

Neonomianism Unmasked
OR, A
Plea for the
ANCIENT GOSPEL

In a Theological debate, occasioned by a book lately
written by Mr. Daniel Williams, entitled, Gospel Truth
Stated & Vindicated; Unwarily Commended and
Subscribed by some divines.

Mr. Chauncy, acting on the behalf, and in the person of,
one Doctor Tobias Crisp, whose sermons have been
ransacked - viciously rent and torn asunder by men
whose poisoned minds have been directed to view the
message of the pure Gospel of Grace through the
spectacles of the Law; in these spiritual conversations
not only vindicates, but also attempts to set forth the
glorious Gospel of Christ, in all its assimilating truth, as
a pure declaration of free & sovereign grace, in the free
proclamation of an accomplished redemption through
the sole merit, righteousness, and death of the
LORD JESUS CHRIST.

*"For as many as are of the works of the law are
under the curse." Gal.3:10. "And the law is not of faith."
Gal.3:12. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to
everyone that believeth." Rom.10:4.*

By ISAAC CHAUNCY, M. A.

ORIGINALLY PRINTED IN 1692.

IN THREE PARTS - COMPLETE & UNABRIDGED

Supralapsarian Press

2017 EDITION

Contents

Neonomianism Unmasked OR, A Plea for the ANCIENT GOSPEL	1
TO ALL	6
True Lovers.....	6
of the.....	6
LORD JESUS CHRIST,	6
BOTH Ministers & Christians of any Persuasions whatever.	6
The Judgment of some Ministers of the Gospel in London, concerning Mr. Williams, and his book, entitled, Gospel Truth Stated & Vindicated.	9
Some of the Paradoxes contained in the Neonomian Scheme.....	12
THE Ancient Gospel DEFENDED; AND THE New Gospel UNMASK'D.....	13
THE DIALOGUE	15
Neonomianism Unmasked OR, THE Ancient Gospel PLEADED;	52
AND THE OTHER CALLED The New LAW.....	52
The SECOND PART of the Theological debate, occasioned by the book of Mr. Daniel Williams, wherein the following points are Discussed.	52
READER,.....	53
NARRATIVE OF THE DIALOGUE AS SPECIFIED. .	53
DEBATE I.	56
OF THE STATE OF THE ELECT BEFORE EFFECTUAL CALLING.....	56
DEBATE II.	67

OF GOD'S LAYING SIN ON CHRIST.	67
DEBATE III.	92
OF THE DISCHARGE OF THE ELECT FROM SINS UPON THEIR BEING LAID ON CHRIST.	92
DEBATE IV.	110
OF THE ELECTS CEASING TO BE SINNERS FROM THE TIME THEIR SINS WERE LAID ON CHRIST.	110
DEBATE V.	121
OF THE TIME WHEN OUR SINS WERE LAID ON CHRIST, AND CONTINUED THERE.....	121
DEBATE VI.	123
OF GOD'S SEPARATION AND ABHORRENCE OF CHRIST WHILE OUR SINS LAY UPON HIM.	123
Neonomianism Unmasked.....	133
OR, THE	133
Ancient Gospel	133
PLEADED;.....	133
AND THE OTHER.....	133
CALLED.....	133
The New LAW.....	133
DEBATE VII.	134
OF THE CHANGE OF PERSON BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE ELECT, AND THEIR BEING AS RIGHTEOUS AS HE.....	134
DEBATE VIII.	156
CONCERNING THE CONDITIONALITY OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE.	156
OF A COVENANT OF PROMISE.	160
DEBATE IX.	227

OF THE NATURE OF SAVING FAITH.	227
DEBATE X.	245
OF THE FREE PROCLAMATION OF CHRIST TO SINNERS, AND OF PREPARATORY QUALIFICATIONS.	245
DEBATE XI.	264
OF UNION WITH CHRIST BEFORE FAITH.	264
DEBATE XII.	272
OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.	272
A DIGRESSION CONCERNING THE NECESSITY OF REPENTANCE TO FORGIVENESS.	290
DEBATE XIII.	299
OF THE NECESSITY, AND BENEFIT OF HOLINESS, OBEDIENCE, AND GOOD WORKS, WITH PERSEVERANCE THEREIN.	299
DEBATE XIV.	332
OF INTENDING OUR SOULS GOOD BY DUTIES WE PERFORM.	332
DEBATE XV.	352
OF THE WAY TO ATTAIN ASSURANCE.	352
NEONOMIANISM	376
UNMASKED, PART III	376
DEBATE XVI.	376
OF GOD'S SEEING SIN IN BELIEVERS.	376
DEBATE XVII.	400
OF THE HURT THAT SIN MAY DO TO BELIEVERS.	400
DEBATE XVIII.	414
OF GOD'S DISPLEASURE FOR SIN IN THE AFFLICTIONS OF HIS PEOPLE.	414

DEBATE XIX.....	426
OF THE BEAUTY OF SINCERE HOLINESS.....	426
DEBATE XX.....	458
OF GOSPEL AND LEGAL PREACHING.....	458
A POSTSCRIPT.....	472
A BRIEF REPLY TO WHAT MR. DANIEL WILLIAMS HAS CHARGED MR. J. N. WITH, IN THE PREFACE TO HIS REPLY TO DR. CRISP.	474
A Rejoinder to Mr. Daniel Williams his Reply.....	477
AN INQUIRY WHETHER THE GOSPEL BE A NEW LAW.....	501
THE STATING OF THE QUESTION.....	502
I COME TO SHOW WHAT A LAW THAT IS, AND WHAT GOSPEL IS.	515
II. CONCERNING THE GOSPEL.....	519
ARGUMENTS THAT THE GOSPEL IS NOT A NEW LAW WITH SANCTION.	524
LASTLY, I SHALL GIVE AN ACCOUNT OF THE BEGINNING AND PROGRESS OF THIS NEONOMIAN ERROR.....	537
EXAMEN CONFECTIONIS PACIFICAÆ, OR A FRIENDLY EXAMINATION OF THE PACIFICK PAPER.....	541
FINIS.....	569

TO ALL
True Lovers
of the
LORD JESUS CHRIST,
BOTH
Ministers & Christians
of any Persuasions whatever.

The Apostle Paul does declaim against nothing more than another Gospel, which is not another Gospel, {as he says,} because it is no Gospel. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel, which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." Gal.1:6-7. "It is nowhere, seeing there is but one Gospel, and not more," says Beza on Galatians 1. This pretended other Gospel was a doctrine that taught the conjunction of the works of a law with the grace of God, and the righteousness of Christ in the justification of a sinner before God, which some false teachers did zealously press upon the Galatians, in opposition to the Apostles doctrine. These he calls, troublers of the Churches, and perverters or subverters of the Gospel of Christ, viz., the doctrine of justification by free grace. "Such as teach justification by a law, of merits, not of Christ, but our own. Although we say they were wrought in us by Christ, as if Christ could be said to justify, by giving us a way or means to justify ourselves; you may as well reconcile light and darkness as these two." Beza.

As to the introducers and teachers of such doctrine, the Apostle denounces a bitter curse against them, whatever they were, {pretending to never so much holiness,} Apostles, or Angels. Yea, he puts himself under this anathema, if at any time he should be guilty in this kind, and to show that he speaks not rashly or passionately, but by the Spirit of God, and to awe men's minds the more, and deter them from such attempts, he redoubles the imprecation. But you'll say, may we not a little make bold with the Gospel of Christ? How far may we venture to

go, and not fall under this anathema? The Apostle answers, verse 9, "as we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." And the doctrines which they had received was justification by faith without the works of a law, and that a law is not of faith in the point of justification. "And the law is not of faith, but, the man that doeth them shall live in them." Gal.3:12. Mr. Beza justifies our translation in rendering "besides," rather than "against." "For {says he} the Apostle said not, if they preach contrary things, and subvert the whole Gospel, {as Chrysostom has it,} but, if they pervert it a little, if they preach anything besides that Gospel which they had received, &c." If they, as the Apostle says many did, II Cor.2:17, corrupt the Word of God, as fraudulent wine merchants, {who dash their wines with water, or any base liquors,} but, says the Apostle, we are of those who preach the Word of God, in sincerity, in the truth of our hearts, as we will answer unto God, without anything of craft or double dealing, or mixing our own schemes or fantasies therewith, that speak the very truth, as we have dealt plainly and truly, not shunning to declare unto you all the counsel of God, Acts 20:27, not shuffling and hiding some great truths, that we think are not fit for the people to know; and therefore, says he, we have abdicated this shameful hiding of the Word of God, not demeaning ourselves craftily, nor handling it deceitfully. "But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." II Cor.4:2.

And to such as receive this other Gospel, who have professed to the receiving the true Gospel, he says, "I marvel you should be so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another Gospel," calling them fools, Gal.3:1, saying that they were fascinated, bewitched, the devil had got a great hand over them; tells them they were apostates, had begun in a spiritual Gospel, but ended in a carnal. Nay, he testifies, that whoever is justified by a law are fallen from grace; and that all their former sufferings, how great soever they have been, would prove in vain. Oh, that professors of our days would seriously consider these things, who are so ready to run after this other Gospel!

Lastly, it is also needful to observe how the Apostle Paul complements Peter that great Apostle, and one of the pillars in the Churches, for his double dealing in these matters, in so much as countenancing this false Gospel, or the imposing teachers of it. He withstood him to the face, and publicly; he rebuked him sharply, because he was exceedingly culpable; and in that he not only committed a great sin himself, but carried away Barnabas,

and many professing Jews with his dissimulation; insomuch that they all played the hypocrites with him, to please the Neonomians. He aggravates their fault, in telling them they countenanced a doctrine, which they were convinced was false; that they made Christ a minister of sin, that they condemned themselves in their practice, by building the things which they had destroyed. He takes off also all apologies that they might make from the seeming smallness of the fault, as to refuse to eat with the Gentiles. Come, come, says he, the mischief lies in its tendency, viz., to encourage the preachers and receivers of the doctrine of justification by the works of the law; for, says he, we have believed on Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of a law; for by the works of a law no flesh living shall be justified. I hope they whom these things do nearly concern at this time, will duly weigh and consider them, though I doubt not but they know them, yet it may not be amiss to stir up knowing men, by putting them in remembrance. II Pet.1:12-13.

As to the present grand assertor of a new law, and of the doctrine of justification by the works of the said law, I thought it due to the grandeur of his appearance in the head of a new sect, to treat him by the name thereof, viz., a Neonomian, {one that asserts the Old Law is abolished, and therein is a superlative Antinomian, but pleads for a New Law, and Justification by the Works of it, and therein is a Neonomian,} and the rather, because by that rectoral rule of government which he has usurped to himself, and the rule of sin, he has judicially sentenced all his opposers to the name of Antinomians, or abettors of them; insomuch that all our first Protestant Reformers, and any known by the name of Calvinists, fall under his severe censure, as ignorant setters up of the name of Christ and his grace against his government. I thought it meet to call in the long-ago deceased Doctor Crisp also, under what name or title soever he is pleased to call him, {whom he carries about to scare children with, and as a trophy of his pretended triumph,} that he might be made to speak, and that the world may hear what he has to say for himself, and be acquainted how he is abused, and that he may be hereafter permitted to rest quietly in his grave, and not used as Wickliffe was, i.e., burnt for an heretic so many years after he has been dead.

In a word, shall we stand still with our fingers in our mouths in such a day of peace and liberty, while we are brow-beaten, or wheedled out of the great fundamental points of Eternal Life and Salvation, which in all ages of Antichristian tyranny have triumphed over the smartest persecutions, through the blood of the Lamb, and the word of his testimony, in the faith and patience of the Saints, who have not loved their lives unto

death in the heroic defense of them, against the very same sort of opposition? And who, I pray, will harm us now, if we as strenuously defend the truth as it is audaciously attacked? Have any of us suffered to the spoiling of our goods in the defense of truth, of a subordinate and subservient nature to these? And shall we suffer all this in vain, and cast ourselves tamely at the feet of such a confident invader of our choicest and precious things in the world? Yea, our very life in Christ? What is it that frightens us? Doth the scripture, law or learning terrify us? If so little a foot-man can run us out of breath, how do we think to contend with horses, dragooners I mean, if they should come? And if in the land of peace we are wearied, what shall we do in the swelling of Jordan? If Popery should ever overrun us again, {which God forbid,} and we should be called to bear testimony to these truths at fire and faggot, as the famous martyrs have done? It's to be feared now, that many Protestants would provide for their safety, by flying to the Neonomian asylum. But to conclude, however we shrink from the despised truths of Christ, shuffle and cut with him, and sometimes huff and bounce at him, or some truth of his, I am fully assured the God of glory and all grace, who has hitherto preserved the pure doctrine of his Gospel, not only from the impure mixtures of pretenders to holiness, the crafty methodists of Satan as an Angel of light, but also from his open rage as a roaring lion, will continue yet to maintain it against all the blitting winds of false doctrine. That Christ has his fan in his hand, and will thoroughly purge his floor; and that if any man lay any other foundation than what is laid, which is Jesus Christ, and continues so to do, his root shall be rottenness, and his blossom go up as dust.

I.C.

**The Judgment of some Ministers of the
Gospel in London, concerning Mr. Williams,
and his
book, entitled, Gospel Truth Stated &
Vindicated.**

We whose names are underwritten, ministers of the Gospel in London, having seriously perused Mr. Williams, and his book, entitled, Gospel Truth Stated and Vindicated; do find the truth falsely stated, in many points, by the said Mr. Williams, who, under pretense of opposing old Antinomian errors, which nobody

now holds, as we know of, and which we ourselves from our hearts, abhor and detest; and under the color of such opposition, he has set up himself, as a champion against Antinomians, though he falls in with them in their main principle, vacating the sanction of the Law, as appears, pages 130-137, and in other places, contrary to Article Seven of the Church of England, and the Westminster Larger Catechism, Question 97. Yet as if he were no Antinomian, and having cast that name of reproach upon all that are not for his way of justification, by evangelical works, he boldly strikes both at Law and Gospel. The Law, with him, is quite out of doors; and, to supply the room of that, the Gospel must be turned into a new law, in the keeping of which we shall be justified for the sake of Christ's righteousness, pages 44, 126, 139, 210, making qualifications and acts of ours a disposing subordinate righteousness, whereby we become capable of being justified by Christ's righteousness, pages 102, 103, 85, 62, 54, 55, 98, 68, 146, 113, 114, 130, 143, contrary to Articles Eleven, Twelve & Thirteen of the Church of England, the Westminster Confession, chapters 11 & 16, and the Westminster Larger Catechism, Questions 70 & 71, Shorter Catechism, Question 33. As if he should say, we must be sure to bring our own righteousness along with us, that we may be justified by the righteousness of another. We must bring money in our purse, that we may buy without money; we must bring qualifying money, but not purchasing money. This qualifying money is clipped within the ring, and so imperfect that it will not pass. What cloudy dark expressions do men run into, when they seek to make sense of that which is not truth? How does our righteousness shrink up to nothing, when it is made an antecedent condition to justification? In adjusting this scheme of his he denies the Covenant of Grace to be made with Christ, as the second Adam, and, in him, with all the elect as his seed. Page 53. Contrary to the Assembly's Larger Catechism, Question 31, Shorter Catechism, Question 29, nor is it with him as such, pleadable by, as in his Preface, Page 6, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed only, as to effects with the purchase of a conditional grant, viz. This proposition, he that believeth shall be saved, pages 39, 51, 102; contrary to the doctrine of Imputation and Redemption, Church of England, Articles 11 & 17; Westminster Confession, Chapter 11; Larger Catechism, Questions 69-73, Shorter Catechism, Question 29, he asserts, that forgiving, adopting, glorifying, and conveyance of every promised benefit, owned God's terms, are judicial acts, as a rector in a way of distribution of rewards, Preface Pages 8 & 9; and contrary to Church of England, Articles 11 & 12; Larger Catechism, Questions 70-74, Shorter Catechism, Question 33 & 34.

He perverts and wrests many eminent portions of Scripture from their plain and received sense which has been given by the best Protestant Interpreters. In particular, those that follow Matt.22:11; Php.3:8-9; Jer.31:31-33; Ezek.16:5-6 & Ezek.11:19; Heb.8:10-11; Isa.64:6, with divers others. These are a few exceptions against the aforesaid book, among many more of the like nature, which, in due time, will be alleged. In this undertaking, Mr. Williams does, as a seeming antagonist to the Antinomians, and the many that he does call so, broach his anti-evangelical principles, endeavoring to hide them, as much as may be, under ambiguous terms, perverting and undermining the whole Protestant Religion in the main fundamental points of it, as they have been truly stated, and hitherto maintained, in the said 39 Articles, the Western and Savoy Confessions; the Assemblies Shorter and Larger Catechism or by any of our best Orthodox divines ancient, and modern, since the reformation hitherto; but he hopes his own name, and the names of some others, obtained by his art and industry, will weigh down all other authorities whatsoever, and set up his new scheme, as the standard and true measure of all Protestant doctrine. Therefore we thought ourselves bound in conscience to declare our judgment herein, as a timely caution to all who shall read the aforesaid book of Mr. Williams; and we do give this public testimony against the design of the whole book, and his new scheme of divinity, which he so boldly intrudes upon all Protestants, discovering thereby, not only his very unbecoming confidence, but also his gross ignorance in the true mystery of the Gospel.

There are others also of the same judgment with us, who, in due time, may declare themselves. This paper was delivered to many London Ministers, assembled October 17, 1692.

George Griffith, Thomas Cole, Nathaniel Mather, Richard Taylor, Robert Trail, Isaac Chauncy.

Some of the Paradoxes contained in the Neonomian Scheme.

1. The sins of the elect are not forgiven immediately upon, nor merely by Christ's enduring sufferings, but were by Divine appointment to interpose a Gospel promise, of pardon, the work of the Spirit, for a conformity to the rule of the promise in the person to be pardoned, and a judicial act of pardon by that promise on the person thus conformed to the rule thereof.
2. The Gospel has another sanction to the preceptive part of the Law than the Covenant of works had; though nothing be abated in the rule of sin and duty, yet blessings are promised to lower degrees of duty, and a continuance in a state of death with a bar to the blessing, are not threatened against every degree of sin as the Covenant of works did.
3. This change of the sanction supposeth the death of Christ, and his honouring the Law by his perfect obedience, wherein God has provided for his own glory, while he promises life by forgiveness to imperfect man, and yet insists on some degrees of obedience, to which of his mere grace he enableth us.
4. The {degrees of obedience} Covenant of redemption secures to the elect, though the grant therein is pleadable only by Christ as the stipulating party for us; and our personal claim depends upon the Gospel Covenant, whereof Christ is Mediator.
5. The Gospel-sanction determines as certain a rule of happiness and misery as the law of works did, though it be not the same; for while it promises a pardon to all believing and repenting sinners, and declares a bar to pardon the impenitent rejecters of Christ and Gospel-grace, it fixes true repentance and faith unfeigned to be the terms of pardon.
6. When it promises Heaven to the sincerely holy persevering believer, it fixes sincere holiness and perseverance in faith as the terms of possessing Heaven.
7. Hence the use of faith and holiness as to those benefits is not from the conformity to the precept, but their conformity to the rule of the promise.
8. Our applying Christ's righteousness, and relying on it, would no more justify us, than our holiness would save us, were it not for the Gospel-promise, God will justify for Christ's sake all such

as believe.

9. God in dispensing Gospel-promised blessings, does judicially determine a conformity to this rule of the promise. When he forgives, he judicially declares a man has true faith; when he admits to Heaven, he judicially declares a man sincerely holy and persevering.

10. The Wedding-Garment, Matt.22:11, is true uniting faith.

11. Forgiving, adopting, glorifying, and the conveyance of every Gospel-benefit given on God's terms, are judicial acts of God as a Rector; if not, he does blindly and promiscuously dispense them, without any regard to our being believers.

12. With respect to what is declared, the Gospel is a law of faith, and it especially insists on that sincerity of grace and holiness, which the rule of the promise makes necessary in its description of the person whom it makes partaker of its included benefits.

13. The merits of Christ are the cause of this Gospel-ordination, his righteousness imputed is the cause for which we are justified and saved, when we do answer the rule of the Gospel.

14. The righteousness of God, Phil.3:9, principally intends the Gospel holiness of a person justified by Christ's righteousness, both which by faith in Christ all his members shall be perfect in.

15. The grace of God is hereby stated as free as is consistent with his government and judicial rectoral distribution of rewards and punishments.

THE Ancient Gospel DEFENDED; AND THE New Gospel UNMASK'D.

Two gentlemen, who had for their recreation walked forth into the fields in utopia, happened to fall into company together, and after mutual salutation, and general discourses of news, {having not as yet a particular acquaintance, or knowledge one of

another,} one of them among many things mentioned by him that were great ground of sadness to a considering and gracious mind, said that he was most affected with and grieved at the great eclipse fallen of late upon the doctrine of the Gospel, insomuch that for the doctrine of justification especially, we are in a manner returned again into Egypt, that of justification by works being brought into the room of justification by faith, and only varnished over with the profession of the Protestant Religion, and the change of a few terms which are used to the same purpose that the former were.

The other Gentleman looked hard upon him while he thus spake, and said, have you seen a book lately come forth, called, Gospel-Truth Stated and Vindicated? It's a book much talked of, and commended. Yes, Sir, said the other, I have seen the book and read most of it, but I will assure you I was much grieved at the reading of it. I pray your reasons. He replied, pray Sir, excuse me there, the other returned, for I am beginning to have some apprehensions as what your principles are; and I find you are an Antinomian. I pray what is your name? I crave your excuse, Sir, you have given me a name, you may call me by that, or what you please; for by this I do as well call you, for I know of what principles those men are of, that are so ready to asperse the asserters of the doctrine of free-grace with the reproachful name of Antinomians, the true account of which sect, and most ancient, is from the Apostle Paul's time, that they took occasion from the doctrine of free-grace, to plead for and practice all manner of licentiousness. And in Leiden we have an account of a sect of Libertines, or carnal Gospellers, which brake out in Germany after the Reformation, circ., 1538, and the ringleader whereof was Islebrius Agricola, the compiler of the Interim or Articles of Agreement. They merited this name of Antinomians by the loose opinions, and looser practices, against whom Luther wrote several books, and Calvin also, with great invectives in his book against the Libertines; which were learned and eminent witnesses to the doctrine of free grace, as it ought to be held forth in all its Gospel splendor and lustre. The other gentleman replied, as for Luther, he was an Antinomian himself, and Calvin but a little better, according to the opinion of our modern divines. We say they are Antinomians that deny justification to be by faith as a conditional receiving act, and by repentance as a qualifying act; and that the continuation of our justification is by works. These men which you name, and their followers indeed pretend to holiness, but they ascribe not that to it which they ought, for the honor of God's rectoral rule of government.

THE DIALOGUE

Antinomian. If these be the men you call Antinomians, they are falsely so called. I think they that come nearest to the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles are the most Orthodox; and I know no such doctrine that they have taught, but contrary to what you call Orthodox; you seem to be of the sect truly called Neonomians, because they assert, that the Gospel is a new law, the condition whereof is imperfect, sincere, persevering obedience, which I take to be no other than a Covenant of works.

Neonomian. I am indeed of that opinion, and my scheme is according thereunto. I say, the Covenant of grace is a conditional Covenant, and the condition of it is sincere obedience in faith, and other graces and duties persevered in; but I say not that we are justified by the Covenant of works, the law of innocency that is abrogated, transit in sententiam, but that Christ has in satisfying that law merited another with milder terms and conditions, viz., of imperfect obedience.

Antinomian. I perceive then that you are the Antinomian indeed, for you set aside the old law as obsolete and abrogated, and of no use to us at all, for the Apostle Paul says, the promise is not against the law, but it does establish it.

Neonomian. It does establish the new law, not the old; we are for a law, and justification by it, though not for the old, for Paul still opposes the law of faith and the works of that law to the old law, i.e., the law of perfect obedience. You must not confound one with another. That was a law of perfection, this of imperfection. I have stated the difference between truth and error in these matters.

Antinomian. Now you say that you have stated the difference, and I begin to suspect you to be the Author of that book lately come forth, called, Gospel Truth Stated and Vindicated, for that Gentleman pretends to a singular dexterity in stating questions, and superlative nicety, even to the splitting a hair between truth and error; and I perceive divers divines do esteem him in that manner, by the commendation they have given him, and the recommendation of his treatise.

Neonomian. Truly it is no more than what it deserves, not to say anything of the Author, who I know, how unworthy soever he thinks himself to be, yet has no greater ambition than to remove mistakes from men's minds about Gospel-truths, of which there are many, even among honest well-meaning divines, {as well as others,} who are too much unstudied in these matters, and therefore frequently utter their crude and undigested conceptions in the pulpit and press too, and as he would reach forth light to them, so he would be a hammer to the

heretics.

Antinomian. I think that I am the more confirmed by this that you yourself were the Author. Are you Mr. Daniel Williams?

Neonomian. I was either the Author, or will personate him so far as to defend the book, if anyone has anything to say against it. I must confess a dislike of contention has long restrained my engaging in this work.

Antinomian. I doubt too much of the contrary appears in that book, or else the Author would never have raked up the ashes of a holy man, that has been so long at rest, to contend with and spurn them about with his foot in so much scorn and contempt.

Neonomian. I have been oft solicited to this work by many able Ministers.

Antinomian. Because they looked upon you as the ablest, {as you seem willing to be thought,} but I perceive now I be not mistaken.

Neonomian. But finding what principles you are of, I know you are mistaken in many things, which I shall rectify you in, if you have patience and will to hearken to me. Do but read my book, and consider it well; peace is the blessing which I cheerfully pursue, and it with the truth what I propose in this very endeavour.

Antinomian. It's well if it be so, but {as they say} the proof of the pudding is in the eating. It's no new thing for men to pretend well, let their undertaking be what it will, but what appears in their sack is not necessarily of any given value. Apollinaris the heretic had a school with an orthodox title; and Nestorius the heretic shrouded himself under a cover of orthodoxy, though submersed in deception and error. It's observed that error will always shelter itself under a plausible pretext of truth, that it may do it with the greatest advantage.

Neonomian. I am convinced after many prayers, and serious thoughts, that the revival of those errors must not only exclude that ministry as legal, which is most apt in its nature, and by Christ's ordination to convert souls, and secure the practical power of religion; but also render unity among Christians a thing impossible.

Antinomian. You know also another old proverb, in the name of God, &c., many will plot their own deises. It was reported of Scipio Africanus, that before he set upon any business, he entered the Capitol alone, pretending thereby a consultation with the gods, whereupon he imposed his own thoughts in pretense of obtaining the mind of the gods, and this always in the presence of the multitude, thereby obtaining great vogue among the people, of the justness of his cause. I can't

persuade myself that the composure of that piece of work that has so much moral evil in it, and bitter opposition to Gospeltruth, is an answer of prayers; neither can I pray as those gentlemen, whose names stand over your porch, but think it my duty to pray quite contrary; and as for what you speak of a revival of errors, I judge that your dictates are no rule to judge of faith and error by, how magisterially soever you impose them; and I think we are come to a sad pass, if a man of your declared principles must be set up as a reformer of error, and former of articles of faith, and such as are in fundamental points directly contrary to the doctrinal part of the 39 Articles; yea, such as our first Protestant Reformers decried by Scripture and the best arguments, as highly Antichristian, and destructive to the souls of men; which witness of theirs many of them sealed with their blood. You say, the danger of such things as you call error, will be in excluding the teaching of your doctrine and ministry as legal. Would to God such ministry as the Spirit of God calls legal preaching, were excluded by the brighter shining of the grace of God into the hearts both of ministers and people; from which light some, and too many this day have swerved, having turned aside unto vain jangling, desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. I Tim.1:6. But you call that evangelical, which we call legal. We can't help your calling light darkness, and darkness light; Law, Gospel; and Gospel, Law; and you say it's most apt in its own nature to secure the power of religion; whereas experience has shown to the contrary. How well the doctrine of justification by works has secured it among the Romanists; and the Apostle Paul testifies by the Spirit, that whosoever is justified by a law {it's not the law} is fallen from grace. Gal.5:4. And therefore it's false that such doctrine is Christ's ordination. It has not fitness in it to convert souls, for the law brings none to God. "No man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident, for, the just shall live by faith." Gal.3:11. Those places, and divers others, should be read a law, and not the law, because the Spirit by them excludes all laws, even your law. The emphatical particle is not put in, and therefore there's no ground to say this or that law only is excluded from justification, but every law; and where there's no true justification taught, there can be no true practical obedience. But the last prejudice is, that such doctrines as are opposite to yours, render unity among Christians a thing impossible. Good reason there is for it, because they cannot unite under their Head Christ Jesus, and therefore can't unite as members. There lies the impossible, for what communion is there between Christ and Belial? By this it appears you strike at the union.

Neonomian. Every sermon will be matter of debate,

and mutual censures of the severest kind will be unavoidable, while one side justly presses the terms of the Gospel under its promises and threats, for which they are accused as enemies to Christ and his Grace, &c.

Antinomian. Reason good, that every sermon that makes the Gospel a Law, i.e., that press duty under a law-sanction, should not only be matter of debate, but earnestly contended against; for the performance of duty as terms enforced by a law-sanction, is a covenant of works. So that such men are preachers of a law, it's no matter what law. Works performed under a law-sanction are legal works, and do make the Covenant enjoining them a Covenant of works. Censures are here justly made of such a ministry; and they that preach such doctrine, are certainly enemies to the grace of God, under whatsoever wizards of pretended holiness they veil themselves.

Neonomian. And the other side ignorantly set up the name of Christ and free grace against the government of Christ and the rule of judgment.

Antinomian. I think the stomach of every good man may justly rise not only against your insolent, but profane expression, for according to your scheme, all men besides Neonomians are ignorant men. What says the poet, "oh unhappy mortality, this spirit all swollen within." Arrogancy is called superiority or overbearing pride, a tough itch not easily cured. How far does this spirit come short of the imitation of Christ in meekness and lowliness? Yea, how far from his rule, {which you would seem to be so zealous for,} to do nothing out of strife and vain-glory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves. Phil.2:3. But with you all that adore free grace, and set up justification by faith {i.e., from henceforth, read justification by Christ; i.e., or by the faithfulness of Christ in fulfilling all righteousness on behalf of his people, which the context of these writings will further elaborate, and more fully clarify, editor,} without the works of a law, do ignorantly set up the name of Christ. Is this a piece of ignorance to set up the name of Christ as a Saviour of sinners, and as that name whereby we are justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses, or any other law. Beware lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets, behold ye despisers, &c. Acts 13:39-40. And what do these men so ignorantly do? They set Christ against himself; they set up his name and free grace against his government. And why? Because they say we are saved not by our works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy; and that it was the mere kindness and love of God our Saviour that appeared to us in the Gospel Salvation. Tit.3:4-5. Therefore they set up the name of Christ against his government. Is his name Jehovah our

righteousness, against his government? See whether Paul is one of those ignorant advancers of Christ. Gal.2:8-9.

Neonomian. I believe that many abettors of these mistakes are honestly zealous for the honor of free grace, but have not sufficient light to see how God has provided for this in his rectoral distribution of benefits by a Gospel rule.

Antinomian. We are beholding to you, Sir, for a drop of charity mingled with your supercilious contempt of holy Protestant Reformers, who in my poor judgment were knowing and learned men, that asserted both the grace and government of Christ against your new law. You esteem them but ignorant honest men that meant well, but ignorantly zealous for the grace of God, carried on only by a blind devotion, and did not understand the mystery of God's Rectoral distribution. The Apostle tells us who are ignorant. Rom.10:3. They that are ignorant of God's righteousness, and go about to establish their own. What do you think of the mythologists of the late Athenian Society? I hope you esteem them learned and knowing as well as honest.

Neonomian. Indeed, I am bound to give them a high character, because they have given so ample a testimony to my scheme. After their learned defense, {that somebody took care of, that it should be well done,} they give me and my book this character. The book is worth perusal of all sorts of persons for the antidote which is annexed to each argument, and we must deliver our opinions, that Mr. Williams has without passion, plainly, learnedly and solidly established the truth with incomparable brevity and criticism, upon many texts.

Antinomian. But I suppose they have wronged you in one thing, viz., branding you for a critic upon texts of Scripture. I would do you right, I believe you were never guilty of that. As to what they say besides of you and your book, I leave others to judge when the matters are impartially tried.

Neonomian. You may say what you please, as you see it passed the judgment of those wise, learned, and judicious men, divines and others, that were eyes to the Nation in all points of difficulty, both in policy, law, divinity, matrimony, and everything else.

Antinomian. As to the politics, or the economics, or what else you will call it, their skill failed, though to their fatal ruin. But I meddle not with those points, for I am most concerned at the inscription upon their Altar, "to the unknown God, which they ignorantly worship." Acts 17:23.

Neonomian. What do you mean by that?

Antinomian. I mean they are ignorant of God according to the Articles of the Church of England.

Neonomian. It's impossible, for I am sure they give no

such ground of suspicion by the credit they have given my scheme.

Antinomian. That may be, with such good capacity, I doubt not but they are of your opinion in doctrinals.

Neonomian. But you say they know not God according to the Church of England. Prove that charge, for we will both fall together; sure if you make not that good, I cannot but take you for a wicked slanderer and backbiter of a worthy, solid, learned society of men.

Antinomian. If I do not prove my charge let me be accounted so. As to the doctrine of election, in answer to this question, does the Scripture anywhere affirm an election of a determinate number of men to eternal life and happiness? They make this answer, {I must confess as men to be pitied for their ignorance,} it's an easy thing to be mistaken in matters of this nature; howsoever if we are so, we'll profess ourselves ready to change our opinion, {this is indeed modest and ingenuous,} on the producing better reason, and in the meantime not to have angry and uncharitable thoughts of those who are of a different judgment.

Now thus far they set you a pattern, for you {forsooth} must dogmatize and anathematize all men that are not of your opinion. But to the question, wherein they say that, we cannot be satisfied by any of those Scriptures which are brought for that purpose, that there is any such an election of a determinate number as either puts a force to their natures, and irresistibly saves them, or absolutely excludes all the rest of mankind from salvation.

Not to stand upon the footing in some words improperly brought, {as forcing men's natures, which is so much like your way of Canons and Articles, that I have a great suspicion that they drew up this answer by your direction,} I shall for all your shifting and shuffling, that I see you are prepared for, and I am as ready to answer, for brevity sake say thus much, that these gentlemen do in this opinion of theirs deny absolute election, which you will also be found to do at the long run, and that this assertion in your denial of absolute election, is contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England. Article 17.

Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed by his Counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom he has chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Now your servant Sir, I think I have proved what I promised; I am sure this Article intends an absolute and unconditional election of some, and such an election as excludes all others eventually, which I am ready to make good. But this is

not all yet, there is another question, concerning the salvation of the heathens that you advance in order to that text, "there's no other name under heaven given," Acts 4:12, that if we believe in God, we believe virtually in Christ; I desire to know what's meant by a virtual belief?

Neonomian. The Jews were under the dispensation of believing our Father, having faith in the Messiah, and whereas the heathens were under the dispensation of the law of nature, the divine light written in man, which is the ordinary voice of the Spirit in every man to restrain him from murder, idolatry, &c., if they kept to that law, they should receive the virtue of the Lamb of God slain before the foundation of the world by the Father's decree for the sins of all men; contrary to the Article 18 of the Church of England.

Antinomian. They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professes, so long as he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature, for Holy Scripture has set out to us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men may be saved.

Neonomian. You are under many mistakes, for you neither understand those learned Mythologists, nor the Articles; for the Articles speak old English, and the Mythologists the new Divinity, but they both mean the same thing; for I have subscribed to the doctrinal Articles, as very tolerable divinity for those former well-meaning times; but you know the opinion of our modern divines about subscriptions, how far a man may go in those cases with a safe conscience. But to proceed to what I was saying, that by the pretense to the honor of free grace, Antinomianism so corrupted Germany, New England, &c.

Antinomian. It was the pretense of those that abused free grace to licentiousness, in St. Paul's time, therefore you might have gone further back than the Antinomians in Germany or New England. And do we not know that a pretense to holiness, and the exaltation of that in opposition to the doctrine of free grace, is that which has brooded all the doctrine of Popery, Arminianism, Quakerism, &c., and is it not this that you shelter all your errors and false accusations under, whereby you endeavour to murder the name of one who was an holy man and a Gospel divine, and hereby would deceive the reader into the belief of a gross and notorious falsehood in the entrance into your book, which is this, for there you say, I have in nothing misrepresented Dr. Crisp's opinion, nor mistaken his sense. This assertion I shall prove to be as I said.

Neonomian. It bid fair to overthrow Church and State in New England; and by its stroke at the vitals of religion, it alarmed most pulpits in England.

Antinomian. It was by reason of some such as you are, that beat the cushion and kettle drums, as they do sometimes against the truth, it may be oftener than for it. The pulpit and press are like the rest of the London roads, you'll meet both truth and error upon the tantivy there, and the fewest in number must break the way; so he that can make the greatest cry of error, and magisterially cry down truth for error, he is the man.

Neonomian. Many of our ablest pens were engaged against those errors, as Mr. Gataker, Rutherford, Burgess, the Provincial Synod, &c.

Antinomian. Sir, these persons were worthy divines, but dead and gone. I will not rake in their ashes, as you have done in this good man's; and whatever errors you pretend they were against, it may be we shall find their opinions were no more, as you represent them in your book, than Dr. Crisp's was, as you represent him.

Neonomian. To the grief of such as perceive the tendency of those principles, we are engaged in a new opposition.

Antinomian. After a certain zealous Neonomian had taken his leave of us, there was a great deal of probability this controversy would have fallen to the ground; but since that you have been the only bellwether that has set it on foot, thinking to make yourself the head of a party; but do not believe that so many do admire you as you think, nor persuade yourself that you can wind all the divines in London about your finger, as you think you have done with some here, and also in Dublin.

Neonomian. I believe many abettors of those notions have grace to preserve their minds and practices from their influence, but they ought to consider that the generality of mankind have no such antidote; and themselves need not to fortify their own temptations, nor lose the defense which the wisdom of God has provided against remissness in duty, and sinful backsliding.

Antinomian. The great advantage the world is easily persuaded of, that the opposers of the doctrine of free grace in the salvation of sinners, have had against the assertors thereof in all ages, is a suggestion, that the said doctrine tends to the countenance and encouragement of sin. And this accusation the Apostle Paul does industriously set himself to the wiping off, Tit. 1:10-12, with divers other places; and to affirm that the grace of God is the only root and foundation of true holiness in the freest and fullest dispensation; the truth of which does not only abundantly appear in the Word, but by manifest experience, that your self-justiciaries, free-willers, and Neonomians, that seek justification by a law, they are least observant of any rules of strict obedience or conscientious regards to the commands of

God. I will go no further now for an instance than yourself, who now come forth into the world in a blizzard of holiness, to the deluding of such as can discern but skin-deep, when your treatise itself is sufficient evidence to contradict what you pretend to, being stuffed with so many immoralities. Immoralities I say, for such are false accusations, malice, envy, evil speaking, and all shot from the quiver as it were of a persecutor, at the good name of one that was upright in heart, Psal.11:1-4, faithful to the name of Christ, with others of his faithful servants.

And as for the danger of those truths to the generality of mankind which you call error, it is an high impeachment of the grace and wisdom of God; because a wicked, carnal, corrupt world, for such is the generality of mankind, do abuse the grace of God as well as refuse, count it folly, yea, and stumble at it; therefore it is to be blamed and shunned as an error, and such a doctrine of life and salvation is to be set up as may be of better influence upon the generality of mankind, and more suitable to their nature, i.e., their carnal reason and corrupt affections. And therefore you would have antidotes to take off the poison that mankind is apt to suck in from the doctrine of free pardoning grace, and this must be the doctrine of Neonomianism, and likewise a cure of that which believers have sucked in already, and are apt to perish under, by reason of temptation; therefore as it may be supposed you have given it the name of a remedial law, to cure the distempers that arise from the doctrine of free-grace.

Neonomian. Who can wonder at the security of sinners, the mistaking the motions of sensible passion for conversion, and the general abatement of exact and humble walking, when so many affirm sins are not to be feared as doing any hurt, even when the most flagitious are committed; grace and holiness can't do us the least good. God has no more to lay to the charge of the wickedest man if he be elected, than he has to lay to the charge of a saint in glory. The elect are not governed by hope or fear; for the laws of Christ have no promises nor threats to rule them by, nor are they under the impressions of rewards or punishments as motives to duty, or preservatives against sin.

Antinomian. As for this great flourish, it's but like Don Quixote's brandishing his sword against a windmill. It's not only a rule that calumniators go by, and known to be their practice, adhere strongly to do something; but calumnies go no further than the ears with wise men; according to a proverbial saying. At the first sight of a black tongue, it's easy to judge of the foulness of the stomach, and that the whole mass of blood is infected with ill humours, or the morbid constitution of some parts. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh, says our Saviour, our great Physician. Is it not sad when there is

a poisonous juice under the lips, and a mouth full of bitterness? Rom.3:14.

You first charge the ministry of some {and most hereabout know what sort of men you mean} with being the cause of men's security in sin, and why? Because they preach the doctrine of the Gospel, in a free justification of a sinner by Christ without the works of a law, according to the Apostle Paul, and preach down your doctrine of justification by works. But you express the effects of this dangerous doctrine to lie in these things.

1. Security in sin, a doctrine that quickens men that are dead in trespasses and sins, {one part of which death is security in sin,} does not cause security in sin, but the doctrine of free grace in the justification of a sinner, without works of any law, does so. "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience, among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, by grace ye are saved." Eph.2:1-5. I shall not now enlarge upon this.

2. Another ill effect is, you say, that it causes the mistaking the motions of sensible passions for conversion. This is rather the effect of your own doctrine, wherein you lay the whole stress of justifying and saving grace upon sensible passions, and set men wholly to judge of their state thereby. It's marvelously to be wondered at, that any man should have the impudence to charge those effects upon an opposite doctrine to his, which are the natural and palpable effects of his own, and he sees so to be.

3. You charge upon it the general abatement of an exact and humble walking. This charge is likewise of the same nature, whereas the Spirit of God has disclaimed any true cause of exact walking, beside the grace of God that brings salvation, and then teacheth it, as has been proved. As for humble walking, what is a greater inducement thereto than the doctrine of faith, which ascribes all to the gift of grace, empties us of every high imagination and thought? It exalts Christ, and makes him all and in all. Whereas yours is the contrary, for no doctrine tends more to the lifting up of the creature than that of Neonomianism, next to that of the Papists.

And no wonder, say you, when so many affirm such and such things. Where are the many or the any that you can charge

with saying these things in the same sense you put upon them? Many expressions, that taken together with their connection in the explained sense of him that speaks, are not only true, but safe and sound; but abstracted and wrested, may be made to look as black as Hell. You may say David says, that there is not an honest man upon the face of the earth, Psal.12:1-2; that he says, there is no God, Psal.14:1; that Moses affirms God to be a man, Exod.15:3; and in a thousand places in your way and manner it's easy to charge blasphemy upon the very Scriptures themselves. And how often lying, if hyperboles be not allowed to be used without wrong to the truth? As to the particular charges, I shall speak to each in its proper place, and lay open your prevarications, errors, and false imputations to the world.

Neonomian. In this present testimony to the truth of the Gospel, I have studied plainness; and to that end oft repeated the same things in my concessions, to prevent the mistakes of the less intelligent, though I could not think it fit to insist anew upon all.

Antinomian. Your testimony is against the truth, as shall be made to appear, and is not to be accounted a testimony. For a testimony is a credible witness or evidence. As the Apostle Paul says, our testimony among you was believed, II Thes.1:10, and this testimony is with a good conscience, II Cor.1:12, and Paul testified the Gospel of the grace of God. Acts 20:24. Your testimony is not to the Gospel of the grace of God, but against it, and therefore not materially true. Your testimony is formally naught, it being not accompanied with a good conscience, but with a purpose and design to deceive. You pretend to do good, but you manifestly design evil; to blast the honor of God's free grace, as if it were a sin-teaching doctrine, and blacken a holy servant of Christ {who is now in glory} for preaching the Gospel. Your testimony can't be believed, because of your manifold prevarications, equivocations, and false teachings in this treatise of yours. And whereas you say you have studied plainness; if you mean that, in some places is no better than plain falsehood, in others plain error, it's true enough; or if you mean plainness in respect of style, it's homely enough, and hardly plain sense. But if you mean plainness of simplicity, without double-tonguedness, I utterly deny it; for when you speak of things, that one would think at first glance you intend truth by, it's nothing so. No Jesuit in the world can out-do you at equivocation, and there lies your natural excellency. You have impertinent repetition enough; your concessions everywhere fall about your own ears in your glozing oppositions to the truth you deny. You design the rectifying the mistakes of the non- intelligent. This is false, it's manifest you design the blinding of them more; else why do you quote Dr. Owen and the Assembly for countenancing those errors which

you know they directly oppose? Let but the mistakes of the less intelligent be removed, their stomachs will rise sufficiently against you and your book too.

Neonomian. I have in nothing misrepresented Dr. Crisp's opinion, nor mistaken his sense.

Antinomian. This must be true or false, and here is the turning point of the whole book; either Dr. Crisp was, or you must be. If you have not misrepresented him, then according to your representation he was so. If you have misrepresented him, and unjustly blackened him, what are you? But that which we have in hand is falsehood and lying. As to this assertion of yours, we shall prove you guilty of falsehood throughout the book, that though you have repeated some of Dr. Crisp's words from time to time, yet you have only repeated such part of his words as might render him odious, not those that give a true and candid sense of what he intended to say; and herein you misrepresented him, and that on purpose. Now the Spirit of God lays the formal nature of a lie upon an intention to deceive, or to deal injuriously with others, as in the case of Doeg. Though I do not design now to come to particulars, I will give one instance wherein you in your book, and your party, do frequently expose Dr. Crisp and his abettors, such as you call Divers, as also Crispians and Antinomians, that he and they do assert that sin can do no hurt; and you would have men understand that he means, that no person in Christ need fear to commit sin, and that sin in its abstract nature is good. Likewise, that Dr. Crisp renders sin innocent, which is your expression. Now you charge him for saying, that the grossest sin that a believer can commit can't do him the least harm, neither ought they to fear the least hurt by their own sins. By this you would give us to understand, that he means sin is in its self-innocent, and that sin bears no evil fruits of its self; that it may be boldly committed without fear. Whereas Dr. Crisp declares plainly, and with much endeavour to prevent mistakes, that the hurt he means is only the penal effects of sin; and declares again and again, that he speaks this not to encourage sin. He speaks of the sins of a believer in Christ, they that are under the dominion of grace; he speaks not of sins to be committed, but that these ought to be looked upon as the most odious and hateful things in the world, and that which here he does speak is only upon the account of some poor distressed consciences, whose sins lay so much upon them, as thereby their souls were driven from the grace of God in Christ. For to prove this, take only a few of his words, and you shall hear many more hereafter.

"Thus I speak of sin, not as it smiles upon a man with a promising countenance before it be committed, for it is most dreadful and odious to the faithful, as that which crucified the

sweetest Lord, but as already committed and lying upon the conscience of a believer, endeavoring to drive him to deny the free-grace and love of God, and the all-sufficiency of Christ. In this regard it is crucified by Christ, and so a believer need not be afraid of sin, the hand-writing of ordinances is taken away." His whole discourse is to evince, that the condemning nature of sin is taken away; the fear he speaks of is only in respect of sins that a believer has fallen into, and to prevent their falling into unbelieving despair. Now let any intelligent person judge whether you have not misrepresented Dr. Crisp, and basely traduced him. You yourself say, "the obliquity of the fact against the precept shall not hurt, where the sanction of the law is answered." I think this being duly weighed, is worse than anything Dr. Crisp sayeth.

I'll instance in one misrepresentation more, for you charge him for holding the uselessness and unprofitableness of holiness, in saying, graces and holiness do us not the least good.

Dr. Crisp, preaching upon Christ the way, shows Christ to be the way to justification, and says, "you that are believers are in a near way to salvation, believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved. Such a near way Christ is, yet still people will be caviling. Where are good works all this while? What justified by faith alone? Saved by Christ alone? I tell you, if Christ be the way to eternal life, then works are not the way, except they be Christ. But must we not work? Yea, but for other purposes, {than for justification and obtaining eternal life by them,} the Lord has propounded other ends for which you are to work. Ye are bought with a price, that's done, therefore glorify God in your bodies, being delivered out of the hands of your enemies, to serve him in holiness and righteousness." He says much to this purpose, often speaks in the high commendation of holiness, but speaks against putting it in the place of Christ. By these things we may see what credit is to be given to you, when you make it so much of your business in pulpit and public places, to charge men and books with saying those things which they never spake, and meaning such things as they never intended. And let all men judge whether you have not misrepresented this good man, {whom in the end of this preface you own to have been a holy man, and could that be true, if you have not misrepresented him as to what he said of sin and good works,} and spoken here a very great falsehood. These two proofs may serve to evince for the present, which also shall be made good that it is so in most, if not all the chapters of your book more or less. The great quarrel you have with him is, that he makes it so much his business to vindicate the honor of free grace, and of the Lord Jesus, in our whole salvation, and in justification to exclude works altogether. You talk of works necessary to

salvation, but how? You mean as a working condition, whereby you put works in the place of Christ, and mean as your oracle plainly speaks, for you are not so honest as he, but play the juggler more.

He says, "but, beloved, though the righteousness we are to perform be superfluous and vain in respect of any power it hath with God; to move him to do us good, yet it is not altogether superfluous; it is most true, that all the righteousness of man cannot prevail with God to do us good; there is but one mover of God, the man Christ Jesus, who is the only and sole Mediator. If you will have your own righteousness to be your mediator with God, to speak to God for you, to prevail with God for you; what is this, but to put it in the room and place of Christ? What is the mediation of Christ else, but for him to come between God and man, and be the daysman to lay his hand upon both, and at once to reconcile them? Job 9:33. And shall your righteousness be the daysman, and lay hands upon God and man; then farewell Christ and his Mediatorship; for this is the peculiar office of Christ, to be man's mediator, and advocate with the Father, to prevail with him for any good for us; so far, therefore as any person looks after his own righteousness, to bring glad tidings from God to him, so far a man establishes it in the room and place of the righteousness of God; which proceeds from the ignorance of that righteousness, and will in the bud prove a stumbling-block to men, and a rock of offence to them."

I will not construe it, for the reputation of him that wrote it; but there's a bone for you to pick, and I think to all learned men it gives your whole meaning in making such a noise as you do, {which you think in very allowable terms that none dare oppose you in,} that works are necessary to salvation.

Neonomian. His scheme is this, that by God's mere electing decree, all saving blessings are by Divine obligation made ours.

Antinomian. He never erected his scheme, and cast theological figures as you have done, to find out a new Gospel. He took his measures of truth from the Word of God, but "Bernard does not see all," some things he might be mistaken in as well as others. But you say that he said, by God's electing decree all saving blessings are by Divine obligation made ours. But where is this expression? I remember it not. He might say, that from God's electing grace it proceeds, that all Divine blessings are made ours by obligation; in the terms that you have put it, its improper, because it seems to confound Election and the Covenant of Grace. I can say nothing further to that, till I see his words, being not willing to believe your reporting of them, for it is manifest you make no conscience to misrepresent any man, to put your meanings, and draw your consequences upon him.

Neonomian. But he says, there's nothing more needful to our title than these blessings.

Antinomian. Is not this spirare one of the First Rate? Doth not Dr. Crisp assert Christ to be needful to salvation, and as our title? Doth he not assert the Covenant of Grace to be needful, the free gift of grace? Sure Christ and the Covenant of Grace are both distinguished from election; and these he affirms needful to our title to blessings. But blessings in your sense are odd things. Sanctification is no blessing with you, but only a condition of getting blessings.

Neonomian. He says, that on the cross all the sins of the elect were transferred to Christ, and ceased ever to be theirs.

Antinomian. Then there was something more needful to our title to blessings than the electing decree, viz., the transferring our sins to Christ on the cross. It is a truth, that our sins were laid upon Christ, and that but once, and after the manner of Imputation, according to the Divine Justice, they shall never be laid upon us. This I will prove against you when you please, and indeed it's this doctrine, viz., of imputation, that you are still bantering; it's that which you have the greatest quarrel against.

Neonomian. That at the first moment of conception, a title to all those decreed blessings is personally applied to the elect, and they invested actually therein.

Antinomian. If that be his particular judgment in that point, he says something for it, and I know not that you can disprove him. If God does secretly and invisibly apply his distinguishing fruits of electing and redeeming love upon the elect, as is manifest in Jeremiah, John the Baptist, yea, Paul, and without dispute in the instance of Jacob that he gives; is any man the worse for it? Must he therefore come under your anathema for a heretic? Yea, is not the blessing thus applied to all the elect dying in infancy?

Neonomian. Hence he says, the elect have nothing to do in order to an interest in any of those blessings, nor ought they to intend the least good to themselves by what they do; sin can do them no harm, because it is none of theirs, nor can God afflict them for any sin.

Antinomian. You may erect such a scheme upon Paul's Epistles, after this manner, and take the Apostle James to prove it in your way. He says, the elect can do nothing in order to an interest in eternal blessings; nor when they have eternal life bestowed upon them, and the grace of sanctification as an undoubted part of it, ought they to put their graces and duties in the place of Christ, or design the procuring or deserving so much as in harmony, in what they do, and that sin can't harm them as to its penal and vindictive effects. He says therefore, it can do

them no real harm, and so he explains himself. And therefore God's afflicting them proceeds not from vindictive justice; he does not afflict them so as to execute justice upon them for sin, but to reform them. His term is, from sin, i.e., to purge sin out of them, and make them partakers of his holiness. As the Apostle says, "for they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness." Heb.12:10.

Neonomian. And all the rest of his opinions follow in a chain, to the dethroning of Christ, enervating his laws and pleadings, obstructing the great designs of redemption, opposing the very scope of the Gospel, and the ministry of Christ, and his Prophets, and Apostles.

Antinomian. It's strange, a holy man, {as you own that he was,} should do Christ so much mischief. Here's a swinging bill of costs; but that's not fair before we have a hearing and trial, but according to your mind your word is a law, your judgment in any case seeming to be enough; for if you pass the sentence, then there is nothing but death and destruction. But you say all his doctrine is linked together as in a chain. That's like the analogy of faith, not like a scheme that must be erected anew every minute, or else it will not agree with the Heavens. Nowmenians or Neonomians must be often erecting new schemes! Your opinions are so far from consistency and linking together, that they hang together like a rope of sand, and like particles of various shapes, that are always jostling one another till they break each other's shins. Doth this doctrine incur all this damage? By what law? Nay, all this damage is excluded by the law of faith, and your boasting too of works. Doth the Apostle Paul's doctrine preached, where he testifies, that Christ is become of none effect to whomsoever is justified by a law, dethrone Christ, and enervate his laws and intercession? Doth he plead your works? Doth it obstruct the great designs of redemption in advancing him in all his offices, and the glory of God's free grace? Your bill of costs will never be allowed you, till you have confuted Paul's Epistles, or by your canons made them no Canonical Scriptures.

Neonomian. The Doctor had not entertained these opinions, if he had considered, that God's electing decree is no legal grant, nor a formal promise to us. The decree includes the means and the end in order to the last; and as it puts nothing in present being, so it bars not God as a Governor, to fix a connection between benefits and duties by his revealed will.

Antinomian. Here I see I must have a care of my crown. The Dr. Seraphicus holds up his fist, well Dr. Crisp you should go to school to learn new principles in Divinity, if you lived in our times. You did not consider that God did not legally elect you.

But sir, is not this a very insolent thing of you to say, that the purpose of God in election was not a legal grant. Was it a grant or no? Or was it an election without a grant? Is not God's designation of good a grant so far as designed? Is not a choosing in Christ before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love, a granting that we should be holy and without blame before him in love, and predestinating us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will; a granting that we should have the adoption of children. But you say, this was not legal. What! Was it not lawful for God to do this according to the good pleasure of his will? That we usually mean, when we say a thing is not legal. Or do you mean, God did not elect by a law? If he had been bound by a law to elect, he had not elected freely, for a free choice implies a person is under no obligation external or previous to his own intention and purpose.

2. You say, nor a formal promise, i.e., explicit, you mean. It's enough that it's an unchangeable purpose to make a formal promise; and as there was an eternal election, so there was an eternal promise, the Covenant of Grace between the Father and the Son being eternal, and it's expressly said, that God's purpose and grace was given us in Christ before the world began. "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." II Tim.1:9. "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Tit.1:2. We were no sooner elected, but the purpose and grace of it was given us in promise. Election eternal, the promise eternal, both equally eternal in point of decree; though in nature election is before the promise, and the cause of it.

3. You say, the decree includes the means and the end. Do you think Dr. Crisp did not know that? Yes, how to express it better than you do. He would have said, the decree was of the means and the end, and he would not have said willing the first, i. e., the means in order to a will of the end, but willing the end to be brought about by the means. The first is intended optimum execution, as to our conception.

4. You say, it puts nothing in present being. I say, it puts the promise in an eternal being. And if you mean as to created beings, and the manner of them, it puts them into a determinate futurity.

5. You say, it bars not God of his government. No, it's not fit nor possible that his own pleasure should bar him of it, neither is it possible it should bar him of what he would have; neither is he the more barred, because you are pleased to find fault; and it was his pleasure to govern as he willed to govern,

and all the connection of events, so as they come to pass in a way of necessity and contingency. But he determined absolutely, and nothing that falls out is contingent to him; for he judgeth not of events as probable by opinion, but as certain to his knowledge; and therefore knows them, because he willeth them to come to pass, according to his counsel and purpose in himself.

Neonomian. So if the Doctor had animadverted, that Christ's sufferings were the foundation of our pardon, but not formally our pardon, for them our sins are forgiven whenever they be forgiven, without them sin can't be forgiven; and they were endured, that the sins of all the elect, when believers, should be forgiven.

Antinomian. There's no doubt but the Doctor was so learned and wise, that he animadverted as much as you can tell him, and undoubtedly what was the main of his judgment that he insisted upon, was not from inanimate vision, ignorance or mistake. But you have found out, it seems, some subtle distinction that he thought not of. You say he should have said, that Christ's sufferings were the foundation of pardon; all that he says and means is, that our sins were fundamentally pardoned in Christ. But your fundamentally is only a remote causality, as election is to creation and redemption; for that's the foundation of both. If you had not intended so, why had you not said the material cause, seeing you deny them to be the formal; but you will have them to be neither; and you say, for them our sins are forgiven. Take heed how you touch there. Be careful you come not too near Christ. It's a tender point; for them our sins are forgiven. How! For them? For them as an end? Or how for them? As a satisfying reason to the law and offended justice of God? Or only as a benefit procured? For them remotely, or for them immediately? For them alone, or for them in conjunction with other things? All that we have at present of your meaning of for them, is, that without them sin cannot be forgiven. As a Judge gives sentence upon a malefactor, or acquits him, why does he sentence or acquit him? For his coming to the judgment-hall? For, say I, unless the judge had come to court, the prisoner could not have been condemned or acquitted. Christ is beholding to you for what you give to his sufferings. But we shall see more of this hereafter.

Neonomian. But yet they are not forgiven immediately upon, nor merely by his enduring those sufferings.

Antinomian. But you mean by something else besides them; not by an immediate application of them, but mediate and remote.

Neonomian. But there was by Divine appointment to interpose a Gospel-promise of pardon.

Antinomian. Now we come to the nicety of the point.

We shall split a hair here with a beetle and wedges, and there's the curiosity of it. What! The promise came after Christ's sufferings, to interpose between us and Christ's sufferings? Was not the promise the cause of Christ's suffering, in the hidden state and mystery of it, before the world was? Was not the promise declared and promulgated before Christ's sufferings, to Adam, Abraham, &c.? And was not Christ in all his sufferings and triumphs the great gift of the promise, as well as the condition of the Covenant? But you'll have Christ to be provided as an indefinite good medicine, to stand in the Apothecaries Shop for some body or other when the Physician prescribes it. Nay, it's not an absolute sick patient neither, that must have this medicine; it's one that the Apothecary has in a manner cured before; but there's some ugly chronical symptom or other remains, which the Physician must be sent to, for, before the person be pardoned, he must be in a very sound and safe condition, I suppose you mean.

Neonomian. There must be a work of the Spirit for conformity to the rule of the promise in the person to be pardoned, and a judicial act of pardon by that promise on the person thus conformed to the promise.

Antinomian. The plain English of this position is, that there must be an inherent righteousness in the person to be pardoned, upon the condition whereof he is to be pardoned; and that the use of Christ's sufferings are, to compound with God, for sinners upon the account of the old law, and put a bar upon his proceedings according to that, and procure another law, by the righteousness whereof we are justified, which righteousness is our own inherent righteousness, and not Christ's. This I affirm, has two things in it. First, the abrogation of the old law. That we have nothing to do with it at all, it's altogether out a- doors. This is Antinomianism, higher than ever Dr. Crisp affirmed, or any of his abettors, as you call them. Secondly, here is erection of a new law of works for our justification, which is Neonomianism.

Neonomian. To clear this point, consider. 1. The law is sometimes taken for the perceptive part of God's will, with the sanction of the Covenant of works.

Antinomian. The preceptive will of God with the sanction of rewards promised upon performance of the things required, and threats of punishment upon the non-performance, is always a Law or Covenant of Works.

Neonomian. In this Covenant life was promised to sinless obedience; and death was threatened against every sin, without admitting repentance to forgiveness.

Antinomian. To talk of any other obedience to a law besides sinless, in respect of that law in its preceptive part, is nonsense, for sinful obedience, which you are going to plead for,

is disobedience; and whereas you say, life was promised in that law to Adam's sinless obedience, that's a supposition; but there was no explicit promise in the sanction, neither was there any need there should; for a Sovereign may command a duty, or make a thing a duty to a subject upon a penalty, without promising a reward. And whereas you say, death was threatened without admitting repentance to forgiveness, it was not expressed, no more was the admittance of a surety. But if God had intended the salvation of man by a law of works, this might have been admitted. When once a transgressor is sentenced by the law, he falls into the hands of prerogative, and the prince may do with him what he pleaseth. God also might have put repentance into the conditions of the law of works at first, and said, if thou dost not eat, or repent of thy eating, thou shalt have thy reward. But God never intended to accept repentance as a federal condition of any covenant whatever, nor any other form of imperfect obedience. There was never but one law of works, and to fulfilling it, he always stood upon perfect sinless obedience.

Neonomian. Upon the Fall life is impossible by the law with this sanction.

Antinomian. Yea, or by any law whatsoever with this sanction.

Neonomian. And hence to preach it to sinners as a way to blessedness, is sinful and vain, and no saving benefit is dispensed to any of us by this rule.

Antinomian. To preach any law to sinners, as a way to blessedness in this aforementioned sense of a law, is sinful and vain, and no saving benefit is dispensed to any of us by such a rule. Therefore the preaching a new law is as sinful and vain.

Neonomian. The Gospel includes the moral preceptive part of the first law, with some additional precepts, which suppose our apostate state, as faith in an atoning Saviour, and repentance for sin; these could not be enjoined as duties upon innocent man by a rule of happiness and misery, nor could they be necessary to his right to life, because they would suppose him a sinner.

Antinomian. 1. I deny that the Gospel takes in or includes any moral preceptive part of the law, as a rule of happiness and misery, with sanction as a federal condition, nor any additional precepts, which suppose our apostate state, as faith and repentance. For it were vain to set up such a law, seeing a law of works proved fruitless to man in his perfect state, it's much more likely to be of none effect, we being now a thousand times more unable to perform the old law, or a new one with additional precepts; and it becomes not the wisdom of God to make a law to enjoin new obedience to dead men, unless he

makes them alive first. Moreover, all the preceptive will of God then or afterward to be revealed, was enjoined to man as his duty to observe, in the law of nature imprinted on his heart. As for faith, it was an eminent part of his perfection, and that which the Serpent first wounded him in by temptation. Repentance also is an included duty, required in every command of God upon a supposal of a transgression; but that repentance, or any duties, are enjoined as a rule of happiness and misery, {if I understand your rule aright, viz., a federal condition giving right as such,} since the Fall, I utterly deny; and the rather, because any such duties suppose him a sinner, as will be very easily made appear when need requires.

Neonomian. The Gospel is taken in a large sense, when I say, it includes all the moral precepts, but yet the Gospel does so, and they are the commands of Christ as Redeemer {to whom all judgment is committed} as well as the law of the Creator.

Antinomian. In your sense it's taken in so large a sense, as to make it Gospel, is nonsense. If it takes in all moral precepts as federal conditions, {which is your sense,} then it sets up the old law again, only new vamps it with some additional precepts. You have the old law you say, and a great deal more, the precepts of faith and repentance, which are a thousand times more hard to perform by man in his apostate state, than ever a hundred laws would have been to Adam in his innocency. Now here is in your new law brought in, not only all the precepts of the old law for condition, but the impossible task of a Blackamore's changing his skin, and a leopard his spots, before the sinner has the benefit of the promise, so much as in any taste of pardoning mercy, which you make {when he has it} the federal reward {for so it must be} of his conformity to the rule.

2. Christ our Redeemer gives commands, and exerts a kingly power in the government of his Church, and has judgment committed to him; but these are not of the Gospel conditions of life unto sinners propounded in the Gospel. God does not require obedience to the laws of Christ in his Church as federal conditions of eternal life. Such obedience is part of the life promised. There is the essence of the Gospel, and the effects of the Gospel. The essence of the Gospel is altogether promise and free gift, the effects of the Gospel is every privilege and blessing, and the production of all good fruits in service and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ.

3. It's true, all judgment is committed to Christ as his reward, but all that judgment is not the Gospel. Whenever Christ is found in a way of judgment, to destroy, not to save, so the word preached, where it proves a savor unto death, it's not Gospel to such in the event.

4. You say, they are the laws of a Redeemer, as well as

the laws of a Creator. It's true, Christ is Creator, but is the Gospel a revival of his law as Creator, in a way of redemption? If you mean so, then the ministry of the New Testament is the same to us with the ministry of death and condemnation, contrary to II Cor.3:7-9. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory."

Neonomian. The Gospel has another sanction to the preceptive part of the law than the Covenant of works had.

Antinomian. This is a strange assertion, for there was never any law of God with sanction, but it was always the same. Suppose that your new law were a reality, {and not a fiction of men's brains as it is,} can there be any other sanction than what was annexed to the old? Is it not a promise of life upon the condition of performing obedience, and a denunciation of death to the non-performers? What other sanction have you, or can you pretend to besides this?

Neonomian. Though nothing be abated in the rule of sin and duty, yet blessings are promised to lower degrees of duty.

Antinomian. The change you pretend to therefore is not in the sanction, but in the condition; the preceptive part, or the obedience to it required, your sanction still remains of life or death, as in the first Covenant of works. But see how well your scheme hangs together. You say there's nothing abated in the rule of sin and duty. 1. I never thought God gave a rule of sin, therefore that's mighty improper; but let it be a rule to judge of sin by. 2. You say, there's nothing abated of the rule of sin and duty, therefore nothing abated in the conditionary preceptive part of the law. And there can be nothing abated in the sanction, it must be life or death, ergo, there's the same law still, and we must be saved by the Covenant of works, or not at all. 3. But, the reason you give of changing the sanction, is, because the blessings are promised to lower degrees of duty. This, as I said, is no change in the promise, but in the condition; and then see how you contradict yourself in the same breath. You say, there's nothing abated in the rule, and yet lower degrees of duty admitted. How can these lower degrees be admitted, but by the rule of the preceptive part? For the degrees of duty required are according to God's commands, and he requires in a law duty answering the perfection of the precept.

Neonomian. And a continuance in a state of death, with a bar to the blessing, are not threatened against every degree of

sin, as the Covenant of works did.

Antinomian. This is not sense as expressed, but I take your meaning, that death was threatened in the Covenant of works, but it spake not of a continuance in that state, with any such bar to a blessing, as should hinder God from the saving of sinners; but you own that bar might be removed, and was, and your Covenant puts as great a bar as that, that if men perform not the condition, they must continue in the state of death notwithstanding all that Christ has done to remove the bar from the Old Covenant. For their concernment {in your sense} is not now for a righteousness to answer that, but to answer the new law, which lays them under life or death. 2. Is the condition the same, and more? And the sanction the same? How is it possible it should not threaten death to every degree of sin? 3. It seems our salvation is according to the degree of sin. We must know what sins are of such a degree, as that they are pardonable; what venial, and what mortal; and if Law and Gospel are distinguished by the degrees of sin, Gospel lies in sin, not grace it seems; for if it be from the degree of sin that we are saved, then not from the blood of Christ which taketh away all sin. 4. Doth God's law admit of sin in any degree, then I say as the Apostle says, is the law sin? To admit of sin into law is sin. No, the law is holy, just and good, and the promise does not make void the law, by abating one jot or tittle of it, but establisheth the law, therefore the law cannot admit of sin.

