But principally, God as Reftor, is said to be at enmity and to hate, where he is by his Law and vindictive Justice, as it were, obliged or engaged to use that man as an enemy, if he so continue; or may, at first, use him as an enemy, at present, according to his Laws; or to speak more properly, when in Law such dealing is due to man from God, as men use to receive from enemies. Contrarily, God's reconciliation is, the change of relations, and Legal obligations, viz. when that punishment is no longer due to us, according to the tenor of God's Law, the obligation being dissolved, and when such dealing is our due by the Law of Grace, as is to be expected from friends. Thus much to shew you a little more of the nature of reconciliation, then your defective distinction, which is worn thred-bare by the Antinomians, doth shew.

To apply this, God is not reconciled to us by a mutation in himself, but by a mu-
mutation in us the objects, and by the new Law-rate, that we stand in towards him: whencesoever you may easily see, if you love the truth. 1. That God is not reconciled to us from eternity; nor from the first Promise, nor from Christ's death actually: but only when we are by Faith, under the Promise, and not before. 2. That the great reconciliation of man to God, which Scripture speaks of, is objective and relative, and is the same thing, and done by the same act, as is God's reconciliation to us, only respectively differing: that act that causeth you to cease hating me, causeth me to cease to be hated by you. Our great reconciliation with God, purchased by Christ, and given in the promise, is being hated by him no more, or ceasing to be passively and objectively his enemies. 3. Our reconciliation Active and Qualitative, whereby our own minds are reconciled to God, containeth the whole work of Sanctification on the heart, from our new birth to our death. 4. The first part or degree of our mental reconciliation to God goes in order of nature, but not of time, before God's reconciliation to us, and our objective, passive relative reconciliation with God. For indeed our mental reconciliation, in its sincere beginning, is nothing but our Faith and repentance, which are the condition of the other. And God's reconciliation to us, is the same thing with our forgiveness and Justification, all under distinct notions. And our great relative reconciliation to God, is our being pardoned and justified. 5. Yet the reconciliation quoad pretium, & secundum quid, which is heretofore described, is long before all this: even from Christ's death undertaken, and the enacting of the Law of Grace. But that is to us but Conditional, not Actual reconciliation. Having told you my mind, I will take an account of yours.

1. Paul in Rom. 5. 10. seems to me to speak of actual reconciliation of God to us, and us to him, following Faith: though he say, we were reconciled by Christ's death, he faith not at Christ's death. If you will needs have it otherwise, then is it but the conditional reconciliation foredescribed, Col. 1. 21. and 2 Cor. 5. 18. I have spoke to twice before. For the 20. verse, I suppose Paul beseecheth them first in order of nature to believe, and so be mentally reconciled, but principally intending in the word Reconciled, their relative passive Reconciliation. q. d. Seeing God hath so far laid down his displeasure, as not to leave your souls remediless, but to provide himself a Saviour for you, and so hath received a sufficient sacrifice and satisfaction to his Justice for you, and hath given you a conditional pardon in his Gospel, and so is on his part fully reconciled to you, so you will but Accept Christ and Reconciliation offered, and hath commissioned us to beseech you to this Acceptance, we do as his Ambassadors, beseech you to yield to these reasonable terms, that so you may be pardoned and reconciled to him, and he may take you actually and fully for his friends.

2. What you talk of doing it, when we apprehend Reconciliation, and God benevolent to us, if you mean it of actual full Reconciliation apprehended, I have oft enough confuted: If of conditional reconciliation it is true.

3. When you say, By and for Christ's obedience God is reconciled to us. 1. Why then said you before, It was an immanent act? and that the thing which Christ's death doth, is to cure that enmity which consists in our not loving God, and not feeling his Love. 2. God is not actually reconciled by Christ's death till we believe.

4. Our Faith is the Antecedent and Condition of God's reconciliation to us, and the formal reason of our mental reconciliation to him (as is our Love also) so that we are not mentally reconciled by Faith, as the efficient of our first mental reconciliation, but formally; and as efficient of what follows.

5. Job 3. 36.
5. Job. 3:36. is not meant of the bare sense of love: but he that believeth on the son hath Life. 1. He hath Christ the fountain and caufe of Life: 2. He hath a new spiritual Life of Inherent grace. 3. But principally, (as to the text) he hath the Relative Life of Iufification, and right to eternal life, in seeing and enjoying God. But for your fourth, it is an unfound and uncomfortable addition; to drive thousands of poor Christians to conclude they have no faith, because they have not the peace and fene of Love which you vainly make the nature or inseparable effect of true faith.

6. I have lately explained that of the Spirit of Adoption, crying Abba Father, in another book.

7. Rom. 5. 1. seems to me to speak of obje&ive Relative Peace with God, and not mental peace, as if a potent adversary cease war with us, we are said to have peace with them.

§ 2.

L. C. The first Reconciliation is the cause of the second: For that we are the sons of God is the cause that he gives us the Spirit. Gal. 4. 6. Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts; to cry Abba Father, to wit, ye are sons by that Grace given in Christ before the world did begin.

§ 2.

A. B. 1. The Spirit in Scripture is said to be given us after our first believing, and so after our Iufification and Adoption. That we may know how far we agree or differ in this point, I will tell you first how far we consent about the Matter, and then that we have a further controversy about the words. 1. We grant that the common works of Grace upon unbelievers or unfound believers, bringing them nigh to the Kingdom of God, and making them almost Christians, and giving them some Illumination, and taste of the heavenly Gift, and of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and to receive the word with Joy, and believe for a time, all these are the works of the Holy Ghost: and so far the Holy Ghost may be said to be given them, and they are said to be partakers of the Holy Ghost, Heb. 6. 4. 2. We grant that the Gift of working miracles, casting out Devils, &c. which many unfound believers had, was the work of the Holy Ghost, and so they are partakers of him. 3. We grant that it is the Holy Ghost that causeth us to believe to Iufification, and worketh in us the first Grace; and thus we may say, the Holy Ghost is given us savingly before our Iufification. 4. We farther affirm, that after our believing, the holy Ghost is given to us in a more eminent manner than ever before, 1. Relatively, as undertaking to be our guide and master, and to possess us for Christ, and secure his Interest in us. 2. And Really to do these works, sanctifying us in a more eminent sort then in the first act of Believing; and helping us in duties, and against temptations, and striving in us against the flesh. 5. We affirm that this last giving of the Holy Ghost is after our believing in order of nature, and faith is the Condition upon which it is promised: 6. As also that the forementioned Gift of Miracles is usually if not ever in Scripture found to be consequential to faith, either sound or unfound. Thus much for the thing. Now for the name, 1. I suppose that the common fene of this phrase in Scripture, of giving the holy Ghost, is of such a giving as follows faith: Bbb And
And that the Spirits working the first Grace, is not usually (nor at all that I know of) called the Gift of the Holy Ghost. So that when you read of Gods giving us his Spirit, it is meant of one of the former works, viz. the sanctifying work, or the work of miracles, both following faith: (the one in uncoun Professors following only an unfound faith) Thus the Holy Ghost is said to dwell in our hearts, and work in us, &c. whereas in working us to believe the Spirit, is not said to dwell in us, nor to be given us; but only to open our hearts, to draw us to Christ, as signifying, as Mr. Tho. Hooker faith, the Spirits making its way into our hearts, or his opening the door, as it were, that he may come in and dwell in us. Or may the reason be according to Camero’s Judgement; that the Spirit at first excite an act of faith without a foregoing Habit, and by that act, forcibly, but congruously caused, he doth cause a Habit; and therefore it being acts more directly then Habits that we are commanded and exhorted to, and God working on man in a way agreeable to his nature (Infused Habits being caused ad modum acquisitorum, as is commonly said), it seemeth best to God to deal with us as free rational agents, and to command us to believe, and exhort us to it, while we are yet without any habit of faith; and withhold to make it the Condition of his promise, on which we shall receive, as Justification, so habitual Grace; and so by the precept and promise without, and by his Spirit powerfully working within, to cause the first act in his elect, and thereby the habit: and so it is only upon the receiving of this habit, that the Holy Ghost is said in Scripture to be given us, and to dwell in us. And this opinion seems best to suite with the common Doctrine of the reformed Churches, who generally make Vocation to be the effecting of faith and repentance, (or faith alone (by some) and Remission and Justification to be next, and Sanctification, distinct from Vocation, to be next: so that when Mr. Pembie begun another way of conceiving and expressing this work, Bishop Dowman wrote against it as an innovation. I was long a zealous follower of Mr. Pembie in this point, as appears in the first part of my book of Refit, in the third Edition whereof I have partly revoked it: not as now resolved of the rightness of any other way, but as apprehending the thing either unrevealed, or at least uncertain to me. But this is past doubt, that the term sanctification is usually taken in Scripture, not for the giving of the first Grace of faith, but for some following sort or degree of change in our hearts and lives: (and perhaps much respecting the actual Covenant of Dedication, and the Relation of being dedicate or separated to God.) And it is as certain that the ordinary meaning of Scripture, when it speaks of our receiving the Spirit, is not of the Spirit to work faith at first, but of some eminent habitual change and gift following faith, as its Condition.

This I will now prove from some Scriptures, Eph. 1. 13. In whom also after ye believed, ye were sealed with the holy Spirit of promise (that is, the promised Spirit) Gal. 3. 14. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ: that we might receive the promise of the Spirit (i.e. the promised Spirit) through faith. Prov. 1. 23. Turn you at my reproof: behold I will pour out my Spirit unto you, &c. Act. 19. 2. Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? &c. ver. 6. Joh. 7. 39. This he spake of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified; ver. 38. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. By this time you may see the sense of the Text alleged by the Differ-
For that Adoption is consequential to faith, is as true as God’s word. Gal. 3. 26. Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. Joh. 1. 12. As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name.

3. There is yet one clause to be answered, that is so monstrous, that I know not well what to make of it. His faith ye are sons by that Grace, given in Christ Jesus before the world did begin; as making this the paraphrase of Gal. 3 6. Here it appears,

1. That he takes us to be sons before the world began. Z. That he takes us to have received Grace in Christ before the world began. The former is confused by all that is, and will be said against Justification from eternity; For Justification and Adoption go inseparably together. The second is a mystery beyond my conceiving: How we should have Grace given us from eternity? or how it is given in Christ from eternity? I believe that we are elected from eternity; and that we are elected in Christ, that is, elected to be lovely, well-pleasing to God, justified and saved in Christ: but not in the Arminian sense, that God confidereth us as in Christ before he electeth us, or that men considered in Christ are the only objects of Election: for I suppose that they are elected to be in Christ, and to believe, and this is the discriminating Election principally. (See Dr. Twif’s Vind Digrefs. of this speech; elected in Christ.) But though we are elected in Christ, as is said, yet how can Grace, even Adoption, be then given us in Christ when Christ was not mediator, nor we subjects to receive it? Decreasing to give it, is not giving: And decreasing from eternity that David should be God’s son, did no more adopt him or make him a son from eternity, then decreasing that he should be King of Israel, made him king from eternity. 3. By this we see what hold there is of this man’s words; Before he thought it most agreeable to the Scripture; to say that it was from the first giving of the promise that we are justified: and now he faith, It is before the world began, that the Grace of Adoption was given us in Christ. It may be he will say that the first promise was given before the world began; and reduce all our Theologie to one act, viz. God’s decree. 4. And when I compare this with his former speech, when he calls Christ’s dying for sinners, an immanent act, I begin to suspect that he thinks Christ dyed before the world begun, even as he thinks we were adopted and received Grace in him! But the truth is, a delusive, vertiginous doctrine must be accordingly delivered: When men are so far once out of their way, they are misled and lost.

S. 3.

L. C. But the place Gal. 3. 26. Ye are all the sons of God by faith belongeth to the effect of the first Reconciliation; for there he speaks of our Reconciliation, or the Manifestation of the first Reconciliation.

S. 3.

R. B. I have explained the sense. There is no Adoption mentioned in Scripture which is from eternity.
§ 4.

R. E. 1. And in this your darkness, you do not see the true actual Scripture-Reconciliation and justification by faith, either as at first in Law, or as at last in person, which is neither of these. Though the first only is called Reconciliation, the latter is the fullest justification. Mark that he seems to yield that his Immanent Original Reconciliation is not Actual: And if so, it is but potential and improper. What faith John 3. 16. of Reconciliation? not a word. But of so loving the world as to give his Son, that whoever believeth should not perish. 4. 1 John 4. 10. faith but thus, Herein is Love: not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins; Is here any thing of Reconciliation? I desire the Diflayer to be informed. 1. That God did from Eternity send his Son to be a propitiation for sin, but in the fulness of time: 2. That if he had, yet we are not Actually but Conditionally Reconciled or Justified, as soon as Christ was sent a propitiation. 3. That Gods eternal Love is not his being reconciled or Justifying us. 4. That he doth but dream, when he thinks of reconciliation before any falling out.

§ 5.

L. C. Both Reconciliations doth Twis thus exhibit to us, Vindic. p. 196. So God reconciled us to himself in Christ as to the truth of the thing; but in his Ministers hath he put the word of reconciliation, as to the manifestation of the same precious truth: So when we were enemies are we said to be reconciled to God as to the truth of the thing; which yet is not done but by the preaching of the Gospel, as to the satisfaction and saving communication of the same truth.

§ 6.

R. E. The same Answers confute Dr. Twis, that confute you: For such passages as these was he questioned in the Assembly. He was so taken up with the doctrine of the Decrees and Divine knowledge, and other School-points, that I more then suspect he was very little seen in this part of Theologie, about satisfaction, remission, justification, as evidently appears in his writings.
L. C. After the example of the Concourse of these acts in reconciliation, we easily suffer the acts of Justification to be described; yea, we think that it clearly exhibits the whole formal reason of Justification. That is, in the first reconciliation, Christ's righteousness was ours, both in the intention and purpose of God, and in the performance of the Mediator: The Righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, yea applied to us, even before faith and repentance; but in the second reconciliation, upon the coming of faith, at length we acknowledge and perceive the Love of God towards us in Christ Jesus: whence the righteousness of Christ is said to be imputed to us by faith, because it is by faith only known to be imputed to us of God; and then are we said to be Justified by that kind of Justification and absolution from our sins, which bredeth peace in our Consciences; For God hath set up a tribunal in our Consciences, in which after a sort it is done Condemnation, Remission of sin, Justification and Absolution; which then followeth faith: and according to this sense Justification is by faith: for in that tribunal of Conscience, God doth according to his Law charge us as guilty, cast us down, torment us, at length by the mercy of God, and the Holy Ghost operating, by kindling faith in our hearts, the conscience ereth and secures in the satisfaction of Christ in which it reflecteth, pronounceth that his sins are forgiven for Christ; but this Justification is not a secretory absolution; but only a pronunciacion that its known to him that his sins are remitted for Christ.

§ 6.

R. B. All this is but a rehearsal of what is before, and commonly by the Antinomians long ago delivered, to which I have already sufficiently answered; and am loth to tire the Reader with needless things. Only briefly I add, 1. That God's purpose and intention, and Christ's sacrifice, did lay the ground on which his righteousness should be ours in season; but did not make it ours till then, nor give us any actual right to it. You may as well seize on your father's lands before he is dead, and lay, God purposed it should be mine when you are dead, and therefore it is mine before: Nor is it only knowledge in Conscience that is wanting, as this Disserter dreams, but first there is wanting a true right in sense of Law, and the dishollution of the obligation to punishment which from the violated Law was upon us. 2. All this Justification in Conscience I have manifested, and God willing, shall fully do, to be none of that which Scripture calls Justification by faith; but a thing far separable, and of incomparably less concernment as to our salvation.

§ 7.

L. C. But in that Justification by faith, or second Reconciliation, faith and repentance is not required that Christ may satisfy for us, as in the first Reconciliation; but that that satisfaction of Christ already performed may be known to us, and by the taste and experience of its sweetness, our consciences may be recreated and pro-
woked to thankfulness to God and the study of good works. But God who blesseth us with all spiritual blessings in Christ, never gives one grace without another, at least in the adults, in whose consciences he begetteth faith, and giveth them a spiritual feeling, whereby they know themselves justified, and therefore seriously rejoice.

§ 7.

R. B. This is but the same long. 1. Faith is not given that Christ may satisfy for us, nor yet that we may feel that we are justified, first or principally, but that Christ and his benefits may be ours, that we may have life in him. 2. God giveth Christ and justification to those that are not sure they are justified many a year after, and perhaps never while they live here. 3. This man is of a jocund religion, that supposeth almost all to consist in rejoicing: But the spiritual practical Christian feels more need of other graces then of Joy.

§ 8.

L. C. God could have redeemed, justified and saved his elect by Christ, without giving them this feeling of favour, as it falls out to infants and the deaf; but such is the goodness and the greatnes of God's mercies to the adult, that he accounts it not enough to justify them by Christ, unless he also give them sure arguments, assuring them of their election and justification. The argument which far most strongly persuades them, is Faith, or that inward testimony, of which 1 John 5. 10. by which we know that have eternal life. v. 13.

§ 9.

R. B. 1. God both could, and doth have many a thousand without giving them in this life the feeling and assurance of their being justified: but whatever he can do; he will have none (for ought we can know by his word) either infants or adults, without giving such a personal interest in Christ and justification on which they had not by election or Christ's death alone or before that time. 2. God could have made him that is man now, to have been another creature: but making him a creature necessarily to be ruled, and to be ruled by a law, and that law must operate, præmiare et punire. If it be suited to man's state; and God must needs be his supreme rector. This being so, God can do nothing inconvenient, nor contrary to good order; nor can he, being rector, rule imperfectly or amis: much less be unjust. And therefore God having made a law for rewarding the faithful, and punishing the unfaithful, it is a presumptuous thing (to speak candidly) to imagine that God can (punish the faithful, or) reward the unfaithful: Nay, a reward it cannot be, if he save them: that is a contradiction. For the reward relates to the duty. But God's law giveth salvation per modum praemii, as a reward, as Dr. Twits tells you often, and Scripture more oft: therefore he cannot so give it to the unfaithful. I hope it is agreed on all that take God's word to be true, that he will not, and in a moral sense cannot reward final infidels with salvation; if you say, He might have made other laws, I answer. 1. These things are much above us, to determine
determine of too boldly. 2. But it seems he hath fitted his Laws to our nature and condition; and that the Law of Grace is as exactly fitted to the nature and state of fallen mankind, as the Law of Nature was to the state of perfect man. And therefore an alteration must presuppose an alteration of our nature and condition. However, God will may satise the sober, without disputing his Power.

3. But let me tell you, though a man might be brought to Heaven without the feeling and assurance you mention, (and multitudes are so whatever you say) yet it is a contradiction for an unsanctified man to be saved in Heaven. For what is salvation and felicity, but the blessed fruition of God by love and joy, and praying him for ever? And how can the haters of God do this? It is therefore of absolute necessity ex natura, that in order of nature at least. men be holy and lovers of God, before they can be saved and happy.

4. You shew great ingratitude for God's mercy in your justification by faith, sanctification, and your union and communions with Christ, to reduce all these into the narrow compass of mere feeling and assurance of God's favour: which you say, God might have saved us without: And yet you pretend to extoll this his mercy? But I pray you more impartially lay all together! Suppose an elect man, living as Solomon, in all worldly contents, having whatsoever his lustful greedy flesh can desire to feed its rage, and for God and his soul he never thinks of them, and perhaps believes not that there is any life after this, or if he do, is confident that he shall be saved. Suppose another elect man lyeth in Job's sorrows, or Lazarus his poverty, or Paul's labors or sufferings, or spends his days in pain, scorn, disgrace, or imprisonment! Is it such an observable mercy as you describe it, for the former elect man to be converted, and brought into the state of the latter, merely for the comfort of it? I confess it is, if God give the latter much spiritual comfort, yea but a little. But then consider, 1. I doubt whether you will make the world believe it; and whether this way of preaching would ever save a soul, to tell them, Sins, while you are whoremongers, drunkards, murderers, haters of God, you may be truly justified, and as much beloved of God, as if you were weaned from the world, and mortified the flesh; but you cannot feel your own happiness. 2. Yea, I will be bold to say to the comfort or support of the drooping souls of many true believers, that there are many in a state of saving grace, that have more fears and terrors from God than comforts, and many saved, that have not assurance of salvation, yea that die in horror: and I had rather be in the case of some that have so died, then of any libertine that ever I yet knew. Lastly, observe how unlike your description of the sanctified is to that of God's word! I know the Gospel is of it itself the way to fill the soul with joy and peace in believing, and that many believers rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: but the great difference between the sanctified and unsanctified, is so far from being principally placed in their comforts and feelings of mercy to themselves in special, that they often think on God and are troubled, their spirits are full of anguish, they cry and God seemeth not to regard, but to shut out their complaints, their moisture is as the drought of Summer; all the night long they water their couch with tears; their bones consume by their daily complaining; they are forced to cry out, My God, why hast thou forsaken me? hast thou forgotten to be merciful, and shut up thy loving kindness in displeasure! All this was David's case; God seemeth to be their Enemy, and to write bitter things against them, and to seal up their iniquities, and to set them as a mark to shoo at, as he did by Job. They are distressed, afflicted, persecuted, tormented, as Paul, and these Heb. 11. and this was not expressly for present comfort, but for a better resurrection, and their respect to the recompence.
compence of Reward: They endured the afflictions of this present life, as not worthy to be compared with the joy that shall be revealed hereafter. Lazarus is at the door in sores, when the rich man fares deliciously. Was Christ of your mind? did he think the main difference in their present condition (besides that without them, which the elect have before Conversion) was in their Comfort? Remember, faith Abraham, that thou in thy lifetime receivedst pleasure, but Lazarus pain; but now contrariwise thou art tormented, and he is comforted; now he is comforted, ye shall weep and lament, and the world shall rejoice (faith Christ) but your sorrow shall be turned into joy. Blessed are ye that weep, for ye shall laugh: Blessed are ye that mourn, for ye shall be comforted; at least, when the times of refreshing is come from the presence of the Lord; but till then the bridegroom is taken from us, and therefore we shall mourn. They that sow in tears, reap in joy; and God will then wipe away all tears from their eyes. For my part, I think the life of a Christian, as prescribed by God, is the joyfullest life on earth; but I am so far from making all or most of God's mercy to me, in and since Conversion to consist in comfortable feelings, that if he would help me to love him more, and give up my self more faithfully to him, and mortifie my corruptions, and make me more truly obedient and serviceable to him, and more to add to the glory of his name, and put me in a state of safety for everlastling, methinks I could value it highly, though I had no great comfort! or methinks I would now choose such condition, though I should have no certainty or feeling of my own felicity, before a state of less Grace, and more feeling. However I am sure safety without feeling of Comfort, is an unspeakable mercy.

§ 9.

L. C. F urthermore as our remission of sins is not suspended on faith (which yet it would be if by faith fins were forgiven), so neither do the faithful say that they are more or less justified by the sense of God's favours; they judge nothing to be imputed to them for righteousness; but that which is most perfect such as the righteousness of Christ, whereby being covered, 1. They are set righteous before the Tribunal of God. 2. They take not themselves to be just by their own righteousness, but another's. 3. And that eternal. 4. Which God doth not command, but decree, and to which he doth not exhort men. Now when faith hath none of these is imperfect, is ours, and not another's, and that for a time only, having its accesse and recesses; and so commanded, and God exhort us to it: no wonder if in the righteousness by which we are justified with God, the sinner do lean on Christ's righteousness alone; according to the saying of Cassander, alleged and praised by Rivet, Dial. p. 92. The faithful soul doth not lean on this righteousness, but to the sole righteousness of Christ given to us. Wherefore it follows, that only that righteousness doth justify us, on which we must rest. Its wonder if Elihu Job 33. from ver. 19 to the 28, do not give us an illusory idea of a sinner and miserable man justified by faith; to wit, when confidences are recreated by confidence of Spiritual saliency, and remission of sins which the sequester of Peace hath obtained for him, and signified to him.

§ 9.
§. 9.

R. B. 1. **Our Iustification in feeling (which is your second) cannot be denied to rise and fall every day, as feeling doth.** 2. No man is righteous at God's bar, by Christ's death, till he believe or be brought into Covenant with him, nor hath any right to Christ till then, (not Infants, but on the Condition of their parents Faith). 3. All this is nothing to the purpose. For who denyeth that it is only the righteousness of Christ given us, that we must rest on, and that can justify us against the accusation of the Law? But our question is, whether this be not offered to men to be accepted by Faith? and whether any man have it actually given him, so as to have right in it in Law's sense, before he believe? or could plead it at God's bar? Christ's righteousness only is the meritorious cause or matter of our Iustification against the Laws accusation: but yet Faith is the condition sine qua non of our right to it.

4. And understand that, when the question is whether we have performed this condition or no? (which is like to be the turning point) then Faith itself is the righteousness by which only we can be justified, (with repentance, sincere obedience and perseverance, which are the full condition of final absolution), against any that accuse us of non-performance. But this is not a sort of righteousness co-ordinate with Christ's, to supply its defects; but an inferior particular Righteousness, subordinate to Christ's, that it may be first made, and then proved to be ours. And thus far as a condition of our Right in Christ, we may rest on it: but not otherwise.

§. 10.

L. C. **And here I must admire, that they who do (deservedly) place Iustification before Sanctification, if not in time, yet in nature, and always teach that a man is justified before he is Sanctified, yet they, when they couple the acts of God remitting sins, and of Faith apprehending remission of sins, that Iustification may be performed, do make not only the act of Faith, but repentance also to go before the act of remitting sins. They are the words of the Author of the Epistle, Repentance goes before Iustification, and is a necessary Condition of Remission of sins.**

§. 10.

R. B. **I have said enough before to shew you the reason of this. They do with the Scripture, take Sanctification, not for the first faith and repentance, but that Habitual, or Stared Holiness of heart, and that of Life, which follows Iustification, in order. But when they take Sanctification for the first special Grace, (of Faith and repentance) they make it to go before Iustification.**

2. Repentance and Faith do not only go together, but are in some respects, and the chiefest, the same thing in several notions. Repentance is the change of the minde:
minde: Changing the minde from infidelity to Faith is believing. And if it were not so, yet you know that Scripture puts repentance as well as Faith, before remission and justification: yea, and repentance is oft placed before Faith: Did you never read, Ye Repented not, that ye might Believe.

§ 11.

L. C. **No doubt, by the same consequence, as when a Prince giveth the dignity of a Senator only, to one that hath money, it follows that money is the condition antecedent of obtaining the Senators dignity.**

§ 11.

R. B. **No doubt, your words are false. Your Senators money is not, as you put the case, *Condition civilis*, but Faith is: It is not *Condition potestativa, id est, Voluntaria vel moralis*: but Faith is. I will tell you trulyer how it is, if you will hear me. It is as a Prince that hath ransomed a condemned woman, doth offer her himseld to be her husband, and her life to be saved (it being put into his hands upon the random) upon condition that she will take him for her husband and redeemer, and repent of her Treason for which she was condemned, and ask the King mercy; else she shall perish, if she refuse this offer, (which yet Christ will cause his chosen to accept.)**

§ 12.

L. C. **Thus they caveat (or undo) what they had begun; not only putting Repentance before Justification, but Sanctification also, which comprehendeth almost Repentance alone; thus troubling the order of the rings of the golden Chain; Rom. 8. 30, where Justifying is put before Sanctifying.**

§ 12.

R. B. 1. **The first part of the charge is answered already. 2. The word Sanctifying is not mentioned at all in the Golden Chain, Rom. 8. 30. And if you mean the thing and not the word; 1. You give us but your bare word, and we take it not to be so credible as to persuade us without reason. 3. You contradict your leader Mr. Pemble, who makes Sanctification there to be comprizd in Vocation, and put before Justification. 4. The truth is, the word Sanctifie is large, and may comprehend all three, Vocation, Justification, and Newness of life, (with stability of Grace): and so the Apostle did not express it there by names as comprehended in the other acts. As it signifies our first change, it is the same with Vocation; as it signifieth our new relations, it is at least partly, in Justification: But the common Scripture use of the word is for our Devotions to God, holiness of heart and life, following Faith, and so some Divines take it, (with the Papists) to be in Justification, but most to be there com-
compriozed in glorification: and some to be omitted: which words so ever you take it to be expressed in, the difference is but about the name: for the Thing and Order, Divines are almost all agreed (till Mr. Temple), and therefore do not disorder that Chain.

§. 13.

L. C. **But it is the greatest Paralogism of the Author of the Epistle**, to infer that Justification cannot be defined, but Faith must be concluded in it, because the act of Christ Remitting sin, and Faith apprehending Remission of sins, are done together (if they be so): For Justification hath a definition different from Sanctification, though they are so connected, that one cannot be conceived without the other. In like manner Christian Virtues, as Goodness, Patience, Humility, though in deed, and in kind unlike, do yet so mutually help each other, and are so connected, that they cannot be separated in a Believer: so Faith cannot be separated from good works, which yet are in their definition differentiated among themselves, and from Faith.

§. 13.

R. B. I. **Nothing but mistakes still!** It is not because Faith and Justification go together, that Faith is put in the Definition, but because Justification is performed by a conditional promise, and Faith is the condition. 2. How far Faith must, or must not enter the definition of Justification, I shewed in the beginning; even as the word definition is taken.

§. 14.

L. C. **Furthermore when the Author of the Epistle saith**, that Faith is a Condition prerequisite to the forgiveness of sins, it is marvelous that he makes not the rest of the graces of the Sanctifying Spirit, as well Conditions to forgiveness of sins; seeing all are equally the Condition of the New-Covenant; not indeed the Condition of merit, but, as they speak of qualification.

§. 14.

R. B. I. **Did he not make Repentance a part of the prerequisite Condition too?** and did not you complain of it, and say that Sanctification contained almost nothing but repentance? And yet now you stand wondering that he brings not in the rest. 2. Faith, as it is the Assent to the Verity of the word, and as it is a belief sufficient to the working of miracles, is in Scripture distinct from Hope and Love. But Faith as it is the Accepting of Christ and Life in him as offered in the Gospel, and so is the Condition of Justification, is taken in a moral or political sense, as the word Marriage is; or as **Taking a man to be my Phylistian, or my Sovereign, or my Tutor, or the like**: and so it Ccc 2

...
comprehendeth Love to Christ so Taken, and Hope of the Glory for which we Take him. This is true, though some carping wits quarrel with it, who give up their understandings more to their Party and Leading men, then to the Scripture: Yea this is a truth of great necessity, for the expediting of many difficulties in Theologic.

3. The Covenant promiseth several blessings: Faith (in the foresaid sense) and repentance are its Conditions of our begun Justification. Obedience actual is the condition of its continuance, or non amittendi annexed to the continuance of Faith: As a wife hath right in her husband's estate at first upon marriage consent; but to the continuance of it, she must also perform her marriage Covenant, of fidelity.

§ 15.

L. C. For the Mediator of the New Covenant took upon him to create Faith, Repentance, Fear, Humility, sincere Obedience, and the rest of the acts of Regeneration, in them whom he brings in the society of the Covenant to God. We must not therefore think that Faith alone is the Condition of the New Covenant, seeing that contradiceth the Scripture: For Deut. 6. 5, to love God with all our heart, and with all our strength, is the Condition of the Covenant; and Jer. 32. 40. I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, to do them good, and I will put my fear in their hearts; So Gen. 17. 1, Sanctity and integrity of life are made the Condition of the Covenant.

§ 15.

R. B. This learned man either knows not what a Condition is in sensu legali vel civili, or else he dissembles it (which is unlikely): He takes the condition of the Covenant to be whatsoever Christ hath undertaken to work in us, and God promised to give (if his words shew his minde): But those are Gods Conditions and not ours, which we are speaking of; our condition is that which God hath imposed on us to be done, as that without which we shall not have the thing promised, and so suspendeth the efficacy of the promise till we have performed it.

§ 16.

L. C. But it is so far from being true, that Remission of sins is given on condition of Faith or Repentance, that God is not so much as a helper to the penitent and thirsty, under a Law or Condition, or for a Condition, either of Repentance, or desire of Grace and any gracious gift, which is created; but for the Union of the faithful Soul with Christ, Gal. 3, 26.
§ 16.

R. B. Here is nothing but crude unproved assertions, fit for a Reader, then to convince him: 1. Did you never read such promises as these, "If you thirst, come to the waters," Rev. 22. whoever will, let him take of the waters of Life freely, &c. To him that hath shall be given with many other like, which I would stand to produce if I thought it worth the labor.

2. If real changes were not given on condition, it would not follow that Relative are not.

3. I know not what you meant to cite Gal. 3. 26, unless to contradict and disprove your own opinion, ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; therefore Remission or Divine help is not given on condition of Faith. A gallant inference.

4. You oppose things that are conjunct. Our Union with Christ is the Virtual Donation of the blessing itself. All being Virtually or Causally in him: as the wife hath all her honor and riches in and with her husband (she being before a beggar); and yet her own marriage consent, or taking that man for her husband, is the condition on her part of enjoying him and all that he hath. So is it in our case. It is therefore as putid and senseless an assertion, to say it is not by Faith, but by Union with Christ, as to say in the former case; it is not by her marrying him, or taking him for her husband, but by marriage-Union with him, that a woman hath Right to the Dignities and Riches of her husband. But this way of setting Gods truths by the ears, and opposing the several links of his Chain, one against another, and saying, It is not This, but This; when it is both, is the Antinomian way of illuminating the world.

§ 17.

L. C. Else the thing promised should be of Debt, and not of Grace: For that which is promised under a certain condition and Law, afterward when the condition is fulfilled, hath the force of a debt.

§ 17.

R. B. Worse and worse! 1. A thing is said to be of debt, either when its due, because freely given: or when due, because deserved by the worth of something given for it. Paul denyeth the reward to be of debt only in the latter sense, and not in the former. It is not so of debt, as not to be of grace. But if this Difisor would have us believe that the reward non Debetur, is not due to us at all, by Promise and gift, then 1, he makes it no reward: 2. Then he must deny that there is such a thing as any Promise or Gift of God: For it is a strange gift that makes not the thing due, by giving. 3. Then what hath the man talked all this while, of our Justification in Christ, and our part in his Righteousness before Faith, if no such thing be due at all? 4. Then God cannot in Justice pardon.
pardon or save any man; because it is justice to give every man his right or due: And if no man have right to Christ, and to the reward as his due, (by gift) then God cannot adjudge that to him, which is not due to him. Where-as Scripture faith, that God giveth us Heaven as a Reward, and that as a Righteous Judge, and that he is not unjust to forget our work and labor of love, with many the like.

2. He tells us that that which is promised on a condition, hath the force of a Debt, when the condition is fulfilled. What an intolerable inclination is here! Either he speaks of Dutes in general, or of debt as opposed to grace. If the former, is it possible that so learned a man should think, that a conditional gift doth any more make the thing given, to be due or debt, than an Absolute! would it not have been debt or due, if God had said; I do pardon the sins of all men; without any condition? If he mean it of Debt, merited by the value of the work, and so opposed to grace, I answer him: When the condition is a meritorious work, by its value deserving the reward, then his Doctrine is true. But when the Condition is no such work at all, but the accepting of the free gift according to its nature, and that you shall not throw it away, or tread the pearl under your feet, nor spit in the face of him that gives it, doth this make the debt to be not of Grace? Let Scripture language decide the case. It makes me pity the poor unscientious Christians in many parts of England, to see with what silly cavils they are deluded.

§. 18.

L. C. The gifts of God, such as God's continual help, the increase of Faith and Grace, consolation in the heart of the contrite, yea eternal salvation itself; which follow upon the precedent collation of Faith and Repentance, are not conferred on us, as to the given Conditions of Faith, repentance, humility, &c. but because we are united to Christ: for we are not by these gifts made the more possessors of the Promise, but by them we are made so much more certain of the gift of the thing promised; for, not because I thirst, therefore do I challenge to myself the promise; but thirst doth impel me the more ardently to quench my thirst: and I must desire, that with Desire, not for Desire of grace, my conscience may persuade me that God will be propitious to me.

§. 18.

A. B. I. God's gifts or our acts, are no reasons moving him to give more, who being immutable cannot be moved: but they are not only preparations to following gifts, but conditions on which God in his Law of Grace hath promised the following gifts: which he hath done to excite and engage us the more to the performance. 2. We are therefore upon the performance of the Condition; not only (nor alway) made certain of the thing promised, but alway put into a Right, and into possession of Justification, which consisted but in a Right.

3. The word For, is equivocal. I expect not God's favor or pardon, for my Faith or desire as the meritorious cause: But I expect it upon, and so for them, as mere Conditions of a free gift. You trifle with unexplained words.
§ 19.

L. C. In like manner, not for any degrees of Faith, humility, self-denial, hope, &c., do I expect the thing promised; but with these I ardently request (or desire) that the thing given or promised may be more clearly known to me, and that I am a Member of Christ, and that the fruits of the mystical Union shall also redound to me. God who hath made the Covenant of Grace with his own, moved by no consideration, loveth his own, but for himself: he unites them to Christ, he makes them by a new life conformable to Christ's death: and createth and confirmeth in the hearts of Believers the gifts of Grace. 1sa 59. 21, 22. that as he hath given us the sum of the matter, even Christ, together also in Christ he may give us the rest of his gifts for an overplus; of which gifts the profit and fruits are very great; for though they be not a cause or argument, on which resting, I promise myself Salvation, yet do they compell me to Christ the fountain, that from him I may drink with open mouth: and may place my hope of Salvation, not in any condition of Faith or Repentance; but in Christ as dead for sinners, with whom I reckon myself the chief; denying all Righteousness howsoever called, besides Christ's Righteousness; and also denying all unrighteousness, when I fly to the altar of Salvation.

§ 19.

R. B. Most of this is fully answered, and I will have some compassion on the Reader.

1. It is not Scripture-sense or language to say, all gifts are given with Christ as overplus: indeed outward things are said to be so given: Mat. 6. 33. but if pardon, sanctification and salvation be but an overplus, how came Christ to dye for the procuring them, and to propound himself still in the Gospel to be received as a means to these? The end is not given with the means by way of overplus. I know that in some respect Christ also is the end of them.

3. We place no hope of Salvation in any works as meritorious, or co-ordinate with Christ, but only as subordinate to him, and as such means as himself hath been pleased to constitute them.

4. I dare provoke this man, whoever he be, on his principles, to produce any rational ground of his expectation of Salvation, or assurance of his pardon, if he fetch it not from his performance of the condition of the promise. He will, I am certain, be presently driven to non-sense, or to bottom his assurance upon Enthusiasms, or inward persuasions, which have no reason to support them, or prove them solid. If any word of God be the ground of your assurance, it is either an Absolute promise or a Conditional. If a Conditional, you can have no more assurance of your right in the thing promised, then you have first assurance that you perform the Condition. As if it be on this promise, whoever believeth is justified from all things, &c., or shall not perish, but have everlasting life. You can hence have no more assurance of being justified or saved, then you have first assurance that you believe in the sense as those texts require it. If it be an absolute promise that assureth you, either it is general to all, or special to you. If to all,
all, then all shall be saved as well as you; (and their ignorance of it will not hinder it). If it be a special promis to you, then either you are named in it, (which is not in my Bible, that I know of) or you are but described. If described either by a common character (and that will not distinguish you from others) or by a special; and then either that special character is some condition performed (and then we are where we were) or some inherent qualifying mark; but that you will not affirm, for then you must equally try by that, and so far rely on that. If you fly, it is as one of the Elect, or one that Christ dyed for more then others, the question recurs how you know your self to be Elect, or one that Christ so dyed for. The thing which I conjecture you will fly to, is this, You will believe first that it is true, and then if you can do so, it is certain it was true: for God will not enable any to believe themselves in Christ, Justified or Elect, that are not. But 1. Thouands believe it falsely, and all our preaching will not cure this presumption in them. 2. Then the first act of your belief was false or groundless, and not a rational belief. For the object as such, is before the act; and it is not a true act that is not fitted to the object. If at first you believe it to be true, without any reason of that believe, or any evidence of truth in the object, then it is an irrational act: may indeed you cannot do it: you must apprehend some truth in the object, and see some shew of reason to make you believe it, or you cannot believe it. Besides, all the wicked about you are commanded to believe as well as you: and it is certainly a truth which God commandeth them to believe. God commandeth no man to believe falfhoods. And it is the same thing which they and you are commanded to believe: therefore it is certain that it is not that you are Elect, or that you are Justified and shall be saved: for this is false of many. It is therefore to believe the Truth of the Gospel, and Accept Christ and Life offered in it, as offered; by so doing you perform the Condition of the gift or promise: and so have right to Christ and Life: upon the review of this performance you may know groundedly and rationally that you are Justified: No other way can you know it: Men will be reasonable while they are men; Grace makes them not bruists, but more rational: Do not therefore lay mens duty and comfort in such a Faith as hath no bottom, nor you can give no reason for, but say I do believe, because I will believe; or I believe it true, because I would have it to be true: and so lead men to meet dreams, or make extraordinary revelations the way of ordinary comfort, and so leave the generality of humble souls in distress, that have no such revelations. These vain Doctrines will not hold long. And if they be right, our common prophanes people, that generally believe they are pardoned by Christ, because they would have it so, are in a better Condition then I took them to be in. I seriously profess, to my best observation it appears to me, that the Antinomian Doctrine is the very same in almost every point, which I finde naturally fastned in the hearts of the common prophanes multitudes, and that in all my discoursces with them I find, that though the ignorant cannot mouth it so plaufully, nor talk not so much of free Grace, yet have they the same tenets, and all men are naturally of the Antinomian Religion; and that very work of Preachers (when Christs death and the Promise of pardon and Life is once revealed) is principally the cure of natural Antinomianism; and this is that we call the work of conversion. I do not wonder therefore if these men would have the Ministry down, when their very daily work is to root out their Religion from the Souls of men.

CHAP.
CHAP. VI.

That a sinner and ungodly man, and not the faithfull and believer, is the adequate Object of Justification.

§ 1.

L. C. BUT let us in the mean time act their part, who will have Faith, Repentance, a New-life, and all the acts of Regeneration to go before, not only the acts of Justification, but also of Election; in Nature, Order, and Time: I contend that it agreeth not so much as with that opinion, that a believing man be the Object of Justification, or faith be the instrumental cause of Justification, or of Remission of sins; or that it enter the definition of Justification; And that this is abhorrent from right reason and Aristotelical Discipline: For if I would be of their opinion, I would easily grant that it rightly follows, that Faith, Repentance, &c. are a cause sine qua non, and prerequisite conditions, and which are supposed to be in them that are Justified: But I would deny that it thence follows, that Justification respects a man believing and penitent, as the adequate object of Justification, whose adequate object rather is a sinner, an ungodly man, yea an incredulous man, and an Infidel (though otherwise faithfull and of an unblemable life) in as much as in the best, the seeds of incredulity (ye hid, Mar. 9. 24. and sin is the off-spring of Infidelity: For every action both Natural and Moral is carried to the object according to the formal Reason: so a Physician considers a man not in respect of Rationality or Resplendence, but of Sanability: In like manner the action of Remitting sin is carried to its object, after the formal reason of the object, to wit, to a sinner capable of Remission, and not as endowed with faith and Repentance.

§ 2.

R. E. 1. ALL this a do to bring forth a poor petitio principii, or a contradiction. You confess as much as we desire, that the formal reason of the Object is: A sinner capable of Remission: We doubt not but you mean an Immediate capacity: And we say, that you beg the question in the next words, which contradict the former: and not as endowed with faith and Repentance. When will you once prove that an Impenitent Infidel is a sinner immediately capable of Justification. You have but one way to attempt it, and that is by proving the Scripture not to be true, which so frequently says otherwise. No man is immediately capable of the benefit given by a conditional Donation or act of Grace, but he that hath performed the condition. But Justification and Remission is a benefit given by a conditional Donation or act of Grace (and faith is the condition) therefore, &c.

2. I have spoke already to the question, whether faith must enter the Definition of Justification: It enters not the Definition of Justification in General, nor of any other species, but of this species, even Evangelical Justification, confi...
ing in Remission of sin, or Sentential Abolition, it doth enter the Definition. Adam and the Angels might be Justified without faith in Christ; and so was Christ himself (in the sense that we now speak of) but man cannot; and it being the condition of the gift, must enter the Definition.

§ 2.

L. C. Nor matters it that Faith and Repentance are supposed to be first in the Subject before he be Justified. Suppose a Prince choose none into his Counsel but a monied man; I do not think it thence follows that money and the man's riches are the formal cause, the Impulsive, Inductive, Intrinsic, or Extrinsic, for which he is chosen among the Counsellors, when the Prince, as when he chose Titius into the Senate, had respect to the man's Judgement exercised by much experience, and his Prudence meet to handle the great business of the Common wealth; but the man's riches were no more the cause that Titius was admitted, than that he lived, is of a sound body, nor is either blind or lame, to hinder him from being in the Senate: which conditions found or supposed in Titius, could not be the object to which the Prince applied himself when he chose him Counsellor.

§ 2.

R. B. I was troubled once already with your monied man, let who will be troubled with him again for me: and for Titius, as I ken not the man, so I have nothing to do with him, nor he, for any thing I can perceive, with our business. Do but distinguish between a natural condition, which is a qualification of the matter, and a Legal or Civil condition properly so called, which morally qualitificat ex ordinatione donantis vel legislatoris, and you have answer enough. Our condition is expressed in the Law or Testament, and so was not Titius his money, nor his life, health, or limbs. Morals suppose naturals, and constitute them not.

§ 3.

L. C. That most famous man, and every way most learned, Dr. Hammond: but who seems to me more addicted to the conceits of the Arminians, saw this: Yet nevertheless in his Cathechism, though he make Faith, Repentance; Tea all the acts of Salvation to go before Justification or Remission of sin as Conditions, Qualities, and Qualifications, as he speaks, necessary and prerequisite in the subject to be Justified; Yet doth he exclude faith or a believer from the definition of Justification, and denyeth faith to be an Instrument or cause of Justification: For he will have Justification to be an act of God which is done *without us: but let

* Extra nos. we here him speak, though not in his country language wherein he wrote his Cathechism.

What is Justification? R. It is God's accepting our persons, and not imputing our sins, his covering or pardoning our iniquities, his being so reconciled unto sinners that he determines not to punish us eternally.

What is the cause of Justification? R. God's free mercy to us in Christ revealed in the New Covenant.
What the Instrumental cause? R. As an Instrument is logically and properly taken, and signifies an inferior less principal efficient cause, so nothing in us can have anything to do (i.e. any kind of physical efficiency) in this work; neither is it imaginable it should, it being a work of God upon us, without us, concerning us, but not within us at all. And if you mark Justification being in plain terms but the accepting our persons, and pardoning of sins, it would be very improper and harsh to affirm, that our works or any thing, even our faith it self, should accept our persons, or pardon our sins, though in never so inferior a Notion; which yet they must, if they were Instrumental in our Justification. Tis true indeed, those necessary qualifications which the Gospel requires in us are conditions, or moral Instruments, without which we shall not be Justified; but those are not properly called instruments or causes.

What are those qualifications?
R. Faith, Repentance, Firm purpose of a new life; and the rest of those Graces upon which in the Gospel pardon is promised the Christian; all comprizable in the new Creature, Conversion, Regeneration, &c.

Truly according to this opinion, if any man were more exact in his forepast life then Paul or Job was, yet would I still maintain (as it is humane to flip) that God does not Justifie him as a believer, but as ungodly and a sinner, yea as an Infidel: For a Prince doth not free from punishment a good man, but a guilty (or Delinquent) So God in remitting sin confedereth not man as a believer or penitent, but obnoxious: to conclude, it seems as unfit a speech to say that God forgiveth sin to a believer and to the faithfull, as to affirm, that a father pardoneth a Son, not as erring, but as obedient; or that the adequate object of the Father chastising his Son, is a Son as obedient, and not as forsaking his duty.

S. 3.
R. E. I. It is the same Doctrine for the substance that these words of Dr. Hammond do express, which I maintain against you. Let those that assert a proper Instrumentality and efficiency of faith to justification, see to themselves.
2. You do not well to say that Dr. Hammond excludeth faith from the Definition of justification. For you may easily see that he never intended those words for a Definition of justification, much less in the most comprehensive sense, but a discovery of the nature of the most actual of justifying in it self considered.
3. Let us agree of the order, nature and office of faith in justification, and we will freely give you leave to put it in your Definition, or leave it out, as you please: This is but a small and trifoulous busines.
4. You do with great resolution profess to maintain, that which you perform with lamentable infirmity, nor doth your performance any whit answer your undertaking, to prove that God justifies a man as an infidel: and for all your talk of Aristotelical Discipline, you do utterly fail our expectations of the fruits of it, in your proof. Here's not a word of Argument that I can find, for what you will still maintain.
1. You must distinguish between a man as he needs pardon: and as a man as he shall receive pardon. The guilty, as guilty, need pardon, and not as Believers: the penitent and believers as they are the persons to whom the promise is made, shall receive pardon, and not any other guilty persons.
2. You must distinguish between the object of Punishment, of Obliga-
But God nor putant as all his father ask guilty, that he knew needing things thankfully I condition, and of Impunity, Remission, and Justification. The object of punishment is the guilty, the object of Obligation to punishment, or subject of guilt, is a sinner, as having offended a penal Law: The object of Impunity, Remission, Justification, is a guilty sinner too; but that not all, nor enough to make him an object immediately capable of these acts. The subject of Impunity (as we now take it) is a pardoned sinner (call him Subject or Object; we must allow some impropriety from the imperfection of the thing.) The Object of Remission and constitutive Justification, is a believing sinner. Can you prove it enough to make a man an Adequate object of Remission, that he hath in him the matter to be remitted? If you consider him before God's act of Grace was passed, and so it is true, it is enough that he is a guilty sinner, for whom Christ died (for I must tell you that must go in to a full Definition too:) But if you speak not of an object of the conditional pardon in the Law or promise, but of the actual pardon by that promise becoming effectual, as no doubt you do, then it is a believing sinner that is the Adequate object. There is the materia renovanda, the Terminus a quo in him, as he is guilty: But there will not be the actual removal, the mutus ab huc termino ad liberationem, Justification, Just a Impunitatem, till the condition of faith be performed, and this condition being not a mere naturally-pre-requisite qualification, but a proper condition in Law: fence, expressed fully in the words of the Covenant or Law, it follows that by so doing the Law hath made it of that moral necessity, that a sinner is no adequate object of Justification without it.

But you say, A prince doth not free from punishment a good man, but a guilty. I answer, If your Prince's pardon be absolute, he freeth a meek offender: but that not our case: But if he pardon a Traytor on condition he come in and thankfully accept a pardon, and return to his allegiance, then there are two things considerable in him whom he pardons to make him a fit object. That he need it, and therefore be guilty; and that he be in the nearest capacity of receiving it, and so that he perform the condition. So God considereth us both as guilty, and so needing pardon, and as believers in Christ, and so fit for it on the terms on which he was pleased to confer it in his Law.

Where you say what an unfit or unreasonable speech it is to say, that God pardoneth sins to Believers: Consider whether you accuse not the Holy Ghost, who knew better how to speak then you can teach him.

To your further similitude I say, It is no fit speech to say that God forgiveth us our obedience or our faith, or forgiveth a believer for believing: Nor for to say a father forgiveth his sons obedience. But if that father say, kneel down and ask me forgiveness, and I will forgive thee: It is no unfit speech to say that the father forgiveth an offending, submissive child, that is, forgiveth his offence upon his submission.

Your last speech discovers more infirmity than wisdom would have had you manifest. Is it as unreasonable a speech to say: God pardoneth sin to a believer, as to say, that the adequate object of the fathers Chastising his son, is a son as obedient, and not as faulty? Whither will not partiality carry men? Besides that all this strikes at the face of Scripture, what an unworthy trick of a learned disputant is it, to take so grofs a point for granted, and run away with it so easily, as if pardoning required no more in the object to make it adequate, then chastising doth. Is it usual even with men to chastise and pardon in the same respect. Do men pardon their children, or Princes their traiterous Subjects, nearly as offenders?
offenders 3 They punish them as offenders; but they will have a further reason of pardoning them; sure I am, God pardoneth not men as sinners, but as redeemed believing sinners.

And if you still say that he pardoneh us as Infidels (telling us before of the formal reason herein) then I again desire you to tell us why all sinners, or all Infidels are not pardoned? I know the word quæ or quatenus may be so taken largely, as that the consequence, ad omne shall not hold: but as you expressly say: it is according to the formal reason, as the act is carried to the object; so a quatenus ad omne valet consequentia; and so all Infidels must be Justified. Nay, infidelity must be the reason of the predicate, and so we must therefore call them Justified, because Infidels. For as Godenius faith, Lexic. Philos. pag. 906. Reduplicatione exigit ut reduplicatum sit causa eur prædicatuum primo & aequare in it subjicto.

Quatenus or qua (as Goden. ibid.) is used to express. 1. Subjectum passionis primum (and to the object of action) so we must say, Pecator-redemptus fidelis, vel fide Christo conjunctus, is the Object and Subject of Justification. 2. Qua significat causam predicati a parte subjicti: And so we must say that, Fidelis qua fidelis, vel Pecator-redemptus fidelis qua fidelis Justificatus. For though faith be no proper cause of Justification, yet being conditio donativa, it may be the causa predicandi Subjectum Justificatum. 3. Qua signifieth the formal reason of considering. 4. And the condition. The Objectum materiale is man offending: the objectum formale is miseric-redemptus-credens. For all these concur ad rationem objecti formalis, but not all on the same reason are appointed hereto: Gods immanent acts have no objectum formale, as ours have (without him) as really specifying them, and being the reason of them: But his legal moral actions have that in the object which may be called, ratio formalis (as have his immanent acts qua ad denominationem extrinsecam also, & respective.) Redemption is a meritorious cause, and faith but a condition: Christ and Remission being given to the Redeemed on that condition, it doth therefore enter the formal reason of the object: as sine qua non, or cum qua.

Note also that we speak not of the Objectum quod, for that is just, but of the objectum cui, and that is as expressed: From all this it appears what an Antichristian Doctrine it is to say that an Infidel, as such, is the adequate object of Justification: For then every infidel, because an infidel, must be said to be Justified. Note also, that all this is spoken of Constitutive Justification or pardon: For the formal object of sentential Justification is Justus. God so Justifieth not any but the righteous, and curseth those that do otherwise.

§ 4.

L. C. By what is said, it appeareth with what inconveniences the usual Doctrine of Justification by faith is urged: and contrarily how apt that is which we exhibit, especially in that it reconcileth Paul with James, whose sentences seemingly differing, have hitherto tormented commentators: For what inviency will there be, if we say that both Faith and Good-works do Justifie, in that faith witnesseth our Reconciliation, and works witnesseth our faith, either in our Consciences or before men? Or what need is there to labour so anxiously to prove against the Papists that faith alone Justifieth, when that Good-works do almost (or in a manner) equally Justifie,
Very man is naturally pleased with his own inventions and notions, and so are you, it seems, to the very great overvaluing of them: I confess the Doctrine of Justification is so inconveniently explained in some parts by too many that might possibly give you and many others so much offence as might occasion your error: but you are so far from escaping those inconveniences as you imagine, that you are run from the Sands into the Gulf, from the Ashes into the Fire, into incomparably greater evils then they, seeking to cure an inconvenience with a mischief. For my part I see no great appearance of any contradiction between Paul and James, as I have elsewhere declared, but your way, I am past all doubt, contradicteth them both, while you think to reconcile them; yea, you quite reject the very subject of their disputes; not speaking of, yea expressly exploding the Justification that they treat of; You say, Works witness to faith: And why do not they in your way as well witness directly to Justification, as faith doth? Nay, you profess that for your declarative Justification, they do Justifie propemodum ex quo. But did Paul think so? or is this any such clear Reconciling Paul and James? You do not fully tell us, whether they speak of your Immanent, or your Relative Justification: and yet you reconcile them? You say, If we speak of the former, they Justifie almost equally? Is that any satisfactory interpreting of Paul, that faith, Is of works, then not of Grace? and that a man is Justified by Faith without the Works of the Law. But you do indeed seem to determine that its your declarative Justification that they speak of; For you add: If we say that both faith and works Justifie, &c. in our Consciences or before men: But it is put past all doubt in the Text, that it is not mere Justification in Conscience or before men, that either Paul or James speak of. I have so often manifested that to others in divers private writings, that I am loth to take this slight occasion to do it again. Only in a word 1. For Paul, he faith, Rom. 3. 19. 20. Whatsoever the Law faith, it faith to them that are under the Law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God: Here you see that the guilt is, 1. Before God. 2. By legal obligation. Therefore by the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be Justified in this sight, for by the Law is the knowledge of sin: Here you see also that first it is before God. 2. And by a civil kind of act, that we are Justified; or as it is ver. 27. By the Law of Faith: And ver. 28, when he had said: A man is Justified by faith without the works of that Law: he adds: Is he the God of the Jews only, &c. And 3. It is one God that shall Justifie the Circumcision by faith, and the Uncircumcision through faith: So that you see it is Justification by God, and in Gods sight that Paul mentioneth: And therefore Chap. 4. 3, 5, 6, &c. it is called imputing Righteousness, Justifying the ungodly, forgiving sin, &c. See also ver. 16. 24. And for James, 1. He speaks of such a Justifying as is equivalent to saving, or of the same nature, ver. 14. cap. 2. Can Faith save him? It is not only in our Consciences, and before men, that faith or works save, 2. He speaks of Abrahams
Abrahams Justification, which was before God, and not only in Conscience, and before men? specially for such an act as men would condemn him for, and was done in private. 3. He speaks of imputing to Righteousness, ver. 23. and that is before God, for it is he that imputeeth. 4. He makes it equivalent to being the friend of God: and that is a change of Relation. Much more might be added.

Yea you might easily see, if you are willing, that it is no such low poor busines, as Justification in Conscience or before men, that the Scripture talks of; but of that which our Salvation lyeth on. We are not thereby justified, as Paul faith, though we know nothing by our selves, that is, Conscience is not the decider of the controversy, whether we are just or unjust; or shall live or dye: We have one that judgeth us, even the Lord. It is his prerogative: and it is his high and honorable judgement, that Scripture commonly speaks of; Yea always when it directeth us what to do to be justified, or tells us of Justification by faith. And for men; it is also a small thing to us to be judged by man, or at mans day or Judgement, See 2 Cor. 4. 3, 4, 5. While therefore you pretend to reconcile Paul and James, you speak of a Justification that neither of them meddle with, nor honor with that name.

In reconciling us with the Papists you deal as slipperily. I am thought by some to say too much for Works my self: But I must make another kind of difference both between Faith and Works, and between Protestants and Papists herein, then you do, or then your Propemodum ex aequo do intimate.

Well, it is undoubtedly certain that Justification in Scripture signifieth, to remit Sin, and to constitute Righteous, and to judge righteous by sentence. How then will you reconcile us and the Papists? Why, 1. For Judging, it is one of the fences wherein you say, Faith and Works do Justifie propemodum ex aequo: And doublets this is the highest and noblest Justification, but I am nor of your mind, if you take Works as Paul doth.

2. But if to Justifie signifieth, to Remit Sin, or impute Righteousness (you say) neither faith alone, nor Works Justifie: A fair Reconciliation, either of Paul and James, or of Protestant and Papists; what this but to say plainly: Both Paul and James, both Protestants and Papists, are out? You both speak falsely: on faith it is one Faith, and the other, it is also Works, when indeed it is neither. This is the way to reconcile Lyars and Quarrellers, to chide them and say, you are both Knaves; But this is not an honest way of Reconciling Gods word, where the difference is only in our misapprehension.

Yet let me remember you of one thing, that for my part I rather use the Phrase, Justified by faith: then that, faith Justifieth. 1. Because the Scripture still useth the former, but never, that I know, the latter. 2. Because the one seemeth more to intend an efficiency in faith (which I deny) and the other but a conditionally, which I maintain. For we may be said to be Justified by the condition, as well as by the efficient. And therefore whenever I use the Phrase, faith Justifieth: I do it in imitation of others, but take it in the latter sense.
L. C. \(\textit{Alas, then this Method of teaching Justification by faith, nothing more sound and more clear; there is nothing that useth violence with the Intelle\textit{\textbf{ct}}, or contradiction right reason: as that saying doth, faith forgiveth sins, or Justifieth objectively: to the understanding whereof, as well as to the dissolving of that peripatetic (saying) the form is educed \& potentia materiæ: there is need of the wit of an Oedipus. For it is not possible to discern the falsity or verity of a proposition, whose terms you can neither understand apart nor together, and in which the definition is more obscure than the thing defined.\)

R. B. \(\textbf{I} \) Will not Justifie or excuse the Phrases which you accuse: and I think it as unfit as you can do, for men to make themselves a Religion of words not intelligible, and to be angry with the World for questioning that which themselves did never understand: But for your own extolled Method; I think seriously, that it is the most false and dissolvent from God's word, and from the very nature of Justification, that ever was yet to my knowledge published by sober Christians; and far more unsound and dangerous than either Ofiander's or the Papists; though I was in my youth inclining to your opinion. As for your snitch at the Peripatetic Doctrine of the education of the form \& potentia materiæ, I can better forbear you in Philosophical Novelties then in Theological.

L. C. i. \(\textit{Oth faith make us righteous either for the Virtue and dignity of the object, or by Participation of the Virtue which the object communica\textit{\textbf{te}} with faith? I conceive not that faith doth either way Justifie: For a created thing cannot have force to produce an effect, such as Remission of sin is, which agreeeth only to an eternal and incorporeal object, which force yet they will have it to have, neither from it self, nor from the Object. Neither doth faith Justifie or forgive sin by participation of Virtue which the object communica\textit{\textbf{te}} with faith, for then faith should formally Justifie.\)

R. B. \(\textbf{C} \) Hrist was not the guilty person, nor did he so bear the very person of any man in suffering, as that in Law-sence we are said to suffer or satisfie in him: But in the third person of a Mediator, taking on him the punishment of our sins, he made by sacrifice satisfaction to Justice, to this end, and thus far, that the sinners might be delivered into his hands as their redeemer, and that by a new Law of Grace the benefits of his sufferings might be made over
over to them. It is therefore only by this Law that any man hath right to Christ and his righteousness: It pleased the Father and the Redeemer to make this Law conditionall; but with a condition fitted to the honoring of free-grace, viz. that men shall accept the gift as it is offered, and glorify God in the repentent confession of their sins, and praying for pardon. Though Christ will cause all his Elect to perform this condition, yet the Law is general, imposing the condition, and promising the benefit thereupon to all: it being secret internal grace flowing from Election, and from Christ's death, as concatenated with Election, that makes the first difference: But the Grace given by Christ as Legislator makes not that difference, nor any at all, till it find this difference made by temporal Election, (that is, internal vocation) the fruit of eternal. It being therefore God will that Christ should be given, and life in him, only by a New-Law, which hath a condition, and not absolutely, it thence follows from the meer will of the free donor, that Faith and Repentance have the Interest of a condition in our Justification, and this is the formal reason of its Justifying us (to speak vulgarly) or of our being justified by it (to speak with Scripture.)

And for those senseless men that think it derogatory from Free grace, that Justification be given on such a condition, it is as much as to say, It derogateth from God's grace to require you to glorify his Grace, to proclaim it free, to confess you deserve not, and to condemn yourself, to ask it as free Grace; in a word, If God give you Grace in the Covenant, on condition you will accept it, and honor the freeness of it, hereby it is dishonored. Is not this a senseless conceit? God meant so to pardon sinners, as principally in the gift to look to his honor, and impose on them conditions both honorable to the giver, and fitted to the necessity and misery of the receiver, and so to deliver the guilty, as not to make him Masterless or Lawless. Thus I have shewed you my judgement, why and in what respect we are Justified by faith.

2. Your last words, then faith should formally Justifie, shew you to hold another error, that Christ's righteousness doth formally Justifie. The righteousness given by Christ doth, that is, Remission of sin: but for Christ's own righteousness, it is but the meritorious cause of that Remission, or Jus ad impunitatem & ad Regnum, which is our Righteousness formally. This you seemed once to profess, when you said you confessed to the Author in his Catechize: But when men understand not themselves, there is no hold of them.

§ 7.

I. C. 2. Will they say, Faith Justifieth as it apprehendeth Christ? But when the chief benefit in Christ which we apprehend is Remission of sin itself, it will follow, that faith Justifieth or remitteth sin, because it apprehendeth Remission of sin.

§ 7.

R. B. I confess that is the common Doctrine: which I like not, as commonly expressed: but you say little against it. Plainly, and truly, faith is appointed to this office, because of its fitness for it, in the nature of the act, as being the acceptance of Christ first, and life in him freely given: But the nearest for-
mal reason of its interest in our justification, is this, that it is a condition of the gift, so made by the will of the Donor.

§ 8.

L.C. 3. Perhaps that apprehendere doth make just, and remit sin: which seeing it is an act or action of faith moving it self to Christ the object, and this act is not the first and direct from Christ to the soul, but the reflexed and second from the soul to Christ, by which act it relyeth on Christ, and reflecteth in his love; what can that apprehension be, beside the virtue, action or work which are in, or are done in the believer, unless to apprehend be the same as to believe? On both sides it will follow, either that a quality, action or work that are in me, do forgive sins; or (if to apprehend, be to believe) that faith justifies because it is faith in Christ; which is as absurd.

§ 8.

R.E. No doubt the last is their fence, whom you dispute against, that faith, as Faith in Christ justifies: And if they expounded it only of its Aptitude to the office, it were true: but seeing they do go further, I leave them to defend themselves, for I cannot.

§ 9.

L.C. 4. Oth any virtue flow into faith from Christ's Righteousness, which virtue doth imprint in faith a power of justifying or forgiving sins? but the Papists put the like power into their works.

§ 9.

R.E. A Good cause is a great advantage. I confess you may say much against this common mistake.

§ 10.

L.C. 5. If they say, faith is the internal Instrument of Application, it is that which I would have; For that Application is faith itself, at least a second act of true faith, and the principal formal reason of faith: yet is not a man justified or made just by it, but only trusteth that he is just: I understand application in respect of man; For in respect of God Application is the same with imputation of Righteousness.
\( \text{§ 10.} \)

\textbf{R. B. A} \textit{LL} this is true: only understand, that the \textit{main act of Faith} is to accept an offered Chrift, \textit{first Believing him to be the Chrift; and not to trust} that we are justified.

\( \text{§ 11.} \)

\textbf{L. C. 6.} \textit{Altho', Faith is not the Instrument of Remifion of sins, unless it be made the efficient cause, though less principal, why God forgiveth sins; doth an eternal cause need a temporary and transient Instrument to produce an eternal effect? But its wonder that God should need this Instrument to remit sins, when even an earthly Prince hath no need of the faith of a condemned man, to whom by his pardon he granteth life; though to his vital life it is necessary that he know the truth of the written pardon: but this is nothing to the act of the Prince, the act of whose pardon is not suspended on any man's belief: nor hath he need to the giving of pardon, that any condition be found in him: Much less doth the most great God pre-require faith, or use it as an instrument to forgive sin.}

\( \text{§ 11.} \)

\textbf{R. B. Y} \textit{our reasons have force enough. 1. Against the Instrumental efficiency of faith. 2. And against its having interest in Remifion. \textit{proximē ex naturā actus, \& non ex voluminate ordinantis: But further against faith being the assigned condition, you say nothing, but a crude affirmation in the end. God hath no need of our faith to forgive us; But God doth all things in wisdom, and he saw it fittest to draw men to Repent and Believe by giving them Remifion upon these conditions, that so the reward might allure them to the duty. God works on man as man; Even where omnipotency worketh Grace, it is by rational means. Besides, do you think it honorable to the redeemer to say to the world: I \textit{will} justify and save you, though you \textit{will not believe in me}, but take me for a deceiver; and though you despise me, spit in my face; You cannot have life but in and with me; and you shall have me whether you \textit{will or no}. These be not terms honorable to God, nor fit for man. \textit{Note also that you do most erroneously call Justification an eternal effect: This utterly denieth Chrift as Mediator to be any cause of it; and so what is it, but to deny Chrift \textit{even the Lord} that bought you. This is a matter of greater moment then the ordering of our Notions about faiths interest in Justifying.}

\textit{Ecc 2}
rained in the Dungeon, expecting daily the execution of the horrible sentence to be thundred on his head; and in a few days delay comes from the Prince, a good Messenger bringing a Pardon, (or all) of Grace: will he therefore think he was abolved and freed from punishment, because he gave credit to the Prince? Or who will believe that the Prince did absole the Delinquent by that faith whereby he believed that the Pardon was not invalid.

§ 12.

R. B. Let those that you charge, defend themselves as they can: Only I must tell you, that in your similitude you far mistake the case: You suppose your Prince's pardon to be absolute, and then believing can do nothing but comfort the man: But the Gospel pardoning Act is Conditional. Rather should you put the case as I did before. A woman is condemned for Treason: The King for loveth her, though a Traitor and Beggar, and pays her Ransome, and sendeth a Messenger with a Pardon, on these terms: If thou wilt thankfully and lovingly acknowledge the favour I have shewed in Redeeming thee, and wilt accept me both for thy Husband and Lord, and return to thy allegiance, I will pardon and save thee: If not, thou shalt dye a far sooner death for thy ingratitude: This is nearer our case.

§ 13.

L. C. Into this Method also do the Asserters of the vulgar opinion incogitantly slide. Bucanus Loc. 31. de Justific. Qu. 20. Maketh the Subject of Justification to be the Elect before the Constitution of the World; And Qu. 17. the matter not prepared, to wit, ungodly and sinners. See Ursin Catech. Qu. 60. Where he makes a double Application. 1. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in respect of God. 2. The act itself of believing in respect of us, whereby we certainly trust, that Christ's obedience is imputed and given to us of God. Idem Qu. 61. faith, We are justified by Faith alone, because we are justified by the Object of Faith alone: A little after, Faith is Correlatively taken: by Faith alone; that is, by Christ's merit alone, we are justified. What? That many, though of the same opinion with Ursin, among these Keckerman, do make two Justifications, and Righteousnesses: one Active, the other Passive, which is improperly called Righteousness, seeing it is only the feeling of the Active, and its Reception.

§ 13.

R. B. You seem to me, either not to understand the Authors you allledge, or wilfully wrong at least two of them. 1. Bucanus faith, Soli electi ante constitutionem mundi Justificantur? But what's that for you? He never said, that they were only considered as elect, or that it was the elect, as elect, that were the formal or adequate object of Justification: or that mere Election before faith made them the object, much less that before the world was made, they were justified. For your second
second saying of Bacchus, I know not whether he mean to number only the two distinct considerations of the Subject of Justification, or also to distinguish of the time, and of two Justifications received, one by ungodly, the other by Believers. If the former be his sense, it is Justifiable, if the latter, I excuse it not.

Vifin doth only less fitly in those words express the nature of faith in justification, which yet presently he better explains: But he taketh not God's application to be from Eternity, nor at all before our faith actually; but only conditionally, and after it actually: his words are these: Ut quamque applicatione necessum est concurrens. Deus enim haec leges applicat Justitiam Christi per imputationem, ut nos ipsumque can nobis applicemus per fidem. Etiam enim aliquid aliis diversis beneficis, tamen si is quod est id non Accipiat, non ipsi applicetur, nec fit eius beneficium. Sine nostra igitur applicatione, Divina applicationem non est, & tamen nostra etiam est a Deo. This is found Doctrine. Its true, in the next words he faith, God's application of Christ's satisfaction to us is before ours: and so it is. 1. It tamen: So far as to give us Grace to believe, which is a fruit of Christ's merits. 2. And to give us a conditional Pardon and Grant of justification and life. 3. But not to give actual pardon and justification, till after our believing.

The second passage cited by you out of Vifin is true: But fair dealing would have confessed that it is but part of Vifin's Explication: And so, no doubt when we are said to be justified by faith alone, it is Christ's merits commended that are principally intended; but not only; For faith quoad conditionem is intended as of necessity to our right to Christ, but Christ only is intended as the satisfactory Meritorious cause. And therefore Vifin adds. 2. Quia propria ascius fidei est apprehendere & sibi applicare Justitiam Christi: Immo fides nihil est aliud quam Acceptio & apprehensio Justitiae alienae, seu meriti Christi in Evangelii promissionibus oblati, &c. And he gives the reason why we say fide sola. 1. To express that it is gratis, &c. 2. Ut omnia opera & merita nostra, vel aliena, causae Justificationis excludantur, &c. 3. Ut non modo omne nostrum meri tum, sed etiam ipsa fides exclusur, ab eo quod fide accipitur; & si sit sensus, sola fide, id est, non mentionem fidei tandem accipiendo, Justificari, &c. 4. Ut intelligamus necessitatis fidei ad Justificationem; Et si tamen non quidam Meriti sibi, sed tamen non nisi fide Accipiente Justitiam Christi, nos Justificari; quia fidei as: su prorsus est, Justitiam cum Accipere.

To all this I subscribe (supposing it the principal Act of Faith to accept Christ himself.) And if this will satisfy those that quarrel with me for ascribing too much to works, or for Levelling Faith and works, I again say, I willingly subscribe to it.

For what you speak of two sorts of Justification, Active and Passive, it seems you understand not those you carp at. Divines ordinarily mean by it no more then this, that Justification signifies either the Act or the Terminus, and effect, the Justificare, or Justificari. Can you quarrel at this? Doth God Justifie a man (Active) and yet he is not Justified (Passive)! confess Maccovius, a leader of your fraternity, makes another kind of difference, and will have Active Justification to go many a hundred years before Passive: and much more such fables he hath in his Antinomian Theues of Justification, (which I had once thought to have confuted, but that I considered it is but the same matter that I have here confuted in you, and that other Divines have already...
confuted, as Mr. Burgess, Mr. Woodbridge, Mr. Gere against Crispe, Mr. Bedford against the Antinomians, Mr. Gataker against Salmaëfis, and many more.) As for Keckermann, you quarrel with him to your dishonor, his words are unquestionable, in the sense I mentioned. 1. Vox Justificationis inter dum Active, inter dum Passive significat. Active significat Absolutionem, sive aetum ejus qui Absolvit: Passive vero significat Absolutionem qua aliquis absolvitur, sive receptionem ut sic dicam Absolutionis. Pleraque ejusmodi vocabula Active simul & Passive Significat. Ut Redemption, &c. You may see that by reception, Keckermann doth not mean, Faith, which is Receptio Moralis Activea improripie sic dixta: But our Justification, which is Receptio Naturalis Passiva propriii sic dixta.

As for their common distinction of righteousness into Active and Passive, that is another business, and is taken from the different matter in which Righteousness consisteth, and is commonly used about Christ's righteousness; which I need not say any more about, upon so slight an occasion.

But it is your very great mistake to think that our Divines mean, by Passive Justification, that which you call, the fence of Justification. Till you better understand them, if you will take my Counsel, contradict them no more. Yet I will not undertake to vindicate all: For as others err as well as you, so some that write for the Truth, do write before they well understand the matter, as well as you; and all of us know but in part, and therefore shall unavoidably err in part.

CHAP. VII.

Objections are Answered.

§ 1.

L. C. The only sight of these things that we have brought, might dissipate all Objections: Yet lest we omit any thing that should illustrate so weighty a question, I am willing concisely to answer them also.

§ 1.

R. B. Either you much overvalue your own reasonings, or else I much undervalue them: which if I do, it is not through an unwillingness to see the truth, but from an utter disability to discern any such convincing evidence in your words. Nay I do not think you can more admire that we are not convinced by you, then I do admire how any tender conscience man, that ever soberly read the Bible, and believeth it to be true, can be of your mind! And yet the great experience of my own and others frailty, the darkness of man's intellect, the power of prejudice and self-conceitedness, and the too great paucity of judicious discerning men, doth much abate my admiration: And should I hear even learned men, such as once seemed Religious, as confident against the Deity of Christ, the truth of Scripture, the Immortality of the soul, and the obedience
to God in the use of ordinances, as you are confident of the justification of Infidels qua Infidels, experience hath taught me that the wonder is not so great as I once took it to be. Though you think that the sight of what you have said should be so potent, having viewed all as impartially as I could, I find much smoke, enough to draw tears from a tender eye, to think what toys can delude the Godly, but little light to acquaint us with the Truth. Your whole discourse seems to me to speak with Demosthenes lungs, that do mutium spirare, & parum valere.

S. 2.

L. C. 1. I T is Objected, that justification is put after Vocation, Rom. 8. 30.

Answ. Deservedly is it done, if justification there signifie the declaration or manifestation that we are just. For there is no doubt but God doth work the work of conversion in us, and translate us from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to the Kingdom of God, before that he do fully, and with full assurance intimate and infilt into our hearts that the righteousness of Christ belongeth to us, and that we are indeed in the Kingdom of God.

S. 2.

R. B. Y ou say but if this be the sense; but what if it be not? It is a matter of no thing with you to make a Scripture, or contradict it, in stead of expounding it; and when God saith it is justification, for you to say, it is the assurance of our justification. Will you be content with this one Reason against your exposition?

If your exposition be true, then all that live and dye without assurance of their own justification are certainly damned. But all that so live and dye are not certainly damned; Therefore your exposition is false.

The Consequence of the major I prove thus. All those that live and dye without the justification mentioned in that text, are certainly damned. Therefore if the justification there mentioned be the assurance of justification, as you expound it, then all that dye without that assurance are certainly damned. The Antecedent I prove thus. All that dye without Vocation, and that are not predestinated, are certainly damned; But all that live and dye without the justification there meant, do dye without Vocation, and were not predestinated; Therefore they are certainly damned. The Major you will grant, except you hold that Infidels are saved, while such, as well as justified as such; yea though you do so hold, yet I conjecture that you will not hold that the non-predestinate are saved. The Minor is past doubt in the text, whom be predestinate them be called, whom be called them be justified.

S. 3.

L. C. 2. B ut though to justify here did signifie to impute Christ's righteousness, and to remit sins; yet it would not hinder that calling be here before justification: For the Apostles in reciting God's works do not always observe the order of nature, or of time; so 1 Cor. 6. 11. Sanification goes before justification; and 2 Thes. 2. 13. Sanification of the Spirit is put before the belief of the Truth; what? that 1 Tim.
§ 3.

R. E. 1. It seems then, if the Holy Ghost speak not of things in the same order as they are wrought once or twice, or more, you will never believe that he hath any regard to order at all; and then we must go look for some other Schoolmaster to teach us the order of God's works. There may be great Reason sometime to mention that first, which is wrought last, and sometime to disregard the order; but yet doubtless the Holy Ghost doth teach us that order, or it is not known.

2. And for this text, you call it yourself before, the golden chain; and it is evident that it is the full intent of the Holy Ghost in it, to shew the order and concatenation of these several works; and I think you cannot find another text in Scripture, where 1 is more exactly and of purpose done. If therefore we may not here expect a certain observation of the Order, I think you cannot tell where we may expect it. Would you not think him blinded by partiality that should deny, that from this text we may prove that Predestination goes before Vocation? or that Vocation and Justification goes before Glorification? what then may we think of you, that deny that it can be proved from this text, that Vocation goes before Justification, when the evidence is the very same for the one as for the other.

Moreover I pray you mark one thing, That in this text the person is expressly noted by every one of the precedent acts to be qualified for the subsequent, and so the object of the following act is one that hath received the precedent. Who doth God call? Why the predestinated? Whom doth he Justifie? The Called. Whom doth he glorifie? The Justified. To my understanding this text is so plain against you, that were there no more, I could not be of your opinion, without stronger arguments then you bring.

And withal consider, that this text doth but second the current of the precedent parts of Scripture, which expressly make vocation and faith to be Means to our justification and forgiveness of sin.

Though this much may well serve; yet to the particular texts cited by you, I add this: 1. That in 1 Cor. 6. 11. Calvin saith, expresseth but one thing in the three terms, that is, it was but the Apostles intent to tell them God had delivered them from that sinful state; and therefore there was no need of noting the order of working.

2. I am persuaded that you do think, that Sanctification there is taken for the first work of Special Grace, in giving the seed of the new Life; And if that be so, then the order observed is exact; for we maintain that Justification follows such a Sanctification.

3. A man that disclaims the popish sense of the word Justifying ordinarily, may yet possibly think that this text takes it for a progress in real holiness, and say as Grotius in loc.  Baptizati elitis & deinde accipientis Spiritum Sanctum, & maiores quotidie in Justitia progressas fecisti. Nam ita illud 12899 of hoc loco sumi suadeor ordo, & idem sensus in Apost. 22. 11.

As for 2 Thes. 2. 13. I answer, 1. If Sanctification be taken for the first work of saving Grace, then the order is such as you would desire. Doubtless the Spirit causeth our faith, and therefore its causing work is in order of nature before the effect. 2. But for my
my part, I suppose sanctification is taken as usual in Scripture, either for that change which follows faith, or else for the whole change of heart and life, whereof faith is but the very entrance or first act, and so are distinguished as the Door and the House. And I say that the Apostle here spoke in exact order: for he spoke not of the order of execution, but of intention. God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, i.e. He hath chosen you to be saved or glorified by sanctification, and to be sanctified by faith; when Scripture speaks de ordine ut decreto, as here, when it speaks of election, it observeth oft the order of Intention.

That in 2 Tim. 1, 9, is in perfect order: For by saving is meant so much of salvation as they had before and in Vocation, whereof the latter part is the same as Vocation, q.d. who hath saved us by Christ's satisfaction from being Remedially miserable, and hath also saved us from the sins of the world in which we lived, by calling us to Holiness. Or if you will take salvation for Glorification (which they yet had not) yet the reason of the Apostle's order may be this: teaching them in using God's mercies as motives to Gratitude, to begin at the end which is the greatest, and so proceed to the means, which cannot be fully seen, but in the end first seen.

And for that in 2 Pet. 1, 10, the order is most exact as can be wished. The Apostle is not speaking which was wrought first, but which was to be made sure first: And how should he then speak in better order, then to say, Give all diligence to make your Calling and Election sure: i.e. make your Calling sure first, and thereby your Election. For none can know his election before or without the knowledge of his Calling.

§. 4.

I. C. 2. That of Matt. is objected. This kind of sin shall not be forgiven, neither in this life, nor in that to come.

Answ. That either the Holy Ghost doth speak and deal of mercy here performed, and in the world to come to be declared, as Famous Religions doth interpret it, preëx. 172, 173. Or which is more probable, the sense of the place is, that be that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost shall be punished, not only in this present life, but also at the day of Judgement, and to everlasting: to wit, sin is taken for the punishment of sin, as elsewhere, sin for a sacrifice for sin; and it shall not be forgiven him for ever, is the same, as he shall be eternally punished. Now he that is punished everlastingly, was before adjudged to that same destruction, the wrath of God did rest upon him, and so his sins were before retained; in the like sort, as the Glorification of the faithful is a certain sign that his sins were before forgiven, and that God was reconciled to him before he enjoyed the celestial Glory. For as it may come to pass that the blasphemer may for a time be unpunished, to whom yet at that time God had not forgiven his sins; so may it fall out, that at what time God punished him, yet then God's anger reflecteth not on him, but long before, his sins were not remitted.

* I think it should be, were Remitted.
4. You take no notice at all of the force of the Argument, from the text expounded. The text makes not only Remission after this life, but Remission in this life to be future. It shall not be forgiven in this life, having before said of other sins, they shall be forgiven, and not, they are forgiven. Now let it be only Remission executiva, that is, non punire, or let it be Judicial Remission by sentence that is meant in the life to come; yet that it is Remission by Legal dissolution of the obligation to punishment, which is in this life, I have proved, and shall do further, God willing; so that you have said nothing at all to the Argument. 2. Yet in that which you have said there is a full acknowledgement, that non punire, is not the sole or great Remission of sin, contrary to what you seemed to hold but even now, (for you hold that either non punire, or nolle punire, is the only remission) pag. § 5.

3. Dr. Reignolds in the preceeding, cited, labours to prove against Bellarmine, that neither in this life, nor that to come, means never without intimating any future remission. Your exposition, he shall be punished in this life, and that to come, is good for the latter part, but scarce found for the former. For though all men living are punished in this life; yet the text seems to speak of some more than ordinary punishment for that Blasphemy: which yet is somewhat doubtful, whether God be obliged still to execute in this life, or do execute on such. I suppose the meaning is according to the plain letter of the text. There is as I have said, a threefold Remission: the first, by the Act of Grace, is in this life: The second by the Sentence of the Judge (the full Justification) is after this life. The third, viz.—nor executing the Punishment deserved, is partly in this life, but Principally in that to come. Now Christ faith. He that blasphemeth the Holy Ghost shall not have either the Legal pardon in this Life, nor the sentimental or executive pardon in the Life to come; though whether he have any of the executive Remission in this life, I determine not. Thus it appears how you have quite overlooked the Argument from this text.

§ 5.

And indeed by the solution of this Objection, the support in like manner falls, which are set forth so many places of Scripture, in which they think it proved, that the acts of remitting sins are reiterated; and that God doth pardon sin all our life time, even after a man is endowed with true faith, so that there is no need to fly to the explication before brought, to wit, that God doth daily pardon sin, in that he won’t suffer us the feeling of pardon; or that when we daily ask of God the forgiveness of sin, we only ask the confidence of Remission, and the application of the benefit which is done by faith, and the increase of faith: For seeing almost everywhere in holy Scripture, to remit sin, and to punish, are opposite: it is plain, that to remit sin, and not to punish; and to punish, and not to remit sin, are parallel; and therefore it may well be said that God doth through a man’s whole life forgive him his sins, as much as he doth not punish him: and that we do no less piously and properly ask daily of God remission of sin, because by that Petition we ask that we may not be punished, and that God would not insist on, how faithful soever, the stripes which we deserve. But if a
any time to remit sin, and to punish are not opposite, as it falls out when to punish is not meant of eternal punishment, but of temporal punishment for a particular sin, such as David's in the matter of Uriah, then to remit sin, is not the same as not to punish; but it signified, to declare God to be propitious and benevolent, and that he will not exact eternal punishment. The history of David shows this, to whom, when David had declared that God had pardoned his enormous sin; thereby he would have understood, that David was not fallen from the Kingdom, as Saul, nor from the favour of God, nor that God would require of him eternal punishment: But not that God remitted his sin in that sense, as that he should not be punished for sin in this life. In what sense forever, there was Reason for David to beg remission of sin with cries and lamentations, whether he prayed that God would give him the sense of his favour, or not to be eternally punished, or else begged of God, the removal of the eternal punishment.

§ 5.

R. B. 1. If the solution of an objection not solved can do so much, its strange.

2. What you here add, doth say nothing at all, (nor that before neither) against a new act of pardon, resulting from the Law of Grace, upon every new act of sin repented of. When God makes a Law of-standing Grant, that every believer confessing his sin, and asking pardon through Christ, shall be forgiven. This same Law doth by a new moral action remit every sin after it is committed, on these terms performed.

3. You do in part in this discourse say the same with those that you oppose. And indeed there is more solidity, Judgement and sobriety in this Section, than I have yet found in all your book: For though you do not take notice of the Legal Remission, which is the main, and oft renewed, and which we daily beg in prayer, because prayer is one part of the Condition of our full obtaining it; yet these several truths are well acknowledged in this Section. 1. That besides the Decree of pardon (from eternity, which is no pardon) and the sense of pardon (which is no pardon, further then as it is the removing the contrary sense, which is a punishment, and giving that mercy, whose privation is a punishment), there is also a pardoning in this life by not executing deferred punishment. And indeed every mercy that we receive, is such a pardoning as this. 2. That God may thus renew pardon again and again, as often as he forbeareth, to punish upon our provocations, This is plainly intimated. 3. That we may beg for this renewed pardon, consisting in impunity; which is much more then to pray for merer feeling of pardon. 4. It is implied that God may thus pardon sin more or less in the same pardon, yea the same sin, as he remitteth more or less of the punishment. 5. It is implied that a Reprobate may be pardoned, so far as any punishment in this life is remitted to him: though this be a small degree of pardon comparatively. 6. You confess that God may remit the eternal punishment, and yet not remit all the temporal. This is true, but not only the Antinomians, but some of our own Divines will be angry with you for it. 7. You confess, that our chastisements in this life, such as David suffered are indeed punishments. 8. Yeaz and consider I pray you one consequence of your doctrine here. If David may be punished for sin (as you lay) notwithstanding Christ'sSuretyship and satisfaction; then Christ did not so take the punishment of our sins on him, as thereby to take it totally off from us; 9. Yeaz then all Remission is not ours to nominate, only because Christ dyed for us, without any further act for giving it to us;
else why do we pray for it? 3. Much less can it truly be laid in Law-sense that we obeyed or satisfied in Christ, or that it is equally ours, as if we had done it: For if we had perfectly either obeyed or satisfied, God could not in Justice have punished us (as Triss oft confesseth) : though he might have tormented us, yet it would have been no punishment. 4. And if it stand well with Gods Justice to punish a Da. vid for the sin that Christ hath satisfied for, then as its no found arguing, Christ hath satisfied: therefore the sin be satisfied for is remitted, much let it is co nomine, and at that time remitted, so it may on the same grounds stand with Gods Justice; to delay any actual Remission at all, (which giveth Legal right to Impunity, to the Delinquent) till the Condition of his Covenant be performed. These consequences (destructive to the foundation of Antinomianism) are unavoidable from your own concessions. And indeed this one Section gives me hope that you have yet so much light and Capacity of Truth, as that upon Consideration, you will see your former mistakes.

§ 6.

L. C. 3. IT is Objected, that it is absurd for a man to be justified before he exist.

Answ. Gods actions and acts are conversant even about objects, that yet are not, but are future, and have an esse cognitum * in Gods understanding.

* Or in re: to whom all his works are known from eternity, Aq. 15. 18. and there spee of God: fore men: for example; God imputed to Christ the sins of all the elect, which are, and are to come, as soon as he was promised to be Mediator; though when the promise was made, he was not yet man: In like manner God imputed Christs satisfaction to all, whose sins be transferred upon Christ, whether they were born, or not yet born; and he freed (or discharged) them from imputation of sin, and induced them with Christs Righteousness.

§ 6.

R. E. TThis Section is as unlike the former, as if they had not come from the same man. 1. Either you mean, that all or some of Gods Actions have objects not existent. If so, then nothing more false: Preservation, Deliverance from affections, Vocation, Salvation, Glorification, Afflicting, with multitudes more, are sure about objects that do exist. If you mean it of some of Gods actions, it is nothing to the point, unless you would have shewed us that Justification is one of them, which you say nothing to prove. Gods works are all foreknown; but only as foreknown they are not the objects of all his actions. Gods actions are Immanent or Transient. The former are either most stricly so called, which do not Transire ne quidem objectivo, of which God himself is the object; these belong not to our purpose: or else they are more largely and imperfectly such; when they are objectivo transeunte, & effectivo, (vel quoad effectum) Immanentes, i.e. in sensu negativo. There are either the acts of Gods Knowledge, or his Will (so far as we can conceive of them) Though we must not affirm a real diversit, yet to our conceiving they are distinct, and so denominated from the objects which respect them. Divines are bold to distinguish these thus. (1.) The first of these acts of Gods, (so to our understanding) is his scientia simplicis Intelligents, whereby he knows
knows what is possible, convenient, and what would be upon supposition of such or such causes put: Thus God knew the possibility of our Justification, and its convenience as a means to His Glory, before he decreed it (in the order that Divines have laid the frame.) I suppose this is not the act that you call Justification. (2) Next to this, is Gods will that these or those things shall be, in such a time, and order, and manner. Me thinks you should not mean this act. 1. Because the object of this act is not so much as cognitum ut futurum (for, say Divines it must be made future first by Volition, before it can be known as such), but only cognitum ut possibile; and out of the infinite number of Possibles, it is but a finite number that are willing to be future. 2. Because Futurum is terminus diminuenter quoad esse reale; and therefore to will the Futurum of our Justification, is not to Justifie. (3) Next is placed Gods Knowledge purae visionis: which though one in it self (as are his knowledge and will) yet must needs be distinguished to our understanding from the state of the objects respecting it: And therefore the knowledge of things future, as such, is made the next act. This cannot make for your opinion; both because it is an act of the Intellige, and Justification (as seems to me) in your sense, is an act of the will; and because the object of it is but futurum; and doubtless to know that we shall be Justified, is inclusively to know that we are not Justified.

The next act (the fourth,) is the Will of God de presente verum existentiae prima, which is effective first, and is it which we call creation or the production of anything, and ascribe it to omnipotency, in that God's very Will is omnipotent. This is said to be the same act with his first will de verum futuritione; only denominatione extrinseca differentiated to our apprehension (and so we might as well say of the rest.) As futurum & existens are not all one, so we denominate these acts as not all one. And the three former acts are eternal, but this last we denominate as being in time. I should conjecture that this is not it that you mean by Justification. 1. Because it is not ordinary to mention this with any distinction from the former; most divine calling all immanent acts eternal. 2. Because this hath not for its object a meer esse cognitum, but an esse reale; Gods Will being productive of its object; and it being first the act, before it is properly the object. This therefore cannot be it that you here mean by Justification in this answer. 3. And indeed this concurs in time with the existence of the thing willed, as creatio & creaturae sunt eodem momento. The fifth act of God is his scientia visionis circa objectum iam existentem; most strictly called his intuitive knowledge; which though it be in substance the same with his scientia futurorum (and so are all his Immanent acts) yet as futura & existentia differ, so must we extrinsically denominate these acts as different. By this God knoweth all things to be, that are, (and by the like acts, all things to be past, that are past.) This I suppose is not the Justification you intend, both because it is an intellecual act, and because it follows the existence of our Justification. When the act that you mention, hath only an esse cognitum for its object.

The sixth act of God in order is, the act of his will about objects already existent. This denominatione extrinsecâ is differentiated necessarily from the former; and is Gods Complacency in the goodness of his own works; and his Displacement at the evil of sin. This act makes not its own object as the former, though some School Divines say, omne Dei vellet esse effectivum; but is that described after the Creation, that God Reflected, &c. in other places where God is said to be well-pleased. Now here that Gods will may be said to have on object, 1. Immediate or meretric; as is the Quality of Holiness in the soul, when God either produceth it or loveth it. 2. Remote, such is the soul in which God is producing or implanting that Quality.

As
As for God's creating or causing accidents, I include it in the fourth act, as well as his causing substances. Now I suppose this last is not your meaning neither; for this followeth our first justification. What therefore you mean by that justification whose object is but esse cognitum, I do not know.

You see it is only immanent acts that are about objects as in esse cognitum, and not all those neither; and this is no immanent act. And for transient acts, as you deny justification to be such, so I suppose you will assign them an existent object, either in securi, or in facio esse. The truth is, justification is God's act by his Law of Grace (as is oft said) which containeth in it these several acts; 1. The nearest to the effect is the moral Act of the Law, as a Law or Deed of Gift. 2. The concomitant is the fourth act before mentioned, as applied to this effect. For though it be called by some an immanent act, because it is God's sole, yet by most a transient act, in that it doth produce an effect ad extra. And so denominations extrinsica, we say that God, by the Law of Grace, as his Instrument, doth Volendo produce our justification at that time when it is produced. 3. To this may be added Gods willing that Law which is his Instrument, and his making it; that is, his Legislation; which yet is in time before its effect, and effecteth not till the condition be performed.

4. And Gods approbation or effectual justification immediately follows our being first justified.

Now to your example about imputation of sin to Christ; see how you prove nothing, yea mar your cause by it. 1. It is no Scripture phrase, that sin was imputed to Christ: and though I admit in the sense as our Divines ordinarily use it, yet that sense is not the same in which the Scripture useth the word Imputation. 2. I know he was made sin for us: but that was in time, even when he suffered: for as you before say, sin is put for a sacrificial for sin. I know also that he bore our iniquities; that is, the punishment of them: but that was not before his incarnation.

3. I perceive it is Christ's humane nature not yet existent, which you say God imputed sin to. And then whatever you mean by imputation, it is plain, you cannot mean it, that Christ was made really guilty in his humane nature: For omne accidentes est subjecti: accidenta. Reatus est accidenta. Therefore Guilt could not exist in a subject not existent, nor yet without a subject. All therefore that you can reasonably mean is but this, That the second person in the Trinity, in the Divine nature, having from eternity willed to be in time the Redeemer of the world; did partly from the state of fall man, and partly by God's promise, from that time (and not before) stand related as one that was engaged to assume man's nature in the fulness of time, and in it to be a sacrificial for the expiation of sin, upon the foreconsideration of which sacrifice to be made, God then made a Covenant of Grace with mankind, pardoning them for the sake of that future satisfaction, as having an esse morale by Virtue of the undertakers Consent, and the Fathers Acceptance. This is the truth, and all that you can well mean. And in all this there is no guilt on the humane nature not yet existing, nor any thing like it; If any obligation is to be supposed before the Incarnation, it is only on the Divine nature, and not on the humane.

4. But let us make the best of your Answer (seeing it is your best,) and suppose you argued thus. If Christ might be Guilty of, or punished for sin not yet existent, then so may we be justified from a Guilt not existing: But, &c. Therefore, &c. To which I reply. As you must distinguish between the esse cognitum, and the esse reale, so of the latter you must distinguish between the esse naturale existens, and the esse morale existens. 2. You must distinguish between proper guilt ex obligatione Legis, & ex merito peccati, and improper Guilt ex obligatione spondonis propriis, live de merito. And so
so I say, 1. Christ was never properly and truly guilty. 2. Nor did God judge him to be. 3. Nor did the Law ever oblige him to punishment. 4. It was therefore ex sponte pr opria only that Christ was obliged to suffer, even to suffer what we had deserved, to free us from it. 5. Nor was it the same punishment formally that we should have suffered, in senso naturali vel morali; but only the same materially (and that but in some part), and the Tantiundem vel Equivalens morally. 6. This being so, it appears that it was not the same formal guilt which lay on Christ, that lies or should have lain on any of the elect; much less on each man, as you seem to suppose. 7. If you deny all this, and would suppose that Christ had taken upon him the very Demerit and Guilt of our sin, and not the punishment only, yet consider that his contract or consent to undertake it, might give it an esse morale as to him. And to that punishment, and the mere foreknowledge of it might suffice to procure that consent or voluntary undertaking which gave it the moral being so far. But it will not follow that our sin can be punished or pardoned to ourselves before it is in being—because we have given no such consent to make us guilty, as Christ gave in his undertaking: and without Guilt there can be no Remission; for Remissio est Reatum Remissio. I do therefore deny both the Antecedent and consequent of the formentioned argument.

Further note here, that you make our Guilt and justification before we were to have no more reality than Christ's guilt (or the effect of that which you call Imputation of our sin to him) had in his humane nature before it had a being: But that was none at all, properly and really.

Note also that you make this Imputation to be but from the first promise, and yet before you make it an immanent act, and to be before the world was made.

But the great answer that I give you is this: that your consequence is not found: Though all you lay of God's imputing sin to Christ were true, yet its not true, that in like manner God did then impute Christ's satisfaction to us, nor gave us any discharge from guilt. It was the will of the Father and Son himself that Christ should then suffer for us; and it was their will that we should not be discharged, nor justified thereby till we were in Christ by faith. And the efficacy of Christ's satisfaction can go no further than his own and his fathers will. I shall say more to this argument anon.

§ 7.

Dr. C. S'Halpius's Arguments drawn out at length-highly which he proves that Faith alone justifies, though they directly militate against the Papists; yet because they obliquely rather touch us, though we have some of them to examination.

§ 7.

R. B. I think you feel the Arguments touch you that are brought against the Papists. And though I should think that the Antinomians and they are far enough slander, even in the two extremes, yet I confess I wondered to find Dr. Baily (of whom I made no doubt then but that he was a Papist, as since he hath declared himself) in the conference between the late King and the Marquess of Worcester, to declare himself in the point of justification, in the pure Antinomian strain, according to the very scope of this book of yours.
§. 8.

L. C. Arg. 1. The promise or things promised cannot be received but by faith alone: Rom. 4. 16. Gal. 3. 22. But Remission of sin, Reconciliation, Justification are the promises: Therefore Justification is by faith alone.

Answ. That argument proves nothing but that God's promises are known to us by Faith, but not that they are made by Faith. For the promise is not made by Faith.

§. 8.

R. B. Datur tertium. It proves (supposing the Divine constitution) that the good promised shall not be ours de jure, till we accept Christ as offered.

§. 9.

L. C. Arg. 2. In the same manner as we obtain Remission of sins, are we all Justified: But only by faith in Christ do we obtain Remission of sins: He proves the minor: As we apprehend Christ, so do we obtain Remission of sins: But we apprehend Christ the Mediator by faith alone: therefore by faith alone do we obtain Remission of sins.

Answ. The Major of the second Syllogism is denied: For we do not obtain Remission of sins in the same manner as we apprehend Christ: For we do not obtain, but apprehend Remission of sins by faith.

§. 9.

R. B. We do accept Christ as Lord and Saviour, which is the condition of our actual pardon. The word Apprehend, is too much used by Divines: But they mean not as you, an apprehending that we are already pardoned, but an accepting Christ and pardon as an offered gift.

§. 10.

L. C. Arg. 3. By that which Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us only, by that we are justified: But by faith alone is Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, Rom. 3. 22. 28.

Answ. In these places Paul speaks of God's Righteousness, which by Faith, or by the Doctrine of the Gospel is revealed; But of these places above: Nor doth the Scripture any where say that Christ's Righteousness is imputed by Faith: though by an Accurologie and Synecdoche I would not deny but it may be said that Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us by faith: to wit, as by faith the Holy Ghost gives me a testimony that Christ's righte-
§. 10.

R. E. I have answered all this oft enough. I seriously profess, as much as I am for a toleration of dissenters, if you should live near me, and preach this Doctrine, that you are favored by Faith (much more by obedience) no further than as a testimony to assure you that you shall be favored, and that it had no whit of the nature of a means to the obtaining Salvation itself. Or that we are favored no more by faith then we are elected by Faith (which you seem to intimate) I would avoid you after a first and second admonition, and I would take heed of trusting you, or expecting much good fruits of this Doctrine in your life. But all the hope that I have of the Salvation of many in these times that hold damnable errors, is this: I hope they receive them but speculatively, and that the truth lies nearer their hearts, which is received practically: and to live contrary to their desperate opinions.

§. 11.

L. C. Arg. 4. By what alone we have access to the Father, by that alone are we justified: But only by Faith in Christ have we access to the Father.

Answ. That access to the Father is a second act of faith, which after Christ is revealed in us, is carried to God by Faith and Love.

§. 11.

R. E. The Text cited by Scharpius, is Rom. 5.2., which faith that by Faith we were brought into this Grace; (i.e., state of God’s favor) wherein we now stand. In other places, by access to God, is meant also the Liberty, Favor, and Privilege of drawing near him, and is Reconciliation itself. Your answer is nothing to the purpose.

§. 12.

L. C. Arg. 5. By that only are we justified, by which Abraham the Father of the faithful was justified: But Abraham was justified by Faith alone.

Answ. The rigid assertors of Justification by Faith (say) that the words of the Apostle here are to be interpreted Synecdochically, so as that faith is taken for the Gospel, or for Christ himself the object of our Faith: but seeing the words, he believed, as Calvin witnesseth, is not to be restrained to the bare act of believing, but to the whole Covenant of Salvation and Grace of Adoption which Abraham did apprehend by Faith.
faith, I see not that any thing can be drawn from this place, but that free Adoption was Abraham's true Righteousness, that he believed should here mean he was a Covenant, nor he was in Covenant. And Calvin on the place teacheth, that we do no otherwise obtain Righteousness, then because we do by faith as it were see the possession of it; that is, we obtain Remission by faith; when by faith we see that our sins are remitted by God. Rivet dial., p. 108. taketh faith for the object of faith, and Apologist, p. 57. The Apostle faith that we are justified by faith, or that faith is Impuited for Righteousness, because that is the proper object of faith in the matter of justification, whereby we believe, that God having accepted Christ's satisfaction, doth give us remission of sins, and is reconciled to us.

§ 12.

A. B. This is answered already. 1. Most Interpreters do take faith to mean Christ no other wise then by Connotation, including and principally intending Christ; 2. No man more expressly against you then Calvin. I have before shewed your abuse of him, and seeing you are not ashamed to repeat it, I must needs tell you, that you are a most partial and un worthy handler of Authors, Let the Reader Judge. In the first place, Calvin speaking against them, that to avoid justification by faith, would expound that of Abraham only of a particular justification arising from a particular act of faith, believing one single word of promise about Isaac, he faith, that Verbum credendi non ad particulare aliquod dictum velstringi debet, sed ad totum factum fads & adoptionis Gratiam, quam dictur Abraham fide apprehendisse; that is, objectively; if it ought not to be restrained to one saying of God, as if it were but that one that Abraham is commended for believing, but the whole Covenant. Now what doth this Differtor but say, that Calvin faith, the word Believed is not to be restrained to the bare act of Believing, and so puts out ad particulare aliquod dictum, and puts in ad nudum actum credendi. Did ever Calvin or any man else think that the act can be without an object? Can a man credere et tamen nihil credere?

In the next place, Calvin expressly speaks against his doctrine; yet doth he 1. Leave out the former sentence that fully shews it. 2. Leave out the the middle words of the very sentence which he citeth. 3. And misunderstand even those he citeth, or draw others to misunderstand them. Calvin's words next before are these, Hanc promissionem & fidei Relationem necessarium est ad flatuandum Iustitiam intelligere: quoniam adem est hic inter Deum & nos ratio, quae apud Jurisconsultos inter Datorem & Duxarium: Then follow the words which he citeth. Neque enim Iustitiam aliter confequimur, nisi quia sicut Evangelii promissione nobis defertur, ita ejus possessionem fide qua simp. Where note, 1. He leaves out sicut Evangelii promissione nobis defertur, without which the rest cannot be understood, this speaking of the offer, and the rest of the Acceptance. 2. Puts nisi quia ejus possessionem fide qua simp. as if Calvin by Cernimus meant the knowledge of a Possession before obtained; and as if this Differtor did not know that Possessionem cernere, is to enter upon, or take possession; and the context expressly shews this to be Calvin's sense. Rivet's words speak of Christ connoted by faith, and principally intended by the Apostle, but not as excluding the act of faith; perhaps Rivet excluded it from being any part of the Iustitia imputata; but he includeth it as a Conditio sine qua.
§ 13.

L. C. Arg. 6. They that are not justified but by faith in Iesus Christ, are justified by faith alone. But none is justified but by faith in Iesus Christ, Gal. 2. 16. Therefore;

Answ. Nothing is thence concluded, but that we are justified either by faith, or the object of faith, or as Christ's righteousness is made known to us.

§ 13.

R. B. It is one thing to have Christ's righteousness made known to us, and another thing to have our Interest in it made known. I doubt not you mean the later; and then I must needs say, that both these Interpretations are against so clear light of Scripture Evidence, that it shews your will faulty as well as your intellect: as I have sufficiently manifested, and more shall do, God willing.

§ 14.

L. C. Arg. 7. That which Christ faith he requires alone on our parts to the receiving of his benefits and Grace, that alone and always is faith: but he requireth faith only to receive these, Mar. 5. 36. Luk. 8. 50. Mar. 9. 20.

Answ. Christ doth not require faith that we may be justified, that is, that Christ's righteousness may be imputed to us; but that it may be known to us that Christ's righteousness belongeth to us; for that which receives God's benefits, is not of our righteousness.

§ 14.

R. B. The answer is an express contradiction of the text: Rom. 4. 21, 22, 23, 24.

And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness; now it was not written for his sake only that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed if we believe on him that raised up our Lord Jesus from the dead.

2. To your reason I say, Faith is the condition of our universal Righteousness by Christ; and thereby it self becomes a particular subordinate Righteousness, by which we must stand or fall in judgement.

§ 15.
§ 15.

L. C. Arg. 8. By what we are the sons of God, and have peace with him, by that only and always are we justified; but by faith only have we these. Answ. So far are we said to be the sons of God by faith, as faith declareth that we are his sons.

§ 15.

R. B. Is it not in vain to urge such men with Scriptures? May they not as well say, that what Scripture speaketh of the world's Creation, Christ's death and Resurrection, was all meant only of our knowledge of it, or of an appearance to us? God's faith, ye are all the sons of God by faith; The Difpencer faith, faith only showeth you that you are his sons before; God's faith, He gave them power to become the sons of God, even to as many as believe, &c. The Difpencer faith, He only maketh known that we were sons before. If this be not to profane God's word, and use the name of God against God, I know what is.

§ 16.

L. C. A Greater Objection is brought from the Intercession of Christ; For if Christ daily intercedeth, then justification is not yet finish'd, nor is done in one act.

* Ad Jus. and seeketh that believers be admitted to * a right of the Kingdom, (but regni. not that they may be made heirs of the Kingdom, or believers) and in the mean time that the force and merit of Christ's death be applied to us: For continually are the satisfaction of Christ and his obedience, the price of Redemption so before God's eyes, that God gives us nothing but for the sake thereof; also Christ interceded to excite in us Groans that cannot be uttered, Rom. 8.26, and to offer our prayers and thanksgivings to God; which he doth by making them grateful and acceptable to him: Lastly, Christ interceded to that end, that they who by his satisfaction are righteous, may be conserved in Grace.

§ 16.  

R. B. It had been more policy to have silenced this Objection, then to have thus shamed your cause by such an answer. 1. You say Christ seeketh or petitioneth that Believers be admitted * ad Jus regni; If you will hold to these words in the full proper sense as here without limitation you seem to take them, all is destroyed that you have
have said, and we are agreed. For if by Jus Regni you mean an *Jus ad regnum* Right to the Kingdom, ye, or but include this as part of your meaning, you yield all the cause; I desire no more. For to give *Ius ad regnum* is the justifying act, or at least concomitant inseparably. To *justifie* is to give *Ius ad Impunitatem*, or *Iustum continuare*, i.e. non reum sanc. and then to sentence him accordingly, and then to use him accordingly. The first is justification by faith here, or our first actual justification. Punishment is of loss and of pain; *Pain damni* is our loss of Right to, and enjoyment of the Kingdom (so far as Adam should have had it on his obedience to the first Law.) To remit our *Pain damni*, therefore is to give us *Ius ad regnum*, and so this is a part of justification: so much as Christ hath superadded to what Adam was capable of, is still given with the rest, and never before it; so that it is past doubt, that if Christ do intercede that we may have *Jus regni*, then he intercedeth that we may be justified.

But if you have made this word but a cover for your deceitful erroneous sense, and will say, that you mean not *Ius ad Regnum*, but *Ius in Regno*, you will but plead against Christ's intercession, by which I hope he is pleading for you; And if you dare say (as you seem to drive at it here) that Christ doth not intercede for your Right to the Kingdom, nor for your pardon or justification, you will shew how you advance Christ and free Grace; and I hope elsewhere more fully to manifest your error. Besides, as the Kingdom consibeth in Righteousness, the giving of one is the giving of the other.

3. You say Christ seeketh not that they be made Heirs of the Kingdom. This is another dishonourable derogation from Christ's Intercession, and a falsehood, robbing him of the Glory of his free Grace. You here confest that it is for Christ's merits represented to the Father, that he gives us all things. All that is given us after, or at our believing, must be given for those merits represented, and that representation is Intercession, as you say: Now I shall shew you that we were not Heirs before we were born, or before we believe; Though still I acknowledge that we were destitute to reign before the world was made, and our Right purchased into Christ's hands to dispose of to us in season; and if this were enough to denominate us heirs, then were we heirs before: But this is not enough; seeing an Heir is one that hath a natural or donative Right *in diem*, an actual Right, though not to the present fruition of the inheritance (and though forfeitable) But so have not Infidels: and Scripture doth use the word Heirs as appropriate to Believers at least ordinarily. Gal. 4. 7. If a Son, then an Heir, beareth that these go together: But it is by faith that we have power to become the Sons of God: *Job. 1. 12*. Therefore, &c. *Heb. 11. 7*. Noah by faith, &c. became heir of the Righteousness which is by faith. *Rom. 8. 17*. If Children, then heirs; Therefore not heirs till Children. *Gal. 3. 26, 29*. Ye are all the Children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. *And if ye be Christ's*, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. All Heirs are Abraham's seed, and Abraham is the Father of the faithful, and not of Infidels. *Tit. 3. 5, 6, 7*. He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, &c. That being justified by his Grace, we should be made Heirs, according to the hope of Eternal Life. To a plain man this seems undoubtedly to speak, that justification, and making us Heirs are concomitant or consequent to Regeneration. *Eph. 2. 5*. The rich in faith are Heirs of the Kingdom. *Heb. 1. 14*. Who shall be heirs of salvation.

3. You say that Christ doth not seek that they may be made believers: If you mean;
be doth not intercede that those that are believers already be made believers, I know not to what purpose you mention such a contradiction. But if you mean, as is most probable by your words, that Christ doth not intercede for us before we believe, that we may be made believers, then you take faith to be no fruit of Christ's Intercession: But then why should you think any other Grace, any more than faith, a fruit of it. If it be a fruit of Christ's merits, it must be a fruit of his Intercession; for his Intercession is the pleading for the fruits of his merits. But I hope you will not say Christ's merits procured not our faith; nor yet that we believed before we were born, and therefore needed no Intercession for collation of the benefit.

4. You yield that Christ intercedeth that the force and merit of his death be applied to us. And by merit you must mean, either the thing merited, and by applied, bestowed; or else you must mean the merit is so far applied, as that we shall have the good merited. Now doubtless pardon of sin and justification is the fruit of Christ's merit; therefore he intercedeth that we may have these (for that we had them before, is yet unproved.)

5. You say Christ intercedeth to excite in us unutterable groans. But 1. May he not intercede for pardon too? 2. What must we groan for according to your doctrine? not pardon and justification, for that we had already: And for salvation, if what we do be but signs of our salvation; then our Prayers can be no means: Therefore we may not use prayer as a means to salvation. And for justification, if that be but a sign it self, then the means to that sign is of the least use. So that when you take down the matter of our prayer, then you tell us, Christ intercedes for unutterable groans, that is, groans for comfort.

Lastly, where you say, Christ offers our prayers, It must not be any prayers for justification, nor pardon of daily sin, but for the feeling of it; only for non-punishing I remember you granted we may pray, not seeing how that contradicted the rest. The sum of your answer I take to be a denial that Christ intercedeth for our Remission or justification, which perhaps I shall say more to prove else where.

---

**CHAP. VIII.**

The Testimonies of Divines not of lowest note.

---

**§ 1.**

L. C. That our Zanchy is for the same way of delivering (the doctrine of) justification by faith, is hence evident, in that he also admitth a certain sanctification in the elect before they are born: For on Ephesians 2. 5. He admits a double vivification; one, which is once wrought in our Head Jesus Christ, and in our name; the other which is continually done in this present life; the words are; both must be considered, first in Christ, then in us; as to the first, God quickeneth us
in the person of Christ, when by the death of Christ our sin being expiated, he freed from the guilt of eternal death, and endowed with right of a Celestial and Eternal life, all the elect, as many as were from the Creation of the world, and will be to the end, as members of Christ, considered in them their head.

§. 1.

R. B. **What is the reason of your citing these Authors?** If to make us believe that the ordinary Orthodox Divines go your way, your Title page, and all our knowledge contradicteth you. If to perswade us that at least, Zanchy, Alsediaus and Tossanus were of your mind, the contrary is undeniable, by the larger plainer passages of their writings. If to perswade us that they contradict themselves, that is no great advantage to you?

1. Zanchy speaks here in terms not convenient, and which I will not justifie, because they agree not with Scripture.

2. Yet it is plain that Zanchy means not actual Justification, Liberation, Remission; But that which Amelius calls Virtual. Now though Scripture speak of no Virtual Justification, yet if any man will use that word, and withall open his meaning, that he intendeth not actual justification, but such a Justification as is in Causa only, the effect itself not yet existing, I would not much contend about the word, though such new use of words is dangerous.

3. That Zanchy meant no more, and was in judgement against you, a hundred places in his writings fully prove. The next words to those cited by you, are these: In nobis veri opsis nos Reipae vivificat, hoc primo vivificationis genere, cum donatos sine in Christum, donat etiam Remissionem Peccatorum, & Juslificatione Christi imputatione, & eam Justification. Tunc enim Reipsa Reisset Reaum mortis aeterna, & donamur jure viti celestis aeg Divinae: dicente Christo, Joh. 3.

On the same Chapter ver. 8. he is more full and express, in so much that he faith, Faith receives Grace, and Grace in the adult cannot be without faith.

So on 1 Joh. 1. Loc. de Remiss. he handleth this yet more fully: And to the fourth Question: To whom sins are remitted, he concludes that, Quanquam omnibus hominibus offeritur Remissio peccatorum, ne vera sanae peccata non remittit, nisi Eleis, fidelius, non autem Infidelibus: is qui sunt in Ecclesia, non autem ipsis qui sunt extra ecclesiam. And to the fifth question, By what means sin is Remitted? Having shewed well that all is given in Christ, and none but with him, and that the Gospel is the external Instrument of Donation; and the Spirit the internal (as he calls it,) so he makes mans heart the Instrumentum in quo, and Hearing, and Believing the Instrumenta per quae, of our reception (Though I suppose he ueth the term Instrument improperly, yet it shews his judgement against you fully.) Yea he faith, sine fide Recipi peccatorum Remissio non potest: Though I will not dispute, that he describes justifying faith but too like you, in which more of those times were for you, then are now. To the sixth Question, On what conditions Remission of sins is offered and bestowed; he hath an excellent discourse (which I would those would peruse that think I ascribe more then the reformed Divines do to Works, or other Graces besides Faith.)
Therein he shews that pardon is given on condition. 1. Of true and constant Repentance. 2. Of confession. 3. Of forgiving others. And he very well answers the Objection, that if pardon have all these conditions, then it is not of free Grace. And after page ( nubis ) 53. he faith, Fides impetrat Remissionem omnium peccatorum; and faith that Scripture affirmit absolute, per fidem peccatorum Remissionem impetrare.

And in his Compendium Theolog. page 755. vol. 3. he faith, Quamalihet Sacri iurate sine Filio Dei: hic tamen conditione semper sunt, quamdiu in Mortali corpore habitant, ut sine Pecatorum Remissione constringe nequeant coram Deo; and shews that sins are daily pardoned.

Nay he is so far from thinking that all our Righteousness was received at Christ's death, that he affirmit that our Works themselves are imputed for Righteousness, the sinfulness being pardoned. ibid. Lec. undecima de Justitia p 793.


And in his Christian Relig. Fid. which he commends as the work of his experienced age, cap. 27. Thess. 6. he professeth to believe, that as in Christ only we have Redemption, Remission, &c. so only the elect, endowed with true repentance and faith, and grafted into Christ as members to the head, are partakers of it, though remission be declared or offered to all: And Thess. 2. he shews what it is to Remit sin, and addeth, Et nos cum in oratione petimus remitti nobis debita nostra, non solam petimus nos a culpa abscendi, Et iniquitatem nobis non imputarti, verum etiam petamus & condamnationem nobis propter iniquitatem debitam, condonari, talis, nos statue ne debito liberari. But I have been too long on Zanchy, and therefore will be briefer with the rest.

§ 2.

L. C. Alstedius in the supplement added to the end of Chamiers works, p. 204. when Bellarmine impugned the Sanctity of the Doctrine of Protestants, and produced that Doctrine as the greatest Paradox, to wit, that I am justified by faith, and yet that Justifying faith is to believe that I am just, which, faith Bellarmine, is against reason. Alstedius among other things answritheth, that Christ and the Elect are like one person, and therefore that the Elect are Originally Justified in Christ before God, and at last by faith are Justified, seeing Faith is the Instrument by which the righteousness of Christ is received.

§ 2.

A. B. Alstedius plainly sheweth you that by Justification Originaliter, he meaneth not actual Justification, but taketh that Originaliter, as terminus diminuens, as to actual Justification: which is as much as to say, that the Original vel causa Justificationis jam existit: As when we say, We were eternally Justified.
Justified in God's Decree: the meaning is, we were eternally Decreed to be Justified, that is, we were not justified, or else we could not be predestinated to it.

2. I confess others have spoken too mistakingly of Christ and we being one person in his obedience and sufferings, as if he had been our instrument or Delegate, which is the very foundation of the Antinomian frame, and Allstedius speaks too like them, and in language not fit, but fully shews he is not of their mind in many places.

3. And that he is not of yours, that and many other places fully shew. As for example, Dislin. Theol. cap. 23. §. 37. Fides est prior Justificatione non tempore sed natura: Est enim Causa Justificationis organica: So in his Definit. Theol. de Remiss. & Justifie. & Passim. Yet I confess he speaks, de Justificatione ante tempora, which is but God's Decree to Justifie us.

S. 3.

L. C. Toaffanus Epist. ad Vorstium: You confound Justification with the Application: For all the Elect are justified in Christ, if you respect his merit, before they were born; and so before we believe, we are justified and Redeemed in Christ.

S. 3.

R. B. I have not this of Toaffanus by me, and therefore cannot examine this Allegation, nor is it any great matter.

For 1. I am sure he ordinarily speaks for Justification by faith.

2. It is no wonder to have Divines let fall inconvenient expressions, and strictly irreconcilable; specially about Justification by faith.

3. Nor is it any wonder if this Differantor pervert and abuse the Authors he allledged.

But for these words, as cited, they are but an improper use of the word, Justification. For it is here a diminutive term, as to actual Justification. To be justified quoad meritum, is to have Christ merit our Justification; as to be justified quoad decreto, is to have God decree to Justifie us: But merit being a Moral cause, may go long before the effect.
L. C. Twiss is express, and with him Maccovius, saying almost the same things as he: For thus Maccovius, disp. 8. de Justific. God endoweth none but the Justified with his holy Spirit and with faith: For unless God had so accepted us in Christ, and for Christ been propitious to us, he would not at all have given us effecual Grace, by which we should believe in Christ; therefore also before faith God was reconciled to us; For he gives us not faith, unless he be first reconciled and propitious. What is spoken gives light to these and other Phrases: A man is not Justified but by faith in Jesus Christ. We believe in Christ that we may be Justified, Gal. 2. 16. that we may be Justified by faith, Gal. 3. 24. For the sense of these Phrases is, by that thing which faith apprehendeth, that is, his satisfaction for sins, and his merit, we are Justified before God; that is, we know and feel by faith that we are righteous before God, who hath forgiven us our sins, and given us right of eternal life, for the bloody satisfaction of Christ, and his imputed righteousness; and by much the more faith increaseth, by so much the more doth the feeling of justification, or larger fruit arise, Rom. 1. 17.

You will object. Scripture oft teacheth that we are Justified by Faith, therefore we were not Justified before, but are then Justified when we are endow'd with faith.

I answer from Twiss: that righteousness of Christ was performed for us before our faith, but was not in possession ours as to sense and the knowledge of so great a benefit: For this knowledge ariseth and proceedeth through faith.

Idem disp. 10. A man is Justified before he have faith; and when he is said to be Justified by faith, and by faith to receive remission of sins, and inheritance among the Sanctified, it is nothing else but to know that he is Justified.

R. B. We well know that Maccovius and Dr. Twiss were of the Antinomian faith in this point, and therefore we are not so immodest as to go about to contradict you in that, or persuade the world of the contrary; the same answers that satisfy your arguings, do satisfy theirs.

As for this great Argument of Maccovius: I know it is also Dr. Twiss's Master argument, That God would not have given us faith, unless we were first Pardoned, Justified and Reconciled. And might not the good men have seen easily, that it will as well follow, God would not have given his Son Jesus Christ to die for the world, unless they had been first Pardoned, Justified and Reconciled. And thus Christ must die, only to make them know that they were Pardoned and Justified, (which he might have told them as well from the Pulpit as from the Cross,) and not to Merit it, or to satisfie for their sins. And thus Socinianism, if not Infidelity, is the natural issue of Antinomianism. And all this is, because:
because men will not hold to Scripture, but set up their vain reasonings against it, yea when they have received a false Model or Platform of Theologie in their brains, and then will stretch all Scriptures to speak their sense, and serve their turns.

L. C. Pemble, an Englishman, a man exceeding Reverend, and conspicuous in Doctrine, is of the same opinion, in his work of Justification, page 124. The Elect not yet converted are actually justified, and freed from the guilt of sin, by the death of Christ, and to God reputed and taken them as discharged, and having accepted of satisfaction, is actually reconciled to them.

R. B. I believe there is no such thing in Pemble of Justification at all: But in his book called Vindict Gratia, he hath such a thing, though not at that page (with me) But its known Mr. Pemble was young when he delivered this, (dying about thirty,) and his Treatise of Justification came from a througher consideration of that point, and in that he wholly lays by (and seems to reclalm) his former conceit. For here he industriously proves that Justification is opposite to Accusation and Condemnation, and defineth it, pag. 15. cap. 2. A Gracious act of God whereby he absolves a believing sinner accused at the Tribunal of his Justice, pronouncing him just, and acquitting him of all punishment for Christ’s sake: (Though indeed he is constituted just for Christ’s sake, before he is so pronounced.) And he maintains it, that the condition required in such as shall be partaker of this Grace of Justification, is true faith, whereby unto God hath ordinarily annexed this great Rightilege; that by faith, and faith only a sinner shall be justified, pag. 22. And that the tenor of the Covenant of Grace is, Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved; the condition of this Covenant is faith, the performance whereof differs from the performance of the condition of the other Covenant. Do this and live, is a compact of pure Justice, wherein wages is given by Debt, &c. Believe this and live, is a Compact of free and pure Mercy, wherein the reward of eternal life is given us in favour for (mark for) that which bears the least proportion of worth with it, so that he which performs the condition, cannot yet demand the wages as due unto him in fev'riety of Justice, but only by the Grace of a firer promise, the fulfilling of which he may humbly sue for. This is true and sound Doctrine, pag. 23. and pag. 24. But in that other proposition (a man is Justified by faith;) we must understand all things Relatively, thus: A sinner is justified in the sight of God from all sin and punishment, by Faith, that is, by the obedience of Jesus Christ believed on, and embraced by a true faith; which act of the Justification of a sinner, although it be properly the only work of God, for the only merit of Christ, yet is it rightly ascribed to faith, and it alone, Foral much as faith is that main condition of that
New Covenant, which as we must perform if we will be Justified, so by the performance thereof we are said to obtain Justification and life. For when God by Grace hath enabled us to perform the condition of believing, then we do begin to enjoy the benefit of the covenant: so he adds as the second reason: 2. Faith and no other Grace directly respects the promises of the Gospel, accepting what God offers, &c. By this you may see both that Justification is a consequent of faith, and in what sense faith Justifies, i.e. 1. Directly and formally, as the condition of the Covenant performed. 2. More remotely, as the reason of its Aptitude to that Office, its accepting Relative nature, that is, that it being the receiving of a free gift, was fittest to be the condition of our right to Christ who is given as a free gift. This last (even the nature of faith as faith) is it that is commonly called the Instrumentality of it in Justifying, which is but the secondary, and not the nearest reason why we are Justified by it: and so Pembroke pag. 57. Faith Justifies us only as a condition required of us; and one Instrument embracing Christ's Righteousness; that is, an Instrument improperly so called, not an efficient Instrumental cause.

So that you see Pembroke's more digested thoughts did reject your opinion, which he first entertained.

§ 6.

I. C. George Walker, one of the late delegates from the City of London to the Assembly, a rigid defender of the Presbyterian Discipline, and a most sharp contender for God's righteousness against John Goodwin the Arminian, in his Catechism is express.

Quæst. How are the Elect Justified, and their sins forgiven?

Resp. They are Justified and their sins forgiven by faith, not as it is an Instrumental cause, and a means by which they are constituted righteous before God; but as faith is the hand of the soul, receiving and applying to themselves Christ's righteousness, that hence they may perceive and feel that they are righteous.

Quæst. Can any man be justified before he actually believe?

Resp. If we take Justification in the proper and most principal sense, as it is the act of God alone communicating the righteousness, and satisfaction of Christ with the Elect, then it must be confessed that man is Justified before he perform any act of believing; as is evident in Infants, and those that are not yet called: or by the example of a Noble mans son, who though he have full right to the Possession, yet knoweth not yet his own goods.

But if we take Justification in a secondary sense, for the act whereby the Elect do mingle works with God, receiving and applying to themselves the free gift of righteousness, and possessing it; then actual believing goeth before Justification as an Instrumental cause, by which God Justifies them in feeling and internal perception: But if we take Justification in a Judicial and forensic sense, for Declaration, and proof, and pronouncement; then not only actual faith, but Repentance, and all words of Piety, must go before as Arguments and Testimonies convincing of the Remission of sins.
§ 6.

W. B. [329] Will not seek to take from you the advantage of Mr. Walker's testimony: But as I cannot speak in excuse of it, so I will say but this against it; it is his mistake, as it is yours, and without proof. And for his instance of a Nobleman's Son that hath full right to the Possession, I say, it is destructive to Religion, and contrary to the very Scope of God's word, to affirm that Infidels each have full right to the possession; Yea, or any proper true right: Though I easily grant that they are predestinated to the right and the Possession, and that Christ hath a right by Redemption, to give them a right in season, and so the price is paid already. And I again say, that even of constituting us just before God, and judging us just sentimentally, faith is the means and antecedent, that is, the condition; And how far obedience hath a hand, especially in that last, which Mr. Walker mentioneth, I have shewed elsewhere.

And thus I have perused your Testimonies, wherein I find, some of our Divines first mentioned, you deal scarce fairly with, and the rest are but three or four that were known to be of your side, as different from the rest. And I confess some great Divines speak mistakingly and inconveniently on these points. If I should say, that the Doctrine of Christ's satisfaction, and of Justification, hath been yet scarce clearly delivered by all or most, the differences and controversies among our selves would too evidently prove it. And though I have no mind to credit your bad cause, nor yet to differ any learned Divines: Yet I must confess, that besides Twiss, Maccovius, Pembble, (at first) and Mr. Walker, who are downright for you, I could tell you of more great names that unadvisedly say, Justification is before Faith, on this poor ground, that the Act must needs presuppose the Object: So Polanus in Ezek. and so Chamier himself. Sam. Marefius Colleg. loc. 11. § 58.

Who yet in other places contradict this and themselves. As if it were Justification that were the object of Justifying faith: when indeed it is Christ himself, whom we receive, that we may be justified. Or if you will call Justification the Object, it is not Justification in being, but as offered, that by acceptance it may exist: As if a Prince offer to pardon a Traitor, it is not an actual pardon, but a conditional, that it may become actual, which he accepteth: Though a written pardon be called a pardon, as a written Prayer is called a Prayer, yet it doth not formally act or pardon, till we believe, being but before a conditional grant, which will be actual upon the performance of the condition. And so, I doubt not, God hath pardoned all, in the tenor of the New Covenant, when yet it is not all that are actually forgiven. Objection: Pedei Justificantis est Christus qui perfette potest servare Hh. H 3.
ommnes per ipsum accedentes ad Deum, a me, adeo Deus per ipsum propitius: Remissio pectorum & salus ipso a, quibus applicata, non est Objectum fidei, sed effectus con-
si:quens. And Elenius, Deilis, Gratii, lib. i, § 5. cap. 3. pag. 341.