Neonomian. Can any doubt this to be the grace of the Gospel-promise?

Antinomian. Yea, I do, not only doubt it, but know and do testify to the world, according to the grace of God given to me, that it is not the grace of the Gospel-promise.

Neonomian. Doth it promise life to all men, however vile and impenitent they be?

Antinomian. It promises and gives life to the vilest and most impenitent sinners. Where grace gives life, it supposeth men dead, and not alive. For, repentance is part of the life given; and to talk of giving life to penitent sinners, is to suppose them alive before life is given; but it does not suppose that where Christ gives life, the vilest sinners shall remain so, or impenitent.

Neonomian. Or does it threaten damnation, or a continuance of it unto any true, penitent, believing, godly man, because he is imperfect.

Antinomian. Let a man pretend himself, or be looked upon to be never so penitent, believing and godly, and seek to be justified and saved by his works; I mean such as you mention, moral obedience, acts of faith, penitence, &c., I affirm thereby he is fallen from grace, Gal.5:4, being fallen short of the righteousness of God, Rom.10:3, and as he puts himself under a

law for justification, so a law condemns for imperfect obedience. For I roundly assert, that no law of God, with a sanction of life and death upon performance, or nonperformance of obedience, does admit of the least imperfection in the said obedience. Therefore such are under the curse for their imperfections. "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things." And I say, if your Gospel be a law, it does denounce damnation to the holiest and godliest man upon earth.

Neonomian. This change of the sanction supposeth the death of Christ, and his honouring his law by his perfect obedience; wherein God has provided for his own glory, while he promises forgiveness to imperfect man.

Antinomian. I have proved the sanction is not changed, but in your law it seems the condition is changed. It was in the old law perfect obedience, in the new it's imperfect. Verily it is changed for the worse; for imperfect is worse than perfect. But how comes this to pass? God has provided for his own glory in Christ, that saving of men is upon the conditions of imperfect obedience, i.e., by a worse law, an unholy and unjust law might not turn to his dishonour. God has provided for himself, you mean, seeing he rashly made such a law as he finds will not answer his ends, justice shall have it's due in his Son, and then he shall be at liberty to make a law with such easy, imperfect and sinful conditions, that sinners may be saved. Is not this admirable stuff for Gospel?

Neonomian. And yet he insists upon some degrees of obedience, unto which of his mere grace he enables us.

Antinomian. He could by his grace as well enable us to perfect obedience, if it were for his honor that obedience should be the condition, but does it make it ever the less a Covenant of works? Doth what you say, make it of grace. 1. For forgiveness, that's but the reward of life. But you'll say, it's for the sake of Christ; well, that's but in respect of the old law, that it may not condemn you, whereby you are come into a capacity to stand again for life upon new conditions. 2. You say, it's to imperfect man. But is it not the same thing to save by perfect or imperfect works, so works be the condition? 3. What if grace enables them? This alters not the case. Did not God give Adam his holiness before the Fall, and enable him to do what he did?

Neonomian. This the Covenant of redemption secures to the elect, though the grant therein is pleadable only by Christ as the stipulating party for us.

Antinomian. As for your notion, that your Covenant of Redemption is distinct from the Covenant of Grace, I deny it, and shall hereafter make it appear, that the Covenant of Grace and Redemption is one and the same Covenant. And for the present, I tax you for saying, that the Covenant of Redemption is

pleadable by none but Christ. Do we never plead redemption, nor the promise made in Christ, nor Christ himself? What, is all in the Covenant of Redemption? Do we not plead it daily? And what Christ stipulated in this Covenant for us; may we not plead it? Is not the promise of life in Christ pleadable? II Tim.1:1,9. "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus...who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."

Neonomian. And our personal claim depends on the Gospel-Covenant, whereof Christ is the Mediator.

Antinomian. So the Covenant of Redemption is not the Gospel-Covenant; but neither is there any claim to be made by it, but another that interposes between the second Covenant and us. We are not entitled at all to this new Covenant blessing by Christ, but by our own obedience {you mean} in performance of the conditions of this Covenant, you say. How? To defend from the old law prosecution, that there may be no interruption, but our new law may have quiet in allowance of our imperfect obedience. Christ the Mediator with you is but as the angel that defended paradise; so Christ stands and defends the new law, that no exception may be taken at its proceeding in justification by imperfect obedience. This is to make the Lord Jesus Christ the Minister of sin, to offer up himself a sacrifice to procure an imperfect righteousness for a Covenant condition, for in all imperfections of obedience there's a mixture of sin. And is not this to make sin good in its own nature? And implicitly to assert, it can do us no hurt in the lower degree, it coming in as an allay to the strictness of the Covenant of works. There's a necessity of it as to the very formal nature of it in the condition, for otherwise it would be a perfect condition, and then exclude us from all blessedness, as you say.

Neonomian. This Gospel sanction determines as certain a rule of happiness and misery as the law of works did, though it be not the same.

Antinomian. To determine rules of sin and misery, as your frequent expression is, is to make the Gospel to approve of sin and misery, and its great design and business to send men to Hell. Take your way of expression in what sense you please, it's so unscholarly, that a school-boy should be whipped for it. 2. I tell you, the Gospel has no law sanction at all of its own, but it only establisheth the sanction of the law, by way of promise to all saved ones; Christ is the end of the law to them; and as to those that are not saved, the law takes its course upon them, for they come not under the efficacy of the Gospel at all. 3. In the whole you have said, you have affirmed the Gospel to be a

Covenant of works, as it's your usual manner.

Neonomian. While it promises pardon to all believing repenting sinners, and declares a bar to pardon to the impenitent rejecters of Christ and Gospel grace; it fixes true repentance and faith unfeigned to be the terms of pardon, so when it promises Heaven to the sincerely holy persevering believer; it fixes sincere holiness and perseverance in faith at the terms of possessing Heaven.

Antinomian. 1. I would fain know whether the Gospel proclaims not pardon unto unbelieving and impenitent sinners? Not that they should continue unbelieving and impenitent, but that they should believe and repent. For the promise of the Gospel is a proclamation of grace and forgiveness unto sinners; and it's preached to them as such, to persuade and encourage them to believe; and whether this promise be not before faith, to work it? If not, the sinner has no ground to believe, for where there's no promise, there's no ground to believe. 2. If it declares a bar to all present impenitent ones and rejecters of Christ, it is preached in vain; for all are so till they receive Christ by faith. 3. Whether faith and repentance be not included in the promise of the Gospel? I say, they are, as all gifts of grace belong to the promise of grace; but faith and repentance are gifts of grace; the Scripture is express in it. Now then I argue, first, that faith and repentance belong to the promise, to the same promise that gives forth pardon, and therefore are no conditions; they are benefits, they are life in Christ, and there's none can have them but such as are in Christ, and therefore pardon is not promised to faith and repentance, as things distinct from the promise; but pardon is promised together with faith and repentance to the sinner. The Spirit of God only gives us to understand that they are bound together, pardon being more so an accompaniment of faith and repentance, and much more, having a causal influence thereunto, than faith and repentance of pardon. 2. The Gospel does not fix faith and repentance as conditions of pardon in your sense, i.e., working conditions to entitle us to Christ; for we are pardoned and justified freely; and though there be faith and repentance upon giving forth of pardon, yet faith, repentance and remission of sins are given in the same promise to the ungodly, to persons that were even till now impenitent rejecters of Christ. 3. But you go on with your mystery. First, you say that the sinner must be qualified with faith and repentance, before he is reconciled to God in a way of pardon; and when he has that, he is to come on upon another covenant for possessing of Heaven. Now there must be sincere holiness and perseverance to qualify him for Heaven. What a sad case is a poor sinner in, if he makes a shift to scramble by his imperfect conditions into Covenant! He is like every day to be turned out again, and when

he has done the best he can; yet he must never believe that he shall go to Heaven till he lies a dying. It were happy for him to be knocked on the head when he is in a good frame, lest he should lose all again, and put to begin to go through all his imperfect, sincere, persevering, moral righteousness, believing he knows not what. For if he falls into sin, he must conclude his perseverance is at an end; you must inform us what degrees of sin in our imperfect obedience may be admitted before we conclude that our perseverance is at an end; and then, though you say happiness will come upon perseverance, in imperfect holiness, I suppose, then perfect holiness is that which qualifies us for perfect happiness, and is the condition of it. Therefore we must arrive at it in this life, that so we may have the condition before the promise. Are not these miserable Chimeras for Protestants?

Neonomian. Hence the use of faith and holiness to those benefits, is not from their conformity to the precept, but their conformity to the rule of the promise.

Antinomian. Now we come to the whirligig, that is the mystery of the scheme. 1. We would know whether there be any difference between conformity to a rule and precept in a law? 2. And, what is the rule of the promise? Is it not with you the precept? If it be not, how is conformity to it obedience? 3. The promise is not properly a precept as such, though the Gospel-promise is the ground and reason of all Gospel-precepts; but not precepts of promises; and how can any man conform to the precept in your sense, and not expect and have from thence the use of the benefits? Yea, and not look upon it as federally flowing therefrom. 4. I would fain know what gave the use of the benefit in the covenant of works? For you say, this determines the rules of happiness and misery in the same manner. Was not the use of Adam's federal holiness as to happiness from conformity to the precept? Where was the rule of the promise there? Either it must be in the precept, or the promise itself, or in the connection of promise and precept. Have I hit it now? It's sure, the connection is the rule of the promise. Now how is that a rule of the promise, but in conformity to the precept, and then it's conformity to the rule of precept and not of promise. Or is it possible to come with a conformity to the connection between the precept and promise? Now all this intricate harangue is only to tell us in the clouds, that faith applying the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ will not assure our hearts before him, but as it is a working condition to which the promise is annexed.

Neonomian. Yes, it follows, our applying Christ's righteousness, and relying on it, would no more justify us, than our sincere holiness would save us, were it not for this Gospel-promise, that God will justify for Christ's sake all those that

believe.

Antinomian. The business here, that is the kernel of this nut, is, that faith does not justify us by applying Christ's righteousness in the promise, by virtue of Christ's righteousness itself imputed, but by its own virtue, as being a righteousness itself, whereby it answers the promise as a condition upon which it is made. As for faith's receiving Christ and his righteousness, it serves thereby to bar the old law; but Christ's righteousness has nothing to do here; for if our own faith and repentance is the righteousness in their conformity to the rule of the promise, then that's Latin for the new law. Here are great mysteries more than Paul understood, and all the Apostles, any other than to reckon them another Gospel, and vain talking. And truly, as for your comparing Christ and holiness in the matter of justification under the umbrage of your invented rule of promise, is perfect stuff, as it amounts but to this at best, that if God had not promised justification, there had been none at all, neither by Christ's righteousness, nor by ours. But how came this promise? Do you not say, Christ purchased it as a conditional grant?

Neonomian. Hence by Gospel grace there's a great difference between imperfect faith and utter unbelief; between sincere holiness, and formal profaneness or wickedness; true love to God and prevailing enmity, &c. By the law of works nothing was holy but what was perfectly so, &c. But read the Bible, if thou doubttest whether there is not a true faith, holiness, love, &c., which be short of perfection.

Antinomian. I thought we should have had a greater instance of the grace of God, than in giving us a worse condition of the Covenant than Adam had. You should have told us what perfection here you mean; I suppose it must be only of parts, that it may be a Gospel federal condition, which must be imperfect; and it must be mingled with sin, or else it will not answer the rule of the promise. Now you will not allow it must answer the rule of the precept, for there's nothing abated of it; but it must chop in between the precept and promise as the Gospel condition in a way of imperfection. So that without sin our holiness is nothing federally. We must take heed it become not perfect holiness; for if once it comes to that, we fall under the law of works. This were to begin in the spirit of imperfection, and end in the flesh of perfect holiness. Again, you do here not a little insinuate what I know lies in your breast, that there is no specific difference between grace and mere moral endowments; and it appears so upon all your hypotheses. For you declare, there ought to be such and such qualifications to entitle a man to the promise of grace, or grace in the promise, before he has the promise. And as to your exhortation to the reading of the Bible, &c., I must tell you, I have read the Bible several times, and

hope to read it, and meditate on the word of grace contained therein, as long as I live. But if that be the true doctrine of the Gospel which you have delivered in this book, I am utterly at a loss for my salvation, which I would be loath to be now at last, after so many years' satisfaction; and let the world take notice, that I do believe your Gospel to be another Gospel, such as Paul speaks of, and accurseth. Gal.1:8-9.

Neonomian. God in dispensing of Gospel-promised blessings, does judicially determine a conformity to this rule of the promise. When he forgives, he judicially declares a man has true faith. When he admits into Heaven, he judicially declares a man sincerely holy and persevering.

Antinomian. This is plainly as much as to say, God dispenseth the Gospel-promise judicially in the same way as a law of works. He looks whether or not we have fully performed the conditions; and upon finding of them, he judicially gives the promise, i.e., in a way of reward to the works performed, whether they be perfect or imperfect, it's no matter, the reward is of debt, and not of grace. And in this way pardon is given upon imperfect faith and repentance. And thus Heaven is given judicially for persevering holiness. Here's not a bit of enquiry whether they have Christ or no, he is a cypher in the matter of our salvation. No Papist can utter more gross Divinity. But this is a strange way of dispensation of Gospel-benefits. First to determine a conformity to the rule of the benefit. As for example, in dispensing faith, for that's a promise, God determines judicially that a man has a conformity to the rule before faith. Again, is forgiveness a judicial declaring a man has true faith? Or does this judicial declaration go before pardon and justification? If so, a man has always true faith before he is justified and pardoned, what absurd consequences will follow thereupon? And what can this be but a declared judgment that his good graces deserve pardon? And I think, meritorious, so as their merit should arise from their own intrinsic worth, and that too before he is pardoned; and upon the same terms are the persevering Saints at last admitted to glory.

Neonomian. As upon a view of his guests he cast out him that had not the wedding garment, viz., true uniting faith; so by keeping out the Foolish Virgins, &c. Can any think that forgiving, adopting, glorifying, or the conveyance of every other promised benefit given upon God's terms, are not judicial acts of God as Rector.

Antinomian. If you understand judicial in respect of the justice of God, answered by the righteousness of Christ, purchasing all good gifts and blessings for sinners that deserve nothing but wrath, it may be said of justification. But if you understand judicial in respect of any duty, grace or qualification

that is found in us, though wrought by the Spirit, I abhor it as an abominable position. And your saying, the wedding garment was faith, and not the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith, is a wretched wresting and abuse of Scripture, turning the sweet and precious doctrine of our Lord and Saviour against himself. I shall meet with you again upon these points more largely, therefore I pass them over briefly now; but in the meantime take notice, that all our Protestants, and particularly the Assemblies Catechism, define justification and adoption always acts of free grace.

Neonomian. If so, does he dispense these blindly and promiscuously, without any regard to our being believers, &c., or no? Whether our faith be true or not, any one would blush to affirm.

Antinomian. I would know whether, if God distribute his free grace to poor, wretched, and worthless creatures, according to his election and distinguishing mercy, does he do it blindly, because he finds no reason in them? And I pray, does God dispense the grace of faith blindly, if he does it without respect to men's being believers first? So if they believe before, they shall have the gift of faith; and their faith must be true too, before they have faith given. I cannot but think you are much mistaken, or you would blush at the delivery of these things.

Neonomian. With respect to what is above declared, the Gospel is a law of faith, a law of Liberty, &c., and it especially insists on that sincerity of grace and holiness which the rule of the promise makes necessary in its description of the person whom it makes partaker of its included benefits.

Antinomian. You do here begin to make conclusions on your premises, but your premises not holding water, your conclusions will no way follow; you conclude the Gospel is a law of faith. We have briefly shown, as you have given occasion, that the Gospel as such, is no law, and has not a sanction, it's wholly a promise of life, and the performance of the promise does not depend upon anything a sinner can do as a federal condition. I shall show fully hereafter, that there is no ground from that place, Romans 3, nor that of James 1, to conclude the Gospel to be a law, i.e., a command of duty for a condition with a sanction of threats upon the non-performance, or promises as rewards upon the performance, whether the condition be perfect or imperfect obedience. You make the sincerity of grace and holiness to be this condition, and you call it the rule of the promise, {which you say is not the precept neither,} neither is it the promise, but a rule that is neither precept or promise. So what your rule is, he is wise that knows. And you say this rule makes sincerity necessary in the description of the person; so the rule of the promise describes a person only, and therefore

makes him not, but tells us he must be sincere before he has anything to do with the promise. From whence has he this sincerity described? From Law or Gospel? From God or himself? If from God, then by way of grace and gift, and so through the promise. If of ourselves, it's dross, for they that are in the flesh cannot please God, and therefore much less perform such a duty, for which God will give the promised benefits.

Neonomian. And the main of our ministry consisteth in pressing men to answer the rule of Gospel promises.

Antinomian. What this means is very strange, when you say the use of faith, and holiness, as to benefits, is not from their conformity to the precept. Therefore what do you press them unto, when you press them to answer the rule of the Gospel? When the conformity to the precept does no good, I suppose in the same sense as you say obliquity in regard of the precept will do no hurt. But the main of our ministry consists in preaching Christ, and bringing sinners unto him, and building them up in him.

Neonomian. And dissuading men from those things which the Gospel threatens shall hinder their interest in all, or any of their benefits, with an aggravation of their misery if they be final rejecters of grace.

Antinomian. Whatever befalls sinners retaining their sinful state, and rejecting grace, is from the law, and not from the Gospel. To talk of a Gospel-threat, is a catechresis at best, and nothing else can save it from being a bull. But what are those that will hinder a sinner from the benefit of being turned from darkness to light? This I can suppose is the nonimprovement of the grace {which you take every one to have} which either hinders or makes that they are not converted.

Neonomian. We call men to be reconciled to God, upon which we know God will be at peace with them.

Antinomian. But you tell them not, according to II Cor.5:18, that all things are of God, who has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ. And this is the ground of the ministry of reconciliation, and the ground of persuasion to sinners to be reconciled unto God. But this Portion of Scripture to the end of the Chapter you take to be hardly canonical.

Neonomian. These things will help thy conceptions, still remembering that the merits of Christ are the cause of this ordination.

Antinomian. The council of God is the cause of the ordination of salvation, means and order. But you mean, they will help to blunder and confound poor men's conceptions. "Through the clouds, through the darkness, through a dream." But you would have us not to forget the cause of this rare Gospel scheme. You should have told us that your own corrupt

imagination was the procatactic cause of this new law ordination.

Neonomian. His righteousness imputed is the cause for which we are justified and saved when we answer the Gospel rule.

Antinomian. It's at Greek moons when a poor wretched sinner must be saved, then Christ is the cause of setting up this new law, and that we should be justified thereby, when we perform the imperfect conditions thereof; and that's your answering the Gospel rule. Since Christ has put a bar upon the old law, now we must set up for a righteousness of our own to answer the Gospel-rule by, and that's not conformity to the precept neither; but answering the Gospel-rule by imperfection. Is not this sad Divinity?

Neonomian. And I exclude not this righteousness, when I affirm, that the righteousness of God, Phil.3:9, by which is intended principally the Gospel-holiness of a person justified by Christ's righteousness, both which by faith in Christ all his members shall be perfect in.

Antinomian. It seems the righteousness of Christ there spoken of, is a mixture of Christ's righteousness and evangelical obedience; but the principal part is Evangelical obedience; Christ's is but a complement of ours. Dr. Beverly has abundantly evinced, that Christ's righteousness alone is there understood according to the best interpreters. We shall have further occasions to deal with you upon this point, and your crude and false interpretation of that excellent portion of Scripture shall be laid open in our progress. You should have told us, whether you mean we are perfect in Christ's righteousness for justification, without our own righteousness, or evangelical obedience joined with it; and whether our perfection in holiness be in the same manner as in righteousness? And whether it be in this life, that we are made perfect in holiness by faith in Christ.

Neonomian. The grace of God is hereby stated as free as is consistent with his government, and judicial rectoral distribution of rewards and punishments.

Antinomian. That is, you have set bounds to the grace of God, and told God and us how far he may lawfully exercise his grace. He must take heed that no unqualified sinners have anything to do with it; and that he be sure, notwithstanding the righteousness of Christ, that he dispenses grace in the way of a law, that it may be consistent with his government; and all grace must be distributed judicially, by rewards and punishments. Let all the world see now whether you have not stated the grace of God very fairly out of doors, and gone about to establish a law of works, as shall more manifestly appear afterwards.

Neonomian. And there's none have need of the grace

of God more than I?

Antinomian. The truest word you have spoken of all. But according to your own principles it's a question whether you have not put a bar upon the grace of God, by making so audacious and daring an opposition to it, as you have done in this book. I am sure, if this be part of your Gospel, the obedience that you intend for your justification will not do, if you persevere in it. But the Lord in his mere free grace look in mercy upon you, pardon you, and turn you from darkness to light!

Neonomian. Note, that in this book I still speak of the adult, and not infants.

Antinomian. I find you see you are like to run your head against a post; but for all your foresight, you are certain of a knock in the head; for hereby I find you see God justifies some without works. God has not one righteousness of one kind to justify infants by, and another of another kind to justify the adult by, adult persons are no more justified by works than infants.

Neonomian. Forget not, though the Doctor in his book speaks to men as believers; yet in everything true of the elect.

Antinomian. Everything that is true of the elect, is so of them when believers; but everything that is true of an elect believer, is not so of him before he's a believer, and to prove you charge the Doctor falsely, I'll bring but your acknowledged sense of the Doctor in your next words. It's true of a believer, that he knows the saving blessings he is entitled to; but it's not true of a person in unbelief, that he knows the saving benefits he is to be partaker of.

Neonomian. They have as much a title to all saving blessings, only they know it not, this was his judgment.

Antinomian. His judgment was, that nothing entitles us to the blessings of the Covenant, but the promise. Deed of gift is that which entitles us, whereby we claim when we take possession of it when we believe, whereby we know our title more or less by believing.

Neonomian. I have carefully avoided to make any reflection on Dr. Crisp, whom I believe a holy man, and abstained the exposing things according to the advantage offered.

Antinomian. These things are but twin shams. Whether here you be not as false as in other things, a little time will discover. We call such a one decorated, who is as Horace describes, within ugly beautiful skin.

Neonomian. Look who is that coming towards us? It's sure Mr. A.B.

Antinomian. It is so indeed, considered arrived, for he's a perfect Calvinist. I'll warrant that you will find him of my opinion concerning your book.

Neonomian. Your servant, Mr. Calvinist. I have a

question to ask you in the first place, before we talk of news or anything. I pray, what do you say of my book?

Calvin. I cannot like it by any means; I was sorry to see it, knowing something of your principles before; but when I read it, it raised a variety of passions in me.

Neonomian. I must confess I am willing to hear what most men think of this piece of mine; though I think I need not regard what many men say, seeing it has so large and ample an encomium by several very grave divines and others, especially the learned mythologists of the late Athenian Club, the dissolution whereof is greatly bewailed by me, for they might have proved of great use to me in these matters. But I pray, Mr. Calvinist, tell me the reason of your dislike of my book, for I thought it might have pleased Calvinists, though Antinomians, {whose opinions are not much to be valued,} are so angry at it; and I have shown that what I have asserted is the sense of the Assembly's Confession, the Savoy's, Dr. Owen, Mr. Norton, and many learned Calvinists.

Calvin. I shall deal ingenuously and plainly with you, and tell you why I cannot approve of your book. My reasons are these.

1. I except against your magisterial way of writing, by canons, as it were anathema's, in the manner of a Council, National or Provincial Assembly, whereby you would have all men to believe that our faith in all matters of salvation is to be measured by your scheme, and pinned upon your sleeve; so arrogant a way of imposing upon others in doctrines, has not been as I know practiced by the Conformists, whereby you endeavour to make human authority the standard of our faith, prescribe new articles contrary to those of the 39, and all our English Confessions, and give an example unto others so to do. For if twenty men of one persuasion may recommend their opinion in doctrinals by a concurrent subscription, by the same reason others may do the like; so that hereby is laid a foundation of incurable factions and division about the main points of our salvation; whereas, whatever of differences has been in lesser matters, and men's private opinions in greater, yet hitherto there's no set of men as I know, that have publicly in the like manner invaded our Confessions, wherein those of the Conformists and Nonconformists has harmoniously agreed in matters of faith in the sense of the Scriptures and first Reformers.

2. That you have plainly drawn in, or rather tricked some divines {under a pretense of bearing witness against error} into these practices of subscribing to your book, merely to put a countenance upon the gross errors that you would vend among the people, and that you might the better slur and brand some

faithful ministers of Christ in this City with the odious name of Antinomians, and the preaching the doctrine of free grace as our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles have done, with Antinomianism; and have in your pulpit at Public Lectures, and at Public Houses, made it your business to blow up a flame of contention in this Town, as if no man was to be esteemed sound and orthodox in Gospel-truths but yourself, and such as will dance after your pipe, and think all others ignorant setters up of the name of Christ, &c.

3. That in your writing, in decrying of what you would charge upon such that you call Antinomians, you take Dr. Crisp and set him up as a pretended butt, {a man dead many years since, a holy man, as you own,} falsely representing unto the world as to his sense and meaning, almost in everything, that through his sides you might wound the doctrine of free grace. I assert, your way is very unreasonable to ground a polemical opposition, and fasten a charge of error upon, to excerpt expressions here and there from popular sermons not printed by himself, but from the notes of sermon writers. How liable the true words and expressions of the exactest men are to mistake and abuse, I need not to insist on to evince, common experience is evidence enough. Moreover, considering that this is the way the worst of men have always taken to expose religion, to encourage and seed atheism and profaneness in the world. Not to name Edward's Gangrena, our present time gives an ample example in that late pamphlet, called the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, or the Foolishness of their Teaching. You may see how the sentences taken out of the sermons of Mr. Rule, and of divers other Presbyterians, does look, when separated from the main sense intended by them. I say, I do highly disapprove of this sermon-hunting trade, as a most disingenuous way, unless a sermon be preached and printed by the author to establish a manifest error, and the whole sermon or sense of the said author be impartially represented and argued.

4. That the more to insinuate yourself and doctrines for truth into the minds of Christians sound in their principles, that they might think you mean nothing by your uncouth and equivocating expressions; and to deceive the less intelligent, {as you call most divines that are not of your persuasion,} you grossly abuse the two reverend Assemblies, with Dr. Owen and Mr. Norton, quoting them for asserters of your errors, in places where they speak or dispute directly against the principles that you assert. Now what is this but to ape a deceiver at least?

5. That you that have subscribed solemnly to the doctrinal part of the 39 Articles, should so palpably and openly go about to overthrow some foundation-principles therein contained, as imputed righteousness, and justification only for

the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not for our own works and deservings, and that we are justified by Christ alone. Article 11. And that principle asserted in the 13th, "that works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasing to God, forasmuch as they spring not from faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, &c." The contrary doctrine to both these Articles {under whatever evasions and prevarications you seem to abscond yourself} you make the great business of your book not only to insinuate, but manifestly enough to assert and endeavour to prove, viz. 1. In that it appears to be your design to blast the whole doctrine of imputation, {whatever you pretend,} both of imputation of our sins to Christ, and of the imputation of his righteousness unto us. 2. That you make it your great business to set up and establish a Covenant of works, boldly asserting the Gospel to be a law with sanction of rewards and punishments, and that the conditional part thereof are imperfect works, and that we are justified by those works as a subordinate righteousness to the righteousness of Christ, and that faith itself is concerned therein but as an act, in the same manner as repentance and other parts of imperfect sincere obedience, though in a little kind of precedency. Your book also is full of many other errors, that have dependence on these capital ones, which for brevity sake I will not now rehearse; besides your many inconsistencies, contradictions, equivocations, false insinuations, illiterate, absurd and unsound expressions, that render your book very offensive to sound and solid minds.

Antinomian. These things which you speak of I have already found, and have made a little inspection into, and discovery of unto him in discourse even now, wherein I took the boldness to open the lower offspring of his morbid body of Divinity, in order {if we can agree upon it} to a thorough dissection.

Neonomian. Both of you go upon great mistakes, and are led to censure my book from prejudice, especially Mr. Antinomian, because the principal scope of it is to lay open his errors, and as for those things which you call inconsistencies, contradictions, absurd expressions, &c., they are terms of art which the learned understand, such as, the rule of promise, the rule of sin, and the rule of happiness and misery, &c. If you once come to see how fully and rightly I have stated the truths and errors mentioned, you will be of another mind.

Calvin. Nay, it's very just and meet to give your book an impartial examination, that we may have a full and clear understanding of your scheme, how you state and defend the points therein contained; and if you will consent thereto, we will appoint some place where we may meet from day to day at a

certain hour, where we will distinctly debate the material points that you assert, as either truths or errors.

Neonomian. I highly approve of it. But where shall this be with most conveniency upon all accounts?

Antinomian. Why, may it not be, Mr. Calvinist, at your Calvinian Society? I suppose you debate theological questions there most of all, and there are many worthy and learned gentlemen that attend there frequently to very much purpose.

Calvin. I like your motion, Mr. Antinomian, and will undertake that both of you will have a very candid and welcome reception there.

Neonomian. I have but one objection, and that is, seeing Mr. Antinomian moves for this place, I fear it smells too much of Antinomianism. Is there liberty to take a pipe of tobacco now and then to clear an ill scent out of the throat.

Antinomian. Yes, yes; else how do you think we could be able to endure the scent of so many morbid theological bodies, which we make our great business to dissect; though this hot weather we are fain to clear them off-hand as fast as we can.

Calvin. Never trouble yourself with such weak objections as these. You know strong smells are good to repel fumes arising from the spleen, by I know not what kind of occult quality, of antipathy, antiperistasis, or militation of abstruse particles one with another.

Neonomian. Well, I agree, I pray how shall I find the place?

Calvin. I will give you such directions that you cannot miss. The Calvinian Society is in Gracious Street, at the Sign of the Geneva Arms, just opposite to the Sign of Cardinal Bellarmine's head, at the foot of the Bridge that crosses Reformation-River, that divides between the Protestant and Popish Cantons.

Gentlemen.

Now fare you well till tomorrow five o'clock, where I expect to meet you according to our agreement, and I pray have a care you mistake not the Sign.

FINIS.

Neonomianism Unmasked
OR, THE
Ancient Gospel
PLEADED;

AND THE OTHER
CALLED
The New LAW.

The SECOND PART of the Theological
debate, occasioned by the book of Mr.
Daniel Williams, wherein the following
points are Discussed.

- I. What the state of the elect is before effectual calling?***
- II. Whether God laid our sins on Christ?***
- III. Whether the elect were Discharged from sin upon Christ's bearing them?***
- IV. Whether the elect cease to be sinners from the time their sins were laid on Christ?***
- V. What was the time when our sins were laid on Christ?***
- VI. Whether God was separated from Christ while our sins lay upon him?***

By ISAAC CHAUNCY, M. A.

LONDON, Printed for H. Barnard at the Bible in the Poultry.

1693.

READER,

The following debate is by way of Dialogue, the rule of which is, that each interlocutor is to be allowed to speak his own sentiments, and of such as he represents, and therewith to produce what light and evidence may be had to evince the truth of what is offered, and defend it from the charge of error, under whatever denomination he stands, thereby truly or falsely called. Here is no attempt to pole, or vouch for truth, or against error, to impose upon the faith of the reader, but he is left to take or leave as he finds sufficient ground to be persuaded in his own mind from what is offered by either of the dialogists.

If anyone would know {among any variety of apprehensions that he may sometimes find concerning matters in debate} what the author's opinion is, he would not have it weigh with anyone, so as to carry a bias in his judgment, and therefore does rather choose modestly and impartially to argue than to determine, allowing each dialogist his full scope; but for satisfaction to the more earnest enquirer, he does declare, that he does acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice, and accounts him sound who owns the doctrinal part of those, commonly called, the Articles of the Church of England, the Confessions and Catechisms, Shorter and Larger, compiled by the Assembly at Westminster, and the Confession agreed on in the Savoy, to be agreeable to the said rule, according to their genuine sense and meaning. And as to his design, it was to prayerfully open the sacred Scriptures, with a view of feeding the flock of God, building upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. How little cause has he then to be surprised, whom the doctrine of Christianity has taught better things; viz., that if he please men, or seek so to do, he should not be the servant of Christ; and that he is not judged at man's day, but he that judgeth him is the Lord. His comfort is that the cause is good, whatever infirmity may accompany the management.

NARRATIVE OF THE DIALOGUE AS SPECIFIED.

The Calvinian Society being seated, there came in an old fashioned black Gentleman, with short hair, mustache, a beard

brought to a point, severe and deathly looking, whom Mr. Calvinist {being in the chair} remembering {since he found him discoursing with Mr. Neonomian in the Ethiopian fields} saluted and welcomed in the name of the Society, and caused to sit down by him, saying, my brethren, this is that gentleman that Mr. Neonomian has so egregiously exposed in his book, as fundamentally erroneous in the doctrine of the Gospel, and called Antinomian. I found them both together lately in the fields, earnestly debating the principles maintained in the said book, and the circumstances that attended the publishing of the same, which I thought not to be a convenient place for such discourse, because of so many that passed and repassed, and therefore invited them to this our Calvinian Society, which they very readily and thankfully embraced. Whereupon there was much whispering in the Company upon the appearance of this new old face, one saying one thing of him, and another something contrary; but in the meantime Mr. Neonomian being not yet come, Mr. Calvinist takes Mr. Antinomian into the drawing room, and thus he begins with him.

Calvin. I pray how was your discourse with your antagonist modified the other day before I came to you. He says, he thought that some of the statements are in themselves over estimated, and that you were too sharp upon him.

Antinomian. I remember a little school-boy's Latin too, so what a drone then and dull animal should I be, if I were not sensible of the severest stimulations! You declared enough of your reasons why you had so ill a resentment of this his so pernicious an undertaking, so grossly circumstantiated; and I think I have reason to be much more concerned than you; for he makes me to have laid the seed-plot of the worst of heresies, denying a possibility of union with me as a Christian, rendering me no better than a Mohammedan. He says, I set up the grace of Christ against his government, and so he makes me a traitor to him. He renders me very lewd, in charging me for making sin innocent, and holiness sin. He makes me a terrible monster, without principles, learning or common sense, in the representation he gives of me to the world. Moreover, how many nauseous circumstances have attended these abusive projects and practices, especially that of obtaining hands that are prefixed to his book, which he did sedulously, clandestinely and precariously, because it could not swim without a float; and this aggregation of hands must go throughout the Nation for an act of the United Brethren; and some ancient brethren must be by some art drawn in under specious pretenses, who have in print refuted his whole scheme keenly and strenuously, and their labours are extant to witness against their own hands. Others also who have preached contrary doctrine several years, both

which must come under the rebuke of building what they have destroyed, and many of these never read the book before they recommended it. Among the others, there are near a dozen young candidates to the ministry proselyted to this corrupt scheme, who are neither pastors, nor ordained in any sense, or so much as ever came under any due promotion of their fitness for the ministerial work, and are but sitting at the feet of their Gamaliel as yet. Lastly, it is not easy to foresee the dangerous consequences that will ensue these things. A promising union must be broken, a new one set up, ministers and christians alienated in judgment and affection, flames of contention kindled, the Gospel and ways of God reproached; theological warfare begun. What could the Devil have done more? For if the truth be so publicly attacked, God will have {among all the wise and prudential men} some of those the world calls fools to defend it, such as he will enable to run the risk of reproach and censure, and through grace shall not be ashamed of the truth of the Gospel of Christ; and rather than there should be no other than the reputed wise and prudent professors among men, that commonly betray truth instead of defending it; God will raise up some fools from the dead to do it, such as I am; and as for my antagonist, I say to him with the comedian, with whose words you began, I have other things now that are to be delivered, of which I will attempt to make clear work of; and if he goes on to injure me, so be it, my comfort lies in the fact that I have not shunned to declare unto you that which I would calculate as unbiased truth.

Calvin. What you have spoken calls for consideration, and will be considered by all good men. But Mr. Neonomian is come, let us not therefore lose time.

DEBATE I

OF THE STATE OF THE ELECT BEFORE EFFECTUAL CALLING.

Calvin. Gentlemen, it's well you are come, pray what case will you propound first to be spoken to?

Neonomian. I have this error to charge Mr. Antinomian with, viz., that he says the elect are at no time of their lives under the wrath of God, nor are they subject to condemnation, if they should die before they should believe; yea, when they are under the dominion of sin, and in the practice of the greatest villainies, they are as much the sons of God, and justified, as the Saints in glory. This I prove from Dr. Crisp, pages 363,364.

Antinomian. He says, "it's thought by some, that in case such a person should die before God call him to grace, and give to him to believe, that person had been damned." But that is a vain supposition, for it were to suppose a man elected and not elected; a man elected to the end and not to the means, or that the sins of the elect are laid upon Christ, and the elect not secured thereby from condemnation. And he says therefore, "that the Lord has no more to lay to the charge of an elect person {considered as such} than to the saints in glory;" his reason is, because his sins are laid on Christ; and though the person remain yet unregenerate, and in the height of iniquity, yet God has no more to lay to his charge than to a believer, or to a saint in glory. By this he means there is so full security and provision made for all the elect, that as to Christ's bearing their sins, and satisfaction to Divine Justice, there is as much already done by Christ as ever shall in respect of satisfaction; for he was once offered to bear the sins of many. Heb.9:28. And if the sins of the elect were borne by Christ, they were satisfied for, and in respect of Divine essential justice there can be nothing laid to their charge, so as to affect them with a stroke of vindictive justice; those that are elected are redeemed by Christ. Eph.1:56. And when the Spirit of God speaks of an elect person, it always speaks of him as secure in his person from wrath and condemnation, as to the real execution of the sentence of the law upon him. It's one thing to say an elect person is free from condemnation as such, and another thing to say a sinner is thus freed from it. He says not, that if a man die under the dominion of sin, or the practice of the greatest villainies, he shall be saved; that's a false charge. Paul as an elect vessel, was by virtue of election and redemption secured from condemnation in execution of the law sentence

upon him, all the time of his unregeneracy; neither could a charge be laid against him that could cut off his person from the benefits designed for him in election, or prepared and purchased in redemption. See what Dr. Crisp says to this charge, page 637.

Neonomian. He says the elect are at no time of their lives under the wrath of God or under condemnation.

Antinomian. That men are not under the sense of the law, and by the state of nature under wrath, he does not say, and in the conscience, when the law speaks to him as under it, for he says, page 359, 360, that "there's a laying sin on Christ, by way of obligation, so he bore the sins of the elect {before he suffered actually} from all eternity, and by virtue thereof the elect were justified before Christ came, as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Secondly, by way of execution, and this was his real bearing, the other was virtual; but there's a third, which is the Lord's laying iniquity on Christ by way of application, i.e., when it is that the Lord does single out this or that particular person, and lay his iniquities on Christ. Concerning the elect in general, they were in the eye of God before they had a real existence. So all their iniquities were laid on Christ from eternity, but it must needs be granted that a particular application of this grace to persons must be in time, before a person is in being there cannot be a personal application of the grace of God; God cannot apply his grace to nothing. "Know also that this application is double, there's God's application and man's; God's application is when he himself does say, he loves such a person. Man's application is, when God gives to men to believe, and by this act of believing to be persuaded and resolved that God has done it."

He distinguishes likewise, and says, "God lays the iniquity of every elect person two ways, in respect of the application of this grace." The first is secretly, and the second is manifestly. As to secret applying, he instances in God's declaration of his love to Jacob, Rom.9:13, and says, "we have here, page 362, the Lord's declaring himself personally and judicially unto the one whom he loved, Jacob; there was a love to him from eternity in the election of grace; but till there was a single individual person, as Jacob, the Lord did not say, Jacob have I loved, &c."

Now he concludes, "that this secret application of the grace of laying sins on Christ, is at the very instant of such a person having a being in the world, then God does appropriate this grace to an elect person; and therefore in the unregenerate estate of such a person, in the excess of riot, he is secured from the judicial charge of sin, from vindictive justice." There's great diversity of judgment about the time of applying this grace, {says he,} some say it's at baptism, some say at first conversion,

&c. It's true, an elect person not called, is never able to know individually for himself, that he is such a one that God has nothing to charge upon him, because until effectual calling God gives not unto persons to believe, and it's only believing that is the evidence of things not seen; and this he calls the application of pardoning grace by way of manifestation. Thus I have given you the sum of Dr. Crisp's opinion in this matter.

Calvin. I perceive then his opinion is, that. 1. In general, that by electing and redeeming love the elect are secured from the stroke of vindictive justice, and God has nothing to lay to their charge, having accepted the satisfaction of Christ on their behalf. 2. That the application of this love to a particular person is in time, as to God's sentence concerning him, and as to some fruits of this love from his first having a being; as suppose, distinguishing of him as a chosen vessel, as he did Jacob from Esau; as he separated Paul to the designs of electing love, as to preventing grace, yea, and providential grace, to bring such a person, it may be, under the secret effects of the promise, and the means of grace. 3. He says, the manifest application is, when God gives to believe; so that notwithstanding all the security he has by election, redemption, and secret application, he is before faith, but in a state of death, and under the law-sentence as pertaining to the conscience, and by nature born a child of wrath. Hence, that he knows nothing of all this, spoken of an elect person, any more than a reprobate does, till he does believe. I think this is Dr. Crisp's full sense, and therefore I think, Mr. Neonomian, you are too partial in your representation of the Doctor; you take those expressions only that may render him odious, and leave out the grounds and reasons thereof. As to that opinion of his concerning God's secret passing over his love to the elect persons so long before they believe. What if he be singular therein, yet there may be more in it than you or I can tell, seeing it is manifest that it has been so in several that have lived to be adult; and I doubt not but it is so daily as to elect infants that die in infancy. And I must tell you, if you deny this Covenant of Grace to belong to the infants of believing parents, as it is claimed by virtue of a Gospel-promise, you can have little ground to plead for infantbaptism, which is a sign and seal of forgiveness of sins in some Gospel-sense or other. But I leave that point now; and I must tell you, that there is no doubt but that there is a secret passing over of the grace of God in Christ to every elect person, before he can put forth any one vital act.

Neonomian. He says, the elect of God are heirs of God; so that their first being puts them into a right of inheritance, &c.

Antinomian. He gathers this from Gal.4:1-3. See Page 367. "Though God does secretly give over his right and title of his own grace to a person in the womb, yet he does not make it

known to him that he has that right and title, till such time as he does call him; during which time, being under the law, he is under a schoolmaster, tutors and governors." And here he says, the heir, so long as a child, differs nothing from a servant, though he be Lord of all. From which I observe from hence. 1. That there is an heirship during childhood itself. 2. That there is this heirship when there is no difference between being a child and a servant. 3. A child is an heir as soon as born; yea, when first conceived. If a man of estate leaves his wife but a month gone with child, he leaves an heir, &c.

Calvin. Mr. Neonomian, though you grant not the secret application of grace he speaks of at conception, yet you cannot deny a secret and sure relation by virtue of election and redemption. The Lord is eternally interconnected with all the objects of his affection. A right must be in the object whenever it has a being; all that are redeemed by Christ, are called the sheep of Christ before calling. Show me a person that is an elect and redeemed one, I can tell you God's justice is satisfied on his behalf, and eternal life procured for him, though he be yet an unbeliever, be not in possession, nor can make any claim as yet. I pray, was not Paul in his unregenerate state an elect vessel, and secured from the hands of vindictive justice by Christ's satisfaction, and heaven secured by Christ's impetration? A right to the benefit of obtaining salvation, as secured by Christ. I pray, Mr. Neonomian, what would you say of Paul a persecutor in the height of his villainy, had you known then that he was an elect vessel?

Neonomian. I would say thus, that Paul when a wicked persecuting Saul, while breathing forth cruelty against the Churches, should not die under the dominion of sin; and being an elect person, and Christ having borne his sins on the cross, was the object of God's love and good will even while he was so wicked and vile, and that God continues his gracious purpose of doing him good, notwithstanding all his wickedness and abomination; that Christ has made full atonement for his sins, and merited eternal life for him, and that he shall certainly be justified, adopted and glorified in God's appointed way and time; and that Christ has left nothing to be done by us in a way of atonement and merit; yea, I affirm, that distinguishing grace does make a very great difference between an elect sinner, and others.

Calvin. I pray now what is it more that Dr. Crisp has said?

Neonomian. He says, the elect are at no time of their lives under the wrath of God.

Calvin. So must you too, if you understand wrath in the same sense that he does, for Christ cannot bear their sins, and

the wrath of God for their sins, and yet they bear it themselves too. Shall not the Judge of all the world deal righteously? And you say, they continue objects of his gracious good will, and full atonement made. God cannot be wroth with a person with whom full atonement is made.

Neonomian. But what if they should die before they should believe?

Calvin. He does not say, they shall be saved if they die before they believe; or under the dominion of sin, &c. You fasten that charge without ground; and never fear that, for you say their justification and adoption is certain, there's no doubt then but they shall certainly believe.

Neonomian. But they are actually unpardoned, and not adopted to life, which the Doctor says they are.

Calvin. The Doctor speaks not here of the elect's actual pardon or adoption. He says indeed, their sins are laid on Christ, and therefore God has nothing to lay to their charge. And you say, Christ has made full atonement for them. I pray what difference is here? He says, they have a secret hidden right to life. You say, by virtue of election, and Christ's merits, they shall certainly have justification, adoption, glorification. So that you own your grounds for this right. He does not say an unregenerate man is adopted, or has received the Spirit of adoption, anywhere as I know.

Neonomian. But the elect, while dead in sin and unbelief, are children of wrath, condemned by the law, not justified by the promise. This I affirm, and the Doctor denies.

Calvin. The Doctor in this point, for ought I know, affirms and denies but as you do. He says, a sinner in respect of his visible estate is under the law-sentence, and dead in sin and unbelief. He will not deny this, but that an elect person as such, has a hidden relation, standing and right, not only in respect of election, satisfaction and procurement, but a secret passing over of grace. So that to be a child of wrath in regard of the law-sentence, and a child of mercy, are not contradictions; for they may be predicated of the same subject in divers respects. A man may be a child of wrath in one respect, and of mercy in another. A man may be poor in one respect, and rich in another, as the Church of Smyrna condemned in one respect, and secured from it in another. Wrath is understood two ways in Scripture. 1. For the sentence of the law, that all the world is under, as having sinned, and come short of the righteousness of God. 2. For the real execution of the sentence of the law by essential vindictive justice. This the elect are abundantly freed from, and the wrath of God shall never fall upon them as such.

Neonomian. But he says, the elect have right to the inheritance.

Calvin. Yes, a secret and hidden right, but true and certain, though not possession or claim, till grace embraceth them, and this grace manifested to them. A child that has a good right to an inheritance may be taken captive in infancy, and remain in Africa a slave many years, and never know of any estate belonging to him; but upon his return to his native country, finds by writings and court rolls that he has had right all this while, though kept out of possession, and knew no ground of a claim. A man may be heir to a crown, and yet during the King's life be no king; yea, it may be, out in rebellion against his Father many years, and yet come to possess the crown upon his previous right. A man may have a good right to an estate in one Court where it is enrolled, when as another Court knows nothing of it. Every elect person is enrolled by name in God's book of election, and the Lamb's book of redemption, while there's nothing of this to be found before the tribunal of conscience; nor according to the estimation of the world. And your own assertion at first cuts you off from all pleas to the contrary. For you say, that "it's certain from God's decree of election, that the elect shall in time be justified, adopted and saved in the way God has appointed, {then they are heirs of justification, adoption and salvation, upon some ground of right or other,} and the whole meritorious cause and price of justification; adoption and eternal life were perfect when Christ finished the work of satisfaction." So now it appears here is a complete right adjusted for them, the estate is bought, and the money all paid, and the title is enrolled in their name, what hinders them from being heirs in law, and having a right of inheritance belonging to them?

Neonomian. I will prove the elect before they are effectually called, to be children of wrath. Eph.2:2-3. Col.1:21.

Calvin. As elect persons the Scripture nowhere saith; but as sinners, and as dead in trespasses, we acknowledge they are under the law sentence, imprisoned in their natural estate, in a state of bondage and darkness; but this hinders not the foundation of God in election and redemption, they have a hidden safety and security from wrath by your own Confession.

Neonomian. The Gospel bars all unbelievers and dead sinners from pardon and adoption, and denounces a continuance of condemnation against them, limiting its benefits to such as believe. Jn.3:18,36. I Cor.16:22.

Calvin. If the Gospel bars all unbelievers, and those that are dead in sin, from Gospel benefits, who shall be saved? It must bar them from life; for life is the first and greatest benefit a dead man can receive; nay, you say, it declares continuance of condemnation against them. It's certainly therefore impossible they should ever be saved. And are not regeneration and faith Gospel-benefits? And are unbelievers forever barred from them?

This puts a bar upon their possibility of salvation, and keeps them from ever being believers. The places you quote are nothing to prove your assertion; for the most they say, is, that whilst a person is in a state of unbelief, he is in a state of condemnation, under the law; but the Gospel does not put a bar to his salvation, but rather takes off the bars, opens the prison-doors, gives him life, gives him a door of hope, brings him to Christ, who is the Resurrection and Life.

Neonomian. If it were not so, neither the Spirit nor the Word of God would have any influence in the salvation of sinners.

Calvin. It does not follow. Can't the state of the elect be secured by election, and yet redemption have its place? Why notwithstanding both, may not the Spirit have its place and influence?

Neonomian. Gospel-benefits imply, that there is a time when we are actually guilty and miserable. Rom.7:4. Col.2:12.

Calvin. Grant it, there is such a time, when we are so in ourselves; but yet until that time, election and redemption are not in vain; they have their force. The changes that pass upon us does not make a change as to electing love, nor as to the satisfaction and merits of Christ.

Neonomian. The Doctor may well infer, that we are sanctified and possessed of Heaven in the womb; for God has elected us to those, as well as to pardon; and Christ merited these also.

Calvin. No, but he might not. One imports a relation, the other a real subjective change. A child may be a son, and yet a very wicked one. There is also a great difference between a right and a possession.

Neonomian. Do you not find that God justifies none but those that are called? Rom.8:30.

Calvin. 1. He justifies infants dying in infancy, that were never called by the Word. 2. What you would prove by that place, that effectual calling is before justification, is not manifest; for, it's whom he called, them he also justified. It might be before calling as well as after, for anything appears in that text. 3. But you go from the terms of the question all along; for that which the Doctor says, is, that the sins of the elect being all laid upon Christ, who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It's Christ has died and rose again, for them. Now God has no charge against the elect considered as such; if justice remain unsatisfied, Christ died in vain.

Neonomian. There is joy in Heaven for one sinner that repents, Lk.15:7,10, and would there be such, if they were pardoned and safe before.

Calvin. Yes, why not? For I question whether the angels be acquainted with the secrets of election and redemption as to

the persons concerned, till it be made manifest by their actual faith and repentance. And as for the safe estate of the elect before believing, you have said enough, i.e., as to their security from wrath, and certainty of eternal life. Therefore it's strange you should deny it now, say and unsay the same thing.

Neonomian. How much is our ministry and concern for souls debased, if all we can prevail with are already actually pardoned.

Calvin. You should have said, if all you prevail with have had their sins laid on Christ, whereby God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. Paul might have said, how then is our ministry debased, to be only Ambassadors for Christ to beseech sinners to be reconciled to God, when their sins are already laid on Christ, and to preach, that all things are of God, who has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, who has slain the enmity, and made peace on the cross, &c. There's great difference between God's being reconciled to us, and our being reconciled to God.

Neonomian. Who can reconcile this notion to the pleadings of God with sinners? Ezek.33:11.

Calvin. Everyone. The pleadings of God in his Word with sinners, is in order to change their hearts by his Word and Spirit, in the embassy of reconciliation, which God has sent unto sinners. Therefore the Apostle says, we beseech you for Christ's sake to be reconciled unto God; and all arguments used in the Word are to that end and purpose, viz., to work faith and repentance, and to bring them unto God. One great end why Christ bore their sins.

Neonomian. I have the Westminster Assembly and Dr. Owen on my side.

Antinomian. We deny not what the Assembly and Dr. Owen says, according to their true meaning and intention, for they all say no otherwise than what I have shown the Doctor sincerely means, and your own assertions will bear out as well as his. As to his particular opinion, that the grace of laying sins on Christ is secretly applied as soon as we have a being, as to some effects wherein we are merely passive, and it's unknown to us till effectual calling; you see he grounds it upon matter of fact, in the instance of Jacob, which undoubtedly deserves consideration. Though I say not that it's so with everyone, but apprehend that the Spirit of God has these things to instruct us thereby, that justification of a sinner before God is not for the act of faith, or Gospel-obedience, because Jacob was justified before either. 2. That the children of believing parents dying in infancy may be justified and saved. 3. That a believing parent has promise ground to baptize his child, and exercise faith, that his child is embraced in the arms of free grace, to work upon it how,

and when, and in what manner he pleaseth; and though he cannot be active therein, yet he may be passive. This we pray for, and in praying believe, God saying, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed. I am not for baptismal regeneration, nor baptismal justification, though there is something analogous to it, and therefore a kind of justification in the realm of the church, it being a significant seal of it, as circumcision was called the Covenant. And therefore if there be any secret application of the grace of election and redemption accompanying that institution of Christ, or coming before or after, neither we nor our children shall be ever the worse for it. And therefore let us not banter and condemn such as have higher apprehensions of the secret workings of grace before we are aware of it. I am sure many divines that you would not call Antinomians, have defended infant baptism upon this notion, that infants are capable of the habit of saving faith. And if so, I am sure according to your notion, they must be justified, because they have the qualifying condition, for a habit is a quality, and a conformity to the rule of the promise, {as you phrase it,} and therefore must justify as such.

Neonomian. The Doctor mistakes the nature of God's decree, because a decree ascertains a thing shall be in time; therefore he thinks a decree gives a thing a present subjective being.

Antinomian. The decree of God gives an objective being to the thing decreed; for the will willing, and the thing willed, are relative; all things in time are present with God, looking upon them in one eternal act; there's neither time past or to come, or succession, that his decrees are measured by; his decree is himself. But if we consider the objects of the decree in execution, they are in time, and measured by succession; but yet things thus standing, are the objects of the decree, they have their first cause in his Divine idea, and have their unchangeable fixation, as to their nature and order in the present or future being and working, either as necessary or contingent agents.

Neonomian. Because Jacob was an elect person, or the object of electing love in the womb, therefore he was then actually a pardoned and adopted person.

Antinomian. Nay, there was more in it than that, for mark the text, "for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger." Rom.9:11-12. It does not only tell us Jacob was elected, but that it was published and declared unto Rebecca, Jacob have I loved. If God should tell my wife when with child, I have elected, and do love

this child that is in thy womb, I should look upon this as a justification of this child, it being a declared sentence of God concerning it's standing in his favor and unchangeable love. 2. The text is particular in the reason of this declaration to Rebecca, verse 11, that we may see that God accomplished his purpose of election in the applying of the grace thereof without works, not so much as upon the account of faith as a work, because the children were not capable of doing good or evil, the application of his distinguishing love could not be upon that account, viz., of any condition found in them; nor could the foresight of any such thing in them be the cause of God's purpose in election, and shows it's one and the same righteousness that an infant and adult person is justified by.

Neonomian. Because an eldest son is an heir in the womb, therefore an elect person who is in time to be adopted, is an heir in the womb.

Calvin. There's a difference between an heir and adoption. If you know there is an elect person in the womb, as Rebecca did, he is a more sure heir to Heaven than ever any great man's son was to an outward estate. And as to adoption, that may not be till some time after, for that is the grace of sonship. It's one thing to be a son, and another to have the grace of sonship. And is the calling them the sons of God, manifestly taking them into the number, and endowing them with the privileges of the sons of God? The relation of an heir, and the state of adoption, admit of different considerations. The state of adoption is the grown state of an elect person; he is put into possession of the estate, and all Gospel privileges, seated together with Christ in Heavenly places as a co-heir. And thus we are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, Gal.3:26, the Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, and so heirs abundantly, joint-heirs with Christ. "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom.8:15-17.

Let us now hear what our approved Calvinists say in this point, that speak most particularly and distinctly to it.

Dr. William Ames, "the transaction between God and Christ was a certain previous application of our redemption and discharge to our Surety, and to us in him, which has the nature of a certain efficacious pattern to that secondary manner of application which is completed in us; so that this is the representation of that, this is produced by virtue of that. Now it is inferred hence, that our freedom from sin and death was not

only determined in God's decree, but also granted and communicated to us in Christ before it is perceived by us." {Marrow of Sacred Theology, Chapter 24, Section 3.}

Mr. Samuel Rutherford, pray speak next, for you wrote against Antinomianism. "Certainly before an elect person does believe, the wrath of God, and all the effects of his wrath, are removed from the persons by virtue of Christ's Satisfaction."

Mr. William Pemble, "that God does actually love the elect before they are regenerate, or can actually believe, may appear further by these reasons. 1. Where God is actually reconciled, there he actually loveth; for love and reconciliation are inseparable; but with the elect before they are converted and believe, God is actually reconciled, therefore, he loves them before faith and conversion. The minor is evident, because before they are born a full atonement and satisfaction is made for their sins by Christ, and accepted on God's part, whereupon all actual reconciliation must needs follow. 2. God did actually love the elect before Christ's time, when actual reconciliation was not yet made, much more therefore after the atonement made. 3. Justification, effectual vocation and faith, are fruits of God's actual love, &c."

Mr. Daniel Chamier, "we are most fully persuaded that our sins are forgiven before we believe; for certainly we deny infants to act faith, and yet their sins are forgiven them. And although it be true, that our sins be forgiven before we believe, i.e., before we know it as actual believers, we do believe the remission of our sins, because this is proposed to us, yea promised to us in the same words which we rely upon by faith, and it's sealed by the same Spirit, whereby that word is truth."

Antinomian. I think I see that Mr. Baxter appears in this cause, though I suppose he is seldom in this society.

Calvin. I pray let us hear Sir what you say to this point.

Mr. Richard Baxter. The Anabaptists bring Ephesians 2:3, against the baptism of infants, and say, because they are by nature children of wrath, the promise belongs not to them. "What though we are by nature children of wrath, does it follow that we may not be otherwise by grace; the state of wrath goes first in order of nature, and whether in order of time also is not worth our disputing; but may not a state of grace immediately succeed? Jeremiah was sanctified in the womb, and John the Baptist; and the infants that Christ blessed were all by nature children of wrath, and yet by grace were in a better state. As they come from old Adam they are children of wrath, but as they receive of the grace procured by the second Adam, so they are not children of wrath. If a Prince should entail some honors upon all your children; you might well say by nature, or as they were your children, they were not honorable or noble, and yet by the

favor of the Prince they might be all honorable from the womb. The godly at age may say that they are still by nature children of wrath, even when they are sure they are children of God by grace; and they use in their Confessions to say, that we by nature are enemies to God, fire-brands of Hell."

Calvin. I would willingly hear what the learned and judicious Mr. Cotton says.

Mr. John Cotton, in answer to that objection made by the Anabaptist against infant baptism, that faith comes by hearing, ergo, infants have not faith. "It is no extraordinary thing which Christ speaks concerning infants, when he says, except you receive the Kingdom of God as little children, &c., and they cannot receive it without Christ, nor without faith in Christ, and yet received not Christ nor faith by their own immediate hearing of the Word; and for the second thing which you make essential to union with Christ, {viz., a heart fitly disposed to apprehend and receive Christ,} be not unwilling to understand that which is truth. The heart is fitly disposed by faith to apprehend or apply Christ, when faith is begotten in the heart; for by this gift of faith begotten in us, Christ apprehends us, and by the same gift of faith the heart is fitly disposed to apprehend Christ even in infants; for when faith is wrought in infants, the heart is quickened with spiritual life, and made a sanctified vessel to receive Christ, which reception of Christ though it be passive, yet it is all one with regeneration, wherein not infants only but all men are passive, which gave the Lord Jesus Christ occasion to say, that whosoever receiveth the Kingdom of God as a little child, i.e., in respect of the passive reception." Lk.18:17.

DEBATE II.

OF GOD'S LAYING SIN ON CHRIST.

Neonomian. You know at last conference our subject that we discoursed upon was the state of the elect before effectual calling. If you please let us discourse the point of laying sins on Christ, I shall here charge considerable errors on Mr. Antinomian.

Calvinist. I pray Sir proceed, I perceive Mr. Antinomian is very willing to hear you with patience.

Neonomian. I charge him with this error, that he says, that God did not only impute the guilt, and lay the punishment of the sins of the elect upon Christ, but he laid all the very sins of the elect upon Christ, and that as to their real filth and

loathsomeness; yea so that Christ was really the blasphemers, murderer, and sinner, and so accounted by the Father.

Calvin. Mr. Antinomian. Did you lay down this position?

Antinomian. Sir, it's bad enough if it be as he says, and in his sense and meaning, I find his way is to put first a wild beasts skin upon me, and then fall a hunting of me. I pray Mr. Neonomian, how do you prove this charge?

Neonomian. You tell us, it's iniquity itself that the Lord laid upon Christ; not only our punishment but our very sin, &c. The transaction of our sins to Christ is a real act; our sins so became Christ's that he stood the sinner in our stead, and we discharged, {and he is not contented to mean only the punishment, but says it's iniquity itself,} I mean, says he, the fault of the transgression itself, &c. To speak more plainly, hast thou been an idolater? Hast thou been a blasphemers, murderer, drunkard, &c. If thou hast part in the Lord, all these transgressions of thine become actually the transgressions of Christ. Nor are we so completely sinful, but Christ being made sin, was as completely sinful as we, &c., and God himself did account him among the number of transgressors.

Calvin. You should first have told us, Mr. Neonomian, what you mean by guilt and punishment of sin, how you distinguish debt from fault, and how you understand the filth of sin; and should have alleged some expression of his whereby it might have been evinced that he held Christ to be the very perpetrator of the sins of the elect; that he had said, Christ was actually drunk when Noah was; that Christ killed Uriah and lay with his wife, and made the golden calf in the wilderness, that he denied himself when Peter did, yea that he slew and murdered himself. You should have told us what you mean by imputation, &c.

Antinomian. I shall show you by comparing his charge and proof together, how fallaciously he deals with you, and invidiously with Dr. Crisp. He says, "I said God laid all the very sins of the elect upon Christ, he should have added, by imputation, for his proof runs thus, our sins so became Christ's, that he stood the sinner in our stead, and we discharged. Now I pray, is it to become the very person and actor, when I stand in the stead of another person that did it? The proof makes his charge false, the very evidence he brings is enough for my defense against his charge; and when he brings these words of mine, {to prove, that I hold Christ became the real murderer, &c.,} if you are a thief, murderer, liar, &c., all these transgressions {if thou hast part in the Lord} become actually the transgressions of Christ, he should have told you how I explained myself; and he knows I mean no otherwise than what can be Christ's by actual imputation. Here's a great sputter of

real and actual, and very sins, &c. He might as well if he had dealt candidly, told you all my meaning, and not perverted it to serve his own reproachful tongue. I say thus in handling this text, 'all we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,' Isa.53:6, that this iniquity was really laid upon Christ; Christ was as really the bearer of the sins of God's people, as a surety is really the debtor when he willingly puts himself into the room of the principal debtor. Insomuch that God cannot expect the debt anywhere but of Christ. Christ gives the bond, and by giving the bond makes himself the debtor. God accepts of this, and upon it discharges the poor sinners themselves, and if he will have payment he must have it where himself has laid the debt. 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.' II Cor.5:19."

Now Sir you have the great prodigious error that Mr. Neonomian charges me to be guilty of. As the surety gives bond for the very debt of the principal to a farthing, the very debt of this or that party by name, living in such a place, of such a calling, for a debt contracted at such a time. "So that it's that debt, not another that he contracted at another time, or the debt of another man, but the debt so and so circumstantiated, described and subscribed by the debtors own hand. A surety enters into the same bond, changing only the names. Sin is called our debts by Christ himself who is our Surety. Did he not bear our very debts? He that bare our very debts, bare our very sins; but Christ bare our very debts; and now for me to pay the very debts of a debtor that is become bankrupt, and spent his estate upon luxury, is it to become the luxurious contractor of the debt."

Neonomian. You may think, gentlemen, that this man means only punishment that was laid on Christ.

Antinomian. No, no, I do not mean only punishment, as you mean; I know, whatever you say, you mean not punishment in a right sense, but only suffering. But you must blot out, for sin, then it's not punishment; for if the law inflicts suffering it is for sin; and if for sin, it's punishment; and if a punishment, sin was in some sense or other found upon him, or else the law wronged him in inflicting sufferings on him. "Now when I say it is iniquity itself that the Lord has laid on Christ, I mean as the Prophet does, it is the fault of the transgression itself; and to speak more fully, that erring and straying like sheep, that very erring, straying and transgressing, is passed off from them, and is laid upon Christ, {viz., by imputation,} to speak it more plainly, hast thou been an idolater, blasphemer, murderer, &c., if thou hast a part in Christ, they become actually the transgressions of Christ, {by imputation,} and so cease to

be thine, for he was numbered with transgressors. God himself did account him among the number of transgressors, for he himself made him a transgressor at that time; bear with the expression, for the Apostle has a higher than this, though it may seem harsh to you, 'for he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' II Cor.5:21. There's a great deal of difference between being made sin and a sinner, the expression in the abstract going beyond the concrete. I know the word may be spoke hyperbolically; not that Christ simply could be made sin, not that his essence could be turned into sin, but the Apostles meaning was, that no transgressor in the world was such a transgressor as Christ was. But still he was a transgressor, as our transgressions were laid upon him; not that he was the actor of any transgressions."

Now Sir you hearing me say this, that Christ was a transgressor by way of suretyship only; not as the actor of any sin in his own person, do not you traduce me slanderously, charge me with saying, that Christ was really the blasphemer and murderer, and idolater? And that because I say, if thou be a thief, murderer or drunkard, if thou hast part in the Lord, all these transgressions of thine become actually the transgressions of Christ, i.e., by actual imputation, as the debts of a bankrupt becomes a surety, that undertakes them. Was not Noah's drunkenness, David's murder and adultery, Rachel's theft and idolatry imputed to Christ? How would you have these great foul sins forgiven? I suppose you are not for the taking away so great sins by the blood of Christ; with you it would redound to the disparagement of Christ.

Neonomian. Yes, if he should bear the filthiness and loathsomeness of sin, as you say, he bears the loathsomeness, abominableness, and hatefulness of rebellion, which is laid on Christ's back; he bears the sin as well as the shame and blame.

Antinomian. I was opening, Psal.68:18, "thou hast received gifts from men, yea, for the rebellious also," an eminent prophesy of Christ. The text says also that thou mightest dwell among them; who is that them? The rebellious. Beloved, you must know that no evil dwells with God; the Lord stands fully off and separated from all iniquity. Therefore seeing God can't dwell with iniquity, there must be a taking away of iniquity, before there be a receiving graciously. "Take with you words, and turn to the LORD, say unto him, take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so will we render the calves of our lips." Hos.14:2. As long as there is iniquity to be charged upon any person, there's no receiving graciously; therefore seeing God cannot dwell with men where iniquity is, Christ received gifts for men that the Lord might dwell among the rebellious, and enlarging here I spake

what he rehearses by way of reproach unto me. It is easy to misrepresent any man's words, and make them look very odiously, if you hang, draw and quarter them, pluck a sentence limb from limb. But the thing in dispute between us is, whether Christ did not bear the very sins of the elect in some sense or other?

Neonomian. Yes, it is so, for you say it's sin opposed to guilt, and to say that God laid the guilt of sin, and not sin itself upon Christ is contrary to Scripture.