Cocceius and Clapprothius give you too much countenance, by their misappré-
ensions of the Doctrine of the Covenant. For my own part, I am as willing we
should lay by the words of men (though the unanimous vote of the Church of
Christ till * Ileibus dates, is not contemptible,) as you are, to remit all that ad
tage that we have against you in this kind,
so be it we may try the cause by the plain
word of God. And I much rejoice in his
mercy, that hath made these things so plain
in his word: Were many other contro-
verted points, but need so plainly deliver-
ed as this, I should not doubt but the sad
contentions of the Churches would have
been left about them, and they would have
been as unanimous in them as they are in
this; I am confident, at least, that my
own intellect would be much more quieted
then it is; For, I bless God, in these
matters it is not a little satisfied. And truly, I think, (and its sad to consider)
that it may be said of many Scriptures that speak of Iustification, as I have read,
not only Multinom, but some Protestant Expositors saying of some Controverted
Texts: This Text had been plain, if none had expounded it: And as I have heard
many a one lay of their health: I had been a sound man in likelihood, if it had not
been for Physicians: the curing of a disease which I had but in conceit, hath brought
on me many, which now I have indeed, I think verily, that those Godly Christians
that have by Practical Divinity been brought to savin Grace, and never heard
much of these controversies about the place of faith, compared with Repentance
and Obedience in matter of Remission, Iustification and Salvation, but what
the bare words of Scripture do express, have usually founded apprehensions of
the business then they that have read controversies of it, and thereby have
perverted their understandings by adhering to parties, and making use of alien
unscriptural Notions. And I think the present disturbed, divided, exasperated
Churches, may say as the Emperor Hadrian when he was dying: Turba medici-
corum me perdidit; si pace Doctorum ita dicam, & sempur Salvi, honore Mini-
stry.

FINIS.
The Preface.

Reader,

Think it not inconvenient to give thee some advertisement of the occasion of this writing. Having met with a Sermon of Mr. B. Woodbridge, Pastor of Newbury, for Justification by faith, and against the Justification of Infidels, I saw so much worth in a narrow room, which caused me to bless God that his Church had such a man, and especially Newbury, who had so excellently earned a Pastor before, who had mistaken so much in this very Point; and withall in the Epistle of a small Book that I since printed, to commend it to others: Mr. Eyre of Salisbury was offended it seems at this; and in an Answer to Mr. Woodbridge, newly published, with an Epistle of Mr. Owen prefixed, he was pleased to speak of me, what thou hast here answered.

In his Epistle against me, he telleth us of one Mr. Cranke of Hampshire that hath now in the Press a large and full Answer to my Paradoxicall Aphorismes. The Character that Mr. Eyre gives of this man is, That he is ["a faithful servant of the Lord Jesus, a workman that needs not to be ashamed." This is good news if it be true: for then he will not write so many things that deserve shame, as are in this book of Mr. Eyre's. But by his wish that others ["of more strength and far greater helps"] may by him be provoked to shame, I am afraid what the fruit of his Weakness may prove. I confess I have heard near this twelvemonth, that this man hath been about this work. The last I heard, informed me, that ["he is against the Morality of the Sabbath in Doctrine and Practice notoriously, and one that calls it Legall preaching to Convinced men of sinne and misery, and supposed to be of Mr. Eyre's Judgment for the Justification of Unbelievers"] and that he having communicated it to Mr. Eyre, was gone.
gone with him to London, to print a large Answer not only to my
Aphorismes, but Passages in my other Books; His book about a hun-
dred sheets, and some six Shillings price, having more leaves then
Arguments, but most liberally pouring forth the Titles of Papift,
Jesuite, &c. which is both the Logick and the Rhetorick of it. Also
that he had written to the Eminentest Ministers in severall Counties,
whom he took to be most disaffected to my Aphorismes, to desire
them for themselves and friends to take off his Books, which way is
much by some distasted. I can say nothing of him of my own know-
ledge, nor of his Book till I see it. But if these two men be Brethren
in a party, and Mr Eyre so much the more esteemed, as I hear; the
Reader then may see what to expect by this. I have purposely ha-
fted the Reply to this, that Mr Crandon may before his Book come
forth, consider better of some things wherein he shall finde his Bro-
ther overshott himself, and correct what may tend to his hurt: for
I would prevent his sinne. And I do hereby inform thee, Reader,
that as soon as ever Mr Crandon's Book doth come to my hands, see-
ing the scope of it is to revile me as a Papift, I purpose to print a
plain Confession of my Faith, and specially how much I ascribe to
Works, and how farre I am from Arminianisme also, which these
Brethren do accuse me of, and I shall do it in as little room as I can;
and then shall leave it to thy choice, whether thou wilt bestow six
Pence to understand my true Belief and Profession, or six Shillings
and six weeks reading ( at least ) to have thy ears charmed with the
delicious notes of Papift, Jesuit, Arminian, Socinian, and what not of
that kinde? If I finde the Book worth the answering, I know not but
I may attempt it at large if ever I have time ( which is not like, ) But
if it be according to my information of it, I shall not trouble my self
or thee. It is my lot to be troubled by two sorts of men, commonly
called Anabaptists and Antinomians, because I was called by God to
Vindicate his truth against them. There came but lately to my hands
two of one sort, and the report of a third that are written against
me, Mr Fisher, Mr Hagger, and Mr Keye; but when I found them
fraught with non-sense, and reviling, I laid them by, and never mean
to meddle with them more. Mr Eyre and Mr Crandon take the next
turn: what one hath done I have seen: what the other will do, I
know not but by report. But for my own part, I confess I had a
hundred times rather encounter with this party then the former: Be-
cause I do not apprehend neer so much danger in the opinion of Re-
baptizing, or not Baptizing Infants, as in the other. I confess this also
also hath been strangely followed with spiritual Judgements: But I suppose the main cause is, because it openeth the door to Separations, Contendings, and so Contempt of the Ministry that are against it; but it is hard to see in the nature of the meer Opinions such hainous evils as we have seen attend it. But for the other, in my Judgment they do as dangerously subvert the very tenour of the Gospel as well as the Law (and much more) as any Sect that I have known, that hath such men to countenance it. I confess also that I do apprehend some more duty lie on us now to resift that way, then hath been ever heretofore: For it was formerly a very rare thing to meet with a man of Learning or considerable Judgement, of that way: What men had Dr Taylor to deal with? Dr Crisp, Eaton, Town, were the chiefest Champions since, whom Mr Burges, Mr Geree, Mr Bedford have confuted. At last Den, Paul Hobson, Mr Saltmarsh took the Chair: The later strangely cryed up by many ignorant fools, and his weakness laid open by that Excellent, Learned, Reverend Mr Gataker. But now Libertinism grows into better Reputation. It makes a greater noife in City and Countrey; yea and men of some name for Learning, are the Patrons of no small portion of it. Lately came forth a Latine Dissertatıon of Ludovicus Colvinus, alias, Ludovicus; Molinans Med. Doctor and History Professour in Oxford, written against his own Brother Cyrus Molinans a Minister. I answered it, before I knew the Author; and had no sooner finishe it, but I received this of Mr Eyres. I profess the desire of my soul is so great for the Unity of Brethren and the Churches Peace, that I could heartily with both contendings and dividing Titles as much as may be laid aside: And therefore for those Reverend Brethren that hold but the more tolerable part of Antinomianism, I would not have them called by that name. But for the rest, to be tender of the credit of such pernicious errors, and to indulge them by favourable titles, is plainly to betray the Gospel, and mens souls.

For my part, if I should not preach against the opinion of the Libertines, I could not preach against prophanenesse: When I look back on the Sermons which I preached many years ago, meery to work mens hearts to Christ, never thinking of the Libertine Controversies, I finde they were the very same things that I am fain to preach now against these Disputers. I was feign to prove to them their natural misery, and that before believing they were children of wrath, and all their sins were unpardoned, with the necessity of
Faith, Repentance and Confession, for pardon: and the necessity of faithfull Endeavours for the attaining of Salvation; together with the necessity of Renewing Repentance, and begging pardon through the blood of Christ, when we fall. Lay by all these and such like which the Libertines dispute against, and what have we almost to preach to those that will not have Christ to Reign over them? Truly I finde as farre as I can discern, that most of the prophan people in every Parish where yet I have liv'd, are Antinomians; They are born and bred such; and it is the very natural Religion of men, that have but the advantage to believe traditionally in Christ: I mean, their corrupt nature carrieth them without any teaching to make this use of Christ and the Gospel. And almost all the success of my Labours which hath so much comforted me, hath been in bringing men from natural Antinomianism or Libertinism, to true Repentance and saving Faith in Christ. And therefore should I now fide with them, I must unsay what I have been long saying from the plain word of God, to the ungodly that I have preached to. Blessed be God that the Church hath such writings for plain men to reade, as Hookers, Boltons, Perkins, Dod, Rogers, Whateleys, Hildershams, &c. which are written in a sounder Brain: Yea that we have such writings as Sibbes, Prestons, Baynes, &e. to shew them, that Consciences may be Pacified without Antinomianism.

I am no Prophet; but I confesse I am so confident that the prevalency of this Sect will be but of short continuance, that I do not much fear them. For though nature be ready enough to befriend it, yet two disadvantages they runne upon, that will infallibly dash them all in pieces, as soon as the Storm of Temptation is allayed: First, They contradict the experiences of the souls of Believers; and the very nature of the New-man is against them: The greatest part of the Spirits work on the Soul is against Libertinism, and the rest against Popery and Pelagianism; supposing the prerequisite foundation laid. And surely the workings of the Spirit are unrefustable, and shall bear down these natural conceits before it. The contest between the Gospel and Libertinism in the Church, is like the Contest between the Spirit and the Flesh within us, and goes much on the same terms: and Christ will be Conquerour and bring forth Judgement unto Victory, in both. Sound-hearted Christians, that be not only tickled with Sermons, but sanctified by the Spirit, will not long be drawn from such apparent Truths, and sweet and needfull Duties, by the bare names of Free-grace: nor will they deny Free-grace, and
and the glory of Christ's intercession and Kingdom, upon an empty pretence of magnifying his death; when that very magnifying is but a dishonour. A sound-hearted Christian I am perswaded hath something within him that potently strives against Libertinism and Pelagianism. For example, In prayer, Let a Libertine tell him, [Your sins were all pardoned before you were born, and therefore you must not pray for pardon, but for the feeling of pardon.] He hath a spirit of prayer within, and a secret impulse to bewail his sins, and make out to God for Remission, that will not let him obey those delusions. So if a Pelagian should say [The Power is in thy own Will to please God, and Love and fear him.] The new nature of a Christian doth contradict this, and is inclining him still to beg grace of God, which is a real confession of his own insufficiency. Yea though this Christian should be tainted with either of these Delusions, I am perswaded even while speculatively he holdeth them and talks for them, yet other principles lie deeper in his heart, and are secretly working him a contrary way, even to pray for pardon, contrary to the Libertine, and for prevailing Grace, contrary to the Pelagian.

Another Rock the Libertines run against that will shortly dash them all to pieces: and that is [the clear light of express Scripture.] So plainly hath God been pleased to reveal his mind in these cases, that though a few may shut their eyes by prejudice, most will see: and if they are blindfolded a while, it is not like to be long. If all Disputers fail us, as long as plain honest Christians have but recourse to the Word of God, it will convince them at last, and shew them the Error. For example, in this very Discourse (by one of the rationalest men of that way that I have met with) what plain light doth shine in his face! what palpable abuse is he forced to offer to the Scriptures? So that I dare trust a Reader of any competent judgement and honesty, that is not deeply forestalled, to confute him by the bare reading and observation of the Text. As for instance, That to be justified by faith, is to be justified by Christ, without faith. So pag.42 he expounds Gal.2.16. [That we might be justified by the faith of Christ] i.e. That it might be manifest that we were justified before we had faith in Christ. But that's common: pag.43. That text Rom.8:30. which most exactly and purposely expresseth the order of God's works, [Whom he called them he justified] is put off but thus, 1. The order of words in Scripture do not shew the order and dependance of things, &c. 2. The Apostle's scope here
here is not to shew in what order these benefits are bestowed, &c.

3. I see no inconvenience at all, in saying that the Apostle here speaks of Justification as declared and terminated in conscience, which some Learned men (Mr. Owen and Mr. Kendall) do make the form of Justification. But more grossly, pag. 44. he expounds Rom. 4.24. [Righteousness shall be imputed to us if we believe.] 1. He faith, "The particle [if] is not conditional, but declarative, describing "him to whom the benefit belongs.] Yet one would think that it might hence be gathered at least, that This benefit belongs not to Infidels: But to avoid that too, this is his Paraphrase, "[g.d.Here-" by we may know and be assured that Christs righteousness is im-"puted to us, &c.] The Apostle faith [It shall be imputed, if we be-"lieve.] Mr. Eyre faith [We know by this that it was imputed before.] To put the time past for the time present, and a Declarative for a Conditional, is the way of such bold Interpreters, as make their own faith. But render-condemn' Christsians will not long suffer you so to make their faith, though you may your own.

Besides such Expositions, the Book contains Conclusions so con-
trary 1. To plain reason: 2. To known Truths in Divinity: 3. To the new nature or inclination of Beleevers: 4. To his own profes-
sions; that though itching ears may be pleased by it, and for the
bait of [the name of Free Grace] it may be swallowed down, yet
when Judgement, Affection and Practice should digest it, the hum-
ble soul will vomit it up again. I will give you but a brief touch of his
dealing in the four respects mentioned.

1. Against common reason and use, he affirms that [If it have
any condition, it is not free] and takes Mr. Walkers patronage, p.93.
and applauds and repeats Mr. Kendals gross Discourse, which would
give much more of the honour and thanks to the Beleever, then the
Giver, and repeats his Welsh example, [God bless her father and mo-
ther, who taught her to read.] Yea this gross conceit is the very
soul of his Discourse; by which it may appear how bruithishly it is
animated. But I have proved to him, that a thing may be free that is
conditional. Donatio, Absoluta, Pura, and Gratuita be not all one, or
equipollent terms.

2. And contrary to all found Divinity, pag.134. he affirms that
[Christs death was solusio ejusdem, because Christ was held in the
same obligation that we were under: Gal.4.3,4. he was made under
the Law; not another, but the very same.] Either he means here
[the same obligation to duty] or [the same obligation to punish-
ment.] If the former, what a proof is here that Christ's suffering is salutis ejusdem? When the Law obligeth a man to duty, can you thence prove that it obligeth him to punishment? then Adam before his fall, and Christ as an innocent creature, and the Angels in heaven are obliged to punishment. But its like he means the later: And then 1. It is most unsound and dangerous doctrine, to say no more: Christ's obligation was spousonis propria, the obligation of Contract or Consent, and as a creature of the special command of his Father thereto: Our obligation is violata Legis. Obligation to punishment is guilt; our guilt was Reatus culpa & pena propter culpam, ex obligatione legis: Christ's guilt is but Reatus pena propter culpam nostram, ex voluntaria susceptione. Christ was obligatus ad eandem panem (the same in value) but not, eadem obligatione. 2. And how doth Gal. 4. 3, 4. prove it? Who can think that it means, Christ was made under the curse of the Law? He was indeed made a curse for us by undergoing the penalty; but not said to be made under the curse, nor under the Law as cursing, but as obliging to duty: though its granted that it was part of his humiliation to undertake that task of ceremonious duty.

So pag. 191. he faith, "[Let them consider whether it be more easie for a man that is dead in sinne, to believe in Christ, to love "God, &c. then it was for Adam in his innocency, &c. to abstain "from the fruit of one tree, when he had a thousand besides as good "as that: there can be no condition imagined more facile and fea- "sible then Adams was.] This is against them that say, Evangelical conditions are easier then Legal works. Where he seems plainly to think, that it was not perfect obedience internal or external that was the condition of Life to Adam, but only the not eating of that tree, and so he makes it the easiest thing imaginable. Do you not see how admirably he exalteth the Gospel above the Law, and Christ's easie yoak and burden, and his commands that are not grievous, above that which Adam was under? Is it not admirable to see that these men must needs have the new Covenant to have no condition, left it be not free, and those must be cried down as enemies to free Grace, and Legal Preachers, that teach the necessity of faith and repentance to remission of sinsnes, when yet the more rigorous Law of nature, Do this and Live, the condition of Adam, is the most easie imaginable? And what thoughts hath he of Adams sin, If ye see not the Apostacy from God to the creature, unbelief, and many hainous sins were in it, as well as eating of that Tree? B 3.Against
3. Against all found Divinity, and the very sense of a gracious soul, he hath many doctrines which the godly will be ready to tremble at. As pag. 122. "[That the Elect Corinthians had no more "Right to salvation after their Believing then they had before.] You see in this mans Judgement what we preach for, and what is the state of a natural man, yea of the veriest Rebel, Whoremonger, Murderer, that is Elect : he may have more knowledge of his happiness after, but he hath no more right to salvation then before. Why say our Divines then that such are not in a state of salvation?

So pag. 103. he faith, "[Though men will not impute or charge "sin upon themselves when there is not a Law to convince them of "it, yet it follows not but God did impute sin to men before there "was any Law promulged, or before the sin was actually committed. "For what is God's hating of a person but his imputing of sin, or his "will to punish him for his sin?] Thus Gods preterition or non-

election, called hatred, is confounded with his hatred of Justice and actual displeasure : and God is made to impute sin to the innocent who have no sin, yea to them that are not: When as Imputation of sin is but either the estimation and judging of a sinner to be a sinner, or the adjudication of punishment for that sin, or the execution of that punishment: all which follow the act of sin; and so he makes Gods act of Imputation to be both untrue and unjust: but that indeed he gives the name of Imputation to the eternal Decree, to which God never gave it.

So pag. 61. he faith, concerning all that Christ died for, though yet Infidels and Wicked, that "[Divine Justice cannot charge up-

on them any of their sins, nor inflict upon them the least of those "punishments which their sins deserve; but contrarily he beholds "them as persons perfectly righteous, and accordingly deals with "them as such who have no sin at all in his sight.] What humble soul would not tremble to say this of himself now regenerate; much more of the unregenerate? Must God be unjust if he inflict on us the least punishment for sin? And yet Scripture say so oft that God punisheth his people, in express words? If it be pecna propter culpas, it is punishment: and is none of your pain, losses, crosses, such? Is not the smallness of your knowledge, love, &c. and the remnant of sin, as suffered upon you, a punishment? nor death, nor the bodies remaining in the grave? Are not chastisements a species of punish-

ment? Is not a man punished when he is hang'd for a sin? yea and that by God as well as man? What man dare say, [Lord, if thou hadst
hadst laid the least punishment on my body, before Conversion, even in the height of my sin, thou hadst been unjust? yea or if yet thou do it.] Was there no punishment in the dominion of sin, and the want of the sense of Gods favour, which they make to be the contrary to Remission and Justification? The Lord deliver poor souls from such Doctrines as these! Yea so far as they have grace, so far they are delivered. And I hope Mr Eyre speaks against his own heart, by the conduct of his fancy, and the instigation of his contentious passion.

4. Is it not against his own pretence, that he faith, in his Epistle to the Parliament, "[Though God doth effectually move and persuade men's hearts, yet he doth not Necessitate them to believe; and "embrace the truth.] Would you think and read this that the man were so zealous against the Arminians, when I, who am called Papist and Arminian, do think, that God doth so effectually move men to believe, as thereby to necessitate them? Though still he doth cause us to do it believes, though necessary, and so necessitate us, as that the act is still contingent in itself, as from our will.

So pag. 117. he hath these words, "[I dare say, a more unsound "Assertion cannot be picked out of the Papists or Arminians, then "this is, that faith (taking it as he doth in a proper sense) hath the "same place in the Covenant of Grace, as works have in the Coven-
"nant of Works.] Where mark, that Mr Woodbridge speaks only of the place of faith, and not of the worth, nature, dignity, nor full use, as if it properly or fully had the same office as works, but the same order in the Covenant. And then see 1. Whether this man doth not make Papists of the generality of the Protestant Churches, and Writers? 2. Or make the Papists as sound as the Protestants. 3. Of what credit this man's word is, that ushers it in with such confidence, [I dare say it,] and whether the reason why he dares say that and to many more such things, may not be because he thinks all's pardoned already, even before he believed. 4. He pretendeth Mr Pemble to be of his Judgement; yet see whether he make not Mr Pemble to hold as unsound doctrine, as any can be picked out of the Writings of Papists or Arminians? I may well bear his heavy charge, when Mr Pemble must bear it, who saies, Treat. of Justif. pag. 23. [There are two Covenants that God hath made with man, By one of which, and by no other means in the world, salvation is to be obtained. The one is the Covenant of Works, the tenour whereof is [Do this and thou shalt live, &c.] The other is the Covenant of Grace, the tenour
Whereof is [Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, &c.] The condition of this Covenant is Faith.] And so goes on to shew that the performance and nature of Faith and Works differ; but here gives them the same place of a condition in the Covenant. And pag. 22. he faith, [The condition required in such as shall be partakers of this grace of Justification is true faith, whereto God hath ordinarily annexed this great privilege, That by faith and faith only a sinner shall be justified.] So pag. 206. he ensnares himself in an objection, which he cannot answer, as I doubt not but Mr Woodbridge will fully shew him, when he hath shied what is the adequate object of that Assensus intellectus and amplexus voluntatis which Mr Eyre acknowledgeth. But I must ask pardon of Mr Woodbridge for thus anticipating his work. Reader, do but study God and thy own heart, and keep a tender conscience, and an upright life, and a little knowledge more may preserve thee from being a Libertine.

One thing I forgot, which I now adde, To intreat Mr Eyre and his partakers, to tell me, upon their grounds, Whether God do accept of the Works as well as the Person of an Elect Infidel? If they say, No: How then are they in Christ, and God perfectly pleased with them? and all the sinfulness of those works forgiven? Doth not God accept of that work in which there is no sin imputed? but all-pardoned? nothing but the sinfulness can hinder his Acceptance of it? And where then is their vain distinction (that God is pleased with the person and not the work) by which they answer us when we tell them truly, that Without faith it is impossible to please God? Heb.ii.6.
He Defence of my Praifes of Mr Woodbridges Sermon.
Of my fleighting all Protestant Divines that differ from me, particularly Dr Twiis.
Of my Daring as a Diliator to prescribe what men shall read.

Whether it be true, that with me an Antinomian and an Anabaptist are all one?
About the name Antinomian.
Whether only sins against the light of nature must be punished by Magistrates?
Whether it be no contradiction to have no sin punished but what's against the light of nature: and yet to have a penalty on them that will call men Antinomians? and not on Mr E. for calling Papist?
Whether all the Reformed Churches hold that which I call Antinomianisme?

Several slanders of Mr E. refuted. About Merit and ascribing to works.
Of my saying Christ's satisfaction is Causa fine qua non of justifi
cation.
Gardiner's Positions answered, which Mr E. makes like mine.

Of my Censure of Maccovius and others. Mr Eyres testimonies exa-
mined: Pemble, Rutherford, &c.

Whether I make all Antinomians that deny justification by personal
Righteousness? and whether I be singular therein?

How I deny or hold Christ to be our Material Righteousness? and imputation to be the form of justification.

Of making Christ a Causa fine qua non. More about Merit. Mr E's befriending the Papists.
§. 5.


Mr. E. Arguments against personall Righteousnes in Justification answered. Paul excludes not all works: nor all that Debt which is by free Grace of promise. What justification by Works Paul speaks against.

Whether Protestants acknowledging an Evangelicall inherent Righteousnes, do not co nomine acknowledge that we are justified by it as far as I do?

Mr. E. gives up his Cause, confessing that it is Christ and not we that are the subjects of justification before we are born. No addition to Christ's Righteousnes to be justified by faith or personall Righteousnes in subordination to it. Imperfect faith may be the Condition of the pardon of its own Imperfections. How faith is taken for the object, in the matter of Justification.

§. 6.

Whether I include Works in Faith?

§. 7.

All Conditions are not Morall Causes, nor nor any qua Conditions.

Mr. E. denying Christ's death to be the Cause of God's Justifying, makes it as much a fine qua non as ever I did, and much more. He is desired to expedite. How Christ's death can be the Meritorious Cause rei volitae, without Causing the actum volentis? All the effects of Electing Love are not given, by through and for Christ, viz. as the Meritorious Cause.

§. 8.

Mr. E's uncharitable Censure of Mr. J. Woodbridge. How our Divines deny Dispositions and preparations to Justification.

§. 9.

His urging the invincibleness of Mr. Owens Answer about Reconciliation being an Immediate effect of Christ's death.

§. 10.

His citation of Mr. Strong. Proved against him (which may serve to the like of Mr. Owen) that it is not of necessity that a Condition be quoad eventum unknown to the promiser; and that God hath Conditionall Promises and Threats though the Condition be foreknown as to the event.

§. 11.

Mr. Eyres proved a notorious slanderer, in saying, that the Papists ascribe no more meritoriousness to works: then I do, by the testimony of Bellarmine, Aquinas, and Mr. Perkins, as a tass till I come to Mr. Crandon.

Many grosse passages of his Book are also opened in the Preface.
Reverend Brother,

Lately received a Book of your writing (whereof I had before intelligence by the weekly News book) entitled, [Justification without Conditions, or The free Justification of a sinner] against Mr. Woodbridge, Mr. Crawford, and myself, as Adversaries of Conditional Justification. Your Scope is to prove the Justification of Infidels, or of the Elect before Faith, and before they are men, if I understand you. Methinks, there appears in your lines, much more Piety, Candour and Judgement, than I am wont to meet with in men of your Way; though with mixed discoveries of too much defect, especially in the two last. For my own part, I bless God, I have at last learned to love and honour a Christian as a Christian; and therefore all that are Christians; though they have that with all that is displeasing to Christ, and must be so to me. This Debt I confess I owe you; Christ in you is nevertheless Christ, because of your frailties; and though he delay much of the cure of your distemper, I hope he will in due time accomplish it: and when the remains of your darknes are removed, you will see that truth which now you see not. I ought not to despise you for these infirmities, when I am daily groaning under them myself; and am in the hands of the same Physician; and am so conscious of a necessity of his tender handling. If Christ would not take me with all my faults, and distinguish between his own and mine, between me and my sins, and put up many a thousand provocations, I were lost. And ought I not to honour Christ in you, and see his amiablenes through the clouds of such humane frailties, which you as well as your infallible Brethren, are yet liable to? Yet as Christ loves my sins, never the more (that is, hates them nevertheless) for all his incomprehensible love to me, no more will he allow me to love yours. And as I must not think well of them, so neither must I speak well of them. If I should not mistake that for your sin which is none, I suppose I shall have your free consent to acquaint you with it: And if I mistake not those for your Errors which are none, I suppose you will consent that I warn all those that read your Book, to take heed of them and reject them. For I suppose you are Virtually contrary to those Opinions which you actually hold and maintain, and those Practices which actually you venture to commit. I take it therefore for my duty, as to manifest your Errors with a hatred to them, because they are against Christ; so with Christian charity to your self, because you intended well, and are Virtually for Christ, even when you do
most against him. For I perceive you have a zeal for Christ, though it seems to me, not according to knowledge: And though some of your opinions, I much fear, are destructive of Fundamentals, and would not stand with salvation, if they were fully reduced to practice, yet I perceive great reason of hopes in the rest of your Writings, and by that good which I have heard of you, that you hold them but speculative, and that in the main you live contrary to the natural tendency of your opinions. I remember therefore that I am writing to a Brother that I must live with in Everlasting Glory, where we shall be both of one mind, when we are perfected in Knowledge: I remember that I am Writing against such sins as are pardoned in the blood of Christ; and as will be very shortly renounced by your self, and against which you will be incomparably more zealous then I can now be, and will speak more disgracefully of them then now I must do. If in the mean time you are confident in the dark, and angry with those that would do you good, yea and abuse them who walk not according to your conceits; it is no wonder, considering what man is, even the best of the Saints while they live in the flesh: Being my self liable to the same defects, I crave your pardon, if I shall any way injure you in these following lines.

The substance of your Book I perceive is against Mr. Woodbridge, Mr. Cranford and I are brought in but on the by, but so as that you deal with him but in the beginning, and with me almost throughout. I shall not anticipate Mr. Woodbridge, and therefore intend not the answering of your Book, but to give you a brief account of my thoughts, of so much of it as concerns my self.

Your first onset is in your third Epistle. My title is [A leading man in these times: ] when I have neither worldly advantages, nor eminency of Abilities, nor yet opportunities, to be much Leading to any but my own charge. I live I believe as retiredly as you, cloistered up in obscurity, daily exercised with the chastisements of my Lord, and waiting for my change, and minding little to be the Leader of any, further then to help them to heaven to the utmost of my power. And for leading of men into any Parties, from the Unity of Christians, my soul is possessed with as deep a dejection of it, as of most sins that the world is guilty of. And I think no man did ever yet come to you, and say, that I once laboured with him to bring him to any private opinion of my own: My Writings contain all my fault of that kind, that I know of. And for them, I desire you and all men to understand me, not as peremptorily affirming every thing that I speak in difficult Controversies, to be infallible Verities, but only as giving you my own opinion of it, and leaving you and all Readers to accept or reject it, according to the evidence. If what I speak, have evidence of Truth, you cannot darken it by what you say against my person: If it have none, my person hath no advantage, to make my opinion taking with the world.

The matter which you first charge me with is, my commendation of M. Woodbridge’s Book in the Epistle to my Directions for Comfort. And your self are pleased to give M. Woodbridge your free commendations for the eminency of his natural and acquired parts, even to be as Saul above his Brethren: and that you seem to confine his worth to these, as if in Spirituals the matter were otherwise, will make his cause never the worse before his Judge. You adde that “[It is not to be wondered at that M. B. hath given this superlative encomium to M. Woodbridge’s Sermon; he knew well enough that it would rebound upon himself, M. B., being a son of his own faith, and this notion of his, but a spark from out of M. Baxter’s forge.” Repl. 1. Thus do bad causes hang together, and the sentences of the Oblivious
Oblivious destroy each other. My great imperfections are commonly known: Mr W. you confess to be as Saul above his Brethren: What likelihood then of his receiving these things from me? 2. If you speak of the caute in hand, do you seriously think that I am the first that hath said, that [Infidels are not justified] or that [the Elect are not justified till they have faith.] Think you that Mr W. need to come to such a one as I, to learn that which the Church hath held ever since it was called Christian? 3. Truly I never saw Mr. Woodbridge, nor did there ever a message or word in writing pass between us; Nay (living here obscurely out of the observation of things remote) I had never to my knowledge heard of him, till I saw his Book. But when I did see, ex pede Herculem, I saw such discoveries in it of a clear understanding, which caused me to bless God for such a man, and in special that you had drawn him out into the world; nor am I sorry much for this your Answer to him, as not doubting but it will draw forth yet more of Gods precious gifts, which he is furnished with for his Church: I also much rejoiced in that providence of God which had made him successor at Newbury to Dr. Twisse, giving that people a man so found, and so able to inform them better, in that one point, wherein the Doctor did so mistake. And indeed Sir, I should take it for a great privilege, were I near him, to be the Auditor and Scholar of so judicious a man; and I doubt not you will finde, that he is well able to manifest your mistakes to the world, And I confess I honour him yet more then I did, since you tell me in this Book (which I knew not before) that Mr. Parker was his Grandfather; the name of that man for his Labours and Patience (and especially that excellent Treatise de Difcensu) being very precious to me. 4. And for your intimation of my self-seeking in commending his Book; you know it is our Masters prerogative to be the Searcher of hearts. Do you not know that an honest man may value those most that are of his own minde? Nay must do, ceteris paribus; for else he cannot value a man for the sake of Gods Truth: For did we not take it to be truth, we could not be of that minde our selves. Doth not this raise your estimation of the Learned commender of your Book, and of others whom you oft quote? Would you have envied the praises of Mr W. or his Labours, if he had been of your opinion? Do as you would be done by: Would you have been offended if I had as much commended you and yours?

You add [I suppose Mr. Baxter’s praises or dispraises are not greatly regarded by sober-minded Christians, who have observed how highly he magnifies F. Goodwin with others of his notion, and how slightly he mentions Dr. Twisse and all our Protestant Divines that differ from him.]

Repl. I confess in respect of ability of judging of mens Learning, and the worth of superlative Divines above my reach, my praise is small addition to any mans honour: But whether my conscience be so small that sober-minded Christians neither should nor do regard my words, must be determined by my Judge, to whose blessed and more equitable sentence I am approaching. And so farre as I am guilty of Error or partiality, I beg his pardon (for its according to my Judgment so to do.) For the high magnifying of F. Goodwin which you mention, I desire the time and the words may be considered; and then I think he that would then envy him such commendation, is more partial then I am, though I were as contrary to him as you. I thought it had been only unmanncrly language to my Brethren that I had been blamed for: but it seems its praising them too, if it be against the interest of the adverse party. Have you ever heard me praise him for any evil? If you have, speak it out: If not, give me leave to love a Christian as a Christ-
a Christian, and a mans Parts and Labours so farre as they deserve, and to honour so much of Christ as I see in any. But how plainly do you still confute your self? You intimate that my commending men is because I am of the same minde: and yet you know or should do, that I do in that very place profess my own Judgement to be contrary to that of Mr. Goodwin and the rest there named, and that I only reprehend men for their bitterness and contempt of them. Now Sir, if your conscience will warrant you in such dealing as this, to say I commend men as of my notion, (if you mean mine) even when I purposely express my opinion to be against them, and write against theirs, it is not of the same complexion as mine is, as bad as I am.

And as little truth is there in your words of my slinging Dr. Twis, yea and all our Protestant Divines! Which be the words Sir that are guilty of that charge? For Dr. Twis I have honoured few men living more formerly; and much honour his Name and Labours still; though I rejoice that I am got out of the shore of one or two of his mistakes. You are no Papist I hope; and therefore do not think a man slighted that is not taken to be infallible, or perfect. But of this I have said enough to Mr. Kendall. The rest of your Accusation, (as to all Protestant Divines that differ from me) is either a breach of the ninth Commandment, or else my Tongue or Pen hath some where spoken quite contrary to my heart.

I marvell at your next speech, that "[Mr. W. throughout all his Sermon, never so much as hinted, how or in what sense we are justified by faith.] Whereas he doth it as solidly (in my weak judgement) as ever I read in any Divine? Nay when your self bestow some labour to confute him: Dost he not tell you it justifies us by the way of a condition, though Naturally Active, yet morally as it were Passive, qualifying us for God's free Justification by his Covenant? To this purpose, but more largely, I well remember he speaks. How then durst you lay, and publish to the world, that he never hinted how or in what sense we are justified by faith? Sure Brother, this is not well done.

Next you lay of me, that "[His advice to all Christians to buy one of these Sermons, argues rather his conceit of himself, than his charity to them.] Repl. Both these sins, self-conceitedness and want of charity, are latent in the heart, and by the Searcher of hearts it is that I must be tried, whose high prerogative, my opinion is, you should not usurp. Truly Brother, I have as much reason to value Truth, so far as I know it, as you or other men: and as little reason as many to be byascled in my seeking it. I dare say, I dearly love it, and that the searching for it doth cost me somewhat? If I know it not, it is not because I would not know it if I could. It is my hourly studied, and daily prayers, and if I knew any other lawfull possible way to attain it, how gladly would I use it; though it were to the loss of all I have in the world, or though the Truth were contrary to my former opinions, or though it would subject me to the hatred of my dearest friends! He that knows my heart, knows that I speak my heart, if I know it my self. Nor do I take this for any high commendations; for mans intellect (as participative voluntary) doth Will Truth as its proper natural object. I mean, it would know things as they are (where carnal intent & enmity causeth not the perverting of the soul herein.) And I do not finde in my self the least opposition to your opinion.

Where you adde your reason "[That he dares take upon him the Office of a Universal Dictator to prescribe not only to his Kedermistrians, but to all private Christians]
"Christians what Books they shall reade." Repl. If by [prescribing] you mean [commanding] all men know that I am no Commander, and therefore my commands were more likely to be derided than obeyed. If you mean [advising] Why may I not dare to do that? Is that the work of a Dictator? If I may advise in other points of duty, I know not why I may not do the like in this. I have advised to the reading of other Books (as far, I think, against your opinion) Bolton, Perkins, Hooker, Preston, &c. yet none ever charged me with [daring to prescribe as a Dictator.] However you know my word will not take much, and therefore you need not be so much offended. And for all the distinctions which you are pleased to take as Helvng-bones, I doubt not but to mean Christians, that Book may be profitable: and that may prove happy food to others, which you call Poison.

You add "[As for the title of Antinomianism which he bestows upon our doctrine, it is no great slander out of Mr. Baxter's mouth, with whom an Antinomian and an Antipapist are termini convertibiles."

Repl. 1. To begin with your last because it is the reason of the former: It is written, Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; but shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour and not suffer sin upon him, Lev. 19.17. I perceive by your words that you are Pastor of a Gathered Church (as its call'd) were I one of your near communion, I should openly desire satisfaction concerning these words, not as to my self for the wrong, but as to the Church, that otherwise if you prove impenitent, we might avoid you. My reasons are, because God hath said, Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. And Lev. 19.11. Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another. Deut. 19.18.19. Behold, if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother; then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his brother. And I suppose you would avoid communion with a Papist, and have men so to do. Prov.6.16.19. Six things doth the Lord hate, yea seven are abomination to him: A proud look, a lying tongue, - a false witness that speaketh lies, and him that soweth discord among brethren. Prov. 19.5. A false witness shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall not escape. So ver.9. Prov. 14.5. & 12.17. Rev. 22.24. Without are - and whosoever loveth and maketh a lye. Plal. 15.1,2,3. Lord who shall abide in thy Tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy Hill? He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. Now as to the fact I prove it thus: If with me an Antipapist and an Antinomian be termini convertibiles, or all one, then I take all Antipapists for Antinomians. But the latter is false: Therefore so is the former. All the Churches of France, Belz, Bohemia, Helvetia, Scotland, England, &c. who subscribed the Harmony of Confessions, or owned them: All our Reverend Assemblies that made the late Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and all that own them: All that subscribed the Synod of Dort, I take for Antipapists, and yet I take them not for Antinomians, no nor any man for an Antinomian who believeth any one of all these: Therefore I take not all Antipapists for Antinomians. Again, either you speak of my heart or of my language. For the latter, shew where, or prove when I said that Papists and Antinomians are termini convertibiles, expressly or implicitly, and then call me a flanderer and spare not. If you speak of my Thoughts, J know them better then you, and J profess them to be other wise. Nay in the very particulars wherein I differ or seem to differ from my Brethren, I have received large Animadversions from very many learned Men, and J profess to take not one of them all for an Antinomian. So much for your ground-work. Now to your structure.
As for the term [Antinomian] I confess I think it more fitly applied to the Practice of those whom I have known, of that way, then to their Doctrine: For whereas the name is taken from one of the least of their great Errors, it should have rather been taken from the greater. For my part I heartily wish that among those whose opinions unfit them not for the Communion of Saints, and suffice not to Excommunicate them, all names of Parties or of Reproach were utterly laid aside; and would willingly contribute my best endeavours to that end, and heartily join with you in your motion to the Parliament that a Penalty might restrain such Dividing ways. But yet, while men go commonly under such a name, we can scarce tell how to make known whom we speak of, but by the name or a description equipollent. And I take a full Antinomian to be one that is unfit for Christian communion, as subverting the very substance of Christian Religion. But I confess I think it fitter to call them Antigofspellers, or Antichriftian, or Libertines, then Antinomians: And because it is the old and fit name, hereafter I will use rather the name of Libertines. But for sober moderate men, which are but half Antinomians, holding but the less dangerous part of their opinions, and disclaiming the rest, (though they are shrewdly concatenated) and not seeing that the rest do follow them, truly, as I dare not disaffect them, nor would avoid communion with them, so neither would I have them called Antinomians, further then to themselves to convince them of their participation in that sinfull way, as the name may be used in a course of arguing. And of these I hope you are one: and I hope it is no worse with some of your partakers.

But Sir, methinks you have some very strange passages in your Epistle Dedicatory about these things: I would warn you to search your heart whether the latter part of the second page of that Epistle, be not the venting of pure malice, and a trampling upon men that have more to say against you, then you seem to take notice of. But the thing I mean is this. Your most dangerous doctrine. Your most palpable self-contradiction by word and deed. In the bottom of the third page in your parenthesis "[Nor can I excuse their connivance at any of these evils that are contrary to the Law of nature.] You seem to teath that the Magistrate should punish no other evils; for these words, following a discourse against force in matter of Religion, can bear no other sense that I know of. But is this your friendship to Christ, that you would have the Magistrate be indifferent to him and Mahomet or Antichrift? What? not command the preaching of Christ? and punish the neglect of it in those that should do it? Nor hinder men from preaching against Christ, or calling him a Deceiver, or blaspheming the holy Ghost? not for preaching up Mahomet? Is this your friendship to the Parliament as to draw them into such a guilt, which would cause God to curse them and cast them out, and make their names hateful to the Christian world? Is this your love to the Churches of Christ, that you would have this deluge of guilt and confusion let in upon us? Methinks the very thoughts of such a doleful state of the Church, should make your heart sad! Is this your love to your native Land, to open upon it such a Floodgate of desolation? And is this your love to the souls of men to prostitute them to all deluders? If you think that truth is so discernable to good and bad, that if all may but speak there is no great danger, do but open your eyes and Judge by the experience which these times afford you! You can scarce get men to receive the truth that fear none contradicting it: How much less when they have ten speaking against it, for one that speaks for it, and that with such subtlety as they cannot resist?
Nay, Sir, I had hoped that you who do so let fly at me as a Papist, would not have proved such a friend to Popery. Would you have Popery have Liberty in England again in all the Points of it that are not against the Light of Nature? Truly you shewed me but what I saw before! that all over-doing is undoing! and that none would sooner let in Popery then those that fly to the contrary extreme. But shall I tell you Sir? If once they have full liberty here as you have, I think you will finde, that their numbers and prevalency will cloud your feet, and all the rest of the facts in England. And as very a Papist as I am, I would far rather joyne with you to keep them out; and would intreat you for the Peace of your own Conscience that you would unlay this again, and write a recantation of it to the Parliament.

I would have you also to consider your strange Contradictions to your own words.

1. You would have Names of Obloquy, and in particular that of Antinomians, restrained by Penalties. But is it against the light of nature for a man that is in Judgment against you, to call you Antinomian? If the Religion or doctrine may be tolerated, why may not the Naming of men accordingly? You will allow men to Do Evil, but not to be called Evil Doers? Where the Light of Nature reacheth not the Thing, me thinks it should not reach the Name! He that should judge you a Heretick, and thinks it his duty to make it known, seeth not by the light of Nature that he may not Call you so.

2. May not the Lord Jesus (for whom you seem zealous) have some of that favour from you, or respect, or tenderness of his Name and Honour, which you would have your self? If the Parliament must lay a Penalty on them that will call you Antinomian, I pray you put in one word with it, that they may lay a Penalty on any that will Call Christ a Deceiver, or reproach his Holy Name, or doctrine, or ways; or would set up Mahomet or Antichrist against him; whether this be against the light of Nature or no. At least it is against the light of Nature to despise God: and Christ's faith, He that despiseth you (his Ministers) despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.

3. If all these Names must be restryan by Penalties, then I doubt the Name of Papist must be restryan, and Socinian too: And would you indeed have a Law made to punish all that call men Papists or Socinians? and yet seem so zealous against them. Still the Overdoing Enemies, are the greatest friends, to Popery and other Errors.

4. But how comes it to pass that I must be so frequently with you a Papist, Socinian, Arminian, and yet it is a sin to be restryan by Penalties to the Names of obloquy? But you shew us plainly what kinde of Liberty of Conscience it is that men are now for: A Liberty for them and others to abuse Christ, his truth, and their Brethren: but a restraint of speaking against their reputation. It seems though you speak generally, it was the Name of Antinomian or Libertine that you meant. Truly Sir, though Mr. Woodbridge, Mr. Cranford and I, deserve not so much respect at your hands, yet me thinks the Parliament deserved sounder advice, and better and more careful language of you then this? You should not have bespoke them with such Contradictions and dangerous Intimations.

You proceed with methus [“Let him shew us any one Church or single person, accounted Orthodox till this present age, that did not hold some, yea most of those Points which he calls Antinomianism, and I will openly acknowledge I have done him wrong: otherwise let him be looked upon as a slanderer and reviler.”]
reviler of all the Protestant Churches, who under a show of friendship, hath endeavoured to expose them to the scorn and obloquy of their enemies.

Repl. I willingly stand to your motion: But I must needs say, that the tempter hath much misled you; when he prevailed with you to write these and the following words; and to add impudence to falsehood and slander: for so it is. You should have cited my words which you lay this charge upon, or else I know not what to vindicate; for I know not what you mean. But observe, that the question between us is not, Whether any of the reformed Churches do differ from me in any thing, or, Whether I err therein? But, Whether they hold any, yea most of those opinions which I call Antinomianism? Would you make men believe that all the Protestant Churches are of your opinion? This is to put our men's eyes, and bid them renounce both sense and reason. I will call no man an Antinomian, that doth hold the doctrines of the most imperfect Confession in all the Harmony: Nay, I provoke you if you are able to name one man in the first, second, third, fourth or fifth Century, yea or for a thousand if not fourteen hundred years after Christ, that held any two, yea, one of the opinions which I ever call'd Antinomianism? excepting were some that were notorious Hereticks. Till then, I suppose it is not the Accused, but the Accuser that is reputed the Calumniator till he make good his charge.

You proceed, ['Mr. B. (the better to engage his Reader) tells him his doctrine is of a middle train, as if all the reformed Churches had hitherto been in an extreme, in this fundamental point of our Justification.']

Repl. Though Justification be a fundamental, yet so is not every point that concerneth it.

2. I hope you will not perswade us, that all the Protestant Churches are for the Justification of Infidels! unless it be by taking the name of Protestant Churches from all that will not say as you.

3. What Divine of note can you name, but doth in one thing or other, differ from the greater part? I think but few. Yet we do not for that one Point separate him from the rest. And let me add to the former Section, that if it be proved of any one or more of our Divines, that they hold one or two lesser points of Antinomianism, I think it not fit, therefore to call them Antinomians. I will not call Zanchy a Papist, because he denied the Pope to be the Antichrist: or because of his so much differing John Baptist's and Christ's: nor will I call him an Anabaptist, because he thought that those in Acts 19. were twice baptized, alledging so many Fathers of his minde. The like I may say of many another.

4. No wonder if any doctrine that avoids your extreme be condemned by you: It hath always been so with men in extremes. But the day is coming when moderation and Truth (which lieth between extremes) will be better regarded.

5. As for my [engaging my Reader] which you talk of; I know not whether it discover more of the secrets of your own heart or mine: sure I am you know not mine, but should know your own: And if you speak according to yours, I will speak according to mine, and that this; that I love God's Truth, and therefore would propagate it; and I love men's souls, and therefore would do them all the good that I can: but for any advantage that I aime at to my self by engaging men to me, besides the doing of my duty, I yet know it not. Nay I must needs reckon upon the loss of mens esteem before I resolve to cross them in their opinions.

You proceed like the rest ['I am sure he gives as much unto Works and less unto Christ, then the Papists do.']
Rep. A false witness shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall not escape. Prov. 19.5. Review the texts before cited. Truly, Sir, I cannot think you durst sin thus without shame and fear, if you had not been hardened in security, by thinking your sins were forgiven before you were born! What good will all your arguments do to prove to any man, that your doctrine encourageth not men in sin, while they shall fee you run on in it so boldly? What hear we words for, when we fee contrary deeds? As the Papists have done as much against their religion, by powder plots, Teresa, lying, as by their very erroneous doctrines, among those that judge by such experiences, to have the men of your sect done, to the wonder of observers. Whether your words here be true or not, I shall refer the reader to my reply to Mr. Crandon, whither I refer it.

You add ["He makes works by virtue of God's promisés and covenant, to be meritorious causes of justification and salvation, and in no other sense do the Papists affirm it.

Rep. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. It is a harsh provoking kind of answering, to give a brother a plain mentis: and therefore I love not to deal with those sayings, that will admit of no other answer in terms or sense. If the ninth commandment be law, then this practice of yours is Antinomian. Produce that place; express those words of mine, which may make good this charge. I have ever professed that our best works are not in the least degree meritorious, no not of a bit of bread, much less of justification and salvation. There never fell from my pen such a word as you charge me with, and yet you dare do it. One would think that common wit should have told you, that when the falshood of such passages de fato are discovered, it should redound to your own shame, and consequently to the great prejudice of your cause. Nay I durst not acknowledge any culpability in faith to our justification, and therefore in that point ventured to differ from many brethren: Yet doth this man say, that I [make works by virtue of God's promise and covenant, meritorious causes of justification. And mark what an occasion he takes of this slander. In the 26. Thes. of my Apher. I purposely speak against the doctrine of merit; shewing that properly no works of ours can be called meritorious, but in the end did concede that improperly they may: This I did, because the fathers for many hundred years after Christ used the word merit, in application to their works; and because all our divines that ever I read against the papists, meriment contradicente, do answer that the fathers used the word merit improperly. But these three things I ever professed in speech and writing on all occasions: 1. That no acts or works of ours are meritorious causes of salvation, much less of justification. 2. That therefore the word merit cannot be applied to them, but improperly. 3. That therefore it is not fit to use so much as the word. And though when we read it in the councils or fathers, we must interpret it with a due reverence to them, yet is it fit to be excluded among our selves. Yet should I meet with any godly, sober man of a contrary judgment, that thought the name might be used while he interprets it in the same sense which the reformed churches hold, I would not approve of that man's opinion of the use of the word, but yet I would not for the base word pretend that we are of different religions, or do differ in the thing which he expresseth by that word. I should think it very unjust if I should report all of my brother, which may be said of him improperly. If David say, All men are liars, meaning, not able to help in time of need, and therefore not to be trusted in, as being fallacious; may I therefore call every man that I speak with a liar? What is there that may not be spoken of you truly
truly in Impropriety? But suppose you would have made the worst of my words that malice could have done without express falsehood, should you not then have taken up with my own words, without the addition of your forgeries? I said that [This is Improperly called Merit.] But I never said that [our works are the Meritorious Causes of Justification or salvation.] For as I have still maintained that they are No Causes at all, so in saying that they are called Merit Improperly, I say, they are no Causes Meritorious: no more then a Causa sine quan non is a true Cause, because it is Improperly so called. Nay I never once said, that as to our Justification begun, that works are so much as existent, but always maintained that we are truly and fully as from all sins past Justified by faith, before Works of external obedience are in being.

The next words [and in no other sense do the Papists affirm it.] is another notorious falsehood: which if it were in Doctrinal only, I could answer it with a cold Negatur; but thus to multiply falsehoods one after another, seems a sad practice from a godly man. He might well know, if indeed he know what the Papists hold, that they are of several parties among themselves differing about this Point, yet all of them except Waldensis, or very few more, do maintain the fitness of the word Merit: most assert both Merit of Congruity before Regeneration, and Merit of Condivgity after; and Scotus and a few more that reduce all to the right by promise are rejected by the rest, who affirm a Merit of value or proportion: And our own Divines generally approve of them that hold only Meritum ex parte, as to the thing, denying only the fitness of the name, and that this is any proper Merit. This all Divines know to be true that have read the Papists writings and ours against them. And yet this man did not fear to say, that [in no other sense do the Papists affirm it.] yea and that I [give as much to Works and less to Christ then the Papists:] I shall purposely delay my particular proof of the contrary till I speak to Mr. Crandon.

Nay a little before he saith of me [as he thinks, that the Papists are much nearer the line of truth then any of them] i.e. of all the Protestant Churches. Here are two sins as evident as his sense, viz. false-speaking and uncharitableness.

A little before he said, he [feareth the men of Kedermister are fed but with little better food!] yet did this man never hear me preach, never see my face, and yet can censure my teaching! Nay had he but enquired of me, he might have learned how little I meddle with Controversie in the Pulpit: Or if I did, and did all erroreously, yet I read the Scripture to them, I publish the doctrine of the Creed and Catechism, is all this poison or obnoxious meat as he speaks? Judge of the affection and practice of this man by the Apotheles marks, I Cor. 13. 3, 4 5, 6, 7. and see what Charity he hath: Charity thinketh no evil: But how much of his own surmiseth hath he vented in a few lines? And yet he proceeds as fresh and fearless as before.

For he adds [I must needs say, I never met with that Papist, which calls Christ a pune qua non (i.e. a Cause which effects nothing) of our Justification.] Rep. Would you not think here that the man did intimate that I lay this, and but this of Christ? But mark the Case. In The 56. p. 215. I speak only of Christ's satisfaction, and nor of any other work of Christ: And I say that it hath several ways of Causing our Justification. 1. That it is the Meritorious Cause, I say, I know few but Socinians will deny. 2. That it is also the Principal Cause frase qua non, as Removing Impediments: withall I shew, that I do call it only
only in respect of its Physical operation; but as to Morall Dignity, I plead for its preheminence. Now what doth this man but lay down this word alone, that I call Christ the *causa sine quanon*, and leave out that I call his satisfaction the Meritorious Cause, and allow it the preheminence in Morall respect. Nay mark that himself makes Justification to be from Eternity, and not at all Caused or procured by Christ's death *quoad actum voluntis*, but only *quoad rem volitam*: And let any man tell me what he can possibly acribe to Christ's satisfaction on those terms more then I do in the place that he carps at. Those things that are but *causa sine quanon* in *sensi physic*o, are of singular Morall Causality, and so I shewed that Christ's death is; but that faith is to *causa sine quanon*, as to have no Morall Causality at all, as being but the Accepting of a free Gift. These things are so far from Popery, that they accord with the opinions of his own Patrons, as expressed hereabouts, and yet this man faith he never met with Papist that said so.

He next proceeds to compare my doctrine with some Positions of Gardiners in Foxes Martyrology. I have not the book at this time in my study to examine his dealing, but to his Positions I shall answer particularly, thus. 1. All the effects of Christ's Passion have not a Condition: The satisfaction of Justice, the making of the new Covenant, the sealing it with Miracles, the publishing it to the world, and preaching it now to any Nation or Person, and the first Grace of faith and repentance; all these are given absolutely, and not made over upon any Condition on mans part. But Justification, Remission, Adoption and Salvation, are given Conditionally. 2. His second Position hath its answer in the first. 3. The third is false; for faith is the Condition itself, and not somewhat antecedent by which we must know it, unless he speak of any common faith which helpeth a man to perceive the need of saving faith; or unless he speak of the Condition of our Glorification or Justification as consummated, which is sincere obedience, in subserviency to faith and concomitancy with it. 4. To the fourth, I will believe that faith is the Gift of God, if all the Papists living believe it, and that by this Gift, I do well in believing in order of nature, but not of time, before I am Justified. 5. And so that I do well toward the attainment of Justification; But not of Justification in the Popish sense, which comprehendeth sanctification even in the first act, for so I do not well before it, so any of my actions are Accepted of God in Christ, and their Infinities pardoned; but only as an unbeliever may comparatively be said to Dowell in coming to hear the word, rather then in going to an alehouse. 6. I believe that Faith and Charity thrive together; I am a Papist if this be Popery; that Faith works by Love. I do not think it good doctrine, that to the Attainment of Justification is required Faith and Charity, without limitations and explication: For though a Love to Christ the Object is essentiell to that Faith that must Accept him (for let men say what they will, Christ must be Accepted as Good, and Good cannot be Accepted without Love,) yet Charity usually signifies that Grace, as extended to all other objects of Love, as well as an offered Christ, and so the Proposition is false. Understood of our first being justified, as the word [Attainment] shews it is. 8. The eighth Proposition is false, if only the beginning be free, then the rest is not free. 9. The ninth is answered in the former. 10. The tenth I never heard Protestant deny in *sensu diviso*; I believe that God gives the grace of Repentance to men in deadly sinne, even to all that have it, and I know not else how they should have it; and that this Repentance is a Condition of Justification, in the Pro-
yea but if but if ye a Papist lives; if I had so many to lay down, on condition you could but make it good, that the Papists were no more than this; yea no more then these words of Gardiners in their obvious sense. But if you would be believed in crediting the Papists, you must get you Readers that never read their writings, or that have read none but such as the late Christian Moderator, that tells you by Merit they mean nothing but rewardableness. If you will make all the Papists Orthodox to prove me a Papist, you shall so much your extremities hurt their Cause. For my part, I say again, would I had lost my life so that it were true. I would no more remove from the truth because the Papists own it, then I would deny God because they profess him. And if you can make me believe that the Papists are as Orthodox men as you pretend them to be, you will but exceedingly glad my heart, and now a whit remove me from my own opinion. These be but words to affright such children that receive their faith on the credit of man, and that must know what the Papists hold, that they may be contrary, before they can tell what to hold themselves. These move not men that wait for the Law at the mouth of Christ, and that attend the Spirit for Illumination by the Study of the Word, and go to the Law and to the Testimony, and call no man Master on earth. The worst you can do by such Toys of malice, are but to diminish my reputation, with factionous men, that follow parties for their faith, and know not what the Unity of the faith means, nor what it is to depend for reaching upon Christ. Though these men may be godly and zealous, and such as I dearly love, yet were it not for being made incapable of doing them good, and diminishing Gods interest and their benefit, by the diminution of mine, I think you would not much assault me with these weapons, if you knew how little I value their esteem, when I cannot have it with Innocency and Truth. Brother, I am proud and full the Lord knows as well as others: but yet I can truly say, that I have bent my studies and vigilance against the sin of Pride above most others, for divers years past, and that I have stood so long on the brink of the grave and the door of eternity, that I can with very little trouble bear all the quarrels and contempes of men. How small a matter is it to me to be judged by man, who is daily looking to be called to the barre of God? I am almost out of this wrangling cenfurious world, and know its Gods Aprobation which I must stand by, and then think of me all as you please; if God justifies me, I care not for your condemning me. But you proceed. ["And for his choice notion of Justification by Works as they are our new Covenant-Righteousness, I finde it was a shift of the Papists long ago, &c.] Rep. You are very unfit to parrell the Papists and me, who for outh I perceive understand neither of us. I need not tell Divines that read them the Papists opinion: but for my own I say still that we are justified first, without so much as the presence of Works, and finally without their Caufality: but yet had rather expound James, then deny the truth of his words. Nor do I acknowledge any Universal Righteousness but Christs, consisting in the remission of sins. Only I think not that Christ died to pardon my Faith and Love as such, but to pardon the infirmity of them: to forgive my sins as sins, and not my duty as duty, and therefore that we have a particular Righteousness by which in subordination to Christs as being only the Condition of our Enjoying it, we may be said to be justified. But of these things more fully God willing hereafter.

He adds ["I shall not trace Mr.B. any further, there being now in the Press,
as I am informed, a large and full Answer to his Paradoxical Apo-

rismes, by a

faithfull servant of the Lord Jesus Mr. Crandon of Fawley in Hamp-

shire, a Work-

man that need not be ashamed.]

Rep. Of this book I have spoke in the Epistle enough. Why speak you of it as

a strange matter [as I am informed?] Its long since I was informed of your

being with him at London, as combined together in the same Cause, and pro-

moting each others work; one against Mr. Woodbridge, the other against me.

Your next shewes your modesty, in calling such books ["farre more dangerous

then the Ranters Blasphemous Pamphlets"] and intimating that they are Popifh

and Arminian, and how Reignolds, Whittakers, Davenants, Prideaux would not have

endured them.] Would you make the world believe that these men were of your

minde for the Justification of Infidels? Truly if you will be of the same minde as

these men were, though I may differ from you in some point of Method or Words,
yet I will never oppose you nor write against you, if you will but give me leave to

forbear. My differences with these men are nothing to my differences with you.

 Nay you might have known if you would, that Davenants maintains the Condi-
tionality of sincere obedience to the Continuance of our Justification in the same

terms as I do. And so much to your Epistle. Now to your Treatise.

§ 2.

The first place that I observe you falling on me, is Pag. 35. about Macovinus,

where you say ["Though one of our late writers (Mr. B. App. p. 147.) men-
tions this Doctors opinion with much contempt and ofcitancy, calling his Af-
sertions strange, senseless and abhorred (which is the least to be regarded, seeing
he usually metes out the same measure unto all men else, whose Notions do not
square with his own mold."]

Rep. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. My words of Macovinus
doctrine I refer to the consideration of any that are impartial: for my part I can-
not repent of them, any more then for saying that whoredom or drunkenness are

to be abhorred. But that I [usually mete out the same measure to all men else
whole Notions square not with my mold,] is a grofs untruth, which any man that

converseth with me, and hath read my writings, may quickly know. But lets hear

your proof.

["As Dr. Twis, Mr. Walker, and them that hold the Imputation of Christ's
active Righteousness, whom he calls A sort of Ignorant and unstudied
Divines."]

Rep. Divers more grofs fallhoods in these few words, are added to the rest. I am

loath to call you Antinomian, but if the ninth Commandement be Law, I am sure

you make as bold to break it, if that be Antinomianisme, as most that I have dealt
with. Why did you not quote the place where I [mete out the same measure]
to Dr. Twis? Mr. Kendal accuses me of slapping him indeed? and what is my
language? why I call him [that most excellent famous Divine.] But I judge
him to mistake in saying Remiflion of sin is from eternity: that is, I judge him
not Infallible nor free from error: Thus Protestants abuse all men, and Papifts all
save the Pope and his Generall Councell. 2. For Mr. Walker I confefs I spoke
undifcreetly, as having no call to meddle with him, and I hereby revoke it, and do
repent it, that I intimated him to be Ignorant, and that I medled with his Reviling:

D 2

But
But yet I will take no man for a competent Judge of my fault, that hath not read his Book against Mr. Goodwin, and Mr. Gasquet's Book against him in Defence of Mr. Wotton. 3. It is here intimated, that the cause of my speech was his differing from my mold: that is, as he means my opinions (for indeed the Scripture is my mold: Whereas the reason of my words against Mr. Walker, was his exceeding hard language to his Brethren; which as being against love and peace, I so far reprehended, as to say [He strongly reviled and weakly disputed] when in discourse and Pulpit he had done so much for above 20 years, against such learned, choice servants of God, as Mr. Wotton, Mr. Bradsha, &c. and when in the Press the term Heretick, Blasphemer, &c. are so familiar; and he even proceeds to the Curse of Anathema Maranatha. But what if I spoke unreverently to this Reverend man, in saying he reviled? is it just that I be accused of doing so to all men, or any others, when I never was guilty? 4. Next I am charged with the like, as to ["them that hold the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness."] Another falsity, as thus without limitation expressed: For I there professed to hold it myself, as part of satisfaction, and I hold it as Meritorious of all that higher felicity then the first Covenant gave (if there be any such:) But it was only one fort or sense of Imputation there explained which I spoke against. 5. Another untruth it is, that I [call these, A fort of Ignorant unstudied Divines:] The words are these ["The maintainers of it, beside some able men, are the vulgar sort of unversed Divines, who having not ability or diligence to search deep into it, have found a Controversie, do still hold that opinion which is most common and in credit."] Where I divide those that are for this way into two sorts: some able men, and others the common unversed Divines that take it on credit: And this is a known truth that too many such there are, that to receive even much of their Religion: As if you did not think so your self of the most that are against your particular opinion? Do you not think they go far company against you? So I do not call all Ignorant that go that way, nor any man because he goes that way.

You add to Macovius ["I dare say his Arguments in this particular will not seem so weak and ridiculous as Mr. Baxter makes them, to an indifferent reader"] that shall compare them with the exceptions that he hath shaped unto them. Sharp Censures are but dull Answers.

Repl. I am not desirous to blast the reputation of that learned man, if I were of any power to do it: But I confess his Doctrine in the matter of justification I would have all friends of mine avoid; and I took it for my duty so to tell them: which I know not why you should be so offended at. I suppose you know how the Synod of Dort judged of his harsh language in another cause, wherein he opposed Lubbertus.

And seeing I am thus brought to take notice of the Witnesses that you produce as for your Cause; give me leave a little to review them.

The first is Mr. Pemble: But as Mr. Pemble is for you in his Vind. Grat. so when he came purposely to treat of that subje&, he seems he changed his judgment: For in his Treat. of Justification, he faith as much of that as most of your adversaries; I pray you read him Pag. 15, c. 2. & p. 22, 23, 24, 57. and then you will live boil of Mr. Pemble no more: If he were once of your minde and afterward rejected it, as he seems fully to have done, that is no great credit to i.

Your second is Mr. Rutherford, who you say hath laid as much as any of you. Will you give the Reader leave to judge how far Mr. Rutherford was for you, by these words of his own, written after a fuller knowledge of the men of your Sect; In his Trial
Trial and Triumph of Faith, pag. 55, Serm. 8, he answers these Objections (as against his first words, wherein he affereth that [The condition of the Covenant is faith: Holiness and sanctification the condition of the Covenanters.) This Do was the condition of the Covenant of Works; This Believe is the condition of this Covenant.

[Obj. 1. But some teach that this Covenant hath no Condition at all, so Dr. Clarke and other Libertines.] [Obj. 2. I will put my law in your inward parts, is no condition to be performed by us, but by God only.] [Obj. 4. Believing and obedience is but a consequent of the Covenant, not an Antecedent: so I must believe upon other grounds, but not in way of the condition of the Covenant, for in that tenor I am to do nothing.] [Obj. 5. The Covenant is God's love to man to take him to himself, and that before the children do good or ill, and to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt.] [Obj. 6. Our act of believing is a work, and no work can be a condition of the Covenant of grace: yea Christ alone justifieth: Faith is not Christ, nor any partner with him in the work; yea we are justified before we believe, and faith only serveth for the manifestation of justification to our conscience, for we believe no lie, when we believe we are justified, but a truth: then it must be true, that we are justified before we believe.] These Mr. Rutherford answers as the Libertines Objections. It would be too tedious to recite his Answers, only some of that to the last I will recite.

He faith, p. 59, 60, 61, 62. [Christ alone as the meritorious cause justifieth, and his imputed Righteousness as the formal cause: and this way Christ alone justifieth the Patriarchs, &c. and all believers before they be born, but this is but the fountain ready to wash: but believe it Christ washeth not, while we be foul, &c. nor is his Name Our Righteousness while we be sinners (i.e. unrenewed.) I. Men not born cannot be the object of actual Righteousness; the unborn child needeth no actual application of Christ's eye-salve, gold, righteousness: Now Justification is a real favour applied to us in time, just as Sanctification in the New birth, &c. We cannot be justified before we believe. 1. We are damned before we believe, Joh. 3. 2. He that is justified is glorified, Rom. 8. 30. 3. We are born and by nature the sons of wrath, Eph. 2. 2, 7. Rom. 7, 5, 6. & 6. 14. 4. By faith we are only united to Christ, possessed of him, Christ dwelling in us, &c. 5. This Justification without faith casteth loose the Covenant, I will be your God. But here's a condition, God is not bound and we free: Therefore this is the other part, Ye shall be my people. Now it is taught by Libertines, that there can be no closing with Christ in a promise that hath a qualification or condition expressed, and that conditional Promises are Legal, &c. (Here he rejecteth Conditions, 1. In the Arminian sense, as they are the work of Free-will not acted by the pre-determining grace of Christ. 2. In the Popish sense, as they are meritorious, as work of wages: and so I reject them too.) 6. Paul in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, takes it for granted that Justification is a work done in time, transient on us, not an immanent and eternal action, remaining either in God from eternity, or performed by Christ on the Cross before we believe, and so never taught on him to prove that we are justified before we either do the works of the Law, or believe in Jesus Christ, but that we are justified by faith, &c. and faith is not the naked Manifestation of our Justification, so as we are justified before we have faith: Satisfaction is indeed given to Justice by Christ on the Cross, for all our sins before we believe, and before any justified person who lived this 1500 years was born; but, alas, that is not Justification, but only the meritori-
ous cause of it: that is, as if one should say, This wall is white since the Creation of the world, though this very day only it was whitened, because whiteness was in the world since the Creation.

And that you may know the true nature of Justification, and Mr. Kendall and you may see what others say of the nature of the act as well as Mr. Woodbridge and I, mark the next words: [Justification is a Forensical sentence in time pronounced in the Gospel, and applied to me now, and never till the instant now, that I believe: Its not-formally an act of the understanding to know a truth concerning my self; But its an heart-adherence of the affections to Christ as the Saviour of sinners, at the presence of which a sentence of free absolution is pronounced: Suppose the Prince have it in his minde to pardon twenty malefactors; his grace is the cause why they are pardoned, yet are they never in Law pardoned, so as they can in Law plead immunity till they can produce their Princes royal sealed pardon.] So Serm. 18. pag. 148. [Nay give me leave to say, that Antinomians make Justification and free grace their common place of Divinity, as if they only had seen the visions of the Almighty and no other, but they are utterly ignorant thereof: For they confound and mix what the word distinguisheth, because Justification is only a Removal of sinne by a Law-way, so that in Law it cannot actually condemn.] So pag. 151. [Justification freeth us in this life from all Law-guile and Obligation to wrath, which is but the second act of sin.] So pag. 153. [All which are true, in a Law-sense, and a Legal and Moral freedom from sin, &c., and, For they are in their actual guilt as touching the Law-finds, and power, as no sinners, &c., removed and taken away quoad actudem reatum eternam mortis, in their Law-demerit and guilt, &c. This is a Law-removal of sin.] So oft pag. 154. [passim: & p. 162. speaking of Christ's sufferings: This threefold taking away of sins I clear from Scripture. 1. Christ taketh away our sins on the Cross Causatively, and by way of merit, whereas he suffereth for our sins on the Cross. So Joh. 1. 29. 1 Cor. 5. 21. 1 Pet. 2. 24. Isa. 53. 10. Now this was the paying of a ransom for us, and a Legal translation of the eternal punishment of our sins, but it is not Justification, nor ever called Justification: there is a sort of imputation of sin to Christ here, and a summe paid for me; but, with leave, No formal imputation, no forensically, and no personal Law-reckoning to me who am not yet born, farre less cited before a Tribunal and absolved from sin: When Christ had complearly paid this summe, Christ was Justified Legally, as a public person, and all his seed Fundamentally, Meritoriously, Causatively, but not in their persons. There is a second removal of sin, when the believer is Justified by faith. This which is formally the Justification of the believing sinner, the Believers person is Accepted, Reconciled, Justified, and really translated by a Law-change, from one state to another.] I have been the longer in reciting Mr. Rutherford's words, 1. Because of themselves they suffice to confute your Opinion. 2. Because you so talk of [the Protestant Divines and Churches,] and yet of those few that you produce for you, it may appear what they judge of your Cause. 3. That your allegations may be understood hereafter by your Reader.

Your third Dr. Twiss, and allo Maccovius, I acknowledge are for you in the point now in question.

Mr. Parker's words imply no more then Rutherford's, viz. That in Christ's Justification we were justified causally; but that is a term of diminution, as to the formal Justification; for till it be extra causs it doth not exist: and it is an improper use of the word Justification.
Chamier I have often noted to have some passages that make for your Opinion: but that he contradicted them elsewhere, I think is not hard to manifest. I will not deny the truth for the credit of the man.

Calvin is so express and frequent against you as few men more. I came but now from citing some passages to that end against Ludomannus Colvinus, and therefore will not now lose time in doing it again, when all men that will read his Books may quickly finde that he was no friend to the Justification of Infidels. I marvell rather that you had not cited Zuingerius, who indeed is blamed for leaning that way, and called Seneca by such a Christian name (unless perhaps he was deceived by Hierome, as Hierome was by his counterfeit Epistle, and thought Seneca a believer indeed.) And you might have allledged an inclination in Erasmus for you, who could scarce forbear saying, Sancte Socrates ora pro nobis. Calvin's words mean but this much (which you cite) that seeing God offereth Remission and we do but Accept it by faith, therefore God doing his part in offering it, he faith that respectu Dei Justificationis fit dem precedit, though we are not actually justified till after. For that offer is common to Infidels. In that very Discourse Calvin hath many passages against you: As pag. (milbi fol.) 390. Nos autem meminerimus fidei naturam a Christo asstamandam esse: quia quod nobis offerit Deus in Christo, non nisi fide recipimus. Proinde quicquid nobis est Christus id ad fide remittetur, que nos componet & Christi omnium ejus bonorum facit. Nec aliter verum est illud Johannis, fidem non- stram esse victoriam, qua mundus vincitur, nisi nos in Christum inseruerit qui solus est mundi victor.

Zanchy in the words cited by you useth inconvenient expressions, but that he is fully against you, is manifest in many places of his Writing. But I have newly Vindicatet Zanchy from Ludomannus Colvinus, who urgeth the same words as you do.

So I have done Alstedius too, and therefore shall say no more of him.

So also have I vindicated Amesius against the fame Colvinus: and as for this testimony which you adde more then he, viz. ex Antifynodal. p. 164. his [aliquo modo] in favorem rellitus, by which he there expoundeth reconciliation, is so stretching a word, as may well be yielded true: for it will let in as improper a reconciliation as yours: but yet Amesius will not use the word Justification fo improperly, at least without discovering the impropriety.

§ 3

The next bout that you have with me is pag. 25. when you have done with Mr. Burges. And you there fall on to some purpose, thus: "[Mr. Bux-"ter's character of an Antinomian will bring all our Protestant Writers under "this censure.]

Repl. Still more faheld! Is the ninth Commandment blotted out of your Decalogue, as the second out of the Papists? Or think you that you are under no Law; or that God sees no iniquity in you, to as to hate it?

But let's hear your proof. "[For with him they are Antinomians who hold "(1.) That our Evangelical Righteousness is without us in Christ, or performed "by him and not by our selves.]

Repl. Here are more untruths then one in these words also. 1. I never said "that they who denied this were Antinomians, but that it was a piece of Antino-
mian doctrine, and that the Antinomians did deny it: Nay, left any should think that I accounted all Antinomians that are offended at this; I added [and some that are no Antinomians, &c. p. 109] I call not all Antinomians that hold any one of their doctrines. 2. It is untrue that all our Protestant Writers are against this: (as I have fully shewed elsewhere) yet or any one accounted Orthodox that ever I met with, as to the sense of my words: For though some of them will not allow the name of Righteousness to our faith and obedience (though the Scripture useth it twenty and twenty times I think) and others commonly will call it Righteousness, but will not say that we are righteous or justified by it. (A strange Righteousness that doth not make righteous formaliter, as it is a strange existent whitenefs, that makes no man white, and a strange honesty or goodnes, or nobility, that makes no man honest, good or noble:) yet do all the Protestants that ever I met with yield to my explicable Proposition, which I purposely annexed, that none might mistake me and quarrel about words, viz. [Though Christ performed the conditions of the Law and satisfied for our non-performance, yet it is our selves that must perform the conditions of the Gospel,] i.e., by the grace of God. Who deny this but your own Sect, and a few Divines, that in that point join with you in making the new Covenant to have no Condition: who are but very few indeed comparatively. Nay of the very Libertines, the first that I remember that taught men when they doubted of the truth of their faith or repentance, to comfort themselves with this perfwasion, that Christ hath believed and repented for them, was Saltmarsh; against whom Mr. Gataker hath told you more truth than I perceive you are willing to learn. 3. Here is added to these open untruths a secret malum: For you deliver it in general terms, as if I did hold that which Divines commonly call our Evangelical Righteousness to be in our selves and not in Christ. When as I purposely explained my self, to avoid all strife about words, that as Christ's Righteousness is called Evangelical, because the Gospel reveals it and gives it; so our righteousness Evangelical is without us. This you hide, to make the Reader that seeth but your words to think that I hold some monstrous thing. Be it known therefore to you and all men, That I trust on that Righteousness of Christ which is without me Materially, and formally consisteth in my Right to Impunity and to the Kingdom of Glory; and that I acknowledge no righteousness within me consisting in faith, repentance or obedience, but only a particular Righteousness required by the new Covenant in meer subordination to Christ's Righteousness, as the condition on which it is made ours; which is first in order of nature a meer condition of our full righteousness in Christ, and then secondarily a particular righteousness it self, when the Cause comes to trial. Whether we did perform that condition or not? If you do not understand these few words, I intreat you either to study them till you do, or else forbear any more to reproach that which you understand not: and do not intimate me to be an Infidel, in denying Christ's Righteousness.

You proceed, "[Or (2.) that Justification is a free act of God without any condition on our part for the obtaining of it.]"

Rep. This is in fente the same with the former. Here also is more untruths then one intimated or expressed (I confess they fall so thick from you, that I doubt I shall be thought a railler by your party, and too sharp by others, for numbring them to you, and desiring you to repent.) 1. I only laid that [the Antinomians think grace cannot be free if there be any condition on our part for enjoying it.] But doth it follow, that because I say, [the Antinomians say so] that therefore I say
say [they are Antinomians who do say so.]. The Papists say, Episcopacy is a superiour order to Presbytery: but [they are not therefore Papists that shall so say, unless there be somewhat else to denominate them.] 2. Do not all the Learned men into whose hands your Book shall fall, know that it is false, that the Protestants do hold the opinion which I here call Antinomian? Do not the Confessions of the Churches, and the generality of Divines make faith the condition of the Covenant, and yet maintain it to be free? If you will speak untruths hereafter, for your credit sake, do it more modestly and warily, and open not your shame in the sight of the world. It was no great wisdom in me on this occasion to heap up the Testimonies of Churches and Divines, in a case so well known.

You add, "[Or else (3.) that Justification is an immanent act, and conse- quently from eternity, which was the judgement of Alsted, Pembis, Twiss, Rutherford, &c.]"

Rep. I think there are at least two untruths and a half here too. 1. Whether it were Rutherford's judgement, let the Reader judge by what is written out of him before. 2. Of Alsted I speak as afore I said against Calvinus. 3. It is half true of Pembis, in that he was once of that opinion, and but half true, because in his Treatise of Justification he fully asserteth ours. 4. What are these four men to all the Protestant Writers which you affirmed I would bring under this censure?

You add, "[Or (4.) that we must not perform duty for life and salvation, but from life and salvation: or that we must not make the attaining of Justification or salvation the end of our endeavours, but obey in Thankfulness, and because we are justified and saved, &c."

Rep. 1. In the place quoted pag. 14. is no such thing in any of the four Editions of that Book. But I well remember the sense of most of it about p. 10, or 11, and that I largely prove it in the Appendix of my Apolo. 2. But indeed dare you say, that all (or any) Protestant Writers do hold this Point? Now God forbid! If they did, I protest seriously I would scarce be called a Protestant if they held but that one Error alone. Did not you know in this Point, that not only Learned men, but the common sort of Christians can disprove you? I appeal to all honest men, women and children of understanding, that use to read Dels, Bolton, Perkins, Prids, Hooker, Rogers, Wheatly, &c. What say you, Sirs? Do these Writers preach that you must use no endeavours for your salvation? that you must do nothing for eternal life? Nay do they teach you that the very unregenerate must do nothing to obtain the life of grace? 3. Truly I hoped well in the beginning that you had not been near so far gone your self, as to own this desperate opinion. The Lord keep you from practising it, or I think, you are a lost man. 4. Yet let me tell you, that I further believe, 1 That thankfulness and Love should be the chiefest spring of duty. 2. Yeas even with the unregenerate, our first labour should be when we have convinced them of sin and misery, and the truth of the Gospel, to possess them with thanks and love for that common redemption which I suppose you deny: I mean there is matter in Christ's common love in his satisfaction, for us to plead with sinners for gratitude (before assurance of special love) though they have not hearts to perceive it to purpose, till God open their hearts by his Spirit. 3. The principle of our new spiritual life is it that Christians must act from, in their whole course. Thus far I say we must act from life and love. 4. And also, from God's love antecedent to ours.
You conclude, "[Now let any man who is moderately versed in our Prot-\textit{est Writers but speak on whom this Arrow falls: I might instance in many others, but I will not put the Reader to so much trouble.}

Rep. Now let any man who hath read the ninth Commandment, and the words of Christ, \textit{By their fruits ye shall know them}, judge 1. Whether it be not his duty to lament the sinfull state of this Brother, and to pray God to forgive him (though I know not whether he will pray so for himself.) 2. And to pity poor Christians that shall hear and read the confident words of such men, and have not means to discern their vanity. 3. And judge whether that be not a bad opinion that can entangle even a godly man in such a course of sin: And whether we ought not all to take heed of believing that we were justified before we were born; or that we ought to do nothing for our own salvation; or that pardon is given without any condition, so much as Acceptance. For my part, I impute these faults to the Opinion first, and to the man but as from thence. And it may be God's will to permit him to practice according to the tendency of his Doctrine even in the Book wherein he maintains it, that those that cannot understand his errors in themselves, may see them in their effects.

\textbf{S. 4.}

The next bout that you have with me you begin thus, pag. 29. "[He may if he will compare his doctrine with Mr. Baxter's notions (whom Mr. W. follows at the very heels) Thel. 56, 26, 73, 64. in his \textit{Apb. who denies, That Christ's obedience is the material, the imputation of his Righteousness the formal cause of our Justification, or that faith is the instrument by which we do receive it.}

Rep. What an unhappy name is mine to your mouth, that is seldom mentioned without sin! 1. I did not deny Christ's obedience to be the material cause in the sense as Divines commonly so called it; and therefore not absolutely and without explanation, as you recite it: But 2. As matter is proper to substance, so Justification being an accident hath no matter. Are not you of the same minde? 2. As accidents do inhere in the subject, so the subject is commonly called their matter: In this sense too our Righteousness or Justification passive is not in Christ's Righteousness, but in ourselves, and so our selves are the matter: for I think it is we that are justified. Nor do I believe yet that it is one 

Whereby Christ and we are justified. There is then no other proper matter of our Justification (the latter being not properly so called it self.) 3. But yet as our Divines commonly call Christ's Righteousness of satisfaction the matter of ours, because it is the matter that merited it, so am I well content to do, and so I willingly profess that our rightness is materially out of us, in Christ's satisfaction: and therefore I there said that they speak nearer the matter that call it [the matter of our Righteousness] then they that call it the matter of our active Justification.

1. Your next charge is that I deny Imputation to be the form. 1. I both grant it and deny it, as you understand the words. I did in that place take the word Imputation in one only sense, for Donation, and so said, it was rather in order of nature before Justification, i.e. sentential: and so faith many another. 2. But I would desire you and all men to take notice that those two pages 218, 219. I have
I have much altered, as finding the expressions unfit, and therefore do refer them. And I say 1. That Imputation is taken either for Donation or Adjudication, and that mentally, by mere estimation, or Judicial by sentence. 2. That Juftification is Constitutive, or Sentential. And so I judge 1. That Imputation of Christs Righteousness taken for Donation is the form of constitutive Juftification (Active Donation of Active Juftification, and Passive Donation of Passive Juftification.) 2. That sentential adjudication of Christs Righteousness to us, is the form of our sentential Juftification. 3. And that after the manner of men, or by extrinsic denomination a nonstat objecti, it may be said, that God doth impute righteousness to us by mental estimation or acceptance, or approbation, when he looks on us as then Righteous and not before, and therefore may be said then to begin so to esteem, accept or approve us, because before there was no object for an act of such denomination. And this may be called the form of a mental Juftification. So in all three senses I say that Imputation is the form of Juftification, but not one sort of Imputation the form of another sort of Juftification; which was all that I there meant to deny, but unjustly expressed my minde, as in some other places of that Book, for which I have ever since suppreffed it.

3. How far I deny faith to be the instrument, I refer the Reader to my Reply to Mr. Blake and Mr. Kendall. You a little after could say, You thought I argued rationally in that when it fitted your turn.

You add, "[He plainly ascribes the same kind of Causality to Christ and faith, making them to differ Only sequendum magis or minus, that Christ is the fine qua non principalis, and faith the fine qua non minus principalis.]

Rep. 1. More calumny and untruth. 1. I said [Christ's satisfaction,] you say [Christ:] as if Christ caused no other way but by satisfaction. 2. The word [Only] is your notorious forgery. 3. I did in the same place expressly say that Christ's satisfaction is the Meritorious Cause, and fine qua non, in several respects. 4. It was only in sensu physico that I called it causa fine quanon (and so do your best friends, in sense) but a moral cause, yea of highest dignity I asserted it to be. 5. I affirmed that faith was no moral cause at all. And now let the Reader judge of your Veracity, and whether you recite not my words just as, you know who, is commonly said to have cited Scripture to Christ.

You adjoin in a parenthesis, "[He might have lifted fin in the same rank, which too, is a fine qua non of our Juftification.]

Rep. 1. Everything sine quanon res existis, is not causa sine quanon. Though this have no true causality, yet it is a medium ad finem, and hath a tendency to the effect, by which it doth so far emulate causality that it receiveth the nature. But who ever called privation causam fine quanon? and yet it is Prinicipium fine quanon. Sin in being is the true cause of guilt: and guilt is the materia removenda, or the Terminus a quo of Juftification, it being the very thing that remission doth destroy: even as life doth death, or light darkness. 2. What if you had spoke senfe in this? yet what had it been to the strengthening of your accuation? Would you have your Reader believe that I make fin to be the meritorious cause of our Juftification, or to have that Dignity in moral caufation which I ascribed to the satisfaction of Christ?

Next you say, "[That faith and works in a larger sense are meritorious causes of life and blessedness.]

Rep. Another false witness: I mentioned merit in a larger improper sense: (as
all Divines that ever I read against the Papists on that Point do) but never called them [a Meritorious cause] that I know of. Why would you print such things, which you knew might be discovered? It may be you will say, It is all one. I answer, 1. You should then have said that I speak to that sense, and not that I speak for: Nay you should have put down my own words, and left the Reader to judge of the sense, and not put your own sense on them, and then say, I speak so. 2. It is not all one. For in denying them to be properly Merit, I deny them to be any way causing by that Merit: therefore you feign me to yield to a further impropriety then I did, or else to false doctrine. 3. But will you go tell the world what is my Judgement, because I take the word Merit in the Fathers in a larger improper sense? Christ called Peter Satan, for his carnal counsel: Will you determine thence that Christ judged Peter to be the devil? David was a worm and no man in improper sense: Must he needs be last by you for speaking false doctrine in so saying? Will you accuse Christ of Error for saying, He is the Vine, and his Father the Husbandman? He is the Way, the Door, the Shepherd, &c? The word Reward is oft enough used in Scripture, and so is the word [Worthy: :] and yet you conclude they are both used improperly: And will you therefore say that Christ was a Papist, or Socinian, or Erroneous, for using those words improperly? Having spoken so much to your Head, let me say this to your Heart: Brothers, you engaged your self in Baptism to fight against the devil: your life is or should be a con inual combat against him: How comes it to pass then that you have so learned his accusing art, when you should have learned of Christ to be holy and to love your brother, and to speak the truth? I do seriously advise you to repent of these wares, and to belive you whether your opinions encourage you not here to. If you reject this wholesome advice, take heed that it rise not up against you in Judgement, and if you proceed in such couries impenitently, take heed left those sins prove unpardoned hereafter, which you say were pardoned before you believed or repented or were born. Because I desire it may not be so, therefore do I warn you.

Pap. 30. you say, "[Too many of our Protestants (setting aside the word "Merit, which yet M'B, thinks may be admitted) do tread directly in their steps; they ascribe as much to works as Papists do.]

Rep. 1. It seems then other Protestants are as much Papists herein as I, in sense, though not in word. 2. Another slander you are guilty of (I say Guilty, for all you lay is pardoned before committed.) Did ever I say [The word Merit may be admitted.] Shew where if you can. I said indeed that in that large improper sense. [Works may be called Merits,] thereby intending no moral admission of it: but only a capacity in the term, to signify such a thing by improper use. But I never said that it is no sin in them that do use words so improperly, or that [it may be admitted.] For my part, I think the danger is so great, that the very use of the word is to be avoided by us, except in Interpretations of others, or with them that will use it whether we will or not; and so we must speak to men in their own language sometime, or say nothing. 3. Better men then you or I, have used the word Merit, even the Church of Christ, the Councils and Fathers for 1400 years and more: And Austin that most eminently vindicated the glory of free grace, yet never disused this word himself. If I have sinned therefore but as all the Church hath done so long, and in its spring, I hope I am no Papist. 4. I would again have you and all men take notice how these Overdoing men are the greatest Undoers. How could this man credit Popery more almost then he doth? As bad
as I am (which is bad I confess) yet if he could make all my neighbours believe that Papists be such as I, he would do more to make them Papists, then such arguments as this Book contains would undo. And I think some Rulers that now may be in the minde to deny Papists the liberty of their Religion, or at least of preaching to others, they grant them both, if they thought that the Religion of Papists were no worse then mine; So the argument would run thus; R. B. is a Papist: But he should have liberty: Therefore Papists should have liberty. But yet this is not that I aim at: But that he should place Papists in a thing which the Church hath used for so many hundred years, even as high as any Ecclesiastical History or Writings can give us light, is not this the way to make all turn Papists, and say, Hath Christ had no Church but Papists so long? then we will be Papists too: For sure the Head had still a Body. Well, when God will heal his Churches divisions, he will teach men moderation.

§ 5.

The next assault I meet with is p. 50, 51. [§ 5. "Some of our late Divines (who seem to disclaim the doctrine of the Papists and Arminians) say the very same; who explain themselves to this effect. That faith doth justify as a Condition, or antecedent qualification, by which we are made capable of being justified, according to the order and Constitution of God: The fulfilling of which Condition say they are our Evangelical Righteousness, whereby we are justified in the sight of God. Mr. Baxter is so fond of this notion, that although in one place he finds fault with the length of our Creeds and Confessions, yet he would have this made an Article of the Creed, a part of our Children's Catechism, and to be believed by every man that is a Christian, so apt are we to smile upon our own babies."]

Rep. More of the old language still: 1. Is this the very same [as the Papists and Arminians hold, which you say it is the very same with, viz. that God for Christ's sake accounts our imperfect faith, to be perfect Righteousness? You know they take not [perfect Righteousness] for Righteousness only that hath a formal Metaphysical perfection of Unity as I do. You say [Their opinion is, that God in the Covenant of Grace requires faith which in his gracious Acceptation stands in stead of that obedience to the Moral Law which we ought to perform.] But I say that Christ's satisfaction is instead of that obedience, in that it is in stead of our suffering for disobedience. You credit the Papists and Arminians still, if you can prove that their opinion is the very same with this. Do they renounce Merit? and do not our Divines generally make that the point of our difference about Justification by Works? viz. Whether the merit of Good Works justify, which I heartily and constantly deny.

2. I have told you before, that I say, that we are no otherwise justified by the Evangelical Righteousness in question, then in necessary subordination to Christ's own Righteousness, as the Condition of our Legal title to it, of his own appointing. This you conceal.

3. It is another fiction, that it is this Notion that I would have an Article of the Creed (if you mean the Notiones secundae, yea or the primum directiis.) For I told you that I spoke of the Matter and not the phrase: It is the substance of the doctrine, viz. That we must believe our selves, and not think we may be excused, as having
having a Saviour that hath believed in himself for us.

4. For my part as I am confident it is implied in the Creed, so it shall be my Creed while I breathe, by the grace of God. And I think Christ put it into the Creed if ever he made a Creed: sure it is the summe or principall heads of the Gospel which he sent his Disciples to preach to the world, and I think that is part of the Creed: and what that was is evident, Mar. 16. 16. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned. And it was the Creed that was taught them before baptism: and that was, Repent and Believe for remission of sins.

You add ["Though I honour Mr. Baxter for his excellent parts, yet I must suspend my Assent to his new Creed."]

Rep. 1. No newer then the Scripture, nor elder then Scripture, for it is as old as the Covenant of Grace. 2. I had rather be without your Honour, then you should be without the Truth: not that I much care whether you be of my opinion, as such; but that I care for your salvation. But my hope is, that though you take not faith to be a Condition of Salvation, yet you do Believe on other Grounds; and if you have that which is the Condition, I doubt not but you may be saved, though you know it not to be the Condition: And if you think you may not Endeavour for Salvation, yet if you do endeavour it, and act for it, while you say the contrary that it may not be done, I doubt not of your safety, because you hold that Practically which you deny Speculatively. But I must tell you, that he that thinks, though but Speculatively, that he ought not to do it, is in great danger of being drawn to omit it.

You proceed ["I shall prove anon that faith is not said to justify as an Antecedent Condition, which qualifies us for Justification, but at present I shall only render him the reasons of my disbelief, why I cannot look upon faith as that Evangelical Righteousness, by which we are justified. I shall not insist upon it, though it be not altogether unconsiderable, that this notion is Guilty of too much confederacy with the forenamed enemies of the Christian faith: For though it is no good argument to say, that Papists, Socinians, &c. do hold this or that, therefore it is not true; yet it will follow that such and such tenets have been held by Papists, &c. and unanimously opposed by our Protestant writers; therefore they ought to be the more suspected, and especially such tenets of theirs, as have been the chief points in difference between us and them, as this is."]

Rep. 1. I shall as readily suspect such points as bear your description, as you.

2. It is untrue that this is such, quod terminos, much more quod sensum. All our Divines maintain an Inherent Righteousness, and in the same sense as they (so far as I understand them of chief note) do deny them to justify us, I deny it too.

You add ["Our Brethren that have started this Notion, do take faith as the others do, in a proper sense, they attribute as much to the credit, as Beller- mine, Arminius, or any other. Faith itself (faith Mr. B.) is our Righteousness: There was never any Papist so absurd as to say, that our Faith, Love, &c. are perfect legal Righteousness; but that God judicio misericordia, non justitia, doth account and accept of it instead of perfect righteousness. For my part I must confess that I can see no difference between them but in expressions. The Papists do acknowledge the satisfaction of Christ, and that he is the meritorious Cause of our Justification. They say indeed that we are not justified by the Righteousness of Christ Imputed, but by a Righteousness inherent in us, or righ-
righteous actions performed by us. And what do our Brethren say less than this?

But I shall follow this parallel no further.

Rep. 1. What do they say less than this, who maintain Imputed Righteousness, viz. less then those that deny it? I'll put another question upon this of yours: Whether a Question can be false? A Logician will say, It cannot be false; and yet a Divine will say, It may be mendacium; and yet both say true: Is not that strange!

2. I desire the Reader to excuse me from the trouble of enumerating all the untruths in these lines (for I am weary of that work, and its to little profit,) and to expect my full satisfaction to this Parallel, in my Reply to Mr. Cran- don (if God will,) where I shall show him whether I be a Papist or an Arminian: and whether his tongue and his brothers be any slander.

You proceed [§ 6.] The Reasons which turn the scales of my judgment against this Notion, that our faith or faithfull actions, are that Evangelical Righteousness, by which we are justified, Are

Rep. Before I weigh your Reasons, I will do the Reader that favour which you deny him, viz. To let him know a little better the state of the Question, and what it is that I maintain.

Understand therefore Reader, that I hold these Conclusions (which I shall fuller open, God willing, in Reply to Mr. Cran- don.) 1. That God's Universal Law of Nature required of us perfect Obedience, on Pain of eternal death if we perform it not. 2. We all sinned, and so were liable to that Death. 3. Christ became the Mediator, and kept between us and the full execution, and took the penalty upon himself, and became a sacrifice to offended Justice, and a Ransome for the sinners. 4. Upon this he acquired Novum Jesu Domini et Novum Jesu Imperii over all men; being now the Sovereign of the world as Redeemer, as superadded to the former Dominion and Sovereignty which the Father, Son and Holy Ghost had as Creator. 5. As Christ the Anointed and Sovereign Redeemer, he made Legem Remediamentem, An Act of Oblivion, A new Law, viz. A Law of Grace; whereby Granting free pardon, Justification, Adoption, and right to Glory to all that will sincerely Repent and Believe in him; and Peremptorily Concluding those to everlasting death that will not. 6. This Repenting and Believing is nothing but Affenting to heartily to the Truth of the Gospel, a thereupon to Accept the Lord Jesus Christ and Life in him, as he is offered, viz. As a pardon er by Gracefull Content and Confidence, as Good to us, by Love; as Sovereign by giving up our selves to him for Guidance, and to take him for the Physician of our souls, to rest on him, and apply his sharpest plasters and take his bitterest medicines, and which are most ungrateful to fresh and blood (and not to believe that the cure is done already;) and, as a free gift we must accept this Grace, with confession of our own utter un deserving, and our defect of eternal wrath, and therefore with Repentance to the glory of him that freely saveth us: and lastly, as he is the Purchaser, Giver, and Conductor to the unseen everlasting Glory, which is the great End for which we do receive him; without respect to which End, faith were no saving faith. 6. Remission and Justification by Christ's Satisfaction and Merit, being given us by a New Law, which hath its Precepts and Penalty, we are obliged by this Law to perform these Conditions, and shall be judged by this Law, whether we have performed them or no. In which judgement, he that is accused not to have performed them, i.e. to be an unbeliever and Rebel against the Lord Redeemer, must plead his own actual performance, and deny the accusation. And therefore that performance is the Justitia causa, the righteousness of that
that his cause, and of his person so farre. 7. In respect to this personal New Covenant Righteousness, the Scripture doth twenty times, if not twenty more, call men Righteous: yea even in the description of the Judgement, Mat. 25. last. 8. As this New Law is but Lex particularis Remediis, properly subordinate to the Law of Nature, so this personal Righteousness, is not our Justitia universalis, but a particular Righteousness, subordinate to the Righteousness of the Lord Jesus. 9. There being therefore a twofold Jusfification or Righteousness, principal and subordinate, one which answers the Law of nature, the other which answers the false charge of not performing the condition of the Law of Grace, one in Christ's Satisfaction and Merit, the other in our faith and repentance, one consisting in the Pardon of all our sin and the Right to Impunity and the Kingdom; the other in our having the true condition of pardon and right; It follows that when the question is of Jusfification in the first sense, and of the matter (as we call it) of that Jusfification, i.e. the thing for which we are justified meritoriously, that we must then conclude that it is only Christ's Righteousness that is our Jusfification or our Righteousness; and that faith or repentance is not the least part of it: But if the question be only of the more subordinate Righteousness and Jusfification, then we must say that our own faith and repentance, and not Christ's Satisfaction is that Righteousness: For it is a debating of Christ's Righteousness, to bring it so low; and it is no other exalting of faith then God hath in his Covenant exalted it, to raise it so high, as to be thus subordinate to Christ's Righteousness, that it may become ours. 10. In regard of the first great Jusfification of a sinner consisting in Remission of sin (constitutive) and sentential absolving him from guilt, Faith or any work of man is but the condition fine quason, and not the least part of that Righteousness (as is said) But in regard of that subordinate Jusfification which is but a means to the former, faith and repentance are our Righteousness itself, so that faith is first in order of nature but a condition; but secondarily, when the case at Jusfification is, Whether we have performed that condition or not, then consequentially it is our subordinate particular Righteousness. 11. No man can perform this condition without God's special grace. 12. It was the intent and absolute Will, yea and undertaking of Christ dying, to cause all the Elect of God infallibly to perform this condition. Thus Reader I have anticipated some part of what I intended to say in my Answer to Mr. Cranham, as being unwilling to delay thy information, or be guilty of the continuance of thy prejudice against the truth. I confess I have lately received Animadversions from Learned men, against the thing here laid down, viz. a personal Righteousness; but God's Word is so plain and mens reasons against it in my eyes so weak, that I am more then ever confirmed in it. I equally hate vain distillation and confusion: But to distinguish between the Law of nature, and the Law of grace, between Christ's Righteousness imputed, and the condition of Imputation, and so between our primary Righteousness and our subordinate Righteousness, I think are no vain distinctions. Let's make it plain by a similitude. In a time of Rebellion, upon the Princes intercession and satisfaction, An Act of grace is granted, that whoever will acknowledge the Princes favour and the Kings, and Accept a pardon, shall be forgiven and shall not die. Is it not one thing here to accuse a man as a Traitor, and another thing to accuse him of not accepting the pardon? and are not these two causes referring to two Laws? yet one subordinate to the other, and not coordinate. When he is accused of Treason, he is justified by the Act of Grace: and this is his Titulus ad Liberationem, But
when it is but one Traitor of many that Accepteth the Act of Grace, and he is accused of non-acceptance, and the cause to be decided fals to be this, Whether the Act of Grace give that man any Right to Impunity? then because it was a conditional act, he must be here justified by pleading that he did perform the condition. And so that Justification which is but subordinate, and in order of dignity but secondary, as a means to the former, is yet in order of Plea at Judgement to go before it, as the means must be before the end.

If thou be unprejudiced, Reader, and lovest the truth, I should think that I need not say much to Mr Eyre's Arguments, having given thee in these Conclusions, so clear a ground of answering them all; But I shall briefly take an account of them, and so return to Mr Eyre: Who thus begins.

"[1. If we are not justified by our own works, then our believing, &c. is not the Evangelical righteousness by which we are justified: But we are not justified by our own works: Therefore.]

Rep. Distinguish of works, and distinguish of justifying. 1. That Justification on which consisteth in remission of sin, is not in our own faith; but that which consisteth in performing the condition of remission is. 2. Works are taken either as Paul doth (which he describeth Rom. 4.4. Which make the reward to be not of grace but of debt: Or as James doth, in necessary subordination to Christ. In the former sense I deny your consequence; In the latter sense I deny your minor or antecedent. And if you say that Paul supposeth that All works do make the reward to be of debt, I answer. 1. Then James faith we are justified by impossibility, or by unlawful waies. The works that James mentions are possible and lawful: works that make the reward to be of debt are impossible, and the attempt of such unlawful: Therefore there are some works which do not make the reward to be of debt. 2. The same Paul that faith we are justified by Christ, faith oft enough that we are justified by faith, and that faith is and shall be imputed to us for Righteousness.

2. Paul takes works for Meritorious actions deserving wages. Faith is no such work; therefore on that ground still I deny your consequence.

3. You must distinguish of the word [by] when you say, We are, or are not justified [by] faith. Its one thing to be justified [by] faith, as the matter of our Righteousness. So we deny it, as to our great principal Justification. And another thing to be justified [by] faith as a merely subordinate condition sine qua non: and so Paul still includeth it as plain as a man can speak. Still saying, We are justified by faith. This answers fully the Texts cited by you: and is another answer then that of the Papists to which you here Reply. Yet to your answers to the last, (that Others say, It is not works of the Law, but Gospel.) I must give you these brief Notes (supposing that the words you answer are none of mine till better explained, limited and reformed.)

To your first, I say, distinguish Lex. Paul and James else will hardly be reconciled: Yea Paul himself distinguisheth, by punctual expressing the works of the Law, or telling you he means only works that make the reward to be not of grace but of debt, and taking in faith as that by which we are justified.

To your second, you speak very darkly and dangerous: and against you I return. If Paul exclude all Debt, which follows upon promise, then he excludes all that follows upon an absolute promise, as well as upon a conditional: But the Consequent is false, therefore so is the Antecedent. The reason of the consequence is clear. Either you mean that this is [From the promise as a promise] or
else [From the promise as conditional.] If the former, then it follows an absolute promise as much as a conditional; and then you must deny all God's promises, and then you will be against the Gospel indeed. If the latter, then I say, That the promise qua conditional, gives no right; distinguish of conditions: Some are of such value as to be Meritorious: these cause the debt by Merit: Others have no meriting value (as the acceptance of a free gift:) these are no causes so much as Moral, but mere conditions. And whoever knows what a condition in Law-sense is, knows that as such, it only suspends the act of a Testament or other gift, till it be performed, but doth not cause it, when it is performed.

To your third, it is answered already.

To your fourth, see my answer to Mr. Blake. Also, The Gospel is a subordinate Law, and the matter of its precept is taken out of the general Law of nature: but informed with a new promise. Adams' body was earth; but yet to be distinguished from common earth, and worthy of another name, when it was informed with a new form, even his soul. I doubt you will not apprehend what these short expressions contain, unless you will please to consider and digest them.

To your fifth Paulus Burgenfis, a Christian Jew, on fam. add. ad Lyra Am. Anno: tells us that his Countremens opinion was, that God denominated a man righteous or wicked according to the greater part of his works. If he had more good works then bad, he was Righteous: else not. The Jews did not think to be justified by perfect unmingling obedience: for they were to confess sin, and sacrifice for it. But they thought that their sacrifices themselves and their good works might to procure the pardon of their sins, or prevail against their evil works, that they looked not for righteousness to Christ the end of the Law. This is the justification by works which Paul argues against directly; and only consequentially a fortiori we may gather it, as of perfect obedience, which is to us impossible, as it may be supposed to justify us from the charge [of being sinners.] Yet because their obedience was not perfect, Paul might well convince them that it could not justify when they erred in thinking, that imperfect obedience, by the help of sacrifices, might justify.

2. Your second Argument is this, "If the righteousness whereby we are justified be a perfect Righteousness, then we are not justified by our obedience to Gospel precepts: But, &c. Therefore.

This is answered in the former, by the same distinctions. The righteousness whereby we are justified as [by the Matter, or Meritorious cause] is perfect: and therefore faith or obedience is not such. But the righteousness whereby we are justified as a meer condition, and consequentially a righteousness subordinate to the former, is not perfect; and therefore of this your consequence fails. All your following words therefore to this, are merely beside the Point and vain. I never doubted of that, Whether any imperfect thing can be our universal grand Righteousness? no doubt it cannot: But you should prove that it cannot be a subordinate conditional particular Righteousness.

You do here confess that our Protestant Divines do call inherent Holiness, Evangelical Righteousness: Very good: I desire no more then those words contain: Yet I pray you confess that the Scripture commonly calls it so before them. 1. Certainly justum fieri & justificari, as to constitutive Justification is all one. He therefore that is righteous is doubtless justified constitutively. And doubtless to be sentenced just, and to be justified by sentence, is all one. And he that is first just by constitution, must needs be justified by sentence. But then all this is but instantum;
so far as he is just, so far he is undoubtedly justificatus contenientit, & justificandus per sententiam: and (as I said before) is it not as strange a righteousness which makes not a man righteous in tumum, (I speak of a formal-making) as a Whiteness that makes not white, or a Pazcrutis that makes not Parent? Do not all men know that (as Mr. Bradshaw said) a very reprobate may have some particular righteousness? If you accuse Judas of killing the man that was slain yesterday, he is righteous as to this cause. Why then should you think the name of Righteousness so intolerable, when applied to faith and obedience.

But (faith a Learned man to me) then you acribe but such a kind of righteousness to faith and obedience, as a reprobate may have? that's a fair advancement to faith.  Anf. 1. Methinks then you should not say I am a Papist, and give too much to faith?  But consider, though both may have a justissm particularis, yet to one it is in a case of no advantage to him: but in the other it is a condition of his eternal felicity, and so made by the Law of God. When salvation lies on one as a condition, and not on the other, I think there is much difference.

Now to your third Argument where you say, "[If the righteousness whereby we are justified be the righteousness of God, then we are not justified by our obedience to Gospel-precepts: But, &c. Therefore.]"

Rep. All is of God's gift. But in your sense I say, Our subordinate particular conditional Righteousness, is not the Righteousness performed by God without us: The word [by] therefore, and [justified] and [Righteousness] must be distinguished as before. All the rest of your words on this need no other answer, and I desire not to tire the Reader. The righteousness mentioned Mat. 25, was personal: so was that which James speaks of when he faith, We are justified by works: and that which John mentions, when he faith, He that doth Righteousness is Righteous: and forty more.

Your fourth Argument is this, "[If we are not justified by two righteousnesses existing in two distinct subjects, then our obedience to Gospel-precepts is not that righteousness whereby we are justified: But, &c. Therefore.]"

Rep. 1. To the Antecedent I say, of two coordinate righteousnesses it is true; but of two, whereof one is coordinate and the other subordinate, it is false, that there is not two. 2. But formally they are both in one subject: for it is We that are Righteous by Christ's Righteousness: that is, by that which is Christ's materially, and in another numerical form; for surely one Accident is not in two subjects. But I say, Materially one is in Christ, and the other in us.

And here I remember an odd passage that you have, p. 7, which I shall recite, "[It doth not follow that Christ's Righteousness cannot be imputed to us, before we have an actual created being, because Accidents cannot subsist without their subjects: for as much as imputed righteousness is not an accident inherent in us, and consequently doth not necessarily require our existence. Christ is the subject of this Righteousness, and the imputation of it as an act of God.]"

Rep. Hear all you that have been seduced by Mr. Eye to believe that man was justified before he was born: Here he explaineth his minde to you. He said [man] but he meant [christ.] If it be not we but Christ that is the subject, then doubtless it is not we but Christ that hath the Accident, and that is to be denominated by it: And then it is Christ that was righteous before we were born, and not we. Or else Christ makes us righteous, and yet we are not Righteous, or we are righteous and not righteous at once, (even when we are not men) and that in respect of the same righteousness. When I read such passages as these, I understand the meaning
meaning of your Patrons, that wonder men should seek to bring God's Truths down to the reason of man: i.e. we must become brutts that we may become Christians (a horrid thing to speak;) and we must put out the eye of reason, that we may see with faith, which is the only supernatural elevation of reason.

But you have an Argument pag. 57. to prove the assumption of your last; viz., "If by Christ's Righteousness alone we are made perfectly just and righteous in the sight of God; then there is no other righteousness which concurs with his to our Justification: For what needs an addition to that which is perfect? But & c. Therefore.] All is granted, if you speak of the matter or form of our principal Righteousness; The addition of a condition is through no defect or imperfection in it: but God hath made it necessary to our participation of that which was not done by our selves but by another. It is not true that we are made righteous by Christ's Righteousness till the condition be performed: but when it is performed, we are justified perfectly by Christ's Righteousness alone, as to the principal general Justification; the condition performed being but a subservient particular Righteousness. I would you would well consider, that Christ died to pardon nothing but our sinnes, and that he that hath nothing but sinne, is not pardoned.

You add, "[If we be justified partly by Christ's Righteousness and partly by our own, then our faith for Justification must rely partly upon Christ's Righteousness and partly upon our selves: But & c. Therefore.]"

Rep. I deny the Consequence. It is the relying on Christ that is our subordinate righteousness itself; and therefore is such because it is made the condition of our part in Christ: They are not coordinate, nor is faith our principal Righteousness, but of a lower sort. God hath said, that if by faith we receive Christ, we shall be justified, and our faith shall be imputed to us for righteousness: but he hath never said, If we will rest on our own faith, we shall be righteous: For then resting on that faith would be a third sort of righteousness subordinate to faith itself. These be but raw fancies.

Your fifth Argument is, "[That which overthrows the main difference between the Law and the Gospel, ought not to be admitted: for the confounding them will open an inlet to innumerable errors; nay by this means the Gospel itself will become a mere Cypher, & c. But the making our obedience to Gospel precepts the righteousness whereby we are justified, overthrows the main difference between the Law and the Gospel: Therefore. For herein stands the chief agreement and difference between the Law and Gospel: They agree in this, That to Justification both do require the perfect fulfilling of the Law: but herein they differ, That the Law requireth to Justification, a righteousness inherent in us, and perfect obedience to be performed in our own persons: The Gospel reveals for our Justification the perfect righteousness of another, even of Christ, which is accepted in their behalf that do believe in him, & c.]

Rep. These words which you cite out of Bishop Downham, say as I say in full sense; and say nothing to confirm your minor, which I deny, if you speak but of a subordinate particular righteousness: else I grant all. Do I say that we are justified by perfect obedience, which Downham speaks of? yea or by any in coordination with Christ? If you understand the difference your self between the Law and Gospel, you would correct all these errors, and be a wiser man then I think either you or I are now. I pray you do me the favour as to consult but Mr. Pembte of Justification, in the place cited even now (seeing you suppose him to be your own,
own, but it seems disclaimed you a little before he went to heaven) and see how he differenceth the Law and the Gospel.

You say, "[A defect in degrees is a sin against the Gospel, &c.]

Rep. It is not a non-performance of the Gospel condition, and then it is no hinderance to our Justification by it. Some Learned men have much boasted of that Argument [Obedience is itself imperfect, and therefore cannot be the condition of our Justification (as consummate as Judgement, or continued) for then what shall pardon the defects of it:] As if imperfect obedience might not be the condition of the pardon of its own imperfections (subordinate to faith, as is said.) May not an imperfect faith be the condition of the pardon of its own imperfections?

But to Mr. Eyre, who having done with me, addes, "[Now briefly my sense of this Proposition, [We are justified by faith] is no other then that which hath been given by all our ancient Protestant Divines, who take faith herein objectively, not properly, &c."

Rep. Our Divines take faith objectively, when the matter of our righteousness is spoken of; but how? Only by connotation of the object; and not by exclusion of faith itself: as if the word [faith] signified Christ. Else you would have taken a strange sense on Paul, when it is said [If we believe it shall be imputed to us also,] doth the word believe stand for the word [Christ?] But this our Divines have to fully confused, that I will say no more to it but this, That if by [believing] be not meant [Believing] but [Christ] when it is so many and many times rehearsed, 1. Scripture is made the most useless unintelligible writing in the world, when no man can know the sense by the words a hundred times repeated. For your saying that Paul by [faith] means not faith, is no evidence to convince me. O how glad are the Papists of such expositions as yours, that may convince men that none can understand the Scripture without a Judge of its sense. 2. And then, why might it not as well be laid that a man is justified by seeing Christ, or hearing him, or hearing of him, or any other act, as well as Believing, if it be not Believing that is meant, where it is spoken? But I will not anticipate Mr. Woodbridge in his work.

§. 6.

The next assault that I meet with is pag. 90.91. where you say, "[Mr. B. (Theb.70.) includes all works of obedience to Evangelical precepts in the definition of faith, in which sense I presume no Papist will deny that we are justified by faith alone, taking it as he doth for fides formata, or faith animated with charity and other Good works.]

Rep. Here is at least one untruth expressed, and another implied. 1. There is no mention in those words of mine of obedience to all Evangelical precepts: but only of that sincere obedience which is made by God the condition of salvation. Now obedience may be sincere, and yet not be to all precepts which are in the Gospel: Many a lesser particular duty may be unknown to one that obeys sincerely: Mr. Eyre is bound by the Gospel to believe that faith goes before Justification, and yet he knows not this: may he not for all that obey sincerely? The Gospel requireth Baptism, and I think of Infants; yet it will not follow that no man is sincerely obedient that is unbaptized, as mistaking it to be now no duty, or that is against Infant-Baptism, on the like mistake.
2. You intimate that it is our first justifying faith, or faith strictly taken that there describe; and so adde your parallel of the Papists. But honesty required you to have confess'd on the contrary, that I had before spoke of faith in the proper strict sense, as it is the condition upon which every man receiveth the remission of all the sins past of his whole life, and that Justification quod stasum, which some call universal Justification, as distinct from particular Justification and Remission following upon every new sin: and that in the words which you cite I only described faith in a more large improper sense, and as it is the condition only of our glorification, and final Justification in the great Judgement. Why should you conceal this, and imply the contrary?

§ 7.

The next touch that I finde is pag. 94. where you tell Mr. W. " 2. If faith were a condition morally disposing us for Justification, we should then be " concurrent causes with the Merits of Christ in procuring our Justification: for " the Merits of Christ are not a Physical but a moral cause, which obtain their " effect by vertue of that Covenant which was made between him and the Father: " now by ascribing unto faith a moral causal influx in our Justification, we do clearly " put it in cedem genere cause with the blood of Christ: which I hope Mr. W. " will better consider of, before he engage too far in Mr. Baxters cause."

Rep. Because you are pleased to make it my cause, I will be bold to give my Reply. There are very palpable errors delivered with confidence in these words.

1. You confound moral disposing and moral causing: All disposing is not causing. 2. You most fallly suppose that we ascribe to faith [a moral causal influx in Justification:] and do nothing to prove it.

3. All is grounded on that gross Error, That [all Civil or Legal conditions, are Moral causes,] which is so farre from truth that the clean contrary is true. [No Civil or Legal condition, quas talis, is a moral cause.] 1. A condition only while unperformed suspendeth the act of the Law or Testament, that is, It was the Will of the Legislator or Testator, or Donor, that his Law, Testament, &c. should act, or effect when the condition is performed, and not before: but not that it should be any cause: no more then quando veniit dies the time is a cause. 2. A condition is but causa sine qua non; therefore it is no moral cause. Yet its true that among men, most conditions in another respect are moral causes; but none of them, as conditions. Men use to make somewhat a condition (though not alway) which is of worth to themselves, and so hath somewhat in the nature of the thing which is meritorious (when the condition is not causal, but testamentive or mixt:) and this is a moral cause, not as it is a condition, but as meritorious. Would you have the world believe, without better manifestation, that you are so excellent a Lawyer, that we must take your word against common sense, and the common judgement of men that should be wiser in their own profession? You know sure that its common in the Civil Law to have cases of such casual conditions, as cannot be causall? As, [if such a Ship come into such a Harbour, such a day] being coming to the Donors advantage. [If such a man live to such an age, he shall have such Lands.] [If the arrow that is shot up, fall within such a space.] And the like is true in testamentive conditions (as they call them) that is, voluntary: [I give thee a pardon on condition thou wilt accept it: or not refuse it: or not ungratefully
gratefully abuse me when I have given thee: not spit in my face: not seek my life, ruin, dishonour; &c.] None of these are Meritorious, and therefore none of them cauual.

4. Have you never observed that your friend Dr Twisse doth not once or twice, but ordinarily, affirm that faith is a condition and medium of our Justification, and that Good works are cause dispositiva, and preparatoria salus? I may tell you more of his minde hereafter.

One thing more in this Section I desire your resolution of. You here say, that [the Merits of Christ are not a Physical but a Moral cause:] upon which I would know; 1. Do not you take as much from it as I, and make the Merits of Christ as much a causa fine quae non in sensu physico, as I? For what can you do more then say it is no Physical cause at all? And with what justice or modesty then could you before pretend that I am worke in this very point then the Papists themselves, when I am no worse then you? A moral causality I allow it, as well as you.

Nay secondly give me leave to enquire whether in deed and truth you do allow it a moral causality of our Justification at all: In your pag. 66. you answera shrewd Objection, which would prove you near to infidelity, viz. "That you make void the Death of Christ: for if Justification be an immanent act in God, it is antecedent not only to faith, but to the Merits of Christ, which is contrary to many Scriptures, that do ascribe our Justification to his blood, as to a meritorious cause." To which you Answer, [That although Gods will not to punish be antecedent to the death of Christ; yet for all we may be said to be justified in him, because the whole effect of that Will is by and for the fake of Christ. As though electing love precedence the consideration of Chrift, Job. 3. 16. yet are we said to be chosen in him, Eph. 2. 4. because all the effects of that Love, are given by and through and for him. Gods not punishing us, is the fruits of his death: yet his Will not to punish, is antecedent thereunto.

Rep. This distinction of Actus volentis, and res volita, we have oft here on such occasions. But 1. Do not you here make our active Justification to be no fruit of Christ's Merits at all, but only our passive? Now if you would publish this doctrine nakedly, That Justification justificans, or Gods active Justification, is not at all procured by Christ, it would be more candid and open dealing, then you use while you pretend so much to exalt Christ's Merit, in your denying the parts or interest of faith and obedience.

2. Surely then we must finde out another Active Justification, whereof Christ's Merits are the cause, as well as of the passive, if we will be ruled by Scripture; and this your Brethren have done, for which you opposte them.

3. I would commend it to your consideration, Whether it be not a work worth your labour, the next time you set upon these imployments, to open to us like a Philosopher and Divine, how and in what sense and respect it is, that the Merits of Christ can cause the effect and not the act? the res Volita, and not the actus Volendi? And how Christ's Merits can be a moral cause, or a meriting cause, and yet not cause the act of God? Merit you know is reckoned among the remote, efficient of our pardon and sanctification and salvation. Now if God be the nearest efficient, how can Merit which is the remote, cause these effects, and not cause Gods act? I would intreat you to answere it, as to all these effects, even Sanctification and Glorification as well as pardon. You know also, I suppose, that Merit
is accounted one of the Procataitical lefts-principal efficient: Now the nature of this cause is to incite the principal cause ad agendum extrinsically. And Merit is said to be that which moveth the agent actionem reddendum. Now if Christ's Merits move nor God as a Procataitical cause, then how are they truly meritorious causes? You know also, I doubt not, that *A moral causing in such cases as ours about voluntary Agents, both consist in an argumentative, objective, or the like moral moving of the Agent. Now how can Christ's Merits be moral causes here, and work nothing upon God the principal Cause? when this moral cause is a remote cause, and a remote cause produceth the effect media causa propriouior? I do not hereby conclude my self that God's Will was moved by Christ's Merits: but there is another wedge then yours by which we must cleave this knotty block; which if I tell you of, its like you will be prejudiced against it, because it is from me; but if you will study to expedite the busines 'your self a little better then here you have done, it may reduce you to a better minde in the main. But if it should prove upon these considerations, that you do contradict your self, and do indeed deny Christ to be any cause, so much as Moral and Meritorious of Justification active or passive, of the actus velentis or res rotita, then I think you have been an unhappy exalter of Christ, while your zeal carried you against the interest of faith.

And methinks it should be scarce favour to a friend of Christ and an exalter of his Merits, to have them made no more a cause of our Justification, then of our Election; that is, of the effects of both which are in time, but of neither of themselves which are from eternity.

And I take it but for private Theology that [all the effects of electing love are given by, through and for Christ.] Whereby you plainly intimate him to be the meritorious cause of the effects, which you deny of the act. But 1. the giving of Christ himself is no small effect of electing love, and yet not given for and through himself. Christ was not given to Merits, for the sake of his Merits, as any efficient cause. 2. Adam and the Creation I think were not made upon the procurement of Christ's Merits. 3. Nor was man endowd then with the Image of God. 4. Nor made Lord of the inferior creatures. 5. Nor placed in a Paradise. 6. Nor had the promise of immortality and felicity, if he sinned not; upon the procurement of the Merits of Christ. Yet all these were effects of electing love, being all means for the attainment of the ends of election. But many such things as these your Reader must bear with you in, unless he be a less scrupulous man that can swall ow all.

§ 8.

He next place that I finde my self snap at is pag. 101, where you say, "He gives us a youthfull frileike to shew his gallantry, like Mr. Baxter's challenge. Let the Antinomians show one Scripture which speaks of Justification from eternity." The Antinomians, faith he (Mr. IV.) the Antipapists and Ante-armiminians he means) may read their eyes out, before they produce us one Text, for any other Justification in Scripture, which is not by Faith or Works.

Rep. This requires small answer. 1. Why could not such a rude challenge as this, once provoke you to open your Bible and transcribe one Text to that sense? Had
Had not one such Text been as soon cited, as all this Book written? But something is wanting? He that cannot say what he should, must say what he can, rather then yield or say nothing.

2. I perceive it is not only I that am a Papist or Arminian with you, or with whom an Antinomian signifies an Antipapist, and an Antiarminian? Mr. Woodbridge fals under the same laft. But, Sir, while the Harmony of Confessions, and the Synod of Dort, and the late Confession of our Assembly are visible, the world hath a better carater to know a Papist and Arminian by, then yours; and will hardly be perfwaded that all are Papists and Arminians that hold not the eternity of Justification or Remifion, and that it is before the death and purchase of Christ, or that hold not that we are justified before we are men, or pardoned before we have sinned; no nor all those that hold not the Justification of Infidels.

But I perceive you are not sparing of your accumulations of those that are not of your party and opinion; when pag. 84. you do so let fly at his Brother Mr. John Woodbridge, forfooth "[as no hearty friend to gathering and reforming Churches, as desiring a Congregation in New England, whereas he was Pastor, to become a Parish-Parion in the Old; and not only so, but hath stood to maintain that Parishes are true Churches.] And you say, [Its like his Parsonage is better, &c.]"

Where you venture to cast your censure upon the hidden thoughts of a mans heart, which is Gods prerogative: Who are thou that judgest another mans servant? Do you know that it was a better Parsonage that is the cause of what you mention? You that dare do this, dare do more. 2. If you deny that any Parishes, yea that many hundred Parishes in England are true Churches, you do more then judge a particular Brother, and more then you are ever able to make good, and more then the Brethren of New England would affirm. But I perceive your error is not a single one, not only in Doctrinals: Separation will not perform in the conclusion, what the Leading Dividers do promise.

Pag. 89, 90. Though I am not named, yet perhaps concerned, I am sure the truth is, where you say, "[I desire the Reader to observe how much Mr. H. is beholden to a Popish Tenent, opposed (by all our Protestant Writers) to support his cause, which is That faith goes before Justification to dispose us for it.]" Bellarmin undertakes to prove, &c. Against whom all our Protestant Divines which my little Library hath obtained, do unanimously affirm, that faith doth not dispose or prepare us for Justification."

Rep. Like Cause, like carriage in maintaining it. 1. I suppose you know that our Divines do speak it of Justification in the Popish sense, which comprizeth sanctification and faith itself. But this you would not see or have your Reader see: This is but pia fraus. 2. I suppose you know that our Divines by [Disposition and preparation] do mean by way of condition sine qua non; and so your Brethren teach as well as you, that faith the first grace, is given without any pre-requisite condition on our parts, properly so called; the contrary is taught by Pelagians, Jesuites and Arminians; but your pious fraud did hide this too. Is deceiving the best Teaching? for error it is, but not for truth. Do you not know that the honest women of your Congregation that ever read Mr. Hookers Souls preparation for Christ, and Souls effectual Vocation, and Souls Justification, or Mr. F. Rogers of Faith, or Mr. Bolton, Perkins, or the like honest old Practical Divines, could quickly confute your general attention, and tell you, Sir, our Library is larger then yours, for all these Divines do tell us of a preparation necessary to Justification,
He next place that I finde my name in is pag. 145. (and divers other places in the margin) "[Our reconciliation is an immediate effect of the death of "Chrift, as Mr. Owen hath invincibly proved in his Anfwer to Baxter, p.34.] Thus you: and oft that Anfwer and Mr.Kendall's is cited.

To which I say but this. I so far abhorre contention, and thirst after the Churches Peace, that I did impose it as a penalty on my self, not to answer that Book of Mr. Owens, till I saw a clear call proving it my duty, because I had been foolishly drawn to be the beginner of the Controversie : But I would not have you therefore talk of [Invincible proof] of such Tenets as these. Were that Reverend man and I to joyn Wit to Wit, and Learning to Learning, and the contest depended on the strength of the Contesters, I should easily yield that he were invincible by such a one as I, and that the congress between him and me would be as unequal, as I too hastily said it would have been between Mr. Ball and him. But when I see what an advantage the Truth yields to a weak Defender, and consider the disadvantage that he hath caft himself upon in that Book, I must profefs to you, that I take it for as easy a thing to Anfwer it sufficiently, almost as to write so much paper as that Anfwer will take up. You force me by your frequent references to that Book to lay this much, which else I would not have said, leaft I should exasperate. And for Mr.Kendall I have told you my thoughts of his Learned Notions more at large.

§. 10.

The next passage that toucheth me that I meet with, is pag.174. where you say, "[A Learned man of the late Assembly in a Sermon before the Parliament "then sitting declared, that all the Promises of the New Covenant are Absolute, "not only citra moritum, but citra conditiones, without any prerequisite conditions "of us: amongst many other places he cites this Text (Mr.Strong Serm. 1 Sam. "2.30.) Besides this I might adde abundance more: But I believe Mr. Baxter is "inflar omnium with Mr.N.]"

Rep. 1. I believe the plain Texts of Gods Word, not to be evaded with mode- fly, is inflar omnium with Mr.Woodbridge. He that reads his digested Sermon, and your acknowledgement of his supereminent parts, natural and acquired, will not believe that he takes his doctrine on trust from any man, much less from such a man as I. 2. It is great immodesty in you, if you intend hereby to perswade
the world, that it is my singular opinion that the New Covenant hath conditions, yea or that the current of the Reformed Divines, and Churches do not expressly contradict your conceit. For me to prove this, were as needless as to heap up testimonies to prove that the Protestant Divines do hold that the Scripture is God’s Word. He that is ignorant of their judgement in this, let him be ignorant still for me. Except here three or four late Writers; especially those three Franquenius, Maccovius, Cocceius and Cloppenburgius. 3. But for Mr. Strong, I can say nothing, as having not his Sermon at hand; but what I have heard of the piety, Judgement and Moderation of that learned Man, and what I finde of his boldness in this Book in frequent untruths, I confess doth make me resolve rather to believe you wrong him, till I shall see the words; though not peremptorily to conclude it and charge you with it. I have oft my self maintaine that the promife of the first Grace is Absolute; but I shall never believe that all the promisses of the New Covenant are Absolute, as long as I take Gods Word for my Rule, which I hope will be till death. But here I must give you some Animadversions on your descriptions of a Condition, pag. 184.

And to the first (out of Dr. Cawell) I say, that it be appointed for suspending the efficacy of the act or grant, is indeed essential to a condition: But that it be Uncertain is meerly Accidentall; Uncertain is put for Contingent, because what is contingent is usually among men uncertain; It means an uncertainty in natura rei, when it may tend ad esse vel non esse; and not that it be in se incertum, id est, ignorant Donatori. Contingent things may be certain to God; and yet contingent in themselves still: As Dr. Twis’s oft faith, He hath decreed not only that contingent things shall come to pass, but contingens contingens eventura. So doth he foreknow that contingent things shall contingently come to pass. Yet while they are contingent they are the fit matter for a condition, though he foreknow them. An unbeliever himself knows not that he shall believe. And if a man had a spirit of Prophefie to foreknow such future events, do you think that makes him incapable of making a conditional contract? If a Prophet had a House or Land to lett, might he not make a Legal conditional Contract, because he foreknows the Rent will be paid? You may as well say, God should make no Law, because he foreknows it will be fulfilled, or men will do the thing commanded. But may he not therefore oblige them to do it? And if so, by a precept, I see not but the case is the same as to a sanction, and condition which is essential to that sanction.

And I must further tell you that you must not separate what God hath conjoin- ed. As he foreknows that we will perform the condition, so he foreknows that it will be a condition by his constitution before we perform it. For we cannot perform a condition which is no condition. And God did not foreknow that we should meerly perform the act of believing, but that we should perform the condition of believing; even as he did not only foreknow that we should perform the act of faith, but the duty of faith, and therefore that it must first be a duty.

Moreover I would know whether ever God threatened an elect man or not in his Law, yea or the reprobate? If not, 1. How said he to Adam, In the day thou eatest thou shalt dye? 2. Then the first Law had no threatening (then which nothing more falsc) or else Adam was not elect. 3. How then are unbelievers condemned already. 4. There are an hundred express threatenings in the Word. 5. The contrary opinion is Antinomianism indeed, to take believers to be not at all threatened by the Law. 6. At least are they not threatened with temporal punishments,
or chastisements? 7. And then wicked reprobates are not threatened, which is false.

If you grant the threatening to the Elect or others, then it is either a conditional threatening or Absolute: If Absolute then they must bear it: there is no escape; nor are all absolute to them that must bear it. If conditional: then either God knows whether they will commit that sin, which is the condition of the threatening, or he doth not. The latter you will disclaim: I doubt not: The former grants that there may be a condition which is yet certainly foreknown to God.

You will finde the Prophet Jeremy making a conditional contract by God's appointment, in a case wherein God had before revealed to him the event.

If (as Dr. Twisse hath well proved) the same thing may be necessary and contingent, then the same thing may be necessary, foreknown, and yet conditionally given out or threatened in Law.

It is a most dangerous course of Divines to see God's Decrees, Foreknowledge, or Disposal of Events, in opposition to his moral Rectorship, if the acts of one must be inconsistent with the acts of the other. Let me speak it out, though to the provocation of the contemptuous and self-conceited, that this one grand mistake, hath introduced most of their errors, and fedeth most of your contentions. They cannot reconcile the acts of God's absolute dominion, with the moral acts of regiment; nor can they see in what a distinct series they stand.

The like Answer serves to the same word [incertum] in the next definition of Cooke. Your two latter I wholly allow of, interpreting [by performance] to mean [upon performance]. Your conclusion pag. 185. is false, that Omnis condition antecedens est effectivus. Though I remember Chamier hath such a word, but enough to the contrary.

I have spoke thus much of this, that you may also see, that though the Truths, in Mr. Owen's Book are Invincible, yet the Mistakes are not; and if you will consider it well, I think you will finde that the pulling out of this one Pin, hath caused his Fabrick to fall in pieces. For my part I profess to follow my conscience, which upon the most impartial search of Scripture that I am able to make, doth tell me that the Scripture doth so evidently contain conditional threatenings and promises to the Elect, that to deny it, would be, to me, to renounce my understanding, and proclaim Scripture to be utterly unintelligible, which were to be no Word of God.