Antinomian. For the objection about guilt, that the Lord lays the guilt and punishment, but not simply the sin itself; for ought that I see it is a simple objection. For first, you shall never find there is distinction in all the Scriptures, that God laid the guilt of sin upon Christ, and not sin itself; nay to affirm that God laid the guilt of sin upon Christ, and not sin itself, is contrary to Scripture, i.e., to deny that God laid sin itself, by saying he laid guilt and not sin, must needs be so, because the Scriptures affirm positively God laid sin, yea iniquity upon him, and that he bore our sins &c. What presumption then is it for man to say, God laid the guilt and not the sin, i.e., to assert the laying of guilt on Christ, with a denial of laying sin. 2. That you may have a little light concerning the word guilt, for I know many spirits are troubled at it, and for my part I do not think as some do, that guilt differs from sin, as that which is an obligation or binding over to the punishment of sin, rather than sin itself being past and gone, for when sin is committed it leaves behind the consciousness of sin committed, which is the sin lying upon us. But that you may have the true nature of guilt. When Joseph's brethren were accused for spies, there it is said they spake one to another, we are guilty concerning our brother. Gen.42:21. As to the word 'guilt,' Johannes Buxtorf, renders it transgress, and it's applied to being under Levitical uncleanness actually, Lev.5:2, we are debtors to the law in breaking of it; we have contracted the debt of sin. And it's not a little remarkable how the LXXII interpret the aforementioned word, Gen.42:21, "we are in our sins, or the sins are upon us, which we committed about our brother." What is the meaning of guilty here? Nissim Ben Reuben expounds that 22nd verse, "did not I say to you, sin not against the lad, but you would not hearken unto me, and therefore behold we are guilty." What is that? We did sin against the child, to be guilty then, and to commit sin, is all one; they are but two words expressing the same thing; for further understanding; a malefactor is asked guilty or not guilty? He answers not guilty; he means he has not done that fact which was laid to his charge; when the Jury say guilty, what do they mean? Do they mean anything of the punishment; no, they enquire only of the justness of the charge concerning matter of

fact. The Jury have nothing to do with the punishment, but only matter of fact, whether done or not done, so that guilt and sin are all one; and thus to say guilt is laid upon Christ, but sin is not laid upon Christ is a contradiction; and whereas some say the punishment of sin, and not the sin; I say, that Scripture warrants the laying punishment on Christ, for he was wounded for our transgressions, which warrants the laying sin upon Christ. I say here is a real act, and not supposed only, God does really pass over sin upon him, still keeping this fast, that Christ acted no sin; so that in respect of the act, not one sin of believers is Christ's, but in respect of transgression, {the relation that sin has to the law as a fault,} in respect of conveyance, as to passing accounts from one head to another, in respect of that, there is a reality of making Christ to be sin; when one man becomes a debtor in another man's room, legally and by consent, this surety that does become the debtor, is not barely supposed to be the debtor, but by undertaking it, and legally having it passed upon him, he is as really and truly the debtor, {yea has the same debt upon him,} as he was who was the principal before; I say as really and truly the debtor. So that there is an absolute truth and reality in God's act of passing over sins to Christ, and laying sins upon him. There must be {in criminal cases} of necessity a present desert upon a person on whom he inflicts punishment; he must not inflict punishment upon a mere supposition.

Calvin. I do not see but that he has given a very clear and distinct account of his notion, but I find you will condemn whatever Mr. Antinomian says, right or wrong.

Neonomian. No, no, I will lay open his mistakes more plainly before you, I will assure you he knows not what he says, I will convince you both immediately. The ground of his mistakes are these. 1. He seems to speak of sin as a positive material thing, and does not distinguish between God's laying our sins on Christ as a physical act, and as a moral act, and thinks God took our sins as a material burden, and laid them upon Christ.

Calvin. Sir, I must tell you then, that you mistake him, I doubt willfully, for he nowhere speaks of sin as a physical act, but as a moral transgression. Doth he not say as plainly as may be the contrary to what you suggest, viz., here is a real act of God, God does really pass over sin upon him, still keeping this fast, that Christ acted no sin. Doth he not plainly here deny the physical act to Christ? And does he speak of sin as a material burden, when he says Christ bore it as a fault, debt, law-breach, &c. He speaks of it as a moral and judicial burden, and so does the Spirit of God speak of it. "For mine iniquities are gone over mine head, as an heavy burden they are too heavy for me." Psal.38:4. And Christ bore them as a burden in his body on the tree; it was not sweet and pleasant naturally to him.

Neonomian. He seems not to apprehend what the true notion is of imputing a thing to another in law, as in criminal cases.

Calvin. Nor do you understand that of Mr. Antinomian, I suppose he means you were never used to the royal court, as you only have been exercised at a trial court for the hearing of civil cases before a judge and jury.

Antinomian. I am no lawyer, but yet am fain to use some law terms {that the Scripture useth, and most men are acquainted with} in this matter, and most divines hold necessary to explain these mysteries by; though Mr. Neonomian will not understand them, nor allow them any otherwise than in his own sense, contrary to all received meanings of them. Do not I talk of sin as a criminal case, when I say David's murder and adultery was imputed to Christ, and the sin of those and such like actions? Imputation is of the same nature, whether the default be debt, or criminal nature, both debts of money and felonies are moral transgressions; nay, both are the breach of one law, theft; and not paying another, or his own money due upon bond, or rent-charge, or the like, is breaking the eighth commandment, thou shalt not steal, and is not theft a criminal case? See Dr. Crisp, pages 288, 289.

Neonomian. God's laying sin on Christ is a moral act of God as a Rector, i.e., he agreed and appointed that Christ should in his person stand obliged to bear the punishment of our sins, that we might obtain pardon, and that punishment was actually laid upon him, and suffered by him.

Antinomian. What do you mean by a Rector? Do you mean as a Rector under a law for the rule of his moral obedience? Or was God bound by his moral law to appoint Christ to bear sin? What do we with this diminutive word 'rector?' Methinks you might entitle God, our great King, Sovereign Lawgiver, who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and does whatever he pleaseth in Heaven and Earth, and you make him a little moral Rector, and as such he covenanted with his Son to bear sin. Did God act in a way of government and dominion over his Son as his Rector, when he said, "if thou shalt make thy Soul an offering for sin, &c?" Or as with one that counted it no robbery to be equal with God. Phil.2:6. Was it not when he was with him, one brought up with him, his delight, his fellow? And was agreeing with Christ to bear sin, and actually laying it upon him, the same act? Whereas one was immanent, and the other transient; God in laying sin or charging sin upon Christ, or executing the punishment upon him, freely submitting himself to be dealt with in a way of justice, did act as a great Judge, the Judge of all the world, yielding the sword of Divine Justice. Why must we have this mean title for God, Rector? God did not covenant with his Son in a way of

judicial proceeding, though that Covenant was executed in a way of vindictive and remunerative justice. And you say the punishment of sin was laid on Christ, but not sin itself. What justice is it in a Judge, or as a Rector, as you call him, to punish him for sin, that is not justly charged with sin, if transgression charged is the only meritorious cause of punishment; where there is no law, there's no transgression; and where there's no transgression, there can be no punishment, though there may be sufferings they cannot be penal. And you say he was obliged to bear the punishment, that we might obtain pardon, cunningly worded indeed; this is an answer to a bill, saving all advantages that hereafter may be taken. You mean Christ has borne the punishment of our sins, that we may hereafter by the righteousness of another law obtain pardon.

Neonomian. Again, also because a man that is bound in a bond of money becomes a debtor; therefore he thinks because Christ suffered to save the idolater or blasphemers, therefore Christ must be the idolater and blasphemers.

Antinomian. But pray sir show first, that he thinks Christ became the very idolater and blasphemers; you heard him again and again deny that he thought so, but he said that Christ was charged with, and bore the sins of the idolater and blasphemers; and I stand to it, and I must tell you, if a man bound for money becomes a debtor, it's for that debt which is owing. And if idolatry be a sin whereby a sinner is a debtor to the law, Christ becomes a debtor in the same sense for idolatry. And I told you, a debtor is a moral transgressor, if he make not due payment as well as a thief, both sinners against one command.

Neonomian. Christ paying our debts was a satisfaction for criminals, not a payment of money.

Antinomian. Not silver and gold, but a better sort of money. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." I Pet.1:18-19. You know the Spirit of God alludes to that metaphor; he calls our redemption, our being bought with a price, or a Ransom, &c. "For ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." I Cor.6:20. Therefore I think you should not pretend to be wiser than the Spirit of God; and Christ's paying our debts was making satisfaction for criminals, and he was a reputed criminal, he was numbered among transgressors not only by man {as you say} but by God.

Neonomian. And yet it is plain, that if I were bound for money for one, that by drunkenness wastes his estate, my being bound to pay the money, does not argue that I was, or must by

the creditors be so accounted when I make payment.

Antinomian. It is very true, Mr. Moderator, I think it's time for us to break up our Club at this time, for if the Constable should happen to look in, and hear such high-flown reasoning as this is, I do not know but we may be in danger of being laid by the heels, the best of it is, that we shall be reckoned incapable of sound reason for being laid by the heels.

Neonomian. Once more, to clinch the last conviction a little closer, because Christ was made sin, i.e., an offering or sacrifice for sin; therefore he thinks our very sins were laid upon him, and he made filthy.

Antinomian. Because he was made a sacrifice for sin, therefore I say he was made sin, the sacrifices were made sin, and bore the sins of the people typically as shadows, Christ really, and as the substance; and as the sacrifices became Levitically unclean by the bearing of sin, so Christ the true sacrifice was judicially unclean when he bore our sins in his body on the Tree.

Neonomian. To add no more, because men wickedly arraigned him as a blasphemer, therefore the Doctor thinks he was so indeed, and in God's account.

Calvin. What blundering Doctor is this to have so many gross mistakes in such a plain point of Divinity, and of so great concern; that ever any man's skull should be so thick, as to think that Christ actually blasphemed God, because he bore the sins upon the cross of those that reproached him for a blasphemer, and arraigned him as such.

Antinomian. I pray Sir, let me ask him one question for information, now he talks of blasphemers, and he is so good at rectifying mistakes. Tell me the meaning of that place, Psal.69:39, applied to Christ, Rom.15:3. Some take it to mean that the blasphemies of blasphemers were charged upon and imputed to Christ; and I think the Apostle Paul quotes the place in that sense, but it may be the Apostle Paul and I may be both mistaken; I pray sir make it so, and add it to the other mistakes.

Calvin. You have been a great while showing what laying of sin upon Christ is not, and convincing this Doctor of Antinomianism, and want of brains; I pray sir now let us be the better for yours, and let us know the truth in this great matter, and that we may not be liable to be led aside by such dark doctors as you make this to be.

Neonomian. I came on purpose to be a Guide to you, I know you are all at a loss in these points; but know this as truth, though our sins were imputed to Christ with respect to the guilt thereof, so that he by the Father's appointment, and his own consent, became obliged, as a Mediator, to bear the punishment of our iniquities; and he did bear those punishments to the full

satisfaction of justice, and to our actual remission when we believe; nevertheless the filth of our sins was not laid on Christ; nor can he be called the transgressor, or was he in God's account the blasphemer, murderer, &c., and that you may not be mistaken, I will tell you in several particulars what I hold, as that Christ bare the punishment of our sins.

Antinomian. Sir, I desire to remark upon your concessions as you name them.

Neonomian. I pray take your liberty as to that.

Antinomian. Punishment is such no otherwise than as the wages of sin, and where sin is not charged there's no wages due, and therefore if punishment be taken only as suffering for sin, it's no punishment but bare sufferings. An innocent person may suffer, but none can be punished by justice but a guilty person, that is so in the eye of the law that inflicts the suffering.

Neonomian. Christ bare the guilt of our sins, which is that respect of sin to the threatening of the law, whereby there is an obligation to bear the punishment.

Antinomian. We have told you the Scripture everywhere says Christ bore our sin. You say before, that our sins were imputed to Christ with respect to guilt, as if they were not laid on the guilty. 2. We find God's people for whom Christ bore sin, do often labour under guilt of sin. 3. Guilt of sin is a result of sin, belongs to the committer, and all the world is found guilty before God; or else it is the judicial charge, or accusation by the law, whereby the sinner is made to deserve punishment; thus it is with thousands that have no sense of guilt in conscience. 4. Guilt in conscience is taken off at the application of the satisfaction of Christ to the soul, by the sense of his bearing sin. 5. Guilt in judgment is upon proof of the charge or confession of it, either from conscience of the fact in the person that committed it, or from a submitting to the charge in the place and stead of another, whereupon the person becomes guilty, i.e., blame-worthy, and faulty in the eye of the law. 6. You mistake in saying guilt is that respect of sin to the threatenings of the law, whereby there is an obligation to bear punishment. Guilt is the just charge of sin, which is a transgression of the preceptive part; it's extrinsic to sin, to suffer punishment for sin, and though they are related by God's Constitution that wherever there is sin there must be punishment, yet it's not so by necessity of nature. 7. Hence obligation to punishment is from the will of the law-giver, and the nature of the law; not from the sinner; the law has tied sin and punishment together, and it's not sin to be obliged to punishment, but it is for sin; obligation to punishment is part of the wages of sin, and not sin in itself, nor the guilt of sin; a murderer that is cast, he is guilty before sentence or execution, not because the law will sentence him, but because he has

committed the fact which the law has forbid, and therefore has annexed a penalty to it. There's a privative nature in sin, which is a contrariety to the goodness of the law, which is the fault, therefore the law to avenge itself makes it worthy, or deserving such a punishment, and upon trial binds over the sinner to it; there's hardly to be found a difference between guilt related to penalty and guilt related to fault, as Dr. Owen says; but sin committed or justly charged upon some account or other, is in itself by virtue of the constitution of the Law an obligation to punishment, being the meritorious cause thereof.

Neonomian. I own Christ was esteemed by men a transgressor, and arraigned as such.

Antinomian. If it were only so, he bore sin no otherwise than the saints and martyrs, who also were accounted transgressors by men, arraigned and condemned as such, but it seems you will not own him accounted a transgressor by God, and therefore no sin was laid upon him, nor any punishment, and here you fall in roundly with the Socinians.

Neonomian. We grant also that Christ's sufferings were as effectual to put away sin, as if our very sins had been transacted on him.

Antinomian. I doubt not but you will ascribe as much to your Gospel, as Paul did to his; there was never any coiners of new doctrine, {Papist, Quaker, Socinian or Arminian, all well-wishers to your Divinity, in some part or other of it,} but will still each of them cry up your doctrine, and decry the truth for error; and this truth of laying sin on Christ, as vehemently as you, especially in the sense that you do.

Neonomian. But I say he became obliged as Mediator to bear the punishment of our iniquities.

Antinomian. If as Mediator, then to take up the difference between God and us, for its sin makes the difference and not punishment; this is but the effect of the difference, the High Priest, the typical Mediator, was to bear the iniquities of the people, and offer a sacrifice on which they were charged.

Neonomian. He did bear those punishments to the full satisfaction of justice.

Antinomian. Unless sin be taken away in a law sense, justice is not satisfied, bearing punishment only does not satisfy for sin, the law will have the sinner, or the sin taken away; therefore the damned must suffer to eternity because they cannot take away sin by suffering, but Christ did more than suffer, he put an end to sin by the sacrifice of himself.

Neonomian. Yea, and to our actual remission when we believe.

Antinomian. It seems there's fundamental potential remission before; and I doubt you will not suffer this remission

to take place without a new law and the righteousness thereof.

Neonomian. The real difference lies in these things. 1. Whether sin itself as to its filth and fault was transacted on Christ? This you affirm, and I deny. 2. Whether Christ was made and accounted by the Father the very transgressor, the adulterer, the blasphemous? This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. You might have put the questions into one, and stated it as it lies between the Apostle Paul and you. Whether God imputed sin to Christ at all?

Neonomian. I go on to confirm my positions. 1. To transact our sins on Christ as opposed to guilt, is impossible, for it would argue either a mistake in the Divine mind to account him the committer of our sins, or a propagator of our corrupt qualities to him, which is impossible; and any other way besides imputing the guilt there is none.

Antinomian. This argument, I judge, is to prove both positions. As to the first, it runs thus, that which is impossible cannot be done; but to transact sin as to its fault, is impossible, ergo, as to the major, I judge the impossibility is meant in respect of the nature of God, or the constitution of God, otherwise I know not why a fault may not be taken away, as well as obligation to punishment; when as fault is that for which a man is obliged to bear punishment. For if the fault remains, the punishment is still due. The minor you prove thus, as it would argue a mistake in God, or suppose him a propagator of sin. 1. It does argue a mistake in you to say, that's transferred from us which was never in us. For the obligation to punishment in its active consideration is subjectively in the law, and that cannot be taken from it; it's the debt which the law owes to the sinner, by reason of its sanction, and the punishment is the payment; the wages of sin is death. For punishment is not the sinner's debt, but the law's debt, and the sinner's due. The sinner's debt is, doing the duty the law requires. His disobedience is an offence to the law, a fault blamed by the preceptive part of the law; and this is guilt, that is, a consciousness of crime or having done wrong, to which deserving of punishment does by virtue of the Constitution belong. There are two respects in sin. 1. To the preceptive part of the law, and that is fault. 2. To the penal part, and that is merit. Now these by reason of the justice of the law, and the connection made by its institution between the accusing and condemning part, are inseparable before God; and being but two different respects of the same individual act, it is a fault and a merit, and a merit because it is a fault; the merit is a result from the fault, and are such relatives that they cannot be parted in judgment. Now then, will not your argument rebound upon yourself? Would it not argue a mistake in God, to lay the merit of punishment upon a person that has not any meritorious cause

of it in no respect? If the fault be not imputed, how can the merit? There can be no merit without a meritorious cause, and this is our sins, and not Christ's, by way of perpetration. In laying sin on Christ, there are these things. 1. The Spirit of God says it's sin, and does not confound sin and punishment, and it's absurd if it should, for punishment is not sin. 2. It says, it's our sins, not Christ's. 3. That these sins are juridically imputed and accounted to Christ. The payment by Christ's sufferings is his own money, not ours; the debt is imputed, not the payment. A surety is charged with, and takes upon him the principal debt, but does not take money from him to pay it; the money is his own; the debt is the principals transferred to him, but the payment is the surety's subjectively and properly. Therefore to say the payment is imputed to the surety is nonsense. The Spirit of God speaks expressly, that our sins were laid on Christ, no less than three times in Isaiah 53, and expressed by three different words, verses 6,11,12. The Apostle plainly there speaking after the Prophet, says, "who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed." I Pet.2:24. He bore it as a sin-offering, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb.9:28. Christ was made sin, "for he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." II Cor.5:21. Therefore we need not fear to say, Christ bore our sins, let the sense be what it will which the Spirit means; it was certainly so, as to take away the charge of sin, which is fault and blame, from before God. To take it away, which is so to take it away, as to set a man right in the eye of justice. "And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." I Jn.3:5.

Your next branch of proof to the minor, is, that to impute sin to Christ, would argue him a propagator of corrupt qualities. What could be done or said more by a Socinian, to load the great truths of the Gospel with reproachful consequences. 1. Sin is no positive quality as such, but only privative. 2. All qualities of a pernicious nature to the sinner, consisting of natural causes, are subjects of sin, not sin itself, and they are separable from sin in its moral consideration. There were in Christ himself effects of our sins, in infirmity, sorrow, reproach, &c. They were very uneasy qualities, though not corrupt. 3. God himself tells us. He laid iniquity upon him, and made him sin, and yet says positively, that he was no committer of sin. And you charge the Spirit of God with nonsense and contradiction. For you say, it's impossible to impute sin to Christ any other way than punishing of him, it's to mistake, and make Christ the committer, which punishment is

not sin; therefore what the Spirit says is false, sin was not laid on Christ at all, and yet the Spirit speaks it expressly. 4. You will infer these absurdities. 1. That sin cannot be laid on Christ but by transfusion, wherein you deny imputation. 2. That Christ must be corrupted thereby, whereas the Spirit of God tells us, he bears sin as a Lamb without spot. You will have it, that he had the blemish and stain of sin fixed on him by bearing it. 3. You will have God, by laying sin on Christ, to become a propagator of sin. The Spirit of God says, he appeared to take away our sins, and in him is no sin. I Jn.3:5. How audacious is our carnal reason, to set upon Divine Mysteries!

Neonomian. It was needless to the ends for which our sins were laid on Christ.

Antinomian. You should have said, what's needless. Your argument should have run thus, laying sins on Christ is needless to the ends for which they were laid on Christ; and therefore those Scriptures that say so, are needless.

Neonomian. Sins were laid on Christ, that he might make atonement by suffering for them; and so release us who had transgressed.

Antinomian. Now, Sir, you say something, you speak like a divine, if you can hold there. Now you own something laid on Christ besides punishment; for the atonement was made by being punished, and say well now, that sin was laid on him, that he might make atonement for them, viz., by being punished. For bearing sin is one thing, and making atonement is another, but they are inseparably related.

Neonomian. Now Christ, by submitting to the guilt as an obligation to punishment, according to the terms of the Covenant of Redemption, was sufficient to this end, and all that was needful.

Antinomian. That Christ bore the desert or demerit of our sin, which is done only by a judicial charge and accusation in our stead, is sufficient. What is sin after the fact is committed, but guilt related to fault? Guilt is the fault declared and applied somewhere in a way of judicial proceeding, and this is often the conscience of sin, and is not removed but by faith on Christ crucified, who bore our sins before God.

Neonomian. All that endangered us, was the threatening of the law, and the punishment included in the threat.

Antinomian. Where there is true godly sorrow, it's more upon this account, that he has sinned against a holy God, and broke his holy, just and good law, than for fear of the threats of wrath. I thought I had better understood the nature of sorrow for sin, that it had been the nature of sin in contrariety to God, had more grieved than the fear of punishment.

Neonomian. The obliquity of the fact, as against the precept, shall not hurt, where the sanction of the law is answered.

Antinomian. I think this is that you call Antinomianism with a witness; you shall hear of it again before long; only observe, that this is as much a doctrine of licentiousness, as any you charge on me. Secure but yourself from hell, and you need not regard the preceptive part of the law, you may live as you list. See how you will clear yourself, when you charge it for a great crime upon me, in saying, sin will do no hurt in some sense, &c.

Neonomian. And he that suffers as sponsor for another, need not sustain in himself the filthiness of the crime, to make him capable of giving satisfaction.

Antinomian. No, that's true upon your hypothesis, there's no need of a sponsor; for the filthiness of sin is too foul for Christ to bear, the sinner must be his own expiator, and carry away his filth himself; or if he keeps it, it will not hurt. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." I Jn.1:9.

Neonomian. This transacting of the filthiness of our sins on Christ is blasphemous.

Antinomian. Friend, that's a cruel bomb to shoot at a good man, to charge him with blasphemy. But where's the blasphemy, to say that Christ bore the filth of sin in a sense. Is not sin filthy under all considerations? Doth not the Spirit of God call it filthy and abominable in all respects? 1. Is not the guilt of sin filthy and abominable in God's sight? And is it not so, when it lies upon the conscience? I think the Spirit of God represents it always as the greatest foulness and uncleanness. I say, a conscience polluted with sin, to those that are defiled and unbelieving, and cannot by faith fetch and derive cleansing virtue from the blood of Christ into their consciences, to such nothing is clean. "Unto the pure all things are pure, but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." Tit.1:15. Now this is the very root and foundation of a defilement, and what is it that takes it off, but faith in the sin-cleansing virtue of Jesus Christ? The great contrariety of sin to the holy law, is the filthiness of sin. And the Apostle tells, "how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb.9:14. How do our consciences come to be purged from dead works; it's no other way than by the offering of Christ without spot to God. This spotless sacrifice, whereon he bore sin, and was not defiled, and hereby the conscience of sin, i.e., the guilt of sin, {which is no other than sin charged upon the conscience,}

is taken away; and thence the Levitical services could not make any perfect, as pertaining to conscience, but it's the blood of Christ that sprinkles from an evil conscience. "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Heb.10:22. 2. A condemning conscience, without which we stand but loathsomely before God; yea, while for want of faith we apprehend God deals with us out of Christ, we are very loathsome, and all our works and services dead, God loathes and abhors them. Is not the virtue of Christ's blood compared to a Fountain to wash us in, and intended especially of justification and pardon, and the saints to betake themselves to it under the notion of its cleansing virtue in that sense? "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." I Jn.1:7. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." Rev.1:5. The guilt of sin then is as great a pollution as belongs to sin; it's no other than sin lying upon the conscience with an accusation. "For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God." I Jn.3:20-21.

Again, wherever sin is to be purged out by sanctification, it is to be rid away by justification, but all filth is to be rid by sanctification, that indwells. Now it is manifest, that the cleansing virtue of the blood of Christ applied by faith, is the first Gospel-effectual means of sanctification; and it must be the great cause of mortification; wherein we are planted together in the likeness of his death. "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom.6:5. And what did Christ in his death, but destroy the body of sin by carrying it away? "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." II Tim.1:10. He has by carrying away sin, abolished sin and death, slain the enmity that lay in hatred of God, depravity and dominion of sin. Whence was it that David was cleansed from blood-guiltiness? Was it not from it's being laid on Christ? Was it not that very filthiness of his sin? "Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, O God, thou God of my salvation, and my tongue shall sing aloud of thy righteousness." Psal.51:14. Doth he not pray to God to be washed thoroughly from his sin, and to be cleansed from it? Was not that by the application of the blood of Christ? Doth he not mention all his depravity, original as well as actual, from which he would be purged as with hyssop, and made whiter than snow? And wherein lies this washing? Is it not in respect of sin; and here not in respect of punishment, for this he

mentions not, as he explains what he means, for it is that radical washing. "Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities," Psal.51:9, i.e., from the face of God's justice. Then follows the creation of a clean heart. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Tit.2:14. There is no depravity, defilement, pollution of sin whatever, that is so but because of its contrariety to the preceptive part of the law, must first have its foundation of cleansing from Christ's bearing of it away, and this faith applying purifies the heart from the indwelling pollution in us. Whence that promise, "then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean, from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." Ezek.36:25. The clean water there is the Spirit working in application of the blood of Christ; and therefore Gospel-cleansing lies chiefly in application of promises. "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." II Cor.7:1.

Neonomian. He took care his body should not see corruption, he would much more abhor to take in our pollution. He was holy, harmless, undefiled, &c.

Antinomian. All this we say over and over, that he bare sin, but was not defiled with sin, nor corrupted in his nature; but the Spirit of God is not to be believed. Christ's taking away of sin by atonement, is called a purging. "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Heb.1:3.

Neonomian. It was condescension enough, that he agreed to be treated as a sinner, but how odious is it to load him with sin itself! To spit that in his face that the worst of men abused him with; and it would justify his persecutors who punished him, if he was really the person your principles renders him to be.

Antinomian. The Spirit of God renders him to be the person that my principles renders him to be. It says he bore our sins in his body on the tree, the Lord laid iniquities on him, he was made sin for us, and yet how dare you reproach the Spirit of God in such a manner! To say, that it's an odious thing; to say, he bore the load and weight of all the sins of the elect, that it is spitting in the face of Christ, doing that which the worst of men did to him, and justifying his murderers. I am surprised with great horror to hear such things out of the mouth of a man that is called a Gospel Minister. I pray God give you repentance, and lay not these things to your charge.

But Sir, you have here declared your defiance of the date of the imputation of our sins to Christ, and yet would pretend you hold that doctrine by saying God laid the punishment of sin only upon Christ. The mere punishment of Christ, I must tell you, was not the bearing our sin; for the bearing the punishment was the payment of the debt, and was his righteousness which is imputed unto us. If imputation of our sins to Christ lay in nothing else, they were not imputed at all to him; punishment was laid upon him, and he bore it by way of suffering in his human nature, and was that righteousness that is imputed to us in justification, the argument against you is this. That which is imputed to us was not imputed to Christ, but punishment of Christ to satisfaction for our sins, is his righteousness imputed to us; and therefore, not the imputation of our sins unto him. If your rooted prejudices will suffer you to consider, I pray weigh well that argument, you will have more by and by. But you still say if Christ bore sin he must be polluted with sin. To which I reply, it argues not that sin was his by perpetration or infusion, but only by imputation, they were our sins by perpetration and inhesion, which he bore by imputation. The Spirit of God tells us he was a sinner in one respect, and no sinner in another; as the Church of Smyrna was poor in one respect, and rich in another, as poverty and riches, sin and no sin; as a man may be rich and poor, wise and foolish in divers respects. And as to the filthiness of sin it could not stain him, he remained untouched in his holy nature, but yet I must tell you, as bearing sin by the sacrifices caused a typical uncleanness, insomuch as the bodies were burnt without the camp, and they that burnt them and gathered up the ashes became unclean; such a judicial uncleanness was Jesus Christ our sacrifice under, wherein he answered those great types, and we are not without ample proof of it, especially from such places as Hebrews 13:11, "for the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp."

Neonomian. Had he been esteemed the very transgressor, his atonement had been unavailable, for he could not atone for himself.

Antinomian. You should have said, had he been the very transgressor; he was a reputed transgressor, and stood instead of the actual transgressor; he therefore was a becoming High Priest, because he needed not to offer for his own sins, but did at once offer for us when he offered up himself, Heb.7:25,27, all the places you mention are against you, that especially, I Pet.3:18, and that of Heb.9:14, above all as we have shown before. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb.9:14.

Neonomian. Christ then suffered for his own sins.

Antinomian. Only so far as they became his own by imputation. To conclude, because you will have it, that in pleading for the imputation of our sins to Christ, I must hold that Christ was the very transgressor. See what I said, there is a certain transacting of sin on Christ, so real, that indeed a believer though an actual transgressor is as absolutely and truly discharged of his sins as if he himself had not committed them. As a debtor when a surety has taken the debt on him, and the debtor receives an acquittance and discharge, he is as free of the debt now as if he never run into the debt. So I say it is with a believer, Christ being made a Surety of a better Testament, and thereby becoming really and truly the Debtor, instead of the believer, he so bears all the debts himself, that they are altogether released and discharged, as if they had never been in debt. Still I say, this hinders not, but there is an acting of sin, and committing of sin every day by a believer, but still the virtue of Christ's Suretyship takes off the sin as soon as it is committed; nay he has a provision, or stock in bank to satisfy it as soon as it is committed.

Calvinist. If this be the judgment of Mr. Antinomian, I see not but it is sound, and according to the Scriptures; and you have little reason to make such a noise as you have done, and load him so invidiously with your loathsome consequences, and misrepresent him so hideously to the world, as if he were a person of no divinity, logic, religion, brains, or common sense; I must confess, I think you have given a great deal of ground of just offence, in wresting the words and sense of so good a man; besides your taking advantage to insinuate to us errors; for I apprehend that your spleen is most especially vented at the doctrine of imputation, for it's that which you principally aim at to wound and cast to the ground. A laying sin on Christ no other than that whereby Christ becomes accountable to God for our sins, and there is in it these things very easy and plain to be understood.

1. Christ's offering himself freely to be accountable to God for our sins; because none can be forced to be accountable for the defaults of another. 2. His answering the will and pleasure of the Law-giver, the Judge of all therein, being called thereunto and accepted in so doing, in the room and stead of the delinquents. 3. Hence it is for our sins and not his own, that he is accountable. 4. Our sins are the material and meritorious cause of his sufferings, which he takes upon him; our very faults in non-conformity to the law; our sins in the delinquency, our very sins in opposition to punishment, our sins in their greatest foulness, under the greatest aggravations, they are the very offending, meritorious causes; and whereas when we are without

Christ they are accounted the offending and the meritorious cause of suffering to us; so Christ being substituted in our room, they are the very offending meritorious causes of suffering to him; sin has a double respect as a fault and demerit, but as a fault is a demerit. To be accountable is to stand under the demerits of sin; and indeed that is guilt; or consciousness of crime, which the Orthodox mean when they say Christ bare the guilt of sin, and it's no other than the charge of delinquency. A deserving of punishment and actual guilt is the same thing, and there's little weight in the distinction between consciousness of crime and liability to punishment; for consciousness of crime is nothing else but deserving of punishment or proper guilt. And hence they say there's no difference between guilt and the sin itself; for sin is no positive thing but privative, and that which is remaining besides the physical act of that which is a moral guilt, or just charge of aberration from the rectitude and duty required in the law, for which men must be accountable to God, and according to the sanction of the law give satisfaction; and that is in this case by receiving the wages of sin, and in so doing the payment is made.

And I shall now prove by many arguments that it's our sins, and our sins in the highest degrees and aggravations that Christ was accountable to God for, and that he bore them in this sense, by way of imputation, though none of the spot or stain by way of inherent pollution or defilement fell upon him, nor could cleave unto him. And we defend the position as the Spirit of God everywhere states. it. That it was sin as sin that Christ bore, and in bearing took away from before God, as it's said to be laid on Christ. "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa.53:6.

1. That which is the radical cause of God's displeasure against a sinner was laid upon Christ to take away, but sin was the radical cause of God's displeasure, ergo, sin in the radical nature of it as it's a fault, and blamed of God as such. Now obligation to punishment is not the cause of God's displeasure, but the effect of it; that which renders a person abominable in the sight of God is sin, as it's against the preceptive part of the law; as to the major it's plain, unless the radical cause of God's manifesting displeasure be taken away, God cannot be reconciled to us; it's called the enmity, Eph.2:15,16, even on God's part, which is upon the default of sin, and its enmity on ours.

2. That which Christ bore in his body on the tree, was sin itself, our blame as well as demerit; for there's no demerit where there's no blame. He that suffers for a fault bears the fault; the fault stands and claims the meritoriousness of sufferings. The Apostle is express in it, that he bore our sins on

the cross, "who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed." I Pet.2:24. This is the punishment only you will say; but the Holy Ghost will tell you he bore sin in the nature of it. "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law, for sin is the transgression of the law," I Jn.3:4, and mark what follows, verse 5, "and ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." Christ was manifest that he might bare away sin in bearing it; and notwithstanding this, {says he,} there was no sin in him; this does plainly evince that the anomy of sin was accounted to him.

3. That the fault of sin is separable from the person of the sinner, but can never be separated from the demerit without payment. David's person is freed from the fault of murder, but his murder cannot be freed from the desert of death. Now that which Christ did especially, was to make the elect without fault before God, to take off that relation which they had to the law, lying as to the blame of it. God's reconciliation to the persons of sinners is by taking away the fault of sin before God, and this is done by the person of Christ bearing sin.

4. That in a sinner that which is to be pardoned by Christ, was laid on Christ; but the fault of sin is to be pardoned; there's the least part of pardon that frees only from punishment, but forgives not the fault or offence; just as a King's reprieving a felon, but not pardoning him. To save him from the gallows, but charge him never to see his face.

5. That without the taking away of which, the conscience of a sinner can never be purified from guilt, was certainly laid upon, and taken away by Jesus Christ, Heb.9:14, but the fault of sin is such without the taking away of which before God, the conscience can never be purified from guilt, ergo, the fault of sin was laid upon Jesus Christ to take it away; let a man be sure he should never see death, yet if the fault lie upon him, there will still be guilt; his conscience will accuse, he cannot have peace towards God.

6. If the wages of sin be in the very nature of sin, viz., spiritual death and it be inseparable from sin itself; then that death cannot be removed without taking away the sin before God; but the wages of sin, which is death, is inseparable from the nature of sin in the fault before God, &c., ergo, he that by death slays our death, slays and carries away the sin which is this death. The Apostle calls the body of sin the body of death. Rom.7:24. "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our

Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." II Tim.1:9-10.

7. That which essentially belongs unto Christ's office as Mediator, must be performed by Christ, but bearing our sins so as to take them away before God, is essentially belonging to Christ's office as Mediator. It's not the essential part of a Mediator to bear the punishment of the wronged party, but to reconcile the parties at variance; he may save one party from utter ruin by bearing punishment, yet cannot reconcile them without taking away all matter of offence; but it is the fault of sin that is the cause of variance; God hates it, and the sinner loves it. God is not offended at the creature because he must be punished, but because it's he who has broken his law, therefore he punisheth him.

8. If the creature will never be reconciled to God till it has some prospect of God's being reconciled first, by Christ taking away the fault of sin before God, then Christ bore it away; but the creature will never be reconciled to God without this prospect, ergo, for the ministry of reconciliation as to its efficacy is founded upon this, and it's there described to be God being in Christ first reconciling the world to himself; and how is he said to be so, but by making Christ sin for us who knew no sin.

9. All the sin-offerings of the law hold forth Christ's bearing sin; if you consider their names, the proper sin-offering was {in the original} called sin itself. "If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people; then let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young bullock without blemish unto the LORD for a sin offering." Lev.4:3. It was called a sin because made sin for us typically, as Christ really, by imputation, the trespass or guilt-offering was for sin, that for the whole congregation was such. "And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the LORD, and the bullock shall be killed before the LORD." Lev.4:15.

So the Burnt-offering was calculated to the taking away of sin by bearing it, in order to the making peace and reconciliation for the sinner; therefore in the consecration of all these, there was the charging them with sin by the laying on of the hands of them that brought them, to be offered up for them. "If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish, he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD." Lev.1:3. The Hebrew Doctors say, all oblations of beasts which particular persons offer of debt, or voluntarily, they lay hands on them, and so it was on the daily sacrifice, as Mr. A., on Num.28:2, says, signifying that it was constituted instead of the

sinner, and the sacrifice placed in the sinner's room, thus charged with his sins, the priest was to offer to make atonement by, to expiate and make reconciliation in regard of man's sin, and God's wrath for the same. That these sacrifices were types of Christ, our sacrifice in bearing sin, appears abundantly. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb.9:28. Neither do we say, that this bearing of sin by Christ does free a person from being formally a sinner, but because we are formally sinners, therefore our sins are thus borne to bring us to God. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." I Pet.3:18.

The physical substance of sin remains, and in us; yea, the moral and habitual sin in depravity and obliquity to be effectually removed in the application of Christ's blood, by the Spirit of holiness; but yet guilt before God must be taken away, which is the fault blamed by the law. Dr. Owen on Justification, page 287, proves sin was laid on Christ as to the guilt, which we have shown, and is either the sin itself, or is so conjoined with it, that it cannot be separated; where there is a demerit there is a fault; if Christ had a demerit to sufferings it was for sin, though ours, and subjective in us, which his bearing sin by imputation always supposeth. His arguments are these.

1. If guilt of sin was not imputed to Christ, sin was not imputed to him in any sense, for the punishment is not sin.
2. There can be no punishment but with respect of the guilt of sin, personally contracted or imputed; guilt alone gives what's materially evil and afflictive, the formal nature of punishment; and what is guilt but sin manifest by conviction, whereof the sinner is charged in before God, or before the tribunal of conscience. The first kind Christ took off by bearing it, immediately the other is removed by application in believing.
3. Christ was made a curse for us, Gal.3:13-14, but the curse of the law respects the guilt of sin only, i.e., a person manifestly faulty, and a delinquent to the law.
4. The express testimonies of Scripture unto this purpose cannot be avoided, Isa.53:6, Psal.32:5, &c. "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa.53:6. "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." Psal.32:5.
5. This was represented in all the sacrifices of old, especially in the great anniversary expiation with the ordinance of the scape-goat.
6. Without supposition of this, it cannot be understood how Christ should be our sin bearing substitute, or suffer in our place and stead.

He likewise vindicates the imputation of sin to Christ in the sense of guilt opposed to punishment, from all these odious consequences that you would lay upon it; such as this, that if our sins be imputed to Christ, then Christ is a sinner and child of the Devil. That which the Scripture affirms is, that he was made sin for us; this the Greek Expositors, Chrysostom, Oecumen, Theophyl, and many others take for a sinner, but all affirm that denomination to be taken from imputation only, he had sin imputed to him, and underwent the punishment. 2. This imputation did not carry with it anything of pollution and filth of sin to be communicated by transfusion. 3. The denomination of an idolater, drunkard belongs not to him upon this account, &c.

"In sin there are three things. 1. The offence of God, which is the fault. 2. Obligation unto eternal punishment, which is the guilt. 3. The stain or pollution of the soul, the inherent vicious inclination of the soul. Sin does not remain in those that are justified in the two first respects, of fault and guilt, both which are taken away by the death of Christ. But sin does remain in the regenerate according to the third respect; viz., the vicious quality and corruption thereof, inherent in the soul." Pemble, *Treatise upon Justification*, page 183. Pinch says, II Cor.5:21, "the meaning of these words, is not that he was made sin for us but as a sacrifice for sin, &c." Norton against Pinch, page 53. "He was made sin for us, as we are made righteousness, i.e., by judicial imputation, without the violation, yea, with the establishing of justice; he was made sin as he was made a curse, Gal.3:13, the Greek word used here and there are the same. But he was made a curse by judicial imputation, because he was the sin-offering in truth; therefore he was made sin by real imputation, as the legal sin-offering was made sin by typical imputation." Likewise in vindication of Isa.53:6, from William Pynchon's false glosses, who used this argument against imputation, that Christ's sacrifice was effectual to procure atonement; therefore sin was not imputed to him. "Here is a mere invalid argument, nay the contrary consequence is true Christ appeared to put away sin, Heb.9:26,28, was once offered to bear the sins of many. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb.9:28. The Greek word used here by Paul, and elsewhere by Peter, I Pet.2:24, signifieth to take, carry, bear up on high, and that so as to bear away; and in allusion to the whole burnt-offering, the person that brought the sacrifice was to put his hand upon the head thereof. The Apostle whilst he was speaking of the antitype, chooseth out such a word to express Christ's bearing of sin, to teach us thereby that Christ did both carry up and bear the load of our sins, imputed to him on the cross, and also bear them clear away.

And thus Isaiah, Paul and Peter sweetly agree together, and interpret one another, as concerning Christ's bearing the imputation of guilt and punishment of sin." See more in his refutation of that Socinian.

"I do not see how he could be said to bear the punishment of sin, {that being strictly taken,} if first he should not take its guilt. We all grant Christ's sufferings to be penal, but how could they have been so without guilt? Therefore having no guilt of his own, he must be looked upon as assuming ours, upon which he might be said properly to undergo punishment. And he also vindicates, II Cor.5:21, showing that his being made sin, is his voluntary susception of the sinner's guilt." Dr. Thomas Jacomb, on Romans 8, pg.490.

Beza on the place, {II Cor.5:21,} has these words, that "the antithesis requires, that rather Christ should be said to be made sin for us, that is, a sinner, not in himself, but on the account of the guilt of all our sins, imputed to him; of which the two goats were a figure, mentioned Lev. xvi."

"As Christ being righteousness and holiness himself, bore our sin and curse before God, not feignedly but really; so the faithful are made the righteousness of God." Joachim Camerarius upon II Cor.5:21.

"This is a singular consolation for all Christians, so to clothe Christ with our sins, and to wrap him in my sins, thy sins, and the sins of all his elect, and so to behold him bearing all our iniquities. For the beholding of him after this manner, shall easily vanquish all the fantastical opinions of the Papists, concerning the justification of works. For they do imagine, as I have said, a certain faith formed and adorned with charity. By this, they say, sins are taken away, and men are justified before God. And what is this else, I pray you, but to unwrap Christ, and to strip him quite out of our sins, to make him innocent, and to charge and overwhelm ourselves with our own sins, and to look upon them, not in Christ, but in ourselves? Yea, what is this else but to take Christ clean away, and to make him utterly unprofitable unto us?" Martin Luther on Gal.3:13.

"Let us therefore receive this most sweet doctrine and full of comfort, with thanksgiving, and with an assured faith, which teacheth that Christ being made a curse for us, {that is, a sinner subject to the wrath of God,} did put upon him our person, and laid our sins upon his own shoulders, saying, I have committed the sins which my redeemed have committed. Therefore he was made a curse indeed, according to the law, not for himself, but, as Paul saith, for us. For unless he had taken upon himself my sins and thine, and the sins of all his people, the law had had no right over him, which condemneth none but sinners only, and holdeth them under the curse. Wherefore he

could neither have been made a curse nor die, since the only cause of the curse and of death is sin, from the which he was free. But because he had taken upon him our sins, not by constraint, but of his own good will, it behooved him to bear the punishment and wrath of God, not for his own person, which was just, holy and invincible, and therefore could be found in no wise guilty, but for our person." Martin Luther on Gal.3:13.

The sum whereof is, it is absurd to say, that a man can be void of his own sin, or the sin of another, and yet condemned to any punishment.

DEBATE III.

OF THE DISCHARGE OF THE ELECT FROM SINS UPON THEIR BEING LAID ON CHRIST.

Neonomian. Gentlemen, you may remember what point was discoursed the last time we met in this conference; now Mr. Antinomian is come, I pray let us proceed in order and method, and if you please, I will propound the subject of our discourse, because I would have it to be such as may lead to discover the errors of the Antinomians, and if it be possible to convince this gentleman whom I take to be so deeply immersed in them.

Calvin. I remember you have charged him with some already, how far he is guilty, we leave every man to his own judgment, to think as matters of proof does evince. It's not a practice to subscribe our names to commend truth or condemn error. Have you any more errors to charge him with.

Neonomian. Yes Sir, very foul ones, I will name you one, and it is this, that he holds that the very act of God's laying sin on Christ upon the cross, is the very actual discharge of all the elect from all their sins.

Mr. Antinomian. Are you sure that this is my opinion? And that if it be, it is an error? It may be there may be such an ambiguity in the terms of the question, that you may understand them in one sense and I in another, the greatest, I judge, lies in actual discharge. But I pray make proof of your charge first, and then we will endeavour to find out the true matter in debate, and discuss the things in difference; it may be you mistake me.

Neonomian. This is your declared opinion, that runs as

a line thru all your discourses, and is the foundation you build most upon. I say all the weight, and all the burden, and all that very sin itself is long ago laid upon Christ; and that laying of it upon him, is a full discharge, and a general release and acquittance unto thee, that there is not any one sin now to be charged on thee. Did not you speak these words in a sermon you preached, you know where, upon Isaiah 53:6, D.C., page 298.

Antinomian. Yes, I did speak these words; but you deal with me as you always have been wont to do, you rehearse only part of my words, and conceal or take no notice of such expressions as may make my true meaning manifest.

"I was speaking to that place, Rom.8:33,34, 'it is God that justifies, who is he that condemns?' I said the same God that justifies, will not eat his own words, and pass sentence of condemnation upon a person that has received the sentence of absolution already. No, you will say, God does not condemn, but he will let sin be charged upon the spirit of a man; does not he then sentence him to be unjust? Answer. There be divers condemnations. Condemnation in sentence, and condemnation in execution. Condemnation in sentence is the pronouncing such a person guilty. The other is the execution of punishment deserved for this guilt, and its but an effect of condemnation, rather than condemnation itself; so far as God charges fault upon a person, so far he condemns that person; so that if God should charge a person as faulty, how can you believe still that this person is manifested and pronounced just by God? I beseech you stop your ears against the quirks of Satan, and of your hearts deceived by him, clamoring still to you, that sin lies upon your own spirits. It is but the voice of a lying spirit in your own hearts, that says, that you that are believers have yet sin wasting your consciences, and lying as a burden too heavy for you to bear, {now comes in the words which you rehearsed,} I say all the weight, and all the burden, and all the very sin itself, &c." Dr. Crisp, page 292. Now I pray judge whether this Gentleman has dealt fairly with me.

Calvin. No indeed, I must needs say he has not; for you see he speaks not of the elect indefinitely; but of believers, and is it not of the Devil that any true believer lies under conscience-wasting sins? And were not all the sins of the elect laid long ago upon Christ, in full discharge of every believer? And is not every believer bound in duty to believe it so?

Neonomian. You teach that the elect are justified before they do believe; otherwise till such believing, the person of the elect does bear his own transgression, and is chargeable for them. Dr. Crisp, pages 616, 617.

Antinomian. Sir, I was preaching from I Jn.2:1-2, and was showing that faith is the fruit of our union with Christ, and

proved it from John, chapter 15, "I am the Vine, and ye are the branches," and I showed that there must be a union to Christ before the branch could bring forth fruit; and that fruit is faith, and proceeds from our radical union with Christ. I also alleged, Colossians, chapter 3, "your life is hid with Christ in God, &c.," and inferred that the life of every elect person has a being in Christ before he does believe; believing therefore does not produce a new life that was not before, {i.e., fundamentally and efficaciously to the producing of faith,} but it makes that life that was before an active life, or is an instrument by which that life which was hid in Christ, does now after believing become an active, and appearing life in this person. So that all that can be made of this, is that till believing there is no life and activity in the person that is elected, his life is in Christ, and was in Christ, and reserved in Christ for him till the time of believing; and then does he, the elect person become active in life when Christ does give him to believe actually.

Calvin. And do you Mr. Neonomian, reckon this false doctrine? I wonder what kind of Gospel you preach; I am much deceived, if this be not true Gospel doctrine, and so strongly built that no sophistry, or all the gates of Hell will never shake it. I see everything is not false doctrine which you are pleased to call so.

Neonomian. Truly now it plainly appears that I am not mistaken in charging Calvinists with Antinomianism, if all be of this Gentleman's opinion.

Antinomian. But Sir, if you be pleased to give me leave, I will proceed in the further account of my discourse.

"I showed the dangerous consequences that must follow this principle, that there is no justification, {i.e., fundamentally,} and union at all belonging unto elect persons, till they do actually believe in Christ. I say if persons are not united unto Christ, and do not partake of justification before they do believe, but that believing is the instrument by which they are first united. 1. That this in some respect would be bringing to life a Covenant of works, do this and live; whereas the Covenant of grace runs upon contrary terms, live and do this, God in the Covenant of grace gives life first, and doing comes from life.

2. If there must be our act of believing before our participating of Christ, then those sins that were laid upon Christ, and taken away from the elect, {i.e., before God,} are returned back again. I say, if there must be believing before there be union with, or interest in Christ, it must necessarily follow the person does bear his own transgression, is chargeable for them, and imputed to him.

3. Hence, if they bear their own sins, till they actually believe, there must be a hatred of God to such persons till they believe actually, {which is death,} and a person may perform a

vital act in a state wherein he is actually dead, and at the same time.

4. This must follow, if there is believing before union with Christ, then there must be some other root from which this fruit of faith does spring; and it's said, Heb.12:2, expressly, Christ is the Author of our faith. I have received this principle merely for the vindication of the glorious privileges which are proper and peculiar to Christ alone, and therefore refer the being of faith itself to Christ; to this end I deliver, that elect persons have a participation and share in Christ himself, even before they do believe; neither would I thereby diminish the prerogative of believing; for there are glorious things done by faith in believers. God has honoured it above all mere creatures in the world; he has made it the conduit-pipe for the conveyance of all peace and comfort; nay of all that strength which believers have all their lives; no faith, no comfort, no faith no peace of conscience, no faith no pleasure to walk with God. The soul lies in darkness while in unbelief. But still that which is proper and peculiar to Christ alone, is not to be ascribed to believing." Dr. Crisp, pages 616-618.

Calvin. Mr. Neonomian. We shall be the better able to take our measures, if you will be pleased to state this point aright, and tell us what we may receive for undoubted truth, and what is to be anathematized for error in your judgment.

Neonomian. I will tell you then first what is truth. The atonement made by Christ by the appointment of God, is that for which alone the elect are pardoned, when it is applied to them.

Antinomian. Pray Sir, give me leave to make my remarks as you dictate, because my memory is but short. 1. You grant then that there is a complete atonement wrought, finished and accepted by God; if so, there is a fundamental life of justification laid up and reserved for them in Christ. 2. That this precedes their actual justification by faith. 3. That this influences to justification by faith and is objective to faith, and meritorious of faith, and of the work of the Spirit working faith.

Neonomian. But the elect are not immediately pardoned upon Christ's being appointed to suffer for them, nor as soon as the atonement was made.

Antinomian. The question is, whether there is not upon Christ's atonement pardon with God that he may be feared? Or whether there be not a life laid up for them in Christ which needs no addition to it? There is a difference between pardon and pardoned; one is the abstract, and the other the concrete. We say where there is atonement for any, there is pardon; but it follows not that because there is pardon for any, that therefore they are pardoned; there may be a pardon sealed for a traitor by the King, and yet he not pardoned, but the law proceeds against

him, till the pardon is sent down and read in Court. So the pardon is certain and finished for all the elect, but they have not the particular pardons taken out, nor pardoned till they believe.

Neonomian. Nor is that act of laying sins on Christ, God's forgiving act by which we are personally discharged.

Antinomian. I doubt you are too presumptuous, to prescribe to God which shall be his forgiving acts, and which not; if God's laying sin on Christ be not of a pardoning and forgiving nature to us, I know not what it was, did he not do it as a God pardoning iniquity, transgression and sin? Was it not his casting our iniquities behind his back? And is it not this act of God which reacheth every elect person unto actual pardon and forgiveness? Yea, are we not manifestly justified by this act of God apprehended and applied by faith? For is not an act of God removing sin from us, and laying them on a surety, a pardoning act.

Calvin. I pray Sir deliver yourself more distinctly, for you do darken and confound things extremely.

Neonomian. I will tell you what is not in dispute between us in diverse particulars, that you may not take up a wrong sense. The question is not, whether Christ made a full atonement for sin.

Antinomian. Give me but the right scent of you {which is hard to keep, you make so many banks and turns} and I will follow you as close at the heels as I can. You grant Christ made full atonement for sin; there's pardon in that atonement without question for all God's elect. Atonement always carries pardon in it as its formal nature, or else it's no atonement.

Neonomian. Nor whether that shall in time be applied to the elect for their actual remission as the effect of it?

Antinomian. Then there is atonement wherein is pardon eventually certain, i.e., shall certainly be applied, and being applied is actual remission as the effect; therefore this atonement is the remission, as the cause and as the object to be applied.

Neonomian. Nor whether we be so far released thereupon, as that God can demand no atonement from any who shall submit to the Gospel way of application of it.

Antinomian. It seems then if they will not submit to the Gospel way of application, God can demand some other atonement from them. I never understood before that the suffering of the damned was atonement; for where there's atonement, God is at last appeased, but he will never be appeased toward the damned. You said but now that the application of the atonement to the elect in time should be {I understood you} certain, but now you make it only conditional, in case of their submission to the Gospel way of application.

Neonomian. Nor, whether the law be answered, and God's honor so vindicated thereby, that the sins of men cannot hinder an offer and promise of forgiveness and life.

Antinomian. There's a great theological intrigue here, we must endeavour to unravel it. What do you mean by answering the law, is it by active or passive obedience, or both? And for whom? For some absolutely or conditionally? You tell us of a conditional atonement, and such an atonement the Scripture is a stranger to. You would have us to understand the end and use of atonement is to fence and secure God against his law, that so he might be at liberty to save men; this is to make an atonement to sin, and not for sin; your suggestion is, that God cannot in honor bestow life and salvation till his law be vindicated, i.e., I suppose he took out of the way, and abolished that law, so another law more practicable might be set up in the room of it; this is a fine way of vindicating a law, to abrogate it.

Neonomian. Nor whether, when we are pardoned, the whole meritorious cause of pardon be that atonement, and what is required of sinners is only a meetness to receive the effects of it.

Antinomian. What do you mean by the whole meritorious cause? Do you exclude Christ's active obedience from the meritorious causes? And do you mean the merit of satisfaction or procurement? There's a great deal of difference in the case before us; and what is the meetness? Whether it be not a meetness of congruity, if not of condignity? And whether this meetness be not of the effects of Christ's merits, and if not from what other cause it ariseth?

Neonomian. Nor whether this atonement is the only way of forgiveness which we can apprehend?

Antinomian. I had thought a meetness to be forgiven, had been with you one way to be forgiven, which you make to be distinct from atonement, and the meritorious cause of forgiveness. Now Sir, you say these things are not the question, but they are questionable to me; you might have told us of a thousand more questions which are not ours; for there is no one thing but in general is separate from all other things in the world. But after, Sir, you have freed our brains from the mixture of all impertinent questions, I pray put your finger upon the very spot.

Neonomian. The real difference, lies in two things. 1. Whether the elect were actually discharged of all their sins at the time that Christ made atonement?

Antinomian. The question is, whether a believer is not to look upon the laying of his sins on Christ as his full release; for I speak of an elect believer; I say not that any other can, whether elect or no; for all the burden and load of sin was long ago laid on Christ, it is not now to do.

Neonomian. Having spoken to the question before, I insist now only upon this, whether the very act of laying sin upon Christ on the cross, be the discharge of the elect from all sin?

Antinomian. You state your questions still with great ambiguity; for what mean you by the act of laying sin on Christ? The laying sin on Christ must suppose and imply all things that conduced to the making him a complete sacrifice for sin, God's acts and his own; on God's part it's to be supposed there was not only a charge of Christ, but a discharge on Christ's part; not only a subjection to the charge, but a suffering by way of satisfaction; not only an undertaking of the debt, but a payment; I suppose you mean, whether the atonement that Christ made was in any sense a discharge unto the elect; for no wise person will give a discharge to a debtor till the money be paid, or suretyship accepted; now then we distinguish of pardon, it was perfect and complete by way of impetration for all the elect, but it has not an actual application till the persons are in being to whom it is to be applied; and that application in regard of the time of their lives, is according to the dispensation of grace. Now all this you seem to grant, and need not put to any further question; you say Christ made full atonement for sin, and it shall be certainly applied; you say only that a sinner is not discharged till application. We distinguish of discharge. 1. There's that which is virtual and fundamental, and real in Christ; or else he could not have rose; for the charge upon him was our sins, and he must have a discharge as a surety; and it was the elects discharge in the mind of God and of Christ, and really transacted. But 2ndly, there's a personal sensible discharge, which is at or by application. Now then in the same sense that Christ bore our sins by Imputation, as a Representative, in that sense we were discharged; for the discharge must be as large and full as the charge, to the very person of Christ, and all he undertook for, or else he is bearing sin still, and the sins of some of the elect must be still upon him. And 3rdly, if Christ obtained what he bore our sins for, then he had a discharge not only for his own person, but for all he undertook for and represented; and Christ having made good and full payment, cannot remain undischarged, for he finished the work which his Father appointed him to do.

Neonomian. But we can claim no interest in his atonement till we believe.

Antinomian. A sinner's first ground of claim is the promise of Christ in the Gospel, and faith is a laying hold upon him, and receiving of him in whom is full atonement and pardon. It is one thing to have a right to a thing, and another to have real right; a child new born, or to be born heir of an estate, has a good right to the inheritance, else he could not be heir, which is previous and lies dormant until the time of claim and

possession, and therefore the Apostle seems to speak in this way of allusion, for he says, "in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," Eph.1:11, and it's grounded upon what he said, verse 7, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." And Dr. Goodwin says, "that the Apostle speaks not there of the redemption that we have here, {i.e., the fruits of redemption,} but of the work of redemption which Christ himself has wrought, which is the cause of all the redemption we receive. And 2dly, we have redemption in Christ as in a common person; and we have it not only when it is applied to us, but we have it in him as we had condemnation in Adam before we were born into the world; so we had redemption in Christ when he died. Dr. Goodwin on Ephesians 1.

Neonomian. It was not that will or purpose of God, or Christ, that the laying our sins on Christ should be the immediate discharge of the elect. Jn.6:40, I Jn.1:2.

Antinomian. It was the will and purpose of God and Christ, that upon Christ's satisfaction for sin he should have an immediate discharge, and all the elect virtually and really in him, a general discharge, but not manifested, and personally applied to particular persons, and in this sense the elect are discharged at and by application; and the places mentioned hold forth no more than this; and this is all the Doctor says, that the Church had a general discharge in Christ, not a particular application till being.

Neonomian. This overthrows the whole scheme so wisely contrived for the distribution of the effects of his death.

Antinomian. It may overthrow your scheme, but it overthrows no true scheme of the Gospel mystery.

Neonomian. Things are so adjusted, that forgiving the elect should be the effect of Christ's Kingly Office as well as his Priestly Office, Acts 5:31, I Cor.6:11, Acts 26:18.

Antinomian. Christ wrought out our forgiveness by way of atonement as a Priest, and God was atoned and appeased thereby; and therein he also gloriously triumphed in his Kingly Office, spoiling principalities and powers, triumphing over them on the cross, Col.2:14; and through death he destroyed him that has the power of death, even the Devil. Heb.2:14. In that place, Christ is meant in all his Offices; first as a Priest entered into the Holiest of all, Heb.4:14, application being by virtue of his Intercession to obtain the ends of his death; likewise as a Prophet he teacheth by his Spirit and Gospel, the promise of eternal life, and the whole mystery of his incarnation, and sufferings, and exaltation; he as a King conquers and subdues the hearts of sinners to himself, and gives forth the promise of the Father, and

hence there comes the application of pardon, and that life laid up and hid in himself. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." Col.3:1-3. And all the places mentioned by you, speak but of our receiving forgiveness, so all the offices of Christ have the honor due unto them, when we were enemies, we were reconciled by the death of his Son, Rom.5:10, and this reconciliation was by his atonement; and therefore the Apostle says, "and not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement," 5:11, viz., through all Christ, in all his Offices. It's one thing to make atonement, and for God to be reconciled to us; that is the accomplishment of the reconciliation of God to the elect, considered as sinners; and another thing to reconcile us, which is done by the Gospel ministry, whereby also we receive the atonement. Dr. John Davenant having showed many ways of redemption, says, "the last and only way of redemption, is that which was by way of justice, all our debts being paid by our Surety Jesus Christ; which price being paid, the great debt is discharged. I Pet.1:18. Christ averts the wrath of God from us, by undergoing the punishment undue to him, to free us from our debt, Gal.3:13; and here it is to be observed, that although the Devil do detain us captives, yet the price of our redemption, viz., the blood of Christ, was offered in satisfaction to God, not to the Devil, &c., and God was satisfied and atoned for our sins." {Dr. Davenant on Col.1:14.}

Neonomian. By the opposite error the elect would have been discharged if Christ had never risen again.

Antinomian. We excepted against this quirk before, as if any man understood not by laying sin on Christ, all things that concern the satisfaction to be made; speaking of things by synecdoche and metonymy as the Scripture does, mentioning sometimes the blood of Christ, sometimes his body, for all the satisfaction of Christ by sufferings, and by metonymies the cross of Christ for his sufferings on the cross. Secondly, Christ's satisfaction had never been completed if he had never rose from the dead, and then we had been still in our sins. "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." I Cor.15:17. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." I Pet.1:3. But let your supposition go, {though no such thing is to be supposed,} make what you can of it; and observe, I pray, was not the sins of believers under the law actually taken away before Christ either died or rose again? I say, if a creditor do accept of an insolvent person for paymaster,

and cancel the debtor's bond, the said creditor cannot recover his debt of the principal, though it may affright him, fearing it is not cancelled; there's nothing truer than that the hand-writing of the law that was against us, which was contrary to us, was taken away and nailed to the cross. Col.2:14. Dr. Davenant after a long explanation of the text, says, "in all these words this one thing is shown, that by virtue of the passion of Christ dying upon the cross, the damning power of the moral law was taken away, and all the rites of the ceremonial law were at once abrogated. The hand-writing of the law bound us to obedience, and bound us over to punishment for non-performance thereof; Christ therefore our Surety, by performing that exact obedience which the law required, and undergoing the punishment which the law exacted of the violators thereof, did that which we were bound unto by this hand-writing; and so blotted out the hand-writing, for the blood of him being shed who was without spot, the hand-writing of all faults are blotted out, as Augustine says, Christ was made in subjection to the law, that he might redeem them that are subject to the law. Gal.4:4-5." He adds, "but that is to be observed, this hand-writing may be said to be blotted out two ways. 1. As to God, comprehensively and sufficiently, because there is such satisfaction given to God by the blood of Christ; because that hand-writing of the law cannot be exacted of any as debtors, when they fly by faith to this Redeemer, but he must absolve them. 2. Particularly and efficaciously, when it is actually blotted out from the consciences of individual faithful ones who do apprehend Christ by faith, {and he follows the true Spiritual sense of this Scripture most Evangelically, I choose to give the sum of it, because it decides the whole point in controversy most excellently,} according to that of the Apostle. Rom.5:1. A man in debt cannot have peace so long as he sees he owes more money than he can pay, and sees he is bound in a bond under his hand to the payment thereof; but as soon as any person apprehends Christ by faith, immediately the handwriting is cancelled {in his view} and he enjoys blessed peace of conscience. Here Paul excellently resolves the case of doubting consciences by an admirable kind of gradation; not content with what he had said in the former verse, all your sins are forgiven; but he adds, the very hand-writing is cancelled; but it may be said, happily not so blotted out but a new suit may arise, he subjoins therefore that it is taken out of the way; but it may be said again, it may be its kept and hid, and hereafter may be produced; yea, says the Apostle it's nailed to the cross, it is cancelled, torn in pieces and nailed to the cross; this he says, we ought to believe, not only that Christ has deserved the blotting out of this hand-writing, but that it is even actually blotted out as to ourselves in particular." I think Sir, now I need say no more of this debate, seeing I have

given you the opinion of the learned Doctor, and of whose opinion I know you are in the point of universal redemption; and I believe your other arguments are here answered.

Neonomian. I will allege them for all that. If taking sins of the elect, and laying them on Christ was their discharge, they would be discharged before the sufferings and death of Christ, &c.

Antinomian. This argument is as it were the same with the former, and admits the same answer. And would it be so absurd to say a believer may be discharged before the death of Christ, were not the faithful under the Old Testament discharged before the death of Christ? We say, when the charge of sin is taken off from one and laid upon another, there is a discharge real in one sense or another. In general, but not particularly; here is a blotting out of sin, in the sight of the Lord, though not in a sinner's conscience. Christ took away sin by way of suretyship before he did it actually, and so the faithful before his coming were saved.

Neonomian. If this error hold, the Gospel notion of forgiveness by the blood of Christ is destroyed.

Antinomian. You mean I suppose if this be truth; no, it confirms Gospel forgiveness by the blood of Christ; but prove that it destroys it.

Neonomian. Forgiveness denotes a person guilty; it is a judicial act of God as Rector acting by a Gospel rule.

Antinomian. The Apostle says, that God justifies by free grace through the redemption of Christ, that he may appear just also, in so doing, because his justice is satisfied. He shows God justifies sitting on a throne of grace; grace is the impulsive cause so far as it consists in the pardon of a sinner; but it is through the righteousness of Christ to show forth his righteousness, and in forgiving in and through the righteousness of Christ; he has the high concurrence of justice therein, that as he is a gracious justifier, so he is justified as righteous by doing it in this way; and whereas you say, it's a judicial act of God, acting by a Gospel rule; I think you should rather say, it is a Gracious act of God acting according to the rules of justice therein; for so the Apostle clearly describes it. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Rom.3:24-25. And methinks you turn my stomach to hear you give so pitiful, a low and mean title to God as a Rector, as if he were but a mayor of a Corporation, or some little earthly Prince.

Neonomian. And this supposeth the full and perfect atonement made by Christ, and the grant made in virtue thereof.

Antinomian. What have we been disputing about all this while? I am glad to see Mr. Neonomian's ingenuity, that now he grants all we dispute about, only differs in naming a thing; you say the atonement of the wrath of God by Christ for sinners, {which is in my sense fundamentally and really pardon before God,} is full, complete and perfect; and that forgiveness supposeth it, and the grant made in the virtue thereof; if you had said, it had been the grant made in the virtue thereof, I take it you had spoken your own sense fuller, than to say it supposeth the grant made in the virtue thereof; unless you mean the grant made to Christ as our Representative, which comes more to our sense; but let these mistakes in expression pass. You seem to distinguish between a discharge and a discharge, so do we; you distinguish between an accepted atonement for us, and giving out the grant and patent to us, and so do we; between impetration and application, and so do we; between forgiveness before God, and forgiveness in our conscience, or evangelically; but as to that first I find you do not love to call it forgiveness, though you think it carries the nature of forgiveness in it; why should you represent me as such an heretic, to scare people from my ministry upon the mere naming a thing, by a word which by your own terms contain the nature and substance.

Neonomian. But forgiveness supposeth a person guilty.

Antinomian. Christ's bearing sin supposeth all the world is become guilty before God, and the elect as well as others; and therefore he became a Propitiation for sin to God, that we who are by nature under the law, and thereby condemned as children of Adam, and in our own consciences, and thereby guilty, might receive forgiveness of sins, or an atonement {both signifying the same thing} by believing. A man is guilty before God, and by the administration of the Law guilty in his conscience, and in this sense shut up under the Law till faith comes, and then is his personal and particular discharge through the blood of Christ; and this last I apprehend to be the justification by faith, which the Apostle Paul speaks so frequently of; neither do I say that this or that man has any part in Christ or pardon, any more than in election and redemption, till he does believe.

Neonomian. But you are of opinion a person is never guilty.

Antinomian. I never had any such opinion, if you distinguish right concerning guilt.

Neonomian. You say, that sins were laid on Christ before we were born, and therefore never upon us.

Antinomian. How old are you? Was not Christ's death and suffering almost 1700 years ago? And do you not say sins were laid then on Christ; and if they were then laid on Christ, they cannot return to us in the sense as they were taken off from

us; and therefore they are never upon us in the same manner as they are on those that are not elect, and this must be in respect of some kind of guilt; distinguish then of guilt, there is guilt in respect of the righteous judgment of God before his throne of judgment; and guilt that accompanies the letter of the Law setting in with our consciences, and in that sense the Law worketh wrath. Sins were laid upon Christ, and they lie upon us, but not both in the same manner, nor for the same end.

Neonomian. A judicial act by a rule there is none.

Antinomian. What your new terms of art mean, I will not trouble myself, my scheme, as you term it, of justification, imports that God graciously pardons in a way of manifestation of his justice, and all God's acts are according to the rule of his good pleasure, and will, and that's enough.

Neonomian. For the Gospel grant of pardon is not to the elect as elect; but as penitent believers, neither is the atonement of Christ supposed to our forgiveness.

Antinomian. Pardon as to the nature of it belongs to sinners, as such, and in name; faith and penitency is given together with remission of sins; and how can you have the face to say, I do not suppose atonement in forgiveness, or belonging to it, when it's upon that account that you have fallen so foully upon me, because you think I lay too great a stress on atonement, and give too much to it in forgiveness.

Neonomian. You own the laying of our sins on Christ before the making of atonement; and without our sins being laid on Christ, he could not justly be punished.

Antinomian. And do not you own that it's first in nature to making atonement, and how could Christ be justly punished without him having the merit upon him either by his own sins, or by the sins of others; but I find you own a man may be justly punished that deserves it in no sense whatever.

Neonomian. So that our discharge being a transferring of sin from us to Christ, and this being done before Christ made atonement, we are discharged not for the atonement of Christ, nor by any act of forgiveness for the sake of this atonement; I need not add, that by this notion heathens may be in a pardoned state, and there's no need of the Gospel or knowledge of Christ to bring them out of a state of wrath.

Antinomian. I hope by this time you have pretty well spent your powder and ball, for as I told you before, when we spake of laying sins on Christ, we understand his offer to bear them, the charge and imputation laid on him, and the payment he made of our debt, all which is the atonement; for bearing of our sins was an essential part of it, as shedding his blood was of the payment; this payment and bearing sin was in the eye of God from eternity as if already done; hence the patriarchs were

actually and personally justified by it; and does it follow that they were justified without Christ's atonement? And whereas you talk of God's acts of forgiveness, you should tell us what you mean; if immanent, there's but one act of forgiveness, for there are no new acts that arise in God, and it was the promise of eternal life before the world began. "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Tit.1:2. If you mean a transient act, it is but one, viz., the performance of that promise to Christ our Surety and Head, and to us in him, virtually and fundamentally. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," I Jn.5:11, and from him derived to us, terminates in and upon us by the same effectual grace of God in Christ towards us; so that the same forgiving act of God terminates in Christ and in us, and therefore you must allow our life of forgiveness first in Christ, and then bestowed upon us in and through him, whereby we are as sinners brought in to him, and receive of his fulness both for justifying and sanctifying grace. Whereas you say that heathens by this notion may be in a pardoned state; you foist in another term to impose upon us, as if we had said, that immediately upon laying sins on Christ, all the elect were in a pardoned state; there's none can be in a pardoned state before a being natural, nor before a being spiritual at least beginning; but what hinders but that the eternal life which is given me, should be in Christ before I was born, and infers not that therefore when I come into the world there will be no need of the Gospel or knowledge of Christ to bring me out of my natural estate into Christ? "Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God; even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints, to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." Col.1:25-27. "How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; as I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." Eph.3:3-5. And are not Gentiles as well as Jews pardoned through Christ?

Neonomian. The Assemblies at Westminster and the Savoy are both against you.

Antinomian. They say in a manner but as we do, if you distinguish between a forgiveness in Christ and forgiveness bestowed, between impetration and application, justification and justified.

Neonomian. I will show you your mistake, Mr.

Antinomian; because it was God's act to appoint Christ to suffer for our sins, that we might in his way and time be discharged, therefore you think we are immediately discharged by that act.

Antinomian. You take greatly upon you, to tell what I think, and make me think contrary to what I have expressed; you take upon you to make me speak what you please, and to think what you please; I take you to be a fit man to be a guide; was there nothing but God's appointing Christ to suffer for our sins? Was there not God's accepting of his sufferings for us? Was not Christ justified from the sins of the elect? For when he arose, was there not a radical justification of all the elect in Christ? If there had not been so, they could never have been personally justified; but you would have Christ only purchase our justification by something else; but I must believe and say that he wrought out our justification, which being in him, is the same that we do partake of; and that our discharge is begun and carried on in Christ, and is completed in him, and received by faith in his blood.

Neonomian. Because Christ's atonement is the sole meritorious cause of forgiveness; therefore he thinks God suspends not forgiveness till he works anything else in the soul, which he made requisite to our being forgiven, though not as a meritorious cause.

Antinomian. No, you mean Christ shall have the honor of being the meritorious cause, but it is that way of justification intended that Christ has merited, that though we have broken the law, and cannot be justified by it; that a new way of justification should be set up, not through his blood, but by something else, a peculiar qualification that shall make us meet to be forgiven, that there may be some reason found in the sinner why he should be forgiven; this is now the new divinity to sham off the satisfaction of Christ from the justification of a sinner; and you think you have been very kind to Christ, to say, these new qualifications are not meritorious causes, but Christ's suffering was, though they must stand afar off and look on upon a justification by something else.

Calvinist. I think, as you said, Mr. Antinomian's ambiguity lies in the word discharge, concerning which you must distinguish, there's a liberty in Christ, and a freedom from Christ; though Mr. Antinomian has abundantly cleared himself, as to his intention and meaning; but you Mr. Neonomian are so harsh in your censures, that nothing but the worst interpretation of his words can be admitted by you. My opinion is, that as Christ bore our sins by imputation; so he made a full payment of our debt, and had a discharge so far as concerned himself and us, represented by him and in him; and hence through this discharge, and the perfection of the new nature in freedom from

all original and actual sin, and perfection of all righteousness, our eternal life which God hath given us, is fully and completely in him both for grace and glory. I say fully, fundamentally, originally, and as in a fountain or root, and of this fulness we do receive, even faith the first vital act, and by faith all discharge in justification, and all conformity to him in sanctification through the operation of the Spirit of holiness; so that it was impossible but Christ must be discharged bearing our common nature, and standing in our stead; and that we were in our measure discharged in him; but it is also as impossible that we should be discharged personally, and in ours, till we had our personal beings, and were first in that state, and under that wrath in some regard, from which we were to be delivered, and brought into the new nature by reconciliation and actual union on our part, and till then we are prisoners of the law, without God, without hope, aliens to the covenant of promise. This account I trust may give both satisfaction, and I think it's that which is generally received as the truth of the Gospel by the Orthodox. I think those testimonies, Mr. Neonomian, brought for your extreme, do all in a manner say as I have said, they do not so deny the discharge of the elect before believing, as to deny Christ's discharge, and the elects in him, so far as they were capable, nor do they assert our discharge in Christ so as to affirm our personal discharge before faith.

The Assembly says thus, "the Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience, and sacrifice of Himself, which he through the eternal Spirit, once offered up unto God, has fully satisfied the justice of his Father; and purchased, not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for those whom the Father has given unto Him." Westminster Confession Chapter 8, Part 5. Here are two things that Christ has done, satisfied for our sins, and over above purchased a great estate, he could not have done the latter had he not done the former; and he has the grant or covenant deeds in his hands; the Lamb's book of life wherein the names of all that are given him are recorded and enrolled; and this is life which he now has the dispensation of in his due time through the Gospel; and therefore they further say, "to all those to whom Christ has purchased redemption, he does certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same, &c." The Catechism and Savoy Confession say the same in effect in everything; and so does Dr. Owen.

"When the Lord Christ died for us, and offered himself a Propitiatory Sacrifice, God laid all our sins on him, Isa.53:6, I Pet.2:24, then he suffered in our stead, and made full satisfaction for all our sins, as appears. 'For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world, but now once in

the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.' Heb.9:26. 'For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.' Heb.10:14. He whose sins were not actually and absolutely satisfied for in that one offering of Christ, shall never have them expiated unto eternity; notwithstanding this plenary satisfaction, yet all men continue equally to be born by nature children of wrath." {This old nature Christ never purchased and redeemed, but intended always to pull down and destroy, for the whole nature is under wrath; and we cannot be in a state of life till we be in the new nature, and be created in Christ Jesus.} "What the Lord Jesus Christ paid for us, is as truly paid as if we had paid it ourselves; and what he underwent and suffered, he underwent and suffered in our stead; but yet the act of God in laying our sins on Christ, conveyed no actual right and title to us, {i.e., immediately, for all our actual right is founded on it, and flows from it,} and therefore he adds, "they are not immediately thereon, nor by virtue thereof ours, or esteemed ours, {personally and in possession,} because God has appointed something, not only antecedent thereunto, but the means thereof; viz., imputation of Christ's righteousness to us." Dr. Owen of Justification.

Christ satisfied the justice of God, not commutative but distributive, and judicial, as well remunerative as vindictive, not precariously, or by way of impetration only, or metaphorically, but really, meritoriously, and fully, not omitting anything that in strict justice ought to be done, whatever was requisite to our salvation. Christ by his obedience and death did fully discharge the debt of all those, that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to his Father's justice, i.e., for all them that should believe. And Mr. Neonomian, I must not forget to tell you that there is nothing more frequent than for mistaken men to tell others how much they are mistaken, as you do tell Mr. Antinomian about the scape-goat.

Neonomian. I say he mistakes the type of the scape-goat, because the scape-goats carried their sins into the wilderness, who expressed faith and repentance by laying hands on it, and confessing sin, therefore the sins of men are taken away by Christ while they continue impenitent and unbelieving.

Calvinist. You may see how in this matter you speak after the Socinian, for they give this interpretation of this type; for though the confession of sin over the head of the scape-goat or sacrifice, did hold forth faith and repentance, yet there's a difference between an act typifying God's imputation of sin unto Christ, and an act testifying our faith concerning God's imputation of sin to Christ. So Ainsworth, "there's nothing more plainly holds forth Christ's bearing away our sins to be remembered no more, as that Azazel or scape-goat had the sins

of the people laid on his head, and so was sent into the Wilderness, Lev.16:21-22, so Christ was dealt with, whom God set forth for a Propitiation through faith in his blood, to show forth his righteousness, Rom.3:25, which those sacrifices did manifestly point out {however they fell short in themselves} yet in relation to the antitype they were not only Expiatory but also Satisfactory, whence the satisfaction wrought by the Antitype is the more strongly argued."

Mr. Norton, "we may distinguish between the being of justification, and being justified, between justification in the abstract, and justification in the concrete; that being without the receiving subject; this considered, together with the receiving subject, viz., the believer's justification considered in the abstract sense, and in itself {in which sense it signifies remission of sins and righteousness to acceptation prepared, though not yet conferred on the elect} has before faith a being, not only in the purpose of God, but also in the Covenant between the Father and the Son, and the Mediator, and in the purchase of Christ; this truth held forth in the Gospel makes the object of faith, and thus the object is before the act. {John Norton, *The Orthodox Evangelist*, 1654, pages 214,215.}

Mr. Perkins speaks next, "Christ is first justified, acquitted of our sins, and we justified in him." {William Perkins on Galatians 3:16.}

Dr. Ames, "our freedom or discharge from sin and death was not only determined in the decree, but also granted and communicated to us in Christ before it's perceived by us." Rom.5:10-11. "The sentence of justification was conceived in the mind of God by the decree of justifying. Gal.3:8. 2. It was pronounced in Christ our Head when risen from the dead. II Cor.5:19. 3. It's virtually pronounced from the first relation, which results from faith wrought in the heart. This sentence is expressly pronounced by the Spirit's witnessing with our spirits of our reconciliation to God." "And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom.5:5.

Mr. Rutherford, "there is a justification in the mind of God eternal, and a justification in time terminated in the conscience of a believer." He wrote against the Antinomians; and therefore this testimony you have no pretense to refuse.

Dr. Twisse likewise speaks, and says, "the righteousness of Christ was ours before we did believe, ours I say in respect of right; because in the intention both of the Father and the Son it was performed for us, though not in respect of possession and enjoyment."

DEBATE IV.

OF THE ELECTS CEASING TO BE SINNERS FROM THE TIME THEIR SINS WERE LAID ON CHRIST.

Neonomian. Gentlemen, now we are come together again as we are wont, to make Discovery of truth and error. I am willing we should be very clear in this point of imputation, for I will assure you, as it's usually understood, I cannot digest it; it's the foundation of this Antinomian error; therefore I would propound this following question to be discussed at this time. Q. Whether the elect cease to be sinners from the time their sins were laid upon Christ?

Calvin. This question is the same with the last, and it's resolved in the resolution of that, viz., so far as the elect are discharged by the satisfaction of Christ, so far they cease to be sinners.

Neonomian. You are mistaken, it is not the same question; there is difference between being discharged of sin in a way of justification, and ceasing to be sinners in respect of sanctification.

Calvin. Ay, if that be your meaning, do you charge Mr. Antinomian with that error, that the elect never sinned since sin was laid on Christ?

Neonomian. Ay, that I do, and will make good my charge too.

Calvin. Say you so; then I have no more to say. Mr. Antinomian, answer for yourself.

Antinomian. He says what he pleaseth of me; for he has an inveterate spirit against me. However, I am willing to hear what he says. I pray, Sir, declare your charge in express terms, that you will not start from, and then prove it.

Neonomian. I must premise some things first, and then tell you, what's truth, that you may the better know the error, and judge of it.

Antinomian. I had rather you would fall down-right upon the error; for your way is to make long speeches and explications of things, that others know as well as you.

Calvin. Pray let him take his own way; sometimes the furthest way about is the nearest way home, as they usually say.

Neonomian. I premise two things. The first, that men are sinners, or not sinners in divers respects. As to the filth or obliquity of sin, with respect to this they are more or less sinners, according to the degree of their innocence and holiness.

Antinomian. There is nothing in sin but is filth and obliquity; God looks upon it all as so, as it stands in opposition both to justification and sanctification, and it consists in its contrariety to the moral rectitude of the law, and the duty required by it; where there's no law there's no sin; those actions that are gross sins in men, are no sins in bruits, because they are not under a moral law. And for degrees of innocency I know none, though there be of holiness.

Neonomian. With some as to the guilt of sin, which refers to the sanction of the law against offenders; with respect to this, the offenders are more or less sinners, as they are forgiven or not forgiven.

Antinomian. With some! What mean you by that some? I judge they are Neonomians by the glimpse you give of them. You say the guilt of sin is no more than this, that a man is bound over to be punished whether right or wrong; and a poor creature that is tried for murder is guilty, because he is to be hanged. I thought always that he was obliged to be hanged because he was guilty; and if the law finds not the fault upon him, he is never guilty. Is it sense to say, a man is guilty? Being whipped, burnt in the hand, or being hanged, never; unless he hangs himself. Obligation to punishment, or the punishment itself, is no sin, its but an effect of it founded in the law. I do not understand more or less sinners in respect of guilt, as forgiven or not forgiven; for in the sense of guilt, whether the fault be more or less, forgiveness takes all off, and all sinners stand equally upon that account before God. A believer here on earth is as fully forgiven as a saint in Heaven. Justification admits not of degrees. But it may be you distinguish sinners in respect of guilt, into forgiven and not forgiven, as men are more eminently sinners before justification than after.

Neonomian. As to the charge of the fact, which was sinful, neither after-sanctification nor pardon will deliver a transgressor from having been a sinner; the fact was his.

Antinomian. I told you already the charge of any one with sinful fact, which the party had done, makes him guilty, it is a fault; and though it be true, that the physical act clothed with its moral depravity was done by him, yet God forbid that pardon and imputed righteousness should not deliver him from being a transgressor. I pray, is David now a murderer, and Noah a drunkard? You would seem to speak some great thing, but you thought safest to change the tense, and say, from having been.

Neonomian. The first and last denominate a man a

sinner most properly.

Antinomian. The filth of sin, and the charge of a sinful fact; and they are near akin; for a sinful fact is filth, and the filth of sin is a sinful fact; and that's a fault, and a fault charged and proved, or confessed, is guilt; so that it's fault or guilt {for they are reciprocal} denominates a sinner.

Neonomian. The second denominates a man punishable, but not a sinner formally.

Antinomian. This second is guilt of sin, which, say some, is a relation to the sanction of the law. We say guilt refers to the preceptive also, and is fault. You say, to the sanction only; and therefore I say, no sin. You say, the guilty person is no sinner formally. What then, a punishable creature? Do you mean a creature capable of suffering; so is a dog, or a cat, or a horse; or do you mean a man under a law? If under a law, he is not punishable but as a sinner. Sin is subjectively the formal reason of punishment, so that a man must be denominated a sinner formally, or else he is not punishable in any way of justice.

Neonomian. In the whole scheme of your principles, it's elect as elect who cease to be sinners. When you speak of believers, you do not mean that he was a sinner before he believed; for you state the time when Christ had his sins laid upon him.

Antinomian. Believers are of great Antiquity, older than Methuselah. But methinks a man that would be taken for a great divine, and one that in tenderness to holiness will rather withhold the truths of the Gospel, and abscond them, lest men should take too much liberty thereby to sin; I say, one would think such a man should for his reputation sake make conscience of speaking truth, and much more tremble at the temptation to bantering, and exposing the great truths of the Gospel to scorn and reproach. How can you dare to toss, tumble, reproach and load this great truth of the Gospel in the very words of the Holy Ghost, with all the odious consequences imaginable? You may value yourself as you please, or other men may judge of you and your words as they please; I shall only desire you to read Job 19:27-29. "Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me. But ye should say, why persecute we him, seeing the root of the matter is found in me? Be ye afraid of the sword, for wrath bringeth the punishments of the sword, that ye may know there is a judgment."

Neonomian. Now I will tell you what is the truth.

Antinomian. No, no; I hope we know the truth. Tell us the error you charge me with, and if there be time, we will hear the truth afterward.

Neonomian. If you are in such haste for it, you shall

have it then. The elect upon the death of Christ ceased to be sinners; and ever since their sins are none of their sins, but are the sins of Christ; and this I prove to be your error from your own words. You put this objection, must he not be reckoned a sinner while he does sin? I answer, No, though he does sin, yet he is not to be reckoned a sinner; but his sins are reckoned to be taken away from him, &c. A man does sin against God; God reckons not his sin to be his, he reckons it Christ's, therefore he cannot reckon it his.

Antinomian. Gentlemen, I would have you observe the things that are asserted by Mr. Neonomian, {for I beseech you do me justice,} that it appears that I speak always of the elect as elect, and not believers; and when I mention believers, that I do not mean he was a sinner before he believed. I will read my discourse to you taken from me as I delivered it. Preaching from John 14:6, I was showing that Christ was the way from a state of sinfulness. There is a two-fold consideration of sinfulness, from which Christ is our way in a special manner. 1. That which is called the guilt of sin, which is indeed the fault, or a person's being faulty as he is a transgressor. 2. The power and overmasterfulness of sin in persons; Christ is the way from both these. 1. From the guilt of sin. Christ is the way from the guilt of sin. It is briefly no more but this, to be rid of the guilt of sin, viz., upon trial to be quitted and discharged from the charge of sin that is laid, or may be laid to him, and to be freed from it. This is for a person in judgment to be pronounced actually innocent, and a just person, as having no sin to be charged on him. This is to be free from the guilt of sin. A man is not free from a fault, as long as the fault is laid to his charge; and he is then free, when he is not charged with it. He is only the way by which a poor sinner may be pronounced innocent; and having proved, that Christ is the way to take away the guilt of sin, which, I say, is the charge of fault, by many plain places of Scripture, and by the type of the Scape Goat, I came to answer this objection, but do not those that receive Christ actually, commit sin? I answer, Yea, they do commit sin; and the truth is, themselves can do nothing but commit sin. If a person that is a believer has anything in the world, he has received that; if he does anything that is good, it is the Spirit of God that does it, not he; therefore he himself does nothing but sin, his soul is a mint of sin. Now therefore judge, gentlemen, whether here I say, that the elect ceased to be sinners ever since the death of Christ. If sinners after believing, much more before, in respect of the indwelling of sin and corruption; and do not in this sense cease to be sinners after believing.

I went on, then you will say, if he does sin, must not God charge it where it is, {all this while speaking of a believer,} must

he not be reckoned to be a sinner while he does sin? I answer, no; though he does sin, yet he is not to be reckoned a sinner, {i.e., being a pardoned believer, God does not reckon him so, and he ought by faith to behold all his sins taken away in Christ,} but his sins are to be reckoned to be taken away from him. A man borrows 100 l., and some man will pay it for him. Doth he not owe this 100 l., seeing he borrowed it? I say no, in case another has paid it for him. A man does sin against God, God reckons not his sin to be his, he reckons it Christ's, therefore he cannot reckon it his, God has laid it upon Christ. Thou hast sinned, Christ takes it off; supposing, I say, thou hast received Christ. Is this any other doctrine than what John teaches? I Jn.1:7-8, 2:1,2. I say, in one respect they are not sinners, in another they are sinners. And is this any other doctrine than what the Scripture and all our best divines teach; therefore judge ye how justly now I am charged with this error.

Neonomian. But you said, if thou hast part in the Lord Christ {which he thinks all unbelieving elect have} all those transgressions of thine become actually the transgressions of Christ, and so cease to be thine.

Antinomian. Is it not very unfair dealing for you to impose a wrong meaning upon my words, when I express myself so plainly. If thou hast received Christ, if thou hast a part in the Lord Christ, who will understand these expressions, but of our active receiving and partaking of Christ? Though I do speak elsewhere of our having benefit by Christ, and a hidden right in him; and it has an influence on us, and we are passive therein before we believe, yet it's not what I speak of here. I was showing from Isaiah 53:6, that Christ is our great Pay-master, and how sad a thing it is to have sin lying upon our spirits; separate sin from the soul, and the spirit has rest in the worst conditions. You will never have quietness of spirit in respect of sin, till you have received this principle, {viz., by faith,} that it is iniquity itself that the Lord has laid on Christ. Now when I say thus, I mean with the Prophet, that it is the fault of the transgression, &c. Reckon up what sins thou canst against thy self; if thou hast part in the Lord, {i.e., by grace through faith,} all these transgressions of thine became Christ's, i.e., thou seest them laid on Christ. Not that they were just then laid on Christ when thou believest; for I would think your divinity is not so gross, as to assert that, but that a believer by faith sees that he is one of those elect ones, whose sins were laid on Christ. What the Lord beheld Christ to be, that he beholds his members to be. So that if you would speak of a sinner, supposing that person of whom you speak to be a member of Christ, {is this speaking of the elect merely as the elect, and no more,} you must not speak of what he manifests, but what Christ was. What unsoundness, I

beseech you, is in this doctrine? I pray speak, gentlemen.

The Company generally smiled; but being afraid to displease Mr. Neonomian, and affrighted at the name of Antinomian, which Mr. Neonomian called every one that contradicted him, were silent; but at last a brisk Gentleman, learned and solid, stood up and said, I think you have greatly abused Mr. Antinomian, and charged him unrighteously, both in your misrepresenting him, and in your charging him with error and false doctrine in the things alleged against him. For, says he, I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, though I see some of my brethren here seem to be so, that will not speak for the truth when they hear a man of confidence run it down. I say and affirm, that he that has a part in Christ, is confidently to believe that Christ bore his sin in his body on the Tree. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Tit.2:14.

Calvin. I pray Mr. Neonomian, give us your thoughts clearly what you hold, and what you deny in this point.

Neonomian. I shall tell first what is not in dispute between us.

Calvin. There's 100 things that are not now in question before us, I pray you to cut short, that we may not lose so much time; come to the very point in difference first.

Neonomian. You are not capable of understanding it, till I have told you what is not in dispute; for I'm sure that you'll mistake the question, if I tell you not what the question is first. The difference is not whether the pardoned sinner shall be delivered from condemnation.

Antinomian. But it is, whether the pardoned sinner is not delivered from condemnation, and that delivery the ground and reason of his pardon.

Neonomian. Nor whether God, for Christ's sake, will deal with a pardoned sinner as if he had not been a sinner.

Antinomian. The question is, whether God can deal with any one violating justice as if he were not a sinner, and yet be esteemed by him legally, and in the just sentence of the law, a sinner; and whether a pardoned sinner be in the righteous judgment of God a sinner; and can be a sinner and not a sinner at the same time, and in the same respect.

Neonomian. Nor whether forgiveness does take away sin as to its obligation to punishment.

Antinomian. If fault in the judgment of the law be made the obligation to punishment, and the demerit of sin lies in the fault, it is a great question how the obligation to punishment can be taken away, without taking away the meritorious cause; and whether if the obligation to punishment could be taken away,

without taking away the sin in the eye of the law, whether it were forgiveness; for forgiveness lies formally in taking off the fault, and but consequentially in remitting the punishment.

Neonomian. Nor whether the atonement of Christ, when it's applied in its full effects, will perfectly remove all punishment, and purge away all filth and defilement from the elect; each of these I affirm.

Antinomian. But it is a question, whether upon the atonement of Christ made and accepted, any of the elect were punishable for sin in a way of vindictive justice, even before faith, much more after? So that the things which are without dispute to you, are questionable to us, especially according to your ambiguous way of expressing them.

Neonomian. I shall now acquaint you with the questions that are in debate betwixt us. 1. Whether because Christ obliged himself to bear the satisfactory punishment of our sins, they did therefore become the sins of Christ?

Antinomian. You state this question fallaciously. The question all this while between us is this, whether if God laid our sins upon Christ, {in the way that he laid them,} they did in that way become the sins of Christ? If you will have it in the notion of Christ's bearing punishment only, it must run thus, if Christ was obliged to bear, or did bear satisfactory punishment, whether or not our punishment, or the punishment due to us did thereby become his? Both these we affirm.

Neonomian. Whether our sins were pardoned when Christ suffered on the cross. This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. I affirm it in my own sense, but deny it in your false and imposed senses.

Neonomian. Whether even they that are members of Christ, yet if they do sin, are they transgressors and sinners, and are the sins they commit their sins? This you deny, and I affirm.

Antinomian. This question, as you state it, I both affirm and deny; because in one sense a man must be a transgressor, in another none. But the question, whether the members of Christ while sin remains, are sinners, and in the sight of God do stand fully justified from all sin? This I affirm.

Neonomian. One would think this needed no proof, whether he that does a sinful act be a doer of it.

Antinomian. It needs no proof, as I always owned it to be so. I tell you, the Saints commit sin, and are therefore the doers of it; and I have told you, 'tis all that they can do of themselves, and that it is my sin, my sinful act; and yet my debt that I contracted may become another man's, if he has engaged for it.

Neonomian. Christ teacheth believers to pray for the pardon of sins. Lk.11:4.

Antinomian. So they had need, for sins are pardoned when they have it not, and it's to them as if they were not pardoned at all, if they have not the comfort.

Neonomian. It would be vain to object; they pray for manifestation of pardon.

Antinomian. Why in vain? Is it any more that a true believer can pray for? For he sees and knows all his sins are pardoned, but yet continues to pray for a further manifestation of pardon. Did not David tell us what it is? "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit." Psal.51:12.

Neonomian. For were it so, yet it is for our sins; it would sound strange to pray, forgive us the sins of Christ.

Antinomian. Yes, we pray for the pardon of our sins that were laid on Christ; and though we do not pray to forgive us the sins of Christ, yet we pray to God to forgive us for the sake of Christ, whose bearing of sin and satisfaction wrought, we always plead believing. But you will banter Christ's bearing sins.

Neonomian. The Saints in Scripture esteemed them their sins, and themselves sinners, when they committed sin, and found its motions. Jer.14:7, Isa.59:12, Job 7:21, Psal.25:11.

Antinomian. So do we, though they and we ought to acknowledge sin always in faith of the pardoning mercy of God in Christ; we should ask pardon in faith, nothing doubting; but sometimes there may be but weak faith, next to none, in God's children, and great doubtings, and therefore great guilt lying upon their consciences, and from thence great darkness in times of temptation. Thence did flow those pathological expressions of many of the faithful from God's hiding of his face, and the weakness of their faith, as if they were reprobated ones, and cast away; and so it is even now sometimes; and though we believe Christ has borne our sins, yet this is the greatest ground of true Gospel-brokenness of heart, that they were our sins, and are now the product of corrupt flesh, the old man remaining in us, which we labour under, endeavoring to get more and more into Christ by a strong faith, that the body of sin, the source of corruption in us, may be destroyed. Therefore repentance and godly sorrow is exercised even for our sins laid on Christ.

Neonomian. God reckons sins to be their own; he reproves them, he forgave them. I Jn.2:12, Jer.33:8, Rev.3:19, II Tim.4:16.

Antinomian. Sins are sins, and our sins, {we have said it again and again,} and therefore reprobable in us, and to be forgiven in us by the application of pardon; all this hinders not, but that we be without fault before God, and our sins cast behind his back. We have a perfection and fulness of pardon and all grace in Christ Jesus, though sin itself was never reconciled to

God; and therefore God sets us to the killing of it. Christ destroyed sin on the cross, as to the obstructing God's complete love to the persons of the elect; so that it cannot condemn before God; but it is sin yet in the elect, and will accuse and condemn wherever it is, or at least the law will by reason of it, and therefore it has its influence this way sometimes on the holiest men. It's in the nature of sin to condemn, but God does not condemn for sin; though he condemns sin daily in the holiest men, and through unbelief they are apt to think their persons condemned of God himself. When God denounces judgment against a sinful Church or Nation, they are ordinarily, hypocritical, profane and apostate, and therefore a mixed people, many or most under a Covenant of works, and a people in their sins, which God awakens by threatenings or judgments themselves; and therefore the places quoted by you affect us not. The force of your arguing lies here. Those sins that God calls our sins, and we ought to call our sins, are not laid on Christ and taken away; but God calls sins our sins, and we ought to call them so, ergo, the major is utterly false, for all places that we bring to prove, that sin was laid on Christ, do call them our sins; and we speak of them as such, and it's cause of abasement in ourselves, and thankful admiration of the free grace of God in Christ, and so the Church acknowledge their sins. "O LORD, though our iniquities testify against us, do thou it for thy name's sake; for our backslidings are many; we have sinned against thee." Jer.14:7. "For our transgressions are multiplied before thee, and our sins testify against us; for our transgressions are with us; and as for our iniquities, we know them. In transgressing and lying against the LORD, and departing away from our God, speaking oppression and revolt, conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood. And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter." Isa.59:12-14.

Neonomian. Mark what will follow hence, no elect members of a Church are justly censured for offences, and no Christian criminal could be punished; for they are not the sinners, the sin is not theirs.

Antinomian. It is a shame to hear a Minister argue in this manner. Your argument runs thus; if the sins of the elect were laid on Christ by imputation, then no Church or Court of judicature can proceed to condemn an offender. Doth man see and judge as God does? Is there no difference between a Divine Court, and a Human, Ecclesiastical or Civil Court? The law before man, and his administration of it, knows no difference of persons, it proceeds in strict accordance to the charges. Church censures are in order to a justification before the Church, that by faith and repentance it may appear, that God has forgiven such a one, that

he belongs to electing and redeeming grace, and the sinners sin laid on Christ; and when they find that, they are soon reconciled to an offending member. And you say, if sins were laid on Christ, no Christian criminal can be punished. A very sad case indeed; for then any criminal condemned justly by man's law, can never be saved; for if Christ bore not his sins, he can't be pardoned; nay, may not a godly man, through temptation, fall into a crime whereby he may justly suffer in a human court; and does this hinder his salvation by Christ? And is it an argument that his sins were never laid on Christ? Are not these consistent, a sinner and condemned by man's law, and an absolved sinner by the satisfied law of God? Was not the converted thief a sinner justly condemned by man, though absolved by God, because Christ bore his sins on the cross; and if he had repented before he had been hanged on the cross, would it have freed him from man's sentence. Satisfaction to God's law is not to man's, nor satisfaction to man's is not to God's. Men stay not execution of a malefactor because he repents to salvation; but man's law must take its course upon him. I doubt not but the Ordinary of Newgate can teach you better divinity than this. A man may be in one respect guilty, and in another not; and so likewise God deals with his children two ways, in case of their eminent falls, in a way of his common providential government of the world, as he dealt with David, that those evils of affliction {judgments in the apprehension of the men of the world} should befall them; and so in the participation of external, common calamities, there should not be any manifest difference between them and other men. Therefore the wise man says, that love and hatred is not known by these things. But notwithstanding all this, the other and certain way of God's dealing with them, is according to the Covenant of Grace, which is the secret of the Lord; he fully pardons their sins, is reconciled to them in Christ, will never leave or forsake them, his loving kindness shall not depart from them, and all things shall work together for their good.

Neonomian. An hundred such consequences naturally proceed from this error, which fully tends to render sin and sinners innocent; not to say what Popery is in it, as if justification did remove the filth of sin.

Antinomian. By such consequent drawers as you are, who will charge the greatest truths of the Gospel with any absurdities that are forged by carnal reason. As for danger of Popery, where is most, in justification by free grace or works? And when you make it appear that justification does not take away the guilt of sin, then you shall convince me, it taketh not away filth in that respect; for I take no greater filth to be in sin than guilt, and that which is the fountain of all other filth that is in it, or produced by it, causeth the inherent corruption. And

whereas you say, the doctrine of laying sins on Christ, tends to make sin and sinners innocent. To make sin innocent is a contradiction; sin is never made no sin, though the sinner may be made no sinner in a Gospel sense, and your position is dangerous.

Neonomian. I will show the grounds of your mistake; you think, because God removes our sins by pardon, so as to acquit us from punishment, therefore our sins cease to be ours.

Antinomian. That is no pardon to acquit only from punishment, if the fault remains, so that the person is under the charge of it. 2. Remitting of punishment only does not discharge us from sin. 3. Sin imputed to Christ, is not imputed to us; it's a contradiction to say, that it is in the same respect; and yet we say, it was our sins imputed to Christ, and so it's still. We say not, they are not ours imputed to Christ, but they are ours by Commission, and his by Imputation.

Neonomian. Because a pardoned sinner is discharged from condemnation, therefore you think that person is not to be denominated a sinner from the violation of the precept.

Antinomian. Pardon discharges from the fault itself, and forgives it, or else it's no pardon. A man may many ways escape punishment, and not have the fault pardoned. He that is pardoned is no sinner in the eye of the law, but we call him a pardoned sinner; and such an one ought by faith to look upon himself as perfectly righteous before God.

Neonomian. Because Christ took upon him to make satisfaction for sin, therefore he thinks no filth can cleave to the offender, nor he be a transgressor by the offence.

Antinomian. You know I do not think so; for you know that I said, a believer of himself can do nothing but sin. And do not you contend with me for saying, our very righteousness is sin, polluted and unclean; and you know my meaning is, that we are perfect and complete in Christ; in our selves all things are polluted and unclean; and I take this to be very sound Divinity. I will tell you what Luther says. "There is no more sin, death or malediction, since Christ now reigneth; we daily confess also in the Creed of the Apostles, which we say, we believe there is an Holy Church, which is indeed nothing else but as if we should say, I believe there is no sin, no malediction, no death in the Church of God. For they that do believe in Christ are no sinners, are not guilty of death, but are holy and righteous, lords over sin and death, and living forever. But faith only seeth this; for we say, I believe there is an Holy Church." {Luther on Gal.3:14.}

Neonomian. If thou wilt believe reason and thine own eyes, thou wilt judge clean contrary; for thou seest many things in the godly which offend thee, they fall into sin, are weak in faith, subject to wrath, envy, and such other evil affections;

therefore the Church is not holy.

Antinomian. I deny the consequence. If I look upon my own person, or the person of my brother, it shall never be holy; but if I behold Christ, who has sanctified and cleansed his Church, then it is altogether holy; for he has taken the sins of the elect; therefore where sins are seen and felt, there are they indeed no sins. For according to Paul's Divinity, there is no sin, no death, no malediction any more in the church, but in Christ that is the Lamb of God, that has taken away the sins of the world; who is made a curse, that he might deliver us from the curse. Contrariwise, according to philosophy and reason, sin, death, and the curse are nowhere else but in the world, in the flesh, or in sinners; for as a sophistical divine can speak no otherwise of sin than does a heathen philosopher, like as the color {says he} cleaveth to the wall, even so does sin in the world, in the flesh, and in the conscience. Therefore it is to be purged by contrary operations. But true divinity teacheth, there is no sin in the elect anymore; for Christ, upon whom the Father has cast the sins of the world, has vanquished and killed the same in his own body. He once dying for sin, and raised up again, dieth no more. Therefore wherever there's a true faith in Christ, there is a realization of sin abolished, dead and buried; but where no faith in Christ is, there sin does still remain; and albeit the remnants of sin be still in the saints, because they believe not perfectly, yet are they dead, in that they are not imputed unto them, because of the work of Christ.

DEBATE V.

OF THE TIME WHEN OUR SINS WERE LAID ON CHRIST, AND CONTINUED THERE

Neonomian. Let us now discourse about the time of God's laying our sins on Jesus Christ. I take Mr. Antinomian to be unsound in this point. For he says, that the time when our sins were laid actually on Christ was, when he was nailed to the cross, and God actually forsook him, and they continued on him till the Resurrection.

Antinomian. My words were these, "now there was a pitched time wherein God did serve execution actually upon him, and that was, when God did forsake this Son of his, when he called him forth, and served sin upon him as the desert of

transgression, when he said, my God, my God, &c. Now was the time of payment and satisfying God." I do not say that this was the first time of his bearing sin, he bore them in the Garden, and was there sorrowful unto death, and lay under soulsufferings; but upon the cross he finished his greatest sufferings, made payment in full; and therefore the Apostle Peter ascribes his bearing of sin mostly to that time when he was upon the cross, and under complaint of the punishment of loss, God's forsaking of him. Besides, I distinguish between the charging sin on Christ as our debt, and the payment of the debt; and say, this was the time of execution and payment; though I know you confound bearing sin as a debt, and making payment. So that you will have payment made when nothing is due upon any account.

Neonomian. But you say, look upon the execution, or rather the serving the execution, i.e., the actual laying of iniquity on Christ. This iniquity was laid upon him at that instant when he was upon the cross, and God nailed the sins of men to the cross of Christ, and from that time there was not one sin to be reckoned, &c.

Antinomian. You should have rehearsed a little more, for you are only for exposing me as much as may be, and therefore will not rehearse my whole sense. I said, from that time there was not one sin to be reckoned to believers, who are the members of Christ, or to Christ himself, he having then made satisfaction, and upon it given out to the world that it was finished. What was finished? It was the payment of the price so long looked for, the utmost farthing laid down. It is proper to say, payment is made, when it is finished.

Calvin. Pray, Sir, from what time do you date the laying of sins on Christ?

Neonomian. The obligation of sufferings for our sins was upon Christ, upon his undertaking the office of a Mediator, to the moment wherein he finished his satisfactory atonement; the punishment of our sins lay upon Christ, from the first moment to the last of his humiliation.

Antinomian. First then you grant his bearing sin by way of obligation from eternity. It was a little while ago you charged this for an error upon me, that our iniquities were laid upon Christ by way of obligation from all eternity, though you call it suffering for our sins; but we say, sin charged upon him unto suffering. And you own obligation from the first undertaking his Mediator's Office, and I take that was from eternity, and that he was indebted from thence to the moment when he finished his satisfactory atonement. I think there's no great difference between us in these things, provided you do but grant this obligation was from the demerit of our sins, which necessarily infers the charging our sins upon him as a guarantor, surety or

sponsor, that takes upon him another's debt; and you say also, satisfactory atonement; wherefore God was satisfied with the payment made. Now why must I be dealt so hardly with, as to be censured for erroneous, for saying, that Christ was under obligation to pay our debt from eternity, and stood obliged till he made full payment by way of execution upon the cross.

Calvin. As to the last part of your assertion, that the punishment of our sin lay upon Christ from the first moment to the last of his humiliation, it is false; for though he was the Lamb of God, in our nature yet he bore not sin actually, till he was offered up in sacrifice, then he was made sin as a sacrifice, and not before.

DEBATE VI

OF GOD'S SEPARATION AND ABHORRENCE OF CHRIST WHILE OUR SINS LAY UPON HIM

Neonomian. I shall acquaint you with an error of a gross nature that Mr. Antinomian is guilty of, and it is this error. That Christ was on the account of the filthiness of sin, while they lay upon him, separate from God, odious to him, and even the object of God's abhorrence, and this to the time of his Resurrection.

Antinomian. I pray Sir let us see how far this great error of your own forging is chargeable upon me.

Neonomian. I will acquaint these gentlemen with what you delivered; you said, Nay, for this I affirm, as Christ did bear our iniquities, so Christ for that iniquity was separated from God, and God was here separated from Christ, or else Christ spake untruth.

Antinomian. Take my words as they were. Iniquity cannot be laid on Christ, because it separates from God; but Christ could not be separated from God. Answer. This objection makes it most manifest that Christ did bear iniquity; because in that bearing of sins there was a separation from God, or else Christ's words were not true, my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? For where iniquity is, there will be a separation from God. And my argument stands thus, where there is a forsaking of God, there is a separation from God in the sense of sins separation from God; but in Christ's bearing sin there was a forsaking of God, ergo, it may be this forsaking was but for a little moment. Answer. It was as long as sin was upon him, had not Christ breathed out the sins of men that were upon him, he

had never seen God again; he having taken sin upon him, he must first unload himself of sin before he could be brought near to God; therefore you find that passage in the Psalms, "I will declare the decree, the LORD hath said unto me, thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee," Psal.2:7, expounded by the Apostle of the Resurrection of Christ, "God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Acts 13:33. As if the Lord at the Resurrection of Christ did beget his Son anew as it were; there was a separation and forsaking when Christ died, but at the Resurrection there was a meeting again, a kind of renewing of sonship with God; therefore the Apostle says, "it is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again from the dead," and sits at God's right hand; and what does he infer from thence? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect, i.e., till Christ himself came off from men's sins, men were in danger of being charged with sin, but Christ has died and made satisfaction, nay, rather is risen again, and has his discharge, &c., and I pray, gentlemen, wherein is this doctrine contrary to the Scriptures, or reason guided by the Word of God.

Neonomian. You say, it is a higher expression of love that Christ should bear the sins of men, than that he should be given to die for men, &c.

Antinomian. My reason of that assertion was added, for Christ to be given to die, comes short of the love he expresses in bearing sin. Affliction is not contrary to the nature of God, &c., but sin is; where God does charge any sinner he has an abhorrence there, i.e., so far as God chargeth and seeth sin. I said, God never did do such a wonderful thing to the astonishment of the creature, as laying sin on Christ; iniquity is the hatefulest thing in the world to God, {therefore the sin charged is abhorred by God,} where iniquity is found, a toad is not so ugly unto man, as that person is in the sight of God, where iniquity is found; sin is the most horrible and abominable, nay, the most abhorred thing in the world to God. That this is so the whole Scripture bears me witness; but observe what follows, that God should make Christ to be sin, is out of the reach of all the creatures in the world to apprehend how God should do it, and yet that he should retain his own power, by love, and respect to his Son. Now as there was an abhorrence of sin charged on Christ, yet, and accordingly a separation or forsaking upon that account, so far as he bore sin in his human nature; yet God did retain that love and respect to him as his Son. Neither do I say, that Christ in his Human nature was separated from the Divine by a dissolution of his hypostatical union; and therefore it's a false charge to say I said, God abhorred the person of his Son,

or that there was a separation between the Divine and Human natures of Christ.

Neonomian. You say, Christ was separated from God, which you affirm and I deny.

Antinomian. If you understand me according to the language of the Scripture and analogy of faith, I say, as sin brings inevitably the punishment of loss as the curse, and the greatest part of it, which is a judicial separation of God from the creature; this I affirm, Christ suffered this punishment in his soul. But if you will wrest my meaning to be this, that he was separated by a dissolution of the hypostatical union, I deny it. I say, should iniquity be laid on the Human nature, and the Divine nature not support it, it would have sunk under sin, as a mere human creature. Therefore it's apparent that I intended no such separation, {as also by my whole discourse it appears,} that you would impose upon me.

Neonomian. The question is, whether Christ was at any time under God's abhorrency, or odious to him, because under the loathsomeness of sin? This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. That I affirm it in your sense, is false; for you know I said in express terms, that God retained his love and respect to his Son, for it's not inconsistent, that God should retain his love to his Son in respect of his Divine nature, and yet lay him in respect of his Human nature under his manifest displeasure, being now under the charge of all the sins of his elect, and so sin on Christ was the object of God's abhorrency.

Neonomian. Whether Christ was thus on the account of the filthiness of sin, &c. This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. When you can clear sin from being filthiness in the sight of God, upon any account; and that guilt of sin, a consciousness of crime having been committed, {I mean, not liableness to punishment, that's not sin, but the effect of it,} is not the greatest filth of sin. I shall tell you, I do not think sin as to its filthiness was not laid on Christ, but this has been argued before. You think you have a great claw at me here; but I am sorry you understand the nature of sin no better, as to think it in the law relation to be so clean, as not to be filth in the sight of God.

Calvin. I pray Mr. Neonomian, lead us into the truth of this point, that we may not be mistaken. We are willing to receive light in these truths; but we think it of dangerous consequence to part with them, or darken them.

Neonomian. Though God testified his threatened indignation against sin in the awful sufferings of Christ, soul and body, in his agony, and suspended those delightful communications of the Divine nature to the Human nature of Christ, as to their wonted degrees; yet God was never separated

from Christ, much less during his body's lying in the grave; neither was the Father ever displeased with Christ; and far less did he abhor him, because of the filthiness of sin upon him.

Antinomian. This is a marvellous aphorism indeed. 1. Did God testify his threatened indignation against sin in the awful sufferings of Christ, soul and body? What is this less than what you would condemn for error in me? 2. Did God suspend his delightful communications to the human nature? What was this but the separation I always shown that I intended? 3. That God was never separated from Christ in the hypostatic union, I always affirm; no, not during his lying in the Grave. 4. Also, I never said, the Father was displeased with Christ as his Son, or in relation to him as Son, but in relation to him as our Surety, and as a sacrifice to bear sin, he was displeased with him, or else you give yourself the lie in the same paragraph, where you say, he testified his threatened indignation against sin in the sufferings of his body and soul; and how could this be without displeasure. 5. What have we been doing all this while? Have you not been arguing against Christ's bearing sin? And now you say, God testified his wrath against sin in the sufferings of Christ. If sin was not imputed to him, could he bear indignation for it? 6. And was not the Father as Judge displeased with Christ as debtor, and bearing our sins? How could he deal with him else in a way of testifying his indignation, as you say? 7. You say, he did not abhor him; so say we, not his person, nor in such a way of abhorrence that is in man's affections. God is not as man, in natural appetite or aversion; but he exerted such an abhorrence or aversion as was proper to his nature; we desire to term it but as you do, a manifestation of threatened indignation to sin, condemning sin in the flesh of Christ. As Christ was made sin, does not the Spirit of God say he was made a curse? Is not sin a cursed thing, that which is odious and abhorred? Suppose then we use not those words odious, abhorred, and we say, God testified his threatened indignation against sin in Christ, even to the making him a curse for us. What greater and higher expression can be used? And how could God's indignation be shown against sin on a person upon all accounts innocent, no way chargeable? Sin cannot suffer indignation, but the sinner may; sin in the abstract is not capable of suffering, it must be sin bringing some person under a law-condemnation, so that he has the denomination of a sinner. 9. And whereas you will not have sin filthy, where is it the Spirit of God represents it any otherwise, and the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice as to the purgation of filth? Therefore it's said, "who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on

high." Heb.1:3. So I say that your argument affects us not, for we never thought of any such separation, as I have told you; and it's your impudence to charge it.

Neonomian. The Father has promised constant supports to Christ in the whole of his undertakings and sufferings. Isa.42:1,4,6, Isa.50:7-9.

Antinomian. Shot beside me still. I said, should iniquity been laid on the Human nature, and the Divine nature not support it, it would have sunk under sin; and you own that I say so.

Neonomian. And is it not strange, gentlemen, that after he had said this, he should affirm a separation?

Antinomian. And is it not strange, that you cannot distinguish between separations. I may separate from a thing in one respect and not in another. I may separate from another as to communion, but not as to relation, let it be son, wife, brother, &c., and it's strange you cannot understand forsaking to be but of a relation.

Neonomian. The Lord Jesus could not be abhorred or odious to God, for in him God was always well-pleased. Isa.42:1, Matt.17:5.

Antinomian. We say the same, Christ's person in his eternal Sonship was so. All the indignation that was testified towards him in his Human nature, in which only he was capable of suffering, in that he became a curse as well as sin, God says it.

Neonomian. Mr. Calvin, how horrid a sound has it to the ear, to say, that Christ is odious to God, and abhorred by the Father?

Calvin. Methinks those new words applied to Christ do not sound so well, and some ears are offended at them. I think it's better to use the Scripture expressions, Christ made sin, and Christ made a curse for us. Let us but have the thing, Mr. Neonomian, we will part with any word that's not Scriptural, if you give us another that will express it as well.

Antinomian. Doth not this make as horrid a sound in a Christian ear, that God manifested his wrathful indignation against sin in the person of Christ, in a most awful and dreadful manner?

Calvin. But that's his way of expressing it, he does not like yours.

Antinomian. Then I will abdicate those words odious and abhorrence, and use his words; if he be not fond of mine.

Neonomian. Christ could not be separated from God, or abhorred; while his body lay in the grave, his soul went into Paradise.

Antinomian. No, his Hypostatical union was not

dissolved, nor God's Fatherly love removed from his person; but yet at the same time he was under the suffering of death, which was penal for sin, he finished his soul-sufferings on the cross, but was under the separation of body and soul, which was part of God's threatened indignation against sin; as also the lying of his body in the Grave.

Neonomian. I will show you your mistakes. You do not distinguish between the affection of wrath and effects of wrath, because God forsook Christ as to the usual degrees of comfort, he thinks Christ was separated from God.

Antinomian. Sure this is a foul mistake; if he should mistake his logic, as to take the cause to be the effect, and the effect the cause. But I doubt you mistake your divinity, as to ascribe an affection of wrath to God. But I pray, where there's an effect of wrath in the creature, is not wrath the cause of it? He that lies under the effects of wrath, is he not under wrath? If Christ suffereth the effects of wrath, he suffereth wrath. I know not how anyone should suffer wrath any other way. As to my thoughts about separation from God, they are only your imposition of thoughts and meanings upon me, as I have told you.

Neonomian. Because he that is formally a sinner is odious to God, therefore he thinks Christ was odious to God, who had on him the punishment of sin, with the guilt or obligation to bear punishment by his own consent, neither of which have anything of the loathsomeness of sin.

Antinomian. I will not use the word odious, because you love not the smell of it; I say therefore, because a formal sinner, or committer of sin unpardoned, is the object of God's threatened indignation bearing the effects of wrath, therefore an imputed sinner is also the object of God's threatened indignation bearing the effects of wrath. You will be at the old Socinian notion still, that Christ bore but the punishment for sin, and guilt is only obligation to punishment; which is absolutely false, unless you mean guilt related to fault; for nothing is a demerit of punishment, but guilt.

Neonomian. I know not why you think Christ came not near God from the time of his Death to his Resurrection, unless because of your conceit, for the loathsomeness of sin God could not bear the sight of him.

Antinomian. Your frequent banter and scoffs at the Scripture-account of the nature of Christ's Satisfaction, and of sin, I am sure is very odious, and a horrid sound to a Christian ear. I shall not think such reasoning worthy of anything but a note of contempt.

Calvin. Mr. Neonomian, you must know that we cannot part with this article of our faith, that Christ was made a curse

for us, no more than that, that he was made sin; that Christ bore the curse of the law, and was made a curse for us, is such a Gospel-truth, that we need no other authority for it, than what is contained in the Scripture, being so expressly declared; which all sound Protestants always understood of bearing the wrath of God in his soul and body, especially in his soul, undergoing the deprivation of the Father's love and the positive infliction of punishment, the first whereof I look to be the greatest and cause of the other, and also fully enough expressed by our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross. Take Mr. Calvin in his Harmony on the Evangelists. "Although there appeared more than human courage in Christ's outcry, yet it's certain it was uttered from extremity of grief. Verily, this was his chiefest conflict, and more grievous than all his other torments, because that in his anguishes he was not so refreshed with his Father's holy favor, that he did in some respect perceive him alienated from him; for neither did he offer his body only as the price of our reconciliation with God, but in his soul he bore the punishment due to us; and they are men of unsavory spirits, that slighting this part of redemption, do insist only on the external punishments of the flesh; for as Christ satisfied for us, so it was requisite that he should be set as guilty before God's tribunal; for nothing is more horrible than to perceive God as a Judge, whose wrath exceeds all deaths. Neither does he complain feignedly or theatrically that he was deserted of God, according to the insipid cavils of some, for the inward grief of his soul from the depth of anguish, compelled him to break forth into this outcry. He did perfectly fulfill the law, endured most grievous torments immediately in his soul. He bore the weight of God's wrath, and laid down his life an offering for sin."

Question. What death did Christ suffer when he sacrificed himself?

Answer. According to Mr. Perkins Catechism, "a death upon the cross, peculiar to himself alone, for besides the separation of body and soul, he felt also the pangs of Hell, in that the whole wrath of God due to the sin of man was poured forth upon him. The Apostle does not say that Christ was cursed, but made a curse, which is more; for it shows that all malediction was included in him. This may seem hard, that it may look like a reproach to the cross of Christ in confession, of which we glory; but God was not ignorant of what kind of death his Son should die, when he said, cursed is every one that hangeth on a Tree. But one may here object, how comes it to pass that the Son in whom the Father delights, should be accursed? I answer, two things are here to be considered, not only in the Person of Christ, but also in his Humanity. One is, that he was the Lamb of God without spot, full of blessing and grace. The other, that he took

our person; therefore he was made sin, and under the curse, not so much in himself as in us, but yet it was necessary he should die in our stead, which he could not do out of the grace of God; and yet he underwent his wrath, else how could he reconcile the Father to us, whom he looked upon as incensed against us; therefore the will of the Father did always rest satisfied in him. Again, how could he free us from the wrath of God, unless he had translated it from us to him; therefore he was wounded for our sins, and experienced God as an angry Judge. This is the foolishness of the cross, but admired by angels, and swallows up all the wisdom of the world. We must not imagine Christ to be innocent, and as a private person, {as do the schoolmen, and almost all the fathers have done,} which is holy and righteous for himself only. True it is, that Christ is a person most pure and unspotted; but thou must not stay there, for thou hast not yet Christ, although thou know him to be God and Man; but then thou hast him indeed, when thou believest that this most pure and innocent person is freely given unto thee of the Father to be thy Priest and Saviour; yea, rather thy servant, that he putting off his innocency and holiness, and taking thy sinful person upon him, might bear thy sin, thy death and thy curse, and might be made a sacrifice and curse for thee, that by this means he might deliver thee from the curse of the law."

As Paul applied unto Christ that place of Moses, accursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; so may we apply unto Christ not only that whole 27th of Deuteronomy but also may gather all the curses of Law of Moses together, and expound the same of Christ. For as Christ is innocent in this general law touching his own person; so is he also in all the rest. And as he is guilty in this general law, in that he is made a curse for us, and is hanged upon the cross, as a wicked man, a blasphemer, a murderer, a traitor, even so is also guilty in all others. For all the curses of the law are heaped together, and laid upon him; and therefore he did bear and suffer them in his own body for us; he was therefore not only accursed, but made a curse for us.

I will tell you what an eminent New England Divine, {Samuel Stone, Minister and Co-founder of Hartford, Connecticut,} no Antinomian, said to this point. "It may appear that Christ was made a curse for us, because he suffered the perfection of the second death, which he began in the Garden, where he began to be sorrowful. Matt.26:37. He drank the first draught of the Cup of wrath, and afterwards it's said, he was in a great agony. There was the second upon the cross; he drank up the bottom and dregs of the Cup of Vengeance, and said, it is finished. Jn.19:30. He was cursed of God in an eminent manner, Deut.21:22,23 compared with Gal.3:13. If a man be guilty of sin, worthy of death, and to be hanged for it, then he is accursed,

otherwise not. Christ was accursed hanging on the Tree, and therefore it's certain he was guilty of our sins charged upon him, being the greatest sinner by imputation; and hence he was really cursed of God, and that in an eminent manner; and not only cursed, but a curse in the abstract; whereby it is most evident that he suffered the immediate impressions of the wrath of God, and the second death, which takes possession of the whole man, and therefore must have suffered while his soul and body were united, or standing together; he was those three hours in the darkness of Hell, encountering the powers of darkness, and wrestling with the wrath of an infinite God, man by sin having displeased such an infinite God, must suffer that infinite displeasure which Christ suffered in our room. The perfection of which second death consisted in this, that he was utterly deprived of all the sweetness of his Father's love and presence, and filled with the sense of all the bitterness of his wrath, Psal.22:1-2, Isa:53:4-11, Matt.27:45-46, Gal.3:13, in which we may attend. 1. The punishment of loss, a total privation and desertion in respect of sense and feeling of the sweetness of his Father's love and presence. This desertion appeared in that the God of glory forsook him, left him destitute and desolate. God the Father hid his face from him, God would not send in any comfort, by sun, angels or saints. God did not only stand at a distance, but locked up himself in anger from him, and would not be entreated by him. Psal.22:1-2, &c. 2. There was not only dereliction but malediction. Gal.3:13. He was assailed by all the infernal powers of Hell. Lk.22:53. This is the authority of darkness; they might do their worst now, they had their full scope; the greatest battle was fought upon the cross. Col.2:15, Heb.5:7. 3. He wrestled with the fierceness of the wrath of an Angry God, consuming Fire; he was smitten of God. Isa.53:4. God was his executioner. 4. A confluence of plagues and evils fell upon him, and settled themselves on his sacred person, and he was filled with them, he was in the depth of them. Psal.69:1."

Question. What did our Saviour suffer in soul? Dr. Usher's Body of Divinity.

Answer. "He drank the full cup of God's wrath filled unto him for our sakes; the whole wrath of God due to the sin of man being poured forth upon him, therefore in soul he did abide unspeakable vexations, horrible griefs, painful troubles, fear of mind, feeling as it were the very pangs of Hell; into which both before, and most of all when he hanged upon the cross, he was cast, which caused him before his bodily passion so grievously to complain. The death of Christ is the last act of his Humiliation, whereby he underwent the most extreme, horrible and greatest punishments for man's sins. 2. It contained the greatest punishments, because it did equalize all that misery which the

sins of men did deserve. Hence is that plenty of words and phrases whereby that death is expressed in Scripture? For it's not called simply death, but cutting off, rejection, treading under foot, a curse, a heaping up of wounds and stripes. Isaiah 53. Psalms 22. The inchoation of the death of Christ in respect of loss, was the loss of joy and delight in the enjoyment of God and the fulness of his grace was wont to supply him with, which he lost not as to the principle and habit, but as to the act and sense. The inchoation of the spiritual death in the punishment of sense was his tasting of Divine wrath, and a kind of subjection to the power of darkness, which Divine wrath was most especially the cup which was given to him to drink. Matt.26:39." Christ as sponsor was that object of this wrath absolutely.

FINIS.

Neonomianism
Unmasked
OR, THE
Ancient Gospel
PLEADED;
AND THE OTHER
CALLED
The New LAW.

Being the Continuation of the
SECOND PART of the
Theological debate, occasioned
by a book by Mr. Daniel
Williams, entitled, Gospel Truth
Stated and Vindicated, &c.

By ISAAC CHAUNCY, M. A.

LONDON, 1693.

DEBATE VII.

OF THE CHANGE OF PERSON BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE ELECT, AND THEIR BEING AS RIGHTEOUS AS HE.

Neonomian. Having stated, and finished the doctrine of imputation of sin, let us, if you please, in the next place examine the doctrine of imputation of righteousness; I have in this point, as I shall state it, great errors to charge upon Mr. Antinomian.

Antinomian. I pray Sir proceed, I shall be very attentive to your charge.

Neonomian. You hold that every believer {or elect person} is as righteous as Christ; and there is a perfect change of person and condition between Christ and the elect; he was what we are, and we are what he was, viz., perfectly holy, without spot or blemish.

Calvin. If I mistake not, this is the 22th error Mr. B. chargeth upon the Antinomian, but that he stated it truer than you. Error 22. "They feign Christ to have made such an exchange with the elect, as that having taken all their sins, he has given them all his righteousness; not only the fruit of it, but the thing itself; so that they are as perfectly righteous as Christ himself, and so esteemed of God; and this doctrine subverts all the Gospel; viz., that God makes an effectual grant and donation of a true, real and perfect righteousness, even that of Christ himself, to all that believe, accounting it as theirs." Scripture Gospel Defended.

Antinomian. Let the question go in his own terms; I choose to hold him to them, because he reckons no man states a question better than himself; pray Sir make proof in matter and form as charged by you.

Neonomian. That I can easily; you say, mark it well, Christ himself is not so completely righteous, but we are as righteous as he; nor we so completely sinful, but Christ became so, being made sin, as completely sinful as we. Nay more, we are the same righteousness, for we are made the righteousness of God; the very sinfulness that we were, Christ is made that very sinfulness before God. So that here is a direct change, Christ takes our person and condition, and stands in our stead; we take Christ's person and condition, and stand in his stead. So that if you reckon well, you must always reckon your selves in another's

person, and that other in your person. God gives Christ, i.e., God gives the person of Christ to men, as much as to say, God gives Christ to stand in the room of men, and men to stand in the room of Christ; so that in giving Christ it is as it were to make a change, &c.

Antinomian. When I speak of completely sinful and righteous, you must know that I still understand by way of imputation, that which was not originally in the subject; and so the perfection is a perfection of imputation, which is as real and complete in its kind as any relative perfection. A man may be a weak sickly man, but a perfect Father; a poor man, but as perfect a son as the son of the richest; a man may be free from debts, and yet make himself as perfect a debtor for the debts of others as any man for his own; and a man may be a poor, wretched, miserable creature, but made as righteous in respect of the law as the richest man on earth, by the money of another man; that which denominates a man perfectly righteous is this, that he owes nothing to the law; and if a man be worth but forty shillings, and owe nothing, he is as righteous in a legal righteousness, as he that has a thousand pound; therefore it's no hyperbolical expression for one that owes nothing to the law, to say, I am as righteous as the King, meaning such a righteousness which the law requireth of him, respecting the precept or sanction, active and passive obedience; I mean not the righteousness of legislation or execution of justice in a way of distribution, but such a righteousness that I am furnished with. So when I say, we are as righteous as Christ, I mean not Christ's Mediatorial righteousness as you suggest; I do not mean Mediatorial righteousness, but the righteousness of the Mediator. When I say I am as righteous now, {after my debt of five pound is paid, and owe no more in all the world,} in the eye of the law, as my friend that paid my debt, and fetched me out of prison. I do not thereby say that I have as good an estate as he, or that I have so many thousand pounds as he; or as able to pay the debts of others as he is; and as for the other part of your charge about our commutation of person, I justify myself in it, that as Christ bore my sins by imputation, so I have his righteousness, and am righteous in his righteousness, by imputation. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." II Cor.5:21.

Calvin. What do you, Mr. Neonomian, reckon to be truth in this point?

Neonomian. The truth is this. The Mediatorial righteousness of Jesus Christ is so imputed to true believers, as that for the sake thereof they are pardoned and accepted unto life eternal; it being reckoned to them, and pleadable by them for these uses, as if they had personally done and suffered what

Christ did as Mediator for them, whereby they are delivered from the curse, and no other atonement or meriting price of saving benefits can be demanded from them?

Antinomian. Your doctrine of imputed righteousness necessarily infers the consequents that you would draw upon us; for if the Mediatorial righteousness of Christ be imputed, {as you explain it yourself,} to be habitual as well as active and passive; then we must be reckoned our own mediators; for we must be reckoned such as Christ is, in person, and in office; but we deny that the Mediatorial righteousness was imputed, but his Mediatory Righteousness, or that Righteousness he wrought for us as Mediator.

2. You say this righteousness is so imputed to a true believer, as for the sake thereof he is pardoned; I am sure by your so, you mean another sense than what we mean; that we are only pardoned effective, and that's no more than we are sanctified and glorified for its sake; and this appears by your second difference, where you say the difference is not, whether our justification, and all other benefits, when we are partakers of them, be the fruits of this righteousness as the only meritorious cause. So that you have no reason to quarrel with me for saying, that through Christ's bearing of sin we appear in perfect holiness, {speaking there of glory,} for you say, justification and all other benefits flow from it; therefore in the same manner as we are justified by the righteousness of Christ, in the same manner we are sanctified and glorified, i.e., effective, in your sense.

3. You say also pleadable for these uses, i.e., for all uses in a like manner.

4. As if they had personally done and suffered what Christ did as Mediator for them; your meaning is, that it's as well done as if they had done it themselves. A man may do a thing as well as another, that he does not for another in his stead; yea, a man may do a thing for another, and not do it in his stead; as a Taylor makes a minister a suit of clothes, but does not do it in his stead; because it's not his business to make his clothes; but it's another thing for a man to come and preach for him, that is, to do it in his stead; because it's his proper work, profession and business.

5. And hereby you say they are delivered from the curse. What mean you by the curse? We shall find this curse is not the whole vindictive wrath of God, only eternal curse. And for our comfort you tell us, this is all the atonement or meriting price of saving benefits that God can demand of us. It's so in our stead, as that God can exact no other atonement, and so a security from God's hurting us.

In a word, the description of imputation here that you have given, is but a mere piece of sophistry; that imputed

righteousness may be anything for all this, and we shall see by and by what you will have it be.

Neonomian. Nevertheless, this Mediatorial righteousness is not subjectively in them; nor is there a change of person between them and Christ, neither are they as righteous as he, but there remain spots and blemishes in them, until Christ by his Spirit perfect that holiness begun in all true believers, which he will effect before he bring them to Heaven.

Antinomian. Now you come to the negative part of your description, which should have been first; and having said nothing of the thing at first, you tell us it's nothing at last. 1. You say this Mediatorial righteousness, Sir, is not subjectively in us. I know no judicious divine ever talked so, nor would you, if you understood Mediatorial righteousness, as it's apparent you do not. 2. You say there's no change of person between Christ and them. You mean, that the believer becomes not Christ, nor Christ the believer. We mean so too. 3. You say too, that believers are not as righteous as he, you mean such a righteousness mediatorial. 4. You basely insinuate, that their righteousness in justification is imperfect; for the spots and blemishes we speak of is in respect of righteousness.

Neonomian. I question not whether Christ by his righteousness merited for all the elect, that they should in his time and way be certainly partakers of its saving effects; and did not only purchase a conditional grant of those effects, viz., that proposition, he that believeth shall be saved.

Antinomian. It seems Christ then merited a certainty of salvation only of the elect; I thought their salvation was made certain by election; the foundation of God stands sure. II Tim.2:19. Your meaning is, Christ's merits made our salvation certain, which in respect of election was uncertain. 2. And but certain in another way, viz., of a conditional grant that is not yet performed, and belongs to the non-elect as well as to the elect; and there's yet an uncertainty remaining, notwithstanding the certainty purchased. 3. It's very odd to say, Christ purchased a proposition, and a conditional one too, the condition whereof must be something not purchased to be performed by us, that we may have the gift promised; for if the certainty depend upon the merit and purchase, then both the condition and promise is purchased, and then the purchase is absolute. I would know whether the certainty of the salvation of the elect be purchased conditionally or absolutely; if purchased conditionally, then this proposition, the elect shall be saved, is yet uncertain in respect of the purchase of Christ, and is but a contingent proposition, and not certain, which is a contradiction. If you say Christ purchased absolutely the salvation of the elect, all your contingent purchase falls to the ground. But Christ purchased

persons absolutely, not conditional propositions; and is he that believes shall be saved, a conditional proposition indeed?

Neonomian. Nor whether besides these effects being made ours, the very righteousness of Christ be imputed to true believers, as what was always undertaken and designed for their salvation, and is now effectual to the actual pardon and acceptance to life; yea, is pleadable by them for their security, and is as useful to their happiness, as if themselves had done and suffered what Christ did.

Antinomian. Gentlemen, you would think that Mr. Neonomian had here owned the doctrine of imputation; but it is nothing so, he does but sham it still. Mark, he says, besides the effects of Christ's righteousness, the very righteousness of Christ is imputed as to effects, or effectualness, i.e., pardon and acceptance is the effects; but he tells you not that it is the proper and immediate righteousness, he will have the righteousness of Christ to have some effects, and is imputed as to such; so that sanctification and glorification being effects, are as much the imputation of the very righteousness of Christ. It's a strange thing to confound the cause and effects; to tell us the very cause is imputed, and presently to tell us he means the effects. This is to talk daggers, for cause and effect are opposite. But he says, the righteousness of Christ is what was undertaken and designed for their salvation, and is effectual, and in that sense imputed. Very good; so that it was a subordinate means to accomplish that end, as was also creation, {which was by Christ, Col.1:16,} preaching the Gospel, their calling, sanctification; hence the imputation of Christ's righteousness is but to give it a place in the order of means for our salvation, and in that order of means has its effects. But he says, there is a privilege by it as well as a proper effect, it's pleadable for their security. I would know how it comes to be pleadable; is it from its own certainty to us, and our salvation by it, or from our performance of the condition of the grant? If a conditional grant he purchased, we cannot plead the certainty of our state from the purchase, but very remotely after another plea first; if the condition of the grant be never so small, we must first plead it, before we can plead the purchase; we must have a plea for the right to the purchase before we can have any plea to the grant by the purchase. Lastly, he says, the righteousness of Christ is as useful this way as any, as if Christ had suffered in their stead he means, i.e., a new Gospel will do your business as well as the old and true.