§. 11.

Yet you have not done with me: for pag. 190. you fall on without fear or—— that the end may be like the beginning. You say, "[1. The Papists assert no other works and condition to be necessary to our justification and salvation than what our adversaries do. 2. Neither Papists nor Arminians do ascribe any more Meritoriousness to Works than our opponents, &c. And in this sense Mr. Baxter will tell you that the performers of a condition may be said to merit the Reward. The Papists never pleaded for Merit upon any other account.]"

Rec. 1. If this be true our Divines are notorious liars and slanderers so frequently to charge them with more. Which yet I had rather of the two believe of Mr. Eyre then of them, if I must needs do one. 2. If this be true, the Papists are notorious
notorious liars and flanderers, to wrong one another so much as they do, by affirming more of one another. 3. If this be true, doth not Mr. Eyre speak better of the Papists then we are use to hear? and should not all honest men be glad to hear that so great a part of Christendom, are farre better men then we took them for. 4. Doth not this intiimate; Why may not the Papists be encouraged and have liberty in England as we, R. B. and a hundred Divines that say as much as he? Especially if you compare this passaige with what he faith to Mr. W. pag. 17. [1 dare (as a more unfound Aosition cannot be picked out of the Writings either of Papists or Arminians then this is.) And why then should not we be respected alike, if we be corrupted alike? Whether he mean that we should be refrained as they, I know not well; but by his Epiftle to the Parliament it is liker he means that they should have Liberty as well as we. You that are Mr. Eyre his neighbours, wrong him forely if you think him a friend to Popery, you may fee the Papists will endure you to call Mr. W. and I and all the Reformed Churches, Papists, if you will but open the door and let them in, and help them in weakening our hands and resisting us in the work of Chrift.

You add, "[Though Mr. B, seems to mince the matter, calling his condition but a fine quan non, and a Pepper corn, &c. he attributes as much, if not more, to Works then the Papists, Arminians and Socinians have done. The Papists will not say that Works do merite in a strict and proper fenfe.]"

Rep. Pro. 19. 5. A false witneffe shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall not escape. Though I delay this business purposely till I come to Mr. Crandon, yet I will give the Reader one word here beforehand.

1. Out of one of their own; Bellarmine (Printed Ingolf. 8° 1605.) pag. 2567, 2568, &c., cap. 17. l. 5. de Justific: thus determineth this Question, [Utrum opera bona sunt Meritoria ex condigno ratione paœti tantum? an ratione operis tantum? an ratione utrisque? Media schentia nobis videtur probabilior, qua docet, Opera bona Sulfuro Meritoria esse vite aeterna ex condigno, ratione Paœti & operis simul, &c.] And p. 2570, 2571, he bringeth seven Arguments to prove that in opere bone ex Gratia procedente, est quodam proportionalitas ad premium vitae aeternae. And li. 16. 31. pag. 2208, 2209, he endeavoureth to prove [Mercium de congruo fundari in aliqua Dignitate operis potius quam in promissiones.] Judge now Reader, what credit is to be given to Mr. Eyre's words? and how dangerous a thing this Antinomian conceit is, that sin is all pardoned before we repent or are born. Durst such a pious man as this else over and over, even here on one page repeat in Print so notorious a falshood? and say, [Neither Papists nor Arminians ascribe any more Meritoriousness to Works] then we do? Nay that [I attribute as much, if not more to Works then the Papists.] Was Bellarmine no Papist? I deny all Merit to our Faith or Works; unless by the word [Merit] you mean somewhat that is not Merit. Doth Bellarmine do so? Nay he faith again here [The Papist never pleaded for Merit upon any other Account] then ex paœto. The Lord pardon this audacious falshood to you Brother, and humble you for it.

But if Bellarmine be no Papist with you, what say you by Aquinas? See him 2.a.q. 14. art. 1.e. & art. 3.e. [Si consideretur secundum operis substantialium & secundum quod procedit ex libero arbitrio, sic non potest ibi esse condignitas propter maximum inqualitatem: sed esset ibi congruitas propter quodam equalitatem proportionis. Si aitem loquamur de opero Meritiorum secundum quod procedit ex gratia Spiritus sancti, sic est Meritiorum vita aeterna ex condigno: sic enim Valor meriti attenditur secundum virtutem Spiritus sancti movemus nos in vitam aeternam, &c.]
3. The world knows that the Papists have commonly maintained (I say not, every man of them) the Merit of congruity, the very nature of which they ordinarily affirm to be from the respect of the work itself, and not from the Pact or Promise.

4. Our Divines commonly charge them with more. Perkins Reformed Cathol. of Merit, Vol. 1, p. 574, 545. faith, [The Papish Church placeth Merits within man, making two sorts thereof: the Merit of the person, and the Merit of the work: The Merit of the work is a dignity or excellency in the work, whereby it is made fit and enabled to deserve Life Everlasting for the doing: And Works as they teach are meritorious two ways, 1. By covenant, because God hath made a promis of Reward to them. 2. By their own dignity: For Christ hath merited that our Works might merit; And this is the substance of their Doctrine.] So far Perkins.

I will add no more, but leave it to the consideration of Mr. Eyre's Churchmembers, whether for this publicque sinne, they ought not to admonish him, and desire him publiquely to profess his repentance? If not, let them at least Ic the evil fruits of his Doctrine, and that all his words are not to be beleived. Its scarce likely that he will make much more confience of an untruth in the Pulpit, then in the Press; the later being the most publique, and therefore should be most advised and cautious way of delivering our mindes.

Yet he is at it again before he comes to the end of the same Page, saying, "[But now Mr. B. goes a step beyond them, in that he ascribes a Meritoriousness to "Works, which the Arminians and Socinians have not dared to do."

Rep. I am glad this is the last place where I finde my self named. For I love not above all Writings to deal with those which are capable of no other Answer for subsistance, than that one Word by which the fellow confuted all Bellarmine. Methinks it fouls my mouth, so much as to tell you what your words are; and it cannot but be unsavoury and unprofitable to the Reader; and therefore I shall say no more to you; but heartily desire the Lord to recover and forgive you, and to that end to make you ask forgiveness beleevingly and penitently, and to that end to convince you that you are guilty, till forgiveness come, and that no Infidels or Impenitent Rebels are forgiven: And I heartily desire that if you preach this to your people, which you publish in this Book, the sad effects of it may never appear in their hearts and lives, but that Gods truth may lye neerer their hearts and prevail, and the face of your doctrine may not be seen in the face of your hearers conversation or your own.

FINIS.
Novemb. 26. 1653.

Reader,

Understand that for all the hot words between us, Mr. Eyre and I are agreed, if he be a man to be believed. For pag. 67, he hath these words, [However were the thing itself granted, That there was in God from Everlasting an Absolute, Fixed and Immutable Will never to deal with his people according to their sins, but to deal with them as Righteous persons, this Controversie were ended.]

Supposing that it is in regard of eternal punishment that he speaks, and not of meer Legal Obligations, Convictions or Condemnations by Law, Conscience, or Men (in all which respects God deals not with the unrighteous as with righteous men) I do grant the whole, and here subscribe my concession: and so if Mr. E. be a man of his word, The Controversie is Ended.

POSTSCRIPT.

Reader,

Because Mr. Eyre hath the modesty to allledge Mr. Rutherford's Judgement for his Opinion, I intreat thee to get and read a full Volume of Mr. Rutherford's (which I had forgotten when I cited those words before) called [A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrift: opening the Secrets of Familism and Antinomianism, against Mr. Saltmarsh, Mr. Dell, Town, Dr. Crispe, H. Den, Eaton, &c. in which is revealed the Rise and Spring of Antinomians, Familists, Libertines, &c.]

It is not only as against Mr. Eyre's Testimony that I desire this of thee, but especially because it is one of the fullest Books that I know extant, against the Errors of this Sect, and very usefull to the godly in these seducing times.

H

READER,
Since this Book was Printed I am able to give thee a more certain account of Mr Crandon's Learned Examination of my Aphorisms: If thou wouldst know the Contents, I'd tell thee the main substance of his Book in one word, viz. [That I am a Papist, and one of the Worse sort of them too.] This one dish adorned with the flowers of Billingsgate Rhetorick, and sawed with many hundred palpable falsehoods, is the precious feast which Mr Eyre hath invited thee to. But if thou think that I tell thee this for my own ends, and as envying thee such felicity as the reading of his Volume, take thy course, and believe me when thou hast tried, Fisher, Haggar, Rejes, Mr Eyre, and all that have opened their mouths against me, are but meal-mouth'd fellows to this Mr Crandon. But if it work on thee as it did on me, thou wilt have some mirth at least for thy money: For I confess I was not able to forbear laughter to see the ridiculous monster come forth, and act such a Tragedy before my face: Nor can I yet forbear when I cast my eye on it, and think how seriously the man persuades me that I am a Papist. But then remember that thy mirth must cost thee sorrow, as mine doth, when I consider that I laugh at the signes of a mans misery, and at that which discovereth our common depravedness, and the misery of our poor people that must be both corrupted and distracted by such Teachers as these. But if thou have a minde to learn Mr Crandon's Ethicks, or Theology, take them and make thy best of them; but I pray thee expect not that ever I should particularly Reply to it, till I have so much time that I know not how better to spend, or dare give an account to God of such an expence of it, and till I am more inclined to stirre in such a puddle as that is. If thou be not able to confute Mr Crandon's strong lines without my help, its not long of me, nor can I have while to help thee, though I pity thee: Yet left thou say I shift it off, I intend God willing, to give thee that which shall be the matter of an Answer, to the exceptions of him and many others, even a plain and full Confession of my Faith, and especially in the

Point
Point in question: How much it is that I ascribe to man or any of his actions in the work of Justification? with so much more against the main charges of Mr. Cr. and Mr. Eyre, as shall give thee cause enough to lament, that Opinion, Faction, and Passion, should make Christians so cruel to their own consciences, as these men have been; and shall convince thee, that whatever they do by the rest of the Law, the ninth Commandment is used but little better by them, then the second is by the Papists. For all these crying sins, I am in hope, by their zealous pretensions to the honour of Free-Grace, that they mean well in the main: And then I desire those that fear God to consider, what crooked pieces the best of us are, what need we have of daily pardon of sin, and what great cause to bear with abundance of darkness even in Teachers themselves, and to put up many and great injuries from one another, if ever we expect any quietness to the Church: and not only to see that we forgive them our selves, but also to pray for them in imitation of our Lord, [Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.] And though Mr. Eyre hath clawed his Brother with this commendations, that he is [a faithfull servant of Jesus Christ, and a Workman that need not be ashamed.] Yet I intreat Mr. Cr. to see that he be not hardened in impenitency by this warrant: For Mr. E. cannot secure him hereby from future shame, though he may do somewhat to destroy the remnants of his present modesty. If such a mass of Railing Accusation, that is, Slander and Reviling twisted together, be the work of [A Workman that need not be ashamed] I confess I know not what men should be ashamed of: and must say, that such men are not over-bashfull. Indeed if there were no Law, and so no transgression, they might prove that they need not be ashamed: Or had they well proved that all their sinne was perfectly pardoned before they were born, I should yield that they need not be ashamed, so far as shame is a punishment for sinne: and therefore must cease upon a perfect Remission. But Impeniteny and Impudence have no good foundation.
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1 Cor. 4. 3, 4, 5.
But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgement:
For I judge not my own self. For I know nothing by my self, yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me, is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to Light the hidden things of darkness, and will make Manifest the counsels of the hearts.

LONDON,
Printed by A. M. for Thomas Underhill at the Anchor and Bible in Pauls Church-yard, and Francis Tyton at the three Daggers in Fleetstreet, 1654.
Suppose I owe thee an Account, both of the Reasons which drew forth this following Reply, and why it is transferred hither from its proper place. For the first; I was once purposed never to have written one line by way of particular Reply to Mr Crandon: and I think I should have continued that Resolution, if there had been no more but his own writing to have called me to such a work. The first sight that I had of it, was only of the midst of the book, before the Epistles or the end were annexed: But when I saw Mr Caryls Epistle Commendatory, I apprehended it my duty to endeavour the satisfaction of so Reverend a man, and to let him know that I dissent not from him without, at least, a shew of Reason.

2. I had written much of my Confession, before I saw this Epistle of Mr Caryls; And upon the sight hereof I added 1. Some Conclusions more then I had before done, of my judgement about Justification by faith; and how far I take in or leave out works. 2. Some Conclusions containing my judgement, how far believers are freed or not freed from the Law: Because these are the two great points wherein I perceive I offend Mr Caryll, and the Fundamentals of a Christians Comfort, which he supposeth Mr Cr. to have vindicated.

3. And then I thought it fit to adjoin my Reasons which forced me to dissent from the judgement of Mr Caryll concerning the Substance of the book which he commendeth. All this fell in, in the midst of my Confession, and while I set down things as they came to hand and occasions call’d from them, I presently made a medley work: And
And finding upon the review when I had finished my Confession, that this contending piece would disturb the Reader in his course, and was like to be as the carkass of Amase to the pursuing Israelites, 2 Sam. 20.12. I thought it best to remove it out of the way, and place it here with the rest of its comforts.

And if the style of this writing seem too harsh to thee, I will not justify it, but only acquaint thee with these two things for the guidance of thy censure: 1. That I had not skill enough to finde out any gentler termes which would be suitable to the matter. Truth requires that I call things as they are; though modesty require that we use the cleanliest termes we can about an uncleanly business; which I think you will say I have not wholly neglected, if you compare impartially his words and mine, and discern aright the occasion of my speeches. 2. That this was all written (and most of my Confession) before I heard of Mr. Crandons death: and I had some hopes of bringing him to Repentance. But had I been to have written it again when he was dead, I should have studied yet harder for more gentle termes, though they had been less fitted to the quality of the subject. I hope the Lord hath forgiven him the many and great finnes of his Volume, as the rest of his life; as I daily pray for pardon to myself for the failings of my doctrine, for matter and manner, as well as of my life. The pain and languishing in which I am writing these lines, assure me that I am hastling after him apace; and I hope to finde him in that Kingdom of Peace, where no flanders or Reproaches, or any failings will be owned; and where we shall both partake of that perfect Light, which will cause us to disown our former errours, and when both our Sanctification, and our pardon and Justification will be found more perfect, then when we first believed, even by those that vehemently denied and disclaimed it, and defamed me as a seducer for affirming such a thing. I doubt not but we shall then finde a greater difference between Heaven and earth, between Christ's Hospitall, and the Fathers perfect Kingdom, then this passionate self-conceited generation will now believe.

If any think that upon the hearing of Mr. Crandons death, I should have been at the pains of altering the whole stile of this writing to a gentler strain, I only say, 1. I had not leisure because of extreme weakness, and greater works. 2. I had not much will to it, because when I am gone hence as well as Mr. Crandon, his writing will remain in the hands of men that knew neither him nor me: And though I perceive that this age which knew us both doth distastfully reject his opprobrious
opprobrious, calumniating Volume, and make my Reply unnecessary as to them; Yet when a generation shall arise that knew neither of us, they may easily be drawn to Credit him, if his Falshood be not plainly laid open to their view. As I hope God hath forgiven him more fully then he was forgiven before he was born, so I beseech the same God of mercy to pardon whatsoever I have here or elsewhere committed, against his Truth, and the Love of my Brethren; and with the rest of my sinnes, to bury them in everlasting oblivion.

Kedermifer, March 31.
1654.

R. B.
THE CONTENTS.

Sect. I.

My first Reason, why I take not Mr. Crandons book to be Profitable to the Church of God, and Worthy the publick view, as Mr. Caryll doth, is from the multitude of falshoods in it, in matter of fact. Instances given of his Calumniations, not only in his speeches against me, but against Mr. Ball, the London Ministers, and the Assembly, and the Ministers of England. The Ministers of England Vindicated from the heavy Charge of fraudulent obscuring Christ and Grace, and keeping the Prophane from it. His solemn fiction of my designes and Legates to propagate my opinions.

Sect. II. My second Reason, From the Railing, Raging, scornfull language Which that book is composed of; so that the matter of Argument cannot easily be found. No need in this Age, to pick Truth out of such excrements, when it may be found in more cleanly Writings.

Sect. III. Whether Mr. Crandon vindicate Gods Truths, yea fundamentals, as Mr. Caryll supposeth? His Assertion of Eternal Justification, perfected in Christ's death, and that faith justifieth only in our own apprehension or conscience, examined; Also, that good Works are not the Way to the Kingdom above, but only Christ: that Christ hath not merited from Gods natural but his ordinate Justice, and not in the strict, but the large sense: That Christ merited not the Eternall Justification, nor that in Conscience but Improperly. How Immanent Acts may begin, and Christ may merit them.

Sect. IV. His direfull Accusations of the most high God: as that he is unjust if he Impute any sinne to any man (though an Insidell) Which was Imputed to Christ, and for which he satisfied. That my doctrine (that our Chastisements are Punishments, and from Gods Wrath, for our sinne as the meritorious Cause) makes all our Salvation, a glorious Privilege! such as a man may finde at Billingsgate for a box on the ear from the Worst of men that he meets with, &c. Likening God to the devil,
or a divellized man and prodigy of nature, with much more such fearfull Blasphemy! 27 false reports of my words all together.

Sect. V. A Reply to all Mr. Crs answers to my Arguments, to prove that our sufferings are Punishments, and sinne the meritorious Cause (which he denieth:) Where Mr. Caryll may see how he vindicateth Fundamentall Truths.

Sect. VI. An Appeal to Scripture in the point, many Texts produced, with twelve Queries; for Mr. Carylls further satisfaction.

Sect. VII. My Reasons tendered to Mr. Caryll, that Mr. Crs vindication of Justification by faith without works (the other Point mentioned by Mr. Caryll) is not profitable to the Church of God, nor worthy the publicke view. First, Because he granteth the main Point in question after his fiercest contradiction; Proved in many particulars. A Confutation of his fiction of many and great differences between our Divines and me, about the word [Conditions.] His false doctrine, that they that have not the Gospel, are bound to seek justification and salvation by the works of the Law or Natural Righteousness: With more of the like.

Sect. VIII. My next Reason to Mr. Caryll: because they are none of my doctrines or words which Mr. Crandon doth confute, but the meer forgeries of his own brain. The substance of all his book, herein, examined, and found, a meer pack of false Reports. The vanity of his ascribing so much humane learning to me, and his copious Inveftive against the use of such Learning in Theologie. His self-contradicting. His vain Charge against me, as pleading for an Implicit faith of the People in their Teachers.
To the Reverend

Mr. JOSEPH CARYL,

Preacher of the

Gospel of CHRIST.

Reverend Sir,

It is the great respect I bear to your Name, for the good things of the Spirit that I have heard of you, and seen in your Writings, which occasioned me, contrary to my former Resolutions, to say so much to Mr. Crandon, as here you will finde: Not that I despised the man, but judged the uncleanly matter unfit for Agitation, as being liker more to Annoy then to Edifie. As many Reverend and Godly Brethren have told me, they more wonder at your Epistle, then all Mr. Cr's Book; so do I feel my self more obliged by a line of yours to be at the pains of tendring you satisfaction, then I did by all his Volume of fallhoods and reproaches, of one line in Reply.

Sir, both you and I are short of Heaven, and therefore Imperfect; and Know but in part, and therefore fallible. Though I will not be so presumptuous as to conclude with confidence that I am in the right, and you in the wrong; yet to suppose you under a possibility of Erring, I hope is no injury; nor to make an Enquiry whether it be you or I that actually Err. I have such eyes upon me as our Master had, that will conclude him a friend of Publicans and
and sinners; and a wine-bibber, if he come eating and drinking; and him to have a devil that comes not so, If I lay, I am in the right, and you and others err, I am sure to hear the titles of Proud, Arrogant and Self-conceited: If I think that modesty and conscientiousness of our present darkness and imperfection, require some abatement of my confidence, and in suspicion of my self and estimation of your judgement, I should seem but to be dubious, and question the verity of what I deliver, I am sure to be called a Sceptick, and Heretical Questionist, that looks for new light, and remaineth in a fluctuation. Seeing I must unavoidably be one of these sorts, I have resolved to be the later: and to profess to you, that my Intellect lieth open to the force of what evidence you shall be pleased to afford me. If therefore, as you seem to judge me an Opposer of the Fundamentals of a Christians Consolation, you will but put forth your helping hand to deliver me from such Errors, I hope I shall not through obstinacy hinder the success, but shall as well digest your Instructions as my low degree of the Spirit and his Graces will enable me. I have in my Confession enlarged the disclosure of my thoughts for your satisfaction; to which I immediately subjoined these Reasons of my dissent from your Judgement about Mr. C's Book; which upon review I removed hither, as unfit for that place. I submit them both to your Consideration, and desire your own Reprehension of their Errors. A page from yourself (which doubtless will be with much Clearness, and convincing Evidence and Candor) may do more with me, than the sending forth of many such Volumes, as that is which is honoured with your Name and Commendations. And I cannot doubt but that as the love of Truth could make you the Midwife of a Volume of false Accusations and Reproaches, so will the same Affection cause you to be the Author of some brief Informations, whereby your straying Brother may be recovered: It being a more desirable work to Reduce, then to befriend any flanders and defamations, though with the modestest seeming to disrelish them: and it being (in my Judgement) an easier task for you, by a few clear Scriptures and Reasons to bring me to a Recantation, then by twenty Commendatory Prefaces, to make such a Book as that, appear to sober unprejudiced men, a Vindication of Fundamental Truths, and profitable to Gods Church. I beseech you interpret not my words as a challenge of Dispute, but as the request of an earnest lover of the Truth, who prays for it, studieth for it in pain.
paine and weakness night and day, and would thankfully accept your help to discover it; and is confident that you think you have very clear evidence against my Doctrine, before you would proceed to do as you have done; and will be ready to communicate that Evidence for my Recovery: Or if you should finde that you have erred (bear with the supposition) I remain confident that your pious minde will finde no rest, till you have righted God's Truth and your Brother as publiquely as you have wronged them, and left as legible a Testimony to Posterity of your Repentance as of your sinne; as beleeving that Non Remittitur Peccatum nisi restitutatur ablatum. Or if you should think it Popery that such Good Works be judged Conditions of your Remission, yet I doubt not but you will regard them as necessary Signes of the sincerity of your Repentance, and that of your Faith.
Hough all Gods Truths are precious, yet Contention is to me so grievous, that I did many years ago unfeignedly groan for the complaint of Summerhurd, Quint me miserum tandem liberabit ab ista rixosa Theologia! and I approved of Bachelors Resolution, and subscribed to his commendation, Qui cum eximis a Deo domestibus effect decoratus, in certamen tamen cum Rabiosis illius seculi Theologic descendere nonuit: Desiunt Disputiae, capsi suppustare. * &c. * Saints Rest, Little did I then think that I must drink so deep of this bitter Cup, and be necessitated to wait my daies of languishing, in a work which I so deftested, and was so fully Resolved against. But he that Made us must Rule us; and he that putteth us in the Vineyard must measure out our Work: I may not with Fohnah turn my back, because the work may seem ungratefull: If he let me to labour among the thorns, which cannot be taken with hands, but the man that shall touch them must be fenced with iron, and the staff of a Spear (2 Sam. 23.6,7.) Yea though the best of them were as a briar, and the most upright sharper then a thorn hedge (Mic. 7.4.) yet have we a gracious Master, his work is good, his end will satisfie us; we shall then have the Grapes and Figs, which thorns and thistles would not yield us. So great have been my neglects of God and his Spirit, so little is my love to him, and the Life to come, that I am very conscious of my unworthines, not only of heaven it self, but of living so near to heaven in my thoughts, and of so much delight in its forecasts, as in more peaceable and practical studies I might have found. I thought seven years ago I had been even entering into the promised Land of Rest: and it seemed good to the Lord, to detain me in the wildernes, and to exercise me in ungratefull skirmishes on the borders; and that not with enemies, but with Brethren. If Melanthon longed for heaven that he might be delivered a Rabie Theologorum! If the laid Bachelors met with such Rabiosis Theologis, qui arceps ex aliquibus voculis calumniandi materia, hanc eum simulatur e traducere optimus virum non crubescens; Frustra obtusam ipsa, dextre data, dextre acceptem; There's great reason that I a worser man, so farre below them in all kinde of worth, should patiently bear as much as they. And though I dare no more resolve to avoid such employments, nor dare runne from my Colours, or sell Gods Truth, for 4th case
of my minde; yet the sharpness of this last assault, and the sensible decayes of my frail flesh, do put me somewhat out of fear of being called out to much more of this unpleasing work: (though I expect some men should do their parts in provocation.)

That which I am now to do is to satisfy Mr Caryll, that his Reasons are not sufficient for the emission of such a Volume as a Vindication of Truths Fundamental to our Comfort, and as profitable to the Church of God, and worthy the publick view. For I conceive that the Judgement of so Reverend a man is not by silence to be condemned.

And 1. Methinks the Reasons of his commendation are unsatisfactory. 1. That it is large is no commendation, unless it be Good as well as Great. For of evils the least is to be preferred. 2. That it is Elaborate proves it but a more aggravated Sinne, if that labour be bestowed to do evil. But I confess I see nothing but the writing that need to cost much labour: Sinne floweth easily from depraved nature, and is oft born without any great travel or the help of a midwife: and the better part of this book need not cost much study. 3. All the question then is, Whether Mr Cr. [do Maintain and Vindicate any Doctrinals of such moment, and so Fundamental in Religion for the comfort of souls, that any Essay tending to the clearing of them, much more this Large and Elaborate Discourse, is profitable to the Church of God.] as Mr Caryll supposeth. And 1. no Fundamentals can be vindicated against me which I did not oppose: And if I opposed any such, it was either in deed and sense, or in words and seeming. Not meekly in words: For 1. it is sense and not mere words which are Fundamentals. 2. I meet with few that will deny my terms to be the terms of Scripture, in the main matters in question. Who denieth that Scripture calleth our sufferings punishments! or that it faith, [By thy words thou shalt be justified] and [A man is justified by works and not by faith only.] 2. And if it be in sense that I have denied Fundamentals, I shall wait in hope that Mr Caryll will evince it, especially now I have given him my sense more fully: And in the mean time I shall freely acquaint him with some of those Reasons which make me to think otherwise then he doth of Mr Cr’s Discourse; and make that labour so unprofitable to me, which Mr Caryl judgeh profitable to the Church of God. And in doing this, as I will not purposely bawlk any momentous passages in him; so I will have so much compassion on the Reader and my self, as not to recite or confute the greater part of his Railings and Calumniations; but will choose out those passages where he recapitulateth his Accusations, and where the chiefest strength of his Arguments seem to lye. And the first Reason of my dissent from Mr Caryll is this:

1. Falshoods or books abounding with falshoods, are not profitable to the Church of God, (unless per accidentem) nor worthy the publick view. But Mr Graudons Book abounding and swarmeth with falshoods: Therefore I think it unprofitable to the Church of God, and unworthy the publick view.

I know it is unsavoury language for Ministers to give each other the Lye: But I think it might be as meet to call a Lye by its proper name, as Swearing, Drunk-kenness or Whoredom by theirs, when the case is so gross as that the offender ought to be openly convinced. And for the minor, I do seriously, deliberately, and solemnly profess in the word of a Christian and Minister of the Gospel, that of all the Theological Writings that ever I saw, I did never see any one, to the utmost of my remembrance, either of Papist, Socinian, Anabaptist, or any Protestant, that
that did need so much abound with untruths as to matter of fact, as Mr. Crandons Book doth. One of the nearest to it that ever I saw was Harding the Papist; and Stapleton, Martyn, Bishop Campian, &c. are not sparing that way; but farre short of Mr. Crandon, if I be able to discern: It is not Doctrinal Errors that I call untruths, these are fitter to be confuted by argument then refelled with such language: But it is [untruths about matter of fact:] And whether the man did it with an intention to deceive, I prelume not to judge, as not knowing (his face much less) his heart: But that they are palpable untruths in matter of fact, and slanders and calumnies, I averre. I now opened the Book of purpose, and without choice took the page that pleased it selfe to me, and I counted fifteen untruths in matter of fact, by way of slander, in one page. I do remember but very few leaves in all the book that I have observed (and I have run over the greater part) which have not many the like. So that according to the number of the pages, I do sufficiently conjecture that there can be no less then some thousands in the whole Book. And if any say, that I am an incompetent Judge, as being a party, I answer, 1. I take not on me to be a deciding Judge, but a Discerner. 2. I think I am the abler on earth to discern it. For his calumnies are most of them of one of these two sorts: Either charging me to write what I never writ, or thought: Or else (which is the most common) searching my heart, and charging me to think what I never thought, and to mean what I never meant, and telling the world my designs and intentions, which my soul was never acquainted with: So that when he meeteth with a passage that he disliketh, in stead of confuting the words and sense of them, he pretendly falls on an enquiry into my thoughts, and tells the world with down right affirmations, what I think and intend, and that this or that is my design in it, as if it were he that made my heart and must judge it. Yea when he meets with words which he liketh, the difference of his opposition is but small; for he pretendly tells the world, that I subtilly hide my minde, and mean not as I speak, or I have this or that reserve, so that Popery it must be in the issue howsoever. In a word, one falsity and calumny doth animate the Book from end to end, which is, that I am a Papist, yea and none of the moderate sort of Papists, but of the groffest and worst; and not only that I am of the same opinion with the Papists in the point of Justification, but that I am a flat Papist, and am subtilely endeavouring to bring as many to Rome with me as I can; and the Arminians are, as it were, behind me, and I would draw them on after me to be Papists too. Yea he describeth, according to his confident conjecture, how I was made a Papist, and what Books they were that turned me to them, and how, in his Preface, in these words: [""But finding him a man of excellent, both natural and acquired parts, of a very rational brain, delighted more in depth then in shallows, in the Logical deep and serious, then in the lighter and superficial parts of Learning; I conceive him to have been carried out by his own genius to the reading of the deepest Scholastic Writers, with the purpose that Virgil once applied himself to the reading of Ennius, though not with the same success. The purpose of both probably was to fetch out et fiero gere gemmam, a jewel out of the dunghill: But this man meeting with Learning perfectly agreeing with his natural genius, became importent to obtain his purpose; for being delighted with the dunghill, he hath made it his sphere and element: the depth of rationality which he found in his Authors, hath drawn and captivated him to their most curled opinions."] Would you think that this were a man that never saw me, nor knows what my studies have been, nor ever was informed by any one that doth know?
know? Nay he often tells his Readers, that I took such and such things out of the Jesuites and other Papists; yea in the main points that he dealteth against, he tells them, I had all from the Papists, and he can tell them where I had it, and undertakes to shew them the very place whence I feeth it, when he shall be called therto. Yea when I cite Scriptures, he tells them confidencely, I feeth them not out of the Bible, but out of the Papists and Jesuites, as I found them cited to my hand. What reply am I capable of making to this man? If I deny all this; his answer is ready, I am not to be believed, I subtilly and dissemblingly hide my Religion, or deny the Truth. Doth he indeed know my thoughts, so much better then I, or the way of my studies? I was bold to mention in the Append. how those things that were excepted against as novelty, were made known to me in my solitude and weaknesses, when I had no books but my Bible with me, and that in that case studying the Scripture alone, I thought I saw more in one fortnight then of many months before: Yet left any should think that I hereby would encourage men to cast off studies and read no book but the Bible, and contemn all humane Learning, and writings of Fathers and Modern Divines, and wait only on the Spirit, without such means, I added, that I did not hereby judge books needless, and that I should not myself have been so capable of improving those solitary hours in studying the Scripture, if I had read no other books before: And how doth this man interpret these words? Why, whereas I mentioned my profiting [in a fortnight] he doubteth not to conclude, that I vouchedfase the Scripture but a fortnights study, as if it had been then no longer, and as if I had contemned and not studied it, the rest of my life, as being too low for my studies. And from the Caution that I put in about former Reading (because we were then where I was, pelted with some Teachers, that perfwaded men to read no books but the Bible,) he gathers, that it was Jesuites and Papists, that I had read before, and then brought it out. Hath a man any Plead against such an Accuser of the Heart, which man can justify by? Or must he not only Appeal to the Judge of hearts. As Job, and Paul in his Epistles, did by Solemne Oathes, Appeal from Accusers and false furmifers, to that Record in Heaven, and that Omniscent Witness, so do I take it to be my duty, in such a case as this is, to Appeal from M. Cr. that only pretendeth to know my heart to the All knowing God that is acquainted with it indeed, who made it, and I think profelled it with that Light, for which I suffer these Reproaches; and deliberately and in his fear I do solemnly profess 5 1. That if I were a Papist the world should soon know it; for I hate the dissembling of my Religion; and (as I said) I scorn that Religion that is a just cause of shame, or that will not bring him off on gainefull terms, that shall suffer in the defence of it. And whether I have ever gone that way that thunneth danger and sufferings in the world, and whether my Conscience hath stooped for the securing of my flethe, I desire them to judge that have known me in the course of my Life and Ministry before the warres, and that have been my associates in the warres. 2. And for the particular in question, I do before the same heart-searching God profess, that these things that the Accuser writes,are false, and that I did not, to the utmost of my remembrance, learn, or borrow, or transcribe from Jesuites, or any other Papist, one line, or word, in that book (but what I have cited them for, which is as I remember, but once the name of St. Thomas and D’Orbeilis, in a common question of Philosphy, and Suarez once or twice in a common point of Metaphysics or Logick, and one trivial sentence in the Epistle out of White;) nor did I transcribe one Text of Scripture out of any of them: Nay that I had read then but
but very few Jesuites on any subject, and to this day, their books are an exceeding small part of my reading; some Schoolmen I confess I have read (and some few Jesuites,) but the main part of my first time was spent in reading English Protestants, and my next in Latin Protestant, and my later years have been mainly spent in the Fathers and Ancient writers: And I further profess before the same God, that I remember not one Point of Religion wherein the Papists and Protestants differ, wherein the reading of any Schoolman, Jesuite or other Papist, or conferring with any of them, hath changed my judgement from the Protestants to them. And I renew the same profession, that the points, or method, or terms in that book of Aphorismes, which cause the great offence, and are charged by others with Novelty, and by Mr. Cr. with Popery, I did not to my utmost remembrance, receive from any Book or Person in the world; but only upon former study of the Scriptures, some undigested conceptions stuck in my minde, and at the time of my conceiving and entertaining those Notions (about the Nature and Necessity of a twofold Righteousness, and many the like.) I was in a strange place, where I had no book but my Bible (and a Concordance, I think, and two or three Physick books were with or near me,) and that in extremity of weakness, I was preparing my own thoughts for my remove to God, and thereupon began for my own use, to write those things which I have since published in a book intituled be Saints Rcest, and when I came to that place which is now at p. 68, and 72. in the 4th Ed. I was urged, partly by the occurring difficulty, and partly by a question put to me, to resolve, In what sense it is that men are called Righteous, and publickly justified at the day of Judgement in reference to the Improvement of their Talents, and the feeding, visiting, cloathing, &c. of Christ? and in what sense Christ gives this as the Reason of the sentence. The expounding of Math. 25. was the task, which I was let upon: which as I seriously let my self to understand, I found to be great difficulties as dreadful to God again and again; and thereupon so great light that I could not relit; so that I solemnly protest that it was partly on my knees, and partly in diligent consideration of the naked Text (when I had not so much as Authors or the thought of them with me) that I received the substance of the fore-mentioned particulars. An over-pouring Light (I thought) did suddenly give me an clear apprehension of those things, which I had oft reached after before in vain. Whereupon I suddenly wrote down the bare Propositions (so many of them as concerns Righteousness and Justification,) and so let them lye by me long after. And then falling into further languishing, and into more confident expectations of death, I revised them, and thrust them out too hastily and undigested, little thinking to have lived so long to have reviewed them; and to having none about me, to afford me such assistance or advice as had been meet, and I being unacquainted with the ticklish captious humour of the world, never doubted of men's favourable acceptance, or toleration of its imperfections, thereupon too simply and rashly rushed into the Press, scarce knowing what I did, and I confess, did by oversight and haste incur the guilt of severall harsh expressions, and some unmeet, and that might seem to a luspicious reader, more unsound then they were in my intention, and so did give cause of just offence to pious and judicious men. Yet little thought I but my brethren would have dealt as friendly and compassionately by me and mine infirmities, as I should have done in the like case by theirs: but with some it proved otherwise. Yet, let me add, that where I say I used no Authors, Papists or Protestants, for the forementioned Theses, I say not so for all in the explications: Two I must confess my self much to have profited
profited by in that doctrine; the one is Mr. Bradshaw, the other is Grotius de satisfaccion, a book written while he remained with the orthodox, and approved much by them, and defended by Eusebius against Cretius: Yet had I almost finished those Aphorismes before ever I read a leaf of Grotius, having only heard of him by no encouraging fame; and being at that time in speech with Mr. Tombes, upon his high commendations of it, I borrowed it of him to peruse, and found it fully to answer his commendations: and I confess, I learned more out of it, than I did out of any book except the Scriptures, of many a year before.

Little did I think to trouble men with this tedious Narrative: but I have no other Reply left to Mr. Crandon's unmanly confident affirmations, of my taking it word by word, from the Jesuits and Papists, yea the very Texts of Scripture which I cited.

But suppose Mr. Gr. had a Toleration to write a Volume of false Accusations against me, my poor opinion is (which I submit to better judgements) that Mr. Cary should more have disrelished his abuse and flanderous reports of others far more worthy than I, then to judge such a work to be profitable to the Church.

To begin with the lowest (because but a single man) how inhumanly dealth he with that holy, Learned man of God Mr. John Ball? a man so far beyond the reach of flanderous tongues, both for Holiness, Learning, Abilities of all sorts, especially of Disputation, Soundness of judgement, and distance from the very appearance of such Matter of Reproach? Yet doth this man once fall on him, c. 24, part i. pag. 298, 299. telling men that ["he heard long since that this Mr. Ball was seen in the fashionableness and formality tending somewhat to the Papish outside, and in Religion was the way to preferment, had before his death somewhat declined:] yet he will here be so charitable when he hath printed this report, not to entertain it, till he see the grounds. But before he endeth, his little modesty is quite spent; and part 2. pag. 207. he falls on again in these words ["If elsewhere he contradicts himself I shall oppose Ball against Ball; yea Ball in affilations, when he lived by faith, and had nothing else but Christ apprehended by faith to support his troubled soul, to Ball now raised to a prosperous state, in the world, and who seeing the Court infected with Popery, Socinianisme and Arminianisme, and no other bridge to preferment so effectual as some few of bending at least to these ways, might possibly so far as conscience would permit him, make use of the language there held most authentick; Isay, of the language, for I cannot condemn his doctrine alledged in his three following Testimonies, if taken in a good sense. But his ambiguity of words, seem to speak him only to have had a level to somewhat else besides the supporting of the Truth."

Unworthy man! to publish such base fumes and scurries of the dead! to talk of his eyeing a Court infected with Popery, Socinianisme and Arminianisme, for preferment, and making a bridge to that in his writings, that never saw the light till he was dead? He that was known to live (and die) a Non-conformist, in a poor house, a poor habit, a poor maintenance of about 20th. per an. in an obscure Village, and teaching School all the week for a further supply, desiring as high esteem and honour as the best Bishop in England, yet looking after no higher things, but living comfortably and prosperously with these. Did this man deserve such Accusations as these to be published against his precious name, which envy shall never be able to fret and disparage, but shall be honourable in England while the English tongue and the Christian faith shall here abide.
abide. I marvell this man had no more wit; if he would needs vent his flanders,
that he chose not some forrainers to be the subject of such language, whom the
English knew only by name, and could not therefore so well disprove him. DOTH
he think that he will get any credit by such tales, in Staffordshire, Cheshire, London,
or any where that his name was known? especially while those holy, upright,
worthy servants of Christ, Mr. Langley, Mr. Asby, Mr. Cook, &c. are yet living to vin-
dicate him, who were his familiar acquaintance, and with him in the worst times
maintained their Integrity.

So Par. 1. pag. 59. he lets fly at some Ministers that have in that point spoke (he
faith) almost the same things with me; and adds ["It hath filled my spirits with
fadsness, to hear not only in the pulpits of the Country, but of the City of London,
pronounced by the mouths of some in great esteem, both for Piety and Learn-
ing, that to say God doth not punish his Saints for their sins is Antinomianism; 
and affirmed that the Affiliations of believers are punishments for their sins. I beseech
these men to consider whom they here explode as Antinomians? whether be-
side the Apostles and Fathers of the Primitive Church, they do not brand all
the Reformed Churches, and their Champions against the Papists, with this ign-
ominity? Whether there be any one Article of Christian Religion, that hath
more stoutly defended by these against the Papists, than this which heat of zeal
without knowledge (or consideration at least) hath of late called Antinomian?
Let them produce any besides the Socinian and Arminian Sophisters, that have
stumbled at this doctrine as offensive.]

Here I offer it to your consideration, 1. Whether he do not expressly make these
London Ministers of great esteem, to take part with the Papists against Protes-
tants, even in that one Article of Christian Religion which they have so stoutly
defended, as none more? 2. Yea against all the Reformed Churches. 3. Yea in
a point that none (that they can produce) besides Socinians and Arminians
have stumbled at: so that there are great store of Socinians, Arminians and Pa-
plist in the world, it seems. 4. Whether he involve them not in all the Curses and
Blasphemous, and Papistical Consequent, which he there charge me on me for the
same opinion? 5. Whether this man did remember to make use of his Mod-
esty, when he durst publish to the world, 1. That it is the Apostles, 2. Fa-
thers, 3. All the Reformed Churches, that deny believers sufferings to be pun-
ishments? When 1. The Apostles have never a word to that end, I dare con-
fidently affirm: nay they have much against it: affirming them to be chastis-
ements, which are a species of punishment: and that they are the effects of sinne,
and of the provocation of God to jealousy and anger, and we are judged of the
Lord when we are chastened, and that our God being a consuming fire, and a
Juder of his People, must be served with fear, and not provoked to anger, &c.
2. Did not the man know, that by this Affliction of the Fathers, he did prostitute
the credit of his Reading, or Veracity, or both, to the scorn and pity, of all that
ever took notice of the sense of the Fathers herein? Did he think to be believed
in such Afflictions, by any men that are able to open their books, and try the
truth of his sayings? when it is a known case, that the generality of the Fathers
are judged by the most eminent Protestants, to go but too farre into the contrary
extrem. And though I would interpret them as favourably, and modestly as I
can, yet indeed, their terms at least are not to be excused. As for his judging
the zeal of these Divines to be without knowledge or consideration, it is but the mild
part of his censure. 6. And is it not sleeping immodesty in him, to talk of all the
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Reformed Churches, and challenging them to produce any besides Socinians and Arminians, &c? Hath the man read all Protestant Writers, that he durst make such a confident challenge? I have now I am writing this, the Testimonies of (as I remember,) about 20 or 30, that call believers sufferings, punishments, lying by me, which I collected on other occasions: And I think it safe to have as many more. But to what purpose! I confess many ancient and some later Protestants, do say that believers sufferings are not punishments, but chastisements, taking the word Punishment in a restrained sense for meer Vindictive Punishment (as it is commonly called.) But what man that ever read Philosophers, Divines, Lawyers, of the nature of Punishment, can be ignorant that Chastisement is a Species of Punishment? I dare not challenge Mr. Crandon to produce any but Libertines that ever denied it, for little do I know how many such books as his own may lurk in the world that I never saw, and hope never shall see; but if he will name a man (whose name is not a scourge or trouble to the ears of the sober) that ever gave a Definition of Punishment in Genere, which did not comprehend Chastisement or Paternal Correction as a species, I will accept it as a novelty, and thank him for shewing me that which I, never saw before, though I reject the thing as a vanity.

And it is but a censorious reproach with a pretence of some more modestly, which the late Reverend Assembly receive at his hands in the seventh page of his Epistle Dedic. in these words, ["Besides I have been told, that some of the late Reverend Synod disdained the doctrine (that Justification is an Immanent act in God, and actually compleated in the Redemption which is by Christ and in Christ, both these before we believe, as pag. 5.) but cannot finde that any one of them hath published his Reasons for such a disdilish. And charity will not permit me, to harbour the lightest imagination, that any one of those grave Divines called and selected out of the whole Nation, for their eminency in Godliness and Learning, should without any means used for information and conviction, exercise a tyranny over the consciences of their lesser Brethren, to force them into an implicate faith to believe as themselves believe; specially when doing it, they shall put out that, which they think at least to be the light of the word in their conscience, and in confessing with them without hearing a Reason, they shall differ from others (whom their modesty will confesse to be of no lesse devisings in the Church) who have given their Reasons."]

But might they not debate the case with Dr. Twif, and give him their reasons within their own walls, without such tyranny on our consciences, or giving us those Reasons? They do tell you what Scripture Justification is in their Confession and Catechism, and give you their Reasons for it, if Gods Word may go for Reasons, and prove that it follows faith: But they never offered violence to your Conscience, if it lead you to believe that there is another, or two, Justifications before this. Or if you think it such a wrong to Conscience, to assert that [Remission of Anne and Accepting us as Righteous] do follow faith, it is Gods Word, which they produce, that you must lay the charge on. Had they restrained you from saying, that another Justification is an Immanent act, its like they would have given you Scripture Reason for it.

But all this against Mr. Ball, the London Ministers, and the Assembly, is a small matter to that flood of reproach which he pours out on the Most of the Ministers of England, in the 11, and 12. page of his Preface to the Reader, too long to be all recited.
That since the heat of Controversie between us and the Papists about
the Pia fraus, as they termed it, prevailed every where, a
godly deceit to withhold from the people the knowledge of the liberty which they
have by Christ, left they should turn it into licentiousness. That as this pious
fraud passed from hand to hand among Ministers, many of them while they
were deceiving, were themselves deceived, and verily thought it the right art of
profitable preaching to hold out the Law and keep in the Gospel, to wash the
outer part of the cup and platter, leaving that which is within full of guilt and
corruption. Hence it came to pass that the Law by many was turned to a twofold
use, like the sword of Achilles, &c. Such repentances for sinne, such degrees of
Contrition and Reformation, prescribed out of the Law, which being practi-
ced, pardon of sinne and eternal life must needs follow. Thus man was made
not only his own condemner, but his own Saviour also: his evil works in trans-
gressing the Law purifying him with vengeance, and his returning by repentance
to good works in strict obedience to the Law, restoring him to life and salvation.
In mean while Christ was left in a corner to look upon all, but without interpo-
fition of his operation or Passion. Sometimes indeed much might be heard of
the riches of God's grace, of the efficacy of Christ's merits to save the chief of
sinners; so that the people might even see the door of heaven open to them: but
in conclusion, the Preacher, as if he had been deputed to the office of the Che-
rubims, Gen. 2:11. to keep the way of the tree of Life, with his flaming sword
turning every way, affrighted the poor souls from all hope of entering, crying,
'Proculhine, proculite probani, no prophane or unclean person hath right to med-
dle with this grace. No: first they must have such heart preparations, purifi-
cations, and prejacent qualifications, before they draw near to partake of mercy;
must first cleanse and cure themselves, and then come to Christ afterwards, must
be cloathed with an inherent Righteousness first, and then expect to be cloathed
upon with a Righteousness imputed. Such hath been, and still is the doctrine
delivered in many Congregations within this Nation. I neither fain nor aggra-
vate. It is that whereof my self, nor without grief, have been oft an ear witness,
and that from the mouths of very zealous Ministers. And I fear the Lord hath a
Controversie against the Ministry, and will more yet obscure and vilifie many of
them, for their obscuring of his Grace and his Christ.

1. And who are these zealous Ministers that must bear all this thunder of reproach and threatening? It seems it is all lying before except but [a
few Pulpits.] And who may those few be, is not hard to conjecture. I know no
men that he is so likely to mean, as such as Mr. John Rogers of Dedham, Mr. Fen-
ner, Mr. Tho. Hooker, Mr. Tho. Shephard, Mr. Bolton, and the generality of our old
solid soul-searching Preachers, that go the same way: Of whom I will say but
one word to him, and one to others. To him, That he would conscientiously ob-
serve whether the Labours of these Reverend, Faithfull Servants of Christ, have
not been blessed with another kind of success, then the Labours of Dr. Giff, Mr.
Din, Mr. Randall, Mr. Saltmarsh, Mr. Town, or any of that train: unless he will
deal by them and their converts, as by me, and say, that they brought men to the
Pope and the Devil, and not to Christ. As Mr. Shephard saith, God hath given to
full a blessing on this way of Preaching, and the most Godly have so generally approved
it from experiences, that one would think we should never have been put so to plead
for it.
2. And it is observable, that he laies all this Acusa-
tion on us of obscuring Christ [since the ceasang of the heat of Contro-
sersive.] It seems it is the heat of Controversie that first gave life to his way of revealing Christ, and that must keep life in it: and for want of the heat of Controversie, it will die. Its past doubt then, that he hath done his part to keep life in it. Truly in my best observation, the heat of Controversie drives men to extremes, while it sets even wise and good men a studying, what to say against the adversary, and how to draw all to the strengthening of their cause: and when in happy peace men have leisure soberly to review such arguings, and can patiently hear all sides speak, and are withall put to try their own doctrines on their own and the peoples spirits, and to see them truly reduced to practice, then it is that men come home by repentance to Truth and Moderation, which Controversie lost, and sober Practice findeth again.

2. To others therefore I again give my advice, that they highly value, and diligently read these practical, searching Authors; and what ever such men as this may judge of such Preachers or Writers, be thankfull for them as the greatest blessing of this age, wherein it excelleth other ages, as this Land doth other Nations. I would not advise Country people of Vulgar capacities to trouble their heads with much Controversie, no not against the Antinomists themselves. But as a better preservative I would every family that hath a care of spiritual things, would but keep in their houses, hands and hearts, four or five of our old solid successful practical Divines, and I should not fear the prevalency of Antinomianism: Especially get Mr. Pinkes five Sermons, Mr. Whitfield, Mr. Rogers Doctrine of Faith and Love: Mr. Boltons and Mr. T. Hookers Works, Mr. Fenners, Mr. Whateleys. New birth, Dod on the Commandments, and (as a full Confutation of all their Libertinism in a practical strain) Mr. Shephard, especially his Sound Believer, a Book that well answers the Title, in giving the true caracter of such.

3. I know not how large Mr. Grandons acquaintance may be in England beyond mine: but I have been in many Counties, if not farre the most; and I shall be bold to leave my contrary observation to posterity, for the Vindication of the Ministry, so farre as my credit will go: And I must profess seriously, that though I have frequently and heartily lamented the great number of weak or worldly, or negligent Ministers in many parts, yet did I never hear, to my best remembrance, any one man, no not of the worst that ever I heard, except the late wandering Sectaries. 1. That ever preached any pardon of sin, but by the Bloodshed and Merits of Jesus Christ, and the free grace of God: 2. Or that ever did tell men that they must merit pardon or liete themselves. 3. Or that ever told men they could by their own strength so prepare themselves for pardon, as that pardon must needs follow. 4. Or that ever made any preparations or works a Price for the purchasing of Christ or Grace. 5. Or that ever preached the Law and not the Gospel. 6. Or that ever (so farre as I could discern) did by that which he calls a pious fraud, conceal from the people their Liberty by Christ. 7. Or that taught them only to wash the outside. 8. Or that ever sent men to Works in stead of Christ. 9. Or that ever told them that their Conversion or Reformation, did so much as joyne with Christ in satisfying or meriting. 10. Yea that ever kept poor sinners from the Tree of Life, or the wounded soul from comfort, except those that spoke against their wounding. 11. Or that ever told them they must first assure themselves and then come to Christ. 12. Or that ever obscured Christ and Grace out of design (so farre as I was able to discern;) but only out of weakness, all
all having not the same measure of ability in preaching the Gospel: Not one man did I ever hear that was guilty of any one of these accusations, so farre as I could possibly perceive. Nay I solemnly profess, that in all my daies, since I understood any thing of these matters, the thing that all the carnal and scandalous and formall Preachers about us, were blamed, and censured for, by all the godly of my acquaintance (till the Warses) was their too liberal giving out pardon and free grace and hope of salvation to the ungodly, and making the gate wider and the way broader then Christ had made it, and preaching comfort so generally, that all the wicked might take it to themselves: and that the generality of Godly, Consciouable Ministers went the contrary way, searching, differencings, driving to through humiliation, and broakeness of heart, and Reformation of Life, and were very cautelous in all their offers of pardon, left the prophanes should snatch it, to whom it belonged not: and that this was the only preaching that godly people then loved (so far as my acquaintance extended) and that wicked men hated, and for which they reproached the Preachers as Puritans and Precifians, and were ufed to say, that they would make men mad. This Testimony I leave against Mr. Grandson's reproach of the English Ministry, who thinks it not enough to get into the fear of the scorners, when God hath with thunderbolts struck them out to the ground before his eyes, but he darest also from that feat, to denounce ["a Controversie from the Lord against the Ministry, that he will more yet obscure and vilifie many of them, for their obcurring of his Grace, and his Christ."] And no wonder if he that dare pass this sentence as from God, dare also execute that which he takes to be God's will, and so do bend himself to obscure and vilifie that Ministry.

4. What Grace is it that these Ministers say, No prophanes person hath right to meddle with? "Wherein they play the part of the Cherubims and keep men from the Tree of Life? Is it the grace of sanctification? No, he dares not yet to say it, that they tell men they must not yet be sanctified because they are prophanes? Is it the grace of faith? Certainly he never heard the Ministers so commonly say, None of you that are prophanes persons must believe in Christ for Remission of sinne. Indeed these two things he might hear, for we must preach them, 1. That no prophanes man can accept or believe in an offered Christ to pardon and Justification, till he feel the need of Christ, by feeling the evil of sinne and milery. 2. That no prophanes person ought while prophanes to believe that his sinne is actually pardoned, and he justified by Christ: And if this be the quarrell, I say, It is presumption and not faith that such keep men from, and it is Satan's most potent delusions, and not God's graces, that we would destroy. But 3. It seems it is the grace of pardon it self that he speaks of: And indeed do Ministers so commonly tell the prophanes that they must not take the grace of pardon? In the Libertine sense they do: for so, Taking is but to believe or conceit that they are pardoned already: But in the Scripture sense, they do not, but call the prophanes to take pardon, that is, to accept it on God's terms of faith and repentance; to Take Christ, and whole Christ first, and pardon with him: And hath God a controversy with us, and will make us vile for preaching this doctrine? Dare any but a Libertine say to all the prophanes, Believe that you are all pardoned, and actually justified without exception? Or would he have the Gospel that we must preach to be only this: Believe that all God's Elect only are pardoned, whether prophanes or not prophanes? This would be as terrible a doctrine, and drive them, as he speaks, from the Tree of Life, as much as ours: for how long would it be before
he could tell them, which are the Elect and which not: And if believing that the Elect shall be saved, would save, without any personal application, why might not the devils be saved, who, no doubt, believe that the Elect shall be saved. For my part, I must profess, I finde it no hard matter to perswade any common profligate people that their sins are forgiven by free grace through Christ's blood, and that they shall be saved; but all the difficulty lies in destroying such perswasions, and breaking down their false faith and hope; and very hardly and heavily doth that work go on: and if Mr. Grundon take the contrary course, I am confident his preaching hath more, (I dare not say better) success then mine, and his Converts are more numerous, unless a profligate prelumpus heart, be not the same thing in Hampshire, as in other Countries. But I beseech too many words on so plain a case.

To recite all the grofs calumnies and shameless forgeries of that Book, would be a weary and ungratefull task to the Writer, and no better to the Reader, and must indeed be a transcribing of no small part of his Book, if not the farre greater? What a solemn fiction have we in the third page of his Epift. Ded. That I have my ["circumforaneous Legates, which having their Provinces assigned either of one or more Counties, are still circling and compassing them; first to difperse this his mystery of iniquity with such acurateness, that there may be no one that hath the repute of a pious Gentleman or Minister, a stranger to it: and then by their frequent visitations, to examine how the Baxterian faith thrives in each person and to hold them fixed to it: These returning once in six or seven months out of their circuits to their grand Matter, may possibly speak in things that they know not, what they think may be plausible to him.]

Conform to this are his following words in the same Epift. ["2. It sprang from other mens, yea Ministers, too much admiration and almost adoration of him, when from all parts there was such concourse in a way of Pilgrimage to him, to bless him or be blessed by him, and the admirers returned to the deceiving of others, with no less applause and triumph, then the Turk from visit- ing the shrine of their Mahomet, &c."]

Would any think this man lived at such a distance from me, and knew so little of what he faith? when he pretendeth to know our very discourses, contrivances, and correspondences? I stand not on the visible envy that he expresseth; but what an imputious falshood is the substance of the story? I confess, with thanks to God and them, that I have sometime the favour of my Brethren's visitations, for an hour, or a night, from several parties; but it is for the most part, but when they pass this way as travellers; it being usual with Ministers, so farre to shew love to each other. But I do solemnly profess (I have no other way to clear my self) 1. That I never sent man, or provoked man to promote that Book, or any singular opinions of mine, or any of those that I am judged to differ from the common way, any other way then the generality of godly Ministers promote them. 2. That I never asked any man living (to the utmost of my memory, and I am very confident of it, in this) whether Ministers or Gentlemen, or who, or how many, did favour that Book, or any singular opinion of mine, or any so called. 3. That I never asked so much as one man, to my utmost remembrance, that came to me, how he liked that Book, or whether himself were of my minde in the points in Controversie between me and my Brethren. 4. That to this day I do not so much as know the Judgements of those Reverend Brethren, or any one of them, that ever came to me out of that County where Mr. Gr. dwells, or any neigh-
bour County, and of very few in England, that ever came to me from any part. Except it be those that dissent, and came to give me their exceptions. 5. That Mr. Crandon's neighbours, whom it seems he raiteth this slander of, are men of another spirit, then to drive a trade of venting new Opinions, or Errors: and that it is not that Book which he deals against, but my other Labours that I have had their thanks for (to the best of my remembrance:) yea that their Conference is upon Praticalms, wholly bending another way, then the Accuser of the Brethren dreams of. 6. Yea I will adde further (because it seems Mr. Crandon knows them) that I know not one Minister of Hampshire or Wiltshire who hath been with me, and with whom I have any familiarity (except one, who medled not with me on such things,) but they have by their Letters perswaded me from Controversie to Practical Writings, yea and some of them have dealt as freely with me (when by misunderstanding that word in my Directions for Peace of Confe, they subfected me to waver in the point of Perseverance:) as any other men have done. 7. That I know none of any part in England that I have any familiar correspondence with, but men reputed Godly, and none that ever visitcd me purposely (as Ministers, for familiarity or acquaintance,) but meerly on that account; nor do I ever use to have much discourse with any of them about any such Opinions; nor is it Opinionalists that are my familiar. 8. That I use to mention that Book of Aphorismes as sparingly as I can, to any, being truly ashamed of it, (and willingly to publish my self) for its indigested passages and imperfections. 9. That when I am forced to speak of it, it is commonly by way of acculsion, or confession of my Rashness, and that especially for the distaste of some Brethren (which I never dream't of before hand) I do repent that ever I published it, and so do hereby profe, 10. That this is my course with neighbour Ministers, as well as Strangers. Let any man living that can, witness against me, that I set upon him to draw him to any opinion of mine, whereon I differ from the generality of my Brethren, or am supposed so to do. 11. Yea let any man of my own Congregation, witness against me, if they can, that I have bestowed one quarter or half quarter of an hours discourse with them to that end: What I preach publiquely the Town and Country knows. 12. Yea I have hindered very many from the reading of that Book; both of my neighbours and young Scholars in the Universities, that any what depended on me for advice. 13. And besides all this I have suppressed it, from being again Printed, this five years or thereabout, contrary to the importunity of multitudes of Letters; when there was never but a thousand Printed in all, as the Bookfellers told me. Lay all this together, which I solemnly profe to be the truth, and then judge of the truth of this man's long forged Story, of Legacies, and Circuits, and Examinations, and the driving on such a laborious enterprise, for propagation of my Opinions, as he adventured to affirm and engage his Credit on! Doth this man know what spirit it is that actuates him? If I have any opinion differing from others, I think he hath seldom known any man, that ever was so zealous in propagating such Opinions. Oh that I knew how to further the Unity and Peace of the Church, and to clofe our wounds, on the condition that Book were burnt; that Mr. Crandon is so angry at.

But I will not for five times the price of Mr. Cr's Volume, undertake to enumerate one half the gros falshoods in matter of fact, which he confidently affirmeth. This then is my first Reason, which I tender to Mr. Caryl, why I think the Church is not like to get any great profit by this Book of his, and that it was not worthy of the publick view.
MY second Reason is this, That book which is so filled from end to end with Railing, scorning and Raving words, that it is hard so much as to finde the very tenece of the mans Reasons, in such an age as this is, when men need not pick up Truths out of mens excrements, doth seem to me unprofitable to the Church, and unworthy to be publick: But such is Mr. Grandons book: Therefore, I confess my Conscience would have received more then such a [little Check] as Mr. Carys received, if I had been desired to approve or applaud such a book, though it had been against mine Enemy that it had been written (or else I know nothing of mine own heart:) It would sure have been [a Check] effectually to the suspending of my Approbation? I have not read all the book (nor ever mean to do,) but I have perused the farre greatest part: and in most places, if not almost all, the seeming reason which he produceth, is so buried in a heap of Raging language, that I must read a great deal, before I can finde it. And so coolant is he, and so violent in this language, upon no apparent cause given him, that I truly profess, I cannot but question whether the mans brain be sound or crackt, and the next I meet with that knows him, I shall enquire better of it.

But I suppose Mr. Carys will say, that for all this his book will be profitable to the Church of God, for the Doctrines taken that it containeth: But is found Doctrine grown so rare in England, that it can be had from no cleaner a hand then this? Are all our sober Divines turned Hereticks? And are all the old books that delivered sound Doctrine, lost or burnt? Sence when a Christian may gather all the sound Doctrine of this book from 500 more, where it is cleaner delivered, it is not profitable to Gods Church to have the same delivered, in such infernall language. Are you sure that most or all Readers, will receive no hurt by such a Volume of faile and Railing words? and that they who take the truth, will not take the filth and all? Had Mr. Grandons great friend desired me so to approve of such a book written against Mr. Carys (supposing him of my judgement and me of his,) I think I should have taken it for a task of no more honour, then to have pind my name upon his close stool, to invite men to it as fit matter for publick food; and to tell them, that though it be matter of ill Refentment, yet it was Good till he concocted it, and perhaps there may be an Apple or two in the bottom if you can finde them. The words may seem unmanerly: but if our Righteousnes be as Menstruous raggs, and the Sacrifices of wicked men be Dang, in the language of God, I think this Unrighteous, Impure Fardell, may patiently bear the same denominations.

But perhaps Mr. Carys may say, Though all the sound Doctrine of this book be common, yet it is worthy of the publicke view, and profitable to the Church, for the confusion of my Errors, and prevering men from the danger of infection. To which I say, 1. Will not the same sound Doctrine as it lay before in sober mens writings, preserve them better? 2. I do not believe that any one man will be preserved by the Argumentative part of his book: If the Reproaches preserve them not, by firing their affections, they are like to be neverethels in danger for this book. 3. But because this is the All that can be said, I will (though contrary to my former purposes) give a taint to Mr. Carys of the force of this Authors Vindication of the Truth, and Confutation of the Errors; and it shall be the most subj-
He first thing that I will do, shall be to give you a taster of that Truth which he Vindicateth; and the second shall be to shew you the strength of his Confutations of my greatest Errors.

1. In his Epistle Dedicatorie, his two first Points which he seeks to vindicate from the Charge of Antinomianism, are thus expressed: 1. Justification is an Immanent act in God; as actually Completed in the Redemption which is by Christ, and in Christ, both these before we believe. If he meant that God's Immanent act is Completed by Christ, it would according to himself make God himself Incompleat till Christ Compleat him: But, his meaning is, I believe, that Justification in General, and not that fort or act is Completed in and by Christ before we believe; and if so, then it is as compleat to Infidels as to Christians: But because he puts in a Reserve afterwards, for caution [As far as I hold it] let us search how far he holds it. And pag. 106, he faith: 4. Faith is self (much less any other qualification, gift or act) is not a Condition of Justification in foro Dei: there Christ pleaded our discharge by his blood, and it still maketh intercession for us: but a means or Instrument by which we receive Christ Jesus, and the Righteousness and Justification that is in him to our selves, for consolation and salvation in foro conscientiae. So then we are saved in foro conscientiae by faith, and in foro Dei without it. Yet he forgot that elsewhere he calls it, forum Dei in consciencie, as being of a better sound. And pag. 116, he faith: That the blood of Christ is sufficient to Complete our Justification before God, and that this is its own work: but that there are other Necessaries to Justifie us in our selves and our own apprehensions, which being supposed the work is endless. So pag. 89. [Though as to themselves and their own judgements, and as to the apprehensions of men, they are under the Law, under wrath, yet in Christ they have done their Law, their Iniquities paid, presented and to come are blotched out, their peace made, and they reconciled to God.]

Pag. 354. He heaps up abusively several texts of Scripture [as giving testimony of our Justification in Christ before faith entered to purifie our hearts, &c.] and annexeth [and all this before we had a being, &c.] when yet there is not so much as mention of Justification in any text but one that he citeth, and that one is abused: the words [being now Justified] being made to be [when we were enemies we were Justified] and were nothing for him, if they had been so, as I have have shewed against Colossians: Many other passages manifest his opinion, that Justification is from Eternity, and compleated before we were born, and that by faith, is but in our own Conscience, to save us there.