Neonomian. I question not whether Christ by his righteousness merited, that believers shall be perfectly holy, even without spot and blemish.

Antinomian. But you say, Christ's merits are imputed only as to their effects; and in that sense the merits of Christ are

imputed for sanctification in the same manner as to justification.

Neonomian. I doubt not but spots and blemishes may consist with his justified state, &c.

Antinomian. Nor I, spots as to inherent holiness, but by virtue of Christ's righteousness imputed unto justification, he is without spot before God; this righteousness has no spot in it, but you charge it for error to say they are so righteous that they have no spot in them.

Neonomian. The difference lies in these points. 1. Whether there be a change of person between Christ and the elect, this you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. I affirm there is in the true Gospel sense, not in such a forced invidious sense that you would put upon us.

Neonomian. 2. Whether the Mediatorial righteousness of Christ be subjectively in us? This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. It's false, I affirm it not.

Neonomian. Whether we be as righteous as Christ, be a proper and safe speech? This you affirm, I deny; though I yield that we are for the sake of his righteousness, delivered from the guilt of sin, and entitled to life; yea, accepted with God against all excluding bars.

Antinomian. We deny a believer is as righteous as Christ in respect of justice meritorious, the righteousness imputed is not that righteousness; neither is it communicable by imputation; but it's the Mediatorial Righteousness of Christ, or that Righteousness he wrought for is as Mediator, that is the material cause of our justification, you make it imputed but in the effect; and in the best sense you make it but, from this path the grace of the matter is; and so we are sanctified and glorified; but we say the righteousness of Christ is the material righteousness of our justification, no other righteousness or condition coming in with it in the imputation, and that thereby believers are as free from the condemnation of the law, and in the eye of justice, as Christ himself; if his righteousness had not been such, he could not have arose from the dead. You say you yield that for the sake of Christ's righteousness we are delivered from guilt. How? Is it not because he bore the guilt, and satisfied for it? It's this bearing guilt, and satisfying God's justice, that we by faith stand in, and all our guilt covered by, it's this very satisfaction in the full nature of it, is imputed to us. You say, accepted of God against all excluding bars. This is little better than nonsense; however your meaning lies very fair in it, that our acceptance to God's positive favor and love is not here, but elsewhere; and acceptance as to excluding bars, is only a negative acceptance, an acceptance and no acceptance; the removing the bars and obstacles to acceptance, supposeth there may be an acceptance upon some other terms. It is a miserable

thing that Christ's righteousness should do no more than remove a bar. The Apostle says, we are accepted in the Beloved, he should have said, the bars of acceptance are removed by the Beloved, now provide for your acceptance as well as you can.

Neonomian. Whether because Christ is perfectly holy, can we be said to be perfect in holiness upon the account of any imputation of his holiness to us, or we so esteemed by God? This I affirm, you deny.

Antinomian. You should affirm it upon your principles, allowing no imputation, but as to the effects of his righteousness; and I tell you, in a perfect person, such as Adam in innocence, and Christ the second Adam, there is no difference between personal righteousness and holiness.

Neonomian. The question is, whether the elect believer before he is perfectly holy, is wholly without spot, filth and blemish? This you affirm, and I deny; though I grant that those spots, blemishes, and filth shall not subject them to the curse and wrath of God, nor forfeit saving benefits.

Antinomian. We say in respect of the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ, that is imputed unto a believer, he is perfect and without spot in the eye of God's justice, and that in Christ this righteousness is perfect holiness, and as such, is theirs as in their head. "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in his sight." Col.1:19-22. And in your divinity you say these spots, &c., shall not subject them to curse and wrath. If so, it has perfectly freed them from the charge of sin in the eye of God's justice, all their iniquities are forgiven, and their sin covered with the righteousness of Christ, that they stand in that righteousness before the Throne. For if justice charge them with sin, i.e., lay it to their charge, it must condemn them to the curse and wrath due; but "who shall lay anything to the charge of God' elect? It is God that justifieth." Rom.8:33. And then follows, "who shall condemn?" Therefore where there's just accusing before God, there's also condemning; and hence though there be remaining sins and corruptions in the holiest believer, yet God marks them not so as to lay them to their charge in the way of vindictive justice; they are not {say you} subjected to curse and wrath.

Neonomian. I shall confirm my positions. There is no change of person between Christ and the elect.

Antinomian. I pray what do you mean by that position?

Neonomian. Christ was the Saviour, and never ceased to be so, we are saved; Christ was the Redeemer, and we the redeemed; Christ forgives, we forgiven.

Antinomian. Imputation of Christ's righteousness in redemption, for justification or forgiveness, does not denominate us Saviours, or Redeemers, and as they stand mutually affected, cannot be converted into each other; you are now upon a sure side. A father cannot be the son in that respect as he is the father, and yet he may be a son too; and though they are contraries, yet do consist in the relation of the two parts to every whole; in respect of the one, it has been a cause, and the other the correlated effect. Redeemer and redeemed are mutual causes and effects, and yet contraries; and the contraries yet do exist by the mutual relation that they have to each other.

Neonomian. What is all this to the purpose?

Antinomian. I would hereby give you to know that I understand the logical difference between Redeemer and redeemed and if you knew it yourself, you would be ashamed to use this argument to any men of learning; but such studied divines take themselves to have such puzzling pates, that they can be dictators to all men.

Neonomian. It's profane arrogance for us to pretend to his prerogatives; and its blasphemy to debase him among their number, who were enemies, and without strength.

Antinomian. Logic failing, it's not amiss to betake yourself to some high strains of rhetoric; some great words may make a man look big, but never affright wise men from the truth.

Neonomian. My second argument is, the Mediatorial righteousness of Christ is not subjectively in us.

Antinomian. No, nor by imputation neither, i.e., both his Mediatorial Righteousness and Justifying Righteousness is both subjectively in Christ and us; originally in Christ, imputatively in or upon us; we are the subjects by your leave of imputed righteousness, and Christ of imputed sin; and this very subjectiveness cuts off both your arguments at once, because the very proposition that we are the subjects of imputed righteousness, denies ourselves to be the authors of that righteousness, and affirms another to be so; my very saying that the creditor took another's bond for my debt, and delivered up my bond to me upon his payment, does sufficiently acquaint all rational men that I not only ascribe the payment to another man, but do affirm that his money was accepted on my account; and if any should hear me say that I became a surety, because he paid my debt, they would think I were mad; but if I say, that the creditor took such an one as pay-master instead of me, and his money paid was reckoned to me, no man but would judge it very good sense besides Mr. Neonomian.

Neonomian. I do not speak of inherent righteousness, of which he is not only the pattern, but also is the cause and worker. Phil.3:9.

Antinomian. We would not mistake you, you would be understood that we are the subjects of inherent righteousness; and I tell you, so are we of imputed righteousness, Christ is not; as Christ is the bearer of our sins by imputation. That which God imputes to us, and faith applies to us, we are the subjects of it. As for Phil.3:9, which you pervert and understand of our inherent righteousness, we shall examine that anon. I see you are very fond of your first argument, and every argument must run into it like a mathematical principle, that must clinch every demonstration; such as this, three angles of a triangle are equal to two square angles; or that any two lines not parallel protracted will at last cut, &c. Now say you, if Christ's righteousness be imputed to us who was a Saviour, then we are saviours; and it runs thus; if a surety pays my debt, then I am a surety; if my Father pays my debt, I am thereby made a father, whether I have children or no. If a rich merchant pay the debt of a poor cobbler, and fetch him out of Ludgate, the cobbler hereby becomes a merchant. A justice of peace takes off the penalty from a Constable for some fault, whereby he has forfeited his Office, and therefore the Constable must become a justice of peace. The absurdity of your inference hence easily appears, imputation of the action of one party to another, no way infers physical change, or individual identity, but signifies a relative change, not of one into another, but of both to the law; the law takes the surety for the debtor, and the original debtor to be a pay-master in the surety. As the sponsor becomes a reputed debtor, and the principal debtor becomes the reputed pay-master; and note, when we speak of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, we understand not the imputation of his Offices, as you would have us, is not that the commutation here meant by you?

Neonomian. It's inconsistent with the nature of Gospel imputation.

Antinomian. It is inconsistent with our doctrine of imputation, but must necessarily follow from your notion of Mediatorial righteousness; and all your inferences upon this hypothesis is but fighting with your own shadow; and therefore we shall leave you therein, for your arguing affects us not in the least.

Calvinist. The doctrine of imputation of Christ's righteousness to us to justification, and a sweet permutation of persons in a law sense and relation, we must assent and stand by, notwithstanding all your cavils against it; the Scriptures are plain and express for it, and will stand as bulwarks to defend this

doctrine against all Papists, Socinians and Neonomians; and because you Mr. Neonomian quote Dr. Owen, would have us to believe that he is a patron to your notions, and men that read him not may think so from your authority, I would disabuse them, and show you how naked, how diametrically opposite to you that learned Doctor is? He says, "there is in Scripture represented to us a commutation between Christ and believers, as unto sin and righteousness, i.e., in the imputation of their sins unto him, and of his righteousness unto them. In the improvement and application hereof unto our souls, no small part of the life and exercise of faith does consist. This was taught the Church in the offering of the Scape-Goat. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness, and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited; and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." Lev.16:21-22. This Goat was sent away with this burden upon him; and whether he did live, and was a type of the life of Christ in his Resurrection, or whether he perished in the Wilderness, being cast down the precipice of a Rock, &c., it's generally acknowledged what was done to him, and with him, was only a representation of what was done really in the person of Christ. He did not transfuse sin from one subject to another, but transferred the guilt of it; and to evidence this translation of sin from the people unto the sacrifice. Aaron in his Confession, put and fixed both his hands on his head. Thence the Jews say, that all Israel was made as innocent on the day of Expiation as they were in the day of Creation, from verse 30, "for on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the LORD," wherein they came short of perfection or consummation; but this is the language of every Expiatory sacrifice, let the guilt be upon him; hence the sacrifice was called sin and guilt. "And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, and slay the sin offering in the place of the burnt offering." Lev.4:29. And so God laid on Christ the iniquities of us all, that by his stripes we might be healed, Isa.53:5-6, our iniquity was laid on him, and he bear it, verse 11, and through his bearing it we were freed from it. His Stripes were our healing, our sin was his, imputed to him; his merit ours, imputed unto us. He was made sin for us, &c., that we might become the righteousness of God in him. II Cor.5:21. This is that commutation I mentioned, he was made sin for us; we are made the righteousness of God in him, God not imputing sin to us but righteousness. The same is expressed by the same Apostle. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak

through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom.8:3-4. The sin was made his, he answered for it, and the righteousness which God requireth by the law is made ours, the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us, not by our doing it, but by his. This is that blessed change and commutation, wherein alone the soul of a convinced sinner can find rest and peace. So he has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, that the blessing of Abraham might come upon us. Gal.3:13-14. He was made a curse, whereof his hanging on a tree was a sign and token; hence said to bear our sins in his body on a tree. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed." I Pet.2:24. And in the blessing of faithful Abraham all righteousness and acceptance with God is included."

And to take off impertinent clamors of some against this doctrine, he quotes the original words of Justin Martyr, "he gave his Son a ransom for us; the holy for transgressors; the innocent for the guilty, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corrupt, the immortal for mortals. For what else could hide or cover our sins but his righteousness? In whom else could we wicked and ungodly ones be justified or esteemed righteous, but in the Son of God alone? O sweet permutation, or change! O Unsearchable work! That the iniquity of many should be hid in one Just One, and the righteousness of One should justify many transgressors." Gregory of Nyssa speaks thus, "he has transferred unto himself the filth of my sins, {observe the expression Mr. Neonomian,} and communicated to me his purity. So Augustine, "he was sin that we might be righteousness, not our own, but the righteousness of God, not in ourselves, but in him, as he was sin, not his own, but ours, not in himself, but in us." And he thus comments on, Psal.22:1, "how says he of my sins, because he prayeth for our sins, he made our sins to be his, {mark Mr. Neonomian,} that he might make his righteousness to be ours; O sweet commutation and change." And he quotes Chrysostom on II Cor.5:21, "what word, what speech is this? What mind can comprehend or express it? For he says, he made him who was righteous to be made a sinner, that he might make sinners righteous." And he speaks not of an inclination, but expresses the quality itself. He saith not, he made him a sinner, but sin; that we might be made not merely righteous but righteousness; and that the righteousness of God; when we are justified, not by works, {for if we should there must be no spot found in them,} but by grace, whereby all sin is blotted out." And how far is this from your Divinity, Mr. Neonomian?

Calvin. He quotes also Bernard and Luther, and divers others, which you may read, Mr. Neonomian, at your leisure, I find you have the book, especially that excellent discourse of Albertus Pighius.

He adds, "nor are we to be moved that men who are unacquainted with these things in reality and power, do reject the whole work of faith herein, as an easy effort of fancy and imagination. For the preaching of the cross is foolishness unto the best of the natural wisdom of men." Dr. Owen gives the original of your argument against imputation of Christ's righteousness to us, viz., "that if the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us so as to be made ours, then are we as righteous as Christ himself, because we are righteous with his righteousness." Dr. Owen shows this to be Bellarmine's argument against the imputation of Christ's righteousness. "If the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us so as to be made ours thereby, then are we as righteous as Christ himself, because we are righteous with his righteousness."

These things are plainly affirmed in Scripture, that as unto ourselves, we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousness are as filthy rags, Isa.64:6, on the one hand, and that in the Lord we have righteousness and strength on the other. "Surely, shall one say, in the LORD have I righteousness and strength, even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the LORD shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." Isa.45:24-25. That if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves; and yet that we are the righteousness of God in Christ; wherefore these things are consistent whatever cavils the will of man makes against them; unless we take Socinus's rule of interpretation, namely, where anything seems repugnant to our reason though never so express in Scripture, not to admit of it, &c. 2. Notwithstanding the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and our being made righteous thereby, we are sinners in ourselves, and so cannot be said to be as righteous as Christ, but only made righteous in him, who are sinners in ourselves. 3. We must distinguish between the personal righteousness of Christ, and our personal righteousness, and between righteousness of inhesion and imputation, being of divers kinds. 4. The righteousness of Christ was the righteousness, personally of the Son of God, in which respect of infinite perfection, and not to be compared to, &c.

And as to that place which you boast of, it's wholly against you; for having shown what imputation is, he tells us, that righteousness itself is imputed, and not any of the effects, but the effects of it are made ours by virtue of that imputation. To say the righteousness of Christ, i.e., his obedience and

sufferings are imputed to us only as unto effects, is to say, we have the benefit of them, and no more, but imputation itself is denied; so say the Socinians, but they knew well, and ingeniously grant that they overthrew all true, real imputation thereby, and quotes Schlictingius, saying, we concede Christ's righteousness is ours, as it redounds to our good and righteousness, &c. And is it not pleasing to see some among ourselves with so great confidence take up the sense and words of these men.

Neonomian. But Dr. Owen says, that imputation is not the transmission or transfusion of the righteousness of another into them that are justified, that they should become perfectly and inherently righteous thereby, &c.

Antinomian. We say so too; but Dr. Owen does not say, we are justified by the imputation of the effects of Christ's righteousness, he opposes that imputation as a Socinian notion.

Neonomian. He does not, for he says, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us as to its effects, has this sound sense, namely, the effects of it are made ours by reason of that imputation. It is imputed, so reckoned unto us of God, as that he really communicates all the effects of it unto us.

Antinomian. But what immediately follows in the next sentence? Why did you not quote all the Doctor said? Is not this base false dealing? You would only quote as much as should serve your turn. But to say the righteousness of Christ is not imputed unto us, only its effects are so, is really to overthrow all imputation, for {as we shall see} the effects of the righteousness of Christ can't be said properly to be imputed to us; and if his righteousness itself be not so, imputation has no place herein, nor can it be understood why the Apostle should so frequently assert it as he does. Therefore the Socinians, who do expressly oppose the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and plead for a participation of its effects and benefits only, do wisely deny any such kind of righteousness of Christ, i.e., of satisfaction and merit, as alone may be imputed to us. Here's matter of fact, to show your double-dealing.

Neonomian. But the Assembly is of my mind. Q. 69. What is the communion in grace which the members of the invisible Church have with Christ. A. In their partaking of the virtue of his mediation in their justification, adoption, sanctification, and whatever in this life manifests their union with him; so that in their judgment it's the virtue of Christ's Mediation operates on us, and not the Mediatorial righteousness in us.

Antinomian. This is strange language, to talk of imputing the Mediation of Christ to us; and this is that you now plainly tell us, is the Mediatorial righteousness that you mean all along; or that partaking of the virtues of Mediation and Imputation are convertible terms? Those reverend divines do not

say, the mediation of Christ was imputed to us, no more than his Kingship, Priesthood, Prophetical Office; yet we are in a sense made kings, priests and prophets, but not by imputation. They tell you only of the effects of his Mediation, of which justification is one. If you would have told us what they say of imputed righteousness, you should have rehearsed the next question. Q. 70. What is justification? A. Justification is an act of God's free grace unto sinners, in which he pardoneth all their sins, accepteth and accounteth their persons righteous in his sight; not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone.

See the Shorter Catechism, Q. 33. See also the Confession, directly condemning all your scheme of divinity at once. Chapter XI, on Justification. "Those whom God effectually calls, he also freely justifies; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God. The Savoy Confession is the same verbatim.

Now, gentlemen, I appeal to all men of sense and honesty, whether Mr. Neonomian has dealt fairly, thus to represent the judgment of Dr. Owen and the reverend divines of the Assembly, or thus to impose upon the weak, and such as have not will or leisure to search into the truth of what he says.

Neonomian. I tell you what the Savoy says, which is the same Articles with the Assemblies.

Antinomian. But you tell us, or would have us to understand, that the meaning of the Assembly about imputation, is, that the virtue of Christ's Mediation {i.e., in your declared sense} the effects only operates upon us; and then after rehearsal of the words of the Savoy, you add, thou seest its Christ's righteousness that is imputed for pardon, and not infused. You'll oppose imputation to infusion, which none of us plead for; but this imputation is in your sense only as to the effect, which you would have us to believe is the judgment of Dr. Owen and the two Assemblies, and I find you lamely rehearse the Article of your Confession, as being ashamed to behold your erroneous doctrine so fully condemned by them.

Do not think such pitiful little sophisms as these, are such as do become a professed minister of the Gospel, or that your reverend vouchers have not prejudiced their honor by

asserting so publicly to the world, that in all material things you have fully and rightly stated the truths and errors in this treatise; and look upon this as a work of considerable service to the Church of Christ, &c., when your manifest design is to hide truth by equivocations, false representations, and odious forced consequences; and to impose old palpable decried errors. The truth will admit none of these corners.

Now, Sir, that you may see we have more than authority for this great doctrine of imputation of Christ's very righteousness. 1. I prove, that to say Christ's righteousness is imputed only as to effects, is to deny the doctrine of imputation. Consider, from the nature of imputation itself. Imputation is the reckoning and esteeming that unto one man, which is done by another. As in case of debt or wrong done by one man to another, a third comes and does, or promises that thing whereby the offended person becomes satisfied with the offender, previous to which satisfaction in nature is his reckoning the payment made, or to be made, unto the offender; it's not the taking of this or that payment in any kind that is satisfactory for the offender, unless it be by the offended person reckoned to him.

Paul to Philemon, verse 18, gives the clear notion of imputation both as to wrong and righteousness, if he has criminally or unrighteously done thee wrong in filching or stealing, impute this to me, or put it upon my account; take me as paymaster, and put my payment on his account, i.e., in respect of any wrong that he has done thee, or debt that he owes thee; here's my hand for it, I will repay it to thee. Now Paul stood bound for Onesimus to Philemon, and unless Philemon had accounted Paul's payment or obligation to Onesimus in respect of any wrong sustained by him, Onesimus is still peccant, and an unreconciled offender in the eye of Philemon.

Now the effects of righteousness is the benefits received by imputation, not imputation itself. Suppose the nearest effects of Christ's righteousness, as satisfaction, reconciliation, justification, adoption, imputation, is cause of those effects. God is satisfied, and reconciled, and justifies the sinner, because he imputes and reckons to him the payment or appeasing act of the Surety. I argue then.

Argument 1. That which is a benefit received by virtue of imputed righteousness, is not imputed righteousness itself, but God's being satisfied, reconciled, and justifying us, is the benefit only of imputed righteousness, ergo, as to the major, that thing which is received by virtue of something else, is not the same with it; nay, they are contrarily affirmed. Now God's giving us the benefit of imputed righteousness, is that which does in a way of justice result from the said righteousness imputed. The imputation is the gift of grace, therefore Christ's righteousness

is first imputed, and graciously reckoned ours to all intents and purposes. Hence results in a way of justice, God's satisfaction, reconciliation, and the sinner's justification. Hence it will needs follow, if there be no more in imputation than God's being satisfied, reconciled, justifying, I will say, how comes it to pass? You'll say, through Christ's righteousness, it's an effect of it. I say so too. But how come we to have these effects, if God never reckoned and accounted Christ's righteousness unto us? Either we are righteous some way or other before God declares us righteous, or we are not. If not, it's not a true sentence. If we are righteous, we are so by our own righteousness, or another's, if by another's, it must be some way or other ours either by communication of it essentially, or by reckoning and esteeming it unto us as if it were ours; but to reckon the effect only, is not imputing of it at all.

Argument 2. To say the imputation of Christ's righteousness is only the bestowing of the effects, is to ascribe justification to the righteousness of Christ in no other sense than we do sanctification and glorification; for it is to say that justification is but a meritorious benefit, and so is sanctification and glorification; for all those are purchased and procured by him. Now there's a vast difference between payment of a debt owing, and making a purchase of a new estate; it's true Christ did both, he satisfied and he purchased; as for the purchase money there's no need it should be imputed to us; if the estate being purchased be bestowed freely, it is enough, but as for satisfaction made for our wrong or debt, this must be reckoned and accounted to us before we can come at a legal discharge, or procured riches.

Argument 3. To say Christ's righteousness is imputed to us only as to effects, is to say, that there is some other righteousness besides this for us to be justified by, for it implies that we are become righteous by another righteousness; the privilege of having whereof is only procured by Christ's righteousness; and the plain truth of it, the original rise of this notion is only to open way for another righteousness to come in to our justification, which is another Gospel; yea, not only contrary to sound doctrine, but radically destructive to the true Grace and Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Argument 4. If we cannot have the effects of the righteousness of Christ, unless the very righteousness of Christ be imputed to us, then the righteousness of Christ is imputed otherwise than in effects; but we cannot have the effects of the righteousness of Christ, &c. The consequence of the major is so clear it needs no proof. I prove the minor; we cannot have the effects of the righteousness of Christ, unless his very righteousness be imputed. The reasons are. 1. Because our

offences will stand in the eye of justice, and we shall remain unrighteous, having no righteousness of our own, nor any of another reckoned to us. For we can be righteous no other way but by our own, or by another's; and Christ's righteousness signifies nothing as to us, if it be not placed to our account; and hence being not made righteous by it, can never be sanctified, &c. 2. We can have none of the effects, because they all proceed from love of reconciliation unto sinners; now the enmity being not taken away by satisfaction, there is no reconciliation, and therefore we cannot possibly partake of the effects of Christ's righteousness.

Argument 5. To say we have only the effects imputed, is to deny imputation, for the effects are not ours by imputation, but personally and really; as suppose justification, God does not justify us by imputing justification, but really upon imputed righteousness. 2. If Christ's very righteousness be not imputed or accounted to us in justification, some other righteousness must, for God cannot justify a sinner without accounting him righteous by some very righteousness either of his own or of another's.

2. I prove that the very righteousness of Christ is imputed. Argument 1. That righteousness that satisfied the Justice of God for our offences, is imputed unto us; but the very righteousness of Christ satisfied that justice, ergo, the major is very evident; for if A do pay money for B, and D to whom it is due accepts it in discharge of B's debt; then D does place it to B's account, and gives a receipt accordingly to A, as having paid him so much for the use of B.

As for the minor, that the very righteousness of Christ satisfied the justice of God for us; it appears. 1. By his intention in giving himself for us, and God's accepting of us in him as his Beloved. 2. Because if God be satisfied for our breach of the law, it can be no other righteousness that could do it; it must also be the very righteousness, and not the effects; now that which God was satisfied with upon our account, is accounted to us; for if it be not accounted to us, it is not accepted for us, our debt stands still, and the hand-writing against us. 3. If the very righteousness of Christ does not satisfy, no effects of righteousness can; for no one gives what he doesn't have.

Argument 2. That righteousness which Christ our Advocate pleads for us, is imputed to us. But Christ our Advocate pleads his very righteousness; for he entered in with his own blood, and pleads those very sufferings, and that payment upon our very account. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb.9:14.

Argument 3. That righteousness which answers all the demands of the law on behalf of a sinner, is imputed to justification; but it was Christ's very righteousness that answered all the demands of the law, in active and passive obedience, ergo, there's nothing that the law expects expressly as to active or passive obedience, but Christ has performed it in his very righteousness when he was in his state of humiliation, what was done was done then, the effects were afterwards in his exaltation.

Argument 4. That which is pleaded in prayer by us for forgiveness, and ought to be, is imputed to us; but the very righteousness of Christ is pleaded by us, this is the sake of Christ for which we ask of God pardon of sin, we have nothing to do to plead that righteousness which is not accounted to us. There's none of us pleads our own righteousness, but the very righteousness of Christ.

Argument 5. That righteousness upon which a sinner has peace with God, is the righteousness reckoned to us for justification; but Christ's very righteousness is that by which we have peace with God. Eph.2:13,15, and peace of conscience. Heb.9:14, Rev.1:5.

Argument 6. Christ could not be said to be Jehovah our righteousness, if his very righteousness were not imputed to us, but only the effects. Jer.23:6. And upon what is it grounded that the Church is named as it is in chapter 33:16, but upon Christ's imputed righteousness? "In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." Jer.23:6.

Argument 7. I might add that argument which others have urged, that as the sin of the first Adam was imputed to his seed, so the righteousness of the second to his seed. Romans 5. But it's easy to prove the sin of Adam was imputed to all his posterity, he being a public person, and all we in his loins; if Mr. Neonomian deny this, we will go upon the proof of it another time.

"It behoveth him to bear the punishment and wrath of God, not for his own person, but for our persons, and so making a happy change with us, he took upon him our sinful person, and gave unto us his innocent and victorious person, wherewith we being now clothed are freed from the curse of the law." Luther on Galatians 3:14.

"Christ's mediation was a redeeming mediation; he must give himself for a ransom or counterprize. 1. The price is a standing price that the law requires, without the least variation or abatement. 2. There must be an exchange betwixt the Mediator and us; he must be a daysman, Job 9:33, standing in our room or stead. There must be an exchange of person for

person, which is the surest exchange in war or captivity, when nothing but one person will be taken in the room of another; no gifts or rewards could unbind the infinite justice of God. I Tim.2:6, Tit.2:14. 4. There must not only be person for person, but like for like. 1. In nature; one of an inferior or superior nature would not do. Heb.2:16, Phil.2:7. 2. There must be an exchange of state for state. Phil.2:7, II Cor.8:9, Isa.53:3-4, Matt.20:28, Gal.3:13." Mr. Samuel Stone of New England.

Neonomian. You seem to speak as if Christ's holiness were imputed to us, and that we are perfectly holy.

Antinomian. You know I told you, it may follow from your doctrine, viz., imputation of sanctification, as well as justifying righteousness; because sanctification is an effect and virtue of Christ's Mediation. I shall now speak but a word to this point, viz., that our life of sanctification is in Christ, we are sanctified in Christ Jesus; and he is made of God to us sanctification. As we are created in him, so we live in him as to holiness, and we have a completeness of sanctification in him; and though that fulness of sanctification is not properly said to be communicated by imputation, as by derivation of grace; yet this infused grace arising into duty, and our duties mingled with much corruption, must be covered by the imputed righteousness of Christ, that they may be accepted as well as our persons. Dr. Horton on Rom.8:3, understands the law of the Spirit of life that is in Christ, to be all that holiness wherewith the living and quickening Spirit of God, has filled the human nature of Jesus Christ, which is the fulness of sanctification in all grace and holiness. {Thomas Horton, "Forty-Six Sermons upon the Whole Eighth Chapter of the Epistle of the apostle Paul to the Romans. 1674.}

Neonomian. Though Christ be perfectly holy, yet his holiness is not so imputed to us, as that we are perfectly holy. You say we appear before God perfect in holiness.

Antinomian. You seem to imply, as if Christ's holiness were ours by imputation, so much as it is ours; and therefore you insinuate as if there were such a thing as partial imputation. But we speak not anything either of Christ's holiness, as so sanctification by way of imputation, but of real communication from him to us; of which perfect fulness we do receive, by the new creation in him, and grace received from him, as members from the head, in our measures, by virtue of our mystical union to him. Let me tell you, if God had not laid the iniquities of men on Christ, there's never a soul had entered into Heaven, for there's no refuge to fly to, there's no hope of drawing near to the everlasting Kingdom of blessedness, till the Lord Jesus cleanse you thoroughly from all sinfulness and filthiness; and so you appear before God perfect in holiness. It is his white raiment

makes us worthy to walk with the Lamb in white; he counsels the Church of Laodicea to buy of him white raiment. Now see how we are abused by you.

The words you refer your proof to, does relate to, and is intended of the state of glory, that the Saints must be personally and perfectly holy before they can draw near to God in that full fruition of him in the state of blessedness in Heaven. If there is anything understood of the Saints perfection in this life, it is not denied but that their graces and duties are imperfect here, as they come from and are acted by them, and are mingled with much sin and pollution; but their acceptation with God must be in a way of perfection. 1. In that Christ, of whom we are members, and who is made unto us sanctification, as the head of the body, the robe and fountain are perfect in sanctification, and we in him. Col.1:19, 2:10. That all the best duties and services as coming from us, and performed by us, being mingled with sin and corruption, must be accepted in and through Christ, and covered in his righteousness; so that as they are presented unto God by our Advocate, they come before him washed white in the blood of the Lamb, and perfumed in his incense.

Neonomian. God cannot account a sincere Christian perfectly holy. The union in marriage does not transfer habitual qualifications from husband to wife. Is a foolish wife perfectly wise because her husband is so? It's absurd, our restored holiness is through the operations of the Spirit, and not by transfusion. If the very holiness of Christ's persons be in us, if increated, then we are gods; if created holiness of Christ's human nature be in us, it must depart from him, and cease to be in him.

Antinomian. It would take up deservedly some paper to show the error and sophistry of what you have spoken. The sum is, that you deny Christ to be a public person, and that all that grace and fulness that is in him by reason of the hypostatical union of both natures, and that unction without measure which he received, was only to qualify him singly and for himself, as an individual person, and not to be conveyed and communicated unto us; and therefore none of his fulness is received by us. Neither do we live by virtue of our union to him, as a root, head, fountain; but if we partake of the Divine nature, as the Apostle Peter, II Pet.1:4, says, we are made gods. If we partake of the virtues of Christ, we rob him, and they are no more in him. You abuse the similitude of husband and wife used by the Apostle, Ephesians 5, and would make it run on four feet. You consider not that Adam and Eve at first were the true type the Apostle aims at to represent Christ and his Church by; Eve being taken out of Adam, had her nature in him first, and was created out of him, and so was flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone. You must distinguish between the individual person and qualification

of the first Adam, and his public capacity, headship and common nature; he had a peculiar distinct person and habits belonging to it as such, but he had also a common nature communicable to his wife and to his posterity by propagation, not only Eve's nature, but ours was in him radically. And therefore the prophet Malachi says, that God made but one at first, Mal.2:15, though he had the residue of the spirit, and could have made more, as he did in the creation of angels; but therefore one, that he might seek a seed of God. Now this seed of God was found in the seed of the woman that was made out of man, and was but one; as Adam was made but one common person, so Christ, and the Church his wife is made out of him, created in him as Eve was, and have a nature common in Christ. And does it follow, that because Adam had the common nature to Eve and his posterity, that his individual qualities were communicated, taken from him, and given to Eve? Was Adam turned into Eve? Was Adam's wisdom, holiness, his natural or moral virtues taken from Adam, and given to her or them? The common nature of a genus is communicated and propagated by individuals, without robbing the individual. Mankind is propagated daily by individuals, yet those individuals lose nothing of their proper adjuncts. If men were not strangers to logic and natural philosophy, and ordinary terms of law, they would not make so much ado about this common nature of Christ, which in him is mystical and transcendent. I shall not here enlarge, but enquire what is the opinion of the Protestant divines.

Calvin. Dr. Davenant, I pray, speak in this matter what your sense is. "There was in the human nature of Christ a fulness of habitual grace; neither take we this to be infinite, seeing it was a created quality, and inhered in the mind of Christ, therefore it could not be infinite; but by fulness of grace we understand all those perfections to which the nature of grace does extend itself. 2. We consider why Christ ought to have a fulness of grace. 1. With due congruity, it was due to him in a way of meetness, by reason of his union to the Word. 2. It was meet that which was nearest to the influencing cause, should partake most of the influx. 3. It was necessarily due, from the supposition of the end, by reason of the habitude, {or relation of Christ himself to the human nature; for grace was conferred upon him, not as a private person, but as an universal principle,} from whom it is transfused into other men, {you say it's not by transfusion,} all things ought to be full, and in an oneness. The Evangelist shows, that grace is diffused to us, but unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Eph.4:7." Dr. John Davenant on Colossians 1:19. {Exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians, 1627.}

And on Colossians 2:10, "to be complete in Christ. 1. Is

spoken from the effect. Christ is not only perfect, in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead, but he makes us perfect and complete, we having all things in him and his doctrine necessary to salvation. 2. The second reason is taken from his office; Christ is the head. As to the first, we have perfect wisdom, right knowledge of the doctrine of the Gospel. Jn.14:26, I Jn.2:27, I Cor.2:2. We have complete righteousness, for satisfaction to the law of God, and for our sins. 3. In Christ we have sanctification or inherent righteousness; for what is sanctification other than the washing away of our errors and vices, whereby we are set at a distance from God, and the susception of gifts and graces, whereby we may draw nigh to God in his service, and this is done as we stand united to Christ by his Spirit. Rom.8:9."

In him, not from him, or by him only; but he says, we are complete in him, to give us to understand, that we have that foresaid wisdom, righteousness and holiness, not as we behold Christ as existing far from us, but as we are incorporated in Christ, as we have Christ abiding and dwelling in us; and we have this grace from Christ, as the stream from the head Fountain; for it's not needful that he that will drink of a fountain, should go into the Fountain; but it's otherwise here; for we cannot receive of Christ's fulness, unless we are in him. As the old Adam is in us, as the cause of corruption and death, so the new Adam dwells in us as the cause of righteousness and salvation. So we are said to be in Christ, to dwell in him, to abide in him. Jn.15:4-5. Whatever therefore men hope or please themselves with of grace, righteousness, sanctification or glorification, it will prove a mere mock and dream, if they be not in Christ, and Christ in them. And now Christ is in us, and we in him, when we are united to our Head, and grafted as branches into the Vine, by the bond of the Spirit, and faith wrought by the Spirit in our hearts. Rom.8:9, Jn.3:36.

Calvin. Speak to this point, Dr. Horton. "In that text, Rom.8:2, there are three terms before us. There's life, the spirit of life, and there's the law of the spirit of life. 1. By life we are to understand, the grace of holiness and sanctification; not that which is inherent in our nature being regenerate, but the full and perfect holiness which is in the human nature of Christ as the proper subject of it; this is the Fountain from which there is a continual flowing of grace to all that are truly united unto Christ. 2. By the word spirit we understand the Spirit of God, the original from whence it flows, the activity and intention of it. This life; for spirit is a word of emphasis. 3. The law is the prevalency and force of this spirit of life, all holiness wherewith the living and quickening Spirit of God has filled the human nature of Christ, and it has freed thee and me, and all others that are in Christ from the power of the sinful and deadly corruption of our nature;

and there is a fulness and sufficiency of all grace and holiness in Christ considered as man. Col.1:19,2:3,9. Jn.1:14, Psal.45:7, Jn.3:34." {Thomas Horton, "Forty-Six Sermons, &c., 1674.}

DEBATE VIII.

CONCERNING THE CONDITIONALITY OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

Calvin: Because the question about the conditionality of the Covenant of Grace has been greatly controverted, and is one of the most considerable points on which matters in difference does depend, I am desirous someone or other of us first may truly describe, and impartially unfold the nature and difference of Covenants. Mr. Philalethes, I take you to be an unbiased man; and I think I have heard you offer some things of this kind, which may tend much to the clearing up of many points before us of this nature.

Philalethes. Sir, I shall readily contribute my mite, and submit it to the consideration of your better judgments. 1. The word 'covenant' comes from "conveniendo" because when two parties agree in some one thing or more on mutual terms, it's usually called a Covenant; and it comprehends and takes in the nature of a contract or bargain. The Latin have divers words to express a Covenant by, such as "pactum, compactum, conventum and foedus." Cicero gives a very plausible account of the etymology of "foedus," that in a Covenant there is an engagement of betroth, as in making a promise of marriage, but it seems the word is most probably derived from an old heathenish custom of ratifying a Covenant by the sacrificing of a sow great with pigs. I take "pactum" therefore or "compactum" to be the better word, and expressing enough of the thing meant, coming from paciscor, "quasi pacis actum," that is, a contract is an act as it were against an act; and if it carries the significance of any ceremony in covenanting, it's that of striking of hands; thence Covenanting is called striking a Covenant. A few of the Greek words vary not from the import of the Latin, but these are hardly used by the New Testament or the LXXII Interpreters for a Covenant, and therefore we need not stay upon them. The word in most use is a Testament, such a Covenant as is like a last will and testament; for this seems to be the true original meaning of this word; and yet many instances may be given, wherein it appears that all sorts of Covenants are expressed by

it; but it's observable the Spirit of God pitches upon this word as most expressive of Sacred Covenants; because the promulgation of the Covenant of Grace was always managed in a way of Testament, typically with the

Patriarchs, and under the Mosaical dispensation, and really by the offering up of Christ, and the Apostle gives us this account of it. "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator." Heb.9:15-16. Hence the promise of life confirmed by the death of Christ, declared and promulgated in the Gospel of the Old and New Testament is in accordance with a Covenant of Grace; because the persons Covenanting do it on free choice, and so the conditions or terms are mutually agreed on. Oft, in making the Covenant, the sacrifice was cut in pieces, and laid so that the Covenanters passed between them. Gen.15:10. And by a metonymy, the sacrifice or ceremony used in ratification was called by the name of the Covenant itself; and after this manner is circumcision called a Covenant.

2. A Covenant then is a mutual obligation upon certain terms between two parties. A Covenant differs from a vow, because in a vow there need be but one part; a man may promise to, and resolve with himself to do this or that thing, there need not be two parties in making a vow; though most times it is making a promise to God, and then it carries the nature of a Covenant, and to this may belong a sanction by way of imprecation upon non-performance.

3. As there are two parties in a Covenant, so in a Covenant properly so, there are two parts, a condition and a promise. The condition is the terms offered by the Covenanter to the covenantee, upon the performance of which the promise becomes due unto him; and this supposeth these two things necessarily. 1. The covenantees ability to perform the said tendered condition. 2. His consent and acceptance of the terms; and here there is no other sanction usually than the promise and forfeiture expressed in the obligation upon non-performance.

4. A Covenant is either express and complete in parts, i. e., a perfect Covenant or a divided Covenant. A perfect Covenant is when two parties of equal liberty and rank do freely, voluntarily, and upon deliberation enter into mutual obligations, with express conditions and promises; and here it's always requisite that there be as it were an equality, i.e., at least a due proportion between the persons Covenanting, that each may be

capable of standing upon his own terms as well as the other, and not one bound to terms at the mere good will and pleasure of another; as a child cannot in non-age stand upon terms with a parent, but must be concluded in his or her will and pleasure; or a single subject with a Sovereign Prince, &c., and therefore the condition to be performed ought to be such, which is not presently due by any former relation or duty; here must be a power in each party, as having full legal capacity to act on one's own behalf, to take or refuse without breach of any former obligation. In this Covenant the sanction is agreed upon by way of stipulation and reticulation, exchange of conditions with forfeiture mutually.

5. There are Covenants which are not express or complete in the former manner, i.e., not between parties bearing a proportion to one another; and therefore one bound in duty or relation to be subjected to the will and pleasure of the other antecedently, or fallen under the breach of their duty, and relative obligation, and so lying at his mercy; and such are the covenants that are made between parents and children under age, masters and servants while in service; between Sovereign Princes in actual dominion, and their subjects. Of these Covenants there are two sorts. 1. A Covenant by way of legislation, or a law Covenant. 2. A Covenant by way of promise, or free obligation, without condition required to entitle to the promise; the Spirit of God calls the first of these a law, and it's properly so, and the second a Covenant of promise.

6. A Law Covenant supposeth these two things. 1. A Sovereign legislative power duly lodged in the law-giver, or else his law Covenant is but usurpation. 2. A power and ability in the subject to perform the conditions his law requireth, or else the said law is unreasonable, unjust and tyrannical. 2dly. It implies. 1. That both the condition and sanction be at the will and pleasure of the said Sovereign law-giver. 2. That the first and natural end of the law is obedience to the preceptive part, which obedience is due first by a relative, politic or natural relation of the subject to the Legislator, so antecedaneous to the law, and secondarily to that particular law obligation. 3dly. Consequently, to this obedience, whether it be little or more, there is an entitling to the remunerative part of the law, if any expressed, or implied; and by virtue of the compact is a reward, and the said obedience, though infinitely disproportionable, is meritorious. But in case of transgression, the sanction by way of penalty takes place, and is called the wages of sin, such a Covenant as this was the Covenant of works; and it's not to be supposed that this law Covenant was grievous to Adam, having a created perfection both of ability to perform it, and an absolute delight in the whole revealed mind and will of God, from the highest principle of love

to God with all his heart and soul; neither could his obedience be without unwavering, steadfast faith, wherein when he began to stagger, his fall began.

7. Adam stood under this law Covenant as under a Covenant of works, wherein he is to be considered, and the law itself. 1. He himself under these considerations. 1. As endowed with a personal perfection, and lying under a particular obligation to obedience, both previous to, and directly by that law with sanction, which the Sovereign Creator brought him under. 2. God brought not him only as a single private person under this obligation only, but as a public common person, the head of all mankind; and he was not only the Covenant Representative, but the natural Fountain; the whole nature being in his loins, and therefore that first Covenant breach of his threw the whole nature out of Covenant, the law charging transgression upon the whole human nature, and laying it under the sentence of death. Hence his sin is justly imputed to all his posterity, the whole world becoming guilty before God, besides that a corrupted nature which is propagated to all his posterity. 2dly. The law itself. 1. The particular command, or rather prohibition that Adam stood under, had these things in it. 1. It was but a small branch of that moral obedience which God expected from him, and put him under, but his breaking thereof in one point made him guilty of all, God showing thereby unto him and the world that no condition could be accepted but perfect obedience. 2. He was not required to work out unto himself any further grace than he had freely received, but to persist in that, and therefore the duty incumbent upon him was perseverance in grace. 3. The particular obedience required of him, was very easy and small, next to nothing; negative, and but withholding his hand from an apple, and bore no proportion as a condition to the promise of eternal life, and therefore could never have merited in respect of the value, but would have been meritorious by reason of law compact. 3. If he had persevered, it must have been by grace, as his ability was of grace, and so it is with the angels that stood; they have nothing but what they have received, and therefore they are saved by grace.

8. The law by reason of the Fall of man, and God's will to restore him by a Saviour, is not vacated and abolished, but remains the same still in the commanding part and sanction. It requires moral obedience of man as God's creature, and continues to condemn man for the first sin, and all sins derived from it, both original and actual, in unregenerate and regenerate; the preceptive parts of it are rules of obedience to redeemed ones, and the sanction remains even to them in Christ Jesus, the law obtaining its complete end as to righteousness active and passive in the second Adam. Besides this, the law that

God governs the world by, and will judge it by at the last day, the works of wicked men will be condemned, and their persons for their works; the saints shall be also justified by their works, because their persons and their works are perfect in Christ Jesus, they being in him, shall be found perfect before God, and there is no condemnation belonging to them, nor sin to be laid unto their charge.

OF A COVENANT OF PROMISE

There is a Covenant by way of free unconditional obligation, and that is where the Principal or Supreme Covenanter binds himself to the covenantee, absolutely requiring no condition to be performed by the covenantee before his performance of the promise; and in a sense this Covenant is unconditional, not as a Covenant with the stones of the field, that abide incapable subjects of restipulation; but it supposeth the covenanters to be such as are by the promise made capable and willing to restipulate and perform all duties for matter and manner, that may answer the design of the Covenant consequential to the bestowing of promise, in which their obedience is contained.

2. That God has covenanted thus with the creature, without requiring previous conditions to the performance of the promise, is not to be questioned; such was that made with Noah, Gen.9:11, "I will {i.e., alone, and by myself,} set up and establish my Covenant with you," without calling you forth to restipulate or perform conditions; and the promise was, that all flesh should not be cut off any more by the waters of the flood, nor shall there be a flood to destroy the earth any more. God laid man under the performance of no condition to entitle him to this promise; yea, though he lay under a forfeiture of all good things promised in the first Covenant, and a desert of all calamity and destruction, and neither able or willing to enter into Covenant with God by the performance of any duties, yet God ties himself, that for that this kind of destruction should no more come upon the earth; there was also the Covenant concerning the continuance of day and night, and that the seasons of the year should be opportune, regular and constant. Gen.8:22. To both these Covenants is the Covenant of Grace compared in respect of its absoluteness and perpetuity. "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me, for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee." Isa.4:9. "Thus saith the LORD; if my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth." Jer.33:25. The promulgation thereof under the Old and New Testament, are thence called the Covenants of Promise.

3. Such a Covenant as this is a Testament which takes place among the most entitling covenants in the world, whereby a legacy is freely bequeathed, entitling the legatee to the estate bequeathed, without any duties or conditions previous to the said title by bequeathment; but the estate bequeathed by will and testament becomes due upon the death of the Testator, according to his free constitution; hence the exhibition of the Covenant of Grace in the Old and New Dispensations, are called Testaments because of their absoluteness, under whatever veils of conditions they seemed to be clothed; and because it was confirmed and become due by death typically, under the Mosaic dispensation by the death of the sacrifices, but really by the death of the Testator, accomplished in the Gospel-days, and this was its sanction, and the proper sanction of a Testament.

4. This Covenant is said to be absolute, free and unconditional in respect of us that are saved by it, because there was no capacity, ability or will in man since the fall to perform any Covenant-conditions or duties to God as such, but he lay utterly condemned and dead in sin. All salvation must come to him of free gift, even life, whereby he might perform any vital act; for all action is from life, and no action can be before life, but must proceed from it; man in innocency acted from life in innocency; and that he should act before, or without life, is most absurd to think, or that in a state of spiritual death he should act for life. The natural man can do neither; before he can do anything for God, the absolute promise must be performed of giving him resurrection from the dead, the new birth, the new nature, the new heart. So that the Covenant of Grace is considered as totally free and absolute as to the tenure thereof, and performance relating unto man in his lost and fallen estate and condition, all the good contained in it relating to us by way of promise, and bestowed upon us by way of free gift, even faith and all holiness, grace and glory. {"The apostle more than once sets forth the Covenant of Grace under the appellation of a testament, which is God's immutable purpose, not suspended on any one condition; and as it is founded on the unchangeable Counsel of God, and ratified by the death of the Testator, so it is not possible it should be made void by any unbelief of the elect, nor acquire its stability from any faith of man; seeing in the said Covenant God hath provided unchangeably no less for their Faith than Salvation." Herman Witsius, "Economy of the Covenants."}

5. But taking the Covenant of Grace or Promise in the full extent of it, it is a mixed Covenant, a conditional and absolute, a Covenant of express compact between two stipulating parties, upon propounded terms; and a Covenant of Promise, wherein God has freely given us his Son, and in him life eternal. It is therefore to be considered as it respects Christ, and

as it respects the elect in him.

6. As it respects Christ, it carries the nature of an express complete Covenant of works, and that in respect of the party's covenanting, and the tenure of the said Covenant. The party's covenanting was the Father and the Son; God the Father proposing, and God the Son accepting the terms. Here the parties confederates were equal, Phil.2:6-8, and had equal freedom of accepting or refusing the terms; hence the agreement was mutual and reciprocal. The tenure of the covenant was express conditions and promises upon the performance of them by reward in a way of remunerative justice. Isaiah 53. The conditions were of the highest nature. 1. To satisfy offended justice on the behalf of the elect, looked upon as fallen by the transgression of the Law Covenant in the first Adam, and to be the end of the law for all righteousness both active and passive to all them that should believe. 2. That the condition performed by Christ should not only be meritorious, as therefore Adam's should have been, but that they should be adequately so, they bearing an equality to and with the eternal life promised, by reason of the transcendent excellency of the person, and the performances; and herein he became, and stands the middle person or Mediator betwixt God and Man; and hence as he was the Covenanting Head and Representative of the elect, so he undertook to be, and was the federal condition in what he was, and what he did; and to him as such was all the promises primarily made, and in him performed, all being Yea and Amen in him; and hence he became the fundamental promise, the Father giving us his Son, and eternal life in him; upon which accounts he is fitly called the Covenant.

7. This Covenant is conditional in respect of the justice of God and the law of works, for grace being to be magnified in a salvation by way of mercy, the subjects of it were such as had broken God's righteous law and offended justice, and such who were never able to fulfill this law by perfect obedience; therefore it was incumbent on the Mediator to make reconciliation, by coming between the justice of God and the elect, to stand in their stead, and to fulfill all righteousness on their behalf.

8. Again the conditionality of the Covenant may be considered to be in Christ, as he is the way of conveyance of all good things from God to us, all blessings come in and through Christ to us; all union and communion that God has with us and we with him, is in and through Jesus Christ, there is no other name given under Heaven; and he is become the living and dispensing Fountain of all Grace and Glory, the Way, the Truth, and Life. Jn.14:6.

9. Upon a due consideration of the federal conditions there will result an appearance of two sorts of promises not

differing specifically, but in a certain manner, and respectively only; some that refer most immediately and directly to the elect, and others that have their aspect more immediately on Jesus Christ. As to the first sort they are to the elect as such, and therefore to Christ the Head of them, and the first-born among many brethren; and so the promise of eternal life is made unto him and them, as considered in Him. As to the second sort which are rewarding unto Christ, and the crowning him with glory and honor, though they primarily respect Christ, yet fall down from his head to the skirts of his garment, and become a joy, comfort and crown to all the elect, what other can such be? As seeing his seed, and prolonging his days, and the prospering of the good pleasure of the Lord in his hand.

10. The nature of the Covenant of Grace is absolute, and a Covenant of Promise, notwithstanding all the conditionality contained in it, and that must be understood in these respects.

1. In respect of the Original Proposer of this Covenant, it came from the free and absolute will, grace and purpose of the Father. "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus...who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." II Tim.1:1,9. This Covenant was not purchased, no not by Jesus Christ; the Covenant itself, Christ in it, and all the glory of it lay in the eternal council of God's will, and became the purpose thereof, and accordingly transacted with Jesus Christ, and in him with all the elect as their Representative. 2. Hence it was free and absolute as to the elect personally considered, the whole of the federal conditions lay upon their Covenant Head as undertaker for them. 3. If the Covenant be considered, as it is applied actually unto the elect in time; this is done absolutely in bestowing the gift of the promise to dead creatures, in whom there is an absolute impossibility of performing the least entitling act to the promise; and therefore there can be nothing freer than life to a dead creature; neither does life given entitle to action; that's very absurd to say, but it's a principle of action; but life, and such a life, and all the effects of it proceeds from the same gift, and this is eternal life. 4. Hence all those promises that contain the promulgation of the Covenant in its original nature, and as respecting us, express the tenure of it as most free and absolute, as it was revealed to Adam, Abraham, David, and in the Gospel Dispensation since Christ. 4. The absoluteness of this Covenant appears as to us, in that all the federal entitling conditions contained in it is to be found in another, and not in us, nor wrought in us; for whatever is wrought in us, is from free gift, and of promise, and must have some condition performed by

another as Federal Head, before we can partake of it. Therefore there is nothing in us before or after conversion that does belong to the Federal condition; all our Gospel obedience is to be referred to the promise, and is built upon it; therefore it's absolute, because both Christ, the condition, and all the good things promised, are freely bestowed upon us.

{“Divines differ about the conditions of the covenant of Grace; we are of their opinion who think that it is an accurate speaking, that the Covenant of Grace hath no conditions properly so called in respect of us. A condition of a covenant, properly so called, is that action, which, being performed, gives a man a right to the reward. But that such a condition cannot be required of us in the covenant of grace, is self-evident; because a right to life neither is, nor indeed can be founded on any action of ours, but on the righteousness of our Lord alone.” Herman Witsius, “Economy of the Covenants.”}

{“The Covenant and Grace thereof, is free and absolute, not conditional, and suspended upon the unstable will of man. ‘It is not of him that willeth, or runneth, but of God that showeth mercy,’ and showeth it on whom he will. Between God, the Father indeed, and Christ, as a second Adam, the transaction of the covenant was wholly conditional; he was to take from his Father a commission in our nature, to lay down his life, and to take it up again; to fulfil all righteousness; to be made sin for us; to have our iniquities, and the chastisement of our peace laid upon him, before he could see of the travail of his soul. Yea, he undertook not only for his own work, but for ours. By the preciousness of his blood he purchased; and out of the plenitude of his Spirit, he supplieth unto us whatever grace is requisite unto our salvation. But I say, as to us, the grace of the covenant is thus far free and absolute, that no duties are required of us. He hath promised to give a new heart, and to put a new spirit within us; to take away the stony heart out of our flesh, and to give us an heart of flesh; and to put his Spirit within us, and to cause us to walk in his statutes, to save us from all our uncleanness, to cleanse us from all our iniquities Ezek.36:25- 33. And though he there tells us, that he will be ‘enquired of by the house of Israel, to do these things for them,’ yet we know it is he only who poureth out the spirit of grace and supplication, whereby we make this enquiry of him. Zech.12:10. True indeed it is, that when we believe, it is we only that believe; and when we work, it is we that work, but our working is not the cause of his grace, but his grace the cause of our working. ‘Thou hast wrought all our works in us,’ saith the prophet. Isa.26:12.” Edward Reynolds, Works.}

11. For the better understanding of the nature of the Covenant of Grace, we must distinguish well upon the nature of

conditions. There are two sorts of conditions; conditions federal, and conditions of connection or dependence of things one upon another. Federal conditions are terms agreed on in Covenant-contract between the parties covenanting; whereupon the promises made become due by reward and debt, and this supposeth, that the terms proposed be accepted before it become a Covenant. A Covenant is not forced, and therefore if the Covenant of Grace were made upon conditional terms with sinners, it could not be a Covenant-Agreement consummated, till they had first accepted the terms. 2. It always supposeth there is a power and ability in the party on whom the Covenant-condition lies to be performed, previous to the proposal of the said conditions, otherwise they would be vain and absurd. Hence to assert faith or obedience to be the federal conditions, does unavoidably throw men into the Arminian doctrine of free-will, and of a natural power in man to provide for his salvation in the performance of the said federal conditions. But we affirm, neither faith itself; no, not the gift of the Spirit that works faith, not our union to Christ, no gifts that accompany salvation, are federal conditions. Christ in the exercise of his Mediator's office in his humiliation and exaltation, is the only federal condition wherein all entitling conditions particularly mentioned in the Gospel are lodged and treasured up, and are freely by Christ bestowed on us.

12. There are also conditions of connection by way of order and dependence of things one upon another, which are accounts among or between themselves and belong to logic; and they arise from all arguments artificial or inartificial, prime and ort, simple or comparative, and they run in a connex axiom, when the said conditionality is expressed. As thus, if a creature be a man, he is a rational creature. If a figure have three corners, it has three sides; all things in the world are capable of coming under this kind of conditionality; yea, the most absolute beings; as if God be the first cause, he is the Creator of all things. In this sense creation is a condition of salvation. If a man be saved, he must be created. So election a condition, if a man be saved, he must be elected; but election is not a federal condition. So if a man believe he shall be saved, believing is a condition of connection to salvation. If a man has the Spirit of Christ, he shall believe unto salvation; but neither faith nor union are federal conditions. A state in grace is a condition to a state in glory by way of connection in the promise, but one is not a federal condition of another, but both come in the gift of grace. In this sense the Covenant of Promise contains all the conditions of order and dependence in the exhibition and performance. The hearing the Word is the condition of faith, but hearing the Word is not a federal condition, so the giving of the Spirit is the

condition of union to Christ and faith, faith the condition of receiving pardon and living in holiness. And the giving of pardon the condition of receiving it, holiness the condition of seeing God and eternal happiness, but these kind of conditions are not federal entitling to the promise, but are contained in the promise, and denote only the connection and dependence of one promised benefit upon another.

{“Whereas the Scriptures often inculcates such expressions as these, without faith none can please God, without holiness none can see God; as if they had called Faith and a New Life conditions of the Covenant; when in accurate speaking, and according to the nature of this Covenant, on God's part they are executions of former promises and the earnest of future happiness; and, on the part of man, the performance of those duties which cannot but precede the consummate perfection of a soul delighting in God. If we will call these conditions, they are not so much conditions of the Covenant, as of the certainty that we are in the Covenant.” Herman Witsius, “Economy of the Covenants.”}

13. Hence the ministry of reconciliation runs conditionally, because in it the Absolute Covenant is preached. 1. Indefinitely to elect and non-elect. 2. The Covenant is declared in all the promissory and duty-dependences contained in it, and duty required because promised. 3. We must distinguish of the ministry of reconciliation in respect of the letter of it, and the spirit of it. “Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” II Cor.3:6. In the Letter of it, the mere external dispensation, that kills, because a sinner looks upon all these conditions of dependence to be federal conditions; but the ministration of the Covenant by the Spirit in that ministry is absolute, according to the Original Contract, and the fullest discovery in its highest freedom; and therefore the Apostle tells us, this Spirit gives life. And the believing Corinthians are said to be the epistle of Christ written and transcribed from the Original Covenant-Contract, not with Ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in Tables of Stone, but in the fleshly Tables of the Heart, according to that promise of a new heart. Hence therefore we must distinguish between the Covenant of Grace, it's absolute tenure, and the ministry of the grace of the Covenant, which ministry is conditionally dispensed, according to the connection and dependence of good things contained in the promise, to a mixed people, elect and non-elect. The effect of this ministry is, either to work effectually by the Spirit according to the nature of an absolute promise, and then becomes a savour of life; or else it works only in the Letter in the conditional nature as a Covenant of works, and then it killeth eventually, and is a savour of death

and condemnation.

14. The Covenant of Grace is to be distinguished according to its different revelation and dispensation, under the names of the Old and New Testament, which is no specific difference, but only subsequently associated revelation. The absoluteness of this Covenant was abundantly revealed under the Old Testament dispensation unto the Patriarchs and Prophets, but not so clearly by the ministry of the worldly Sanctuary, but veiled, on which veiledness the faultiness of that dispensation was charged, and did consist, in comparison of what was to ensue. 1. It stood veiled under a figurative, carnal ministry and ordinances. 2. Such as were weak and insufficient as to reaching those ends that were designed by the grace of the Covenant. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect." Heb.10:1. And that in respect of the main Gospel, grace in pardon of sin, and purifying the conscience. 3. In that it insisted so much upon the conditionality of works, and wherein it's said they continued not, viz., in the Mount Sinai Covenant which God gave them when he brought them out of Egypt. In regard of that sort of promises which they stood encouraged by to the performance of this external obedience; they were usually temporal blessings only, and the threats and curses denounced against disobedience was usually in respect of outward things; though under all this cloudiness and conditionality the Covenant of Promise was applied in its absolute nature, as at first revealed to Adam and Abraham, which was to all the elect living before Christ, the ministry of the quickening Spirit, and a Saviour of life.

15. The Original Contract of this Covenant before the world was, is by some called the Covenant of Redemption, and distinguished from the Covenant of Grace, but such do greatly mistake, for both the Original Contract, and the manifestation thereof are one and the same Covenant, there's no specific difference, that which is, is but linked according to order and manifestation.

Neonomian. Next to the doctrine of imputation, which I think I have sufficiently cleared up according to my scheme, and fully and rightly stated truths and errors in those points; let us now debate the conditionality of the Covenant of Grace. This being a point of great concern, I shall premise an enquiry into some particulars for the explaining this subject. Q. 1. What is the Covenant of Grace? A. 1. It is not the Covenant of Redemption between the Father and Spirit as one party, and the Eternal Word the Lord Jesus as the other party.

Antinomian. Whoever put the Father and Spirit on one

party in the Covenant of Grace? It's new divinity; and secondly, you are very magisterial in this negative position. Methinks the judgment of the Westminster divines should have weighed so much with you as not to have blew it off at one puff. In the Larger Catechism.

Q. 30. Doth God leave mankind to perish in a state of sin and misery?

A. God does not leave all mankind to perish in the estate of sin and misery into which they fell by the breach of the first Covenant, commonly called the Covenant of works, but of his mere love and mercy delivereth his elect out of it, and bringeth them into a state of salvation by the second Covenant, commonly called a Covenant of Grace.

Q. 31. With whom was the Covenant of Grace made?

A. The Covenant of Grace was made with Christ as the second Adam, and in him with all the elect as his seed.

You say, that the Covenant Agreement made with Christ, was not the Covenant of Grace. You call it a Covenant of Redemption as another thing from the Covenant of Grace. I acknowledge the Covenant of Grace is a Covenant of Redemption, and the Covenant {you call} the Covenant of Redemption is the Covenant of Grace; and therefore shall not encumber our discourse with a debate about names, but shall affirm that there is no such thing as an essential difference between the Covenant of Grace and Redemption, the distinction made between them is but novel, at least that it was but lately so generally received; for it appears by what is here spoken in this answer of the Assembly so plainly and positively, that they owned but two Covenants, that of works and that of grace. They are only distinguished between the making and manifesting this hidden or secret Covenant of Grace; therefore after they had told us that this Covenant of Grace was made with Christ the second Adam, and with all the elect as his seed. They enquire next.

Q. 32. How is the grace of God manifest in the second Covenant?

A. The grace of God is manifested in the second Covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life, and salvation by him, &c. So that the Covenant of Grace contains all grace and mercy, redemption, and the proclamation and application thereof.

Neonomian. Were this Covenant understood, I think many well-meaning people would be undeceived. In that Covenant {i.e., of redemption} all the causes of man's salvation are adjusted and secured; all satisfaction and merit are on Christ, as his undertaking, &c.

Antinomian. It seems then this well-meaning Assembly was deceived, and many able divines besides, who have not

admitted of this novel distinction between the Covenant of Redemption, and that of Grace. 2. You talk at least very improperly; that the causes of man's salvation are adjusted and secured in the Covenant of Redemption, which places it before election; for I take the grace of election to be the first adjusting and securing cause of men's salvation, and not so only, but of the Covenant itself made with Christ. I thought all the causes were sufficiently adjusted in the Council of God's will, and that by the purpose of grace they were secured to us, and redemption too. Christ's undertaking the charge of satisfaction and merit, is a cause of our salvation, not adjusting and securing it, they were adjusted and secured before.

Neonomian. Yea, it's provided there that the elect shall obey the terms of life, and certainly possess salvation.

Antinomian. 1. It's manifest that you esteem not redemption one of the terms of life, but some other terms distinct from it, I had thought that Christ's righteousness had been the great condition of our life and salvation, but it seems its but provision for the performing the terms of life. 2. I thought it had been provided in election, that all the elect should certainly believe and obey the Gospel, but it seems by what you say here they were only conditionally elected, and provision made in the Covenant of Redemption, that they should perform the condition, and obey the term, {very improper,} it's to perform the terms. Now what is in such a Covenant of Grace more than Adam's would have had if he had stood; for God must have provided that he should obey or perform the terms of life, which were to him very small and easy, no more than giving a pepper-corn, or not so much; only to forbear plucking and eating an apple when he had enough besides. There's no essential difference in your opinion, for wherever the creature performs a condition of a Covenant of God's making, God must provide for that performance, by grace given and confirmed.

Neonomian. Yea, as that Covenant was not made with the elect, though for the elect; so they have nothing to do as a condition of this Covenant.

Antinomian. Rare divinity! 1. You say that Covenant was not made with the elect. The Assembly say it was made with the second Adam and his seed; but you suppose that I deny Christ to be a second Adam, a public person, and a spiritual or mystical root. 2. I would fain know whether Christ in his human nature was not elect, and the head of all the elect; therefore if we consider him but singly, whether he was not the principal elect one? And I pray, was the Covenant made with him or for him? I say it was made with him and for him, and so it was made with the elect in him, both with them and for them; or else how comes God's purpose and grace to be given us in Christ Jesus

before the world began. "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." II Tim.1:9. But you tell us that the elect have nothing to do as a condition of this Covenant; you reckon, you highly honour Christ in giving all the conditionality of this Covenant to him; and what's that? It's that he provided for our performing the condition of another Covenant, and why might he not have prepared us by that condition for another Covenant condition after that? But it seems your Covenant of Redemption is but a subordinate Covenant to that of Grace, and its righteousness subordinate to our righteousness, which you make the condition of the Covenant of Grace.

Neonomian. And to this Covenant of Redemption all absolute promises and prophesies of grace are reducible, they being a transcript hereof.

Antinomian. What is your meaning in this, it's hard to guess, whether absolute promises are made in the Covenant of Redemption? 2. And if so, whom in that Covenant they are made to, to Christ? You must mean so; for you say we are not in it; then the promise of giving a new heart is made to Christ, and not to us. 3. Or if you mean they are reducible to it, as being the Covenant of promise, and so Christ and all his benefits are given absolutely and unconditionally to us in it; this makes us concerned as a party in the Covenant; for to whom the promise of the Covenant belongs, to them the Covenant belongs as a party concerned.

Neonomian. This Dr. Owen makes to be a distinct Covenant from the Covenant of Grace.

Antinomian. It is true, Dr. Owen and other learned divines have spoken of a Covenant of Redemption, as in some respect distinct from the Covenant of Grace, but make not such an ill use of that notion as you do. The Doctor does not call these federal transactions the Covenant of Grace absolutely; nor is it so called in Scripture. And it may well be so, for we find not the term Covenant of Grace mentioned in Scripture, and some will not distinguish between a Covenant of a Mediator, and the Covenant of Grace, because the promises of the Covenant are absolutely said to be made to Christ, Gal.3:16, of which some its plain the Assembly at Westminster was. And therefore it appears there have been different apprehensions in this matter. I reverence and honour both parties as orthodox and sound in what they intended and meant in this point; but I must adhere to the Word of God as the most infallible guide in this and other things, according to what light I receive. All the difference that I find they make, is no more than respecting adjuncts, that is hiddenness and declaration, or at most to execution. And indeed

all I understand by Dr. Owen is two things.

1. To show us under how many considerations the New Covenant comes. 2. Which of these considerations it is the Spirit of God seems mostly to point at, when it speaks of this New Covenant, as a promise, Covenant of Grace or Peace. And he says, its variously represented. 1. In the designation and preparation of its terms and benefits in the Council of God, which although it have the nature of an eternal decree, yet is it not the same with the decree of election, &c. 2. It may be considered with respect of the federal transactions between the Father and the Son. In respect of declaration of it by Special Revelation. A. By way of absolute promise. B. By way of additional prescription of the way and means whereby it is the will of God that we should enter into a Covenant-state with him, &c. 3. The Covenant may be considered as to the actual application of the grace, benefit and privileges unto any persons, &c.

Now all this while he makes not two Covenants, a Covenant of Redemption, and of Grace, but gives divers considerations of the new Covenant in its dispensation, and under which consideration it may most usually and properly be termed by us a Covenant of Grace; and the ground of this discourse is to disprove your notion, that the Covenant of Redemption or Suretyship is the procuring cause of the Covenant of Grace, and he shows that it is nowhere said in the Scripture, that Christ by his death merited, procured or obtained the New Covenant, or that God should enter into a New Covenant with mankind; yea, that which is contrary to it, and inconsistent with it, is frequently asserted.

Now he comes to show what respect the Covenant of Grace has unto the death of Christ, and what influence it has thereunto?

A. Supposing what is spoken of his being a Surety thereof, it has a three-fold respect thereunto. 1. In that the Covenant, as to the grace and glory of it, were prepared in the Council of God, as the terms of it was fixed in the Covenant of the Mediator, and as it were declared in the promise, was confirmed, ratified, and made it revocable thereby. This the Apostle insists on at large. Heb.9:15-20. 2. He thereby underwent and performed all that which in the righteousness and wisdom of God was required, that the effects, fruits, benefits and grace intended and designed, and prepared in the New Covenant might be effectually accomplished and communicated unto sinners. 3. All the benefits were procured by him, &c.

Now says he, the sum of these things is, whereas it's affirmed the New Covenant was procured by the death of Christ, if it be understood with respect unto the actual communication of all grace and glory prepared in the Covenant, and proposed

unto us in the promises of it; it is most true, all the grace and glory promised in the Covenant was purchased for the Church by Jesus Christ. In this sense, by his death he procured the New Covenant; but as to the New Covenant itself it's not procured.

All this is rather a confirmation than a denial of the truth of what the Assembly affirms concerning the Covenant of Grace.

Neonomian. I say, that the Covenant of Grace is not the Covenant of Redemption between the Father and the Son.

Antinomian. You should have told what the Covenant of Grace is.

Neonomian. The Covenant of Grace is the way that God has ordained to apply to sinners that salvation which is prepared by Christ, and which he will enable the elect to comply with.

Antinomian. This definition or description I except against. For first, it contains not the genus or common nature of a Covenant, viz., to be an agreement wherein two parties do mutually consent; nor the parties wherein the nature of a Covenant does consist, which is a condition and promise; nor is there a Covenant in the more improper fence denoted, viz., a promise; for if it be a Covenant of Grace, it must be at least a Covenant of promise. 2. You say, it's a way ordained of God. Here's no form or difference; for many things are ways and means, which are not covenants; you should have said {according to your sense} it's God's agreement with sinners upon terms of faith and repentance. 3. The application of the means effectually is part of the salvation itself. 4. You say this salvation is prepared by Christ; you should have said, by the Father in his council and purpose for the giving of his Son, and blessing us with all blessings in him. The life and salvation is Christ, and in Christ; he is our life; the Father has given us life, and this is in his Son. You should have said, which he has promised to enable the elect to comply with, or else it has nothing of a Covenant in it; it carries only the force of electing will; and if he has promised, then to some or other, either to Christ, and then it brings in your Covenant of Redemption; if to any other excluding Christ, then to the elect out of Christ. For the promise to make a person comply, must be made, and must be in nature before he does comply.

Neonomian. I pray, what do you say is the Covenant of Grace.

Antinomian. I shall tell you the parties between whom it was made. It was made by God in the person of the Father with man in the person of the Son. You speak improperly to talk of the Father and Spirit covenanting with the Son; you should rather say, the Father, Son and Spirit covenanted with the Son, for by this notion you take in the persons of the Trinity; for you must take them all in the covenanting part; and then there's as

much reason to take them in all in their stipulating part, because the Son is God, and so the three persons covenanted with themselves under the same distinct consideration in the Godhead. But we say, God essentially considered covenanted in the person of the Father, with man in the person of the Son. His Son taking man's part, being his Representative, as having his nature in the same person; therefore as the second Adam, having all the spiritual seed in his loins, and as a common person federally.

Neonomian. And what is a Covenant between these?

Antinomian. It's the promise of eternal life made to Christ, and to the elect in him to be performed in and through Jesus Christ as the great condition to all them that shall be saved by him. Covenants are denominated from either part, by a synecdoche here chiefly from the promise, as the same is sometimes from the condition. The Covenant of Grace is a great mystery, &c. Rom.16:25. Col.1:26. 1. Because it is eternal. Tit.1:2. II Tim.1:9. 2. That though between God and man, yet being made with us in Christ, it was between equals. Phil.2:6. 3. That though it was a Covenant of works, yet a Covenant of Grace, to Christ a Covenant of works, and most conditional, Isa.53:10-12, to us absolute and free, being a promise of the gift of Christ, and all blessings in him. 4. It is mysterious in respect of the several states that it has had. 1. Hidden. 2. Revealed. Hidden in God before the world was; revealed since the world. 1. Less manifested in the promulgation before Christ's coming. In respect of the few emanations and discoveries of its brightness and lustre in absolute promises to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, David; and in regard of its veiled state. First, under the veils, of sacrifices, types, figures. Secondly, under a legal, moral and conditional Administration. 5. It is mysterious in regard of the various names and titles that it has had from its different dispensations; that under the law was called old and faulty, because it made but a partial discovery of its glory and lustre. In the New Testament it's called the New Covenant, in respect of the new and clear dispensation; it's called the promise, because it appears absolutely given forth in a promissory way; it's called the counsel, oath, as well as compact, and from the nature of it in relation to sinners it's good news to them. It's called a Testament, because confirmed by Christ's death.

Neonomian. But you tell me not how you prove the Covenant of Grace and Redemption are all one.

Antinomian. 1. Because I know them not spoken of anywhere as distinct Covenants. The Scripture of Isaiah 53:1012 is a place wherein this Covenant is so clearly described between the Father and the Son, it holds forth the Covenant of Grace fully and clearly, the promise of all grace and benefits that are

contained in the said Covenant of Grace; and the Apostle tells us expressly that this Covenant-Agreement was the will by which we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all. Heb.10:8-10.

2. That Covenant that contains in it the whole matter and form, in conditions and promises, of the Covenant of Grace, does not essentially differ from it, but the Covenant of Redemption does. It contains conditions and promises of grace, all things that pertain to life and godliness; and it contains in it all conditions upon which we may be partakers of any promises, Christ's Person, Offices, Sacrifice, Righteousness active and passive, there's no Covenant condition, of Atonement, Propitiation, Satisfaction unto the justice of God, but it is here, Christ is the great Fulfiller of the Law, and Satisfier of it; he is the end of the Law for righteousness to every believer. Rom.10:4.

3. From the veiled dispensation of the Covenant of Grace before the coming of Christ, their sacrifices, and their ceremonial administration held forth in a figure, that it is made to Christ, and confirmed in him as the great offering, and atonement; Christ is there exemplified and set forth as the fulness of the Covenant of Grace, both in respect of promises and conditions.

4. When we plead anything of the Covenant of Grace, it's the promises of life made to us in Christ, as Yea and Amen to us in him, in respect of obtaining and performance to us.

5. Our acts of faith are fixed on Christ as the sum of the Covenant of Grace, as Satisfying for our sins, and as to whom the promises were made, and the great thing promised, as the fountain and meritorious cause of all blessings; he is given us as the Covenant.

6. There is all grace to be had in this Covenant; there is no grace but is given forth and received by us in this Covenant between the Father and Son; the gift of the Spirit, the grace of faith, justification by his blood; by him came all grace; yea all other supposed grace that came not from the Father, and through Christ, is no grace, and will not profit us.

7. Where the Covenant condition and promises are all from grace and love to us, there's a Covenant of Grace; but in that which you call a distinct Covenant of Redemption, the Covenants, the conditions and promises are of free grace and love to us; God the Father from his free grace and love to us called his Son to this undertaking and covenanting with him; God the Son in our person from his love and free grace covenanted with his Father, he came and freely offered himself to perform the Covenant condition. The condition of this Covenant in all Mediatorial perfections and performances, is freely promised and

bestowed upon us. The promise of eternal life, all grace and glory are promised and given in this Covenant. That is a Covenant of Grace, wherein God is to us a God of all grace.

8. If the Covenant of Redemption be not the Covenant of Grace, then there is more Covenants than the Covenant of works, and the Covenant of Grace for life and salvation, but there is no more Covenants for our life and salvation, but that of works, and that of grace. The minor I think hardly any will deny; but if it be said there was Moses Mount Sinai Covenant; that was but a darker and faultier dispensation of the Covenant of Grace in the moral and ceremonial law; if Church Covenants be alleged under the Law or Gospel, they add nothing to this grand Covenant, but are accomplishments of the promises thereof to whom it does belong, it being promised that they shall be God's people. In this Covenant Christ stipulates, and we in him, as we did in the first Adam, then when we believe we stipulate, moved thereto from the grace of the promise, and enter personally into this Covenant, embracing that Covenant which was made for us in Christ, which is called laying hold of it. It is solemnly also owned, professed and restipulated to, when we enter into Church fellowship; repeated restipulations and renewings of the same Covenant may be, without changing the Covenant; for as we find God often repeats this Covenant, and renews it with his people in revelation and establishment, as with Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, yet it was but the same Covenant; so are God's children excited and encouraged thereto from the free grace of the said Covenant.

I shall not here enlarge any further, but refer the reader to that excellent treatise of the Mr. Petto concerning the Covenants; wherein he gives us this account of the Covenant of Grace, viz., "the Covenant of Grace was made and established not only with us, but jointly with Jesus Christ, and us in him; so that both are within one and the same Covenant, for the great transactions with Jesus, yea, even the giving and sending of him, and his accepting the Office of a Redeemer, and undertaking for us, these are all of grace as well as what is promised to us through him; therefore the Covenant of Grace must take in all that conduces {otherwise than a mere decree} to our restoration and eternal salvation. 1. There is no Scripture evidence for making these two Covenants, one of suretyship or redemption with Jesus Christ, and another of grace and reconciliation made with us; that distinction which some use is improper, for the parts are coincident, seeing that which was with Christ was of mere grace also. And it's promised that he should be given for a Covenant, Isa.42:6, therefore it's of grace we are redeemed by him. II Tim.1:9. There was grace before the world was, and that must be in the Covenant as with Jesus Christ, which was for

reconciling the world to the Father. II Cor.5:18-19, Col.1:20-21. It's true, Christ only is our Redeemer and Surety, not we in our own persons, and Christ has some peculiar precepts and promises appropriated to him, which are not afforded to us in the same manner and degree, yet this hindereth not the oneness of the Covenant with him and us. 2. The Covenant of Grace was made with Jesus Christ as a Public person, a second Adam, and therefore with all his seed in him. 3. All in the Covenant as with us, is undertaken for and promised in the Covenant as between the Father and the Son, and so together make but one Covenant. 4. All Covenant blessings are primarily granted to Christ."

Neonomian. Q. What is intended by a condition? A. I answer in the words of the worthy Mr. Flavel, {Discourse of Errors, pg. 248,} "an antecedent condition signifies no more than an act of ours; which though it be neither perfect in every degree, nor in the least meritorious of the benefit conferred, nor performed in our natural strength, yet according to the Constitution of the Covenant, it is required of us, in order to the blessing consequent thereupon, by virtue of the promise; and consequently the benefits and mercies granted in this order, are and must be suspended by the donor, or disposer of them, till it be performed; such a condition we affirm faith to be."

Antinomian. Mr. Flavel was a worthy man, but it may be not without some hay and stubble; I hope it does not chip away at the one foundation, which is Christ the Lord. I Cor.3:10-13. You tell us, what an antecedent condition is; that it signifies no more than an act of ours, and such is faith. I suppose you and he mean, in distinction from a consequent condition. The antecedent gains the estate; the lawyers reckon it the purchase-money, the consequent condition keeps it, and it's the quit-rent, which if it be not duly paid, the Lord can enter and take to the estate. So that faith, you'll have to be the antecedent condition money deposited and laid down, before you have anything of your spiritual estate. And you say, it signifies no more than an act of ours. I pray, whose should it be but ours, if the condition is to be performed by us? And why is this put in, it signifies no more? Unless the meaning be, that Christ's righteousness should be shut out, and it should be reckoned under the nature of this condition merely as an act of ours, without respect to Christ the Author of it, and Christ the true object of it. And now you tell us it's negative qualifications. 1. It's not perfect in every degree. What's the meaning of that? This insinuates as if it were perfect in some degrees. I had thought no grace were perfect in degrees, though as to kind and truth. But you will have it perfect in some degrees, and imperfect in other degrees? Pray in what degrees is this condition perfect, and in what imperfect? And whether it be not an imperfect Covenant that has an imperfect condition?

2. It's not in the least meritorious of the benefits conferred, by no means, i.e., by any intrinsic value and worth, either adequate to, or excelling the benefits received. No, your meaning is, what you have for it is well worth your money; it's a good bargain. But by your favor, every federal condition is meritorious; so that you may challenge your bargain upon performance, if it be but 20 guineas to purchase a 100 l. per annum, so that we have only your word for it, that it's not meritorious, when it's so in reality; the nature of the thing speaks it to the understanding of all men of sense. No, no; do not think to wheedle Christ out of his merits, and God out of the honor of his free-grace, and us out of the comfort of both. 3. You say it's not performed in our natural strength. No, and yet a condition of Covenant made with man? A most unreasonable thing, to require a condition of a Covenant of one, that we know has no strength to perform it. If a rich man should offer an estate of 1000 l. a year to a poor man that he knew was not worth a groat, provided he fetched him twenty pounds of his own money; this act would be reckoned a mocking and ridiculing this poor wretch. God did not require that small condition of Adam, but that he actually had natural strength to perform it. You will say, God will give him ability to perform, so he did to Adam, previous to the Covenant. As the rich merchant tells the poor laborer, I will give thee 20 l. to pay me for my estate, he'll say, well, Sir, when you give it me, I will then bargain with you; and when I have it, though you gave it me, I shall reckon it mine as much as if I had raised it myself, or another had given; and if we bargain, I shall expect to have my bargain upon this condition. Though it's a good bargain, yet it's a bargain, and whatever I have of you is debt. I can sue for it as purchased by me, says the poor man. Now see how well qualified this condition is; no, no, believe it, God makes no such lame bargains as these. Yet you say, according to the Constitution of the Covenant, it is required of us in order to the blessings consequent thereupon by virtue of the promise. This I must confess is an unorthodox paradox indeed. What mean you by the Constitution of the Covenant? Is it not as other Covenants, by the Constitution of your scheme? Is it not by a condition and promise? And is not this condition performed meritoriously? And is not, "do this and live," and the blessings consequent according to contract, and therefore debt? Think not to beat us out of our senses, that the blessings of a Covenant are only suspended upon conditions performed, as one man follows another in a narrow path, or according to a natural order, as a son is after a father; but here it is in order to a federal right and challenge of the benefits as a due debt. But how do you understand that clause, by virtue of the promise?

Neonomian. It's from God's will in the promise, that

they are made to be conditions. He connected the benefit and the duty; though he chose those conditions that were fit, yet their fitness would not have availed to our interest in the benefits, unless he had promised that they should avail. A penitent believer had not been saved but for the promise, though it's unlike God to have saved any that were not such.

Antinomian. Wherefore God's will in the promise? Are not the promise and the conditions both equally willed by God? Is God's will in the promise anything besides that will of God that is in the condition? The plain truth is, this is a puzzling doctrine, God's will in the promise that makes conditions. But how? You tell us, he connected benefit and duty. But in what manner? For he connected benefit and duty in the Covenant of works; and it was as much God's will in the promise as you can pretend to, if I understand the riddle; but you say, he chose fit conditions. It was fit God should choose his conditions, and it became his wisdom and power to make fit conditions. But imperfect, lame, sinful conditions of a Covenant do not become a holy and perfect God to choose; to cast away perfect conditions, and take imperfect in their room. But though God chose fit conditions, yet they would not have availed, {sufficient, you reckon, but not efficient,} God's choice of persons or things in your sense, makes them not certainly future; yet we find that many things that God has chosen do avail to attain the end to which he chose them, though there be no promise of their availing. But it seems God makes a Covenant with man, and is fain to enter into bond for man's performance of the condition, and perform them himself at last in giving the first grace. But what indeed should be the true English, after all this splutter about a condition? Its but a little thing wrapped up in the promise, and is ours by virtue of promise. So that at last our conditional Covenant is become absolute; for we have the duty as well as the benefit by promise. The penitent believer has his faith and repentance as a part of eternal life given to him by promise.

Neonomian. And consequently the benefits and mercies granted in this order, are, and must be suspended by the Donor or Disposer of them till it be performed, and such a condition we affirm faith to be.

Antinomian. And a fine business you have made of it. And consequently, i.e., federally; for it's no otherwise consequently. There must be a suspension of the granted benefits, not by the Donor, that's improper, but by the bargainer, and how long? Till he is pleased to give the man money to make the purchase with. And is not this reason, if he be to find the money? And is it any fault in the poor man that he does not make the Purchase, when he that should sell him the estate has all the Purchase-money in his hands? You bid poor sinners come and

buy; and you say not with the prophet, without money and price, but you must have such a parcel of money to do it with, which money is in God's hands. They will tell you, when God gives us the money, we will buy, and till then it's not our fault. He is a hard Master if he looks to reap where he sowed not.

Neonomian. These conditions are our duty by God's command, and no less so by being made terms of the benefit in the Divine Grant.

Antinomian. It seems you make more conditions than one; we shall meet with them by and by. You make the Covenant of Grace a Covenant of Legislation, and so a new law directly opposed to the Covenant of promise, as we do make appear. Was not the condition appointed to Adam by God's command, and had antecedent power given him to perform? Is it not unreasonable to command the performance of a condition, where the commander knows there is no power to perform? Is it consistent with the wisdom of God to command an impossibility to his creature, as a Covenant-condition? And is it just to deal with him upon his non-performance, according to the sanction of a law? And you say, his duty no less by being made terms, &c. You should have said, legally much more. Instead of terms of the benefit, you should have said, terms of the Covenant, if you had spoken properly. And as for the grant you speak of, its but conditional, and there's no grant at all pleadable till the condition be performed.

Neonomian. The Covenant, though conditional, is a disposition of grace. There's grace in giving ability to perform the condition, as well as bestowing the benefits; God's enjoining one in order to the other, makes not the benefit to be the less given.

Antinomian. In a conditional Covenant {that is a Covenant of works in the highest sense} there is always a disposition of grace to the creature, even in that by which the very good angels stand, and was in that made with Adam. It's grace that God offers happiness to his creature upon any terms, when he is in a capacity to perform them. It's grace to take his creature into Covenant. The Angels are saved by grace, and so would man have been, if he had stood; and though he fell, there was that grace you speak of in giving ability to perform the condition, and giving it before he put the condition upon him, which is not here; for you'll have the condition put upon a sinner, before the disposition of grace to give him ability; which makes it a harsh dealing, and unreasonable, and hence far from grace, and therefore this enjoining makes not only less grace, but no grace.

Neonomian. It's a Display of God's wisdom, in conferring the benefit, suitably to the nature and state of man in this life, whose eternal condition is not eternally decided, but are

in a state of trial; yea, the conditions are but a meetness to receive the blessings.

Antinomian. Gross Divinity! I had thought Christ in the Covenant had been the great display of God's wisdom. But you must have a pitiful condition, an imperfect, sinful righteousness instead of him, and a Covenant agreeable to the corrupt nature and state of men, and indeed so is yours, for there's nothing suits more with our carnal, corrupt hearts, than to seek salvation in such a way as you pretend to. And is not the state of believers decided in this life? But is it still a contingent axiom that John a true believer shall be saved? What miserable consequences will hence be inferred, the conditions are still performing these Federal conditions and subjective qualifications, it may be the man may not perform them all, and then he perisheth eternally; there's no certainty of salvation here, no man can have any more than an opinion of it, shake hands with the Papists and Arminians. Nay hence it seems that all the grace given here is no part of eternal life, but qualifying conditions to make them meet for it federally, and that in true English is to make them merit it. Lastly, all the doctrine of election is hereby overthrown, you may tear out, Ephesians 1 & Romans 9, and several other places of Scripture out of your Bible. Thus, according to your scheme, no man's eternal condition is by the eternal God decided. The best man is but upon his trial as Adam was, whether he will stand or fall.

Neonomian. I will show you the reason why we use the word condition. 1. Because it best suits with man's relation to God, in his presents dealings with us as subjects in trial for eternity.

Antinomian. I know not why you should make any apology for using the word, for undoubtedly it best suits with your System of Divinity; though it would not have suited with Paul's conditions, it will suit our nature that are dead in trespasses, without strength, in the flesh, and cannot please God in the performance of any conditions; and it suits his present dealings you say in way of trial for our eternal estate, upon our good behaviour in performance of after conditions as well as first conditions, our calling, election, justification, union with Christ, the promises of perseverance, all does not decide our eternal estate, nothing but our final performance of conditions. Lord have mercy upon us and our Ministers! Where's our Gospel?

Neonomian. Christ as Priest has merited all.

Antinomian. He ought then to be content, and not except against your scheme, you allow him enough.

Neonomian. But as King or Priest upon his Throne he dispenses all, he enjoins the conditions in order to the benefits; and makes the benefits motives to our compliance with the

conditions. He treats with men as his subjects, whom he will now rule, and hereafter judge.

Antinomian. Now he comes to his rectoral rule of government, and gives forth his new law. I had thought Christ had been a King, and exerted his Kingly Office upon the cross as well as upon the Throne; but now you say he acts as a King or Priest upon the Throne; and as such, either King or Priest, you know not which, he enjoins conditions in order to benefits. You should speak plainly; you mean, he sets up a new law, justifies or condemns men by the works of this law, and treats all the world as redeemed subjects, deals with them according to this new law, bringing them upon their trial for eternity. Your meaning is, that Christ has merited a power to himself to exercise dominion in the earth, and bring men under his trial and judicature in performance of conditions; and they that are saved shall be saved by his regal power. It's enough for his Priestly Office, that it merited what he was to do as King. But not all; for the first grace must not come from his merits; and now there's but a little use for his Priesthood; all the rest depend upon our conditions.

Neonomian. Now what word is so proper to express the duty as enjoined means of benefits, like this word conditions?

Antinomian. It seems you hug this word condition extremely.

Neonomian. Yes, I do. There's few authors of note, even of any persuasion, but make use of this word in my sense. viz., Twisse, Rutherford, &c.

Antinomian. Few of them understood the word as you do, or at least made use of it in your sense. But whether they understood it so or not, it's no great matter. I would wish you to build a condition-school, where all persons might resort to the hearing condition-lectures, to sit them to understand your terms of art in preaching; and let us consider a little the nature of it. Condition comes under several considerations.

1. Logical; and there it's a condition conditioned or conditions conditioned. It's more the order, or of a relation, with respect to the other; it ariseth from a priority and posteriority of things; all things can't be at once, but one thing must be before another; and here one thing is the condition of another with respect to time, there is a relative condition, and so all arguments are mutual conditions one of another, and consist in mutual relation. There the condition is axiomatic, which ariseth from a contingent axiom, or necessary. The condition in the disposition of the term of a syllogism, out of a dependence between the conclusions and the previous remarks. There are also law-conditions. Dr. Cawel says, "it is a rate, manner, or law annexed to men's acts or grants, staying and suspending the

same, and making them uncertain whether they shall take effect or no." And Papinian says, "it is said, that when something is on the chances of a condition, it is most uncertain as to who is able to make his way towards its accomplishment." This is a general account of a condition, as arising out of a contingency, the effect depending upon uncertain causes. And a learned lawyer says, "a condition is a restraint or bridle annexed and joined to a promise, by the performance of which it's ratified and takes effect, and by the non-performance of it becomes void." Such a condition I perceive you and Mr. Flavel will have faith to be; a condition upon which the promise is made, and the performance suspended by the Disposer till the said condition be performed. The condition must be fulfilled before the effect follows. Now this being your condition, I say, it's federal. It's a federal condition and let it be in value less or more, it makes a Covenant of works, and is clothed with all the logical notions of conditions besides. The logical conditions are in all things necessarily mutually dependent; and a man cannot move a hand or tongue without them. Even brutes and all inanimate beings, as well as men, they belong to the whole fabric and constitution of created beings. But a federal condition belongs only to rational beings; and it's related to the promise according to contract in a way of merit, and the promise belongs to it by way of debt. And in this sense the Apostle always decries the law, or any law, to have to do with our justification; he affirms, that it's always of grace, and never of debt, upon the least consideration whatever of our performance and qualification. And this is the condition that I contend against, and say, that neither faith, or any other gracious qualifications or graces of the Spirit, are federal conditions, or conditions of the Covenant of Grace. My arguments, some of them in brief are these.

That which is a gift of the promise of eternal life, is no condition of it; but faith is a gift of the promise, ergo, for the major, it's clear; for one thing cannot be another. The condition and promise are opposites; they are opposing affirmatives; a father cannot be a son in that respect as he is a father. As to the minor, it's out of all doubt by Divine testimony. See John 17:3 & Ephesians 2:8. To know Christ by faith, is eternal life; and this life of faith is the gift of God. Hence faith, that is the benefit promised, is not the condition of it. A promise, or gift of the promise, cannot be the condition of itself.

2. That which would make the promise a debt, and the gift of it a reward of debt, is not to be allowed. But to make faith a federal condition of the Covenant of Grace, would make the promise to be debt, and the reward a reward of debt. Therefore faith is not to be allowed to be a condition of the Covenant. For the major, it will stand with invincible strength from the Apostle

Paul's divinity and logic. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Rom.4:4. Believing and working are opposed as working and not working, as contradictions. It's vain and frivolous to shift by evasive interpretations; and all that's said to that purpose, is easily wiped off. For the minor, that putting faith in as a federal condition, would make the promise a debt. The performance of any work, or doing any act as a federal condition, let it be never so small, the promising Federator becomes indebted thereby to bestow the benefit promised on the fulfilment thereof, in a way of obligation, and therefore becomes a debtor. Now the Apostle will not allow anything of this in the least measure.

3. That doctrine which will make all the graces of sanctification or gracious qualifications, federal conditions, is not to be admitted. But to say, faith is a condition of the Covenant in the sense pleaded for, will bring in all other graces as well as itself, ergo, this doctrine is not to be admitted; for there is as much reason that all of them be allowed to be conditions, as that faith should; and therefore I see you and your party bring in repentance and other graces together with faith; and say, our eternal life is given unto us at the last, upon conditional meetness for it. But the Scripture nowhere speaks of our justification, for or by repentance, love, patience, mortification of sin, &c., not so much as once in the sense that it speaks of Justification by faith; and therefore faith justifies not in its qualifying nature, which it has in common with other graces of the Spirit. God never intended our strictest holiness and highest degrees of grace should be our justifying righteousness before God, or federal conditions of the Covenant of Grace.

4. That any act of ours should be a federal condition of the Covenant of Grace, destroys the very nature of it, as it stands in opposition to the Covenant of works; it can't be distinguished otherwise from the Covenant of works; for the condition of the Covenant of works was as small as anything, imagining the ability was given before the condition was required. He should have had persevering grace in the promise, had he outstood this temptation. Now the formal difference between the Covenant of works, and grace was in the condition, that in the Covenant of works the righteousness which was the condition was in man himself that was to be justified. In the Covenant of Grace, the conditional righteousness is in another; not only the promise, but the condition is freely given, and is in another. If we must provide the condition; nay, if it must be inherent in us, though wrought by God, it makes our Covenantstanding no otherwise than the first and old Covenant-standing. Besides, the Design of God in the Covenant of Grace, is not only to save graciously, so he does save elect angels, but to save mercifully; to take them into

Covenant with him, that not only are without good qualifications, but such as are most sinful and miserable, and not to qualify them with meriting or dignifying righteousness first, but to save them so, that neither they themselves, nor God himself, will see any federal conditions of righteousness in them. The design of grace is to save the creature in the highest degree of abasement in himself, and far from boasting, or seeing any reason in himself to do it.

5. The great and evangelical promulgations of this Covenant of Grace was always in absolute promises, and no mention made of federal conditions in us. "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." Jer.31:33. "And I will betroth thee unto me forever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in lovingkindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness, and thou shalt know the LORD." Hos.2:19-20. "And I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the LORD, saith the Lord GOD, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean, from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." Ezek.36:23-27.

See Zanchius upon the place, "he does not say, if thou wilt repent, I will receive thee into favor, and betroth thee; but absolutely, I will betroth thee. It is therefore a most absolute Covenant, wherein God without any condition does promise that he will receive his people into favor, and save them. The first promise to Adam was absolute; and was not those repeated promises of it to Abraham and the patriarchs absolute?" The forenamed author speaking of the Covenant made with Abraham, Gen.17:7, notes, that this promise is altogether free, absolute, and without condition, because in the words of the Covenant we find no condition.

6. That which is a new Covenant condition to some saved ones, is to all; for it's not to be supposed that the new Covenant has divers sorts of conditions, but faith or evangelical obedience cannot be a condition to some, ergo, not the condition. It cannot be the condition to saved infants nor idiots, but it is not

to be doubted but God saves many of them by the Covenant of Grace.

7. If Jesus Christ himself be the sole condition of the New Covenant, then faith nor any other grace of the Spirit is not the condition. The Spirit itself is not the federal condition of the Covenant, but promised to work faith and holiness in us. But Christ is the only condition. 1. His righteousness is our condition in satisfaction of the law, both as to active and passive obedience. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom.10:4. He is the condition in whom it is, through whom eternal life is conveyed to us. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." I Jn.5:11. He is the condition through whom all the benefits flow, redemption, forgiveness, &c. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph.1:3-7. He is the condition of all good, in him, through him, and by him we have complete reconciliation. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." I Cor.1:30. Of him we have our faith. "Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith." Heb.12:2. That Christ is the only federal condition of the Covenant, is so clear and plain a truth throughout all the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, that he must deny the sun in the firmament that denies this truth; Christ himself is the sole condition of the Covenant.

It's impossible anything else should be the condition, &c. There's nothing else can reconcile sinners to God in bearing sin and the curse; he only was our condition for reconciliation. There's nothing else pleadable with God. 1. Christ can plead nothing else in his intercession, but his own righteousness. 2. We can plead nothing else with God, not our faith or obedience, when we come before God in prayer. "O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name, for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies." Dan.9:18. 3. Our best holiness cannot have any satisfying virtue for sin committed. II. Christ must be the only condition, that the Covenant of Grace might be free to us, that grace might be free grace. III. He that is the condition of bestowing the Spirit which works grace, is the condition of all grace that ensues, but Christ is the condition of the bestowing the Spirit, ergo, he has purchased this gift; he sends the Spirit; it is his Spirit, he had it for this end without measure.

Neonomian. I will tell you what is intended by the

benefits of the Covenant? The good things or privileges promised to such as by grace are enabled to comply with the terms of the Covenant, especially whatever is essential to our felicity.

Antinomian. I pray to what does that grace that does enable a man to comply with the terms belong? Is it any privilege or benefit of the Covenant? Or has he it out of Covenant? And what is that benefit that he has in changing his heart, in turning him from darkness to light? Is not this the performance of the promise of eternal life? What condition have you to premise to this gift of God? You talk of the grace of God enabling a sinner to comply, just as if he were to keep his old state, and the grace of God did only help and assist him by some moral persuasion; I pray tell me. 1. Is not the first life of grace a good thing and privilege? What in us is the condition of it? 2. Nay, is not the preaching of the Gospel a good thing and privilege? And does not faith come by hearing? You should make hearing a condition of the Covenant; for every duty to be performed antecedaneous to another in order thereunto, or as a means for it, is its condition, but not a federal condition; dressing meat is such a condition to the eating of it; making a suit of clothes to the putting it on, &c.

Neonomian. It's needful that I acquaint you, wherein the conditions of the Covenant of Grace, differ from conditions in the Covenant of Innocency, or Works as vulgarly called; for both lie in doing something, though not the same thing, nor to the same end.

Antinomian. We are like to have excellent doctrine now; here's a plain declaration that the Covenant of Grace is a Covenant of Works, though it's not the same individual thing, and something else designed, but it lies in doing.

Neonomian. The conditions of the Covenant of Grace are performed by the grace of Christ freely given to sinners. The conditions of the Covenant of Innocency were performed by a strength due to and inherent in our innocent nature.

Antinomian. To say the conditions of the Covenant of Grace are performed by the grace of Christ freely given to sinners, and that any act of ours is a condition, I affirm to be a contradiction. 1. Whatever is freely given to a sinner, is no part of a federal condition as such, but of a promise. 2. That which is to be ascribed wholly as to all its good to grace, is no condition of a Covenant in us, or conditional part, if there be any it's in Christ. 3. You do manifestly own that sinners are not capable of a Covenant condition, it must be wrought in them, therefore how absurd is it to say a Covenant promise was made to them upon condition of their own act, when they do not act, nor have power to act. The conditions of the Covenant of Innocency {as you would have it improperly enough} were performed by a strength given freely, and that before the condition was imposed; you

make the new law harder, because it commands duty as a condition before it gives strength to perform; and how was it due to our innocent nature? No more than a distinct nature from bruits was due to us; it was all of gracious bounty and from the Lord's good pleasure alone; there's nothing due to the creature from the Creator, but what he will from his free good will and pleasure make due; well then, hitherto you show us no more grace in your new law than in the old law, and I am mistaken if not less.

Neonomian. The principal conditions of the Covenant of Grace express the guilt and misery of them that perform them. Repentance owns our filth and guilt, and faith in a Redeemer expresses our sinful and lost estate; neither of these could have place in our legal righteousness, as being utterly inconsistent with an innocent condition. Nor can they have much room in Heaven, where we shall be perfect, whereas the terms of the Covenant of Works implied nothing but innocency and happiness.

Antinomian. You tell us of faith and repentance being the principal condition; I pray which are the rest of the conditions, it's fit we should know them all, and when we have performed our part that we make our claim, for we can make none till we have performed all. If our repentance only as a condition express guilt and filth, it expresses our condemnation only, and thereby not a condition of salvation; it worketh wrath, and thereby belongs to the law of works broken. Rom.4:15. If it be a condition of salvation it must take off guilt and filth by expiation, which you dare not say repentance does make; and so faith, it's not enough to express a sinful and lost estate; that's but a sentence of death, but it must as a condition take off this sentence, by its own nature. 3. Whereas you say neither of these, i.e., faith or repentance could have place in our legal righteousness; it's false, for faith had place in our legal righteousness. Adam's legal righteousness was faith and obedience, and his legal unrighteousness was begun in unbelief, which is manifest from the serpent's temptation, Gen.3:3, which Adam complied with; our first parents fell first by unbelief. And why could not repentance have been one of the conditions, if the Law-giver had pleased to put it in? Why might not the law run in these terms, in the day thou eatest, and dost not repent thereof, thou shalt die, and so one law should have done all? Why could there not have been as many conditions, and the same in the old law as you will have in the new? Therefore there's nothing hinders in the nature of the thing that makes it inconsistent, as you say, with an innocent condition; why may not a provision be made in a state of innocency for the cure of nocency, if the Legislator pleaseth? For he made not his law by necessity of nature. And know, that repentance hath great consistency with

the law, and naturally follows in case of transgression, and there was no need of it but upon that supposition, and upon the Fall Adam naturally fell into repentance, expressing the guilt and filth of his sin.

Nor {you say} can they have much room in Heaven; it seems they have a little, at least so much as to retain the nature of a condition, or else the Covenant is lost in Heaven; for the Covenant must always be made up of conditions and promises, or performance of things promised, it is an everlasting Covenant. But by your favor, faith has place in Heaven, and that a higher faith than we are capable of here.

You say, the terms of the Covenant of works implies nothing but innocency and happiness; there was not a promise of happiness expressed, though implied, and God never intended to give us happiness by that law; for the Apostle says, "is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid, for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Gal.3:21. Therefore God never intended to give life to us by that law or any other; if he had, he could have given a law sufficient for it at first; and were there no terms but innocency and happiness? Was there not terms of transgression and condemnation? And those were the express terms, the other were but supposed or implied.

Neonomian. The conditions of the Covenant of Grace make us capable of no happiness, except what Christ has bought and prepared for us, his blood is the price of all. But the happiness granted to sinless obedience was immediately from the Creator, and knew no Atonement or Mediator.

Antinomian. Doth that make your Covenant the better or the worse? Is not a perfect entire Covenant without any flaws in it, better than a faulty Covenant? The Apostle condemns a faulty Covenant, but you chose to prefer a Covenant that is faulty, made up of sinful obedience, and that must have a Mediator to provide against it, and to mend the faults of it; and hence this Covenant could not be without a Mediator, because of its faultiness; and you say your Covenant makes us capable of no happiness but what was bought and prepared for us. 1. Then this is a Covenant that capacitates us first for what Christ bought, and then when we are capable we shall be partakers of Christ, by a previous Covenant where Christ has nothing to do but extrinsically only; this capability is by congruity or condignity. 2. It's a kindness to Christ that you will allow him the honour to buy and prepare happiness for us, and have it ready against we have occasion for it. 3. What other kind of happiness can you suppose? Is there any but what comes to us in or by Christ? Would the life promised to Adam have differed in specie, and be of another kind? But is not the gift of the Son himself a happiness? All

blessings of the Covenant are happiness to sinners. 4. The Father's love was not purchased, nor the gift of the Son; God so loved the world that he sent his Son, &c. 5. But his blood is the price of all, there's enough for him, he bought your whole new law at a lump, both your inherent federal righteousness for a condition, and the reward of debt; he capacitated the law, and brought it to so low terms, that you were capable of performing the conditions of it. But has his blood no capacitating faculty in it, but merely to be a price to free us from the old law, that we may come upon new terms now with God in the second law? 6. And what if the happiness granted to a sinless obedience came immediately from the Creator, was it the worse for it, provided it were the same happiness, and knew no atonement? You say, why? Because it needed none. But it might know a Mediator, though no atonement. A Mediator may be where there's no atonement. What did the tree of life import? Lastly, I would fain know whether Christ, and all the Gospel blessings, come not immediately from God the Creator? And whether they that come from Christ, come not from a Creator? Were not all things made by him? "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him, and for him." Col.1:16. And is not our state in Christ a new creation?

Neonomian. The blessings promised on the conditions of the Covenant of Grace, are merely of grace; they be for another's sake, and not our own.

Antinomian. You cannot make that merely of grace that requires a previous condition in us to the bestowing of it; you allow this indeed, that Christ has obtained a good bargain for us, and this we have for his sake, but the Purchase money must be paid by us, though we borrow it, and get it as we can; and if a friend be so kind as to give us the money, yet the purchase must go in our name, we must be accounted the buyers.

Neonomian. They are given to them that are condemned by the Covenant of works, and that are still condemnable by the law for the imperfection of the performed Gospel conditions.

Antinomian. Therefore their condition of the happiness must be an adequate satisfaction to that Covenant, which you dare not say can be found in your conditions; condemnation cannot be taken off upon any other condition. 2. But I pray what a strange law is your law of imperfection, is it an imperfect law? Or a law to allow imperfect obedience for a Gospel condition, that is a sinful obedience, in distinction from the sinless obedience which was the condition of the first? This law of imperfection in no wise becomes such a perfect lawgiver, to drop a law of

perfection, and set up a law of imperfection. 3. It seems this law of imperfection is soundly so; for it's not only imperfect in the conditions, but in the happiness; for you say they are still condemnable by this law, truly by the conditions you have brought us into a pretty condition, you have brought us from a law wherein we were condemned, and into another law wherein we continue condemnable, we are condemned by one, and condemnable by the other, when we have performed these conditions; here we perform imperfect Gospel conditions, and remain damnable, liable to damnation, not passed from death to life. What miserable divinity is here!

Neonomian. Ay, but it's forgiveness which renders these persons blessed. Rom.4:7.

Antinomian. That is when they can get it; for they are condemned by the law of perfection, and remain condemnable by the law of imperfection. And this is certainly not a holy, just and good law; it's not holy, because sinful obedience is the condition, and it becomes not a Holy God to command sinful obedience, for the law condition is a command of duty; neither is it just, to give a reward to a person condemnable by the law; neither is it good, for that which is neither holy nor just is not good; and therefore we condemn that law which will do no more than make us condemnable. Is this your remedial law?

Neonomian. But the sinless obedience of innocent Adam made the reward to be of debt. Rom.4:4.

Antinomian. It seems that God may make his reward to be of grace, he throws away the sinless condition, and blends up a condition with sin; is this the way for grace to abound, to make sin a sharer in the federal condition; yea, and damnation too, a sinful, imperfect condemnable condition; the Covenant of Grace is to save from sin and damnation, not by sin and for damnation. And is there not a reward of debt, if a man purchases an estate with brass half crowns, washed and clipped money, if they be accepted, as well as if he paid in good current money? It seems now God's willing to take your copper money, he shall have the credit of giving you an estate; I tell you, if copper money will pass, it makes as clear debts and purchases as silver and gold. But I must say this is but washed divinity, and clipped too; and there's no part of it but is filthily mixed at best.

Neonomian. The use and interest of Gospel conditions, is not from the conformity of them to the preceptive part of the law, {though in a degree there be that,} but from the conformity to the rule of the grace of the promise.

Antinomian. It is good now we should know how to use these law ingredients, and mix them well by weight and measure, according to the art of mixture; and then to know the virtues and right way of application, and it's fit we should have good

testimony from Doctor experience, that this remedial law is a remedy for all diseases, evils, or difficulties; in essence, a cure-all. Let the case be never so deplorable. It seems the great difficulty lies in finding from whence the use and interest of the money {i.e., I suppose the virtue} does arise. It's not from any conformity to the law precepts, that would make it too good and too strong for a weak stomach, besides it would be too costly. But there is a little of it in a degree, the proportion is not above a grain of conformity to the preceptive part of the law, to a pound of conformity to the law of imperfection, which is your rule of the grace of the promise; but though there is a little touch of conformity to the old law, to season the julep, as a few drops of spirit of vitriol to make it more palatable, yet the virtue lies more absconded than what the patient can presently find; but where do you think? In the imperfection of it. This mixture is contrary to all natural remedies, that the worse the ingredients are, and the more imperfectly prepared, the better it is; if it should be perfect it would spoil all, it would make the happiness debt, as bad as it would have been to Adam in innocency, or to the saints in Heaven.

Neonomian. The promise of pardon through Christ being to the penitent believer, and no other; repentance and faith becomes necessary and useful conditions of this pardon, by the order of God in that gracious promise.

Antinomian. The promise of pardon is not to a sinner as penitent, but as a sinner; neither does a sinner when he applies pardon rightly, apply it to himself as penitent, but as a sinner. Repentance is part of the promise, and is given with remission of sins through faith in the blood of Christ; and without justifying faith applying to Christ for pardon first, there can be no repentance to life; pardon through faith is first in nature before the exercise of true Gospel repentance; repentance is turning from sin to God, and this must be by faith, for none can come to God but by him. Repentance and faith do become necessary and useful by virtue of the promise in the way of salvation, but by no means in the nature of federal conditions, God never constituted them in such a Covenant order.

Neonomian. In the Covenant of works the mere work gave an interest in the reward, as it was obedience to the precept by a sanction, which had goodness, but no such grace in it.

Antinomian. It's a gross mistake that Adam's obedience would have merited from intrinsic value or worth; and whatever condition of the creature-performance the Legislator puts into the Covenant, let it be less or more, perfect or imperfect it's all one, they do retroactively change the legal consequences of actions that were committed against the law, make the benefit promised a debt, and this I will maintain against all the

Neonomians in the world.

Neonomian. Upon these accounts I shall never fear that conditionality of the Covenant of Grace should turn it into a Covenant of works, till I see it proved that God can promise and apply no benefit purchased by Christ to a poor sinner, upon a condition of an action he commands, and freely enables the sinner to perform. The judgment day is past, and a state of trial is over whenever it is proved. Thus much for removal of mistakes.

Antinomian. And poor confident man, I can but pity you to see how miserably mistaken you are. All that you have said is so far from turning your law of imperfection into a Covenant of works, that it proves it to be a Covenant of works against all the world. What God can do is one thing, and will do is another. I am sure he has made no other federal condition of the new Covenant than Jesus Christ himself and his righteousness; and when the judgment day is come, and it may be through grace before, during the state of trial, as you call it, you will be glad to throw away all your conditions, and hold Christ alone as the only federal condition of life and salvation. And let me tell you again, that you forget it not, that God never promised or applied any benefit to the most perfect and innocent creature, upon the condition of any action he commands, but what he freely enableth the said person so commanded to perform; and hitherto you have given us no specific difference between the Covenant of works and grace, it's only in degree that this is worse in condition, and we are all together without strength to perform it.

Neonomian. Having premised these things to remove mistakes, I will tell you the truth, which I will express in the words of the Assembly. Q. 32. How is the grace of God manifested in the second Covenant? A. The grace of God is manifested in the second Covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation by him, requiring faith as the condition to interest them in him, promises and gives his Holy Spirit to all his elect, to work in them that faith with all other saving graces.

Antinomian. In the first place you should have observed that they speak only of the manifestation of the grace of the Covenant, and no distinct Covenant from that of redemption. 2. They make not faith a condition of the Covenant of Grace, but only of interest, reception or participation of the said Covenant. With them 'tis no more than the mode of receiving or participating, which is generally called the instrument, and therefore explain themselves thus. Q. 73. How does faith justify a sinner in the sight of God? A. Not as if works, or any grace of faith, or any act thereof were imputed to him for his justification, but only as it is an instrument whereby he receiveth and applieth

Christ and his righteousness.

I made no question but that it was that fly that you caught, and watched for. The word condition was then but a very small inconsiderable word, that none made any great matter of, as importing no more than the connection of the connective axiom, whose band of connection is the conjunction "if" and this conditional connection may fall upon any things that have necessary or contingent dependency one upon another, whereby they have a mutual affection or dissatisfactions one to another, and I call it a relative condition, and all things may come under it which way soever they look. If the antecedent be true, then the consequence is true; and though both antecedent and consequent may be false, yet the "if" may be a true Proposition by virtue of the connection. So if Judas be saved, he did believe. It's a true proposition; though Judas never did believe, nor was saved; neither was there any Covenant of Grace made with him. So that such a proposition as this importeth no Covenant-condition, unless it be federal over and above. If the Devils shall be saved, Christ died for them. It's true as a connecting proposition, because there's no other name given under Heaven by which any sinner can be saved. But neither parts of this proposition is true, for Christ died not for them, nor shall they be saved. So here, if a sinner partakes of Christ, it's by believing, because believing is his participation, and giving and receiving are relata, and is no more a condition here, than faith is to holiness. As thus, if I believe I shall bring forth fruits of faith, and it will be a condition the other way, if I bring forth good fruits, then I believe. So that this sort of condition attends the expression of all sorts of relations and dependencies, either logical, mathematical, natural or theological. But when the word condition is carried further, to denote a federal bond or obligation, it becomes a big-bellied word {as you have phrased it} and is always a distinguishing character of a Covenant of works. And that the Assembly intended no other than a relative condition, not a federal, I can give you many grounds from themselves.

Neonomian. But I will give my reasons why they must understand a federal condition. For they judge, that though God provided a Mediator for sinners, yet they have no interest in him till they believe.

Antinomian. They by interest mean claim of interest and participation, which we have by faith; and there faith is no more a condition, than my hand is to the receiving a 1000 l. When it's brought, it's only a relative condition; where there's giving there is receiving; but if there be any condition on one side more than another, it's in the giving side, which in nature and causality has the first place. For it runs thus, if you receive,

there's somebody gives; so the giving is the condition of receiving. Or see it thus, if you be a Father, you have a son; they are mutual causes one of another, but the Father is first in respect of nature and causality. If receiving lie upon the condition of giving, then receiving is not the condition of giving, but vice versa, but receiving lies under, and depends upon the condition of giving; for if there be no giving, there can be no receiving.

Neonomian. They judge the Covenant is conditional; they scruple not to call faith the condition of our interest in Christ, and salvation by him.

Antinomian. They do intend, and so do we, that the new Covenant is conditional, and has a great condition, Jesus Christ. Christ is the federal condition satisfactory and procurative; but they mean not, that faith is a condition of the Covenant, but a condition relative in the manifestation, for they could not suppose faith to be the condition of what they make the Covenant, for its but in the foregoing answer they say, the Covenant of Grace was made with the second Adam, and in him with all the elect as his seed. They speak not of any condition of the Covenant of Grace, which they give an account of, but speak only of the way and manner of the manifestation of the grace of God in the second Covenant, and that they tell you it's by faith as a correlative receiving condition. They speak not of any condition of the Covenant, but of the manifestation of the grace in the Covenant, by the participation thereof.

Neonomian. They judge that Christ and salvation are offered to all sinners on the same condition, though God effectually enable the elect to obey the condition.

Antinomian. They say he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator and life. Is faith the condition of God's providing a Mediator? And upon the same terms, that he provideth he also offereth, i.e., freely. If you look for a condition, here it must be of providing and offering. And they say, God requires and works faith as a condition, i.e., no more in their sense, but a means of conveyance the grace of the second Covenant unto them. Now that this is their meaning, take a full confirmation, their sense fully expressed in their Confession. In Chapter 11, of justification, speaking of the nature of justification. "It's not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ alone, not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, nor any other evangelical obedience to them as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith, which faith they have not of themselves." Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification. Thus, gentlemen, you see what a catch he has got of the word condition made use of by

the Assembly. When they used the word condition, it was but Aaron's rod, it's now turned into a serpent, and every one that savours Christ aright will fly from it. It is no better now than a Nehushtan, II Kings 18:4, and is to be broke in pieces in the sense of a federal condition.

Neonomian. An Antinomian error is that which says that the Covenant of Grace has no condition to be performed on man's part, though in the strength of Christ; neither is faith itself the condition of this Covenant, but all the saving benefits of this Covenant are actually ours before we are born; neither are we required so much as to believe that we may come to have an interest in the Covenant-benefits.

Antinomian. We have told you, and proved to you your error, in saying, that faith is the condition federally of the Covenant of Grace; and we have shown how far saving benefits are prepared for us and ours in the promise right before we believe; yea, before we are born; and though it's our duty to believe, and do believe, as thereby partaking of Christ unto salvation, yet not in your sense as a condition of a Covenant of Grace, but as a promised gift and benefit bestowed upon us in Christ, and wrought in us by him.

Neonomian. You spend more than a sermon to prove this, and say, there is not any condition in this Covenant.

Antinomian. In preaching on Isaiah 42:6-7, I showed by way of doctrine, that the Father is pleased to give Christ for a Covenant to the people; and in opening it I showed, what it is for Christ to be a Covenant; where I showed, that the Lord means not a Covenant of works, but the Covenant of Grace, which Covenant is mentioned in Jer.31:33, and renewed again, Ezek.36:26, and also Heb.8:6, where you shall find this appropriated to Christ, to be his great privilege to have the sole hand and managing of this new Covenant. But now says the Apostle, "he has obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant." And what is this better Covenant? Mark what follows, verse 8, "behold the days come, &c.," here see the substance of the Covenant, "I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Now I show the difference between this Covenant and others; all others run upon stipulations; the promise runs altogether upon conditions on both sides. The condition on God's part, they shall live. The condition on man's part, that he might live, he must do this. And in the old Covenant, in case man failed, the condition was broken, but in this Covenant there's no condition on man's part to be performed, because the Covenant is everlasting. God says, "I will be merciful to your iniquities, and your sins I will remember no more." Now suppose there were conditions for man to perform, and suppose man did fail in those conditions, what were become

of the Covenant? The Covenant is frustrated as soon as the conditions are broken.

Objection. There are many conditions mentioned in this Covenant, there must be a law put in the mind, written in the heart, &c. Answer. It is true, God says, I will put my law in your inward parts. But it is not said, this is a condition to be performed on man's part. Objection. But conditions or no conditions, a man must have his heart in this manner. Answer. I answer, it's true by way of consequence, that after we are in Covenant, he will bestow those things upon us as fruits and effects of this Covenant; but it's not true by way of antecedence, that God will require those things at our hands before we be partakers of this Covenant. You shall see plainly, that man has no tie upon him to perform anything whatsoever in this Covenant as a condition to be observed on his part. Mark how it is in Jeremiah, Ezekiel & Hebrews. God says, I will put it in, I will write it; they shall be my people. The word 'shall' here is a word of power. And it follows, they shall not teach everyone his neighbour, for they shall know me. How? By their own study and industry. No. "It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Jn.6:45. The condition of knowing the Lord is to be performed by the Lord, "they shall be all taught of God." Observe also the larger expression of the Covenant, "then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them, &c." Ezek.36:25- 27. Objection. If all lies on God's part, and man must do nothing, then all his life-time he may live as he lists. Answer. You must make a difference between doing anything in reference to the Covenant as a condition thereof; and in doing something in reference to duty and service to God, who freely enters into Covenant with you. I say only in way of condition of the Covenant you must do nothing.

Calvin. You see, Mr. Neonomian, he does not deny duties to belong to this Covenant, and duties to be performed under the highest obligation of God's free and bountiful acting towards us in this Covenant; but he speaks against your basis by which it acts or operates; that we are not to perform these duties in a mercenary way, as if we were thereby obtainers of the benefits by federal conditionality, which way of performance brings us under a Covenant of works; but we are to do all as such, who receive both to will and to do by virtue of the

Covenant, and as the effects thereof; and I am very much mistaken, if this be not Gospel-truth.

Neonomian. But he says in answer to an objection, I must needs tell you directly, that faith is not the condition of the Covenant.

Antinomian. I did say so, and say so still. Objection. But you will say, he that believes shall be saved, he that believes not shall be damned. Is not faith therefore the condition of the Covenant? Answer. There is no person under Heaven shall be saved till he has believed this, I grant; yet this will not make faith a condition of the Covenant. Faith as an act is our act, and our act of believing is a work; but it does not depend upon a work. For the Apostle says, "to him that justifies the ungodly." Thus far to satisfy you from what I discoursed.

Now I tell you further, that the proposition, he that believes shall be saved, denotes no more than the necessary connection of faith and salvation by virtue of the promise, viz., of one gift of the promise to another, the Lord making many of the gifts or duties from a Covenant-Principle, not upon terms of federal conditionality on our part; but that all is to be done by virtue of, and flowing from the promise of eternal life, whereof faith itself, and the lively fruits thereof, are parts, as well as glory itself; and all eternal life is in one promise, though not bestowed together; but the several gifts thereof have a subsequent priority and condition relative to each other, but none of these gifts are federal conditions one of another, but all alike belong to the promissory part, grace as well as glory.

Neonomian. But you say, that after we are in Covenant with God, he will bestow these things upon us as effects; and that the Covenant in the actual substance of it is made good to a man before he can do anything.

Calvin. Great truths, for without Christ we can do nothing; therefore Christ, the Substance of the Covenant, must be given to us first, or else Christ himself has not spoken truth.

Neonomian. I will show you now how far I agree with you in this point, and then it will the better appear where the difference lies. The question is not, whether God has promised, and Christ engaged in the Covenant of Redemption, that the elect shall believe and possess Christ, &c., for this I affirm.

Antinomian. Then you own a Covenant between the Father and the Son, and the promise of it was Christ and all his benefits. This one assertion lays the Covenant of Grace higher than it's possible that you or I can reach by our conditions; only you would not have this the Covenant of Grace, though it contains all grace, but a Covenant of Redemption, distinct to the Covenant of Grace, which is most absurd; for what is redemption but rich grace? God has "accepted us in the beloved, in whom we

have redemption through his blood the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace, wherein he has abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of his will." Eph.1:6-9. This mystery of his will is the Covenant of Grace, which I can easily also evince, made manifest by the appearing of Jesus Christ, and working out our redemption, and by the preaching thereof.

Neonomian. Neither is there any question, whether there be any duty on man's part as a condition of Christ's undertaking, or of the certainty of the things undertaken in that Covenant. This I deny.

Antinomian. Then you deny all conditions of ours as required in the Covenant of Redemption, as you call it. Call it then but the Covenant of Grace as it is, as the Assembly called it, and then you say as we do in that point.

Neonomian. Nor whether the conditions of the Covenant of Grace be performed in our own strength, or be uncertain as to the elect. This I deny.

Antinomian. Then this performance by Divine strength and certainty is founded on promise; and if so, is the gift of God; and thence it's frivolous to talk of conditions to be performed on our part. God does not give his gifts to us to make purchase with, and rob his free grace and his Son of the honor due to them.

Neonomian. Nor whether the performance of the conditions move God to enact, offer or appoint this Covenant, whereby the grace of Christ is applied. This I deny.

Antinomian. What mean you by enacting or appointing this Covenant? If you mean, your law of imperfection, we know no such Covenant of God ever enacted or appointed.

Neonomian. Yea, I add, that God enacted this Covenant before we were born, and offers an interest in it on its proper terms to men when sinners.

Antinomian. Then the Covenant was an eternal Covenant, or at least the completing of it did not depend upon our coming in with our personal federal conditions; but I do not grant, that your Covenant of imperfection was ever so enacted. And you say, offers an interest in it to men when sinners. Now our Covenant of Redemption and Grace come to be all one; all that remains to be done, is to bring sinners to a participating interest in it. Undoubtedly, when the Covenant was enacted, it was provided that sinners should have a free unconditional participation of it, for the infinite wise God knew sinners would be so poor and wretched that they would have no condition money; and never thought fit to make them purchasers with his money, lest they should boast and claim all as debt, when he had given them forty shillings to begin with. But you will have Popish terms come in at the tail of this fair story; your dead fly of

conditions must be in every pot of your Apothecaries ointment.

Neonomian. Nor whether the performance of the conditions of the Covenant be a purchasing price, or meritorious of the benefits promised on such conditions. This I deny, for Christ alone paid the price, and it's the Covenant promises gives the benefits to such as perform the conditions.

Antinomian. What security will you give us that they be not a purchasing price or meritorious? What if Christ will say they be such as will rob him, and that he say, if we put in and stand upon our conditions he shall profit us nothing? What if poor creatures that you infuse your notions into, and put your conditions upon, they take them to be purchasing prices of an interest in Christ? How will you answer the preaching another Gospel than Paul preached, and free yourselves from the anathema? But secondly, if a man that has purchased an estate for me, and left me a hundred pounds to pay of the purchase money, I reckon that I pay part as well as he, though he paid a thousand pounds, and so will all men. It's not enough for you to say, Christ only paid the price, when federal conditions besides lies to be performed by some others; and we do as confidently affirm, and do prove, that where there is a Covenant stipulated by conditions and promises, the performance of the conditions, though never so small and disproportionable to the benefit, carries a merit of a reward as of debt, by virtue of agreement, though it lie not in the intrinsic value of the condition, whether it be mine, or imputed to me by loan or gift, to buy the benefit, or swap for it. And this is such a truth that every child almost that runs about to play in the street knows and daily practices.

Neonomian. Nor whether the first grace by which we are enabled to perform the condition be absolutely given. This I affirm, though that be dispensed ordinarily in a due use of means, and in a way discountenancing idleness, and fit encouragement given to the use of means.

Antinomian. It seems as to the first grace, it is absolute, then we come at first into an unconditional Covenant, but afterward we must pay for what we have; God gives a stock of money, and then we must buy; first begin in the Spirit, and then finish in the Flesh. I pray what Covenant promise does this first grace belong to, to the Covenant of Redemption, or the Covenant of Imperfection? It's plain then that a sinner does not come under an obligation to the Covenant of Imperfection till he has been furnished with conditions some other way. So that he must needs come under two distinct Covenants; first an absolute, and then conditional. What a cutting and hacking is here of the Covenant of Grace, to puzzle and confound poor souls in the great concernment of their salvation.

Neonomian. Nor whether all the conditions of the

Covenant be of the same use, to the same purpose, or alike complete terms of the principal benefits; this I deny, for faith is supposed to all other conditions, &c.

Antinomian. It is not to our business, whether they have other distinct offices, but respecting federal conditions, they are equally conditions; the comparison is not here in quantity but quality. One shilling is as much a condition in the price set upon a horse or cow that is sold, as five pound, though it be not so great in quantity; but it seems here are divers sorts of conditions, some greater than others, and faith has the preeminence. I have a question or two to ask, whether if one of these little conditions be not performed, I do therefore forfeit my bargain? One inconsiderable one that has ten times more sin and imperfection in it than good? And whether this Covenant of Imperfection does not look upon the imperfectest conditions, and most sinful, provided there's a little good in them, to be the best conditions? And whether it be fit that we should have good, sound and perfect commodities for a debased coin?

Neonomian. Nor whether upon the performance of the conditions, the Covenant grant becomes not as absolute, and the right to the benefit no longer suspended. This I affirm, for the promise conveys the title as soon as the terms of the grant are answered.

Antinomian. As absolute as what? It's nonsense. I take it to be an erratum, but it's not among them, and that as should not be there; and therefore it's thus, that upon performance of the conditions the grant should become absolute; this is impossible, for absolute and conditional are things that are opposed to each other, as much as if you should say, after I have bought a house of you and paid my money, that you gave the house to me freely. And what do you talk of the promise conveying the title, it's the condition gives me the title, the promise is challenged upon the performance of the condition.

Neonomian. I come now to the real difference betwixt us. Whether men have an actual interest in the saving benefits of the Covenant of Grace, while they live in unbelief; this you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. Did you not grant a real interest to the elect in the Covenant of Redemption, which to us is the Covenant of Grace? That God has there covenanted that they shall believe; and that Christ has undertaken for the certainty of their faith and holiness; and that Christ has paid actually all the price of redemption for them, and are all those no saving benefits? What if they know not their interest, have they therefore none? Doth that follow? A good estate may be bought and made over to me, that I have as good an interest in, and title to as any man in the world to his, and yet I not know it; it may be it's in the Barbados,

bought or given by a Friend, and I know not of it a year after, but when I hear of it, or enter possession, is my title any better than before? And when is the first grace given which you said is absolute, but when we are in unbelief? For there's no medium between unbelief and faith.

Neonomian. Whether God does offer the saving benefits of the Covenant upon official terms, as believe and thou shalt be saved; this I affirm, and you deny.

Antinomian. You mean by official terms only federal conditions, do and live, or believe and live in the same sense as do and live. I say the Covenant of Grace speaks otherwise, it says live and do; and the command in the Gospel becoming effectual to believe, is the performance of the promise, in quickening and raising him from the dead; believing is his very saving, it's his life begun, and not the condition of it. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and be saved, is a proposition declaring the near and indubitable connection of all the gifts of grace, as blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted; blessed are the merciful, they shall obtain mercy, &c. These propositions of beatitudes do not declare any federal conditionality lying in the antecedent, but a Covenant connection of good things in the promise of life to be bestowed, that one of these blessings will be where the other is, either first or last; for meekness, godly sorrow, purity of heart, faith, &c., they are all the gifts of grace, and belong to the promissory part of the Covenant, and not to the conditional, and yet become duties by virtue of the promise and precepts accompanying.

Neonomian. Whether the beneficial privileges of the Covenant be not suspended on the terms of duty? As does not God forbear to pardon us till we believe? This I affirm, and you deny.

Antinomian. It is as much as to say that duty is no beneficial part of the Covenant; the change of the heart is no beneficial part of the Covenant; but you say these beneficial parts are suspended upon the terms of duty. It's as much as to say he shall have no benefit by the Covenant, and all benefits are suspended till he do some duty that is no benefit of the Covenant. And as to your enquiry, whether God forbear to pardon us till we believe; I answer, pardon is with God before it is with us, if it were not we should never have it; and the pardoning grace of God is at work with us before we do believe, and does by the light of it in the glorious Gospel work faith in our hearts. As for your phrasing it thus, that God forbears pardoning till we believe, it insinuates thus much according to your scheme of conditions, that God suspends his acts toward the creature till he seeth something in it to encourage him, and that God would have wrought sooner than he did, if it had not been our fault;

whereas God works, and none can let, neither does his working, or not working, depend upon the creatures, but that it is in his own way and time, and when he will pardon he works faith; and it must be so, because the believer is pardoned in application of pardon, therefore the pardoner and pardoned are interrelated; and though as related they are simultaneously, yet in respect of causality the pardoner is first; and if he should forbear pardoning till the sinner were fit for it by good qualification, it would be long enough before it come unto us. You say the first grace is absolute, and if the second grace or benefit be conditional federally, where lies the condition? And if a man be fallen into a deep well, and have broken an arm or leg, would it not be very odd to say, I forbear the setting of his arm or leg till he comes out of the ditch, whereas it lies upon me to fetch him out of the ditch first. As God pardons who and when he pleaseth, so by the same grace he has provided for all ways and means of application.

Neonomian. It's enquired, whether God does engage to bestow the promised benefits of the Covenant on all such, who through grace perform the conditions? This you affirm and I deny.

Antinomian. I affirm, that God does bestow all the benefits of the Covenant upon all those unto whom through grace they do belong; and to perform any duty of the Covenant required, is a gift of grace. You say, through grace, and therefore a promised benefit, creation in Christ Jesus, a new heart, union to Christ. Where are there conditions through grace to be wrought in us before the effectual power of grace? To say anything is to be performed through grace, that is not the gift of grace, and is not a benefit of the Covenant, is something; otherwise your conditions are but in order of working, or at most relative conditions, the connection of one gift of grace or benefit to another, and then your conditionality is no more than the Apostles, Rom.5:1-3, faith the condition of hope, hope of glorying in tribulation, tribulation of patience, patience of experience, &c., these may all be brought into a joined proposition forward and backward. If I believe I shall hope, if I hope I shall glory in Tribulation, if I have patience I shall have experience; but yet all gifts of grace are none of them federal conditions, but promises bestowed.

Neonomian. All may be reduced to this, whether our believing consent to the Covenant of Grace be absolutely necessary by God's command, and promised to our interest in the saving benefits of the Covenants. This you deny and I affirm.

Antinomian. It's one thing to be antecedently necessary, another thing to be consequently necessary. Whatever is commanded in the Covenant of Grace {as you will

insinuate} is also promised; and being promised, is a benefit. Therefore if you make believing antecedently necessary {which is a work and gift of grace} to all the benefits, you contradict yourself and all right reason. And as to the great ado you make about interest, I have told you it comes under a double consideration, of real and known, or manifest. All the elect have a real right and interest in the Covenant even before believing, such a right as entitles them to believing, for Christ has undertaken, that all that the Father has given him shall come to him; and it's therefore absolutely necessary they should, as promised in the Covenant, not as a condition, as a leading benefit, and no otherwise. And do you not call them saving benefits? Show me a condition to be performed before any saving benefits that we do receive, and then you will say something. What's a greater benefit than life itself?

Neonomian. I will confirm the truth by several arguments.

Antinomian. Let it be truth first. It's very little truth that hitherto you have affirmed, as I think I have made sufficiently appear. But go on, I am willing to hear what you can say, and to embrace truth.

Neonomian. Each of the benefits of the Covenant are offered to men on condition, and not absolutely in relation to God as his people is. So Lev.26:3,12, compared with II Cor.6:16, Matt.22:2-3,9-11, Rom.4:25, Gal.3:7.

Antinomian. Your argument is very confused and rough drawn; for you tell us not what you would conclude of all the previous questions. I take it for granted, that you would conclude your imperfect conditions in whatever question you put about the Covenant. 2. Then you use very ambiguous terms; you talk of offering the benefits of a Covenant? It's one thing to make a Covenant, and another thing to offer to make a Covenant; for there are conditions to the offer, and the conditions to the making, and what you mean by offering absolutely in relation to God, I know not? Doth not God bestow grace absolutely? Is he provoked to offer grace from anything out of himself? Sure he bestows grace absolutely and from himself, though, according to your scheme, he offers upon condition, or makes conditions in his offer; and how that comes in, as his people is, I know not? I take the whole put together not to be sense. But I will extract your argument as well as I can.

If each benefit of the Covenant is offered to men upon condition, and not absolutely in relation to God, then there are conditions in the Covenant of Grace to be performed by us before we can have the benefits. But each benefit of the Covenant is given freely, &c., ergo, here I deny the consequence of the major first; for there are conditions in offers, and conditions

propounded in offers; mean them if you please. God's propounding the grace of the Covenant-condition, is no ground of proof, that therefore there are conditions to be performed by us before we receive the benefit; for the duty required, and good thing promised, are but both of them benefits, and the leading duty it may be the greatest, and the greatest exemplification of the grace of the promise. Here is connection then of benefits as to relation and order, and therefore I deny your consequence, that promises conditionally made do infer necessarily federal conditions distinct from the benefits. The minor is also denied; for each benefit of the Covenant is not offered conditionally; as the making a new heart, the gift of faith, the uniting power and efficacy of the Spirit, whereby we are inserted into Christ as our root, before we can bring forth the fruit of faith. As to the places mentioned, I say, first, that the Covenant of Grace as dispensed under the Old Testament, was veiled and covered two ways. 1. By types and ceremonies. 2. By a legal ministration in denunciations, conditions, promises of temporal blessings, whereby they were carried on to duty; but yet in the sacrifices they had some sight by faith of the absoluteness and freeness of the grace of God in the promise; and it's evident the unconditionality of the promise, though it was manifested sometimes to the Patriarchs and Prophets, yet was mostly under a cloud; as in a cloudy day the sun may now and then break out with marvellous brightness and splendor, when for the generality a legal darkness clouded and obscured the grace of God. In other ages the mystery of the Covenant was not made known and revealed so as now. "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." Eph.3:5.