From hence it must needs follow, that no elect person, though an Infidell, may Confess any other Guilt or Miserie, but that which is opposite to Justification in Conscience: and that they must not Pray for any other Justification or pardon, and that they must not be beholden to Christ, nor thank him for any other pardon or Justification received since they believed or were born, but only this in Conscience; with abundance of the like consequents, of which I intend to say more anon.
But these are not all his mistakes. *Part 1, pag. 205*, he faith that the saying of Bernard [*Via regni sunt non causa regendi*; some do, and all should thus construe: "not that they are the way to the Kingdom above, Christ alone being this way, "but they are the way of the Saints which are Christ's spiritual Kingdom." As if Bernard by *Via Regni*, meant the Kingdom now within us, when he opposeth it to *Causa Regendi*! But see what an opposition he makes between [the way to the Kingdom above] and [the way of the Saints!] As if it might not, yea must not be both! As if he should say to a traveller [that is not the way to such or such a place, but it is the way of the traveller]. The word [way] implieth no more then to have the nature of a Means to that End: and this man will have Christ only to be the way to the Kingdom above! as if Faith, Love, Obedience, Promises, Sacraments, other Ordinances, were no Means to the Kingdom above, and so that our salvation there were no End of any of these: and as no Nothing else can be the way in subordination to Christ because Christ is the only way. These words may be toys to some, and may please those ears that do by the opinions which they call Orthodox, as others in these times do by the opinions which are novel and heterodox, even place their Religion in holding such opinions: but I desire God to preserve his Church from the practising of them, as small a matter as they may seem to be: He that makes not Heaven his End, and knoweth of no Means to it, but Christ, never knew Christ aright, nor shall never come there. This I lay, because I believe God.

*Part 1, pag. 193*. That ["Christ hath not Merited from Gods Naturall, but "his ordinate Justice, not in the strict, but in the large sense:)" and this he makes "the ground of his bold Affirmation, ["That I do equalize the Merits of men, "with the Merits of Christ's Righteousness." For the first part of his Assertion, I had rather Mr. Owen might school him, by his late *Distrib.de Justitiae vindicatrice*, then I dispute with him: For the later, I know what I should have (justly) heard, if I had said that Christ merited not in the strict, but in the large sense. The large sense which I there express, is when there's no value in the thing, but meekly the promise of the Donor, that can be any Causa of that called Merit; and when it makes not the Reward to be of Debt, but meekly of Grace. And indeed is that man orthodox, and a vindicator of Christ and his Merits against Popery, that affirneth that Christ hath no otherwise merited than thus? I will not ask, Whether this be consistent with Christianity it self: But I that am, with this man the great enemy of free Grace, do profess to believe, that it was the Value of Christ's performance that made it Meritorious, as it was a most excellent Means to the attainment of Gods Ends: and that it made the Reward to be of Debt to Christ, and not of meek Grace; and that it was Merit in the strictest sense, even on the terms of Commutative Justice, considering it as undertaken and dignified by the second Person in Trinity, who was never obliged by subjection but by voluntary pittance; and that afterward as performed by God-man, under the Law, it was strictly and properly meritorious from Distributive Justice. See then how the Vindicators of free Grace do Maintain it by Denying it, and the supposed enemies of it acknowledge and maintain it! And whether this Doctrine be Profitable to the Church of God, and worthy of the publick view?

*Part 1, pag. 210, 321*. You may see more how he advanceth Christ in the work of our Justification. He tells me that ["He will deny my Assertion [that "Christ's satisfaction is the Meritorious Cause of Justification] unless I will "grant him these 4 or 5 suppositions. 1. That so farre as Justification is an act "Eternal!"
"Eternall and Immanent in God, Christs satisfaction is not the Meritorious Cause of it. 2. If in some other respect it be the Meritorious Cause, that God doth therein merit of himself. 3. That this Merit must in no wise hinder but that the entire benefit of Justification must come to us freely without money or price. 4. That it is but improperly termed Merit, even then when it respecteth the discharge which God giveth into a mans conscience, &c. 5. That Christs satisfaction is more properly to be called Gods foundation of this our new Relation of Justified persons, upon which he hath enabled himself to Justifie us in Mercy, without any seeming diminution of his Justice and truth."

You see now how far Christ hath merited our Justification, according to this zealous Patron of his Merits. 1. The Immanent Justification, he neither did nor could merit: as p. 32. he faith again, and he faith I will and must grant it: But I conjecture (for its a high business) that Gods essence is but Denomination extrinseca called Justifying] or [such or such an immanent a&:] and that this extrinseca Denomination may oriis de novo, and not be eternall; because of the newness of the object: it being a denomination from Relation, which is not subjected properly in God as Related to the object really, but in the objects Relation to God, from whence it is only denominatively and rationally given to God: This is the doctrine of Aquinas, Capellos, and the rest of that Tribe, and the other Schoolmen in greatest credit (Papsists I confess, but) owned also by those Protestants that are the greatest adversaries to the Arminian Cause: This being so, even the Immanent Justification, if there be any to be called (as the Esteeming and Accepting us as Righteous) is the effect of Christs Merits, and the Consequent of faith: (Though I easily acknowledge, the Eternall Deed to Justifie, is not so.) And do not our Divines of the Assembly, in the Catechisme and Confession, define Justification by Remission and Accepting us as Righteous? And Accepting is taken for an Immanent a& (and is, unless you take it improperly for the Acceptance of the Law it self, rather then of the Law-giver.) And yet they affirm it to follow faith, and to be the fruit of Christs Merit.

2. But this Justification Mr. Grandon denieth to proceed from Christs Merits, and the second here named is but [the discharge given in to Conscience:] and in respect to this he faith, it is but improperly termed merit. Is not Christs Merit then well advanced? Justification in God he meriteth not at all; Justification in Conscience he meriteth but [improperly.] But perhaps you will say, He might yet properly Merit a third Justification not there mentioned, viz. his own as the publick person, and ours in him. I answer, 1. There is no such thing as our Justification in Christ, properly so called; (and the phrase that I used that way, I have already published my revocation of. 2. He that knowes no Justification of us personally, but Immanent in God from eternity, and Transient in Conscience, will likely acknowledge no other to Christ: and to the Justification of Christ himself as the publick person, is either Immanent, and that, say they, he merited not; or transient in the Conscience of Christ; and that is but improperly called Merit. A fair Advancement of Christs Merit. Thus over-doers are the most successfull undoers.

But suppose that he had acknowledged the most proper Meriting of Justification in Conscience, (both in the Conscience of Christ, if he will so speak, and of us;) is this a fair dignifying of the Merit of Christ? what! to Merit no Justification but that in Conscience? I assure Mr. Caryl, I that am taken by him for the opposer [of Justification by Christs satisfaction alone without works] do give in-
S E C T. I V.

P a r t i. p a g. 301. Against my Conditionall Justification, he thus argueth; "I. Whatsoever finnes of whatsoever persons were Imputed to Christ, and for which he hath made full satisfaction to God's Justice, these are no more Imputed, but for ever remitted in Christ Absolutely and unconditionally to them who were the committers thereof. But all the finnes of all the Elect, and of them only, and not of the world, were Imputed to Christ, and he hath made full satisfaction. Therefore] The Proposition is a desperate error, of such consequence, as is fearfull to consider: yet it is said by this man [to be clear, unless we will pronounce God to be unjust.] See here a little more of the face of his sound Doctrine! Paul faith, Rom. 4. 24. that faith shall be Imputed to us for Righteousness, if we believe,] and till Righteousness is Imputed sinne is Imputed. Paul faith, that God hath shut up all under sinne, that the promise in Jesus Christ might be to them, that believe: Christ faith, He that believeth not, is condemned already, and the wrath of God abideth on him. How frequently doth Scripture describe the misery of an unregenerate mans estate, that he is by nature the child of wrath, that such are strangers to the Covenant of Promise, without Hope, without God in the world (at least the Gentile part,) and still they Receive Remission, and Justification, and Adoption, when they believe. Yet this man dare say, That no sinne is ever Imputed more to these men, though Infidels, if Elect, because Christ hath satisfied, but they are all Absolutely and unconditionally Remitted to them who were the committers thereof.] So that if this be true, no Elect Infidel, is capable of any pardon of sinne from his youth, to his death, all being done in Christ before (except assuring us in Conscience of it:) and so they have no such pardon to pray for, desire, endeavour after, or acknowledge. Do not call this Doctrine Libertinisme, least you wrong it, or be a Papist for so doing. But here is his proof. That "God is unjust, if any sinne be Imputed to any man, which was before Imputed to Christ, and he satisfied for." He faith "For
[19]

["For if he should impute to the offender any one sinne, which was imputed to "Christ, and for which Christ hath fully satisfied God's justice, then should "God be unjust in taking vengeance twice of the same sinne, &c. contrary to the "equity of his justice, and infallibility of his Truth, &c.] See how high a charge "this brother of ours, this dwarf, this earth-worm, dare lay against the Almighty God, "even as high, as of injustice and untruth, should he but impute one unlawful word or "thought to an infidel or pagan, that is elect.

But yet this is his more humble and meeker language. Pag 55. Part 1. He "fals on me as a papist, for laying that 1. Some part of the curie (that is, the evil "threatned for sinne) is executed on the whole man, soul and body. 2. That till "the resurrection, all the effects of sinne, and law and wrath will not be removed. "3. That there is no unpardoned sinne in the death of believers which shall pro- "cure further judgement, and so no hatred in it, though there be anger. I recite "the words as he takes them together in his order: But let this stand at present. "What if I affirm that the death of the Godly is a penal effect of sinne, and the law "and God's wrath? (still maintaining that this which is of itself a penal evil, is "sanctified by God for their good, he maketh all their chastishments to be their ad- "vantage, and the effects of his anger are means to prevent that destruction which "is the effect of his hatred to them that suffer it;) What if I say that their death "may be from God's anger yet from his love as prevalent, and that there is no un- "pardoned sinne in that death, to bring further judgement on them? Why you "shall hear what thanks this man would give God for such a mercy as his eternal "salvation, supposing that there be any sinne, law and anger the cause of his death, "he saith ["A glorious privilege no doubt! such as, according to our usual "proverb, a man may finde at Belluligia for a box on the ear, from the worst of "men that he meets with! When a man hath in revengefull fury persecuted his "hated neighbour with all the strokes and storms of wrath and mischief, and after "many years persecution, hath at last slaughtered him, and trampled his dead "corps into the mire and dust, now at last he escape the hatred, and is but an- "grily with his poor relics, forgives him all the rest, when he can do no more "to him, and forgiveness can do him no good. Such tender mercies of cruelty (as "the wise man terms them, Prov. 12. 10.) doth Mr. Baxter here ascribe unto God, "in his gracious dealings with believers for Christ's sake, &c. to persecute them "with all the strokes of his wrath, and all the curses of the Law, all their life "time, sparing neither their body nor soul, and at last with great indignation to "destroy them, and trample their bodies into the earth, dust and rottenness, yea "and their souls whither he lift, and under what torment he lift, and after this "(so remarkable is his love) he will hate them no more, but be angry with them "still. When they are dead and can offend no more, and God hath inflicted up- "on them all his judgements, that he can inflict no more, now their sins shall be "so pardoned that they shall suffer no more, no more then all, which they already "suffer. Who denies this to be the very quintessence of mercy and spirits of love, "when Mr. Baxter hath so defined it, and held it forth to us as the most celestial "comfort that we shall finde in death. There is, faith he, no unpardoned sin in "the death of believers that shall procure further judgement.]"

The Lord pardon the great hardness of my heart, that trembleth no more at the "most horrid blaspheming of his sacred Name! and that is no more deeply affectcd with zeal for God, and compassion to the man that durst use this direfull lan- "guage! If it should prove true, that the chastishments and death of the Saints are "penalties,
Penalties, and though sanctified to their good, are yet in themselves evil, and so far as evil, the effects of God's displeasure and wrath; dare man therefore vomit out all these horrid reproaches against the God of heaven! Is God as bad as the worst of men for this? Would the worst of men for a box on the ear, bestowed everlasting salvation on us, besides all the unspeakable riches of mercy, which (for all these penal chastisements) we receive in this life? Dōth God no more then the worst of men would do for nothing, if he give us his Christ to redeem us from the curse that we were fallen under by our sinne, and to become the Physician of our wounded, defiled souls, and to undertake the perfect cure (though he will not finneth it till death) giving us his Spirit, remitting our sins perfectly at the present, as to all the destructive punishment, and making a saving Medicine of all the retaliatory punishment which remains? Is it nothing to be delivered from Gods burning jealousy and hatred which he beareth to all the workers of iniquity, and from eternal flames which else we must have undergone? The Lord pity and watch over the hearts of his people! or else whither will they run! O fad cafe, to hear a Christian zealot speak the language of a Rabfhalieh. He will say, no doubt, he intends these but against me, as the consequents of my doctrine: But should the dreadful God be thus desperately charged, in case my supposition were true! And hath he not reason, at least, to take it as displeasur′e, when the Scripture speaks it in most express terms, so frequently as it doth? How commonly doth it call our sufferings, chastisements, and punishments, and express God as angry with his People, and make their sinne the cause! See the texts cited before in my Confession. And beside the fearfull language here given to God, what a multitude of false Accusations, palpable falshoods are here heaped up and charged on me, as if it were my doctrine, (whether directly or consequentially.) 1. The scornfull term of [A glorious priviledge!] implies a falshood, as if heaven were no such thing. 2. That he may have the like of the worst of men for a box on the ear, is as false as horrid. 3. That God persecuteth his people in revengefull fury, or that I ever so taught, is as false. 4. That it is with all the strokes and storms of wrath and mischief: when I still professeth that it is but the Remnants of the fruits of sinne, moderated by Paternal affections of abundant Love. 5. That God having slaughtered us, trampleth our dead corpse in the mire and dust; all expressing revengefull enmity. 6. That he ceaseth then from hatred; when the man himself is forced to take notice, that I deny God to do any thing in hatred to his people, but in anger and love as fathers chastise, speaking of the affect from the effects; and so the love still greater then the anger. 7. That he feigns me to make God angry with his reliques: when I never so said; though now I will say, that our bodies being so many years in the dust, when else they should have been in Paradice, is penal, and so farre may be said to be an effect of Gods anger, as it is penal. 8. That God then forgiveth him the rest, when he can do no more to him, is a scorn of salvation, and a falshood: What! can God do no more to a man when he is dead! Cannot he raise his body to torment, and torment his soul, and shut him everlastingly out of his glory! What desperate words are these! 9. That forgiveness can then do him no good, is as false, unless the Everlasting fruition of God, and the escape of damnation be no good. 10. As false and horrid is it, that such dealing is cruelty, or that I charge Gods tender mercies to be cruelty, as he vilely applies Prov.12.10 to God, which describeth the wicked. 11. He repeats the same falshood again, that I make God to persecute them with all the strokes of his wrath. 12. And with all the curses of the Law: as if we were delivered
livered from no curse, if our castigations are in any measure penal. 13. As false is it, that I say, He spareth neither their bodies nor souls! when he unconceivably spareth them in his sharpest chastisements! Is there no sparing, if there be any penalty? 14. As false that I say, he doth at last in great indignation, destroy them: Though death destroy the body, I called it not a destroying the man, nor said God did it in great indignation. 15. Nor did I say he tramples their bodies to rottenness. 16. Nor did I ever say, he trampleth their souls whether he lift: for his lift is to glorifie, and not trample them. 17. Much less said I, that he trampleth them to what torments he lift, when I expressly said, they had no further punishments, and elsewhere proved by twenty Arguments against the Socinians, that they go immediately to blessedness with Christ. 18. After the scorn at Gods love, the next words are as false, that I say, He will hate them no more, as if I said that he hated them till then, or said not the contrary. 19. And as false that I say, He will be angry with them still. 20. Its not true that the dead can offend no more, if they are such as lie under all Gods judgements. 21. Its false that I say, God inflicteth on them All his judgements. 22. Or that he can inflict no more. 23. Or that they have suffered all already. 24. Or that I ever said directly or consequentially, that this is all the Comfort we shall finde in death. All these are as false, as that the Sunne is meer darkness. Yet the very next words add more of the same nature. 25. He faith, I say not absolutely there is no unpardoned sinne on the Saints after death, but none so unpardoned: when my words were chief: ["There is no unpardoned sinne in it, which shall procure further Judgement, and so no hatred, though there be anger." And I think in Scripture sense, no sinne is unpardoned, when the sinner hath Absolute Right to Glory and Impunity, at present for the soul, and in diem for the body to be with Christ. 26. Next he addeth, That ["I deny not, but rather imply, their sinnes to be yet still unpardoned, to the holding on them, these Judgements already inflicted: a comfort that the Devils and Reprobates in Hell shall not want after the very day of Judgement in the midst of these flames.".] 27. He makes me to affirm that the soul shall suffer till the Resurrection: And thus he goes on in falsehoods as thick almost as lines, and sometimes more! Contrary to my express words from which he would force them. When I say, that In the death of believers, that is, on dying believers, there is no unpardoned sinne, which shall procure further Judgement, besides or after death it self; he falsely chargeth me to say, that even the soul suffereth after, when I have many years ago in my book of Rest by twenty Arguments (as is said) proved that they go to rest with Christ.

But I am fallen before I intended it on the second part of my task, to shew Mr. Caryl how this man vindicareth the truth against me. And because I am call on this point, and this is the first point that Mr. Caryl mentions as vindicated against me, I will proceed a little further to try the success of his attempts.

That which is Vindicated by most direfull blasphemyms of the Name of God, is not well Vindicated: But such is Mr. C's supposed Vindication of truth, as I have begun to shew; and if you will read on, you may finde him proceed in the same rage.

His third charge against this Doctrine (that Believers sufferings are punishments) is this: He faith, ["It is scandalous to the grace and mercy of God, &c.; making flames of fury to break out from the very bowels of his compassion, that poor
poor souls believing what he faith, will be apt to fly from God as from a Satan, and from his Gospel dispensations, as from death and hell itself. When they hear him to be a bloody, to take delight in cursing, cursing, rending, tearing and tormenting in soul and body, unto death, and after death, his own sons and daughters, and that under a profession of grace and love to them, what difference can they conceive to be between such a God and the Devil? If there be such bitterness in his Love, who will desire the least satisfaction thereof? If his "armes of embracing be such Lions paws, who will not in all union, all drawing nigh to him, &c." The next Accusation is this. 4. It is slanderous to the justice of God. 1. By accusing it there to inflict the curse, wrath and judgments, where he impureth not sinne. 2. By charging it to receive full satisfaction for our debt, from Christ our Surety, and afterward when all is paid to require satisfaction from us too. A piece of injustice so odious to the light of nature it self, that Mr. Baxter would account him a prodigy of Nature, a Divilized man that should so do, yet hath he the face to charge the most righteous God therewith. Thus he proceedeth, heaping up more of these direfull consequents, as he imagineth, to the number of ten. These words I consider first as they are a charge against God, and secondly, as a charge against me. 1. What will you call that man, that durst lay all this to the charge of God, supposing he did deal with man as hardly as I expressed? Suppose God did lay all the evil that we bear upon us as penal, yet sanctifying this to our advantage, and saving us for ever; shall the creature conclude to the face of God, that he is cruel, bloody, delighting in tormenting soul and body, and that there's little or no difference between him and the Devil? and his love and union not to be desired, &c.? I profess my flesh trembleth at the writing and thinking of these words? What if it were true? (for disputation fake he will sure give us leave to suppose it); that after all Christ's satisfaction, God should inflict the penalty of a toothach, or of sickness, or of temporal death on our selves, shall just and as it stand up, and tell God, that none but a prodigy of Nature, a Divilized man would do so, among men! O Christians look to your hearts! you see what fruits the corrupt seed that is there latent would bring forth, if God should leave you to your selves. Did I think that God had had a creature on the earth, that durst have uttered such words, till the Ranters lately arose, and till I now read them in this Book? Did I think there had been a Preacher of the Gospel, zealous for the honour of God's grace, that durst have spoke thus? O unfull man, whether art thou fallen? O patient God, what indignities dost thou put up? Open your eyes, whoever you are of this man's opinion, that there is no penal effects of sinne remaining on us, and see whether you need any further proof, then the legible demonstration of his own hideous reproaches of the Almighty? Is the withdrawing of the Spirit of God, so farre, as that all this sinne should follow no punishment? Is all this horrid sinne the fruit of nothing but Love in God? Is former sin no cause of this? O blinded man that can believe it.

2. As all these are made the doctrine which I deliver, and he faith, I charge the righteous God therewith, I have but one answer, That the Accuser is the most monstrous false speaker that ever I had to do with. Here are almost as many untruths as lines still. Where and when did I ever say, that God requireth satisfaction of us, or that God was bloody, or took delight in cursing, cursing, rending, tearing, tormenting soul and body unto death and after death, of his own children, and that under a profession of Grace and Love? Nay where said I that ever he doth, though with-
out delight, torment them after death? Nay how expressly have I denied all this here? Besides what I have largelier written of Afflictions and Death, in my Book of Rest, Part 3d, Chap. 12. and Part 4. Chap. 2., which I desire the Reader to see, if he would know whether this mans Accusations be true or false.

My second Reason therefore which I give Mr. Caryl against the profitablenes of this Vindication is this. To heap up a multitude of Lies is not a Vindication of Fundamental Truth, profitable to the Church of God: But such is this Vindication of Mr. C. and therefore:

I troubled my self and the Reader to number 27 even now in one piece of a leaf, there being more on the same leaf: And how many are in the next? It goes against my minde, and is unflavoury to me, so much as to name the fault of this Volume: but I must profess that I never saw a Theological discourse (to my best remembrance) that might be so sufficiently answered almost from end to end (in the points of difference) with one word, Antithesis (as Bellarmine was once answered) as this Book of Mr. C.'s.

And because this is the great point of offence, I will go back to his stating the Question, and his arguings and Answers to my Arguments.

Sect. V.

P. Ag. 31. he poureth out his raving terms for not right stating the Question, and thereupon he will state it better, and deal with me as an opposer of the new Question of his stating, and not of that which I stated my self: I professed only to dissent from them that deny our sufferings to be an sort of punishments, or the moral effects of sinne, or to proceed from God's anger or threatening. For as I maintain on one hand, that they are but mere chastisements, having more good in them by Accident then evil in themselves, and therefore more of God's love then his wrath; so I maintain that still as they are evil of themselves, and as farre as they are penal, our sinne and God's anger and threat are the cau ses of them.

Yet here I confess two faults that I committed in that Dispute. The first was in wronging the Reformed Divines, by making the opinion which I oppose to be more commonly held by them then indeed it is. But the Reasons of my mistake were 1. That I had not then read so many that speak otherwise as since I have done: 2. I had left been reading two or three of great Name that speak in that language, and I am much fixed on their words, that I enquired not with sufficient diligence into the words of others. This I do now revere, as finding that it is very common among the Reformed Divines to hold and maintain, that our Afflictions are Penal. The second thing which I now disapprove is, that I used the word [Curse] though I expressed that I meant nothing by it, but either any part of the Threatning, or any part of the evil Threatned: and though the Scripture itself do frequently apply the word [Curse] even to chastisements upon Believers, as I have proved before at large: Yet because our common use of the word [Curse] is such as intimates some Revenging, Destructive Punishment, that may denominate the man Accursed, I think I should have forbore it, and hereafter purpose so to do. Though I ever professed that it is utterly unfit to call Believers Accursed, though their penalty might be called some part of the Curse; because the Person is to be Denominated from that which is Predominant: and
the Curse or Evil is but comparatively small, and in the way of certain Cure; but the Good of Blessing is so great, that the weakest Christian is a Blessed Man.

But Mr. Cr. would perswade us, pag. 31. that the Reformed Divines that I opposed in that Point, are of his mind, "that our Sufferings are Chaftisements and Trials flowing from the same Grace and Love, by which Christ himself, and the Redemption we have by him, inferred, &c." What gross contradictions doth this man hold? viz. That our Sufferings are Chaftisements, and yet 1. no Punishments. 2. nor for Sinne. 3. nor from Gods Wrath? I easily confess that they proceed from Gods Love: Did I not maintain that in the Papers which he writes against? But so farre as they are Evil and Penal they proceed not from his Love; but only so farre as they are Medicinal and Means intended to our further benefit. Did ever man on earth, before this man, know such a thing as chaftisement which was not for Sinne as the Meritorious Cause? or which was no what Penal? Its as palpable a contradiction as to say, This Paper hath whiteness, and this Ink hath blackness, but neither of them hath Colour: or that Mr. Cr. is a Man, but not an Animal.

I must desire the Reader therefore well to observe these two things, 1. What is indeed the Judgement of our Divines and Churches in this point. 2. What is Mr. Crandon Judgement, and the true state of the Controversie between him and me. 1. The Reformed Churches and Divines do very frequently give the name of Penalty to our Chaftisements: But yet Pet. Martyr and some more in their Disputings with the Papists, do deny them to be Punishments. But then mark, that the reason is because they did appropriate the name of Punishment to one species, which we call Destructive, Vindictive Punishment: so that it was but the Name and not the Thing that they denied: For they still give it the definition of Punishment, and confess it to be a natural evil (usually involuntary) inflicted for a moral evil: and then Sinne is its meritorious cause, as it is evil. And it is undeniable that these Divines did very unjustly deny the name of the genus to one species, and where they give the definition. Whether the heat of Difputation were the cause of this (which Mr. Cr. so much acribith his opinion of Justification to) or what else; I will not judge; but as herein they contradicted multitudes of their Brethren, so did they contradict all Philosophers and Lawyers, or any other Politicians, that ever I read or heard of; or I think, ever shall do. But still this is but a verbal difference. 2. But it is a Real Difference between us and Mr. Crandon. The true state of the Controversie you may gather partly from what is cited out of him before, where he makes it so horrid, prodigious and devilish a thing, to inflict any punishment on us, to satisfie for those sinnes that Christ hath satisfied for, withall (falsly) supposing that all punished is Satisfactory to Justice: But fully doth he express his minde, pag. 41. in these words, [We grant a Believers Sinne to be of the Occasion, never the proper Cause of his Suffering.

On the contrary, I maintain that Sinne is ever the meritorious cause of all his castigatory sufferings, so farre as they are penal, and that penal they are so farre as evil (at least usually) and that evil they are of themselves, notwithstanding the greater accidental good which shall follow them.

Here then is the true state of the Question between Mr. Cr. and me: and for my part I undertook to maintain no more in sense, then this: and who can engage me to more against my will, I know not. I again profess, that though my own opinion
opinion be, that these Chastisements (especially death, sinne (as a consequent of the withdrawing of the Spirit) and loss of Communion with God in so great a measure, and the deacies of grace) are partly the remnants of the (curse, as I then called it, or) threatened and inflicted Penalty of the first Law, as the evil that Christ our Physician is curing, and by degrees taking off, and partly the effects of the threatening of the Law of Grace, in execution of Paternal Justice; yet I will not contend with any man, what Law they come from, whether the Moral Law, or the Law of Grace, so they will but yield that sinne is the Meritorious Cause, and some Law of God is the Cause by its Commination; and Paternal displeasure and Justice in God, is the cause so farre as it is penal and evil. Or if they grant any one of these, I take it as the granting of all.

Now when this is the true state of the Question, see how honestly Mr. Cr. sta-
teth it, pag. 32, 33. 1. He saith ["It is agreed on both sides, that the curse is the penalty, or the revenging judgment, or an effect of Gods revenging wrath, by the execution whereof he taketh satisfaction to his Justice upon transgressors, for the breach of his Law; so Mr. B. makes it out, p. 17.

The simple Reader, seeing such a man as Mr. Carlyl commend the Vindication of these points, may easily think, All this is true true; when there are as many falsehoods as lines. My words which he referres you to, as agreeing to all this, are these only, [This Covenant being soon by man violat'd, the threatening must be fulfilled, and so the penalty suffered] (these words should have been added [unless sufficient satisfaction were made to God.]) 1. I never said that the curse or penalty now in question, is the penalty absolutely considered, or the whole penalty, but a part of that penalty, comparatively exceeding small, managed by the Physitians hands for our cure. 2. Is here ever a word of mine that mentioneth [Reving Justice?] I maintain that so small a part of the penalty, used by a father as a means to save us from the whole, is not Revinging Justice, (as the word is commonly taken, for that Justice which will have the ruine of the offender, or that affliction where it is intended to do him more hurt then good; but it is Paternal Justice that now disposeth it.) 3. Nor did I there or ever say, It is an effect of Gods revenging Wrath. 4. Nor did I there or ever agree, that in execution hereof God taketh any satisfaction to his Justice. Compare my words with his, and see if there be ever such a word as any of these.

His next words, as expressing how far we are agreed, are these ["2. That the Justice of God is so fully satisfied, by this curse or penalty, as by a compleat full filling of all the righteousness which the Law requeirth, p. 48, 50.

To which I Reply, 1. If the Reader will peruse my Book in the pages quoted, he shall finde no such word there. I only speak there of Christ's satisfaction, and not of any suffering, or execution at all. I do not think that the sufferings of the damned do satisfy Justice properly; for if Justice were satisfied they should be freed. 2. If I had said the words that he citeth of the whole Penalty, both he well and truly in applying it to an inconsiderable part turned to good? Will it follow that because I teach that Justice is satisfied when the whole penalty of eternal damnation is born, therefore it is satisfied if God leave on us but the least part, though for our own advantage? 3. He cannot be content to put untruths on me, but he addeth new sense to it: when he speaks of the satisfaction of Justice by suffering, he can mean none but punishing justice: And did I ever say that this justice is as fully satisfied by bearing the curse, as by fulfilling all Righteousneses which it requireth? This were to imply, that Punent or Vindicitive justice
is satisfied also by Obedience, or fulfilling Righteousness; which was never
before heard of. Obedience is the fulfilling of the Precept, and not of the
Threat.

His third and fourth agreed Propositions are [That Christ hath satisfied, and
that God is satisfied fully.] Which I easily agree to, supposing still that the ful-
ness of Christ's satisfaction be judged of from the true ends of it, and not by seign-
ed ends. It was never the end of Christ's satisfaction, immediately to effect our full
deliverance, but to bring us into Christ's Kingdom of grace first, that in the time
of this life he might perform the cure, and so deliver us Perfect into the Fathers
Kingdom of Glory. The same God that received satisfaction, received it with
this intent and to this end, that we might be delivered by degrees from the penal
effects of our sin, and sin it self, and might be brought under a lighter bur-
den and easier yoke, even a Law of Grace, which hath its Commissions as well
as its Promises, yea some Commissions to Believers for their miscarriages, and
the principal penalty of this Law is, more or less, a non-liberation from the penali-
ty or misery that we had brought on ourselves by violating the Law of Nature, or
Works, or the Moral Law (call it which you will.) So that as the non-liberation
from eternal torments is its penalty executed on the finally impenitent, so the non-
liberation from some degrees of sin, of outward and inward temporal penalties,
and death it self, is its penalty executed on Believers for their sins. So that God
never intended in receiving satisfaction, to free them presently from all penalty,
even castigatory as well as destructive; nor to leave them Lawless, nor under a
Law that had no Commission, or none that should be executed on them. The
great ignorance of this one point, and the misunderstanding of the Doctrine of
Christ's satisfaction is the very Heart of all the Antinomian Errors. I told you
before that even the Author of the Marrow of Modern Divinity approved by Mr.
Caryl, and here Vindicated (in his common way) by Mr. Cr. doth confede
our Chastishments to be Penalties of the Law of Christ executed on us for
sinne.

Because it is a weighty point, and if Mr. Cr. be cured it must be here, from
whence all the rest of his mistakes do seem to rise, I will propound to his Conside-
ration these things following, as a few of my reasons against his way.

1. He seemeth to me to confound the Kingdom of Glory and of Grace, or not
to understand the difference. God hath three Kingdoms, in species, over mankind,
whereof the first two are on earth and the third in heaven (though in regard of
the Identity of the Sovereign, Subjects, &c. they may be called all one.) These
are grounded on a threefold *ius Dominii & Imperii, Right of Propriety and Go-
vernment: *viz. His Creation, Redemption, and Raising and Glorifying us. The
first was the Kingdom of God over Perfect man, and is never called the Kingdom
of the Son, or the Mediator, or Redeemer: This endured but till the fall of
man. The second is the Kingdom of the Son, or Redeemer, which is disingu-
ished from the rest by the Foundation of Right (General Redemption) by its
Ends, Laws, State of the Subjects, &c. The work and end of this Kingdom, is to
effect mans cure and recovery, and to bring the lapsed disobedient creature, to a
perfect Conformity and Obedience to God again: so that this whole Kingdom,
from first to last, will be employed in Recovery and Cure, and when that is fi-
nished, the Son then shall deliver up the Kingdom to the Father, 1 Cor. 15. 24,
25, 27. not laying by his humane Nature, Authority or Honour, but that *species
of Government which was Medicinal, Restorative, and for Reduction of the dis-
obedient
obedient to God that made them; and so as a Conquering General, as a Physician that hath finished the Cure, so will the Kingdom of Christ then cease, his work being done, and the Restored delivered Spotless to the Father: And then it shall be the Kingdom of the Father, of God, again, in the fullest sense.

Now Mr. Cr. supposing that Christ's satisfaction hath set us presently on as good terms as if we had never sinned, and perfected our state, as to all guilt and punishment, and that upon the very sacrifice offered, doth hereby confound the Kingdom of Grace and Glory (a small mistake!) and while he takes himself to be perfected (in those particulars, though not in holiness) he destroyeth Christ's Kingdom, and dreameth that he is in another, that the good man never yet did see. Perfection is referred to the Kingdom of Perfection. If he have no punishment to suffer, then he is certainly in heaven already: Unless to be out of heaven so long, and to be without more Communion with God, and without perfection of holiness, be no Pasa damnii: which I will not yet believe.

2. If God may justly threaten damnation to them for whom Christ hath satisfied, then he may justly execute the penalty of some bodily sufferings and death: But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent. [Except ye Repent, ye shall all likewise perish: If ye live after the flesh ye shall die: If any man draw back, his soul shall have no pleasure in him: Luk. 13. 5. Rom. 8. 13. Heb. 10. 38. with multitudes of the like, are undeniably conditional Threatens to the Redeemed, as well as those supposed to be unredempted.

3. Nay, doth not Mr. Cr.'s dire full charge against God, if he should punish us for the same sinne that Christ satisfied for, as evidently fall upon God for his very Threatnings? For an unjust Law, is no more justifiable than an unjust execution. And if the least execution of penalty were so unjust and vile a thing as he makes it, must not the Threatning of incomparably more, be so much more injustice in the Law? But I will add no more of this, but proceed to Mr. Cr. enumeration of our Agreements.

5. The fifth is, "That Afflictions are incident to Believers. The sixth is, "That these Afflictions have in them a smart and bitterness, as they befall the "Saints, so that oftentimes in their apprehension the very wrath and curse seems to "be in them."

But here's no Agreement, that any of this is for sin, and so is a Chastisement, which is ever Penal.

["The difference then (faith Mr. Cr.) betwixt him and us, consists principally in these two things. 1. Whether when Christ hath by doing their Law, "paying their debt, and bearing their curse, satisfied the justice of God for "the sinnes of Believers, when God hath accepted the satisfaction given, when "Believers have by faith apprehended and laid hold on it, they do yet remain liable to the curse of the Law in whole or in part to be inflicted on "them."]

1. Here he fraudulently would make the Reader believe that it is only the case of Believers that is in Question, when he hath poured forth such dire full Accusations against God, if he punish any man for that which Christ hath satisfied for; whether he be a Believer, or yet an Infidell, varies not the case. 2. He falsly makes the Question to concern the whole curse of the Law, or part, when it only concerneth the smallest part for a small time. 3. He fasteneth upon the term [Curse] thinking the sound will somewhat advantage him, and letteth passe
the terms that I more frequently used, as the Threatening, the Anger of God, &c.

Now doth he let the Reader know that by the Curse I explained myself to mean some small part of the Threatened evil, sanctified to a greater good. He proceeds.

["2. Whether the Afflictions which God inflicts on believers in this life, are the effects of God's Revenging Justice, the Curse which the Law threatens, and so consequently, whether after that God hath taken full satisfaction from Christ, he doth in whole or in part require and take satisfaction from them also. Mr. Baxter with the Papists and Arminians maintains the affirmative of both these questions, we the Negative: He faith that 1. After Christ hath borne the Curse of the Law for believers, they are liable to bear it in whole or in part themselves also. 2. That the afflictions which they suffer are from the Revenging Justice of God, the effects and Curse of the Law, Vindictive Punishment of sinne, full of the wrath of God; as in his answer to the third question he declares himself."]

Are we not like to dispute fairly, when in the state of the Question we have such a heap of forgeries? How false is it: That ever I said 1. That our Afflictions are the effects of God's Revenging Justice? 2. Or Vindictive Punishments. 3. Of full of the Wrath of God. As all these are the fictions of the false Accuser, and never spoken or written by me, so neither do I hold them to be from Vindictive Justice in any other sense than Paternal Chastisements are.

Upon this Calumniation, called a stating of the Question, he proceeds to his proofs for his opinion, from some Scriptures abused, and others that expressely condemn his cause, calling our sufferings the Chastisements of Children. And did Mr. Cudworth ever know a Father chastise his childe for no fault, in mere Love, or without any fault; as the meritorious cause but: only the occasion? I will not trouble the Readers Patience with his vain Reasonings.

Next he proceeds to answer my Arguments: p. 38 c. 6. To the first from Gen. 3, 7, to 20. he faith ["He must first prove that they were believers, which a meer and dark promulgation of a Saviour, Gen. 3, 15 doth not evince (for many thousands have had the Gospel more fully and clearly preached to them, yet have continued in unbelieving. 2. That the sufferings to which his quotations direct, were inflicted upon them as a Curse by God's revenging Justice."] To which I Reply: 1. If his Cause have so ticklish a standing, that it must fall unless Adam and Eve were Infidels, I suppose it will stand but in the judgement of a very few. 2. I thought according to his doctrine, the very enring of that Covenant of Grace with them, would have proved them elect, and the promising of a Saviour for them. 2. I took it as undeniable, that the sentence Gen. 3, was not passed upon one man only personally considered, but on mankind or the whole nature that should be derived from him in the ordinary way of propagation: and that thence it is that women have still pain in childbearing, and the earth bringeth forth briers, and that men return to dust.

To the second I Reply, what he faitheth in of Revenging Justice, I did not engage myself to prove, and he hath no authority by false Accusations to impose it on me to prove it. 2. That it was God's sentence on sinful man, adjuring him to the personal suffering of so much of the Death before that was before threatened to him for his sinne, is a thing that needeth not proof with any that read the text, but such as Mr. Cudworth. For his answer out of Justin and Suidius somewhere else given, I will not trouble myself to seek for it.
To the second he gives no better an answer. He saith "that the wicked feel all those sorrows that he mentioneth, and bear the curse and hatred of God in them, is not denied. But the godly have their part in the same sorrows, yet they bear not the curse and hatred of God therein."

1. Mark here that he granteth all that ever I pleaded for, as to the wicked, and denieth it only of the godly. And are none of the wicked E c. and redeemed? Doth he not here make himself guilty of all those hideous accusations of the Almighty which he after chargeth on me? Surely Christ suffered for the sins of wicked men: and if God may yet hate them and punish them, I hope you will no more compare him to [a prodigie of nature: a divellized man] for so doing.

2. He learnedly confuteth me, by saying as I say, That the godly bear not God's hatred in their sufferings. 3. Once more for all, to put an end to your vain clamours from the word [Curfe] I grant that as the Curfe signifieth any effect of God's hatred to the person, or any destrutive punishment, that Christ hath taken it all away, and there is none of it in the sufferings of the godly. But as [the Curfe] signifieth any part of the penalty threatened, I deny that the whole is so removed. But the question between us should be, Whether our sufferings are penal, and sinne be the cause or only the occasion, as himself expresseth it? All the Rallings to the end of that Section I pass.

To the third of mine he answereth, That ["there is nothing in it but a wrestling of Scriptures from their proper sense, &c." And first to 1 Cor. 15. 21, 22. For since by man came death, so by man came also the resurrection from the dead. For as in Adam all dye, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. He saith this is wrested, viz. by citing the place. The summe of his answer is, That ["here is not any mention of the Death of believers, more less of the Curfe and wrath in their death, but that the meaning is this, As in Adam all dye, i.e. All that live and die in Adam perihopelessly and eternally: so in Christ all shall be made alive, i.e. All that are translated out of Adam into Christ."] This is his setting right the Text that I wrested, by citing the place to prove that we die in Adam a bodily or temporal death. 1. I wrested it, by judging that the words [All die] is meant [All die] as it speaketh. He saith all right by laying that by [All] is meant [only them that perish eternally.] 2. I wrested the Text, by judging that [All shall be made alive] meaneth [All] indeed as it speaketh. And he righteth it by laying, that by All is meant none but believers. 3. I wrested the text, by supposing, that the Apostle is here expressing the Misery and Death that Christ raifieth us from, to intimize that it being part of our Deliverance, we are to value it accordingly: and so that he meaneth plainly [Adam killed us, and Christ Reviveth us.] He righteth the Text, by expounding all this, as not speaking of any Death that Christ doth Recover us from, but that which the damned only must suffer. 4. I wrested the Text, by supposing that when the Apostle mentioneth [All dying, and All Rising] he means the same All. He supposeth that he obscurely changeth the subject or persons, and means none of the same. 5. I wrested the Text, by supposing that the Apostle by Death, meant the same Death, in both places; and that when he saith, By man also came Resurrection from death, he meant a Resurrection from the same Death that he saith came by man in the foregoing words. Mr. Grand. vindicateth the Text from my abuse, by supposing that the Apostle equivocateth here, and means one thing by Death in one sentence, and another in the next. 6. I thought that this much had been plainly intimated in the cauffall exq.of gap: \[since or because, by man came death, so by man came also the resurrection. To such a simple.
simple man as I, the causall declareth that its the same death he speaks of; and that else it would not conclude what he intended. 7. I thought: the Apostle had been directly proving the Resurrection of them he speaks of, opposed to their death; and but consequentially the Salvation that followeth it. 8. Yea I thought: it was the Resurrection in Generall that the seducers and seduced among the Corintians questioned, that there was no Resurrection, ver. 12. and not only the Resurrection of the faithfull, as granting a Resurrection to Damnation and none to Salvation. 9. Yet I doubted not but it was finally to the consolation of the faithfull who shall live after the Resurrection in happiness, that the Apostle speaks this; and therefore applie it still to them: But I supposed that the thing that he was proving directly was the Resurrection of all man, or that there is a Resurrection, (though he speak not to all;) that from hence the faithfull might receive their consolation, seeing there must needs then be a Resurrection for them.

To Rom. 6. 23. The wages of sinne is death, &c. he answereth, ["Who doubteth but it is so to them that are under the Guilt and Dominion of sinne? But what is this to believers?] I confess the Apostle extendeth it also to eternall death where it is suffered, but so as including temporall also, and that even of all that suffer it. For his scope is not to shew how God dealeth with the wicked and how with the godly; only or chiefly: but what are the different fruits of grace and sinne. So that death is the reward of sinne, whose death forever it be. The Apostle doth not say, The wages of sinne is the death of unbelievers only: and I will not limit where I finde not the word limit it self. And you may take Death for the subject and wages of sinne] for the predicate, or wages for the subject, and death for the predicate; the difference is small. Gen. 3. and other Scriptures that affure us that even the death of the godly is the wages of sinne, do teach us to expound this Text.

3. To the next Text 1 Cor. 11. 30, 31, 32. he saith [{as pat as the two former}] For this cause many are weak and sick among you, and many sleep: For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. A simple man would think it impossible to speak plainer, to prove that sinne is the cause of the sickness, death, chastisement and judgement of them that are not condemned with the world. But Mr. Grandon faith ["The Apostle writes to a visible Church, in which it appears there were some true, and some formall temporary believers. Christ is in the midst of this Church dispensing his Discipline. The true believers by the congregation of the formall professors had somewhat prophaned the Lords Table, by referring to it somewhat disorderly. The other had totally violated it by coming to it drunken (and so were worse then beasts) from their own tables. Here now had Christ inflicted chastisements of sickness and weakness, for humbling and amending those that were his; but death and vengeance upon them, that while they professed faith in him, yet were indeed disputers of him and his Ordinances: what is this to the curse of the Law upon believers? Therefore I shall add to Mr. Baxter's, [And if so] my [and if so:] if so that wrestling of Scripture will serve the turn, Mr. B. will surely have the water run in his ground, and his fancy stand, though God's truth thereby fall to the earth.

This Vindication may be thought profitable to the Church by Mr. Car, but not by me, for these Reasons. 1. The Apostle doth as expressly as the tongue of a man can speak, say it of those men that are not condemned with the world, 1. That they are chastened of God (and therefore punished.) 2. That they are judged of the
the Lord: 3. That self-judging would prevent it (and therefore it is penal:)
4. That the matter of this judgement or chastisement was, sickness and weakness on some, and death on others. 5. That sin was the cause: For this cause. And shall I believe him then that faith sinne is but the occasion and no proper cause?

2. Though there were formalists in the Church, the Apostle doth here as usually elsewhere, bespeak them all as believers. 3. For all the greatness of the sin, there is not a word in the text cenfuring any of them whom he speaks of as Reprobates: the quality of the sinne doth no more prove them so, then Davids and Lots and Solomon did prove them such. 4. What word in the text intimates that it was the Elect that the sickness was laid on, and the Reprobates that the death was laid on? 5. He is forced to yield that the sickness and weakness was laid on the godly: And is not that as much as the cause needeth that I defend, as long as the Holy Ghost faith, that [for this cause some are sickly and weak] and that we are judged of the Lord and chastained, that we might not be condemned with the world. For my part I believe God's word, and therefore cannot take such palpable contradicting of it, for a profitable Vindication: I desire no more but that any Reader, not willing to err, do but read the bare text, and chuse whether he will take notice of any explications of mine: and if he cannot there finde, that sinne is the cause of the godly's chastisements, and that they are judged of God, let him be Mr.Cr's disciple for me. Yet see the confidence of the man, that can conclude such unworthy evasions and perverting of the Text, with such triumphant lerones.

4. To my fourth, where I say [It is manifest that our sufferings are in their own nature evils to us, and the sanctifying of them to us taketh not away their natural evil, but only produceth by it, as by an occasion, a greater good: Doubtless so far as it is the effect of sin, it is evil, and the effect also of the Law.] His answer is twofold.

1. That he knows not what I mean by evil. A Judicious answer, worthy the publick view. He knows not what kind of evil malum pane is; when I called it natural evil in the words before him. But he that would not know, cannot understand!

And let the Reader judge, whether the man take notice in his charges against me, of what I here and elsewhere confess, viz. That [this evil is sanctified to us, and God produceth by it a greater good:]

2. His next answer is, ["We deny it to be the effect of sinne, as the meritorious cause thereof, so that the suffering of a believer should be the curse or revenge punishment for his sinne."] Can you tell by this, whether he absolutely deny sinne to be the meritorious cause, or no? His [so that] would seem a restriction; but indeed is but by the found to divers the odium from himself on me. This his next words shew, before cited [We grant a Believers sinne to be of the occasion, never the proper cause of a Believers sufferings.] This proper cause denied, is that before named A Meritorious Cause: and that's a cause proper enough of such an effect as the formal nature of punishment is. It seems undeniable then, that this Vindicatour doth not use to confess that his sinnes deserve any of the castigations that God layeth on him, or any other that he taketh for a true Believer: It seems he dare tell God in his sufferings, Lord, no sinnes of mine have deserved any of this at thy hands! I dare not so. I have lived in the School of Affliction from my youth, and am writing these words in great pain and weakness: and I durst never tell God, I...
deserved it not: Nor do I think such praying and preaching would be profitable to our Congregations, and therefore I think not that such Books are profitable to the Church of God.

To my fifth he faith, ["We deny not the sufferings of Believers to be oft in Scripture ascribed to God's Anger: But it is after the manner of men, &c. not that God hath passions: 2. In respect of the sufferers apprehension, who being weak in faith, and too much prejudiced by sense, is apt for a season some times in great trials to conclude himself cast out of God's favour, and overwhelmed with his wrath and fury. Not that it is so really: for God hath forgiven their sinnes. Therefore after his forgiving to retain wrath and anger, may be ascribed to malicious men, whom we shall hear saying, I will forgive, but never forget him: But in no wise to the most righteous God, &c."]

This Vindication is like the rest. First he confesseth that Scripture ascribeth our sufferings to God's wrath: And what, must Scripture be cast by when it fiteth not his turn, as if God knew not how to speak of himself to us? Who would think that this were the same man that heaped up so many leaves against humane Learning, and not sticking to the simplicity of the Scripture?

And (to his first.) What though anger be not properly in God? no more is Hatred, Pleasure, Dipleasure, Love, or, I think, any humane act! But there is somewhat in God, which he propoundeth to our conceptions under these Nations, till we are capable of higher. 2. Let us, as is usual, say, that denomination is taken from the effect: There is that done by God to his children, which is an effect of wrath in men, that is, punishing them. 3. Why did he not apply this answer of his to all that flood of Accusation, when he anon doth so mouth it, against God, as furious, and pouring out his wrath, &c? Could he not say, God hath no passion? 4. Is it fitter for us to learn to speak of God or of Mr. Cr? If the Scripture say, that our sufferings are from God's wrath; am I a Papist for saying so? I will keep close to the Scripture language as near as I can, for all Mr. Cr's higher conceptions.

To his second I say, The godly too oft think that there is more of God's Anger and less love in their sufferings then there is: But doth it follow that there is therefore none at all of his anger in them? 2. Who dare think that because deluded men do falsely imagine that God's chastisements are effects of his anger, therefore God himself will a hundred times over say so too, and fit his speech to the false speeches or conceptions of erring men?

Let Mr. Cr. therefore not renounce the judgement of the word, or else not renounce the name of an Antinomian: And then let him soberly (if possible) tell us, Whether God do us Good (as such) in Wrath and Anger, and whether it be not some Penal evil that is ascribed to God's Wrath? Light will be Light, though there were no creatures in the world but Bats and Owles.

My sixth Reason was, [They are called Punishments in Scripture: therefore we may call them so.] And I cited many Texts. To this he answereth, ["I will not fall into a λογομαθίαν, a strife about words and names. Let Mr. B. agree with us in the Matter, and we will not stick to close with him in the Name and Words. Let him deny all Malignity and Curse in the sufferings of the godly, and to do him a pleasure we will call them Punishments as he doth."]

See how mild the man is when there is no remedy! 1. Then, If by Malignity and Curse he mean, any effect of God's Wrath, or any Deleterious Punish-
I never said there was Malignity in them: I oft say, They are Chastisements, sanctified to our Greater good. But if he mean I must deny that they are for Sinne as the Meritorious Cause, and from Paternal Justice and Anger, and from the Threatning, or have any Penal evil in them, then this is the Summe of his Answer, q. d. I confess God calls them Punishments; and let Mr. B. grant that they are not Punishments, and then we will (to please him) speak as God doth, and call them that which they are not.

4. But what are Names for, but to signifie Things? And if God mean not that they are Punishments when he so calleth them, then how shall we know his mind?

3. What hath Mr. C. against me but Words? How else doth he know my mind? If then my words be Scripture words, for ought he knows I may have the Scripture meaning. 4. At least let him give me leave to speake as God doth, and blame my words no more when they are his: Nor let him say that all these are Bellarmines and the Jesuites words, yea Scriptures taken out of them, and thereupon reject them. If God say, They are Punishments, I will believe it, and say so to.

I intreat the Reader to consider, whether such answers as this, be not a yielding of the Cause: and whether after such Concessions, it be seemeth him to use such dircfull language against God, as afterward he doth, in case he do punish us for sinne: and whether this man adhere as close to Scripture as he doth pretend.

In the seventh, I did by oversight put the word [Affliction] in stead of [Chastisement:] upon which he inculketh, as if I had spoke the most deceitfull Herefore: and tells us of [a pack of little sense, and much arrogance, a compound of absurdity and prelumption.] Blot out Affliction, and put in Chastisement, and I hope this horrid evil is cured.

2. Note that yet here he can tell that I mean [evil of Punishment] but even now when he should have answered he knew not what I meant.

3. He addeth that ["If I had said Chastisements are in their own nature so qualified, we should have born with it; but he shunneth that word as a Rock upon which he might have dashed the Curse,"etc.]

See after and before such hideous outcries, that yet the man and I must be friends. Hee'll bear with me if I lay the same of Chastisements, and a little wit and charity might have sufficed to assure him, that that was my meaning. 2. How then could I dash the Curse on it, when I mean but Chastisements by the Curse. 3. How falsly faith he that I shun the word Chastisements, when it is Printed in my Book before his eyes, and himself thence recited it? 4. But are we indeed now agreed, as we seem? I am content hereafter to forbear the word [Curse] and to use the word [Chastisements] more frequently. But for all this we are agreed but in words, and not indeed: For by Chastisements I mean as I speak, Chastisements, which are penalties for sin, to the Amendment of the sinner: but by Chastisements, he means contrarily, that they are no Chastisements, no penalty for sin as the Meritorious Cause.

That which follows in that Section, needs no other answer then is given, it being nothing but his mouthing the word Curse, to a false interpretation of my sense: and an Accusation that [I insinuate, that they deny all Pain in the sufferings of believers,) which is but another of his untruths. I contend against those that deny our chastisements to be Pain, formal Punishment; but I never insinuated that any man denied them to be Pain or hurts. Upon this he annexeth a double
double charge: 1. My ["abasing opinion of others in the superlative confidence, that I have of myself, and in my self, thinking almost all others to be meer "Terra filius, clods of clay in comparison of my self," etc.] And how is all this proved? Why [I shake out my absurdities as Oracles.] If every man that speaks absurdities be so hainously proud and contemptuous, where will this good man shew his face? But where did I tell him that I took my absurdities for Oracles?

The summe of his Argument must be this: He that once by oversight calleth Chastisements by the name of Afflictions, hath an abasing opinion of others in a superlative self-confidence. But so did I: Therefore, Negatur major Domine.

The second charge is my ["suspending Conscience, that while I pretend to truth, yet I take the reins by any absurd false tricks to subvert it." I will leave this and a hundred and hundred more, for him to Answer, who justifieth the Slandered against the Accuser. Let the Reader finde out the ground of his charge if he can.

But the great storm is poured out on me for asking this Question, [What Reason can be given why God should not do us all that good without our sufferings which now he doth by them, if there were not sinne, and wrath, and Law in them? Sure he could better us by easier means.] Let the Accuser know that is not ascending into the Chair of God to judge him: It is but speaking his Revealed will. He hath revealed himself to be Good, and to do Good, and to have no pleasure in mens sufferings and death: Nay he hath oft told us, that our sinne is the cause, and if it were not for that, he would not chasten us. Have not I good ground to conclude then, that if we did judge ourselves we should not be judged of the Lord, in Chastisements? and that he would do us all that good without Caftigation, which he now doth by it, if it were not for sinne. Nay the man himself confesseth sinne to be oft the Occasion, though he deny it to be the proper Caufe.

In the eighth place, I shewed that the Scriptures commonly brought against this, do only prove a predominancy of Love in our Chastisements, but not that there is no Anger or sinne the Caufe. To this there is nothing but rage, which I cannot well answer I confess. But for my speaking of Love and Anger mixt in God, etc. he tells me I ["make God to be in a commotion against himself, to carry fire in one hand, and water in the other, to fight with the right hand against the left, sometimes the one and sometimes the other overcoming," etc. an excellent Disputer to have stood alway at Marcions elbow, prompting him with arguments to prove this God a Malignant and envious God, the Author of all evil to mankind," etc.] So that for God to have Love and Anger to the same person in several respects, it seems lays him open to these more direfull reproaches of a worm! It is well for us that we serve a patient God. This man did but even now confess that our sufferings are laid in Scripture to come from Gods wrath, and himself maintaineth that they come from his Love. And must not this man then either lay all these Blasphemies to the charge of Scripture, or take them to himself, or both? Dare he deny that it is the language of the Holy Ghost, that God doth chasten us because he loveth us, and also because he is Angry or displeased? This we must hear, for speaking as the Scripture. Nay is there any Divine that ever wrote of this subject, that is not of the same minde? None but Libertines that ever I knew of.

And for setting God against himself in commotion, let him know that as we speak of God, as Scripture doth after the manner of man, so we still acknowledge the.
the impropriety of all such attributions, and desire to separate from God; so much of them as implyth imperfection, and yet we will use these notions till we are perfect and capable of better: As also that it is (say Divines) by extrinsical denomination that these Affections are attributed to God, and so we may well attribute to him various Affections at once, as safely as any at all: He knowes how to love his childe and be angry with him both at once, in severall respects, wherein incurring all this Reproach.

And must God be termed [Malignant and Evious, and the Author of all Evil] if he Punish in Anger, even when Love is predominant! The Lord in mercy pardon all this language to this man! I would intreat the Reader to mark these two things. 1. Are these men fit to tell us that we make God the author of all evil, when we have such indignation for pleading against some of their strain, for the vindication of God, as not being the author of sinne? and when themselves do commonly maintain it with such zeal, that God doth by an Immediate Physical efficient premotion, predetermine men will to every act that is infall, which he chooseth; and that by unresistible power. 2. Should these men charge us to make God Malignant, Envious, for punishing his children in Anger, though for their Good, with greater Love, when yet we must bear such a flood of Reproach from them, because we will not deny that Christ died, for any but the elect, and will not believe that the rest of men have no more satisfaction made by him for their sinne then the Devils have, when yet the same suffering was sufficient to have been a satisfaction for all! Yet, God forbid, that I should charge the contrary minded, with such Accusations, though the Cause be incomparably greater.

Here he scorneth at my citing 1 Cor. 15. 55, 56. But these words well considered, I think, evince all that I have maintained on this point. The sting of death is sinne, i.e. sinne animates it, to do what it doth against us: the strength of sinne is the Law: that is, the Threatning of the Law, which I called the Curse! But we may triumph over death as conquerours in Christ, and say, O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory! Not that the full actual conquest over it is past! But we have it in promise, and faith can foresee it, and make it as present; for it certainly will be. For the 54 verse faith, So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. Mark that the victory is not till then. Yet so farre as unpardoned sinne obliging to eternall punishment, and leaving under enmity to God, is the sting, so farre it is taken out before.

In the 9th I instanced 1. Death. 2. Sinne. The former out of 1 Cor. 15. 25. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. I supposed the meaning to be this [the last of the enemies of the Churches felicity:] Christ being by Office our Redeemer, his work is to rescue us from all the calamity that we had brought on our selves, and against all enemies that would hinder our recovery. Now one and the last part of the work is, by Resurrection to restore us from the dust; and so cure the last penal calamity that we lay under for sinne, and to finishe his cure and conquest. Mr. Grandon understandeth it thus, that "when all Christ's enemies are sent to hell, then death it self shall be destroyed, because there is no more use of it. As if it were no act of Liberation to the Saints by a Resurrection that is here spoken of, but an end of killing the Reprobates: contrary to the Scope of the chapter. Whole exposition now is right, Mr. Grandon or mine? Certainly his, if you will not judge him past all modesty in his confidence: For he faith ["That this.
this is the proper meaning of this Text, a blinde man may see (better perhaps then a seeing man) and consequently see it to be sinfully wrested by M. Baxter.

I leave my self then to the censure of the blinde, seeing there is no escaping it: and I leave them to follow this confident expositor.

2. To my second Instance, That all our corruption of heart, shall not be cured till death, he faith he hath spoken before: But as I finde not where (and mean not more to search) So I must needs thinke that somewhat is the matter that made him here so sparing of his words. I finde him not so short winded, and concise elsewhere: and he could not but know that I laid great stress on this Instance. Truly he that thinks Mr. Crandon is perfect when he hath read this his Volume, shall freely enjoy his opinion for me: And he that thinkest that the withdrawing of the Spirit, whence followeth scandalous sinnes, decay of Grace, of Love, Faith, Humility, &c. and this to the death (which may befall a Saint;) is no penal evil, nor is caused by our sinne, nor by Gods Anger or Grieving the Spirit, but only from Gods Love, this man hath not those thoughts of sinne and Grace as I have; nor I think as he should have.

In the tenth place I brought a General Reason, from the tenour of the word, when it mentioneth the freedom that we have by Christ from temporeall punishment: viz. that it doth not make him presently to take them all off, but only to manage them for our best advantage (in order to our sanctiy and Recovery.) A man would thinke these words should be pardonable: Yet the charge of Impedency, Blasphemy, &c. is heaped upon them in words at length, and not in figures. Nay he pretendeth me to be so wholly destitute of any Scripture for this: (when yet I had given so many before, which himself plainly confesseth, to call our sufferings Punishments from Gods wrath, &c.) that he faith ["that curse is denounced against my self, Rev. 22. 18, 19. All plagues on him that shall add anything, &c."] Which of my words are Additions? 1. That Christ takes not presently all penalty for sinne off his people, all the foregoing texts and a hundred more manifest. 2. That all are in his power or hands, many Scriptures express, that say, All things are delivered into his hands, Joh. 13. 3. and All power in Heaven and earth is given him, and the Father hath committed all judgement to him, and he is the Lord and King, &c. 3. That he manages these penalties for our advantage, I thought Mr. Crandon could not deny (if he yielded but that there are such things.) Yet faith he [no drop of Scripture hath a relish of it.]

For the Texts he citeth, I conselleth with joy that Christ hath delivered us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us: that is, quod pretium, he hath done it perfectly in his suffering: quod actualem liberationem, he hath delivered us from the actual obligation to eternall punishment, and from our present state of enmity to God, then when we first believe: and as to a perfect freedom from all temporeall chastisements, as he hath freed us quod pretium, so he hath given us a promise of perfect actual freedom in a very short time; alas, it is as nothing, till the day of our Redemption come, and we shall sinne and suffer no more: This is I think, a sufficient Redeeming us from the Curse. And that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ, I gladly acknowledge. But my opinion still is, that there may not only be Castigatory Punishments where there is no condemnation, but also that even therefore are we judged and chastened, that we might not be condemned with the world: And I think this is Scripture for all these hot words.

Yet doth he here proceed to accuse my arguing ["as tending to the abasing, annihilating and even unchristening of Christ, as purchasing to himself a World."]
"poly of Curling, &c.] with more of the like. Alas, must our dear Lord hear all
this reproach from his poor creatures, unless he deliver them at the very present
from all punishment for sinne, though managed to their own advantage, and con-
tinued for their own necessary use? Must Christ be no Christ, if we suffer but one
lash for sinne! Me thinks his sanctified ones should be more humble and thank-
ful, and should confess it infinite mercy, if they were in hell but for such a mo-
mant as this life, much more to lye under fatherly corrections, and then be advan-
ced to eternall Glory! So much for that Chapter.

In the next Chapter is all that fearfull language against God that I before
mentioned, with more the like, which I am aware of reciting: And multitudes
of falfhoods do fill up most leaves. These last words of mine (that Afflictions
are managed by Christ to our advantage and good, he mentions again pag. 54. and
addeth ["What means he by this advantage and good? Not our purifying and
"bettering, &c. as we hold; for this as we have seen he shakes off as a single solid
"supposition with a kinde of Apage.] Hath he the face of a Christian and Pre-
acher of the Gospel, that dare heap up such shameles falfhoods? Finde but the
least word in any writing of mine, where there is any such thing as he accuseth me
of, and then believe him and spare not. It is past the power of my imagination,
to conjecture whence he should have the least appearance of it.

I dare not for all this say of him as he is bold to do of me, pag. 58. ["He seems
to me to be so left of God, destitute of his Spirit, that he can see no further then
a meer naturall man in spirituall things, and so following the letter, and scarce
the letter, without the spirit of the Word, he can think of no other way to Happ-
eness, but that which the instinct of nature suggesteth, namely a mans own wil-
ling, running and procurements."

You see a man that knows me not can suppose me a meer Pagan. When I un-
derstand that Willing to have Christ, and Running to obey him, are inconsisten-
t with his being the Way to my Happiness, then I may be of your Religion and Cha-
arity too.

I will conclude this point with these two or three Observations. 1. After all
his Accusations, as if I made God———(I am afraid to recite his words so oft,) yet,
for ought I know this man faith not one word les then I do, of the sufferings
of the godly, but only denieth sinne to be the cause, and that they proceed from
the threat and Gods anger. He cannot deny bur we are sick, weak, sinfull, enjoy lit-
tle of God in comparison of what we shall, &c. Do I name any one thing that we
suffer which he denieth? What Mercy doth he proclaim then more then I? Doth
he say, it is for our our advantage, having more of Gods Love in his anger,
and none of his hatred? so do I. Doth he say, that there is no Anger of God in
it? He conscfiteth the Scripture faith the contrary: Yea but he faith, there is no
Curse? If he mean, destructive punishment, or that which tendeth more to our
hurt, then our good, I deny it too. If he mean any penal nature, that is, not to
make the Mercy greater, but sinne to have no hand in our sufferings, laying all on
God himself. And doth that man so highly advance free Grace, that faith [God
killeth us meerly of his own will without any desert of ours as the cause] more
then he that faith, he doth it for our own sinne? And for any Good that God in-
tendeth us, and effecteth by affliction, I do not yet finde where he ascribeth any
more to it then I do. So that all these hideous outcries, are not of the misery, which
both alike, I think, confest; but of the Cause of it: whether God do it, because of
our sin as the Meritorious Cause, or without any desert of our selves.
2. You may see pag. 59. (as is said) that he poureth out all these Accusations consequentially, against the London Divines as against me; who, as he saith [speaking almost the same thing with me] and say [that to say God doth not punish his Saints for their sinnes, is flat Antinomianism.]

**S E C T. VI.**

To conclude, as I have said all this (more than I intended) to satisfie Mr. Catn., that this book, no not for its vindication of this point, is not profitable to the Church of God, or worthy of publick view; so besides all that is said, I will recite here some more of the words of God, and leave you to judge of the worth of this Vindication.

And 1. Let us see whether sinne be the Cause of our chastishments or punishments, as I say, or only the Occasion, as the Vindicator saith; premising this much, that it is no great credit to us, the Guides and Teachers of the flocks of Christ, to put one another upon such tasks as these, to prove that Pæna est peccasit pæna, that all punishment or chastisement is for some fault, when it is the very formalis ratio pæna: and I hope there is no silly woman in our Congregations but knows it, except the diligence of seducers have put out the Light of Nature in them: and if I must either put out the Light of Nature or be a Papist, the case seems hard.