But as to Lev.26:3,12, it makes nothing against us, for God does but by his commands and promises bring them into participation of the Covenant of Grace. For what is faith and obedience but the gifts of his grace? And it's he who through the blood of the everlasting Covenant works in us the things that are well-pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ. "Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." Heb.13:21. And this was the way of his working with them, being under this tutorage, differing little from servants till the time appointed of his Father, Gal.4:1-4, and accordingly you see, Lev.26:3, the promise of encouragement is, then will I give you rain in due season. And likewise as he promises outward blessings, so spiritual privileges, his ordinances and presence among them, and in them. "And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people." Lev.26:12. Not that their walking in his statutes was the

condition of his being a God in Covenant; for he chose them before they chose him. And God says notwithstanding these conditional promises, "I am the LORD your God, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, that ye should not be their bondmen; and I have broken the bands of your yoke, and made you go upright." Lev.26:13. Likewise as the promises were mostly of outward good and things temporal, and the continuance of his ordinances, so performance of these were connected to their external conformity to his instituted worship; they were to be a separate and peculiar people, sequestered from other people unto his pure worship and ordinances; and to that sense does the Apostle apply this place, "wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you." II Cor.6:17. For he presseth purity in Churchfellowship in the foregoing verses by divers arguments; and among others, this of Leviticus, that God expected such purity of the Church of the Old Testament, much more of them; and hence presseth separation in external Church-fellowship and ordinances; and then as they have the blessings of ordinances, they will have the blessing of God's visible presence. Whereas I said before, benefits are connected. A duty benefit to a privilege, to be as motives to performance, the Spirit working with the Word. There may be commands, directions, motives to duty in the Word, and none of these make duty antecedently necessary and conditional to our being in Covenant, but all consequently necessary, being a series of connected benefits flowing in after we are taken into Covenant.

As to Matt.22:2-3,9-11, you say, coming to the wedding supper was a condition of having share in it, so is it of pardon of sin and acceptance to life. Coming to the wedding-supper was not the condition that gave right, but the invitation. Coming is a privilege which the people that are invited to receive the Gospel have, whom Christ by the power and efficacy of his grace working with the Word compels and constrains, overcoming their rebellious hearts. As to that place of Rom.10:9, you have as much reason to infer thence, that confession is a condition, as well as faith; the great antecedent condition there mentioned, is hearing, by which faith comes. As for Rom.4:25 & Gal.3:7, they all show but connection of Covenant-benefits, all absolutely given in the promise of eternal life, pardon and faith, faith and holiness, grace and glory, all sounded upon one condition of the Covenant, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Neonomian. I pray, by what justice then do you say the first grace is absolute? It's injustice to add new terms to any of those benefits, if they be ours by the Covenant as absolute before.

Antinomian. I see you will stand upon terms with God,

and will have him stand upon terms with you. But God never made any such terms as you dream of! Blessed be his name.

Neonomian. If the Covenant be not conditional, as to the disposing of benefits, it would follow, that all to whom the offers are made, have an interest in them, or it is not a serious offer; no, nor a true offer, as not containing a real and natural connection between the benefit and the duty.

Antinomian. I must take notice of your shifting in your antecedent, what do you put in as to the disposal of benefits; the disposal of benefits is the performance of the promise; your condition ought to lie before the disposal of benefits. If you mean an adjusted order in the disposal of benefits, you multiply conditions to the end of the world, and turn all benefits into conditions. We are to talk of a condition, upon which as such, all others are benefits, and relative conditions are given forth by promise; and we say, Jehovah our righteousness is that condition for which we are blessed with all blessings in and through him; in and through him they are bestowed, and all ways and means of bestowing them are blessings provided in him, and bestowed by him; that there is a method of order in bestowing them, and a relative connection between them there is, as also among the blessings and benefits, and is no hindrance to the absoluteness of the promise. A man gives me an estate to come gradually to me 20 l. per annum this year, and 20 l. next year, &c., is my having 20 l. per annum this year the reason, by way of condition, of my having 20 l. per annum more the next year? The condition of all this estate is resolved into the free-will of the Donor, and his purchasing of it for me with his money.

As to your consequence, it follows, you say, that all to whom the offer is made have an interest in them. I deny it utterly in such offers as God makes; for though the proclamation of grace be indefinite, yet God knows who are his by election and redemption, and to them he gives his Son and his Spirit, and the first gift of the promise to persuade and enable them to come unto Christ. Or you say, it's not a serious offer, viz., to offer grace upon such terms and conditions, which the sinner is not able to perform. This inference will rebound back again upon you, for saying, that these conditions are freely wrought of God in us. Doth God work these conditions before he bestows the grace of the Covenant? If so, you say something, and work them in all too to which they are bestowed; if not, it's, {this so-called offer,} not serious, as you and the Arminians will say. Therefore to support your hypothesis, you must grant a free-will in man, and power of himself to perform the said condition. Now it is true, you say, as not containing a real and natural connection between the benefit and duty. Why so? Can't benefits be relative and truly connected, without there being a federal condition? Having food

and raiment, let us therewith be content. Contentment is the benefit here, and it's a duty, and the condition food and raiment, a manifest benefit too; and can't these be connected, without one being a federal condition of the other? Which wanting, the blessing is not looked for. Then you may say, not having food and raiment sufficient, I need not be content. Know this, the Spirit of God makes the promise the condition of the duty. As to Abraham, I am God all-sufficient, walk before me; and its always so, if we rightly understand the language; for it first bids us live before it bids us do. And this is the difference between the Covenant of works and that of grace.

Neonomian. Faith itself is no more necessary to our first interest in those benefits, than any other grace; nay, than unbelief. Let no man object, it's a sign; for so is any other grace; so might be the description of Paul by his name, by his abode, yea, sin, a persecutor, &c.

Antinomian. There is an interest antecedent to faith, but hidden, yet such as our faith can never come into being without. And as to our interest by faith you speak of, Christ by revelation of his grace in the Gospel makes us partaker thereof; it's an interest of possession, and yet a man may be thrown out of possession, unless he have this antecedent right and title to it. And the interest by possession of, and communion with Christ, is greater by faith than any other way, because it's directed to Christ objectively, and receives more eminently Christ himself; and though it do so, yet it cannot be the condition of receiving Christ. That is, the very receiving of Christ; for the receiving cannot be the condition of receiving, then an act should be the condition of itself.

Neonomian. Let not any one say it's a sign, for so is any other grace, and Paul may be known by this name, abode, &c.

Antinomian. Faith is for those uses that Christ has appointed, but he never appointed it for a moral federal condition, for if it be a condition, it's so as an act; and if as an act, a duty; and as a duty, moral, and so makes your Covenant only a moral law. Believing is more than a sign; but it's most naturally so in your sense; for in its conditionality you make it but the same with other graces and duties. But we say, believing is feeding on Christ; seeing of him, receiving of him; and it's not proper for to say, feeding is a condition of feeding, seeing a condition of seeing, yet it carries its evidence with it abundantly, because there is perception of all I see and feed upon.

Neonomian. Men are said to enter into Covenant with God, Deut.29:12-13, to keep Covenant, Psal.103:18, to perform the Covenant, II Chron.34:31, and to take hold of the Covenant. Isa.66:6.

Antinomian. In the Covenants mentioned betwixt God and the Church of the Jews, we must always consider the pedagogy that they were under, and that they were under the Covenant of Grace veiled, and not only with Levitical types, but legal dispensations in respect of duty. And the Apostle tells us, that this ministry was faulty; and therefore he says, Christ has obtained a more excellent ministry, far differing, by so much, that he was the Mediator of a better Covenant, which is established on better promises, Heb.8:6, for if the first Covenant had been faultless, there had been no place found for the second. This second is not to be understood of the Covenant of works, but the Mosaical ministry of the Covenant of Grace, which is fully expressed in the beginning of the chapter. Neither does the Apostle mean only the mere ceremonial part of that ministry, but the morally legal and conditional way of dispensation like the Covenant of works; and therefore he says, the New Covenant that he would make or promulgate by the more excellent ministry of the Mediator, it should be published in the true, absolute, and unconditional light of it, not according to the Mount-Sinai Covenant upon their coming out of Egypt, they abiding not in that Covenant, by performing the conditional duties, says the Lord, verse 9, i.e., he did not give them those promises of external good things that he made unto them; for the promises were external for the most part, as the conditions of them were morally legal. Besides these explicit Covenants, there were ecclesiastical Covenants, as they were a National Congregational Church; and in these Covenants they promised subjection unto God, and observation of all his appointments in that dispensation, whereby God would have them to be visibly a peculiar and separate people; and what they did in this kind in a right manner, was an effect, and not a cause of their true interest in the Covenant of Grace; but the Covenant itself as externally made, was a National Church-Covenant, as appears, and so when it was renewed in Joshua's time. Joshua 24. And I think any one that readeth that Solemn Covenant, Deut.29, will see, that it carried with it all the thunder and lightning of Mount Sinai to enforce it, and also the blessings promised were temporal, and the conditions were the duties of the moral law and ceremonies. Now I wonder that any can pretend that this Covenant was the new Covenant, for so it was not in the sense of the Apostle, and that it was a ministry of the Covenant of Grace any more than in a carnal and legal dispensation after the manner of the Covenant of works; and you shall find among the great things promised for the strengthening and encouraging of the faithful, one thing was the reforming the external dispensation of grace in taking off the veils; and therefore always in those places we have it run as a free absolute promise, and God beginning first with them before

any condition is performed on their parts. "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean, &c." So, Ezek.37:26, "I will make a Covenant of peace with them, and it shall be an everlasting Covenant, &c." Jer.31:31,33. "And I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God, in truth and in righteousness." Zech.8:8.

Hence all external Covenant-obligations that the Church makes are effects of this new Covenant-interest; Covenants that they are obliged to, and Covenants that in the New Covenant are promised absolutely as their blessings and privileges, and in that way commended to Gospel-Churches. "And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." II Cor.6:16- 18. "I will be their God, and they shall be my people." It's all promise, and upon this account they are commanded to walk as a becoming people under such an obligation of free grace laid upon them. Yea, God always in these Old Testament Covenants made his goodness and kindness to them first as a motive and condition unto them to build their obedience upon, whereby he preached free-grace to them, Exod.20:12, and innumerable other places. And you mention places yourself, which show our Covenant with God is promised by him, Jer.50:4-5, "they shall go and seek the Lord their God," "they shall ask the way to Zion, saying, come, let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual Covenant that shall not be forgotten." We grant every believer does actually and freely enter into Covenant, but it's because God has covenanted with him first. We are not reconciled to God but upon believing God's reconciliation to us; therefore the Gospel Ministry is the declaration of God's reconciliation, and from thence an argument to persuade us to be reconciled unto God.

Neonomian. All these expressions are convincing, that there is a restipulation on man's part, and that it is a Covenant in respect of that mutual stipulation between God and us.

Antinomian. It's a strange thing, that most of those men that quote the Church-Covenant of the Old Testament to make good their notion of the Covenant of Grace, that it's a moral conditional Covenant, are against all explicit Church Covenants, whereby men that profess godliness should have an external visible tie to walk in the faith and order of the Gospel, which was the main intent and design that God had upon his people in the days of the Old Covenant, and never intended it as a condition

of their personal Covenant with him, but a fruit and consequent after they were in Covenant. It's mightily to derogate from the Covenant of Grace, to make the promise thereof to depend on a stipulation on our part. For if we stipulate with God, we also promise to him, as well as he to us before performance, and likewise that we do our part before he does his; for the stipulation is covenanting; and for any man to talk of any such thing, runs upon multitudes of rocks; for our radical stipulation was in Christ, all other stipulations are effects of it.

Neonomian. To suppose the Covenant to be the sole act of God, and an act that's merely absolute, renders all these phrases impertinent and impossible.

Antinomian. The Covenant of Grace is the act of God in the Person of the Father, with us in the Person of Christ, in him we did restipulate; he was the great Covenantor on our part, and the condition of this Covenant; and when we, by virtue of the promise, take hold of this Covenant, we stand upon this condition with God, and God dispenses all benefits upon this condition to us; and it's a free and absolute Covenant to us, a Covenant of promise, because not only the promise is bestowed without federal conditions performed by ourselves, and the great federal condition the Lord Christ is freely bestowed on us.

Neonomian. It was his act to appoint a Covenant, and enable us to keep it; and it's his act to restipulate on his part, &c.

Antinomian. This frees it not from being a Covenant of works; for God appointed Adam's Covenant, and gave him strength to keep it, which strength he had when God gave him the law; but to talk of God's covenanting with fallen man in that state, and say, man has restipulated while in a state of enmity, is most absurd. Or to say, he shall restipulate when God gives him power so to do, is as much as to say, I have sold to a man my horse for 10 l., and when he brings me that 10 l., he shall have it, but has not a groat to pay, rags to his back, or bread for his belly, and he refused my horse too, and hates me with a perfect hatred, yet I will make him willing to take the horse, and I will give him the money to pay for it; there's no man can think this man has any other design than to lose the honor of giving away his horse, that this man and all the world should look upon the horse as purchased; and so it was, and the law will find it so, for all his giving him the purchase-money. And it's no less absurd, that God restipulates to our covenanting, to make us first in covenanting with God, which is contrary to all the account we have of the Covenant of Grace; and when any place speaks so, it's ad hominem, and in the language of the Covenant of works.

Neonomian. Consider the seals of the Covenant, baptism and the Lord's Supper; they seal not absolutely, but

conditionally.

Antinomian. Baptism is for remission of sins, which is an absolute gift, and it supposeth it given where there's no qualification for it; and this is an argument to baptize infants. And if you will have it to seal the performance of conditional duties, you must never baptize infants. I would desire no stronger argument to manage against infant-baptism than your principle of conditionality of the Covenant. And as for the Lord's Supper, it holds forth Christ's body freely given, and his blood freely shed for us, and that his blood was a seal and ratification of the new Covenant, whereby it becomes a Testament.

Neonomian. Baptism that saves us, is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, I Pet.3:21, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, i.e., an upright consent of heart to the vow and profession.

Antinomian. To what was baptism an antitype? Was it not to the waters of Noah, that saved persons by bearing up the Ark, when the rest of the world were drowned. What condition was there of God's saving those eight persons? And to bring it home, the Apostle tells us, the mere element in baptism and external administration, not the washing away External or Levitical uncleanness, as it was used by the Jews, but as it signifies the blood of Christ reaching to the purifying of the conscience from guilt, Hebrews 9 & 10, and thence through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, as it signifies the carrying or washing away our sins by the blood of Christ, and our rising again, wherein we were fundamentally justified, and the application of both by faith, whereby our present sense of God's wrath and condemnation is removed. To talk that it signifies a vow or upright consent, is very superficial, against the stream of Interpreters.

Neonomian. An elect person known by revelation to be so while unregenerate, is not entitled to the Lord's Supper.

Antinomian. He that has that revelation, I suppose, will have something more revealed, but in the meantime I wonder why you that stand upon such strict moral qualifications for an interest in Covenant-benefits, and so sparing of Gospel grace, stand upon so slight terms for admission to the Lord's Supper, and are so lavish of Covenant-benefits upon such easy terms. I am sure you may know some of them are not regenerate without revelation.

Neonomian. Unbelief, and whatever sins are contrary to the terms of the Covenant, are the only hindrances to a sinners interest in the benefits of the Covenant, and by these we are said to reject and refuse the Covenant. The Scripture lays men's want of forgiveness on their unbelief as the culpable cause, &c.

Antinomian. Then the great business of the Covenant

of Grace is to save sinners, and give them life, being dead in sin and unbelief; and the gift of God is eternal life, begun in remission of sins, and faith in Christ's blood, which God gives freely unto those that are altogether incapable to perform any conditions for it; he gives these gifts to unbelieving rebellious ones, and if unbelief should hinder these gifts of God's grace, there's none could be saved. And as unbelief does not hinder fundamental Covenant right which they have by Christ's Imputation, so it hinders not God's application when he will work; for then nothing shall hinder. You seem also to hint, as if some sins were more venial than others; and some more consistent with your moral conditions of the Covenant of imperfection; and know that no culpable cause shall hinder the forgiveness of those for whom Christ died.

Neonomian. The Gospel-promise being the way which Christ appoints to dispense saving benefits to believers, must have the same rules with the Covenant of Grace.

Antinomian. Yea, for the Covenant of Promise and the Covenant of Grace are the same, and saving benefits are dispensed only by way of gift, which is performance of the promise, and no other way.

Neonomian. The Gospel is his Testament, and a Covenant cannot be a disposition contrary to this Gospel.

Antinomian. The Covenant of Grace is a Testament, because confirmed by the death of Christ; and there's no adding to it, {if it were but a man's Testament and last will, as the Apostle says,} and therefore there's no bringing in any after-terms or conditions of it, and the Gospel is a declaration of this promise and seal, and addeth no further terms.

Neonomian. This promise tells us, that there is a promise of the first grant made to Christ for the elect, and by virtue of that promise the elect do consent to the Covenant.

Antinomian. Promise and grant are in a manner one, and this made to Christ for the elect, {it's better to the elect in Christ, but that will do for the present,} and by virtue of that promise the elect do consent. I suppose you mean the first consent, which you will sometimes have the condition of their receiving benefit by the promise. I hope it's this, a great benefit and absolute gift of the promise; and of this then there's no condition but Christ by your own confession.

Neonomian. That Gospel or Covenant is the means whereby that faith is wrought.

Antinomian. Very good; then the Covenant is the condition of faith, and not faith of the Covenant.

Neonomian. This Gospel commands, and by the power of the Spirit works that faith in order to saving benefits, which benefits it promises to such as do believe, and no other.

Antinomian. I thought but now you were got above your Covenant of imperfections, but I find you are working down again. These conditions are heavy bulky things, they will weigh a man down do what he can. And is faith wrought only in order to saving benefits? How often shall I tell you, it's one of the principal saving benefits of any grace wrought in us? And faith is promised to unbelievers, else they would never have it.

Neonomian. This Gospel invests believers to those saving benefits.

Antinomian. And it invests unbelievers in the saving benefit of faith; and therefore the Gospel is the condition of faith.

Neonomian. It secures the perseverance of believers in the true faith, and the necessary effects, and thereby secures those benefits as unforfeited.

Antinomian. Then they are not under an uncertain trial all this life, that it is not determined whether they shall be saved or no, as you suggested.

Neonomian. But Christ never bequeathed or promised in the Gospel a pardon or salvation to unbelievers.

Antinomian. That's a riddle. Was it not in Christ's Testament to save sinners, to justify the ungodly? Did he not pray for them that should believe? Doth not the Gospel tell us, he came not to save righteous, but to bring sinners to repentance; that he came to seek and to save them that are lost? Doth not Christ say, he is the Resurrection and the Life; and that we are quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins, &c., the main tenure of the Gospel. If it be as you say, there's none should be saved; for if men are not saved by virtue of the promise, they will never be saved. What a miserable condition are all in, if believing and promising mercy be not bestowed upon unbelieving sinners.

Neonomian. Nor the continuance of that pardon or salvation, but upon supposition that this faith perseveres; and if the Gospel-promise say no such thing, I am sure the Covenant did not.

Antinomian. What Christ bequeathed he purchased; but it seems {to all who deny his effectual redemption,} that all was done but upon condition of perseverance. We must {they assert} stand upon these uncertain conditions all our days; it would be some comfort, if we could come to some certainty of our pardon and salvation after we are over the first brunt; but we can't be sure we are pardoned, or that we shall be saved till the last gasp; and if we happen to fall in the meantime, our pardon is gone.

Neonomian. The account of the Covenant, which seems most for its absoluteness, implies this conditional connection of the required grace and the promised benefits.

Antinomian. Now all our federal conditions are dwindled away into conditional connections only. It is well some places seem to be for the absoluteness of the Covenant; if there be but one text that is really for it, I think we are bound to believe it. But you say, they imply a conditional connection. God forbid, that conditional connections should be turned out of the world; if they should, all things must be returned into the first chaos, and this would be a conditional connection; and this connection is between the required grace and promised benefit. If you had said, bestowed grace, it had been more proper; or said, required duty. There's nobody has so little sense as to deny cause and effects, subjects and adjuncts, arguments of all sorts in the Covenant of Grace in that free absolute Covenant; and among the gifts of it, there is Christ and all his effects, the Spirit and its effects, faith and its effects, adjuncts and contraries. This we call relative conditions, or else things must cease to have a being. But that which we deny is, moral federal conditions to be performed by us; such as these we say there's none in the Covenant of Grace there's no required gracious act that is such a moral condition of any promised benefit.

Neonomian. The places that seem to be for an absolute Covenant are, Jer.31:31-33, Heb.8:10-12, Heb.10:16-17, Jer.32:40, Ezra 11:19,20, &c., there be others that relate to the restoration of the Captivity.

Antinomian. You name Ezra 11, for one, and Ezra has not so many chapters. I suppose it's an erratum, but I find it not among the errata's. As for the rest, you insinuate, as if they referred only to the return of the Captivity.

Neonomian. Yes, I'll pitch upon one, Jer.31:31, &c., this is quoted in Heb.8:10,12 & chapter 10:16,17. To understand this, we must consider. 1. Whom is this Covenant made with? 2. What can be inferred from this scheme of the Covenant? It's made with the house of Judah and Israel, not the men in present being, but men to be hereafter. It's after those days I will make it, so that it was after the Mosaic Covenant was to expire. "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." Jer.31:33.

Antinomian. Hence then you refute yourself, in saying, that it referred to the restoration of the Captivity; for then the Mosaic Covenant was in its full force.

Neonomian. And it could not be the only Covenant of Grace, for that had it's being from the Fall, and the sincere Israelites lost not the advantage of it. Gal.3:17.

Antinomian. The Covenant of Grace had it's being before the Fall, and from the Fall it had its promulgation; then

was that first revealed state of it, before it was the mystery that lay hid in God. But observe, that as it was then manifested, it was absolute as to us. The seed of the woman shall break the serpents head. There was no condition mentioned, nor rationally supposed to be implied, but Christ. And it's to be observed that this Covenant-promise was made before the sentence was pronounced upon our fallen parents, which blessing was the curse of the serpent denounced. Now as this promulgated Covenant had it's being from the Fall, so it continued as the Covenant of Grace and Salvation to all the faithful under the Old Testament. The Lamb slain from the foundations of the world, or before them, was looked upon as the only federal condition, which was exemplified by sacrifices, early begun in Adam's Family, and continued till the Messiah came. Now indeed this Covenant in the Epistle to the Hebrews is not meant in the essential nature of it, but in the veiled state of it under the Mosaic Administration, which is called by the Apostle, "graven in stone," II Cor.3:6-7, and opposed to the ministration of the spirit, verse 8, which is the Gospel unveiled ministration, which is said, therefore to be new, because of the full and clear discovery that was made by the revelation of Christ in his coming and ministry, which was not before. And in the same sense Mount Sinai and Mount Zion is opposed in Hebrews 12; and what was seen by this last ministration? It was, that Christ Jesus was the sum and substance of the former ministration. 1. That it was a Covenant of free-grace, the promise given upon the condition of redemption by the blood of Christ, which appeared to be the true intent of all the sacrifices. 2. That though so much was conditionally required, yet no duties could expiate sin, or reconcile us to God; and the reason of those duties are given us as truly, though then not so fully seen, was the performance of the Covenant-condition virtually in redemption typified by redemption out of Egypt. Exodus 20. In a word, the Covenant of Grace stood veiled under the Mosaic pedagogy, which stood in a conditional command under the sanction of rewards and punishments mostly temporal, and under types and figures.

Now this ministration of the Letter stood under a double faultiness, which clouded the glory and beauty of the promise. First, a typical and shadowy administration in sacrifices, by which the great condition of the Covenant was pointed at, as being not yet come, and symbolically only expressed to their faith. The other fault was, the moral Mount Sinai veil, which called for duty as it were in the way of federal condition, caused them to perform duty as under a spirit of bondage, and in a mercenary manner, through the encouragement of temporal rewards, and fear of temporary sufferings, and a seeming attribution of demerits to the performances. And therefore the Apostle shows, that the

faultiness lay here also. "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." Heb.8:9. Because they continued not in my Covenant, they could not be saved by those legal conditional performances, but by an absolute Covenant couched under that conditional Ministration, being saved even as we; for the law and legal ministration it was weak through the flesh. Rom.8:3. And you speak very truly, that the true Israelites never lost the spiritual advantage of the Covenant of Grace by reason of this veiled ministration, but looked through the veil by faith; for the law-deliverance at Mount Sinai did not, or could not disannul it, the Covenant or Testament fortified by God unto Christ. Thus far we do in some measure agree.

Neonomian. But the point before us is, to know who this Israel and Judah be. 1. They are either the natural Jews to be alive in those days, which this promise refers to, or to true believers, who are inwardly Israel. Rom.9:6. If it terminates in the natural Jews, it's a strong text for the conversion of the Jews, for the most part by an immediate influence.

Antinomian. Those days are the days of the Gospel-ministration, and it's plain the Spirit of God refers to the Jews that then lived. The Apostle wrote to the Hebrews, and his design was to take them from the Mount Sinai Ministration, which they were most fond of. He tells them, that now the days were come which the Prophet spake of; and therefore this is but shuffling with the texts, as if the time of fulfilling this promise was not yet come, when the Spirit of God gives us so clearly to understand when this prophecy was accomplished, verse 6, having given us an account of the ministry of the old sanctuary, that then the priests did serve the example and shadow of heavenly things. They do service, or minister by way of similitude and shadow, whereby they understood that they were not to last but till a better ministry ensued. And he says, "but now has he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also as he is the Mediator of a better Covenant." And this is the time, at the appearance of this Mediator, and his fulfilling all righteousness, that there should be this clear, unveiled dispensation of the promise. Not but God did thus unconditionally save them before; but now they should understand the true ground, principle, and use of Gospel services and duties. And here's all absolute; God forgives their iniquity, and writes his law in their hearts, where all is absolute and free, without mentioning any condition; though you would fain hook them in any way by head and shoulders, but you labour in vain.

Neonomian. If they be true believers, inward Israel,

then there is faith in such who are the parties with whom God makes this Covenant, &c.

Antinomian. We showed you, it's meant first of the professed Jews in those days, out of which God would take a true Israel by virtue of this promise; and whenever they that were blinded should be converted, and turn to the Lord, it should be so; and this way they should come to be believers; for giving the new heart, and writing the law there, is making them believers. How absurdly do you talk of making believers first, and then taking them into Covenant? As if making men believers, and giving them new hearts, were not taking them into Covenant. This is from your principle, that there's no promise of giving pardon or salvation to mere sinners and unbelievers, which is contrary to the whole Gospel. I will show you a promise that declares this absolute Covenant expressly to the sinners of the Gentiles, though the same promise belongs to both expressed in either of the places. "And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory." Rom.9:23. This forepreparation was in the Covenant of Grace, even us whom he has called, not of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles, "as he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved." See the place, and that this calling refers to more than an outward profession appears by I Pet.2:9,10, "but ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light; which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God, which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." You will make the writing of God's law in the heart to be the condition, when it's the very promise made. Give me the condition of this promise to be found in us before God's law is written, or else you do nothing.

Neonomian. It cannot be inferred from this scheme of the new Covenant, that {the Doctor would have it} God does not require any duty as the condition of the benefits which he promised to give.

Antinomian. You say the first grace is freely given, which in the promise is a new heart. Now what is a greater benefit than life from the dead? And what duty can be required as a condition to this benefit? Here you must fall in with the Papists, and directly contrary to Article 13 of the Church of England.

Neonomian. I talk not of a condition before a new heart, but that the new heart is the condition, for God's law is written in the heart, before our relation to him as his people, or the pardon of sin.

Antinomian. Here you plainly say, there's a real state in grace, without a relative; sanctification, without justification or adoption; the law written in the heart, and therefore good works. While we are unreconciled to God, it's before we are his people. Now this law must be written. 1. In the heart of the ungodly man and unbeliever; contrary to what you say, that there's no promise made to such because unbelievers; or it must be in the heart of him, who at once is made a believer in the working of a new heart, in which instant he is related to God, and has the pardon of sin. But it's unaccountable divinity, that the law of God is written in the heart before our relation to God as his people, or the pardon of sins.

Neonomian. But God requires us to make us new hearts as a condition of life. Ezek.8:31, Jer.7:23.

Antinomian. I suppose, Sir, you yourself cannot say, that the first quoted places are wrote in the new Covenant dialect, but in that of the veiled Covenant, especially that of Ezekiel 18, the place quoted by you. I suppose you will not say it's quite contrary to Jer.31:31, for if so, we may throw away our Bibles, but that this place is to be taken in some sense that is not contrary to the very nature and design of that of Jeremiah.

The drift of this chapter, Ezekiel 18, is to vindicate the just and righteous proceedings of God, for they had charged God with injustice and unrighteousness of his dealings towards them, that the son suffered for the father's sins, the father ate sour grapes, &c., God visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children. The Lord tells them, there's no child suffers for his father's sins, any further than he entails the curse, and as he walketh in his father's sins; and that by personal repentance of the vilest person a man should be saved, and not suffer for the sins of his parents. And verse 29, the prophet says, notwithstanding you have heard the justice of God thus vindicated, you will persist in it, and say, the way of God is not just or right. O house of Israel, {says the Lord,} are not my ways just? Are not yours unjust? For thus says the Lord, I will judge you; seeing that you stand so upon your own justification, and censure my justice; see now that you repent, and turn you from your iniquities, and so iniquity shall not be your ruin. And if they plead this, we cannot do it without the gift of grace, and thou change our hearts. No, saith God, seeing you stand upon such terms with me, you must do as you have pretended you could, verse 31, "cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit," get up your selves such faith as those have, who receive my grace freely, and I give new hearts to, and it shall be well with you, for, says the Lord, my nature is not to delight in the misery of the creature, {as no just judge that passeth sentence

delights to afflict or kill the prisoner at the bar,} I had according to my nature, rather he should repent and live; but if he does not, justice requireth that he should die. Now that which seems here to be chiefly aimed at, is, to convince them of their sinful undone state, that they were never able to perform so much as the external commands of the law of Moses, or any commands to repentance or obedience in their own strength and power. And seeing you charge me with this, that I accept not your pretended repentance, but have carried you away into captivity, it's for the iniquity of our fathers, they have sinned and we must suffer. No, says God, do but repent, sin shall not be your ruin; make you new hearts your selves, seeing you pretend you deserve so much, and have done so and so, let me now see what you can do without me as to help and grace; you shall see I shall deal with you according to your good, as well as according to your wickedness. The current of the Old Testament is to convince them of the faultiness of this conditional Covenant, and to confirm what the Apostle says, Hebrews 8, Rom.10:21, which is the sense of that place. Jer.7:23,4. This thing I commanded them, but they hearkened not, &c., that they continued not in that conditional way of salvation, nor obtained the law of righteousness, neglecting the true spiritual meaning of the sacrifices; but they that were saved, were saved as we, by Christ in a Free and an Unconditional Covenant of Grace.

Calvin says on the place, God does not speak this in vain, though they had no power to do it, but for this end, that men being convinced of their sins, should blame none but themselves; and acknowledging their impotency, should betake themselves to the help of the Holy Spirit as David. Psal.51:11. So as also this external exhortation is as it were the instrument God useth to confer grace upon them. And the Apostle acquaints us, and shows us how the Israelites failed, and rebelled against this conditional Covenant, and so brought themselves under the calamities threatened to their disobedience, and tells us, that all these things happened unto them in a type. They were types, and were written for our instruction. Wherein was that, viz., that we should not think as they, to be saved upon the condition of our performances, which they did, notwithstanding they had Christ and the free promise of life given to them in the types of the cloud, and the rock which they made not improvement of, or regarded, but stood mostly on their own strength and righteousness. Therefore, says he, verse 12, the instruction lies here, which we are taught, he that thinks that he stands, let him take heed lest he falls; i.e., let him depend upon the free grace of the Covenant, and not upon his conditional performances.

Neonomian. I will tell you your mistakes, you think everything is a price to buy a benefit, which is a compliance with

the way God has ordained to be a way to bestow a gift.

Antinomian. I think God has a way to bestow grace upon us by price and gift too; the price is paid by Christ, i.e., the conditional part of the Covenant performed, and Christ is freely given to us, and this is all the Covenant-way of salvation in him. Now if you bring in any other federal condition between Christ and us, you destroy it as a gift of righteousness and life, and make it debt, because that which makes the benefits promised due by remunerative justice, makes them but a debt that is owed; but a previous federal condition performed, makes the benefits promised due by remunerative justice, ergo, make them a debt, and the condition a price; therefore all such conditions are rejected as money and price. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." Isa.55:1.

Neonomian. You think because God has promised to Christ, that the elect shall believe; therefore God cannot make faith a condition of any other blessing.

Antinomian. I think faith being promised to Christ for us, and to all his seed in him, it can never lose the nature of a promise to us, and can't return into the nature of a federal condition. That the promises are bestowed according to divine order and relative connection, I deny not, nor no body of sense; but no gifts of the promise are federal conditions, but Christ himself.

Neonomian. He thinks because Christ is given to be a Covenant, i.e., is appointed to be a Surety, to serve the great ends of the Covenant accomplished and secured, therefore there is nothing required from men as the way of their interest in the benefits of the Covenant, though under the influence of Christ.

Antinomian. It seems you give two things to Christ as Surety only. 1. That he is the Executor. 2. That he has given bond and security that we shall perform the conditions of the Covenant. But we say, he was so a Surety, as not only to undertake, but actually to fulfill all righteousness for us, and was our Federal condition, and was the Testator of the promise; and it being made unto him, and us in him, all power was put into his hand; he gave it us by will, sealed it with his blood, and now is exalted, and in full power to give out the entire Covenant grant himself, and eternal life in him to sinners freely that have no qualification for it, neither are capable of making or performing any federal conditions.

Neonomian. You think because Christ is appointed to work faith in order to union, and other benefits, therefore we must have an actual interest in Christ and his benefits before this faith is wrought.

Antinomian. Faith is the fruit that grows upon a branch of the Vine Christ Jesus. Now tell me how that fruit shall grow without the influence of the root, unless you will say, a branch out of Christ can bring forth Fruit. I will not undertake to tell how long the union made by the Spirit is before faith appear, but I am sure faith cannot so much as arise into the first act, without the sinner's union and spiritual communion, so far as to have from the root; but as to his active and apprehended union, it can't be before faith.

Neonomian. You think because all grace after union comes from Christ as our actual Head, therefore Christ by his Spirit can work no grace in us as our designated Head.

Antinomian. I know not how you put that paradox upon me, or what you mean by it very well; I can but guess at it by your other notions; all that I can say to it is, that Christ works grace as our actual Head. That Christ works grace in us as a designed Head is a riddle; for so grace must be wrought in us before we are in Christ.

Neonomian. You think because God sovereignly decreed what benefits he would bestow; therefore he has as our Ruler, stated no rectoral method of bestowing those benefits.

Antinomian. I never thought God to be any other than a God of order, and that he is wise in all his ways, and holy in all his works, and always thought that as God has decreed to us all Covenant-blessings, so he has provided the best method and way for bestowing them, most to the honor and glory of his free-grace.

Neonomian. Because the Covenant is everlasting, {as to future,} therefore you judge there can be no condition on man's part; nor remembering, that the Covenant secures our perseverance in performing those conditions.

Antinomian. Because the Covenant is eternal, before the world began, I judge it was complete, and that the condition was as ancient as the Covenant, and the security both in condition and promise as ancient.

Neonomian. Dr. Owen in his treatise of justification, says, that Christ undertook that those who were to be taken into this Covenant should receive grace, enabling them to comply with the terms of it, fulfill its conditions, and yield obedience, which God required therein. How frequently does he assert, that our interest in the benefits of the Covenant depends on our answering the terms of the Gospel; and so Mr. Norton.

Calvin. Dr. Owen shows what Christ undertook as sponsor, to answer for all the sins of those who are to be, and are made partakers of the benefits of it; and that those who are to be taken into Covenant, {by their actual embracing it,} should receive grace enabling them; and whatever Christ undertook,

God promised; and this grace of compliance is no other than what Christ procured, undertook, and God promised. To say that the promises are conditions one of another, is to say no more than that they stand in an order of application, and in a constituted relation one to another. And these are all the terms the Doctor means; and that he does mean so, and not in your sense, is manifest, by noting other notions of these things, two of which he rehearses, wherein I am sure your notion is comprised at length and breadth.

He tells us what some say we owe to the death of Christ, the Procurator of the New Covenant, and that he suffered what God appointed he should; not that the justice of God required any such thing, &c., as in their stead, but what by a free Constitution of Divine wisdom and sovereignty was appointed; and hereon God remitted the terms of the Old Covenant, and entered into a new Covenant, suited unto reason, &c. These are faith and sincere obedience, &c. Others say, the whole righteousness of Christ is imputed to us so far, as that we are made partakers of the benefits thereof. And that the way of the communication of them unto us is by the New Covenant, which by his death the Lord Christ procured. For the conditions of the Covenant are established in the Covenant itself, whereon God will bestow all the benefits and effects of it upon us, which are faith and obedience. Wherefore, what the Lord Christ has done for us, is thus far accepted as our legal righteousness, as that God upon our faith and obedience with respect thereunto, does release and pardon all our sins. Upon this pardon there is no need of any positive perfect righteousness unto our justification or salvation; but our own personal righteousness is accepted with God in the room of it, by virtue of the new Covenant which Christ has procured. So is the doctrine hereof stated accursed, and those that join with and follow him, as I take it you do. This doctrine he refutes.

As for what you quote from Mr. Norton, it's not to the purpose. His design is to prove, the Gospel is preached in an indefinite proposition, which is not to our purpose; you quote Mr. Norton in the wrong place. The application both of grace and glory, and all the good of the Covenant of Grace, are free to us, though conditioned unto Christ. Free grace excludes not Christ's merit, but man's merit.

Objection. Faith is a condition, though not of itself, yet of salvation, and that in the elect themselves; therefore the application of salvation seems not to be free in respect of the elect.

Answer. A condition is either a condition properly so called, i.e., an antecedent condition, or a condition improperly so called, i.e., a consequent condition. A condition properly so called

is a law or observation, annexed to a business, the performance whereof lieth upon the Covenant, and accordingly the business becomes valid or null. Such a condition was works in the first Covenant. If faith were such a condition, there would soon be an end of the Covenant of Grace; yea, the Covenant of Grace were indeed no Covenant of Grace. A condition improperly so called, or a consequent condition, is such a condition, whose performance by the Covenantee is absolutely undertaken for, and irresistibly wrought by the Covenanter, and not left in suspense upon the Covenantee, to be performed by his own strength. Faith is a consequent condition, not an antecedent condition. So as this proposition, I will give eternal life to the elect, if they believe, is equivalent unto this, I will out of my absolute will give unto the elect eternal life, because I will out of my absolute will give unto the elect to believe.

Objection. Repentance and new obedience are necessary to salvation, Lk.13:3 Heb.3:13, therefore the application of the good of election is not to be free in respect of us.

Answer. Good works {which is also true repentance} are necessary, as the way appointed of God unto salvation, but not as the cause; this were to change the Covenant of Grace into a Covenant of Works, our good works are the effects of grace, the reward of good works are a reward of grace; good works are necessary to salvation as the way, not as an instrument or cause. Faith is necessary to salvation as an instrument. The active and passive obedience of Christ is necessary as a meritorious cause.

Calvin. Mr. Antisozzo, {otherwise known as Vincent Alsop, who wrote a book entitled, Antisozzo, Sive Sherlocismus Enervatus, In Vindication of Some Great Truths Opposed, and Opposition to Some Great Errors Maintained by Mr. William Sherlock, 1675,} I pray do you now speak impartially to this point.

Antisozzo. I think I have met with his scheme before now, and as I take it, it runs thus, and the question that lies before us is this, what influence the sacrifice of Christ's death, and the righteousness of his life have upon our acceptance with God? The gentleman that I once disputed with stated the question so, and resolved it as follows, "all that I can find in Scripture about this is, that to this we owe the Covenant of Grace; that God being well-pleased with the obedience of Christ's life, and the sacrifice of his death, for his sake entered into a new Covenant with mankind, wherein he promises pardon of sin and eternal life to those who believe and obey the Gospel."

I think this is exactly your scheme, Mr. Neonomian.

Neonomian. Yes, and something more, that the Gospel bars all unbelievers and dead sinners from pardon and adoption, and denounces the continuance of condemnation against them,

limiting its benefits to such as believe.

Antisozzo. This scheme contains three things. 1. A Description of the Covenant of Grace. 2. An assertion that this Covenant of Grace is owing to the sacrifice and righteousness of Christ. 3. A supposition that this righteousness and sacrifice of Christ has no other influence upon our acceptance with God, but that for his sake he entered into such a Covenant with mankind. 1. His Description is this, a promise of the pardon of sin and eternal life to those who believe and obey the Gospel.

Neonomian. You will not, I hope, deny this to be a true description of the Covenant of Grace.

Antisozzo. But I will for all you stated say that it is a description so liable to exceptions, that it describes neither the whole of the Covenant, nor a new Covenant, nor {upon the matter} any Covenant at all.

Neonomian. If you prove what you say, I'll strike out your name from my book; and if I can be convinced, I must subscribe yours.

Antisozzo. You shall see what I can do presently. 1. This Description gives us very little of a true Covenant of Grace. 1. For, though you think to put us off with a promise of pardon and life to those that believe and obey; the true Covenant of Grace has given us a promise of that faith whereby we may believe, and of that new heart, whereby we are enabled to obey the Gospel. And First, we have the promise of the right faith in the true Covenant, Jn.6:37, Eph.1:8, and lest it should be said, faith is a common gift, as other things are, the Apostle has his reply ready. "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power." Eph.1:19. Secondly, we have a direct and express promise too of that new heart from which we give to God new obedience, Ezek.36:26,27, &c.

2. This Description gives but very little of the true Covenant of Grace; there's a promise of pardon and life to them who believe and obey, but perseverance in faith and obedience is left to the desultory and lubricious power of free will; whereas in the true Covenant of Grace there's an undertaking that the Covenant shall be immutable both on God's part. "And they shall be my people, and I will be their God; and I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me forever, for the good of them, and of their children after them; and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." Jer.32:38-40. God has said, he will not turn away from doing them good. And 2ndly, he has promised, that they shall not depart from him, &c.

3. As it describes not the whole of the Covenant, so it

describes not the nature of a new Covenant. 1. It describes no new Covenant in opposition to the old Covenant of works. The Covenant with Adam promised life upon condition of Obedience, and those commands as easy as those now given to mankind, and much easier too, if we consider Adam's natural strength. 2. We are told by you, that Christ has added to the moral law, {i.e., to the moral duties required by the new law, faith and repentance,} which is to lay more load on those that were overcharged before. So that as you make covenants, Adam's was much the better Covenant of the two; but you have wisely shuffled in a promise of the pardon of sin, which may seem to give this Covenant a preeminence above that of Adam; but that will not mend the matter, both because it's better to have no sin in our natures, than such a remedy; better to have no wound than such a plaster; and also because the promise of pardon {as you say} is suspended upon the condition of faith and obedience, which without a supernatural real influx of immediate Divine power, reduces the promise to an impossibility of performance. 2. This Covenant described is no new Covenant in opposition to the old administration of the Covenant of Grace; there were the same promises then that we have now, the same moral precepts that we have now. Though the word Gospel come in for a blind, yet the Apostle assures us the Gospel was preached to Abraham.

4. Upon the matter it's no Covenant of Grace at all. 1. For a promise of pardon and life upon condition of believing and obeying, is neither better nor worse than a threatening of condemnation and death, to them who believe not and obey not. It may with equal right be called a threatening of death, as a promise of life. It's no more of grace than a Covenant of wrath; and therefore, if it be lawful to consider man as the Word of God describes him, dead in sins and trespasses, it's no Covenant at all to him. For what is the difference betwixt the promise of life to him that obeys, when it's certain before-hand he cannot obey, and no promise at all, &c.

Neonomian. Well, Sir, pray let us call another cause. Mr. Calvinist is a sharp man, and he does this only for argumentation sake; he is of my mind for all this.

Antisozzo. No, do not you believe that; you wheedled me in to vouch for your book I know not how; but I shall stick the closer upon your skirts for that, I have not done with you yet.

Calvin. I will then propound one question to Mr. Antisozzo, whether the Covenant of Grace be owing to the sacrifice of Christ's death, and so be distinct from that he calls the Covenant of Redemption? Because our time now is up, speak only what your judgment is in this point.

Antisozzo. Mr. Neonomian, I must tell you I have narrowly pried into this paradox, that the Covenant of Grace is

owing to, procured by, and founded on the obedience of Christ's life, and the sacrifice of his death, and yet so unhappy I have been in my search that I cannot find any proof, or any attempt to prove it; and therefore {till I see evidence to the contrary} I shall take for granted that the Covenant of Grace is owing to, and founded on, and given forth by that free grace of God from whence its justly denominated a Covenant of Grace, though the intervention of a Mediator. Such a Mediator was absolutely necessary to put us into actual possession of those rich mercies designed to us by God in that Covenant; which Mediator himself is owing to, and founded on that Covenant of Grace; and therefore the Covenant of Grace is not founded upon him, but indeed for that Covenant {which Mr. Neonomian} is pleased to call a Covenant of Grace, it's no great matter where it is founded; and therefore let him dispose of his own creature as he pleaseth, &c.

Neonomian. There are precepts and threatenings in the Covenant of Grace; and therefore those duties required are federal conditions, for to the performance of them are annexed promises, and to the breach of them threats.

Calvin. I pray, Dr. Witsius, do you speak in answer to this argument.

Dr. Witsius. The Covenant of Grace, or Gospel strictly so called, as a platform of that Covenant, seeing it consists in mere promises, properly prescribes nothing as duty, it requires or commands nothing, not so much as believe, trust and hope in the Lord, &c., but it reports, declares and signifies to us what God in Christ has promised, what he will and is about to do. All prescription of duty belongs to the law, even as after others venerable Voetius has pressed again and again; and this we must firmly hold, if we will constantly defend {with all the Reformed} the perfection of the law, containing in its compass all virtues, all duties of holiness. But the law fitted to the Covenant of Grace, and according thereto written in the heart of the elect, commands all these things which are propounded in the Gospel, to embrace it with faith unfeigned, and to live a life of grace and glory agreeable thereto. As to comminations, it cannot be denied but in the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, there are many comminations, which have a peculiar respect unto the Covenant of Grace, as, he that believes not shall be condemned, &c., which comminations do seem to be distinguished from those that are plainly legal. Such as this, cursed be he that continues not in all things, &c. Yet if we exactly consider them, the Covenant of Grace has no peculiar threats, for all the threats are from the law, which law as to all its parts, does accommodate and suit itself to the Covenant of Grace; and there are none which cannot be referred to, or deduced from that mere legal Commination

cursed is every one that continueth not in all things, &c.

DEBATE IX

OF THE NATURE OF SAVING FAITH.

Calvin. At our last Meeting we finished our debate about the Covenant of Grace, and the conditions of it. What have you further, Mr. Neonomian, to discourse Mr. Antinomian about.

Neonomian. Divers points besides that he is erroneous in. The next I would challenge him upon, is saving faith, and the nature of it. For his error is this, that saving faith is nothing but a persuasion or absolute concluding within ourselves, that our sins are pardoned, and that Christ is ours.

Calvin. But you do not deny faith to be a persuasion, do you? If you do deny that persuasion is the genus of faith, every common porter, or youth in the street, will contradict you; for they will tell you, that they do believe this or that to be true. Ask them what they mean by believing, they will tell you, they are persuaded of it. They take faith and persuasion to be equivalent terms, and indeed reciprocal; for that which I am persuaded of I do believe, and that which I believe I am persuaded of. But go on, let us hear what Mr. Antinomian says in this point.

Neonomian. Sir, he tells us, that the whole essence of faith is nothing else but the echo of the heart answering the foregoing voice of the Spirit and Word of Grace. My sins are forgiven me, says faith. And the soul that can assume trust from the Spirit and Word of grace, has the whole essence of believing.

Antinomian. I doubt not, Sir, but to prove that this is a good account of saving faith. I said, that which has the whole essence of faith, is not a dead but living faith, {i.e., which bringeth forth fruits,} but the question was, whether faith gives evidence by itself or no, by its own direct act. Now I said, the whole essence of faith is nothing else but the echo of the heart answering the voice of the Spirit and Word of grace, &c. Now I thought I could not give a more lively account of it; for the echo is, the daughter of the voice; it's begotten by the voice. So says the Scripture. "But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom.10:16-17. He quotes Isaiah 53:1, "who hath believed our report?" The word 'report' signifies the voice heard, or that comes to the hearing. And so does the Hebrew word import, who hath believed or heard our voice? That is, who has so heard it, as to make an impression thereof upon their hearts believingly? And the Apostle says, when this heard voice takes in a due

impression upon the heart through the Spirit, it begets faith, and that impress is faith, Rom.10:17, &c., faith verily is from hearing, and this hearing by the Word of God. Hearing, or the voice that is heard, is by the Word of God. Hence that expression of the Apostle, "of his own will begat he us with the word of truth," Jas.1:18, of his own sovereign-will, {working effectually by his Spirit in opening and new framing the heart, as Lydia's,} he begets us by the Word of truth. The truth of the Word is received into the heart as it were with an echo, and formation of the heart into it, by an assent to it as true, and consent to it as a good truth. And this is indeed the writing the law of God in the heart, the law being taken often for any truth declared in the Word. After this manner the Apostle speaks, "in Christ Jesus I have begotten you by the Gospel," I Cor.4:15, so that the Gospel begets faith. The Apostle James, 1:15, useth the word 'bringeth forth' concerning sin when it is finished or completed, bringing forth death, i.e., sin when it appears as it is, it's death and condemnation in the conscience. So the word brought thus by the Spirit into the heart, the soul is freed from condemnation; it thereby has life, he believes, to the saving of the soul. And can this be denied to be good faith, and true faith, and all the essence of our Divine faith, it being the believing of the word so as to close with it, and receive it, according to the nature and end of it. The Apostle, Heb.11:1, describes faith by two words, marvelously significant in our sense, by 'substance.' The word is besides used concerning the person of the Father, Heb.1:3, where Christ is said to be the character of the Father's hypostacy, we read it personality. So here faith is said to personate the truth, or to be the image of it, as it were in the heart; or rather things hoped for; it makes them as it were present, echoing them in the heart, the echo speaking the same things the voice does; and he says the evidence, or rather demonstration of things not seen; it takes up a demonstration from God's authority, not from sense or reason. Divine testimony is of greater force than any artificial arguments can be. There is also another word whereby faith is expressed, and it's a persuasion, Rom.4:20, it's said of Abraham, he was strong in faith, and what was his strength of faith? It was his fulness of persuasion or confidence, verse 21, "he was fully persuaded of what God had promised." The word is used for faith, Col.2:2, "to all riches of the full assurance of understanding," denoting that faith is primarily an act of the understanding; this word is often used for it. "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake." I Thes.1:5. "And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end." Heb.6:11. "Let us draw

near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Heb.10:22. "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us." Lk.1:1. And the very Greek word for persuasion is used, II Tim.1:5,12, whence, "I am persuaded," i.e., do believe that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him, Rom.8:38, "I am persuaded that neither death nor life," &c., i.e., this was his strong faith. Rom.14:14. I am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that there's nothing unclean of itself. This was his faith. I will but name one place more, Heb.11:13, where it is said of those eminent believers mentioned in that chapter, that they received not the promises in the fulfilling of them by performance, but saw them afar off, and being persuaded of them, saluted them in their own hearts, "and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth."

Calvin. You must own saving faith to be a saving persuasion you see, or else you must deny the Scriptures; and according to the weakness and strength of persuasion we account our faith is weaker or stronger, yet has its form and difference from its proper adjuncts and object.

Neonomian. When he puts a man to examine his faith, he has these words, how do I know I believe in Christ? He answers, do I rest my heart upon his truth? Do I receive it as a truth that I do believe? Or do I reject it, and will not receive it? Then I do not believe it. But if thou sit down and rest upon this truth, and receive it, and do in reality believe it, then you may absolutely conclude Christ is yours.

Antinomian. I am sorry to see that you should have such an aversion to these things. I was preaching from Isaiah 42:6-7, and showing how Christ receiveth sinners as sinners, he never shuts out one of those thousands that come upon the venture of the Gospel; and if there be no example of any shut out in the whole Scripture, from whence fetch you that bitterness of your own spirit, that you may not, that you dare not look to Christ? But you will say, if this taking Christ be the best security, how shall I know whether I believe or no? Or how shall I know that this my taking is not counterfeit, but solid and real. I answer, by the reality of the thing. Do you it indeed? If you do it indeed, it's a real taking. Do you not bid men believe sincerely and indeed? If a man should ask you, how do you know the sun shines? The light of the sun does show itself, and by its light we know it shines. How shall I know I believe? There is a light in faith that does discover itself unto men. The soul that does really close with Christ, may conclude he does so. If you give 6 pence to a poor man, and you say to him, how do you know I have

given you 6 pence? He will answer, I have it in my hand, and feel I have it. So ask your hearts this question, how do I know I believe in Christ? Do I rest my heart upon this truth? Do I receive it as a truth, &c?

Calvin. What, can you, Mr. Neonomian, with any face except against this doctrine? Doth not the Apostle say, I Jn.5:10, "he that believeth on the Son has a witness in himself?" Is there any clearer evidence of an action than the doing it? Ask a man how he knows he can eat; says he, I do eat, I do taste and swallow what I eat. So that instance of the sun shining, which he gives, there's no doubt but the first evidence the soul has is in believing itself; though he tries his faith by its fruits also, and receives evidence therefrom. Is not faith illustrated in Scripture by all our senses, hearing, tasting, smelling, feeling or touching, seeing? And is there not perception in the exercise of all the senses? And how shall I know better that I do exercise them than by perceiving their objects, which is a witness, an evidence, a demonstration to myself above all others that it is so. The natural man indeed receiveth not the things of the Spirit by faith, I Cor.2:14, and therefore they are foolishness to him, but the spiritual man does, i.e., by faith.

Neonomian. He says, if the Lord give to any to believe this truth, that it is his iniquity the Lord has laid on Christ, God himself cannot charge one sin on that man, and he makes a difference between a strong believer and a weak, to consist in the degree of his persuasion.

Antinomian. This was a use that I made upon that point of laying sin on Christ. If God have laid our iniquity upon Christ, then whosoever thou art to whom the Lord will be pleased to give the believing of this truth, that the Lord has laid thine iniquity on Christ, that laying thine iniquity upon him is an absolute and full discharge to thee, that there neither is nor can be any iniquity for the present, nor for hereafter, that can be laid to thy charge; and then follows what he has rehearsed. And if this be not true doctrine, that every believer that by the grace of God sees his sins laid on Christ, has a full pardon of all sins, past, present and to come; so that sin shall never be charged on him for condemnation before God; I am to seek for the doctrine of the Gospel. I quote that place, Rom.8:33, to me a very full proof. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." Rom.8:33. And I do affirm, that the degrees of our faith does stand in the degrees of the sight of Christ's glory, and the persuasion we have in our hearts of our part in him. And I do not say, that he is no believer that has not this perfectly; far be it from me to say so; there are that are believers, that are weak in the faith; and there are believers that are strong in the faith; the more the light and glory of the Gospel shines in the

true intention of God to his people, the more shall they return to their rest, the more shall they have joy and gladness. Why may not a believer then say as David did, the Lord has been very bountiful to me, that I may return to my rest. God has done everything in Christ, and taken away all things that can disturb my peace and comfort.

Calvin. I pray, Mr. Neonomian, let us have your description of saving faith.

Neonomian. I shall express it in the words of the Assembly. "By this faith, a Christian believes to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God Himself speaking therein, and acts differently upon that which each particular passage thereof contains; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life, and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace." Chapter 14. Gentlemen, weigh this account of faith well; which if it were regarded, and no essential part excluded, when faith is considered as a condition of any Gospel-benefit. One would think no man need prove that it is not saving faith when any essential part of it is wanting; and that it must be saving faith, when we mention faith as a condition.

Antinomian. That reverend Assembly do here express the essential parts of faith, and something more as the effects of it. I take it not to be intended for a definition, wherein only essentials are put, but a description that takes in subjects, adjuncts, effects, &c. The definition is first given, that the grace of faith is whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls. After they proceed to show the causes of it, the Word and Spirit, and after that its several ways of acting, and its effects. They do in the Shorter Catechism give a briefer account of it, which may be more properly called a Definition.

Question. 86. What is faith in Jesus Christ? Answer. Faith in Jesus Christ is a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon him alone for salvation, as he is offered to us in the Gospel. And if you please to turn to Question 31, you shall see what they mean by receiving and resting. There they say that "effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit, whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he does persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the Gospel."

And in the Larger Catechism you have a full description of faith as justifying in Question 72, wherein there is the genus of it, a saving grace; the principal efficient cause; the Spirit, the ministerial cause; the Word, the subservient efficient cause; both

causes effectual. The subject in whom it is wrought, a sinful, miserable and lost creature, really so, and in his own eyes. And then you have the material cause, the truth of the promise of the Gospel. In the Confession, {wherein it's more largely expressed,} it's whatever is revealed in the Word, this is the objective part of it, and material. The form of faith is an impression wrought upon the soul from the proper efficacy of the Spirit, by the Word, according to the acceptable nature and evidence thereof. The truth must have goodness in it, because we believe many things that we fear and are averse to. The Word works objectively upon the understanding, persuading it to assent and set to its seal, that the Word is truth, and from the goodness in that truth it persuades the will to embrace, because the will follows the dictates of the understanding; and the consenting of the will is an effect of the assenting of the understanding. Hence then it's not barely believing without ground, but upon some Authority. In the Confession 'tis said, for the Authority of God himself speaking in the Word, which is believing on Christ, believing in God, from whence follows an awful reverence and regard to his Word, as also the resting and depending of the soul thereon; and when it's determined to the grace of justification, {it's as in the Larger and Shorter Catechism,} it receiveth Christ and his righteousness in the promise, and resteth thereon for pardon of sin. Justifying grace through the righteousness of Christ is the object, and that which it aims at, is the accepting and accounting of a man's person righteous in the sight of God for salvation, which is fuller expressed in the Confession, showing what saving faith in the largest sense designs, viz., accepting, receiving and resting upon Christ alone {excluding all other federal conditions} for justification, sanctification and eternal life, by virtue of the Covenant of Grace. Now you see how clearly they make faith a persuasion, and that it does all objectively, by taking in the truth and receiving it; for the understanding receiveth and embraceth by being persuaded, it takes in the light of truth, and the will embraceth by being persuaded, and the great procatarctic cause is the Covenant of Grace. Now I see you have a clean contrary notion of making it a condition and moral instrument, i.e., a moral condition of the Covenant, and so a work, and as such to reach the end of the Covenant, which I utterly deny; for that would destroy its own nature and use, and also the Covenant of Grace itself.

Neonomian. The question is not, whether assurance be attainable in this life as an effect of faith?

Antinomian. A persuasion of truth, and certainty thereof, is assurance, and so far as I do believe, there is this in the act of faith, though a weak faith has doubtings attending, but

not therefore commendable, and there can be no faith without some degree of persuasion concerning the truth of the object. You speak here of an assurance, {which must be reckoned of the highest degree of persuasion,} and therefore you deal not fairly to change your terms from persuasion to assurance. There is a two-fold assurance, the plerophory of faith, and an assurance that I have true faith, which is spiritual sense and argumentation from its nature and effects; one is by the proper direct act of believing, the other by reflex acts of the soul upon itself.

Neonomian. Nor whether a sinner ought to apply, yea, does personally apply the general offers of Christ and life by his own compliance with the terms of the Gospel; for upon a true acceptance of a whole Christ, he is mine in virtue of the Gospel-promise, which God will perform in giving Christ and life to all that accept him as he is proposed for our acceptance.

Antinomian. You are very dark and obscure in what you here speak. By personal application I understand particular application, and so it's your sense that a sinner ought to make a particular application of the general declarations of Christ and life in the very act of believing; and so far I join with you, and that his thus believing is his compliance, the Gospel's work being persuading, my compliance is to be persuaded, and there's nothing else expected, {which you call terms; the terms is that we put in no terms,} but accepting Christ freely proclaimed. And you say he is yours in virtue of the Gospel-promise; you must intend in the virtue of the Gospel-promise believed, or else you have no right but as you had before, believing an intentional right only; if it be a claimable right, it's in a promise believed; for whatever right is real in the promise, none will plead any but what he believes. And it is in virtue of the promise to give Christ and life to many that do not yet accept of him, for it's the virtue of the promise to give life to dead sinners, that they may actively and comfortably receive and accept him.

Neonomian. Nor whether a convinced sinner has a more special regard at first of the Priestly Offices and Sufferings, as what are more sensibly fitted to his guilty state.

Antinomian. I understand not what you mean by Priestly Offices, as if Christ had more Priestly Offices than one? Christ does exercise his Priestly Office in the state of humiliation and exaltation; but I have not seen any before that ascribes to Christ two Priestly Offices; and if you mean justifying faith, it's office is to lay hold on and apply the person of Christ in his Priestly Office.

Neonomian. Nor whether everything recorded in Scripture must be dwelt on with the same regard, concern and assurance as the essentials of the Covenant of life.

Antinomian. You mean here faith as to the general

nature of it; you do not distinguish it from faith in the justifying nature all along.

Neonomian. Nor whether faith contain in it a reliance on Christ as our only Saviour, and on his satisfaction and merits, as what alone purchased our pardon and acceptance, as well as it includes the realizing assent to the truth, and unfeigned fiducial consent to acceptance of a whole Christ in all his Offices. All these I affirm.

Antinomian. You acknowledge then that faith contains in it. 1. A reliance on Christ as an only Saviour. How can this be without some persuasion? A rational man never rests and leans upon a thing that he has not some ground of persuasion that its strong enough to bear him. 2. You own it includes a realizing assent to the truth, and this is a very high persuasion of a truth, with a particular application of it to a man's self as belonging to him. 3. You say there's an unfeigned fiducial consent to, and acceptance of Christ and all his offices. This is strong confidence, when the soul is so far persuaded of the reality of the certainty of Christ made in the promise, that he does not only take him, but with boldness; questions not but he has the Son, and has life in this very act of believing. You say we rely on Christ's satisfaction and merits, as what alone purchased our pardon and acceptance. This is true in a true sense, but we easily see what you mean by what you speak before.

Neonomian. The real difference is, whether the whole essence of saving faith consists in an inward persuasion or assurance that our sins are pardoned, and Christ is ours. This you affirm and I deny; yea, I deny that it is at all of the essence of saving faith.

Antinomian. What I said, and you charge for my error, I stand to it, and have made it appear to be truth. I said the whole essence of faith is the echo of the heart answering the voice of the Spirit and Word of grace, and thereby it's the obedience of faith. The soul believes and closes with truth according to the nature of it, and in such a manner as is received. You wrong me to say, I used the words persuasion or assurance; for I said, if you receive truth, and in reality believe it, and rely upon it, you may conclude that Christ is yours; and this is now a conclusion made upon my believing too. I pray would you not say so to a poor sinner, if thou dost believe on the Lord Jesus with all thy heart, thou shalt be saved; and you ought to conclude you shall be saved? And this is a persuasion of my state upon believing.

Calvin. Mr. Neonomian. It's indeed a marvellous thing that you should say and unsay a thing in the same breath; to own faith a reliance on Christ, that it carries a realizing assent to the truth, and an unfeigned fiducial consent, and now to say

persuasion is not at all of the essence of faith.

Neonomian. I said it contained, and it included it; I said not they were of the essence.

Antinomian. This is just like your wonted way of dodging? How does faith contain and include these things? As in a box, which contains and includes things of a specific nature different from itself. Well, we will attend your proof.

Neonomian. The second thing in difference is, whether saving faith includes not in its nature that powerful efficacious assent to the Word, and fiducial consenting to acceptance of Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, with a reliance on his merits, and obediential regards to God as the truth above-mentioned does express. This you deny and I affirm.

Antinomian. Now we are for filling up the box; and this assent, or persuasion and consent or reliance is put in, but not as the essence of faith; and among the rest there is obediential regards. And why comes in this, but only because he would make up faith into a moral condition? I speak of the essence of faith; you talk of containing, including, and tell us those things that are contained and included. I told you not what was necessarily concomitant to faith; I did not speak of love, sincerity, hope, &c., which are concomitants to faith, and inseparable from it, but yet be not faith in the essential consideration.

Neonomian. I will now confirm the truth that faith is not an assurance or inward persuasion, that Christ is ours, and our sins are pardoned.

Antinomian. I say faith is a persuasion of truth propounded unto me upon credible grounds. You should first state the question concerning faith in general, whether it be human faith or divine; and then divine faith is that which takes all divine things in general for its object, or that which has some more particular divine truth for its object, as justifying faith. There is also a particular divine faith, which is not saving in its special nature, as faith of miracles, historical, &c.

Neonomian. That which I will prove is, that saving faith is not persuasion.

Antinomian. Very well, i.e., that persuasion is not the general nature of faith. We are not to meddle here with the distinguishing specific form of one faith from another. Let us join issue there.

Neonomian. Yes; but I will have my liberty to dispute of what I please, whether it be the question or no. Men may have this faith, though they do not savingly believe. Matt.25:1- 2. Nay, the most profligate sinners grow secure by it.

Antinomian. Your argument runs two ways, or should. 1. Against persuasion, as not being the genus of faith; and it stands thus, if they that do not savingly believe may have

persuasion, then persuasion is not of the essence of faith; but they that do not savingly believe may have persuasion. There's two species of believers, those that have a faith, not saving, as merely historical, temporary, or faith of miracles, and those that have saving faith is the genus of both those species, which is persuasion. Now you argue, because such as have not a saving faith have persuasion, therefore they that have saving faith, have not persuasion. Not an invalid argument, but rather quite contrary, that they have; for the genus communicates its common nature to both species.

Neonomian. No, no, I don't mean so; I mean that faith is not an inward persuasion that Christ is ours.

Antinomian. I thought so, I was going to speak that. No indeed, it's not a distinction of faith, but a particular instance of one thing believed by us. If you should ask me, what faith is, and I should tell you, it's believing Peter betrayed Christ, or that Paul was converted, you would take me to be very ridiculous; or I should say, it is not believing that I am a rich man. So that if you will have the question run in a particular instance, it's easily decided; for whatever is universally affirmed of a kind is affirmable as well for any sub-kind of that kind. Therefore I acknowledge, to say, faith is a persuasion that Christ is mine, is no more a definition of faith, than to say that an animal is a rational creature is a definition of animals. But this is true, if you affirm the genus of the species, a rational creature is an animal, and it holds true, but not mutually. This therefore I affirm, that he that believes that Christ is his, and his sins are forgiven, does believe it by a persuasion. You say, those that said Lord, Lord, and the Foolish Virgins had a faith of persuasion, and many profligate sinners have a presumptuous persuasion, but not true believers. Therefore, say you, faith is not a persuasion that their sins are forgiven; you might as well say, because some have a false faith, therefore none have a true; because one man that trades is persuaded his stock is good, and deceives himself, and breaks; does it follow that no merchant must persuade himself that his stock is good. These are mighty inconsequences.

Neonomian. Many true believers have not this persuasion.

Antinomian. Give an instance of a believer that has not a persuasion of the thing he professes to believe, and so far as he is not persuaded he does not believe. Doth anyone believe the record that God has given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son? I Jn.5:11. If he does, he is persuaded of it. But you'll say, he does not believe Christ is his; he ought confidently to believe there is pardon and acceptance from him; and to get this witness of faith in his own heart. You'll grant he ought to have the Son. How shall he have him, but by receiving him in the

promise? Believing on him as the faithful witness, depending on the truth of the promise, and the reality of the purpose and intention of Christ towards us; and there is not the weakest true believers but have a persuasion, such as their faith is, though it may not so properly be called assurance, because that denotes a strong and high degree of faith; but it's a persuasion accompanied with much doubting, a staggering faith; Lord, I believe, help my unbelief; Lord, I am persuaded in some measure, help my doubting.

Neonomian. Such as had assurance do {by this Doctors opinion} fall into the sin of damning unbelief, whenever they doubt their interest in Christ, and especially if they conclude that they have no interest in him.