2 Sam. 12.9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. Wherefore hast thou despised the Commandement of the Lord to do evil in his sight? shew hast killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, &c. Now therefore the sword shall never depart from thine house, because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the wife, &c. Thus saith the Lord, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, &c. Ver. 13, 14. The Lord also hath put away thy sinne, thou shalt not die. Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die.


Numb. 12. 10, 11, 12. Aaron looked upon Miriam, and beheld she was leprous. And Aaron spake to Moses, Alas my Lord! I beseech thee lay not the sinne upon us, wherein we have done foolishly, &c.

Numb. 27. 3. Our Father died in the wilderness, and he was not in the company of them that gathered themselves together against the Lord in the company of Corah, but died in his own sinne and had no sinners.

1. King. 8. 33, 34, 35, 38. When thy people Israel be smitten down before the enemy, because they have sinned against thee, and shall turn again, &c. then hear thou in Heaven and forgive the sinne of thy people Israel, and bring again unto the land, &c. When Heaven is shut up, and there is no rain because they have sinned against thee; if they pray towards this place and confess thy Name, and turn from their sinnes when thou affliest them: Then hear thou in Heaven, and forgive the sinne of thy servants, and of thy people Israel, that thou teach them the good way, &c.

Lam. 4. 6. For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of people, is greater then the punishment of the sinne of Sodome, &c. Lam. 3. 34. Wherefore doth a living man complain? a man for the punishment of his sinne. Let us search and try our ways, &c. v. 42. We have trespassed, and have rebelled, thou hast not pardoned.

Psal. 38. 1, 2, 3. There is no soundness in my flesh because of thine anger, neither is there
any rest in my bones because of my sin. For mine iniquities are gone over my head, &c. ver. 18. For I will declare mine iniquity, I will be sorry for my sin.

Psalm 32:4, 5. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me, &c. I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.

Read Psalm 51:1. Daniel 9:5. We have sinned and committed iniquity, &c. ver. 7. Whither thou hast driven them because of their trespass which they have trespassed against thee. O Lord to us belongeth confusion of face, to our Kings, to our Princes, to our Fathers, because we have sinned against thee. Ver. 11. Therefore the curse is poured upon us, &c. because we have sinned against him. Ver. 14. Therefore hath the Lord watched upon the evil, and brought it upon us: for the Lord our God is righteous in all his works which he doth; for we obeyed not his voice. So ver. 16.

Exodus 32:34. Nevertheless in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them.

Numb. 32:23. Be sure your sin will find you out.

1 King. 11:11. The Lord said to Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my Covenant and my statutes which I commanded thee, I will surely rend the Kingdom from thee, &c. Read the Chapter.


1 John 5:16. If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death.

1 John 5:15, 16. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed sins, he shall be forgiven him. Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another that ye may be healed.

Hebrews 3:17. But with whom was it that forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?

Romans 5:12. Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sinne, and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned.


Micah 7:9. I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him.

Ezra 9:13. And after all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that thou our God hast punished us, lest then our iniquities do deserve, &c. See Neh. 1:6, 8, 9.Jer. 5:25. Your iniquities have turned away these things, and your sins have withholden good things from you.

John 24:19. He is an holy God: he is a jealous God, he will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins.

Exodus 23:21. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my name is in him.

Leviticus 26:18, 24, 28. I will punish you yet seven times more for your sins.

1 Corinthians 5:5. To deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

Isaiah 40:1, 2. Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith thy God, &c. Her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lords hand double for all her sins.

Jeremiah 30:11, 14. 15. For I am with thee saith the Lord to save thee: though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee: but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished. Ver. 14. For I have wounded thee with the wound of an enemy, with the chastisement of a cruel one, for the multitude of thine iniquity, because thy sins were encreased. Ver. 15. Why cryest thou for thine affliction? thy sorrow is incurable for the multitude of thine iniquity,
because thy sins were increased, I have done these things to thee.

Mic. 1.5. For the transgression of Jacob is all this, and for the sins of the house of Israel.

Lev. 26.41, 42. If then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept the punishment of their iniquity, then will I remember my Covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my Covenant with Abraham, &c.

Psal. 39.10, 11. Remove thy break away from me; I am consumed by the blow of thine hand. When thou with rebukes dost correct man for iniquity, thou maketh his beauty to consume, &c.

Psal. 89.30, 31, 32. If his children forsake my Law, and walk not in my judgements: if they break my statutes and keep not my Commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes.

If this be not enough to prove sin the Caufe of our Punishment, and that we are really punished for sin, I undertake to bring forty and forty more texts, when I see it necessary.

2. Next let us see whether this Punishment come from Gods Anger or wrath.

Numb. 13.9, 10. And the Anger of the Lord was kindled against them (Aaron and Miriam) and bebold Miriam became leprous, as snow.

1 Kings. 11.9, 11. And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, &c.

Psal. 30.5. His anger endureth but for a moment.

Psal. 3.8. There is no soundness in my flesh because of thine anger.

Psal. 74.1. Why doth thine anger smok against the sheep of thy pasture?

Psal. 78.49. He cast upon them the fierceness of his anger, wrath, and indignation, and trouble, by sending evil Angels among them. He made a way to his anger, he shewed not their soul from death; but gave their life over to the pestilence.

Psal. 85.2, 3, 4, 5. Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people, thou hast covered all their sin. Thou hast taken away all thy wrath, thou hast turned thyself from the fierceness of thine anger. Turn us O God of our salvation, and cause thine anger toward us to cease. Wilt thou be angry with us for ever? wilt thou draw out thine anger to all generations?

Psal. 6.1. O Lord rebuke me not in thine anger, neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure.

Psal. 90.7, 8, 11. For we are consumed by thine anger, and by thy wrath are we troubled. Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance. Who knoweth the power of thine anger, &c.

Psal. 103.8, 9, 10. Slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger for ever. He hath not dealt with us after our sins, &c.

Isa. 5.25, and 42.25. He poured out on him the fury of his anger, &c. Jer. 25.38, and 36.6, and 42.18. Lam. 2.1, 6, 21, 22, and 3.43. Thou hast covered with anger, and perfected us, &c. and 4.11. The Lord hath accomplished his fury, and poured out his fierce anger, &c. Jon. 3.9.

Exod. 4.14. The anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses, &c.

2 Sam. 6.7. The anger of the Lord kindled against Uzzah, &c. 1 Chron. 13.10.

Deut. 1.37, and 4.21. The Lord was angry with me for your sakes, &c. Deut. 9.20. And the Lord was very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him, &c.

Ezra 9.14. Should we again break thy Commandments, &c. wouldst thou not be angry with us, till thou had consumed us, &c.

Psal. 83.16. Thy fierce wrath goeth over me, thy terror hath cut me off.
Ver. 7. Thy wrath lyeth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves.

Psal. 102.9,10. For I have eaten ashes like bread, and mingled my drink with weeping, because of thine indignation and thy wrath, &c.

Multitudes more there be of the like to these in Scripture; but this Mr. Grandon denieth not.

3. Yea, Gods Jealousy, fury, indignation, are made in Scripture the cause of our sufferings.

Psal. 79.5. Shall thy jealousie burn like fire, &c. 1 Cor. 10.22. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousie? are we stronger then he? John. 24.19. Dan. 9.16. Let thy fury be turned away, &c. Lam. 2.4. He poured out his fury like fire, &c. and 4.11. Mich. 7.9. He bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him. Psal. 102.10. with many more like places.

4. Our sufferings are called Gods Judgements. 1 Cor. 11.32. When we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, &c. Psal. 119.120. I am afraid of thy judgements. 1 Pet. 4.17. The time is come that judgement must begin at the house of God, &c. (Some interpret this, as performed in this life, some of the last judgement.

5. Our sufferings are called Plagues in Scripture.

Psal. 73.5,14. They are not plagued like other men, &c. All the day long have I been plagued, and chastened every morning.

6. Yea, see whether or no, God himself will teach us to call our sufferings Curses, or not: and think as ill of this phrase as Mr. Cro. doth.

Dan. 9.11. Yea, all Israell hath transgressed, &c. therefore the curse is poured upon us, &c. Gen. 27.12,13. John. 6.18. Keep your selves from the accursed thing, lest ye make your selves accursed when ye take of the accursed thing, and make the camp of Israel a curse, and trouble it. Isa. 43.27,28. Thy first birth hast sinn'd, and thy teachers have transgressed against me, therefore I have profan'd the Princes of the sanctuary, and have given Jacob to the curse and Israel to reproaches. Jer. 24.9. and 25.18. Zach. 8.13. As ye were a curse among the heathen, O house of Judah, and house of Israel, so will I save you and ye shall be a blessing. Mal. 3.9. Ye are cursed with a curse, for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation: (Doubtless among these people, had God his chosen (or no where) though involved too far in the sins of the times.) Mal. 2.2. I will send a curse upon you, and curse your blessings, yea I have cursed them already, &c. (It is not certain or probable that all these Priests were reprobates.) Nay it is the last word in the old Testament, Left I come and smite the earth with a curse.

And remarkable it is that Rev. 22.3. And there shall be no more curse, but the throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it: To shew when the curse shall wholly cease.

John. 9.23. Now therefore ye are cursed, and there shall none of you be freed from being bondmen, andholders of wood, &c. (yet might they be freed from damnation.) John. 7.12. The children of Israel turned their backs before their enemies, because they were accursed.

And see what the Scripture faith of some other terms as offensive to Mr. Cran- don as this.

Lev. 26.25. I will send a sword upon you, which shall avenge the quarrel of my Covenant. 1 Thess. 4.6. That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter, because that the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we also have forewarned you and testified. (And a godly man may be drawn to defraud, Rom. 3.4. He is the Minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.

Psal. 99.8. Thou didst save them O Lord our God: thou wast a God that forgavest them, though thou tookst vengeance on their inventions.
I will not weary the Reader with adding more, but conclude with these two or three Queries following.

Qu. 1. Whether just Governours be not Gods Ministers, acting by his Commission, and that which they do justly, he doth by them, as the Soveraigne by his Minister?

Qu. 2. Whether jest Laws be not Gods Laws, and Justice in execution be not Gods Justice, who hath said, Vengeance is mine: the Righteous Lord loveth Righteousness?

Qu. 3. Whether godly men ought not to be punished, even with death or excommunication if they deserve it? and may not possibly deserve such punishment?

Qu. 4. Whether then to teach that Christs satisfaction hath freed us from all punishment and execution of justice (Gods justice by his Ministers,) be not destructive to the being of Christian Magistrates and their Government, and Christian Ministers and their Government?

Qu. 5. Whether then it be not destructive to the being of all Christian societies, either Churches or Commonwealts? as long as government and penalties are of such necessity to their being?

Qu. 6. Whether this doctrine do not make it the work of Christs satisfaction, to take men from under Gods government, and so to be masterless rebels, or gods to our selves? seeing government here is by Law: and the general nature of a Law is to oblige to obedience or punishment in case of disobedience? And if God be disabled from making or executing any penall Law, on his subjects, at all, how is he his governour? while man is finfull and imperfect, needing a government by penall Laws. Nay its considerable, whether the doctrine of these men do not disable God from making a meer precept, though without execution of a penalty, seeing the Law obligeth but *aut ad obedientiam, aut ad penam; aut hoc agere, aut hoc pati,* and not both to obey and suffer too, (as to the same time, and the same Numerical act:) yet I know that satisfaction as maintained by the Orthodox, that understand its nature and order, hath no such consequence.

Qu. 7. Whether the forefaid doctrine, do not make Christs satisfaction, destructive of, or inconsistent with his Kingdom and Lordship, on the forefaid grounds?

Qu. 8. Whether they that affirm that God inflietheth on us, all the sufferings which we undergo, without any deserving cause on our part; or they that say, he inflietheth them for our sin (withall making them medicinal for our cure,) do more honour Gods free grace, wisedom and justice? Both agreeing as to the matter of suffering.

Qu. 9. Whether the maintainers of the forefaid doctrine, go not against the light of nature? and the full stream of many hundred plain Scripture texts? And then Whether they indeed make Scripture the judge as they pretend to do?

Qu. 10. Whether (considering all the forecited Scriptures;) it be fit to say, without any restriction or limitation, that pardon of sinne is absolutely perfect before death? while there are yet more sinnes to be pardoned, and penalties to be suffered?

Qu. 11. Whether (upon all the forementioned considerations;) it appear not, that they who teach that we did legally obey or satisfy perfectly in Christ, or that Christ hath so satisfied for all our sins, as that God cannot (nor Christ himself;) inflict the least penalty on the Redeemed, without injustice (as requiring satisfaction twice for our sin,) I say whether these turn not the grace of God into licentiousness, and the doctrine of Redemption into a doctrine of Rebellion, subverting.
subverting all government of God and man and making him the greatest friend to him, that died to destroy it?

Qu. II. Whether this aforesaid be not one of the doctrines which our late Charter of this Commonwealth, Art. 38. hath excepted from liberty and preservation, under the term (Licentiousness?)

Mr. C randon's two following Chapters about the force of the Law, have nothing in them worthy a Reply, which is not before confuted in my Conclusions. Only that he feigneth me to feign, that some reach the Law of Works to be abrogate to Believers, and others to all the world, and he insidiously seerns me for such lying insinuations: when as the former laying is common in English Writers, and for the later, as Learned, Judicious Animadversions on my Aphorismes as ever I received, do almost wholly maintain, that the Covenant or Law of Works is properly Abrogated to all the world. And as the name is given to the whole from the promisory part, I myself do now maintain, that there is no such thing as a Covenant of Works now in being to any on earth.

The Texts that Mr. C randon cites Cap. 8. speak of the Mosaical Law. And so much for that Point.

SECT. VII.

I have given Mr. C arly some of my Reasons why I judge not Mr. C randon's Vindication of our freedom from the curse of the Law to be profitable to the Church of God, and worthy the publick view. I shall give some few Reasons also why I judge so of his Vindication of our Justification by faith without works, which is the other point for which Mr. C arly esteemeth and commendeth it,

And the summe of my Reasons are these. 1. Because he granteth the main points in question, or which I assert. 2. He makes my assertions to be what they are not, and heapeth up such a multitude of false Accusations, and then bestoweth his labour in confuting his own forgeries, and that with copious scorn and railing, that I appeal to any sober Reader, who will be at the pains to examine his book by mine, whether his Volume can have any Title to proper as Liber Mendaciorum & convitiorum. 3. Yea he often contradistheth his own Confutations.

1. The first of these Reasons (that he granteth what I seek) I thus manifest.

That our Gospel-obedience is frequently in Scripture called our Righteousness, and the performers in respect to it called Righteous, he cannot, he doth not deny. For he yet confesseth the Scripture to be true.

2. The thing then that he denieth is, that we are justified by that Righteousness. Here the Question must be either 1. Of our Universal Justification at Judgement against all Accusations. 2. Or of a particular Justification at Judgement (or in this life) against the particular Accusation of being Infidels, and Impenitent Rebels. 3. Of that Justification at our first believing which wholly confiteth in (or only signifieth) Remission of sinne, and Accepting us as pardoned. 4. For the constituting of us Righteous, Inherently, or personally in tantum; so farre as indeed we are, by that personal Righteousness, which the Scripture ascribeth to us.

For the first of these, as it is not, that which he usually speaks of, so I affirm, that
that our Non Reatus mortis and Sum al Premiun is our Righteousness formally:
and our Title is the Covenant Grant; and the Condition of that Title is our
faith, repentance, sincere obedience and perseverance (as to the Judicial absolu-
tion and possession of the Kingdom;) and the Righteousness of Christ is the sole
Meritorious Cause.

2. As to the second, I affirm that when the Question is, Whether we have
truly performed the Condition? and that is the point to be decided, then our own
performance is so farre our Righteousness: so that the same performance which as
to our main final Justification, is but a condition of our Justification, and not
our Justice itself: Yet in this subservient preparatory Justification, which is
but: Justification particularis, it comes to be the Justitia Cause materially it self (whether
any such & be, I have spoke before, and its evident in Mat. 25. & Mat. 12.
37, &c.)

3. For the third, it is that sense in which Mr. Cr. takes Justification, as per-
fected in Conscience on our believing, which was perfected in foro Dei before we
were born. Now here I grant him as much or more then he desir'd: viz. That
obedience to Christ doth not so justify us; nay that it is not then in Being, but
follows that Justification. Indeed I affirm that when we are justified before and
without such obedience, yet it is a Causa sine qua non, subordinate to faith, of our
continuance in a justified State, or of not-losing our Justification; but here I af-
firm it to be but a Condition, and no Cause, much les the Matter or Meritorious
Cause of our Righteousnes.

4. As to the fourth I know not any sober man that will deny it, but that if to
constitute Jult, may be called justifying, then that Inherent Righteousness which
constituteth us Righteous so farre, doth so farre justify us as our Righteous-
ness. But this is a Righteousness that is so farre from justifying us at Gods
Barre against the Acculation of Guilt of death, that it will not merit the pardon
of one sinne, and serve but to intitle us to Chrifi, by whose Merits we are so
justified.

So that in summe the Question between Mr. Cr. and me can be no more then
this, Whether Obedience to the Redeemer, be a condition of continuing or not-
losing our Justification, given before it? and a condition of our Justification at
Judgement or not? Now let us see what he faith to this.

And first for the foundation of the whole busines, whereas I argued from the
true nature of Christs Satisfaction, that God might notwithstanding Christs
suffering for us, give us the benefits of it, but upon a condition appointed by
himself. Mr. Cr. Part 1. pag. 117. grants it in these words [Because our Justifi-
cation is an act proceeding from the meer and free will of God and of Christ, it
was therefore in their power after payment made by Christ and accepted by the
Father in our behalf, to Covenant and accomplish our discharge, either forth-
with or a long time after, either simply or upon Conditions.] This Mr. Cr. not
denying doth falsely accuse me of arguing a posse ad esse, and calls it A mad Ar-
umentation. I only by this argued for the Poisse, which I think was with good
sucess, when it hath forced that mans Pen to concede it, who before durst liken
God to [a prodigle of nature, a devillized man] if he should by any punishment
on us require (as he calls it) satisfaction for the same sinnes that Christ hath al-
ready satisfied for. As for the actual conveyance of the gift of Justification sub
conditione, by way of condition, I proved that otherwise, by a multitude of Scrip-
tures, and if I did not prove it indeed, let Mr. Cr. call me a mad Arguer, and
and spare not. But remember that here the Τεθε is granted, viz. that for all
the payment made by Christ and Accepted by the Father, it was nevertheless in
the power of God and his Christ, to discharge us simply or on condition, sudden-
ly or long after.

2. Well: Let us next see what he faith of the condition it self, and whe-
ther Justification be granted Conditionally in the renour of the Covenant
or not.

Pag. 349. he faith, "Yea in this point I should be totally silent, because
Mr. B. in words speaks no more here, then what some of our most found and
godly Divines have spoken before him, that faith is the Condition of Justifi-
cation, were it that Mr. B. meaneth as they mean. For though in the best
meaning of the best men, the propriety of the terms or phrase may be much que-
tioned, and give occasion of much dispute, yet traversing Controversies about
words, when there is agreement in the substance to which both parties drive,
is in my apprehension a business so farre tending to distraction and breach of
union among the Saints, that it is the last and least trade, I am confident, that
ever will betell me to drive.] Exorc tuo, &c. O modesty! who would easily
have believed that a man in his wins could possibly have been so ignorant of his
own heart, and write such a Volume as this, and know no more what he hath
done? But perhaps the word [Saints] will be some salve to his credit; for he
hath before pronounced me forsbene of God, and delitue of the Spirit, as a mere
natural man, &c. But here you see that my words are justified by the Accuset
himself so farre as to be the same with the words of the soundest and godliest Di-
vines: and he adds ["But in this point though Mr. B. here speaks in words
what some of ours have said, and do say still, and that without any detriment,
that I can see, to the Gospel; yet his meaning and theirs are in no les anipar-
thly then a Hawk and a Heron, and that as in other lesset so principally in these
particulars of moment." Let's hear now the principal difference. [1. By faith
they mean our Application, or faith as it is our Instrument of applying Christ,
and the grace of God in Christ to our Justification: He by faith means not
only the reception as a part of our inherent Righteousness, but as a generall and
common word, that comprizeth within it all good qualifications and good
works whatsoever, as elsewhere, and specially in and under his 7o; 6 & 7. The thesis
he declareth himself so that he makes, and under the word faith understandeth
all these as equal conditions with faith, of our Justification."

Here's the first principal difference: More plainly this: Mr. C's speaks truly and
charitably of the words of our Divines, but falsely and maliciously of mine.
A wide difference! But 1. What's all this to the point of Conditionality? It
seems then we differ not in that, whether the Covenant be conditional? or wheth-
er faith be the Condition? and so whether Justification be conditionally grant-
ed? but only what that faith is which is the condition? At least, here he men-
tioned no other difference, but de Materiis.

2. Do they, by faith, mean [our Application?] to do I, if the Acceptance
of a free gift be Application. And are we not yet agreed?

3. But they mean faith [as it is our instrument of applying Christ, &c.] It's pity a man that so abhorreth contending about words, should lay so great
a stress on the word [Instrument.] But seeing the man himself here calls it
not the instrument of Justification, but only of applying Christ, why
should we differ, when I openly professed pag. 221, 222. that I do not so much
stick
stick at this speech, though I judge it not proper. I will contend with no man for calling it our Instrument of receiving Christ, largely, vulgarly, or metaphorically so called: My question was Whether it justifieth as an instrument? Is not all that our Divines mean by the word Instrument comprized in the nature of the act of faith, as exercized on its object? and is not this act confessed to be the Acceptance of Christ freely given? All this I confess as much as any of them. And are we not then agreed in the Matter? By [Instrument] they mean a Receiving of the thing Given: and I confess faith is such a Receiving.

4. Well, but what is it that I mean, if Mr. Cr. speak true? I mean the \( \tau \) credere. And do not those that he mentioneth mean it too? I thought it had been the act of faith which they call Application, Apprehension, and an Instrument? If it be the Habit; I will agree with them too: If neither act nor habit, what is it? and why do they call it faith?

5. But if Mr. Cr. would intimate that I make the \( \tau \) credere to justifie formally as such, sub bae ratione, I do as constantly deny it, as he is constant in false accusing. Nay consider whether they make that faith \( qus \) instrumentum to justifie, do not make the \( \tau \) credere in Christum to justifie as such? For act is the causality of the instrument in effecting, and this is the act: It is \( \tau \) credere in Christum which they call instrumentality. I say still \( \tau \) credere, that is, Faith is the matter of the condition, but justifies not as such, but as a condition appointed to this office in the instrument of conveyance by the free giver.

6. The same answer serves to the next charge, [as a part of our inherent Righteousness.] Had he left our [as] and meant that: fides quae faith which is a part of our inherent Righteousness, is also a condition of our Justification, I should own it, and think all our Divines will do too: If not, I would gladly know what faith it is that they mean: For if it be no part of our inherent righteousness, it is absolutely a sinne: And I confess that's none of my sense, that God justifieth us by a forbidden act.

But he puts in his quatenus to shew you that he forgettest not his old trade; as if I made faith to justifie or to be the condition of our Justification, \( qus \) Justitia inherens; whereas clean contrarily, I take it to be our inherent Righteousness in a peculiar sense, a posteriore, because it is our fulfilling of the condition? and that it justifieth (in our Remission, and Acceptation with God) not as Righteousness but as the Condition. (I laid no more then this in my Book: but now I add, that if any Accuse us of being Infidels, against that particular Acceptation faith, must justifie us as the particular Righteousness of our cause.) So that here is a mere false accusation of Mr. Cr.'s: and no opinion of mine: Nor could the man shew a line or word of mine that contained any such thing.

Two gross falsities more follow, as if they were my sense of the point. 1. That I take faith in a general sense here as comprizing all good qualifications and good works whatsoever. 2. And these as equal conditions with faith of our Justification.] I maintained indeed that justifying faith hath more acts natural then one, viz. both the assent of the intellect and content of the will, as is afore explained: but I made it contain none but what are a Reception of Christ as offered in the Gospel. I comprized love in it indeed: not all love that is a grace; but that it must be a Velle, a loving acceptance of Christ, of which I am ready to give a fuller account then I shall now stand to do. But that I comprehended all good
good works, is Mr. Gr's own. I still contradistinguished justifying faith from obe-
dience to Christ, and made obedience a fruit of faith. Its true, I made subject
essential to faith: For to take Christ as King, is subjecting our selves to him: But
I ever maintain, that to engage myself as a subject, is in order before my obeying
as a subject, and is the cause of it.

I confess also, that I mentioned several acts, (as Repenting, begging pardon,
&c.) which though they are not faith, are yet implied as attendants, when we
are said to be justified by faith: but as I made not the to be faith, so I never
said so much as that of all obedience, or any obedience to Christ, at least, as
such.

I also confess that I said that faith is sometime taken yet in a larger sense,
as containing all Gospel-proper obedience: but I do not say that ever faith
is so taken when we are said to be justified by it. So that Mr. Crandon's defi-
ations are more naked, then to seem credible to any that will examine before they
believe.

And his last is as false: for though I say that Repentance is a Condition as well
as faith, (which yet I never said of all good works) yet I never said it was [an
equal condition with faith.] Nay I did purposely attempt to open how those other
acts, stood in subordination to faith, which are made conditions with it in the
Gospel; and therefore fitted to be conditions, because they necessarily appertain
to faith, it being the acceptance of Christ, and they making it a right reception, as to
the Moral Modifications.

So that for all Mr. Crandon's false accatations, I am not here manifested to differ
from the Divines in question, so much as about the matter of the Condition; much
lest the form; or Whether Justification be given on Condition or not. His
next difference is this.

[2. "By [Condition] they mean that which being once attained and once
"fixed upon Christ, speaks us absolutely justified for ever. So that in calling
"faith a Condition of Justification, they mean, we cannot be justified without
"it, but having once by faith apprehended Christ, we are by it united and joined
"to Christ, and by force of our union with him, are thenceforth absolutely and
"irrevocably pardoned and accepted as Righteous in God's sight."

Now he comes to the formal difference between me and others, about the na-
ture of a Condition, having spoken before only of a feigned difference in the na-
ture of Faith. And what difference doth he here shew? not a word that I can
find, as if we did at all differ de formal ratione conditionis. What my sense is of
the word Condition, I have shewed in my Reply to Mr. Blake. I take it in sense
Civili, as a Moral condition, agreeable to the nature of the subject, and not for a
meat natural qualification called a condition by some, as the dryness of the wood,
and its proximity to the fire is its condition of burning. The difference that he
here feigneth between me and others, is only of the sufficiency of this condition
to the perpetuating of the effect of the Donor in Justification, and not of the for-
mal nature of a Condition. Remember therefore that for all Mr. Crandon can
say, I take the word Condition in the same sense, as Reformed Divines ordina-
arily do.

And for the difference that he feigneth, who knows his meaning? either he
means only that a man once justified, shall never lose his Faith and Justification;
and if so, he spoils but the old game of false accusing, in feigning me to deny it.
Or else he means, that the tenor of the Covenant is such, as giveth a perpetual
pardon
pardon of all sins past, present and to come, on condition only of that first act of faith? If so, 1. I'll tell him my dissent. 2. Why I think our Divines do not so judge as he feigneth them to do.

3. My opinion is, that the Reason why Believers lose not Justification, is from God's immutable Decree of Election, and the special purpose of Christ in his sacrifice, to effect infallibly the salvation of all such, as are chosen and given him by the Father to be so saved: as also from some discoveries of this Will or Decree of God, in the Word, which may be called promises. But with all I believe that the Law of Grace, or the promise, which doth convey our Justification is one and the same, and not changed by our believing, and therefore continue to justifie only Believers: and should we cease believing that promise would cease justifying: and that we do not cease believing is from the forementioned causes, and not from that promise. So that the same God that decreed to maintain the faith of his chosen people to the death (that is, of all Believers in sincerity) did yet think meet for the right government of the world, and for the suiting of his dealings to the condition of man, to make over the right to this benefit by a conditional general act of pardon, or Law of Grace, which would condemn and not justify them if they should turn unbelievers: Though by his secret grace he will keep them from such Apostasy, yet Threatnings and conditional Promises are his moral means thereto, which he sees meet to use: And if the special work of the Spirit excluded, or included not moral means; then would it exclude, or not include the Word, Sacraments, and all other as well as this. So that the conditionality of the promise is nothing against the Certainty of perseverance: And Mr. Cramton's zeal in making the doctrine of Conditions to be damming (as he elsewhere doth) doth but make the plain Doctrine and Gospel of Christ to be damming.

2. The Reasons why I conceive our Divines mean as I in this, are these:

1. Because it is evidently the Truth of God (which I will not believe them to deny till I needs must.) And that it is truth, I prove now by these three Arguments only. 1. In that the Scripture promise of salvation is still Conditional; yea Overcoming and Continuing to the end are made its Conditions. And he that should lose his right to Salvation would lose his Justification: if Right to Salvation (i.e. Glorification) be not part of Justification it self: yea praying for pardon, forgiving others, repenting, are made conditions frequently of renewed pardon. 2. If Justification were given in the promise to be perpetual on condition of our first believing only, then all after-acts or habits of faith should not be Justifying faith, nor should any man have Justifying faith after the first minute of his first believing: which let him believe that can for me. 3. If Justification were Absolutely given as perpetual, or God gave us a pardon of all sins past, present and to come, at our first believing, then his threatening us with damnation, if we should Apostatize, would be a Threatening to break his own promise, or to reverse that which he gave us an irreversible Right to. But that's not true: Therefore I take it for granted that Mr. Cramton is not yet so farre gone as to deny that God any where threateneth his people, if they Apostatize; (though he will preferve them from it, making the threatening his moral means of preservation:) If he should, I would dispute no more with him out of the Bible, but from some principles which he will acknowledge. I know God may Decree to give us perseverance, and reveal that Decree, which Revelation, (or Poulitication if you will) declare to us that if he should not accomplish it, he were mutable; and yet he
he may give us Right to our final Abolition and Salvation, but on condition:
and in these there is no contradiction; because Purposes and Pollicitations (which
are distinct a promissionibus) give no Right: besides other reasons that are at hand.
But to say, [I now give thee absolute final irreversible Justification from all future
past, present and to come] and at the same time to make a Law which faith to the
same man [If thou draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in thee,] seems to be
a contradiction (though he should resolve to maintain him in the faith:) because
in the latter, he threatens on a condition to take away that which is supposed to
have been given him absolutely and irreversibly: For to be in Law under a con-
ditional threat of losing it, shews that in Law the continuance of our possession is
but conditional.

The second Reason that persuades me that our Divines do not think that our
first believing doth give us in Law sense, an irreversible Title to final Justifica-
tion, nor an absolute pardon of all sins to come, or absolute Justification as to the
continuance, is this: Because they commonly teach that no sin is pardoned before
it is commissed: In potestiam vel virtutem Cause, some (as Ames.) say they are: but
not Actually.

A third Reason is, Because the same Divines commonly affirm renewed repen-
tance, faith, prayer for pardon, &c. to be conditions of the renewed pardon of
known (especially gross) sins.

A fourth Reason is, Because they do commonly affirm that faith justifieth, not
only in the first act, but to our lives end; and that we must go to Christ by faith
for daily pardon.

A fifth Reason is, Because many of our most Learned Divines do maintain
that Justification is a continued act, and not so simul et semel as to be ended quoad
actum Justificandum as soon as begun. See Bishop Downe of Justification, pro-
ving this at large. And Mr. Grandon himself durst not deny it. So that I think it
is manifest, that not only de formali ratione Conductionis our Divines say the same as
I, and I as they, but also de sufficienti sui actus sider ad continuandum Justificatio-
nem, which is the thing wherein he feigns a difference. Now let us see what he makes
to be my opinion, when I have owned theirs.

He adds ["He calls it so a condition, as that it continues still a condition,
justifying us only conditionally and not absolutely: so that it leaves our estate
still one and the same; no more justified and pardoned when Believers, then
with unbelievers. For by the satisfaction of Christ, we are before faith con-
ditionally justified if we believe, and when faith is come we remain still
but conditionally justified if we believe, our safety being as loose and uncer-
tain then as before, depending still upon the residence and abode of faith in us,
as before it did upon the possibility of its future regeneration into us and acting
in us, and that we are no longer justified then when we believe and obey: so
that by believing and unbelieving, obeying and rebellling, we may be justified
and unjustified again a thousand times before we die; and how often after,
himself expresseth not. I need not mention more: these two differences are
enough to declare, that though here he speak in the same tone with some of
our Divines, yet his Judgement no more agrees with theirs, then the Pope with
Luther and Calvin, Elmas with Paul, Simon Magus with Peter, or the Scribes
and Pharisees with Christ."]

Here is little but what one denial doth honestly and sufficiently answer, it being
so false.
1. It is false, where he makes me to deny that we are absolutely justified, and assert only a conditional justification. For though I once said that the discharge or justifying Law remains conditional still, yet I ever expressed my self to hold that we are actually and absolutely in a justified state as soon as we believe, and did we die in that moment should be saved: only, I say, that in the tenour of the Law, the future continuance is conditional if we continue here.

2. It is spoken in Mr. Grandon's Dialect, in antipathy to the ninth Commandment, that I ["leave our estate one and the same, no more justified and pardoned when Believers then when unbelievers." Let any Animal Reason be judge, whether a pardoned Traitor be in no better case than an unpardoned, because if he turn Traitor again he shall die for all his former pardon. If a Prince offer himself in marriage to one poor condemned woman, and she refuse him and deliverance offered with him; and he offereth the same to another, and she accepteth the offer and is married to him; Is this left in no better a case who is made a Princess, then the former that lies in Jail, looking for the Affizies to be executed, because that if she be unfaithfull, and seek her husbands life, or play the Adulterers, she shall be divorced again? A Landlord offereth two poor men, that if they will but Accept his Curtesy, and once a year in stead of Rent, put off their hats and thank him, they shall have a Lease of a large Revenue. The one refuseth the offer, and thereupon hath neither Lease, House nor Land: The other accepteth it, and is put in posseffion, and his Lease sealed: Is this man in the very same case as he was, and as the other is, and no more a Tenant, because he holdeth his Lease upon the Condition of an act of Homage? (I'll name the Pepper corn no more, for Doge overheard me the last time.)

3. His reason is reasonless: [Both before and after the faith, it is Conditional.] But Sir, before the whole Right and possession is only conditional, and not actual at all: but after the Right and Possession for the present is actual, and only the continuance is Conditional: Is that all one?

4. Where he talks of [our safety being as loose and uncertain as before.] He feigneth me to make it uncertain, when I affirm that it is certain in itself and to God, then and before, upon the foundation of Gods Decree. 2. Doth not himself make it as uncertain as before? that is, as certain before as then?

5. The like fiction of his venturous brain is that following, that I make this Certainty to depend on our faith, which I ever judged to depend on Gods Decree.

6. And worse is the next, that I say [we are no longer justified then we believe and obey] which the man never found a word for in my Writings: else sleeping men should be unjustified. Nay, that was one reason still that I had against instrumentality being the formal reason of faiths interest in justification, and conditionality is that Interest: because the former being a mere Physical interest, we can be no longer justified then we are believing, and faith no longer an instrument, and consequently no longer justifying then it acteth: but the latter being a Moral Legal Interest, may suffice to the effect Propers beneficium Donatoris even when the act is intermitted: for it reputatively continueth while the Habit continueth. But if Mr. Grandon think that in case he should turn Infidel again, he should continue justified, I will not believe him as credible a man as he is.

7. Another forgery of his it is, that I teach that we may by believing and unbelieving be justified and unjustified again a thousand times before we die.] When I still
I still affirm that God will preserve us from turning unbelievers, notwithstanding the conditionality of this promise, yea by the means of this conditionality to excite us to vigilance and care for perseverance.

8. What he faith about being unpardoned in the life to come, is but the intimation of ridiculous malice, which cannot lie latent for a few lines, even where it confesseth it wanteth matter to work on.

All this laid together, I should not doubt to convince Mr. Grandon, were his black choller but a while allayed, that the Pope, and Elmas, and Simon Magus, and the Pharisees, shall all be saved, if they differ no more from Christ, from Peter and Paul, from Calvin and Luther, then I do from the Reformed Divines about the conditionality of the promise of Justification, or the meaning of the word Condition.

Further hear him make his own Confession, pag. 356. ["We have granted " before the promulgation and offer of Justification by the Gospel to be conditional: but the gift and being of it to be Absolute, &c."] Concordatio: You and I are agreed: I plead for no more but that the Tenor of the Gospel-promise, (which is the offer, and the gift in an active sense) is conditional: and so Justification actual none at all till we believe: but when we believe, the gift in a Passive sense is absolute, and in an Active sense absolute or equivalent; as I did before explain my thoughts. You see then what is like to become of Mr. Grandon, who holdeth this doctrine of Conditions, which he faith will condition me to damnation.

P. 204. The next place where I finde him undertaking a fuller discovery of the difference between the Protestant Divines, and me a Papist, in this Point, and how farre they make Works to be Conditions, he putteth down their Judgement (as he takes it) in these Propositions. ["They grant that the promulgation of Righteousness and Life is to be made Universally and Conditionally to all: God knoweth who are his: but the Heralds of his Grace know not. Therefore by the command of Christ they are to testify this Word of Life to all without exception, promising upon condition of believing, in the Name and by the Word of Christ, Righteousness and Salvation. In the mean time they maintain, Christ hath satisfied only for those that the Father hath given him, so effectually as that by virtue of Christs purchase they shall receive power from above to believe unto salvation."

Repl. Is it not strange that even in the Point of Universal Redemption, and Conditional pardoning of all, the Papists and Protestants should so fully accord? Shall they both be damned? or both be saved? and the Accusser prove false? I profess my self wholly to agree to all this, as being according to my Judgement. The second is ["They are wont oft to use the word salvation (as the Scripture also doth) for Glorification hereafter: and so take it as a distinct thing from Justification, and involve into the Salvation more then into the condition of Justification.

Hitherto I am a Protestant still: For even so do I, understanding not Justification at Judgement, which hath the same conditions with Glorification, but as they do, our Justification upon our first believing, by which we receive actually the pardon of all our sins, Reconciliation with God, and Title to Glorification. Let us hear the rest.

["By the word Condition they understand of all the necessary Antecedents, and"]
and sometimes also the necessary Consequent of Justification and salvation. But if, as they term such Antecedents the Conditions, without which going before, these ends cannot be attained; and those Consequent, the Conditions without which following cannot attain the certain knowledge that we are justified and intimated to glory.

I doubt the Protestants anon will be made two-fold more the children of damnation then I. For it seems they hold two sorts of Conditions, and I but one: and if my one sort, will condition me to condemnation, as he speaks; what will that and more do? I am wholly a Protestant in holding Antecedent Condition, but Consequent I know none. But who would have thought that I had come short of Mr. Crandon and the Protestants, where he makes me to go beyond them as farre as the Jesuites? I confess Chamier makes a distinction of Conditions into Antecedent and Consequent, but confessing (justly) the unfitness of the terms, and using them in a farre other sense then here Mr. Crandon doth (of which more in the testimony in the end.) Nay Mr. Crandon makes his own conditions Antecedent, while he names them Consequent: for when he calls them [Conditions without which we know not our Justification] They are plainly made Antecedent Conditions of that Knowledge, but no Conditions at all of Justification itself. I confess also that there are (in Chamiers sense) Conditions following the Benefit, but they are not Conditions as Consequent, nor of the Benefit as past, but of the continuance of that Benefit, which continuance is still future. Also let Mr. Crandon know that I speak de moralius, and therefore of Conditions in a morall or Law sense, and not ut Merus Physicus, of natural, necessary qualifications as such: (as is a condition of my Believing that I have my hearing or other senses, and the use of reason, &c.) that were but a ridiculous transition from one Genus or Subject to another. And thus it seems I am hitherto a Protestant, at the worst.

The fourth followeth [4. That as oft as they speak of the Conditions of Justification, they mean the Justification of the new Covenant, nor the Justification immanent in God, or that which Mr. B. calleth Christ's own Justification as the publick person.]

Rep. So do I; yea I acknowledge no such thing as a justification of any man properly so called, either eternall, or in Christ's Justification: though I used that last term once, speaking as in their language to whom I spake. Hitherto yet I am a Protestant, and differ not from others here mentioned.

The fift of Mr. Crandon's Propositions is this [5. They utterly deny Morall obedience and Good-works to be in any other sense a Condition of Justification, but as it is a Consequent thereof to evidence it.]

Rep. 1. I will anon, God willing, prove this to be false, as I generally delivered, past all doubt: For this is expressly to deny it to be any Condition of Justification at all, and to make it only a Condition of our discerning that we are justified. And a sign as such is not a morall Condition. 2. But yet taking Justification only for God's putting us into a justified, pardoned state at the first, and not as extensive to the continuance of that Justification, or to our justification at the judgment, so I confess more then Mr. Crandon here desireth, viz. that Morall obedience, and good works, are no conditions of that Justification at all, but meer consequents and signs of it. And because I am confident that Mr. Crandon and many Protestant Divines do so understand the word Justification, in this dispute, therefore I think I may take my self of their minde in the thing, and so farre yet no Papist.

The
The sixth Proposition followeth: Saith Mr. Grandon "They deny all Cau-
sality of Good works to salvation.

Rep. 1. Taking salvation generally as comprehending Sanctification and con-
solation, this is not true. 2. But taking it for the Right to Glorification (as I
doubt not, but Mr. Grandon doth) and I as confidently deny it as they: which if
Mr. Grandon will not know when he readeth it, that's not my fault. So that hitherto
yet I am no Papist.

The seventh Proposition is this, "Much more a conc anality in the same kinde
with faith and the satisfaction of Christ.

Rep. This would intimate as if I give to works what Protestants are here said
to deny. But it's untrue: 1. For faith, I deny it to have any proper causality as to
our justification or right to salvation: and how can I then give works a concanal-
ity? But you stumble not at such straws as this.
2. I affirm Christ to be the meritorious cause, and works to be no cause, nor any
condition of our justification at first, and but conditions subordinate to faith, of
our justification at judgement, and the non-amission of it in this life: and this
not as works in Paul's sense, but in James's sense.

But know the thing that the man looks at (with little ingenuity) is that I
once said, that Christ's satisfaction was as a meritorious cause, so a fine qua non:
But that was in several respects, and I with themselves gave any more to it at all:
But did I not then and still maintain that satisfaction to be also the meritorious
cause? But of this I have said enough to Mr. Eyre. Yet then I am no Papist.

The eighth Proposition is this ["Most of all, that they in any rational sense
merit it."]

Rep. Little matter from without will serve to make a net. I have ever
disclaimed Merit. I have said forty times more for it in this book, only to mo-
derate the over-zealous against the phrase in Fathers and Protestants, then ever I
said in any book or Sermon before. Nor did I ever say that it may be used in a ra-
tional sense: but said when I was pleading against Merit, that yet in a large im-
proper sense, our condition of the matter may be called worthiness and Merit:
Not that it may lawfully be so called, but that the word improperly used may sig-
nify such a thing. What Mr. Grandon will call a rational sense, little do I know:
only I know that I use not much Ratiocination in finding out the meaning of the
words, more then to finde how they have been used. Custom helps me more then
Reasoning from any thing in the word, to know the meaning of it. I take words
to be arbitrary signes, and not natural signes: And if custom will but change, and
call [bread] a Stone, and a Stone bread, I will not confute it as irrational, much
les, as Popery: And for the irrational Fathers and Churches that used the word
Merit for so many hundred years, and the irrational Protestants that used it in the
Augustine Confession, and the irrational Calvin, Bucer, &c. as well as Luther,
Melancthon, &c. that did subscribe it, and all the irrational Protestant Churches
that adhere to it to this day, I say for all these I am more willing to excuse them,
and consult with Charity then spiceth Zeal, for the understanding of them, then
to imitate them, or approve their use of the word. Thus far therefore I see not that
I am a Papist.

The ninth Proposition followeth ["Or that as they make up the Inherent
"Rightness of man to be a collateral with the sacrifice of, or righteousness which
"is by Christ to salvation, so that we are saved by works, for works, as by Christ,
"and for Christ. All this dirt they leave to Mr. B. to stick off from the nails of
"the.
"the Jesuites, bidding defiance against it, as a cursed doctrine.

Never did it once enter into my thoughts, or fall from my mouth or pen, that our Inherent Righteousness is collateral with Christ's sacrifice and Righteousness, ro salvation: or that we are saved by and for works, as by and for Christ! If I must be affirmed to hold this or any thing that this man will say I hold, and made a Papist whether I will or no, what remedy.

These are all the Propositions wherein he expresseth the judgement of Protestant Divines as differing from me; and now I leave it to any sober Christian to compare them together, and judge of the difference; only supposing that my own profession of my belief is more to be credited then Mr. Crandon's recital of it, according to his own invention. And I desire Mr. Crandon to consider, whether the fear of the Lord were operative in his spirit, when he durst insinuate or plainly affirm that I hold all these things which he faith [they bid defiance to as a cursed doctrine?] when he said [they leave all this dirt to me, &c.] Did he remember the ninth Commandement and the day of judgement, when he wrote this, and such a Volume of the like?

He addeth next ["What they understand then of Works as a condition of salvation is in this compriz'd, that to salvation already attained, they have the relation of an adjunct, consequent and effect: But to the salvation hereafter to be attained, the relation of an adjunct, antecedent and disponent, as also of an argument confirming the hope and assurance thereof."]

Rep. This is my very sense also; and yet must I be a Papist whether I will or no? Only I must tell Mr. Crandon, 1. That he doth not in these words give us any thing of the nature of the Condition, but only the reasons why it is made a Condition; and our Divines do call it a condition, and without doubt did know what a Condition is, better then any man can learn from these words of his. 2. That I use not to call Works [a Condition of salvation already obtained,] nor do I know any such Condition, but know it is a contradiction. Yet I say as he, that they are an Adjunct, Consequent and Effect. 3. But I add, that they are part of that salvation itself. I think our love to God, our hatred of sinne, our new obedience, are parts of our begun Recovery, Health or Salvation, and not only Adjuncts, Consequents and Effects. 4. To be an Adjunct, antecedent and disponent to future salvation, is full as much as ever I gave to any acts of man: though these words are but an ill-favoured definition of a Condition.

And now I here appeal to any moderate man, whether Mr. Crandon make not all Protestant Divines and himself as much Papist as me? I profess to ascribe no more to works, then to be, as he speaks, to be [Antecedent, Disponent Adjuncts to future salvation] or to Dispose the person thereto: This much he maketh; all Protestants to hold as well as I: Doth he not then damn them and himself as much as me? I confess my self blinde and ignorant of the English tongue if he do not.

If you say [You make them Conditions disponent to Justification, and so doth not he,] I answer, Not to the Receiving of a State of Justification; nor never did: but only to the Continuing or not losing that State, and to our particular remission of and justification from particular sins when they are committed. And all this is future: especially the justification at judgement. Obj. But Mr. Crandon doth take Justification to be perfect at first, and so to have no need of these Conditions. Ans. It is a perfect Remission of all sinne that then is sinne: but if Mr. Crandon dare think or say, 1. That we need not Christ or Grace, nor are beholden to
to God to continue that Justification, 2. Or to Remit particular sinnes when we commit them, 3. Or to justifie us at judgement, 4. Or that these are not parts of our future salvation; I am sure our Protestant Divines will renounce him, and dare not or do not say any such thing, but the clean contrary.

He next adds ["They express themselves usually in the phrase of that Father "(though possibly misunderstood by some) via Regnium, non causa regnandi; which some do, all should thus construe; not that they are the way to the Kingdom above, Christ alone being this way; but, they are that way of the Saints which are Christ's spiritual Kingdom."

Rep. 1. That good works are via Regni, is as much as ever I held. A way hath the nature of a Means to the end, and I know no lower means then meer conditions. 2. If our Divines mean as this man faith, that [Works are not the way to the Kingdom above, but of the Saints who are Christ's Kingdom,] then I profess my self-unable to understand them: in the mean time I dare aver that this man doth unworthily abuse them, and doth abrade upon us a ridiculous piece of non-sense, which I opened before. 3. Doth he not here contradict what he said in the foregoing words? There he faith that [Works are Disponent Adjuncts to future salvation.] Here he faith [They are not the way to the Kingdom above.] Is not the Kingdom above, our salvation which yet remains to be attained? and doth [a way] signify here any more than [an Antecedent, Disponent, Condition?]

Will you hear now how this man concludes his parallell? in these words ["Let now the vast difference and contrariety in so many particulars, between Mr. Baxter and these Divines opinions, about this question be considered, and then let it be judged whether Mr. Baxter had not taken his leave of all baflfullness, when he would impose on his Readers an opinion that he delivers upon this argument nothing but what they had taught before him."

To which I only add; 1. Let the words be shewed where I sought to imposed that opinion. 2. If I had, let the differences indeed be weighed as he desires, and let the forehead of this man be judged of as it shall be found. I think I have shewed that he here granteth as much as I desire in this point of the Conditionality of Works; and makes the Protestants to do the like.

Let us follow him yet further. Part 2. pag. 142, 143, 144. you shall finde him in four Propositions granting as much to mans actions for life and salvation (though with self-contradictions intermixt) as that for which I am charged with Popery. I will not weary the Reader with the rehearse of the words; he that will, may read them in his book. Nay he granteth more then I desire, or indeed then is true and safe. His first Proposition begins thus ["We grant that they which are wholly under the old Covenant, having never the Gospel revealed to them, are Bound to seek Justification and salvation by the works of the Law or naturall Righteousness still.

Rep. A vile and false assertion, and of desperate consequence. I prove the contrary thus:

1. He that is bound to acknowledge that he hath lost all possibility of justification and salvation, without some supernatural remedy, is not bound to seek justification and salvation by the works of the Law: But those that have not the Gospel, are bound to acknowledge that they have lost all possibility of justification and salvation, without some supernatural remedy. Therefore.

1. By the light of nature they may see that they are sinners, and that sinne deserveth death.
death, and that justice must be done (See Mr Owen de Fustit, Vindicat.) and this light of nature they are bound to improve.

2. No man is bound to a natural impossibility: For a sinner to be justified and saved by the Law, or natural righteousness, is a natural impossibility (it being a contradiction, to be a sinner, and to be justified by that Law that condemns all sinners: ) Therefore.

Though men may be bound to moral impossibilities, when they have made a Duty impossible by disabling themselves, yet not to natural impossibilities, nor to believe contradictions. He that is bound to believe it impossible for the Law of nature to justify him, is not bound to seek justification by that Law: But all sinners are so bound: Therefore.

3. No man is bound to rob God of his honour, and overlook the righteous sentence of his judgement: For a condemned sinner to seek yet to be justified by the Law that condemned him, is to rob God of his honor, and to overlook the righteous sentence of his judgement: Therefore.

Such men being under condemnation already, are bound to acknowledge their misery, and give God the glory of his justice, and to despair of ever being justified by that Law which condemned them.

4. No man is bound to go the way clean contrary to his salvation: For a sinner condemned already, to seek justification by that Law, is to go the way clean contrary to his salvation. Therefore.

Such seeking would carry him further from God, and fasten him under a greater guilt. He is at that time bound, as to confess his sinne and misery, so to enquire far and near after any discoveries of God's way of Mercy, and to hearken after Light, to see if it be possible to finde out the way of Grace, and in the mean time, to be led to Repentance by the mercies and long-suffering of God, and not to seek justification and salvation, where he is bound to despair of ever finding it. Let none call this man an Antinomian, in this point, where he preacheth the Law in so destructive a sense, as would be the everlasting ruine of those that obey him.

Part 2, pag. 132. He granteth ["1. That the whole world that hath not heard of Christ shall be judged according to their works to life or death. 2. The whole bulk of professed Christians shall be judged according to their works. 3. That the very Saints as compared one with another shall be judged according to their works, i.e., shall be adjudged to glory in several measures above, according to the several measures of their services and sufferings here.] See the rest. One would think this man were a Papist as gross as I am. But what's the difference? Why 1. He faith, this is [the sentence of judgement, but not the justifying sentence.] If he have found out a sentence of judgement, which doth neither justify nor condemn, he hath done like himself, Matt. 12, 36, 37.

2. He faith [It is not according to Works as a Condition.] As what then? If the word [According to] be taken secundum subjecti naturam, i.e. in sensu forensi, I appeal to any man that hath eyes in his head, whether it can signific any thing lower then a Condition? And here he blasphemat our a deal of his language of darkness; that evil works cannot be the condition of justification, and therefore we are not justified by works at judgement as by a Condition, as I affirmed; with more such stuff which I am aweary of reading over, and will not add the trouble of reciting.

Part 1, pag. 370. When I had shewed that I did confess faiths Receptive nature (as having Christ for the object) to be the remote reason of its Interest in our Justification,
Justification, as being its Aptitude to that office; but maintained that the nearest or formall Reason of its Interest is, its being the condition of the promise, freely by God designed to this office; See how he confutes me, ["The question controverted between us and the Papists first, and in these later times the Arminians also, is not Whether Gods Instituting of faith in Christ, or else the acting of faith so Instituted, be one the formall, and the other the Remote reason why it justifieth? but whether so Instituted of God to be the mean or Instrument of Justification, it doth justifie by virtue received from Christ its object, or else by its own virtue as it is a good work, or as it is an act of righteousness performed in obedience to Gods Commandments. That which they maintain is, that faith justifieth by virtue of its object Christ, denying the Papists work, and the Arminians act. If Mr. B. did labour more for truth then for victory, we should not finde in him so much fraud, and so little of sincerity. It is not Christs, but Antichrists kingdom, that is maintained by the pillage of shits and sophisms. Let him not astonish the poor Saints of Christ with words that they cannot understand, obscuring the truth with needless terms of Art.] And so he proceeds in his accustomed Rhetoric.

Let the Judicious here be judge, Whether he do not grant all that I desire: and that is indeed, the main point opposed by most in my book, viz. That faiths apprehension, i.e. faith as faith, or as faith in Christ, is not the formall Reason of its Interest in Justification, but only the Remote, and Gods Instituting it to the office of justifying, is the formall or nearest reason. If I understand him hegranteth this; or denieth it not: and I desire no more. 2. When he hath proclaimed me a Papist, he vomits out his reproaches against me, because I will not maintain the Popish or Arminian Cause; telling us that this is not the Question between the Papists and us, and so I am guilty of [much fraud, little sincerity, upholding Antichrists Kingdom by the pillage of shits.] with much of the like, because I will not maintain the Papists doctrine, nor state the question as they do. 3. When I do solemnly profess, that I do now disclaim and detest, and have still disclaimed and detested, the doctrine of the Papists and Arminians, as himself here lays it down (whether it be theirs or no, I leave to him,) I never thought that faith justifieth [by its own virtue as it is a good work, or as it is an act of Righteousness performed in obedience to Gods commandments] but as it is by the free donor made the condition of our Justification. And thus I fully wrote in that book which he opposeth; and yet doth this man load me with Reproaches, for not maintaining the opinions which I wrote against, i.e. for not being a Papist in doctrine, when he hath told the world that I am one. If ever man in the Church of Christ, before me, had such an adversary as this, I confess, his name and surname is to me unknown.

As for what he adds, of [faiths justifying by virtue received from Christ its object.] I will believe it when I see Scripture for it, or sense in it. I believe that Christ justifieth, but I believe not that as he is faiths object, he conveyeth virtue into it, to justify. It seems the man is of the Papists opinion himself, for ought I see by him, after all this noise against me, for not owning it: If faith receive virtue from Christ to justify, then faith hath in it itself (so received) a virtue to justify: But this man affirmeth it to be the Protestant doctrine, that faith doth justify by virtue received from Christ its object: Therefore,

If faith receive such virtue, doublets it hath the virtue in itself which it hath received.
3. If faith justify by a received virtue, it seems its made a Cause of our Justification (for virtue is exercised by way of causality, to produce the effect;) But faith is not the Cause of Justification: Therefore.

3. If faith receive this virtue from Christ its object as its object, then faith as faith, that is, as this faith, doth justify: (for it is essential to the act in specie to have such or such an object:) But the Antecedent is false: therefore so is the Consequent.

See now how well Mr. Grandon's doctrine takes down man in the work of Justification, and freeth it from the mischiefs which it pretendeth to oppose! Even as errors use to do.

For my part, I say not that faith receives virtue from Christ to justify, because it is no Scripture phrase, and let I intimate in it a Causal Interest of our Justification: much less do I say that it receives it from Christ as its object, that is, that it is in faith, as faith: But I say, that the place or Interest which faith hath in Justification is two-fold: One remote and Aptitudinall: this it receives from God as the New Creator, or Author of our faith. The other is its nearest or formal Interest, and that is, its being the Condition of the promise (as the former was its Receptive nature,) And this it receives from God, as Promiser, Donor, or Legislator of the Law of Grace, or act of obedience and pardon.

Part 2. pag. 26, 27, 28. He first chargeth me with dealing worse than Bellarmin: What's the crime? In not manifesting what I mean by Repentance. Then he faith ["All the Scriptures which have the least shew or sound of speaking for me, I have them, in part from Bellarmin, whom I here follow, and in part from other Jesuites and Friars that controversially handle the Popish Justification against us.] In all which if there be one true word, let me be stigmatized for the most Impudent Lyer, that ever dared to write of holy things. Yea if ever I took one text or word out of Bellarmin, or any Papist, or any but the Bible, of all that he here mentioneth.

Then he proceedeth to tell us ["what the Scriptures mean by Repentance, when they hold forth the Promise of Life upon Condition of Repentance to sinners,] (A Condition it seems it is then, how damnable ever it is in me to say so.) And first he tells you, that these texts speak sometime of a Legall, and sometime of an Evangelical Repentance. And of the Legal he faith thus [A Legal, consisting meerly in a feeling of humiliation and contrition for, hatred against; departing from sinne, and applying of the endeavours to all morall virtue and obedience. This is a meerly morall Repentance, derivable from the strength of natural conscience, illuminated by the Law and common knowledge of Gods will and nature. In this sense is the word taken in most of the Scriptures quoted from the old Testament, and some also of those possibly that are quoted out of the new.

Rep. O holy doctrine, and far from Arminianisme! Naturall strength can do all this: O that it could but do one thing more; even persuade men that they are Justified and shall be saved, and then what need of Grace? But according to this Character I must change my judgement of most of my neighbours: For most of the vicious ignorant people, will believe that they are justified and shall be saved, let me say what I can: but those that Mr. Grandon here describeth [that are humbled, and hate sinne, and depart from it, and apply their endeavours to all morall virtue and obedience] are much more rare, and such as I had better thoughts of. If hated of sinne, and endeavours of univerell obedience may come from nature, I confess.
Confess Nature is not so bad as I supposed it, nor Free will so much captivated and corrupted, as we Papists and Arminians did imagine. At least he might have yielded to the necessity of a common Grace for this much, if not a special: and such a common grace as shall work upon the will, and not only give that Light which he mentioneth to natural Conscience.

But he adds, that ["the Life by these Scriptures promised, is not the life of Justification or of spiritual and supernatural blessedness, but that which the administration under the Law is wont to call Life, ver. 1. The fruition of the Land of Canaan which promised the life and rest both of Grace and Glory.

2. Of the blessings of health, honour, peace, plenty, safety and other temporal benefits promised to the obedient in the Land of Canaan."]

Rep. I will not enter the Controversie, what the Life was that was promised by Moses Law, as such: But as I doubt not, but it was Eternal Life that was promised in the first Law, so I doubt not but the old Testament abounded with Gospel promises of eternal Life: and that these are such, at least many of them, which make Repentance the Condition of Life, as the Gospel it self also doth. Will Mr. Cr. blot out all the Gospel part of the old Testament at a dash, which promised life to the penitent, yea and tell us the like of some places in the New.

Consider also what a mean kinde of Repentance this man feigneth God to require in the Old Testament, even such as natural strength may perform: or else what strength of nature and freedom of will men had then, that could Repent without supernatural Grace: and what an easie Law that was, which Paul accounted such an intollerable yoak of bondage, which required but such a repentance, which natural strength may perform!

But I forget my task, which is not now to rake in the channel of Mr. Crandoun's Errors, but to discover his concessions of as much as I need. The main Error that I am supposed guilty of, is bringing other acts under the name of faith, to be with it the conditions of Justification or Salvation, though but in a subordination to it: Let the Reader that regards the business, mark these following words of Mr. Cr. pag. 28, 29, 30, and see whether he prove not my defendour. ["2. Those Scriptures which he quotes that offer Life upon condition of Evangelical Repentance, do not make for him, any more then the former: For Gospel Repentance is taken either in a large or in a strict sense. In the more large sense it is the same with Conversion or Regeneration, and oftentimesequivollent and the same thing with faith, though some little consider it to be so: And this is as oft as Repentance is put for the One and Whole thing required on our part to put us into the actual and sensible possession of the Grace and Life of the Gospel: as Matt. 3. 2. Mark 6. 12. Repent for the Kingdom of God is at hand. The summe of their preaching was, Repent: So Luke 13. 3. 5. Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish: and 24. 47. and many other of the Scriptures which he quotes."]

Here we see Repentance that is the condition of Life is the same thing with Conversion, Regeneration and Faith. Hear him go on.

["In all these places Repentance containeth primarily the change of our Relation, and but secondarily of our qualifications and manners."]

It was not for nothing that the man did make so long an Oration against humane Learning used in these Divines things: he would, he must I mean, have liberty to speak contradictions. Here is a strange precept of God, that requires men [Primarily to change their Relations, and but secondarily their Qualifications.
An imaginary impossible change, like the Libertines faith that is made the cause of it. Was there ever a Relation Primarily required, before that act which is its Foundation; or ever a Relation without some Foundation first laid? or did ever any Law require the change of Relation, before the change of acts or qualities? I know not what such a Relation is. If he say, As in Marriage it is first required of the woman that she take the Relation of such a mans Wife, so of men coming to Christ it is first required that they be Related to him, as his Members: I answer, It was never heard that either of them was primarily required. It is Marriage Consent and Covenanting that is first required as the Fundamentum of the Marriage Relation: And it is the Consent and Covenant to be the Disciples of Christ, that is first required, before the Relation of Disciples. Shall we feign God, or any wise man to teach and command a natural Possibility, such as is a Relation before that in which it is founded, or the ratio fundandi? Our acts must be changed before we are justified or related as Members of Christ, whatever these men say: We must have the act of Faith and Repentance, and so farre the old and hard heart taken out of us, and a heart of flesh and a new heart given us: else that will prove a conditional promise. But he proceeds thus, [*It is a quidam motus in which acti agimus, being moved by Gods Spirit we move*] Is not this a strange Relation that is a quidam motus in which acti agimus? It shall never have my Vote to stand in the old predicament of Relation: nor any of the ten: but shall have the honour of making an eleventh predicament, or else be Transcendental. He goes on, [*The Terminus æ quo in this motion is self, our self-righteousness and self-confidence from which we turn no les then from our polluted self, sinfull self, and sinfull waies. The Terminus ad quem is God, the grace of God inviting us. The Medium per quod is the Lord Christ, through whom we have access to the Father, for Remission first, and then for Sanctification also.] And after [*What will ye call this obedience to the faith, this closing of his heart with Christ in stead of further dashing against him? Was it not his Conversion? his Repentance? Or is the promise of Life, I mean, the Life of Justification, made to any other Repentance besides this? In this sense therefore Repentance is not a quid distinatum, a thing distinct from, but one and the same with justifying faith; or if it be object and that it is somewhat larger then justifying faith, I shall not contend, but acknowledge that it comprehends Whole faith, both qua Justificat and qua Sanctificat. Yet this hinderers not but that these two phraes, Repentance to Life and Remission of sins, and Faith to Life and Remission of sins, are in the language of the holy Ghost one and the same.]

You see then that justifying faith in Mr.brandours sense, is Conversion of the heart from Self and self-confidence to Christ, and the same with Repentance, and he will not deny but that Repentance contains more then justifying faith, even Whole faith. What faith this man les then I here? but only that I maintain that it is only Whole faith that is the Condition of Justification: and that faith as faith doth neither justify nor sanctifie, though both follow it. Yet hear him further, [*Where Repentance is taken in a stricter sense, and some of the Scripture which he quotes seem to promise Remission of sin, or Life to it, we must necessarily understand of every such Scriptures that it speaketh of the Repentance which is a situated in our first Conversion, Calling, or after it. That which is in our first Conversion or Calling, when it is taken in a stricter sense, is not as in the former sense put as the whole thing required on our parts, but seems*]
seems in words a coordinate with faith to interest us in the Righteousness and
Life which are by Christ. Such are these Scriptures, Repent and believe the
Gospel: Repentance towards God and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ, Mar. 1.
15. Acts 20, 21, and many other. But in these Repentance and Faith together,
makes up no more then in other Scriptures, either Faith alone or Repentance
alone in their larger sense import: and so Repentance is taken for self-denial,
self-abhorring, self-subduing, and Faith for embracing Christ: both these are
repentance or faith in their larger sense, &c. And Repentance here is no dis-
finite thing from Faith, nor Faith from Repentance; and so in naming these
two the holy Ghost nameth not two gifts of Grace, but two acts of the same gift
of Grace in us.

You see here Mr. Grindon confesseth that Repentance is in Scripture so made the
Condition of Justification, that it seems in words a coordinate with faith, that it is
indeed faith it self: that it is a self-denying, self-abhorring, and self-subduing;
and so these acts are the conditions of Justification. How easily, were he like other
men, could I prove to him, that in this Conversion, it is not only self, as opposite
to Christ's Righteousness, that this Repentance turns us from? When himself
makes Christ but the Medium, and God the Terminus ad quem of the change, no
doubt then it is from self as opposite to this Terminus ad quem: and that is, as we
are our own Idols, and esteemed, honoured, loved, pleased, before God: and this
essentially contains a turning from all those things (worldly pleasures, profits and
honours) by which this Self doth please it self above God: and so the cleaving to
God as our only happiness and ultimate End, as well as to Christ as the Way.
See now what a deal is here taken in, and whether his own concession lead him
not into that damnable Popery which he takes me to be in.

But let us see the very bottom of the whole business: Doth he indeed make this
Conversion, this self-denying, self-abhorring, self-subduing, all justifying acts,
and that equal with faith it self? Just as far as I do, if I can understand him!
That is, that faith is the only apprehending act, and is the principal part of the
Condition, and Repenance, self-denial, self-subduing, are required or made
conditional, but as requisite to our right believing: Only he gives more to faith
in appearance, then I do: Hear his words: Though these two acts must
needs cooperate together, viz. the calling out of Self, and the receiving of
Christ, yet it is the later alone that doth properly and instrumentally justify,
by receiving the Justifier and his Righteousness. The former act doth but different materiam (as one faith not too catechetically) doth but put a man, as it
were, into a justifiable posture and capacity; doth but obiciem tollere, pluck out
and cast away the barre that might fasten the door against Christ's entrance; and
this it doth not as a distinct virtue from faith, but as a subservient act of faith
to its receiving of Christ.

Is it not pity that this man and I must be of two Religions, when we hold the
same thing in the great point of difference? We differ in being of one minde.
He faith the same that I more largely explicate and maintain. Here is not a faith
of one single act, but of many. Here is as much given to Repentance as ever I
gave to it or any act of man, that is, to dispose the matter and remove the barre.
And yet must I be a Papist and he a Protestant? But here's the difference, I deny
faith to be the Instrument of Justification, and so give less to it then he: But if
I do, I give so much the less to man, when I give to the lower act no more then
he gives to the highest. State the case right then, and let the difference lie where

it is: Mr. Crandon and I are agreed that the subservient aet doth but dispone materia and tolle obicem: we are agreed that Faith is a receiving of Christ for Life; but the faith that one aet is an instrument of justifying, and this I deny. Nay but it say a while: Though I differ from others I am reconciled with Mr. Crandon in this also: For justification with him, is but justification in sense, and in foro Conscientiae: and I confess that Faith may be called an Instrument, or some efficient cause of that kind of justification. Is there yet any remaining difference? Doth not Mr. Crandon make one aet subordinate, and the other superior, when I make them coordinate (Faith and Repentance?) No: I say as he for that: It is receiving Christ that is the Principal aet: it is in subordination to this that Repentance, self-denial, self-abhorring, self-subduing are required and made the condition: Only give me leave to add also, The aversion of the soul from sin, or worldly Idols, and conversion to God, as our chiefest good, must finde a place in Repentance or Faith, or both.

Can you be think you of any thing else wherein you would with Mr. Crandon and me agreed? Yes, that one point before named. He makes justification by faith (today nothing of his other two before faith) to be in foro Conscientiae, and in our sense of former justification, and I make it to be, a state or right in Law, (whether we feel it or not;) by which we have the obligation to punishment actually dissolved, or right to impunity given us. Stay a little, and see whether Mr. Cr. and I be not friends whether he will or no. Reade Part. 1, pag. 324. these words having recited many Texts of the Evangelists, that call justification by the name of Life, he addeth [In all which and many other Texts of this Evangelist none can deny but by Life is to be understood chiefly, if not only, Life in Law, the Life of justification.]

What say you to this? are we not yet agreed? No: Mr. Crandon doth up and down, make his Life in Law to consist in the sense of pardon in Conscience. A wonderfull Law title, which consisteth in the sense of Conscience! A strange Relation that is the same thing with an internal Passion or Action! But we must bear now and then with a contradiction in an Author that is at such mortal odds with Philosophy. Here then is the difference. Mr. Crandon confesteth all that I desire, that justification by faith is chiefly if not only that in Law: but he superaddeth elsewhere, that even this same is the feeling of pardon in conscience: whereas I take this to be as palpable a contradiction, as to say, Paternitas, filiation, just, debitis, &c. are Passions or Actions in Conscience. I take them to be two things, both separable and frequently separated, and that the same man that is pardoned and justifieth in Law, is yet oftentimes unsensible and ignorant of that benefit.

And now I leave it to sober consideration, Whether this Book of Mr. Crandons which granteth what it opposeth, and yet pourreth out upon me such a form of reproach, for that which he openly owneth himself, be a profitable piece for the Church of God, and worthy the publike view, or a just Vindication of the Fundamentals of a Christian's Comfort. I have said as much as I mean to do on that Reason to the contrary, drawn from his Concessions. I now come to the next, which is drawn from his false Accusations, and making that to be my Doctrine which never entered into my thoughts, nor ever fell from my Mouth or Pen.
Sect. VIII.

If it be none of my Doctrines, but his own forgeries, about which Mr. Crodon bestoweth most (if not almost all) of his labour in Confutation, then his Book is not profitable to the Church of God, nor worthy the publick view: And whether the Antecedent be true, or no, though I resolve not to trouble my self and the Reader with so large a trial, as the recital of most of his Book would be, yet I shall give you a taste of the substance of what he chargeth on me; and this for Mr. Caryll's satisfaction.

You have seen no small part of his dealing with me this way, in what hath been said already; The best way to see the rest with least trouble is, to take it from those places where he summs up my Errors, and speaks more directly to the point, for in other places you will scarce quickly finde the matter it is so buried in heaps of personal Reproach.

Part 1. pag. 78. he heapeth up many of my supposed Errors: The first he scornfully reports thus. ["1. That they (the Elect Saints) have so large a discharge from the rigour of the Law as any of the worst Reprobates."]

Repl. If he intend an equality, how proves he that this is any Doctrine of mine? Because I say the Law of Works is not to them Abrogated. Doth not the Assembly say as much in the place before cited? As for the term [Covenant of Works] I have shewed in what sense I take that to be ceased, or continued, which we call by that name. Are all Reprobates actually pardoned, as Believers are? Is this man a Divine, and doth not know that it the Law were not in force to oblige to punishment there could be no pardon? For how can an obligation be dissolved that is no obligation? But he thinks we are pardoned from Eternity.

His next is ["2. That they have no more discharge from the Laws curse then the worst of Reprobates.""] Repl. Would you think any Christian durst speak such Accusations without any truth? There is not a true word in any of his charge. Hear the proof, which he ushers in with this scorn. ["Must we not account him a Saint that hath a fastidious stomack, or fome mouth that cannot relish these dainties? The former Conclusion he reacheth to us in these words, so farre is the Law dispensed with to all, as to suspend the rigorous execution of it for a time, and a liberation and discharge conditional procured and granted them. Jam sumus ergo pares: In this the Sons of God are in as good a case as the reprobates, and somewhat before the devils."]

Repl. Its true that the Saints in heaven are in as good a case as Reprobates: but to what purpofe speaks he this, but to intimate that I make them to be in no better a case? Is it not pity that any man that preacheth the Gospel, should be yet ignorant of the truth of these two attentions of mine which he here brings in? 1. Should a Preacher of the Gospel dare to say, that reprobates are deald with at present according to the utmost rigour of the Law? and to tell them that God never shewed them any mercy since the Fall? and therefore they owe him no thanks for any mercy, nor is their sinne aggravated by any mercy, nor shoulf his mercy and long suffering leade them to repentance? Would this Preacher honour Free Grace, or edifie souls? 2. How can that man preach the Gospel that knoweth not that it containeth a General Conditional Discharge? even on the condition
tion of Repenting and Believing? He addeth ["The later Conclusion in these "words. But an Absolute discharge is granted to man in this life: Jam sumus "ergo pares. Yet have we as large caufe of exulting and joy in the holy Ghost, as "the reprobates, that (as far as we can discern) we are no nearer to hell then the "children of hell, whose inheritance is in hell for ever."

Repl. I have before shewed, that by [an Absolute Discharge] in the words that he carps at, I meant not Liberationem Passium, sed activam; not pardon as it is ours, but the grant of pardon in the word: and so I say still, that the word contains a Conditional pardon to all, and no Absolute pardon to any, that is, no act of pardon that is in Absolute terms, from which any receive an actual Remission. And in regard of Passive pardon or discharge, I maintain this also, that till death the continuance of it is still conditional. But I ever plainly affirmed, that all Believers are Actually and so Absolutely pardoned as to all their sins, (for that to come is yet no sinne:) though the pardoning act remain still the same in the Gospel in Conditional terms, yet when we perform the condition by believing, the effect is actual and so farre absolute. And can he prove that Reprobates are in Gods favour, and have all their sins pardoned, yea and shall be kept by grace from falling away, which I affirm of the Elect? You see the truth and ground then of these Accusations.

He proceeds thus ["To prove the later Affertion, that none are, that Be- "lievers are not Absolutely discharged from the Law as a Covenant of Works "in this life, he borroweth matter from Pelagians, Papists, Socinians, Ar- "minians, and the whole rabble of confessed enemies to the grace of God in "Christ."]

Repl. Not a true word.

After some railing lines, he next addes, ["The Popish Errors which he brings "as an addition to confirm, that Believers are during life under the Law, are these: "I: That they which are in Christ have not their sins fully pardoned, neither are "themselves wholly justified in this world."]

Repl. Very false: shew any such words of mine. I still affirm that they which are in Christ have their sinnes fully pardoned, that is, all sinne past, and present fully pardoned as to eternal punishment: though castigatory punishment may remain, and though future sinnes are not yet pardoned. And I affirm that we are wholly justified in this world, as Justification is taken for Remission of sinne, or Right to impunity and to life: But I confess it is my opinion that the great day of Judgement shall not be till you and I are dead; and that the Justification which we shall there have, is our most full and compleat Justification: And therefore I said, that in its kind Justification here is perfect, but it is not the most perfect kind of Justification. And therefore it is not fit to say without explication, that any mans present pardon or Justification is perfect. An easie truth, the Lord knows, if men were not blinded with prejudice: when we are taught to pray for daily pardon.

He next addeth ["2. That whosoever shall be justified in the world to come, "must procure it by his own willing, running and persevering in this world."]

Repl. Shew any such words of mine. If [Procuring] signifie [Causing] it is false, and ever by me disclaimed: but if it signifie no more but that our will- ing, running and persevering are Conditions without which none shall be then justified, I say, Its pity any Preacher of the Gospel should be ignorant of it.

His
His third follows ["3. That they which are in Christ may fall away and be damned."] Repl. A most immodest falsehood: when I ever maintained the contrary, yes in that very Book.

["4. That no man while he lives can be certain of salvation."] Repl. Shew where I ever said so, or bear the name of a shameless slanderer. I have largely proved the contrary in my Book of Refut.

["5. To this he addeth one worse, then any Popish or Socinian heresie, as proper to himself and from himself alone: viz. That all believers, notwithstanding Christs satisfaction for them, notwithstanding their persevering faith in him, yet must be at last damned for ever."] Repl. Go on: for I am weary and ashamed of mentioning your faults. We shall now hear the proof.

["The first he expressly affirmeth, &c."] Repl. As is before explained only.

["So that in this life there is no discharge, but a conditional promise that possibly we may in the world to come be discharged."] Repl. Very false: We are actually discharged as to all sin past; but conditionally for the future: and our justification in the life to come, as you speak, is not only possible but certain: How ill becometh you, to make it light, and such a scorn of justification in the life to come? You will value it more one day.

The second he proves, because I say, We must continue to perform the conditions, and addes, ["And so it is by our own strong and lasting endeavours, that after the world is ended our sinner may be possibly forgiven, and we saved."] Repl. It is no otherwise by our endeavours then as by conditions of Gods making: Himself contemnith Faith and Repentance to be conditions: and must not we continue Believers and penitent, if we will be saved? He that will read Mat. 25. Rev. 2. & 3. may answer this without my help.

["3. That they that are in Christ may fall away, and be damned, if they continue in their apostacy, or may after their many apostacies, oft renew again their union with Christ, and so at last be justified, he speaks out fully, in telling us, [It is not one Instantaneous act of believing, but a continued faith, that shall quite discharge us: that no longer are we discharged then we are believers; and when we cease to believe, the Law is still in force and condemmeth.]

Repl. I. The last words of mine he falsificheth: I say, If we should cease to believe, the Law is in force, and would condemn us; and say withal, that God will cause his people to perseverae. He fauncheth me to say [If we cease to believe, &c.]. 2. Whether my words contain any such thing as he faith I speak out fully, or whether all be mere forgery, I leave to any man that can read English and understand it. If God threaten his own people, if they draw back, his soul shall have no pleasure in them, and this as a means to preserve them from Apostacy, will this man say that God speaks out fully, that they fall away? Cannot God make a conditional grant, as certainly to be accomplished as an absolute? One would think that this man judged us to be from under all Law and Government.

He next faith, ["If I argue from impossibilities, it makes not for my purpole] and conclude, [But he argueth as from a possible and usual cause."] Repl. Still falle: it is possible in the nature of the thing in it felt considered, but it never comes to pass; and the threatening and Conditionality of the Promise,
is one means of God to hinder it; from coming to pass.

The fourth, ["That none can in this life be certain of salvation"] he saith [depends on the former : for if we cannot be certain of our Perseverance, we cannot be certain of Eternal Happiness.] Repl. A conscionable way of Accusation! to make one falsehood of your own feigning to be mine, and then gather more out of it. Produce a word where ever I said, that none can be certain of Perseverance or Salvation! or else confess your self to be, what this Volume proclaims you.

His fifth slander (that all Believers shall be damned) he will needs have me affirm in saying they are under a Covenant of Works: of which I have opened my minde before so fully, that I will not with such a raving Disputer say any more.

He undertakes here also to declare the grounds of these my Errors, which he [are principally these two 1. That faith as an infused gift of grace, and a part of our inherent Righteousness, doth justify, &c.] Repl. Never such a thing came into my thoughts; to own it, or believe it. I have still thought, that the same faith which is a gift of grace, and part of our inherent Righteousness, justifieth, that is, It is the condition of our pardon: but never did I think it was as such a gift of grace, but only as a condition of God's free constitution.

The second follows ['"2. That faith and all those its concomitants, with their fruits and effects depend upon our free will, to gain and retain, refute and lose them, at the pleasure and will of our corrupt free will."'] Repl. How dare this man heap up such things as these, and believe there is a God that hateth falsehood! I believe that corrupt free will refuseth Christ, but only sanctified free will accepteth him; and that sanctification is from God's special grace, on whom free will and all things depend. Yet I believe that none have Christ; or pardon, or heaven against their wills, that is, continuing unwilling. Nor do I know that ever in any writing I gave the man any occasion of these false reports, nor doth he once tell us whence he fetcheth them, but only boldly faith, It is so.

But the principal place where I finde him gather together my Errors, is Part 2. pag. 272, 273, 274. When I had expressly professed that I take not any act of mans to justify us, [1. Not as works simply considered, 2. Not as Legal works. 3. Not as Meritorious works. 4. Not as good works which God is pleased with. 5. But as conditions to which the free Lawgiver hath promised Justification and Life: and that I dare not give so much to any act of man, as is usually given to faith, to say that it justifieth as it apprehendeth Christ, which is its intrinsic Nature, and Essence, and so faith as faith should justifie, whereas I give all the honour to the free Donor who hath constituted this the condition of his gift.] Mr. Crandon gives this following answer hereto.

["All this hath been oft and fully examined before in its place also; and how little truth there is in any part or parcel thereof discovered. It would be weariness to the flesh and vexation to the Spirit, but to look so often upon his great Goddesse, his Queen of Heaven, CONDITION, as he blesteth her. O that his Conscience had been so well acquainted with Christ, as his fancy is with this idol! he would not then have pestered the Church with such an imaginary Deity, nor prostituted all that is called God, at the feet of such a Proserpina."]

Repl.
Rqi. If Mr. Carlyl think this a Vindication of God's Truth, and profitable to the Church, he is not of my Judgement: Nor have I any Answer for it now, but to minde the Reader, that the generality of Reformed Divines do say the same of this Conditional, as I do, and that the mouth that so reproacheth it, doth acknowledge their use of the word in the same sense as I use it.

He proceeds, [“I am weary any more to attend to him, making the Will of God, i.e. God willing, Conditional; and so the Immutable God, a Conditional God, the salvation of Christ Conditional, and so Christ a conditional Saviour; or the witnesses and seal of Christ a conditional seal and witness, and so the holy Ghost a conditional Spirit of Adoption; or the Gospel of Righteousness, Forgiveness and Life, a conditional Gospel, and consequently nulling all these, and pronouncing them no God, no Christ, no holy Ghost, no Gospel.”]

It is a most sad consideration that the worst of the sons of men should be given up to such a spirit as animateth these lines: Was there ever a man called a Protestant Divine that durst say, that there was no conditional Promises or Threats in the Word of God? Nay, do not the Antinomians themselves confess some, even when they cavil against Conditions? as Mr. Gasker hath manifested even in Saltmarsh himself. Doth that man know what the Bible is that knoweth no conditional Promises or Threats in it? And do every one of these in Scripture make God a conditional God, and Christ a conditional Christ, &c. and Null God, Christ, the holy Ghost, and Gospel? I profess I am sure that Mr. Carlyl durst think such a Book worthy the Publick view that lares this highest Blasphemy to the charge of all Christian Divines in the world, (unless the Libertines are such:)

Mr. Carlyl knows that all our Divines affirm God to have Conditional promises and threats; and knows that there are such things indeed in the Scripture: and yet could he finde in his heart to be the Midwife of that Book that shall proclaim all these Divines, yea and Scripture itself to Null God, Christ, the holy Ghost, and the Gospel? and pronounce them no God, no Christ, &c. sure he will not say, It fals only on me: For if I pronounce God to be no God, because he hath a Conditional promise or threatening, then doth every Divine, so doth Scripture that faith the same. And he that dare stand out and say, There is no conditional promis or threatening in Scripture, let him tend me his Name and his Reasons, and if I manifest him not unworthy to be a Preacher of the Gospel, let me be the common scorn of Divines. Had I said that God's Will de rerum eventu had been Conditional, and that so as that there are conditions of the act of his Will on which he willeth or not willeth, and not only conditions revoluta, of the thing willed, then this mouth might have been opened thus, with more show of reason, and less impudence: but when it is only a Conditional Promise and Threatening that I speak of, what answer should one make to such a man. Did not I tell him where even Dr. Twisst hath these words following? [“Ger. Vossius interpreteth the Will of God touching the salvation of all, of a Conditional Will, thus: God will have all to be saved, to wit, in case they believe: which Conditional Will, in this sense, neither Austin did, nor do we deny. Conf. Synod. Dort and Arlec. reduc. to praec. pag. 61.”] And pag. 143, 144 [“I willingly profess that Christ died for All in respect of procuring the benefit (of pardon and salvation) Conditionally, on condition of their faith.”] And against Mr. Cotton, pag. 71. [“Still you prove that which no man denieth (mark No man) viz. That God purposed Life to the world upon Condition of obedience.
dience and Repentance, provided that you understand it right, viz. that Obe-
dience and Repentance is ordained of God as a Condition of Life, not of Gods
minor. 441. [I confess Salvation, and so pardon and Adoption are offered to
All and singular men, on Condition they believe, &c. And so I deny not that
Redemption is so farre obtained for all and every man.] And with eight more
places I cited and refer'd to Dr. Twis' in the book which he opposeth. I would not
mention any Divines words in such a common thing, but that I know this sort of
men do more then ordinarily reverence Dr. Twis', for his favouring them in two or
three opinions.

He next proceeds to [mind the Reader of two things. 1. That both the
whole and every least fragment of all that is here collected, whether we look to
the substance or Artifice used about it, is not his, but borrowed partly from
the Papists, partly from the Socinians, and their Apes the Arminians, as hath
been before shewed: and if I shall be called thereto, I am ready more fully to
show, by quoting the Authors out of whom he hath transcribed All, almost word
for word, to his use.]

Rep. If there be one true word in these lines; if ever I transcribed or borrowed
a word of what he mentions from Papist, Socinian or Arminian, let me never more
be known by any other name, then, The most impudent Lyar. If all be talle——

Next, after a torrent of gumble stoole oratory, persuading his Reader not to believe in
the words of his own belief, seeing my words are [false fallacious
flatteries,] he heaps up these following Accusations, to prove that I am not to be believed.

[1. He maketh our Righteousness of works, and Christ's satisfactoy Right-
eousness, coordinate and collateral in the procurement of our Justification: the
one as absolutely necessary as the other to the attainment of this end: the one to
purchase a possibility of justification; the other, to render that which was but
in possibility, actual and effectual to us: Both satisfactory: the one as a suffi-
cient fine and payment, the other as satisfactory Rent and homage. Ap. Theof. 17, 18, 19, p. 129.

Rep. A heap of inventions of his own brain, which he well useth in with a
Nulla fides verbis. 1. Never were my thoughts nor pen guilty of making, that is,
judging and adhering, either our works to be any proper causes of our justification
at all, or ( much less ) coordinate and collateral with Christ's Righteousness.
Fnde such a word, and burn the book at the market-Cross. 2. I take faith and
obedience to be Absolutely necessary to their ends, and Christ's Righteousness to
its end: but never thought that they had the same office towards the attainment of
that end, or that they had at all the same neefet ends. It should seem the man is
offended that I make faith and obedience of Absolute necessity: that is, that Infidels and Rebels may not be saved. Such a Volume as he hath written, doth well
suit with the opinion, that Infidels are justified, and neither faith of Absolute nece-
sity to our first state of justification, nor obedience to that at judgement. Yet
I do I make a great difference between the Reasons of the Necessity of Christ's sa-
tisfaction, and the Necessity of our faith and obedience: But still I suppose both
Absolutely Necessary on Supposition of God's Ordination. Should I say otherwise
to please the Anomomians who would have elect Infidels be justified, I should by
others be thought an Arminian, as pleading for the possibility of the justification
of those Infidels, that never heard the Gospel. Its hard pleasing all this kind of
men.
3: I never said either that our justification was but in Possibility before our faith, nor that Christ purchased but a Possibility: These are still his fearles forgeries. *Deus tertium.* Though our justification were not Actual before faith, yet it was more than Possible, for it was Infallibly and Immutably Future. That's all that I knew of it (and that it was *inaevias*) he that knows more, let him reveal it. 4. I never thought that [our Righteousness of works did render that justification actual and effectual to us, which was but Possible.] For 1. This Rendering effectual plainly speaks a causality, which I still denied to any act of ours as to justification. 2. I maintained that our justification is actual and effectual upon the Condition of our faith alone, before works of obedience; and that they are but the Conditions of our not-losing it, and of that as judgment. 5. Never did I think or say that our faith or works were satisfactory for any sinne committed, as Christ's sufferings were. 6. There is not a word in the places that he cites for any of these his forgeries.

7. Yea in the 129 page which he citeth, raising an *odium* from the word [*Rent*] I purposely explained my thoughts to be these: that our faith and obedience was required as homage in acknowledgment of the free Grace of the Deliverer; but have not the least *rationem pretij* and left any should think otherwise because I used the word [*Rent*] when I mentioned the similitude of a Pepper-corn; I did (as distinguishing between a Rent that had in it *rationem pretij*, and a Rent that had nothing but meer Acknowledgment) express my minde in these words, which he refers to, which I am not ashamed to recite, that the Reader may see whether they contain that which he boldly avers they do. [Two things are considerable in this Debt of Righteousness: The Value, and the personall performance or Interest. The Value of Christ's satisfaction is Imputed to us in stead of the Value of a perfect obedience of our own performing; and the Value of our faith is not so Imputed: But because there must be some personall performance of homage, therefore the personall performance of faith shall be imputed to us, for a sufficient personall payment, as if we had paid the full Rent, because Christ whom we believe, hath paid it, and he will take this for satisfactory homage: so it is in point of personall performance, and not of Value, that faith is Imputed.] Can you find in these words that which he accuses them of? Only he eagerly falls on the word [*satisfactory hommage*] desiring to make the Reader believe, that I make this homage satisfactory in the same sense as I do Christ's sufferings? whereas one is a proper satisfaction to vindicate Justice, *A Reddition equivalentis alius indebiti*, as the Schoolmen and Dr. Ames define satisfaction. The other is but *Debitterium in tantum implice*: to be satisfactory, was with me, but to be acceptable, and hereafter I will be more cautious, when I consider what financiers I must converse with.

He proceeds in the next words thus: ["2. He puts both in the same order and kind of Causes, making our Righteousness and Christ's satisfaction to be both the *Causa fine qua non*, Thes. 56. For although he names faith there, yet himself declares hisfelf under faith, to mean and comprehend obedience also. This Civility Alone he vouchsafeth to Christ, that he names Christ's satisfaction before our faith or obedience, because it seems, that is the elder. But in order, Power and Authority to the producing of this effect, Christ hath no prece-

*Repl. The Lord pardon this audacious, fearles speaking of untruths; and shew you the sinfullness of it, that it may be pardoned. I. I did expressly in the same place affirm, that Christ's satisfaction is the meritorious Cause of our pardon,
and that faith is not; yet this preacher of the Gospel dare before the Lord, write and publish to the world, that [in order, Power and Authority to the producing of this effect, Christ hath no preheminence given him above man] and that I [vouchsafe Christ this Civility Alone] to be first named, &c. Lord! what will men become, if thou leave them to themselves?

2. I do not find that ever the man doth once dare to accuse this saying of falsehood (that Christ's satisfaction is in one respect a causa sine qua non,) for all the reproach he pourreth out upon it. It removeth impediments: Every inferior contains its superior: had I said, It was no more then so, or not assigned more to it, well might he have spoken to my Reproach.

3. Nay, for ought I see, he and his party give no more to it, then as to a causa sine qua non, as I have shewed elsewhere.

4. Yea how can they that say Justification is an Immanent act of God from Eternity, give so much to Christ's death, for the attaining it, as to a causa sine qua non?

His next words are these ["3. He affirms man's Righteousness to be as Perfect as Christ's Righteousness in order to Justification: viz. both perfect [in suo genere] Christ's Righteousness perfect to do its work, and man's to its work: or (as he explains himself) both perfect, in the perfection of sufficiency in order to its end. So that here also is a parity: no efficiency in Christ's Righteousness without mans, nor in mans without Christ's to justify: But when the two perfections meet, if neither lose its perfection, they may after the world is ended, perfect our Justification, Thel. 24. p. 132. In the mean while, till our works be added to Christ's satisfaction, what he faith of faith, that he every where implies of the satisfaction of Christ, that it is dead being alone, as to the use and purpose of Justifying: and so as works make faith alive, so they make Christ's satisfaction alive, as to the attainment of its end, Justification."]

Reply. Did not I tell you how these men used the ninth Commandment? 1. So far was I from saying that [Mans Righteousness is as perfect as Christ's Righteousness in order to Justification] that I expressly mention at least five respects in which our Righteousness is imperfect, when I ascribe Absolute Perfection to Christ. 2. All the perfection that I give our Righteousness, as you may see in the page cited by him, is but these two: 1. A metaphysical perfection of being (this he had more brains then to deny,) 2. A perfection of sufficiency in order to its end, viz. to be the Condition of our Justification, &c. this End it shall perfectly attain.] Never did any man question this that vouchsafed me his animadversions, till now. Mr. Blake, you may see acknowledged it in his book. If our faith be a Means to our Justification, and be not sufficient in its own place, to the attainment of the End whereof it is a Means, what will follow, but that we must all perish, and that God hath appointed an Insufficient Means to Justification, or else that it is not a Necessary Means? Though they that think Infidels are Justified, take it for no Means, yet Protestants do.

3. Is it true that he faith, that then [here's a parity?] What if Christ's Righteousness will not justify without man's faith, no more then faith without Christ's Righteousness; doth that make any parity in Causality or dignity? The vilest causa sine qua non, may have as much laid for it; the noblest efficient effecteth not without it: and so it is here: when yet the Condition effecteth not at all, so far is it from a parity.

4. Doth he that dare write such a Volume of untruths and railing accusations as
as this, yet insist on it so confidently that he is perfectly justified? And doth he not voluminously calumniate with the greater ardacity, because he supposeth that so long ago he was perfectly justified, from all the sinnes in this world committed. I believe, and shall believe till death, that the most perfect justification will be at the great Judgment; and that I must be justified in this life from more sinnes, then I was justified from at my first believing, or else perish.

5. He falsely affirms that I lay, Works make alive Christ's satisfaction as to the attainment of justification, or that I imply this. And it hath in it more untruths then one. For I. I never ascribed any Cauaility to works. 2. I never made them so much as Conditions of our first justified state, but affirm that on our meer Repenting and Believing, i.e. Accepting Christ as offered in the Gospel, we are justified before works; and that the Righteousness of ours which consisteth in our fulfilling the Conditions of the new Covenant, is to be found in faith alone without works, at our first being justified, seeing it alone without works, is the Condition of our first being justified. 3. And though I dare not say, that Christ's satisfaction doth justify without our faith (that is, it justiteth not Infidels) yet I lay 1. That this is not through any Insufficiency or Imperfection in it; but because it was never the will of the Father or Redeemer, that any Infidel, or Refuser of Christ, while such, should be justified by his satisfaction. 2. That yet Christ's satisfaction is before faith, effectual to other ends, though not to justify: viz. to suspend execution of justice, to procure us the new Covenant, and the promulgation of it, and the preaching of the Gospel, and to procure us also Grace to Believe, that so we may be justified: To me, this is not contemptible.

His next words are thus ["4. That works justify in the same kind of causality and procurement with faith, not only proving faith to be found, but themselves being in the same obligation with faith, not idle concomitants, only standing by while faith doth all (which some fools might imagine that he meaneth; when he calls them only Necessary Antecedents of Justification, p. 223.) nay they are concomitants with faith, in the very act of procuring it, and in that kind of causality which they have.""]

Rep. 1. Here are many threads of my words dismembered from that which must manifest their sense; and in all this he conceals that I express and maintain that all this procurement is by no proper Causality, but by mere Conditionality as causa fine quanon. 2. He insinuates untruly in his parenthesis, that I give more to them than to be Necessary Antecedents (that this Section may have somewhat like the rest) when as I ever took a Condition to be but an Antecedent, though I take not every Antecedent to be a Condition.

His next words are these ["5. They do all this as they are Works. Even faith it self justifieth as it is an act of ours. Append. p. 80; and as a Morall Duty.""]

Append. p. 102. So do all other Morall Duties as they are parts of our sincere obedience to Christ, ibid.

Repl. Here are in this Section four Propositions, as affirmed by me; and the pages cited where I affirm them. If ever a one of these were ever spoken or meant by me, and if all these Accusations be not downright falsehoods of his own devising, then I know not what I have thougnt or wrote.

For the first [They do all this as they are works.] I not only never spoke, but do so expressly affirm the contrary, viz. that it is only as the free Donor hath made the Conditions of his Guilt, that I even now call the man by it into such a chase, that he charged me with [Blessing this Condition as the Queen of Heaven, making]
making it my Idol, prostituting all that is called God at the feet of it, making God no God, Christ no Christ, the holy Ghost no holy Ghost, and the Gospel no Gospel by it: and yet both this man in answer to the same Section, charge me to affirm, that [They do all this, that is, justify and save, as they are Works.] As if we had given two different Formal Reasons of their Interest in our Justification, or as if he saw not that this is a plain contradiction!

The second Proposition he citeth my book as affirming. You shall hear both, and judge of the mens Credit. He faith I affirm ['"That even Faith it self justifieth As it is an Act of ours'] and cites Appendix, p. 80. All the words there concerning it that he can refer to, are these [And we are still said to be justified by faith, which is an Act of ours.] This was spoken to prove that we may lawfully Act for Life, as well as from Life. This Credible Divine makes nothing to turn [which is an Act of ours] into [As it is an Act of ours] and to affirm that I say the later when I say the former. As if the Matter and form, or the Material and formal Interest were all one. If I had said that [Mr. Grundon whose word is of so little credit, is a Preacher of the Gospel.] is this all one as to say, that [as such a one, he is a Preacher of the Gospel? Or if I say that [he who is a Preacher of the Gospel speaks untruths by the hundreds] it is not all one as to say that [As a Preacher of the Gospel he speaks untruths.]

His third Proposition which he faith I affirm is [that As a Morall Duty faith justifies.] And the fourth, that so do all other Morall Duties as they are parts of our sincere obedience to Christ.] For both these he cites App. p. 102. The words there are these [I have fully proved that Morall Duties as parts of our sincere obedience to Christ, are parts of the Condition of our salvation, and for it to be performed. And even faith is a Morall Duty.] The words are in answer to the Marrow of Modern Divinity, which faith [when in Scripture there is any Morall work Commanded to be done, either for eschewing of punishment, or upon promise of any reward temporal or eternall, &c. there is to be understood the voice of the Law.] I shew that this opinion turns all the substance of Christ's Covenant into the Law: and that Morall Duties as they are the Matter of our sincere obedience to Christ, are part of the Condition of Salvation. Do I therefore say, that as part of our obedience they justify us? Mark 1, 7. That I speak not here of Justification, but Salvation. 2. That I speak not of the Formal Nature of a Condition, but of the Matter of the Condition of Salvation. And supposing it proved, that sincere obedience to Christ is made by God, part of the Matter of the Condition of Salvation, I consequently affirmed that some Morall Duties, though not As such, yet as parts of our sincere obedience, are part of the Condition, that is, of the Matter of the Condition of salvation. I never intended [as] to express the formal reason of its Interest in our Justification, having frequently expressed the contrary.

And for his third Proposition; Is it all one for me to say [And even faith is a Morall Duty] which are my words: and to say that [even faith it self justifieth As a Morall Duty] which he feigneth me to say? I cannot believe that such heaps of palpable forgery, are vindications of fundamentall truth, profitable to the Church of God, and worthy the publicke view.

His next words are ['"6. That we are justified not only by Works, Aph. p. 300, and according to our works, but also for our works, p. 320. That good works are a Ground and Reason of it.] Repl. 1. Whether the two first sayings be accused or no, I know not: If they be, the
the holy Ghost is Accused that useth them. For the third, That we are justified for our works, if I had so delivered my minde, he could have interpreted it no otherwise, then so farre as [for] may express the Interest of a Condition, seeing I so oft profess to give them no more. But my words which he refers to, are only a question upon Mat. 25, 34, 35. Where Christ gives the reason of his sentence thus For I was hungry and ye fed me, &c. Now I desire to note, that I never said, that we are justified for Works, as the Meritorious Cause, nor that our Constitutive Justification in this Life is for them, at all: but I speak only of Justification at Judgement, and mention [for] as the Reason of the sentence only: and nor as any Cause of our Right in the Bleffedness to which we are sentenced. For that which is but a Condition and no Cause of our Right to the Benefit, yet may be the Reason of the sentence, when the performance of that Condition is the thing questioned. Luke faith [Because thou hast been faithful in a very little, &c.] I said not so much as that, nor as many other Scriptures say. But I have to do with such an Accuser, as I have no hope to please without Renouncing the language of Christ, and of all other Divines. Paracels his exposition is this, which I desire the Reader to compare with my Popery [Ad Causalem enim dico, significare quidem Causam, verum non Meritorium Regni, sed 'Declaratorium justae sententiae a judicio prolatum.'] jure ovibus regnum adipicari, quia operibus e urbe ovem h.c. sedite (esse declarativo]. So that in Paracels his judgment it is a Cause of the sentence, though not of their Right to the Kingdom. But because the same opinion is found in other men, which is Popery in me, I will spare men Names and words, but undertake to prove against any adversary, that sincere obedience is one ground or reason of the sentence of Justification at the last Judgment: and that if any man be accused to be an Infidell or a Rebell against the Lord that bought him, the faith and obedience of that man must be a ground and reason of his Justification, or he shall perish.

His next words are thus [""]. That we are Justified for our Works, that is, for the Merit of them. Not Merit in the most proper and strict sense, &c. [But so farre as it is Possible for a perfect man to have Merit, under the Covenant of Works] he may now Merit also under the Covenant of Grace by his Works, &c.

Repl. I have shewed at large before, that Adam, or a perfect man under the Covenant of Works, was Capable of a much further Meriting, and in less unfitness and Impropriety of Speech: Never did I speak any such words as the Accuser chargeth me with, either in the place cited by him, or elsewhere. The words that are the occasion of his charge I have vindicated before against him, and against Mr. Eyre: nor did I ever read to my remembrance one Protestant writer against the Papists on that point, that faith not as much for Merit as I did. I do except from my great Accuser, the father of Lyes, more malice, then from this man: but I never expect such untruths to be by himself immediately charged upon me, in judgment, as supposing he hath more wit and less Liberty.

Thus I have answered, I think, the summe of his book, as to the main matter of Justification by Works, for he contracted the venom of his charge into these heats: and after his usual oratory, makes this challenge: ["""] Let now any of his Disciples produce (I will not say one Arminian, but) one Socinian, Papist, yea or Jew, that ascribes more to Works than this man, in Derogation from ""Christ and Grace, else let him cease to be a follower of him, or openly and ingeniously
Ingeniously professes that he follows him as a Jew, Papist or Socinian: and consequently that he hath made not Mr. B. but Mr. B.'s masters his master also in the doctrine of Justification: And that in advancing self so high, as to affirm he Meriteth no less fully and properly then Christ himself hath or could have done.

Mr. Cary thinks this book worthy the publick view: I think him so unworthy an Answer, that as I will let this pass without, so I profess upon the review I should be ashamed that ever I said a word to him; were it not that I take my self bound even to do the bestt work that is lawfull, to satisfy such men as I take Mr. Cary to be: And intreat the Reader to pardon my abusing of his patience with such a task, as long as I am thus necessitated.

Were it not for tyting the Reader and my self, I might go over the rest of Mr. Grands Book, and shew them how like it is to this much: but truly I have not so much time or patience to spare. Yet a few more tafts lets me give you. Part 2. p. 203. he faith [1]. Then all the Testimonies of Dr. Twiss, Junius, Parasus, Piscator, Atcatus, Wellet, Mr. Burgoft, are here compiled, to tell them that are no friends to the doctrine of Grace, that all these Divines content with him in his doctrine of a Universal Conditionall Redemption and Justification purchas'd by Christ, without any more effectual satisfaction made to the Justice of God, for them that shall be saved then for them that shall be damned; and 2. That Morall obediencie and good works are Concaules or collateral Conditions with faith to Justification.

Repl. Can the wit of man imagin whence this man should be occasioned to devise these things? Where in all my writings did I ever hint such a thing, as that there is no more effectual satisfaction made for the saved, than for the damned? or suppose Christ to die equally for all? Much I am sure I have said against it, but nothing for it. 2. And how can I make faith and works Concaules, when I ever deny them both to be any Causes?

Part 1. p. 73. Because I said that [some think the Covenant of Works is repealed to all the world, and the Covenant of Grace alone in force.] he lets fly at me as a Lyar, with a torrent of reproach saying [those that hold this (most probably) are some Utopians, that Mr. B. alone and no other either man or Angel besides him have had acquaintance with, or the happiness to know their opinion: so that Mr. B. might have done well to have taken a second voyage into the Land of Euporia, either to have joyned with them, or disputed against them on their happy turfe: &c. This Nation among all hath not such bug-bears and phreneticals, that I know, who maintain such an assertion. But it is one of Mr. B.'s lubtilities to feign such Ghosts and phantasmes of men to fight against, thereby taking the advantage secretly and unespied (as he hopeth,) to erect more cursed and monstrous assertions &c.]

Repl. Should a man vex or laugh at such a creature as this, is? or rather pity him. Must I (in the midst of so much business, and languishing weakness, spend so much of my precious time, as I have done, in writing against that opinion, with most Learned, Judicious men? and now must I and the world be persuaded that they are but Ghosts, and there is no such opinion? I would he could have persuaded them and me of this sooner, and spared me all that labour! Have I such volumes of it pro and con. and now is there no such thing? Have I been contending all this while with Ghosts? They are such Ghosts, as write more Reason in a page, than I have yet seen in all his volume. And I can prove that one of these volumes
volumes that a Reverend, Learned and much honoured Brother wrote to me for that Opinion, was carried to Oxford and shewed in more Colledges then one, and to some of Mr. Crandon's friends, or Mr. Eyre's at least: and do those friends of theirs dwell in Eutopia? or is this my fiction and subtility? Methinks this is hard measure.

**Part i. p. 300.** When I said [I believe that the justified by faith, never do or shall fall away,] as before he flatly affirmed that I say, They do fall away, so here he faith ["What can we think can be his meaning but this, that they that are sentenced once to Life, in the day of Judgement, and are already Glorified, noether do, nor shall fall away?"]

Methinks still this is bare measure: and if the grand Accuser had used me thus, I should have thought he had dealt more dishonestly with me then with most others.

**Pag. 322. Part i.** he speaks thus ["Obj. Yes he reserves the entire praise of Merit still to Christ's satisfaction alone. Ans. Not so: for though in words he sometime affereth Christ's satisfaction to be the Merit of our justification, yet he makes the Worthiness of our own Righteousness to be that which makes both Christ's Merit and justification merited to be ours, and so we ourselves Christ, delivering not only justification, but Christ the Meriter, and the merit of Christ to be made ours. In this he is worse than the Papists. They give the praise of our Merit to Christ: he hath merited (say they) a power to our Works to Merit: This man contrary-wise, that neither Christ's Merits, nor justification the fruit of it, becomes ours till we by our Merits and Worthiness, have put our selves into the possession of it; so according to the Papists the efficacy of mans merits depends upon Christ's Merits; according to Mr. Baxter the efficacy of Christ's Merits (as to this or that justified person) depends upon a mans own Merits.]

**Repl.** All this he dare Print, though I ever renounced mans Merits, never owned so much as the name, much less the thing, never to this day thought or said that man deserved one bit of bread, much less that he deserved Christ, his Merits, and our justification: never said so much as that faith or any act of mans doth make Christ and his Righteousness ours, but only that they shall not be ours before or without faith, nor continue ours without true obedience: and this very condition I ever maintainted to be a fruit of Christ's Merits. By this way am I confuted by this man.

**Pag. 363, 364.** He laces heavy charges on me, unless I will hold that Infants are justified without faith, habitual or actual, thinking in that instance he hath got a proof of justification before and without faith: When I have so largely in my Book of Baptism, not only given my judgment, but proofs that the Parents faith is the condition of the Infants justification, and therefore it is not without faith that they are justified.

**Part. i. p. 369.** He mentioneth that vain charge which is the summe of much of his Book, thus, [His meaning is, that it (faith) only so farre justifies as it fulfillleth the condition. But throughout our whole life according to his principles, we are but fulfilling, have not fulfilled the condition of the new Covenant: therefore throughout our whole life we are but in justifying, not justified, &c.]

**Repl.** In the first moment of our true believing we have fulfilled the whole condition of our actual justification from all sinne then committed, and so of our being.
being in a justified state: But we have not then fulfilled all the Condition of our Justification at judgement, if we live longer, nor yet of our non-amination of our justified state.

Part 1. pag. 381. he questions, ["How after Mr. Baxter's principles can Christ's Righteousness be said to be ours by Divine Donation and Imputation, when he holds it no otherwise by God's Donation ours, then the wilde Goose is his? his if he can catch her, and as long as he can hold her: so his, as it is every one else, as well as his if they can take and hold her. For the is the world's Goose, and proper to none, before one hath taken her, and no longer, that ones then while he holds her; if he let her go, he is the world's Goose again."] If Mr. B's Righteousness be established upon such a Law, Donation and Imputation, let it be his not mine.]

Repl. But that God who is found of them that sought him not, may yet be so mercifull as to give you a part in that Righteousness which you renounce: though not while you renounce it knowingly, yet while you do it ignorantly, and know not what you say: Yet if a Papist should say, [Let not that impumed Righteousness be mine, which is given by a conditional promise;] I should be thought a Papist if I allowed them the charity that I here allow my friend Mr. Granden. Cannot God give us Christ and his Righteousness by a Conditional promis, without all this reproach and contempt of his gift? Especially when the Condition is but Acceptance of the free gift according to its nature and use? and when God giveth his Elect the Condition it self? To catch his wilde Goose is a work of Art, and perhaps to most of natural inculpable impossibility, nor is the fent as a gift to them. To receive an offered Christ is an act of meer Consent or Willingness. Physically impossible to none, and Morally only through mens own fault; and Christ is sent as a gift to all that will Accept him, and grace is given to the Elect to Accept him. Is it a Truth then that he here chargeth me with? Methinks he should have born so much Reverence, at least, to the unanimous Judgement of Protestant Divines, who maintain that: Christ and his Righteousness is given us by a Conditional promise, as not to renounce the Righteousness that they all look to be saved by, nor to cast in their face this wilde Goose scorn.

Pag. 343. he faith ["Mr. B. makes and laies his own principles of Religion, and from them he battereth Christ and his doctrine, &c. 1. How shall it appear otherwise then by Mr. B's own magisterial dictates that justifying faith is nothing else but the receiving of Christ?"]

Repl. 1. Is this a mount to batter Christ from? 2. Did I say it was nothing else? because I said, It is the receiving of Christ? 3. Is this a fit charge from him that feigneth me to comprize all good works as such in this faith? 4. Is it not the words of God, and not my magisterial dictare? joy. 1.2. As many as received him, &c. 5. Is it the Assemblies magisterial dictare, to define it, The receiving of Christ as he is offered in the Gospel? See their proof in the Catechism from Scriptures.

He adds ["2. Why else doth he make it simply and only a quality or act of the soul, without the addition of its original from above, but to generate into the mindes of men an opinion, that it hath its emanancy and rise from nature, from free will, that every man may have and act it, if and when he will, and that it is not infused of God, to be, &c."]

Repl. Yet no more regard to the ninth Commandment? O learned Vindication
tion of Fundamental Truths, by crowds of shameless falsehoods! Doth the efficient enter the definition of a habit? or specially the manner of effecting? Do I deny the infusion of faith, or affirm it to be of nature, if I tell you not how God works it, when it nothing concerns the matter in hand, but would be a digression? I suppose Satan himself would not have thus accused me, without a fairer colour then this is.

What he holdeth himself (beside what is said before) you may see pag. 357. how farre we are justified by faith, ["Faith is not the Caufa fine quænon of our Justification in God, no nor yet in Chrifts Justification. &c. for these are Answers to our faith, and our faith not an Antecedent to it. At the utmost it can be but the Caufa fine quænon of Gods declaring and evidencing of our selves to our selves justified."]

Repl. Doth Mr Cary think this a Vindicating Gods Truth? Next, faith he, ["And this Justification Mr B. so disdaineth and incurs at, that he will not own it, much less mention it. Yet can he not with all his Sophisty name any other Act of Justification in this life, whereof faith can be proved to be the Antecedent, Medium, or Caufa fine quænon."]

Rep. 1. Do I indeed disdain Gods declaring me to my self to be justified, because I take it not to be the Justification by faith? Good proof of his Acquaintance! I disdain it not, but beg daily for it as a choice blessing! 2. How can he say [I disdain it] and yet [mention it not]; Was not reason or memory here wanting? 3. Its untrue that I mention it not, for I do give my reasons that it is not, and therefore the Justification by faith which Scripture means! 4. I thought it had been more to Own it, than to Mention it, and not less. 5. Is not here a soul defect of modesty to say, that [with all my Sophisty I cannot name any other Act of Justification, &c.]. When I did not only name another, but stand more particularly on the explication of it, then almost any one thing in the Book, viz. The Act of God by his Covenant or Law of grace, conveying to us a Right to Chrift, Impunity, and Glory, and so changing our relation; (whether our selves do feel it or not.)

Pag. 341. He faith, when I answer the objection that some make, that faith is a Passive instrument, ["Let him name some one of his [some] that have so objectted a Passive instrument of Justification, or else leave us to conclude, that the objection is of his own head, partly to take advantage thereby yet further to take his patlme in his Logical and Metaphysical Learning, which may possibly please him, but never jusifie or save him; and partly by shewing the weaknes of the objection, to gull his unwary Reader with an opinion of the weaknes of their Cause, who are forced with such Egyptian reeds, for lack of better Pillars, to sustaine it. It is one of the Jesuites principles to fetch arms indifferently, either from Heaven or Hell, to florm the Church and Truth of Chrift, and to promote the holy Mother harlot of Rome."]

Repl. 1. The charge is heavy: Do you hear how I am proved to promote the Harlot of Rome, as a Jesuite, to fetch armes from Hell, &c. and for what? for saying that some object [that faith is a Passive instrument?] And did I lie and feign this? There is but two that I know of, that have wrote against me on that Point, Mr Kendall and Mr Blake, and the first most triumphanty disputes for it, though he say, They need it not: and the later owns it, maintaines, and soberly dispute for it: So that it is not the smallest part of my Papers now in
in the Press to answer them. Was ever man in the world so beset as I? that must be wearied and grieved with writing against such opinions on one side; and on the other side, be accounted a Jesuite, that fetches arms from Hell to maintain the Harlot of Rome, for saying that any man ever made such an objection?

2. Let Mr. Kendall and Mr. Blake see how this man befriends their Cause, that calls it such a weak objection and Egyptian Reed.

3. And let the moderate Reader consider by such instances, as this, and a former of the like kind as I gave him, how impossible it is for me to please all, or be esteemed Orthodox by all: when one part use theses objections, which another sends me to Rome, if not to hell, for saying that any man uleth. They must better agree among themselves before I can please them all.

Part 2. p. 214. He asketh ["Whether is the more arrogant doctrine, the Papists, or Mr. Baxter's that faith, Works as Conquesus with, not fruits of faith, that flow from no other Grace, but Pelagius his Moral swasion, with out any Physical Renovation and change upon the Will, (as for di ffections take some of our Divines are wont to express themselves) do so merit?"

Repl. It is a wonder to me that a man truly believes that there is a God in heaven, and a day of Judgement, should have the heart and face to write such things, and leave them on Record against himself to all ages: I thought a man could not have the true fear of God, that had used but now and then to swear in a passion, or lye for an advantage: but I see I must judge better of one that feareth not before God, to study and heap up in such a Volume, and publish deliberately and impenitently to the world, such false Accusations as a modest Pagan would scorn to be guilty of. 1. The first sentence here is, that I say [Works are Conquesus] when I not only never said it, but denied both faith and Works to be any Caules. 2. The next is [not fruits of faith:] I ever maintain them to be fruits of faith; but it is not possible that he can hold them to merit as fruits of faith, that holds them not to Merit at all. 3. The third sentence is that I say [they flow from no other Grace, but Pelagius his Moral swasion:] I dare challenge him that tempered you to utter these words, to prove if he can, that ever I said them, or any such thing. 4. The next words are [without any Physical Renovation and change upon the Will.] Shew such a word in any Writing of mine, and burn the Book. I confess I have elsewhere said this, that The wind bloweth where it list, and we hear the sound thereof, but know not whence it cometh, or whither it goeth; so is every man that is born of the Spirit: and that he that knoweth not how his own members were formed in the womb, knoweth not the mysterious way of the Spirits working on the soul, and therefore what name best suiteth it, Morall, Physicall, or both in several respects, let them tell that know: but that it is special, effectual, infallibly prevailing Grace, on the will, I ever maintained. 5. The next assertion is, that I say, these works [do Merit] yea [so Merit] as the Papists affirm: both which are shameful falshoods, against my constant profession. But his next words give you the proof of all this.

["If Mr. B. means any thing else by Grace, he conceals it as a mystery from us, and will not throughout his whole Book give one hint of it: but makes man in his own natural and moral qualifications the Merit of his own Justification by Christ."]
Before he writes that [I said it] and now he proves it in that I said not the contrary. Do I deny all that I say not, when its quite beside my subject? I was writing of no such matter, as the manner of working Grace. 3. Even this is but like the rest, for I do in that Book, maintain a special effectual Grace to the Ele•t, flowing from Gods absolute decree, and which is the fulfilling of that absolute promise, of taking the heart of stone from us, &•. 4. Is it not enough that I do this in other Books, since, though I did it not in that? 5. Yet doth he in the same breath here venture to say again, that I ["make man in his own natural and moral qualifications, the Meriter of his own J ustification by Christ."] I profess I am ready in charity to hope the man is not well in his wits; for as I had rather he had lost his wits then his conscience and common honesty, so methinks a sober man should hardly be so prodigal of his own Reputation, as to publish such a Volume to the world: and it astonisheth me to think that such a man as Mr. Caryt, can judge it Profitable to the Church of God, and worthy the Public like view, unless it be to shew me, what the Doctrine of this sort of men is by its fruits, and to deterre them thereby from the entertainment of such Opinions.

In the next Page he begins a Parallel between me and the Papists; like to the rest:

1. Most of his quotations from them are general, without telling us the particular place: and they may seek it that list, and have nothing else to do.

2. Many of the words of the Papists cited, are the same that our Divines approve of, and ordinarily cite for our Doctrine against the rest of the Papists.

3. He plies with the ambiguity of the word [Justification] and when the Papists are known to mean it of sanctification, he parallels it as the same doctrine with mine, who use it as the Protestant do, for a Relative change: And to be parallels the Papists doctrine of first and second Justification, with mine of our being first justified, and our so continuing, or being Justified also at Judgement.

4. Those few sayings of the Papists which particularly he directs us to, are some of them nothing to the purpose, some of them most vilely abused: For example, he doth with unusual exactness quote Bellarmine, for these words ["Good works are the Conditions of Justification without which Christs satisfaction is not applied to us."] Where I intreat the Reader to note the front of the man. 1. This opinion Bellarmine mentions as Erroneous, and rejects it. 2. He tells you it is the opinion of Michael Baius, whose name is enough to shew that it is mentioned in dislike. 3. It is commonly known that the Pope himself condemned this Michael Baius, with a long lift of his Opinions (filing divers pages in to) as Erroneous or Heretical, and forced the said Baius (as the Jesuites do to against the Dominicans) to recant them all. 4. There is not one word about Justification in the place in Bellarmine, but that is fallly added by this man. 5. The second Opinion which Bellarmine takes as probable is, that there are two satisfactions, one of Christs, and one of ours; and one depending on the other, and this for the honour of man as well as Christ, though one might have sufficed. 5. The third way which Bellarmine chooseth as most probable is, [Quod una tam tautum sit actualis satisfaction, & cæ sit nostra] that there is but one actual Satisfaction, and this is ours. Is this my Doctrine?
But perhaps you will say, Mr. Cr. confesseth Bellarmine to differ? I answer, He
doeth so: but hear how: in these words: ["Of this Opinion Bellarmine affirm-
eth some of his fellows to be, and fays no fault with it or them, only himself
"takes up what seemed to him more probable."

 República. O face past blushing! 1. Bellarmine talks of no fellows, but fays this is
the opinion of some, and names only Michael Baius.

2. He addeth these words ["Isa Michael Baius lib. do Indulg. cant. Quae sen-
tentia erronea mibi videtur"] which opinion seems to me Erroneous. Is this to finde
no fault with it?

3. Yea he thus argueth against it ["Nam Scriptura & Patres pa fabricated in our
opera satisfactions & peccatorum Redemptiones; Deinde fi poors homo justum sui operi-
bus mereri de condigno vitam aeternam, non faal facere pro pena temporalis, quod est
minus? Is this nothing?"

4. If he had found no fault, the name of Baius had been disbaragement en-
ough.

Should I give you an account of the rest of his quotations of the Papists, I
should have small thanks from the Reader, for tiring his patience.

5. Thofe words which in his parrellel he placeth as mine, are some of them
none of mine, but his own forgeries; some of them disembred scraps; some
of them intermixt with twice as many of his own, or frequently with some of
his own, to pervert the fone, and some of them plain truths confessed by all,
with his false interpretations and collections adjoined. For example, p. 216, he
thus citeth my words: ["We are still said to be justified by faith, which
is an act of ours. Append. pag. 80. Moral duties are part of the Condition
of our Salvation; and for it to be performed: And even Faith is a Moral
Duty."]

Reply. Was there ever Protestant that denied any of this, or accounted it Pope-
ry? But hear his collection how he makes it Popery. ["So that according to
Mr. B's doctrine, Moral works and duties, alone, as such, are required of us to
Justification: and not faith, it self this way usefull but as a moral work and duty.

O hard forehead! He durft put in [alone] and [as such] and that [faith it
self is not usefull, but as a moral work or duty] out of his own brain, and make
it mine, to parrellel me with Papists! Well! I have for Mr. Carys satisfac-
tion gone thus farre to shew how he confuteth my Doctrine, and Vin-
dicateth Fundamentals: but my Patience will not hold out, nor my Con-
science suffer me to waste my time, in saying much more to such a man.
And if any man will judge of his Parrellel, without turning to the Au-
thours and to my words, but will believe what this man faith of them or
me, without trial, I appeal from him: as a seduced incompetent Judge.

I had thought to have performed the third part of my task, and have shew-
ed you a multitude of his Contradictions; but I'll but give you, a very brief
tale. You heard before how he made me [as a Jesuite ferching arms from
Hell, to promote the Mother Harlot of Rome] for saying, that any body
doeth object that faith is a Passive Instrument. Yet see whether himself do
not so, pag. 360. in these words, ["Did we hereby make man the Causa
proxima, yet it is but the Causa proxima instrumenatius Passiva of his Justifi-
cation.

Part
Part 2. p. 22. He complains of men Gallopping after me to the very Lateran of Rome, and running with head and shoulders thronging who shall be formost. And in his Epistles, what admiration and dolefull complaints finde we, for the success of my doctrine. Yet pg. 121. he faith [It is his own, and possibly may continue his own to the worlds end, all men else proving themselves too wise or too foolish to join with him in this his speculation.] that is, of a two-fold Righteousness.

I am loath it should prove true, that he dare swear an untruth as well as speak it, nor will I affirm it. But let it be considered by the sober: what fear of God is manifested, in the very beginning of his book in the Epistle Dedicatory: In the 5th and 6th pages he comes to clear himself from the charge of Antinomianisme, which he reduceth to four heads: The two first he thus conjoynes ["1. Juftification as an Immanenc act in God; as actually compleated in the Redemption which is by Christ and in Christ; both these before we believe."] And concerning this he faith, that so farre he holdeth and hath declared himself to hold them (a cautious addition; but I have before shewed how farre that is) ["1. They are or seem at least to be grounded on Scripture: 2. They are expressly and boldly assered by many of the most conspicuous Divines in Piety and Learning that any of the Protestant Churches have enjoyed ever since the Reformation. 3. And that without the contradiction or exception of any Church or Orthodox writer for well nigh a hundred years made against it: A great and probable argument that it was the Common Judgment of all the Churches."]

Rep. Mark here the height of Immodesty. 1. Would this one man perswade all the sober Divines of England, to whom he Dedicateth his Book, that this is true? Which is the hundred years space that he means? Not before the Reformation no doubt. Not the last hundred, no doubt, wherein so many have contradicted them. It is most probable he means the first hundred after the Reformation: and if so, who is the man that he hath yet named to us that is for his opinion? or have his more learned partakers truly cited any orthodox Divine that for a hundred years after the Reformation, did hold it? I remember not that I have seen any cited. I have observed myself in Chamier and Polanus, a word or two, sounding expressly for Juftification before faith, but I think they were a hundred years after the Reformation begun: much more were Maccovius, Dr. Twis and Mr. Pemb. But let it be when he pleache that the hundred years begin; doth not the Christian world know, that if not all Churches and Eminent writers, yet some at least ever since the Reformation, have maintained, that none are Justified till they believe? and without limitation denied that there is any such thing as Justification before faith, either of Infidels, or non-existent! much less, a Justification Compleated in Christ! Must we, can we all believe, that there hath been a hundred years since the Reformation wherein no one orthodox Writer denied Justification before faith? Yea that others writ for it that while, and no man excepted against it! Have we not their books at hand to evince the falshood of this! For my part, according to my small Reading the clean contrary is true, and much more then that: I know not of any man, till Polanus on Ezek. and Chamier Panftras were written, that ever let fall a word for their opinion, that I now remember; (though one or two words there are in Zanchy, and a few more, lyable to misconstruction:) But I know
I know that it is the currant doctrine of the Protestants till that time (and since, excepting a few such as aforesaid), that there is no justification of Infidels, or before faith: And if from the Apostles dayes till the Reformation be can name any one Orthodox writer, that ever was of his opinion; I will confest he hath read that which I never did.

2. But suppose all this were nothing, let any sober man tell me, how it is possible for this man knowingly to say or swear, and that absolutely without the least limitation or exception, that it was [without the contradiction or exception of any Church or Orthodox writer for well nigh a hundred years, made against it] Could this man possibly know every contradiction or exception that any Church in the Christian world, did for nigh a hundred years make against it? or hath he read all the books that every Orthodox writer hath written in that time? yea when he confesseth his so small reading in the following lines, as I thought few men pretending to Theologie, had been guilty of. It is therefore both unquestionably false, that there was no contradicting or excepting Divines (when there were any of his way to contradict,) and most certain that he could not have known it, if it had been true; there being many a hundred books that he never read or saw.

Yet see pag. 10, of that Epistle, how he Seals up all with a solemn and dreadful Oath: saying ["I have no more to say on this subject; and what I have said hath been before him that being omniscient knoweth that I have spoken singulary the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth."] Here is an appeal to God, in asking him to witness. And if this be the whole Truth, how come we to have so much more of his minde afterward on this point?

I will mention but two points more of his vanity: The first is in his silly ascribing so much humane Learning to me, when Mr. Kendall might have given him a true Information of me: Had I as much Learning as Mr. Crandon I have, and as much Piety as Mr. Kendall concedeth, sure I were some excellent person, farre better then I am: And if I be not only as unlearned as Mr. K. doth intimate, but also as Impious and damnable a Seducer as Mr. Crandon doth make me, I was one of the unhappiest men on earth. The Testimony of these two Witnesses doth ill agree. But the vanity that I mean of Mr. Crandon is upon this occasion, to write so laboriously against the use of humane Learning in Divinity: Between eleven and twelve Leaves he spends against it in his Epistle: The second Chapter is much against it: The third Chapter is almost all against it. Alas friend, Learning and I be not so near akin, but that you may spare it, and yet be revenged on me, and pour out your gall against me to the full.

The last vanity that I will shew you, is his first Chapter (for I thought it fittest to read him backward:) I had wrote these words in the Epistle to my hearers; [who] I hope do understand, that to take upon trutth from your Teachers, what you cannot yet see in its own evidence, is less absurd, and more necessary then many do imagin.] Upon these words he will prove me to hold the doctrine of implicit faith: The many senseless cavils: the false accusations without the least ground, which are in that Chapter: I will not so abuse the Readers Patience as to recite. For the thing it self I lay but these two things: 1. My judgement is that all that will be saved must believe the Fundamentals explictly: and that as much more as they can reach to know: and that
that they should use all diligence to know as much as may be, and so should their Teachers to help them to it: and that no Teacher must be believed against the known sense of God's word: But yet, that they who know the fundamentals by a Divine faith, should as Learners believe their Teachers in the rest with a humane faith, so far as they have no sufficient case of jealousy or unbelief: and that the body of our auditors must take much upon Trust from their Teachers, or they are undone. They that would see more of my thoughts on this point, I refer them to what I have written on it, in my Method for Peace of Conscience, and in the second part of my book of Rest, and in the Preface to that Part. If they that cannot read believe not their Teachers, how know they that they reads true, or that there is such a thing as a Bible in the world! How shall others know that the Scripture is true translated, or the same book that is in the Hebrew and Greek, or that there is any at all in the Hebrew and Greek? or that we have now the same books that the Prophets and Apostles did write or that ever they wrote any?

2. Let me be bold to tell my opinion to my Brethren of the Ministry, that though I deny them to have either Credit or Authority against the known word of God, yet so great is their Credit and Authority, even as Teachers and Guides of the Church in Cases agreeable to the word, and in Cases to the people doubtful and unknown, and in Cases left by the word to their determination, (the word determining them but Generally) that I think the Ignorance of this Truth, hath been the main Cause of our sad Confusions and schismes in England, and that the Minifters have been Guilty of it, partly by an overmodest concealing their Authority, and partly by an indiscreet opposition to the Papists error of the Authority of the Church: And I think that till we have better taught even our godly People, what Credit and Obedience is due to their Teachers and spiritual Guides, the Churches of England shall never have Peace or any good established order: I say again, we are broken for want of the knowledge of this Truth, and till this be known, we shall never be well bound up and healed.

But because Mr. Greeno is one that I had rather come to a reference with, then to a dispute, if he please our difference may be thus compromised according to our various principles. Because it is agreeable to my Opinions, I shall desire that my hearers would believe me fide humana as a faithfull Teacher, when I am shewing them what they know not, that they may learn; and not take me for a Lyar, when ever I speak any word that they know not themselves as well as I, and consequently have need to be taught. But for Mr. Greeno's hearers or Readers, lest they should make a Papist of him, or themselves, let them believe him in nothing that they know not to be true before they told it them, or see not clear proof of in the evidence which he bringeth. And if they are at any time assaulted with a Temptation, further to believe him; let them but open his book at random, and read but one page with judgment and tryall, yea half a leaf well chewed and considered, I doubt not may effectually save them from this Temptation to Poverty, and restore them to their Incredulity: Probatum est.

And thus I have performed the most unfavoury task that ever I did attempt: If any think I have done it too briefly, I shall desire his own more Patient lungs to traverse the rest by the help of these Informations which I have given him: and so let him judge of it as he findeth cause.
It shall suffice me to present these Reasons to Mr. Cary, which hinder me from believing, that Mr. Grandon hath here Vindicated the Truth of God, much less the Fundamentals of a Christian's Comfort, or that this his large and elaborate Volume is Profitable to the Church of God, and Worthy Commendation to the Publick View: or that it is likely to add one cubit to the stature of any man's Reputation that shall so commend it, or to advance that Name which Posterity shall find affixed, or to give one Grain of solid Peace to the Conscience of any that hath secretly or openly Promoted it. This Judgment I pass, as Impartially as I can, and am somewhat confident the Event will confirm it, and Convince the Incredulous.

FINIS.