Antinomian. Do you in your conscience judge that I hold falling away from grace? Is not unbelief of a damning nature of itself, and so far as it prevails, brings the consciences of the best under guilt? And wherein consists the doubts and fears of God's people, but in the prevailing of unbelief, which shakes their faith, and darkens their persuasion? Is my doctrine the more condemnable, because I hold, as experience and God's Word witnesseth, that faith, as other graces, have their ebbings or flowings? And do not you hold unbelief to be a damning sin in itself? But is there not a great difference between the degrees of faith, yea, of assurance, as you yourself grant elsewhere? And what degrees of unbelief and doubting a child of God may fall into, even to the making very dangerous conclusions concerning himself, and not fall totally from faith; it's beyond us to judge. There are great instances in Scripture, and we have seen some.

Neonomian. This persuasion should suppose an interest in Christ does not give it; it is a false conclusion, that Christ is mine before he is so; and must the great terms of life be a lie. We are to examine ourselves, whether we are in the faith or not. II Cor.13:5. Where has God made this proposition, my sins are laid on Christ, unless you are for general redemption; the Word of grace promises pardon to none but a believer, and the Spirit speaks to none but a believer.

Antinomian. In all things we receive of gift there must be a right of donation first; if we take before it's given, it's theft; and unless I am persuaded that the giving hand is reached out, I cannot receive. We have our first earnest for blessedness in the persuasion of faith, in the very act of it; and it's nonsense to talk any way of partaking of Christ, but by the Spirit and Faith; and he that in an act of believing at first finds Christ in the true persuasion of faith, does not, nor cannot say of Christ he is his before he is so. The soul cannot be too nimble for Christ; and if he that believeth not, makes God a liar, what are those that persuade to unbelief? That faith in its very act is an evidence, is

no hindrance to the trial and examination of ourselves by the fruit of faith besides. And though the proposition in the Gospel be an indefinite proposition, yet the application by faith in a sinner, ought to be particular and fiducial, or else the faith of believers will be no more than that of others that believe only that Christ came to save sinners; and if the promise of pardon were not to sinners as such, it were not pardon; and if a man upon trial must first find by signs that he does believe, before he lay claim to pardon, sinners would be in a sad condition. But this is the comfort, that as the promise of pardon is the great encouragement to believing, so believing itself is the receiving and perceiving of it, and the soul says, or should by faith, he loved me, and gave himself for me. At the sight of Christ, it says, my Lord, and my God. If the Lord speak to a believer, in believing, by his Word and Spirit, thy sins are forgiven, it's not said so to one that is a believer first. The promise of paternity is not a promise or gift to one that's a Father first, nor Sonship to one that is a Son first. God promises himself to be a Father to them that are not my people. "Then said God, call his name Loammi; for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God." Hos.1:9. And how gross is that assertion, that the Spirit speaks it to none but to a believer as a believer. Doth not the Spirit speak peace, before we receive it by an act of faith? Doth not this cause us to believe, it's the light causeth the eye to see? It's the light shining into the dark unbelieving heart, that persuades the heart; it's God that says to the Soul, I am thy salvation, before we can believe it.

Neonomian. The second thing that I will prove is, that saving faith has the essentials expressed in the abovementioned truth, as assent, trust, consenting, acceptance of Christ, reliance, &c.

Antinomian. You said before, that inward persuasion of the pardon of sin was no part of saving faith. And said in the next, that it contained assent to the Word, fiducial consent and acceptance of Christ. A man therefore may understand you, that though it contained it, yet it was not of its essence. Now you seem to say, these are essentials; if you do not, you hide yourself again in the word include. If you say, these be essentials which you name, we say so too, but allow not yours, &c., and all these essentials are in the word persuasion. Assent is the persuasion of the understanding, consent the persuasion of the will to the truths and good things propounded, the promise whereby the soul relies upon Christ therein for himself, particularizes Christ and all blessings to himself as his; and now go on, and prove all that you said before to be false.

Neonomian. You are mistaken, I will prove my position true, and then see where your error will be. Faith can be no less

than the souls answer to the call of God, &c.

Antinomian. We say it is so, and he bids us believe; but it's not faith as such; for all obedience is an answer to the Call of God.

Neonomian. The Scripture describes saving faith by all these acts; it's the evidence of things not seen, substance of things hoped for, Heb.11:1, receiving of Christ. Jn.1:12, Isa.55:4, Acts 13:26, Rom.15:12, Isa.44:5.

Antinomian. This we say it is, evidence and substance of things at a distance, is a full persuasion of them according to the nature of them; such a persuasion as carries the whole soul forth to God to rest and rely upon him, having union with Christ thereby, bringing him in all his excellencies into our souls, and taking him for our own. Doth a man believe any good thing promised, and does not he catch at it for himself, if he has any savour of it? If the promise of pardon present itself to us, does a man believe till he appropriate it to himself, saying, it is mine, though an unworthy sinner? If a condemned prisoner hears a pardon is come out for some, he may believe that; but till he believes he is one, it's no comfort to him, though there may be hopes at least he is in it.

Neonomian. Christ cannot be received as a Saviour without these.

Antinomian. It's very true, he is never received as such till I receive him as my Saviour, and believe him to be so in some measure; and this I am bound to do, to receive him by confident persuasion and resting upon him.

Neonomian. A faith without these essentials could never produce those great effects as are ascribed to faith, to purify the heart, Acts 15:9, to be a shield against temptations, Eph.6:16, works by love, Gal.5:6, sanctifies us, Acts 26:18, by faith we are risen with Christ. Col.2:12.

Antinomian. It's certain that no faith can do it, but such as makes a particular application by a persuasion of the love of God, or interest in Christ, pardon of sins, and reconciliation to God through him, that can produce the effects spoken of; this will purify the heart from an evil guilty conscience, to serve the living God; this will be a shield against the most mortal darts of Satan, that he shoots at our state by bringing in law condemnations; hereby love to God is produced in the soul, and we act towards God and our neighbours in love, hereby we are brought to true obedience, such as the law required at first for the principle, to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, soul and strength; and therefore the Apostle says, love is the sum of all obedience, as our Saviour said. It's the fulfilling of the law, through this grace of the Spirit; for by receiving forgiveness of sin, we have an inheritance among them that are sanctified;

pardon believed is the root of sanctification, and this cannot be without it, for by faith we are risen with Christ, we are planted in the likeness of his death and resurrection; and faith in this point of Christ's resurrection, is that which sets us above the charge of sin and condemnation. By the resurrection of Christ preached, we are begotten to this lively believing hope, and we are risen with him through this faith of the operation of God; hence the body of sin is destroyed, death abolished, life and immortality brought to light; Christ by his resurrection being discharged and justified from the iniquities of us all, which were laid upon him, and which he bore in his body upon the tree.

Neonomian. An enlightened regenerate soul cannot act towards Christ, when he is first presented to its view below these instances.

Antinomian. No, it's the sight of Christ, and taste of Christ that carries him forth to all duties of sanctification, he having Christ in all his fulness; he has done with all his conditions, all his righteousness is filthy rags. A soul truly instated by a lively faith is far above paddling with his own little poor sinful duties, as conditions between him and Christ, he can serve Christ, obey him, and his commandments are not grievous to him, neither will he think they have any such virtue in them as to give him right to Christ, in any way of federal conditionality.

Neonomian. His mistakes are, because faith is the evidence of things unseen, {i.e., it assents unto unseen realities,} therefore he thinks that our faith is nothing but our assent.

Antinomian. I think I understand the import of those words, as I have told you; but I have shown you it's such a work of the Spirit and Word, whereby the heart echoes to the Word by such persuasion of the truth, whereby Christ and the truth is as it were formed in us; and your selves can give no account of faith that reacheth the essentials thereof, but what we have done from the Word of God.

Neonomian. Because the Word of grace promises justification unto all true believers, therefore an assurance of my being justified is believing, whereas I must first be a believer in order to pardon, before I justly can or ought to believe that I am pardoned.

Antinomian. The word assurance is a word you impose; it was not in the words you allege against me; what is it the Gospel would have us believe, if it be not forgiveness of sins? Acts 13:38. Be it known unto you, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified, &c. What do they believe? It's forgiveness of sins, and in this act of faith is the justification by faith, in that they believe forgiveness of sins, and as they are weakly or

strongly persuaded, through the Spirit of grace working the promise upon their souls. Popish school divines do dream that faith is a quality cleaving in the heart, without Christ. This is a devilish error. But Christ should be so set forth, that thou shouldest see nothing besides him, and shouldest think that nothing can be more near unto thee, or more present within thy heart than he is, for he sitteth not idly in Heaven, but is present in us. "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." And here likewise you have put on Christ. Faith therefore is a certain steadfast beholding, which looketh upon nothing else but Christ the Conqueror of sin and death, and the Giver of righteousness, salvation and eternal life; this is the cause that Paul nameth Jesus Christ so often in his Epistles, almost in every verse; for he setteth him forth by the Word; for otherwise he cannot be comprehended but by the Word. This was lively and notably set forth by the Brazen Serpent, for Moses commanded them that were stung to do nothing else but steadfastly behold the Brazen Serpent, they that did so were healed. Read with great vehemency this word, me, and, for me, and so inwardly practice with thy self, that thou with a sure faith mayest conceive and print this 'me' in thy heart, and apply it unto thy self, not doubting but thou art of the number of those to whom this belongeth; also that Christ has not only loved Peter and Paul, and given himself for them, but that the same grace also which is comprehended in this me, as well appertaineth and cometh unto us as unto them. When I feel and confess myself a sinner through Adam's transgression, why should I not say that I am made righteous through the righteousness of Christ, especially when I hear that he loved me, and gave himself for me. This did Paul most steadfastly believe, and therefore he speaketh these words with so great vehemency and full assurance, which God grant unto us in some part at the least, who has loved us, and given himself for us. What is faith? The first part of religion, whereby from knowledge I believe in God. The first act of faith is passive in receiving what God gives. Here may we justly say, it is a poorer and meaner act to believe than to love; nay, rather passion than action, for we are first apprehended of God before we apprehend him again. "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Phil.3:12. This grace is most freely graced, that it might the more frankly reflect all on God again. No doubt faith receives a full discharge, makes it not, we rather by faith receive an acquittance sealed in the blood of Christ, than the blood of Christ to make our own works meritorious, which we may offer to God in payment for ourselves. Here lies the error of Papists even in faith itself, and other graces; if God will not bear half the charges by

his co-operation, man shall undertake to merit his own glory, and fulfill the royal law so abundantly, that he shall have something over and above. Works are the effects of sanctification; sanctification is the effect of justification.

The object of the understanding is truth, of the will goodness. Faith is an assent to the truth and goodness of Divine Revelation, wherefore we affirm that this faith is an act of the understanding, and of the will, both together approving and allowing the truth and goodness of Divine Things. In which assertion you are to note that we do not make the habit of faith to be inherent in two faculties, but we affirm the subject is but one and the same, viz., the intellectual nature; for I take it with divers of the learned, that these speculations about the real distinction of faculties in spiritual substances of angels and souls of men, are but mere drivel in the schools, without any true ground in the nature of it. The understanding essentially includes the will, and the will the understanding; wherefore the Object of the understanding and will are one and the same, truth and goodness are essentially the same.

Faith is general or particular. A general faith is that which assents to all Divine Revelation, as good and true in regard of ourselves. Here comes in the common work of the Spirit. A particular assent of faith, is when all things revealed by God are assented to as most true and excellent in regard of ourselves, when they are particularly applied to our proper occasion, and compared with all desires and provocations whatsoever to the contrary, when we know and believe these things that are generally delivered, for ourselves, in application to our own use and practice, {as Job was counselled by his friends,} so that we believe in this particular as well as that, at this time as well as another.

The root and fountain of this blessed assent, is the grace of sanctification, and the object is twofold. 1. The whole will of God revealed in his Word, containing all histories, doctrine, commands, threatenings, promises, &c. 2. The particular promise of remission of sin, and everlasting life by the death of Christ, which in one word we call the Gospel; though both be one and the same infused grace which respects both, yet faith as it respects these objects, the whole will of God, and a particular promise of the Gospel, admits of divers considerations, names, and use. Faith, as it assents to the whole will of God, I call legal, because it is such a virtue as is immediately required by the moral law, in the same manner as duties of the moral law are, and as all other moral duties are required of us in their degrees, as parts of our inward and outward sanctity, necessary to salvation; so is this faith commanded as a principal grace, and prime part of our obedience to the first command; so in this

respect it may be saving, namely, as other graces are.

Faith, as it assents unto the special promise of grace, I call evangelical, because it's such an act as is expressly commanded in the Gospel, not revealed by the moral law. It is called properly saving and justifying, in regard of the use of it, through God's gracious appointment, to be the only testimony of our justification and salvation by Christ. He defines it thus, it is a grace of sanctification wrought by the Holy Ghost in every regenerate man, whereby for his own particular he trusteth perfectly on the promise of remission of sins, and salvation by Christ's righteousness. The proper act of faith as it justifies the conscience of the believer consisteth in trust and reliance for our own particular, to believe the truth of a particular promise, is to trust upon the performance of it to me; and that assent of faith which is given to such a promise, is properly called trust. To assent unto such a promise, is not barely to believe that there is such a thing in the world as remission of sins by Christ, to be bestowed upon God knows who, {for this is to believe the promise not as a promise, but a history,} but this assent is of the whole heart, in trust, reliance, adherence, &c.

That trust is the essence of faith. 1. From the phrase of Scripture used in this business to believe in, upon, into God, Christ, &c. 2. From the opposition between faith and distrust. 3. From that excellent place, "I am persuaded he is able to keep, &c." "For the which cause I also suffer these things; nevertheless I am not ashamed, for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." II Tim.1:12.

Wherefore to believe the promise, is with confidence and trust to rely upon it; which assent of faith is wrought in this manner. 1. A man is enlightened to see his sin and misery. 2. The promise of grace is proposed and freely proclaimed unto him. 3. Whence the heart touched by the Spirit of grace draws near to Christ, casts himself into his arms, &c. It bespeaks Christ in all terms of confidence and affiance, my Lord, my God, my Hope. This work of faith, as it does greatly glorify God, in ascribing the whole honor of our salvation only to free grace in Christ, so God does highly honour it above all fellow-graces, by making it the blessed instrument of all the comfort we enjoy in this world, thereby giving us assurance of our justification in his sight by Christ's righteousness, and a double comfort. 1. Peace of conscience, resting itself secure upon the stability of God's promise, against the severities of justice, the accusations of the law; it has, wherewithal to answer even an all-sufficient, righteousness in Christ. 2. That kind of trust which we call assurance of full pardon of our sins. This is the fruit of that trust, or trusting unto the promise itself, wherein stands the proper act

of faith. Many do steadfastly believe, and rest themselves only upon Christ for salvation, who yet would give a world to be assured and fully persuaded that their sins are pardoned. Whereupon they will be apt to fall back and say, they do not, nor can't believe at all. A great mistake, and that which casteth many a conscience upon the rack. It's a false argument; for faith is not to be assured of pardon, but to trust wholly upon the promise for pardon.

What is essential unto faith is manifest, that which in order of nature seems to have the precedency, is the assent of the mind, unto that which the Psalmist betakes himself unto in the first place, for relief under a sense of sin and trouble. "If thou, LORD, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared." Psal.130:3-4. It's declared in the Gospel, that God in his love and grace will pardon and justify guilty sinners, through the blood and mediation of Christ, so it's proposed. Rom.3:23,24.

The assent of the mind hereunto as proposed in the promise of the Gospel, is the root of faith, the foundation of all that the soul does in believing; nor is there any evangelical faith without it, yet consider it abstractedly, as a mere act of the mind, the essence of faith does not consist solely therein.

This is accompanied in sincere believing, with an approbation of the way of deliverance and salvation proposed, &c. This assent and approbation causing the heart to rest upon Divine grace, wisdom and love, and apply itself thereto according to the mind of God, is the faith whereby we are justified; and concludes in it renunciation of all other ways and means of attaining righteousness, the consent of the will, acquiescence of the heart in God, trust and confidence, &c.

Peter Martyr says, faith is an assent, and that a firm assent unto the words of God; obtained not by reason or natural demonstration, but by the authority of the Speaker, and by the power of the Holy Ghost.

We must now declare what is the chiefest thing to which faith is directed, which is the promise of God whereto by believing we assent; and this promise is chiefly that wherein he promises that he will through Christ be favorable and merciful to us; and although there be many promises in Scripture are declared unto us, yet this one is the chiefest, for whose sake the rest are performed unto us, unto which all other promises are to be referred. The common object of faith is the Word of God, but the chiefest object is as is rehearsed. He proves it to be a firm assent from Acts 10:20, and yet he says it conflicts with many doubtings.

DEBATE X.

OF THE FREE PROCLAMATION OF CHRIST TO SINNERS, AND OF PREPARATORY QUALIFICATIONS.

Calvin. We have discoursed several points in our late meetings, I suppose you have had pretty good satisfaction in all material things you have charged Mr. Antinomian with for error, I hope you cannot charge him with more error.

Neonomian. But I can, I have a whole cargo yet behind; and this is one among the rest that he says. That Christ is offered to blasphemers, murderers, and the worst of sinners; that they remaining ignorant, unconvinced, unhumbled, and resolved in their purpose to continue such, they may be assured they have a full interest in Christ, and this by only concluding in their minds upon this assertion, that Christ is theirs.

Calvin. I hope he proclaims Christ to them then, in all his salvation as he is revealed in the Gospel, that he gave himself for us, to redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works. Tit.2:14. And if he does so, I know not why he may not proclaim Christ as such to the worst of men, I know no other way to make them better. But what were his words?

Neonomian. I need give no proof of it; it is a declared point, which he oft strives to prove, that all the elect are actually united to Christ, before they believe. But of this in our next discourse. He says, "is not unbelief a bar to have a part in Christ? A. It is a bar to hinder the manifestation of Christ in the Spirit, but it's not a bar to hinder one from having a part in Christ."

Antinomian. He leaves out part of the very sentence I spake, for I said, it is not a bar to hinder the manifestation of Christ in the Spirit on whom God does bestow. {A sinner being passive in the work of grace, God breaketh all those bars of brass, when Christ manifests himself in the spirit by converting grace; mark how my words refer plainly to God's act, and not to ours.} I proceeded thus, it is true, that you nor I can say by experience that Christ is our Christ, until we believe, as long as we continue in total unbelief, we cannot conclude to our own spirits that Christ is ours, but unbelief {mark my very words} is not simply a bar to the bestowing of Christ to such a person; he bestows him without any regard to belief or unbelief, {i.e., as a

reason of bestowing him;} if unbelief should be a bar to hinder Christ from being bestowed upon persons, where is the person upon whom Christ should be bestowed? There's no person under Heaven considered simply as ungodly, under the notion of ungodliness, but he is considered as an unbeliever.

Calvin. You must needs grant this to be true, that a sinful state is not a bar to the power of God in working grace upon the heart, he speaks altogether in respect of the act of God upon the soul, where he works, and nothing can let or hinder.

Neonomian. But he seems to insist on men's coming to Christ, and closing with him. He says, no consideration in the world can so aggravate a man's condition, would he make his condition as bad as the devils themselves; yet if there be but a coming, there can be no consideration, in the highest pitch of sinfulness for Christ to reject him.

Antinomian. I said, suppose a person be dead in trespasses and sins, Eph.2:1, &c. the lowliest person that can be imagined and continuing so to this very instant, now, before the Lord, without any change and alteration until now; by this text, "all that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." Jn.6:37. It appears so manifest, that if the Lord do but grant, and if the Lord has put a willingness and readiness of spirit into this man that Christ he would have, if it might appear he might have him; if his heart do but say, I would have him; all that sinfulness, though to this instant continued in, is no bar in the world; and after follows the words mentioned by him; after which I added, for you must know Christ is well acquainted with all the objections the heart of man, nay, the devils can make against the freeness of his grace, and life by him; to save a labour therefore, in this one passage, I will in no wise cast him out. Christ at once answers all the objections that could be made, and I dare be bold to maintain in the name and stead of Christ; let a person but say and lay down this for granted, come he would, Christ he would have rather than his life, let this be granted for a truth, {mark well these words, I speak not of a ludicrous, hypocritical say so,} I will be bold with Christ out of this passage to answer a thousand objections, I will in no wise cast him out, i.e., I will upon no consideration that can be imagined or conceived. I know the objections are very many and strong in respect of such a person to whom the Lord has given a willingness and desire of spirit to close with Christ, yet dare not do the thing; but let them be what they will, let me tell you, the Lord has sent me at this time to proclaim liberty to the captives, that are in this sad, bitter, and {to your own thinking} desperate condition; liberty God has given thee, and if thou wilt come freely, nothing in the world shall hinder thee.

Calvin. I profess, Mr. Neonomian, I wonder what kind of

Gospel you would have, that you call this error.

Neonomian. He says, whatever thou art, suppose a drunkard, a whore-master, a swearer, a blasphemer, a madman in iniquity; couldest thou but come to Christ, I say come, only come, it is no matter if there be no alteration in thee when thou dost come to Christ.

Antinomian. These words were in the same sermon, and before I spake the words above rehearsed, I only in all supposed that a sinner saw no alteration in himself till the time of the call to come to Christ; the drift of this discourse was principally to take off objections from such as willingly would come to Christ, and dare not. I showed there are two sorts of people that are given by the Father to Christ, who yet for the present do not actually come to him. 1. There are some elected indeed, but for the present are like wild asses on the mountains, snuffing up the wind; as desperate in iniquity as the very reprobates under heaven; and yet shall there not be rejection for these persons when they come, though for the present they scorn the grace of God. But there are a second sort given by God to Christ, that have not received Christ, and are not actually come to him, and yet for the present are wrought upon to be a willing people in some sort, i.e., the Lord has dealt thus far with them, fain they would close with Christ, fain they would conclude an interest and portion in Christ. Oh it would be welcome and life to them, &c., but they dare not set up their rest here, there is something or other must be removed before they can make this certain conclusion, Christ is their Christ; my principal errand at this time is to this people.

Neonomian. But coming or believing is no other in your judgment than an inward persuasion or concluding that Christ is ours; and this is not in order to an interest, but to our knowing; as it appears by those words.

Antinomian. Do I speak any otherwise than concluding this upon their coming; how often do I say couldest thou but come to Christ, and so I say again, can but a sinner, the vilest, but come to Christ, they may conclude that Christ will not cast them off? And you say that I intend by this coming nothing but an inward persuasion that Christ is mine; my words will not bear that sense, for I say all along, if thou come thou mayest conclude Christ is thine; is coming merely persuasion?

Neonomian. That is your meaning, you do not distinguish between coming to Christ, and knowing your portion in Christ. You say, I must tell you there's no better way to know your portion in Christ, than upon the general tender of the Gospel to conclude absolutely he is yours; say to yourselves, and let not this be contradicted, seeing Christ has reached out himself to sinners as sinners, my part is as good as any mans. Set down

thy rest here, question it not, but believe it; venture thy soul upon it, without seeking for further security. But some will say, he does not belong to me; why not to thee? He belongs to sinners as sinners; and if there be no worse than sinfulness, rebellion, and enmity in thee, he belongs to thee as well as to any in the world.

Antinomian. You may easily see how he puts upon me his own sense and meaning; you must know, gentlemen, that which he rehearses is in another discourse of mine, which was from Isaiah 42, where I speak to this enquiry, how shall I come to know that I am amongst the number of those sinners that shall not miscarry? Observe by the way, now we are speaking of knowing, whether Christ be my Christ or no, not simply of Christ's being ours, {where you have a flat denial of what he asserts to be my meaning,} but of Christ's manifestation and knowing him to be ours; and I show the direct way is to make a particular application of the general declaration of the Gospel by believing. I say, not that all believing and trusting on Christ is full assurance, but this I say, that the strongest and best assurance is confidently venturing all in believing on Christ, and receiving the salvation proclaimed to us by the free grace of God in the promise. The best way to be sure of a rich gift promised to me, {suppose by the King,} which I am amazed at, that so great a person should give me so great a treasure, and question whether he is sincere in it; I say, the best way to know whether he intends it for me or no, is humbly and thankfully to take it, and not to stand still and scruple whether it belongs to me or no, saying, surely he don't mean me, when it's to none but such persons that he gives it to. But I nowhere say, that murderers, &c., remaining in a purpose to be such, may conclude their interest in Christ. This is a false accusation.

Calvin. Let us hear, Mr. Neonomian, what is the truth in this matter, how you teach this doctrine of the gift of Christ.

Neonomian. The truth is this, Christ is freely offered to be Head and Saviour to the vilest sinners, who will knowingly assent to the truth of the Gospel, and from a conviction of their sin and misery out of Christ, are humbled, and truly renounce all their idols and sins; denying their carnal self, and merits, and accept of Christ as offered in the Gospel, relying on him alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life.

Antinomian. And you should add, when they see they can do all these things, then they should come to Christ, and not before; you reckon that a sinner is only invited to Christ for remission of sins, but not for repentance, and the sensible concomitants thereof, whereas his office is to give repentance too. And how do you mean? That Christ is offered to be Head and Saviour, do you mean mystical Head? Christ makes himself so to

every sinner, he works faith in them. If you mean King, as I suppose you do, that the first notion Christ announces himself to sinners under, is as King, and that's the first notion a sinner is to receive him under; it is not true, the whole current of the Gospel and common experience is against it. An earthly King will not offer himself as a King to a Rebel, but under the notion of pardon and forgiveness. Again, is not a knowing assent to the truth of the Gospel a higher degree of persuasion and assurance than I speak of in coming to Christ? If you intend truth of the Gospel as I do, and then it's proclaiming Christ as a Saviour to the vilest of sinners that will come to him, and saying to the vilest of sinners, that they should come to Christ, and he will in no wise cast them off; but if you look for sinners truly humbled, and truly renouncing their sins and righteousness, and in a readiness to receive Christ before set him forth as the Saviour of sinners, I know not when you will preach him thus, and they must cease to be vile sinners, and become holy out of Christ before he be is to be preached.

Neonomian. But observe that Christ is freely to be preached to the vilest of sinners, for their believing in him according to the Gospel.

Antinomian. So say we.

Neonomian. He is not to be preached thus, as if any sinner might have a saving interest in him, till they are willing to deny themselves, renounce all sins and idols, and do accept of, and rely on him as a full Saviour according to the terms of the Gospel.

Antinomian. And these I suppose are your terms, your moral qualifying conditions, so that the work must be pretty well over for mortification and vivification before Christ comes in, before a saving interest in Christ may be had; a sinner must not touch him, or the preacher so much as preach Christ to teach them the doctrine of self-denial, or to enable them through the beauty and excellency of his grace and love to renounce idols. Did you ever know any sinner renounce idols till he saw a ground and reason in Christ for it, and felt his power in the grace of the Gospel? The Spirit says, the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin; and accordingly the promise of Christ is, "then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh," Ezek.36:25-26, and you will have a vile filthy sinner to be washed first, and have his idols removed first, and exercise one of the highest virtues in the Christian religion, to deny himself, before he dare to come to Christ, or before any one must preach Christ to him; and if he be preached, it must be

upon the condition of these gigantean performances.

Neonomian. There cannot be an acceptance of Christ, without a renouncing sin and idols, and denying carnal self, and our own merits, as opposite to him; and on the other hands, to renounce sin and idols, and deny ourselves, will not avail us, without an acceptance of Christ, and reliance on him.

Antinomian. This is an old British way of arguing; because the preaching of Christ is accompanied with renouncing idols, &c., therefore he may not preach Christ as the Saviour of sinners till he has renounced idols, and denied himself, &c. Because a man has arms and legs, therefore a thing must have arms and legs before it be a man; or because a man is animal reasonable, therefore he must be animal reasonable before he is a man, and made a man afterwards. There is one and the same cause of renouncing sin and acceptance of Christ, and Christ is held forth in the Gospel to turn men from darkness to light, and the power of Satan unto God; and sinners are even the worst to be called to him, to come for all those ends and purposes, for destruction of sin and life of grace; and I tell you, there cannot be one of these sins mortified, or idol renounced, without faith in the blood of Christ, I say, before faith and acceptance of Christ.

Neonomian. I mention some things as antecedently necessary to our renouncing sin and idols, &c.

Antinomian. This you mean, antecedently necessary to know the true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent.

Neonomian. I mean knowledge, assent, conviction of sin and misery, &c., these are all preparatory qualifications; not that an interest in Christ always follows these, but they dispose the soul to a hearty acceptance of Christ, in opposition to all rival opposites, and are necessary thereto in some degree.

Antinomian. I cannot understand your meaning, unless this be it, that nature and grace differ only gradually, and that some men do grow up out of a natural condition by these degrees, and some do fall off and not come to it; first, there must be conviction of sin, and humbling, and then follows selfdenial, and renouncing idols; and then Christ comes in at last when he can be willing, and these previous qualifications must dispose the soul for Christ; this is Popery.

Neonomian. The declared design of the offers of Christ to sinners, is that they be thus willing to accept of Christ, and partake of an interest in him.

Antinomian. The declared design of preaching Christ, is not to tell them they must thus prepare themselves before Christ is of use to them; but that they come to Christ and receive of his grace, to furnish them with his Spirit, and all gracious effects and operations. It is the Spirit that convinceth of sin, and all saving convictions and humiliations, and renunciation of idols, are

included in repentance and mortification, which are the effects of the true grace of God in the heart, whereby faith is wrought; and that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ for righteousness and life, purifies the heart, and produceth repentance, love, compliance with the commands of Christ, and they are not grievous. You propound wrong methods for the curing diseased souls; this way will not do.

Neonomian. 1. You mistake me still, I will tell you where the difference is not. It is not whether there is in Christ a sufficiency of merit and grace to save the worst of sinners?

Antinomian. The question is, whether the grace and merit of Christ be not efficient in the saving the worst of sinners.

Neonomian. 2. Nor whether Christ is preached to the worst of sinners, if they will accept him on the terms of the Gospel?

Antinomian. But the question is, whether the sinner can accept of Christ on such terms, before Christ has wrought in them to will and do, and made them willing in the day of his power? And whether they ought not to be called to Christ, and to receive him in the Gospel proclamation, for the working this willingness by efficacious grace.

Neonomian. 3. Nor whether sinners are not often the objects of God's effectual calling, in order to an interest in Christ.

Antinomian. God's effectual call is an interest in Christ, and there's no effectual call can be before an interest in Christ, it's the putting the soul in actual possession of Christ, and the uniting it to Christ.

Neonomian. Nor whether there may not be knowledge, assent, convictions, humblings, and feigned resolves, and yet a soul fail of an interest in Christ, for want of true conversion, though they are hopeful signs?

Antinomian. But the question is, whether you ought to make common grace the federal condition of special, and tell souls that they cannot receive Christ in a way of special grace, till they have attained common grace out of Christ?

Neonomian. Nor whether the degrees of convictions and humblings are equal in all?

Antinomian. You should have told us whether you mean saving, or common; if they be saving, they are wrought as an effect of union to Christ; if common and out of Christ, it's no great matter what degree they are of, for there is nothing in an unregenerate man, though never so plausible, that gives him a disposition to a new heart, no more than one that's stone dead can have in himself a disposition to life; they that are in the graves of sin hear the voice of the Son of God and live; he quickens them that are dead. There is no medium between death and life.

Neonomian. Nor whether preparatory qualifications do merit true grace.

Antinomian. You should have told us what merit, conditional or unconditional; if you deny the word, you assert the thing. For a federal condition is a merit.

Neonomian. Yea, or whether faith or repentance do merit an interest in Christ? This I deny, and say, that their whole use depends on God's ordination.

Antinomian. I wonder that you will ground your denial upon such a weak reason; for would not Adam's merits have depended on God's ordination? And does not Christ's merits depend on God's ordination?

Neonomian. Nor whether a soul may neglect to accept of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King, because they feel not that degree of these humblings and convictions which they desire and expect.

Antinomian. But being you set them a digging in the rock of their own hearts for the pearl of great price, you should tell them how deep it lies, before they are likely to find it; for all these convictions and humblings are before they come at Christ; you put them upon hard service, unless you tell them when they are convinced enough, and humbled enough; and why do you use the word neglect, for as long as they are upon the work you assign them, they wait for you to preach Christ to them, and you tell them it's better to stay longer, and there's reason for it, according to your hypothesis; if some degrees of humblings must be had to fit them for Christ, then more degrees will make them more fit.

Neonomian. Nor whether these preparatory qualifications be the work of the Spirit by providential mercy. This I affirm.

Antinomian. So then they may dig, and not find the mine, and spend all their days in God's providential mercy, and never find spiritual grace; now here you fully declare yourself that common grace is the condition of special grace. What a work is here with conditions?

Neonomian. Nor whether their immediate influence {I mean of preparatory qualifications} be to prepare the soul for a true acceptance, which it is hereby less averse to, and more disposed for. This I affirm.

Antinomian. I know not what sense to put upon this but the Papists congruity; and that common grace is a degree, or a qualifying condition of saving grace, and that common and special differ not specifically, but gradually only, which to me is gross divinity. Certainly it is the common and received opinion of the schools, that with the help of the first preventing grace, we may obtain further helps by acting and endeavoring; yea, the

first habitual, justifying grace, and in some measure deserve it because of personal fitness, i.e., of meetness, fitness, and aptitude, and it's the common opinion of all the doctors, as to after-helps in respect of the first grace, and as Abraham Sancta Clara tells us, {who takes Scotus's judgment instead of all as the best,} "repentance is a mere disposition to habitual grace."

And amongst such as he quotes for his opinion, he brings in the 13th Article of the Church of England, which he would wrest to his sense; that although works before the faith of Christ, or the first actual grace, are excluded as meritorious by the said Article; yet he says, "other works {according to this Article} done as fruits of faith, may in some measure dispose, and deserve justifying grace," which opinion he would make Augustine to be of. And whereas it's said in the said Article, "we doubt not but they have the nature of sin," he would palliate it thus, saying, "they say not that such are simply sins, but do partake of sin, which without all doubt is a term of diminution, {i.e., the word rather,} or else they would have said that they were sins without restriction. You see what Jesuitical evasions here are to establish your qualifications, which you and the Papists are so fond of; whereas these first Reforming Protestants say: XIII. Of Works before Justification. "Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or {as the School-authors say} deserve grace of congruity; yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin." Yet you will say, they prepare for true acceptance, and make the soul less averse, and more disposed to it; whereas the quite contrary mostly appears, that those that become merely moral, and leave off the practice of some gross sins, and do some good works, from that principle are usually the most averse, and least disposed to the grace of God of the two.

Neonomian. I shall show you wherein the real difference is, whether coming to Christ is an inward persuasion that Christ is mine. This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. You abuse me in charging me with speaking what you would fasten upon me, for I spake distinctly of these two things; first of coming to Christ, and then of knowing that Christ is mine by my being come to him; but yet I say that this coming to Christ ought to be by a particular persuasion that Christ is preached to me as a sinner, freely preached to me without any consideration of any qualification, and this persuasion every believer has less or more. Dr. Twisse distinguishes between faith in Christ, and faith concerning Christ being ours; the first is this, coming to Christ for life, the other,

our persuasion and sweet sense of the love of God in Christ.

Neonomian. Whether Christ is preached to sinners, with a design that they may conclude they have a saving interest in him, before they are regenerated by the Spirit, and savingly believe.

Antinomian. The design of preaching Christ to sinners, is that they may receive the message concerning Christ freely and immediately; and that when they are brought to Christ, they should know this faith was not of themselves, or did spring out of any natural or moral qualification, but from Christ the author of it, and from their union to Christ Jesus, which I take to be a saving part in him, and that they cannot believe without a saving part in Jesus Christ before they believe. He having blessed us with all spiritual blessings in Christ, of which faith is none of the least. And Dr. Twisse says, faith being one proper effect only of a saving interest, though not claimable by them till they believe, &c., the righteousness of Christ as it is Christ's, and performed by him, so it's ours as wrought for us, even before faith, as meritorious of efficacious grace for the working of that faith, for if without Christ they can do nothing, then they cannot believe without part in him, and the Covenant promise gives a part before that receiving him, in giving Christ; for the gift of Christ must be by nature before we can receive him.

Neonomian. Whether the soul of a sinner as to its habitual disposition and purpose, is under the reigning power of enmity, rebellion and filthiness, till after he has a saving interest in Christ. This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. I do affirm that a sinner has no habitual disposition or true purpose of heart for God, and is under the power of enmity, &c., till he has a saving faith. Here you will have a sinner free from dominion of sin, before he is under the dominion of grace; the heart changed and sin mortified without saving interest in Christ, he must be sanctified before Christ is justification or sanctification to him. This is strange doctrine!

Neonomian. Whether some degrees of conviction, and humiliation of soul be necessary prerequisites to the souls true acceptance of Christ for pardon. I affirm this, and you deny it.

Antinomian. We have told you, what Protestants long since say, that no antecedent qualities before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are pleasing to God, or make men meet to receive grace; but all such are sins, the rather, because they are not done as God wills, for effectual vocation is by an interest in Christ; therefore it's vain and frivolous to talk that those things are prerequisites that are the thing itself.

Neonomian. I shall only prove the truth as contained in the third and fourth question. 1. That the soul of a sinner, as to its habitual disposition and power, is not under the reigning

power of enmity, rebellion and filthiness, till after it has a saving interest in Christ. 2. Effectual vocation makes this change in the habitual disposition of the heart, and this vocation is necessary to our interest in Christ.

Antinomian. What is it that you would prove? That which you are to prove is this, that the habitual disposition of the soul is changed, as to the dominion of sin, and as to the filthiness thereof, before a saving interest in Christ; and now you shift the terms, and after you have been speaking all this while of preparatory works, how we must be humbled, have selfdenial, and cast off all our idols, before we have an interest in Christ; now you shuffle your cards, and say, the soul is not continued under the reigning power of enmity, &c., till after his interest in Christ. Doth not any man that has half an eye see this juggle? And forsooth you'll prove that this disposition of habitual and reigning enmity does not remain till after our interest in Christ; why? Because it's taken away in our saving interest in Christ. Is not this shifting and shuffling? That all this while you make such a noise and vapor of what we have before we come to Christ; it's nothing else but what we have by virtue of an interest in Christ. And your argument should run thus, if effectual calling makes this change in the habitual disposition of the heart, and is necessary antecedaneously to our interest in Christ, then this enmity, rebellion and filthiness is taken away before our interest in Christ; ergo, we deny the consequence, for this reason, because the reigning power of sin has its first blow in our effectual calling, and then, and not before, we are beginning to be made holy, and this effectual calling is our interest in Christ; sin shall not have dominion over us, because we are under grace; Christ is made to us sanctification, and we are sanctified in Christ, &c. And now you shift your hands and say, we do not lie under this enmity till after our saving interest; and good reason, because Christ has slain the enmity upon the cross, and the doctrine of reconciliation being received by faith in our effectual calling, the enmity is slain there also; the new man put on, we are created in Christ Jesus to good works, and the depraved disposition and habit changed, and now what you go about to conclude; is so far from the question, that it is against you; for you say that this disposition is altered in effectual vocation, and there can be no true coming to Christ for pardon, and especially for sanctification, without that purpose; whence it appears, that effectual vocation must be before saving faith in Christ, and that therein the reigning power of sin must be slain before justifying faith, or any sanctifying grace, that is the fruit of it.

Neonomian. The Confessions are for me, for they both say, that this call lies in enlightening the minds spiritually, taking away the heart of stone, giving a heart of flesh, &c.

Antinomian. I pray take their words together; they say, all those whom God has predestinated unto life, and those only, mark the words, I know you cannot swallow all this article without kicking, he is pleased in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by his Word and Spirit, {is not this to give them saving interest in Christ,} out of that state of sin and death, {is not this the habitual purpose and disposition of the heart under the reigning power of enmity, rebellion and filthiness,} in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ, enlightening their minds savingly, taking away the heart of stone, giving a heart of flesh, &c. And now you would argue, because this habitual disposition, enmity and reigning power of sin is taken away in and by our saving interest in Christ; therefore it's done before our saving interest; and because that would look so grossly absurd, you say therefore, it does not remain till after our interest in Christ. I pray gentlemen judge, whether this be not either very foul play, or from gross ignorance of the rules of right reasoning?

Neonomian. How inconsistent with vocation, regeneration and conversion, are hearts of such vile disposition.

Antinomian. Death and life, darkness and light are inconsistent, they are negatives; a natural estate and effectual calling are such, because this takes that out of one state into another in an instant, by uniting them to Christ, they thereby pass from darkness to light, from death to life; and the passage from death is the passage into life; it's our death unto sin, and life unto God through Jesus Christ. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom.6:11. And being made free from sin, you became servants of righteousness. Rom.6:18,22.

Neonomian. That cannot be a true faith and acceptance, that consists with such vile dispositions, &c.

Antinomian. True, but are not such vile dispositions changed in the new creation? The taking away the heart of stone, and giving a heart of flesh, is at once; and one thing is the corruption of another, and faith is now in the new heart, yea, the very essence of it.

Neonomian. Can he be said to accept of Christ, who, as you say, has a knife in his hand, and thoughts in his heart to murder Christ, and yet without so much as laying down his arms?

Antinomian. I wish you have not thoughts in your heart, and a knife in your hand, not only to wound my ministry but the doctrine of free-grace, for you show such an inveterate spirit against both. Gentlemen, speaking from that text, Jn.6:37, and endeavoring to remove objections from poor distressed souls that dare not come to Christ, because of a deep sense of their filthiness and loathsomeness, and that are always aggravating

their condition under the saddest and most dreadful consideration. You will say, for all this high aggravation of loathsomeness and sinfulness, my case is worse than all this you speak of; therefore there is something in my condition, that if I come to Christ he must cast me off. {Mark, gentlemen, these are the bitter complaints of a poor distressed soul against himself, set on by temptation, to keep him from Jesus Christ.} Besides positive filthiness, I am a rebel, a sturdy enemy; I fight against God, I quarrel with God, and take up arms against him. I endeavour to remove this objection thus, imagine your condition is a condition of as great madness and enmity against God as you can devise, {as always it is looked upon to be by one labouring under a wounded conscience, in whom sin is revived by the law; the remedy that I advise, is, to bring this poor broken-hearted creature to Christ to be bound up, I go on and say,} sure you will say, if I be such an enemy, I must lay down my arms before Christ will have to do with me, or admit me to come to him. Will a King let a cut-throat traitor, while he has thoughts in his heart to murder him; will he let him come with a naked knife into his presence, and graciously embrace him in his arms? For answer, still see the close of the text.

Observe, that if this be true, that in respect of this rebelliousness in thy spirit against God, thou say, if I come to Christ, he will cast me off. This word, in no wise, cannot be true. Do you think it was out of the thoughts of Christ, viz., our enmity and rebellion? And if he thought of it, do you not think he would not have put it in to clear up this truth? Look into Psal.68:18, and Rom.5:6-8. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them." Psal.68:18. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom.5:6-8.

Now observe what I say, I do not speak this to the intent that any should conceive, that God leaves persons rebellious, vile and loathsome as he does find them when he closes with them, but I say that time when the Lord closes with them, it's a state of rebellion; and if thou come to Christ in this condition, it manifestly shall appear to thee, that he will open his bosom for thy head to rest upon; as well as for the righteousest saint in the world; so Christ compels every one that thirsts to come and drink of the water of life freely.

Calvin. I would fain know, Mr. Neonomian, what you would say to a distressed soul in such a condition, that would not only liken himself to a murderer or a cut-throat traitor, but will

give you an instance that he is so even at this very time; he has continually horrid blasphemous thoughts of God, yea, atheistical, and such as is a horror to mention. He will tell you what a sink of vileness and hypocrisy he is in upon all respects, what would you tell him? Indeed here's the skill of a divine.

Neonomian. Tell him, I would tell him he must be humbled for those sins, and he must cast out these filthy thoughts, and that he must pray and hear the Word, and watch over his heart, and resist Satan; and indeed must get rid of this enmity that is in his heart, and this rebellion, and then he may come to Christ for pardon.

Calvin. Ay, but I can do none of these; my proud heart will not be humbled, my filthy thoughts will remain, I cannot love God, nay, I cannot pray, and the Word of God is a terror unto me; I fly from the Law; and as for the Gospel I dare not come at it, God is a terror to me.

Neonomian. I would tell him, such a vile heart, corrupt affections, blasphemous thoughts, are inconsistent with vocation, regeneration, conversion; I would tell him he can't have true faith or acceptance with Christ, which consists with such vile dispositions, and is void of a purpose to be otherwise.

Calvin. And would you not think meet to compel this poor soul to come to Jesus Christ in this sad condition?

Neonomian. No indeed, that I would not, in that miserable pickle.

Calvin. What would you do with him?

Neonomian. I would tell him, he has a proud heart which God is humbling, his lusts must be mortified, he must bear the indignation of the Lord; God will shine in upon you in his due time when you are fit for it, and your sins be purged; in the mean time you must wait.

Calvin. But may not a man speak to such a one, of help being laid upon one that's mighty to save?

Neonomian. Take heed of being too bold there. If Christ be mentioned it must but be as King and Law-giver; if you be too busy in talking of Christ as Priest and Sacrifice, and of laying his sins on Christ, it may prove such a narcotic to him as may cast him into the contrary extreme of carnal security, and presumption that his condition is better than it is.

Calvin. Do you deal thus always with distressed afflicted souls, when they come to you for advice?

Neonomian. No, not always in private conference, but in the pulpit this way must be taken, or else you'll have a company of vile loathsome sinners growing too saucy upon the doctrine of grace and the promise.

Calvin. And yet here your ministry is very successful; you receive many members I suppose, you have to deal with

great variety of cases.

Neonomian. I do not trouble myself with that way of experiences, I know no rule for that, I ask them whether they have been humbled, and whether they are sincere in taking Christ as their Lord; and I tell them now, God accepts sincerity and imperfect duties as the condition of the Covenant of Grace; and I find this way succeeds very well, and I hope to make it take throughout the City, and extirpate those Antinomian principles, and Congregational too.

Calvin. Indeed Mr. Neonomian, I must take my liberty to dissent altogether from you in your method with, and cure of distressed consciences; it was not the way formerly. I am for bringing such a poor loathsome polluted creature to the Fountain set open for sin and uncleanness, &c., and not say he must be washed first.

Neonomian. Can we thus marry Christ? What a carnal, selfish thing is believing? A mere using Christ for our own safety in our abominations, which we resolve shall rule over us without one desire to be rid of them.

Calvin. Do you think there will be any fellowship between Christ and Belial? One must be gone. When Christ comes in unto the heart, he binds the strong man armed, and spoils him of his goods. I am sorry to hear you banter a poor sinner's believing in Christ, under the sense of the vileness and sinfulness of his disposition, and the enmity of his heart; or that you should suppose, or suggest to the world, that there is any way under Heaven to change the heart and disposition savingly, or heal the conscience, but by bringing a poor creature to Jesus Christ, and him crucified, and saying to him, believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved. There is pardon, forgiveness, cleansing, in the blood of Christ, therefore the course that I take always, is to endeavour to set the Lord Jesus Christ in all his fulness before an awakened sinner; and if he be yet secure, and going on in his evil ways, I bring him as near to Christ as I can; I endeavour to convince him that he sins against Christ as well as the Law, the precious blood of Christ that was shed for sinners; I do what I can to bring him to Christ to be taught, to be compelled, overcome by the sweetness and amiableness of Jesus Christ, and let him know the danger if he persist obstinate.

Neonomian. But some degrees of convictions and humiliations of soul are necessary prerequisites to the souls acceptation of Christ for pardon, weary and heavy laden that Christ invites, Matt.11:28, who came not to call the righteous, {i.e., conceited and secure,} but sinners to repentance. Lk.5:31-32. They in Acts 2:37, were pricked to the heart; the jailer felt some humbling concern. Acts 16:30. Paul knew what this trembling was; so Zacheus and the Prodigal. Lk.15:14-15.

Calvin. All his humblings, prickings, weariness, awakenings, were by the power of Gospel grace, and by the preaching of Jesus Christ. Christ's ministry is enough with his power to save souls; he needs no prerequisites. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, therewith he wounds, and therewith he makes whole; Christ makes weary, and gives rest; he convinceth sinners, and gives repentance; the preaching Christ Crucified pricked those converts to the heart, and healed those wounds. It was the same hand of grace that awakened the jailer, and when he had a knife in his hand even to murder Christ in his members; and when he saw that was wrenched out of his hand, took a knife to murder himself; in the height of that desperate villainy, he was commanded to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and he should be saved. The case plainly is this, that Jesus Christ himself, the minister of the true sanctuary, and the preaching of him, is the only and sufficient remedy to change and save the worst of sinners through the effectual working of the Spirit; the order and method is various, it's as the Spirit listeth, we are not to prescribe any methods or measures of humblings, much less to say such and such moral virtues or duties are necessary prerequisites and qualifications before a sinner comes to Christ. The Apostle Paul said, that he determined to know nothing, i.e., {so as to preach,} among them, but Jesus Christ and him crucified. I Cor.2:2. I am for working humiliations by setting Christ before the most refractory sinners for all salvation; true mourning and humiliation proceeds from looking on him whom a poor sinner has pierced, I am for the bringing of the most leprous sinner, {I cannot engage he will come,} to wash in this spiritual Jordan, though I find you are rather for washing off his leprosy first in the rivers of Abana and Pharpar Rivers of Damascus.

Neonomian. I am not for bringing such foul filthy sinners to Jesus Christ, it sounds very ill in the ear, to say Christ saves murderers, adulterers, persecutors, &c., and to compel them to come to Christ reeking in their sins, and under the reigning enmity of their hearts; it's fit that they should be civilized first, and this wicked, profligate disposition removed, and that they have new hearts before they come to Christ; for I tell you Christ will not pardon them else.

Antinomian. You mistake the whole sense of the Gospel, or will not understand it, that you may seem to have a plausible pretense to oppose it. When sinners are summoned to come to Christ, it's not merely under the notion of pardon, but of all salvation; Christ is proclaimed in all his fulness of grace and truth, and the sinner is called to come unto him, as having given himself for us, to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works. A sinner is by

the Gospel called to Christ in all states of his unregeneracy, whether openly profane, or morally virtuous; one is as easily saved by Christ as the other; the former ordinarily sooner, easier converted seemingly than the latter; neither is the latter better qualified and fitted for the grace of God than the other. That place quoted by you, I Cor.14:24-25, is a clear proof how the Word of God's grace works these true convictions in the saving work, and that your humblings in the state of unregeneracy are no necessary prerequisites to the grace of God.

Neonomian. I will discover your mistakes in these things. Because they that truly come to Christ shall have an interest in Christ, therefore he thinks whosoever can persuade himself that he has an interest in Christ does come to him.

Antinomian. It would have been well if it had been my happiness to have attained to your degree of learning, and had so great a capacity for it as you, that I might not have fallen under so gross mistakes. I confess it's pity a Doctor should be so silly a John-an-Oaks as you represent me. But what shall I say to it? It's not every man's portion to be learned or wise, only there's one proverb I remember that is some satisfaction to an empty skull, "it is not given to everyone in Corinth to appeal." But methinks you mistake about my thoughts, if I have wit enough to tell my own thoughts. It is strange I should be so stupid, as to believe that I have when I have not, and to call that persuasion my having, I spake of having Christ by coming to Christ, and then of our knowing that we have Christ. If you will examine what I think, I will tell you, I think coming to Christ is by believing and appropriating Christ, and what is generally delivered of him and by him unto myself; if it be by way of promise or command; and that this believing is such persuasion of the goodness and truth of Christ and his Gospel salvation, that it carries me forth to rest and stay myself confidently thereon, and that I can persuade myself of the truth of my faith from its act on its proper object, and by the several fruits that it does produce.

Neonomian. Because sometimes the worst of sinners are made subjects of preparatory work, and of effectual calling as God's act on them, therefore he thinks, that these sinners are invited to conclude they have an interest in Christ, before they do at all answer that Call.

Antinomian. You intimate as if you thought some sinners were more capable subjects of effectual calling as to God's act than others, and that there's a preparatory work distinct from God's act in effectual calling, which I do not think. Besides, I think God's act in effectual calling upon a sinner, is more than a bare invitation, and I do not think or say, that any man concludes their personal interest in Christ because they are

invited, but because being invited they did come; therefore not before they answer the call by coming.

Neonomian. But his greatest cause of mistake is, that he thinks the worst of sinners, if elect, have as much interest in Christ as the greatest saint.

Antinomian. May you be so bewildered for your thoughts, when you make it appear that I think so, by what I have spoken, I will answer to it, and your sarcastic inference therefrom.

Neonomian. You may see the Large Catechism. Question: What is justifying faith? They tell us, that a sinner is convinced of sin and misery who receiveth Christ.

Antinomian. But they tell us that that conviction which is saving comes by saving faith, their words are, justifying faith is a saving grace wrought in the heart of a sinner by the Spirit and Word of God, whereby he being convinced of his sin and misery, and of disability in himself and other creatures to recover him out of his lost condition, not only ascendeth to the truth of the promise of the Gospel, but receiveth and resteth upon Christ and his righteousness, &c., and in the Shorter Catechism you may see a more particular account of saving convictions, that they are wrought in effectual calling, though they be not so properly of the nature of justifying faith; for they say, effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit, whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds, &c. He does persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely set forth to us in the Gospel. You see conviction and illumination are both the saving works of the Spirit. And in the Confession they'll tell you, that saving faith is of a larger extent as to the object it acts upon, than merely justifying, saving faith; it convinceth, it enlightens, it justifies, it sanctifies, and in this sense they tell you the nature of saving faith, chapter 14, whereby they are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, and by this faith a Christian is enabled to believe to be true whatever is revealed in the Word, and from thence comes trembling at the Word, and embracing the promises of life, &c. So that this contradicts not, but confirms the doctrine of the 39 Articles, that all works before faith, even legal convictions, are no more than sin; its but the filthy conscience-polluting guilt of sin, which thousands have, and which do not dispose the sinner to love God, but to hate him; nor to seek pardon, but to seek out a righteousness of his own.

Neonomian. Dr. Owen tells us, "there is nothing in the whole doctrine that I will more firmly adhere to, than the necessity of convictions previous to true believing."

Antinomian. If he means believing savingly, he must mean a thing that is absolutely necessary, not as a preparatory virtue; but as sin is previous to pardon, and thereby guilt also,

whereby sin pollutes the conscience, and is both sin and misery; and this may arise from a mere natural stirring of the law, or by the preaching of it, which is the death of sin, the wrath and curse that attends it; and this may and must arise from a common faith; for a man is not convinced of anything that he believes not. But if he means saving convictions, they are good fruits, and wrought in saving faith. This he intends here, for he said just before, let no man think to understand the Gospel, who knows nothing of the Law. God's constitution, and the nature of things themselves, have given the law the precedency with respect unto sinners; for by the law is the knowledge of sin, and Gospel faith is the souls acting according to the mind of God, for deliverance from that state and condition which it is cast under by the law; and he supposeth the state of a man under mere legal conviction to be a state of death and condemnation.

Neonomian. He says, displicency, sorrow, fear, a desire of deliverance, with other necessary effects of true conviction.

Antinomian. True convictions, i.e., saving, have such effects; but observe, he is there distinguishing between common convictions, which before faith are the common condition of sinners more or less, which is the death they lie under. He says, temporary faith and legal conviction are the principles of all works or duties in religion antecedent unto justification, {observe now what he says,} which therefore we must deny to have in them any causality thereof; and so he proceeds to show what affections and duties in religion may follow thence; not that they are Gospel virtues, but rather glittering sins, and they, I say, are so far from disposing the natural man to justification by grace, that they dispose him rather to seek justification in himself by the works of the law, till the law comes to be preached in true spirituality in the Gospel, and received by faith. And he says, that Reformation of life, and these things are where real convictions are; but yet it must be said, that they are neither severally nor jointly, though in the highest degree, either necessary dispositions, preparations previous, congruities in a way of merit, or conditions of our justification. Now is not this a marvellous measure of presumption, and palpable design upon your reader to take the imperfect sense of a man's discourse to justify your errors, when you must needs see, the said discourse is point blank against you; I'll hear no more therefore of your allegations in this point out of Dr. Owen.

Neonomian. Mr. Norton also speaks of preparatory works between the carnal rest of the soul in a state of sin and effectual vocation.

Antinomian. I know of no such middle state, for there is but two states, that of death, and that of life; that of light, and that of darkness; but the works done before conversion he tells

you, are called preparatory by way of mere order, which he says all the Orthodox assert; for that which is plainly first in order and nature must be said to be so; all the sin and wickedness, as well as the common graces and religion, performed by an unregenerate man, are all antecedent to his regenerate state. But says Mr. Norton, it's contrary to the Scriptures to say they are preparatory, by way of causation, merit and congruity, {i.e., by disposing, fitting, and making men the fitter for effectual grace, as you say,} as asserted by the Papists and Arminians.

DEBATE XI

OF UNION WITH CHRIST BEFORE FAITH

Neonomian. Another error of his is, that all the elect are actually united to Christ, before they have the Spirit of Christ, or at all believe in him, even before they are born; yea, and against their own will.

Antinomian. Your terms are all ambiguous, you seldom use a word of two or three syllables, but you'll have him twofaced like Janus; I pray produce your proof, and I shall see which way you look most.

Neonomian. The title of a sermon of yours is, Christ ours before Gracious Qualifications.

Antinomian. I own such a sermon, from Isaiah 53:6, and the design of it was to answer this query, how I may be assured my part lies here, that my sins were laid on Christ. The Apostle speaks of full assurance of faith, and of coming to the throne of grace with boldness, herein I showed that it may be found out as the Lord has chalked it out, in his grace and grant; not only when the Lord is pleased to hold out his grace and grant to a man, but also upon those terms that he holds it out on, such as the terms of God are, or conditions, if you will call them so. Sure I am; as the conditions are, by which they may claim interest in Christ; those conditions being granted and found, the soul may close with the grace of God; now all the difficulty lies in this, whether the Lord propounds to men, that there shall be no part in Christ, nor grace by him till they find their spirits, souls and bodies sanctified throughout, or whether the Lord holds out the grant of pardon of sin without those previous qualifications. And I say, that the grace of laying iniquity upon Christ is applicable by forgiveness of sins to persons before there be ever the least measure of sanctification in works; and being applied

by the Lord's own grant, there may be safety and security in applying the same by faith, without regard to sanctification in any measure. That is, in respect of making trial thereby, I seeing yet no sanctification in works to try by; it's certain such pardon is to be had, and that the grace of forgiveness is applicable before works, or a person capable of doing them, as to elect infants, and to the dying thief, and has the same place in every elect person that does believe; forgiveness is applied to him before he can exert any of the working fruits of faith, and being applied to him by God's grant, it may be applied to himself by believing; but because you insist on nothing in this sermon that you particularly express, I say no more of it now.

Neonomian. Sure you intend only to exclude works, and not faith.

Antinomian. I do not exclude works from a ground of assurance, for I own when the conditions are granted and found, {i.e., the fruits of the Spirit in the heart,} the soul may close with the grace of God by way of assurance; but I say also, there may be an assurance of faith without particular respect to the said works; I say not that works evidence not, but that there is an evidence besides.

Neonomian. No, you tell us of dangerous consequences that must follow on if persons are not united to Christ, and partake not of justification before they believe; and addeth, there is not, I say, such a thing as a uniting or knitting power in faith, as that faith does or should become an instrument to unite a soul to Christ.

Antinomian. My discourse was from I Jn.2:1-2, and the main design of my discourse there is to prove, that faith is the fruit of our union to Christ. I showed that Christ himself frames and creates that very faith in persons that come to him, uniting them as members first to him their head. I showed that a branch must have union with the root before it can bring forth fruit. Christ is the Vine, we the branches, faith part of the fruit. Communion is a fruit of union; faith is a grace of communion. Suppose that the life spoken of is not in persons till they believe it is, but this, that there is no activeness of the life of Christ in the person that is elected, his life is in Christ, and was in Christ, and reserved in Christ till the time of believing, for him; and then does the elect person become active in life, when Christ does give him to believe actually. But to say that this believing should give the first being of that life that should be in persons, is to say, there is not that life of the elect persons in Christ before they do believe; if this be maintained, that there is no justification at all belonging to elect persons, till they do actually believe in Christ, or faith be the instrument by which they are first united, dangerous consequences must needs follow. 1. That

in some respect there will be a bringing to life again the Covenant of works, do this and live, viz., for persons to do that they may live; but the Covenant of Grace, gives life first, and from life comes doing, &c. But the words you refer to, page 616, for they are not there, nor do I find them elsewhere.

Neonomian. He denies the presence of faith, to this end he spends much time to prove that Christ is ours before we come to him, and that our not coming unto him does not import a state of disunion with Christ.

Antinomian. I said, let us suppose the coming in this place is spoken of believing, ye will not come to me that you might have life; it cannot follow, that although there be no life till believing, therefore there can be no union till believing. I say, if it possibly might be imagined, that there may not be life from Christ till believing, yet it follows not that there must be believing before this union; suppose, I say, that there cannot be life before there be believing, yet there must be union before there can be life fetched from Christ, faith being the fruit born, as aforesaid.

Neonomian. He says, you may as soon conceive, that a man is able to see whilst he has no head, as think a man can have spiritual eyes; whether the eye of faith to behold Christ, or the eye of mourning to lament one's wickedness, before there be actually the presence and conjunction of Christ the head to such a body.

Antinomian. I say so, and will stand to it.

Calvin. I wonder you should find fault with that divinity, or note down that expression for an error; you cannot suppose that there can be any living act performed without life, as the cause of it, which life must be our union to Christ, which according to the most orthodox is, and must be before faith itself at least.

Neonomian. He says, we partake of the Spirit by virtue of this union.

Calvin. Yes, how should members partake of the Spirit and life that is in the Head, but by virtue of this union, and yet the Spirit unites. A branch engrafted partakes of the spirits of the root by virtue of a union, and the spirits unite and knit it.

Neonomian. He says, God did not only decree to put such qualifications into them; but I say further, that God gives actual possession of this Christ, and that Christ takes possession of that person before there be any qualifications.

Calvin. I doubt not but Christ takes actual possession of us before we have any holy qualifications, but as to our actual possession of Christ, it's better expressed that we have it by faith; although where there is possession there is relation and correlation.

Neonomian. The question is not, whether God has

decreed the union of the elect, nor whether this union is agreed in the Covenant of Redemption?

Antinomian. But it is, whether the elect have not a union of federal relation in the Covenant, as you call of redemption, as being a seed in him, and covenanted with in him, and he as a common person representing them, and undoubtedly is that root or head out of which all his elect seed or members do spring.

Neonomian. Nor is it any question, whether Christ's giving us the Spirit of grace does begin this union, and the Spirit given in order to saving operations produceth this faith whereby the union is consummated?

Calvin. Well, well, if you own so much, what do you make a controversy of this point; it seems you acknowledge the union is begun with Christ giving his Spirit in order to saving operations, only you say it's consummated by our active cleaving unto Christ by believing, and he does as good as say as much; he says, there is no activeness of this life of Christ in the elect, till they do believe, and in this sense he will say the elect are not united, viz., by faith till they do believe; as for his notion of the elect being in Christ before calling, it has been discoursed already, and let's not fetch things over again.

Antinomian. There is a passive recipiency, and there is an active recipiency; there is a passive receiving of Christ, and that is, so that Christ is received without any hands; but in an active receiving of him, he is not received without hands. This passive receiving of Christ is just such a receiving of him, as when a froward patient takes a purge, or some bitter physick; he shuts his teeth against it, but the physician forces his mouth open, and pours it in down his throat, and so it works against his will by the over-ruling power of one over him.

Neonomian. For my part I like not such similitudes, and it insinuates that men are said to receive Christ against their wills. And he said too, that our first coming to Christ, is as a coach is said to come to town, when it is drawn to town.

Calvin. You know his meaning by those similes, and they are not to run on four feet; it's enough they serve to illustrate that part of truth which they are used for. Mr. Antinomian means as you do as to man's will. There's nothing more contrary to a rebellious carnal man, than the grace of God; their hearts are full of enmity and hatred to God and truth; but yet he shows you often that God gives gifts to the rebellious. And here you see how he gives it, and what he gives; it may be he binds them with the cords of afflictions, and opens their eyes to see their undone condition, pours into their consciences whole potions of the guilt of sin, and the laws condemnation, whereby as undone creatures, through grace they become willing and ready to

receive Christ, and he becomes precious to them by the same hand of his Spirit. If you should pick up odd similes out of sermons, which it may be has done good, and God has blessed, you may expose many a good man's labours. See holy Cranmer, and I think such were those of famous Mr. Rogers of Dedham; and consider how the Spirit of God purposes that the preaching Christ to be foolishness to the world; therefore be very wary how you despise, reproach or ridicule in these cases, lest in striking pretendedly at men and their weakness, you happen to give a slant blow at the Spirit of God, for he tells you there is such a kind of reciprocity of Christ, as he instances in Ephraim. "I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself thus; thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke; turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art the LORD my God. Surely after that I was turned, I repented; and after that I was instructed, I smote upon my thigh; I was ashamed, yea, even confounded, because I did bear the reproach of my youth." Jer.31:18-19. And in the like dialect Elihu speaks to Job, "if they be bound in fetters, and be holden in cords of affliction; then he sheweth them their work, and their transgressions that they have exceeded." Job 36:8-9. And in the metaphor of a coach or chariot, the Spirit of God speaks in the sacred Scripture; and the Church says to Christ, "draw me, and I shall run after thee."

Neonomian. The real difference is. 1. Whether the elect are actually united to Christ before they are born? 2. Whether the elect are united to Christ till they are effectually called, and truly believe?

Antinomian. That though there be not an active union on our parts but by faith, so that it can't be said properly to be a conjugal union by mutual consent of parties, yet there is a relative union, such as between Father and child, where the child gives not consent to this relation; he is wholly passive in being brought into it. God from eternity constituted and ordained Christ and all the elect, to be as it were one body, one lump, wherein Christ is the head, and they the members; Christ the root, and they the branches. They are given to Christ, John 17, to be in Christ, Ephesians 1, being they are called his seed, before they are called, John 10, his seed. "Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death, and he was numbered with

the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." Isa.53:10-12. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Heb.2:14. He that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified; and by virtue of this union it is that the obedience and satisfaction of Christ descends particularly unto them, and not to the rest of mankind.

Calvin. The learned Mr. Rutherford, has as follows, the faith by which as by an instrument we are justified, presupposes three unions, and maketh a fourth union. It presupposes a natural, legal, federal union. 1. Natural, that Christ and we are not only both mankind, for Christ, and Pharaoh, and Judas, are one species and nature, true men, but one in brotherhood, he assuming the nature of man with a special eye to Abraham, Heb.2:16, i.e., to the elect and believers; for with them he is bone of their bone, and is not ashamed to call them brethren. Heb.2:11-12. "I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee." Psal.22:22.

2. It presupposes a legal union between Christ and them that God made; the debtor and surety one in law, and the sum one, so far as he laid our debts on Christ. "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa.53:6. "And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." II Cor.6:18.

3. It presupposes an union federal, God making Christ our Surety; and to assume not only our nature in a personal union, but also our state, condition, and made our cause his cause, our sins his sins; not to defend them, but to suffer punishment for them, and our faith makes the fourth union betwixt Christ and us, whether natural, as betwixt head and members, the branches and vine-tree; or mystical, as that of the spouse and beloved wife; or artificial, {as the foundation and building,} or mixed, as that of the limb and tree; or legal between the surety and debtor, advocate and client; or rather a union above all hard to determine, for these are but comparisons, and this Christ prays for. "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." Jn.17:23,26.

And something to this purpose Mr. Norton speaks, the efficacy of this relation springs from its foundation, which is first by the absolute grace of God in election, and thence flowing down in the promise according to the merit of Christ, by the effectual operation of the Spirit. Needs must the River of life be full, ever overflowing and quickening that ariseth from and is maintained by such fountains. And he shows the form of this union. The

bands on Christ's part and the believers. It's manner as to sameness of spirit, for he that's joined to the Lord is one spirit. I Jn.4:13, Rom.8:9, Eph.2:8, 4:4. One Mystical body, I Cor.12:12-13; and the third, a spiritual married estate. Eph.5:32, Isa.44:5. But you will see all along how he makes Christ first in this personal union to Christ by the Spirit and faith. Dr. Ames, the passive is the reception of Christ, whereby the spiritual principle of grace is ingenerate in the will of man, Eph.2:5, and this grace is the foundation of that relation, whereby a man is united unto Christ. Jn.3:5.

Neonomian. I'll tell you what I take to be truth in these points, every man is without Christ, or not united to Christ until he be effectually called; but when by this call the Spirit of God inclineth and enableth him willingly to accept of Christ as a Head and Saviour; a man becomes united to him, and partaker of those influences and privileges, which are peculiar to the members of Jesus Christ.

Antinomian. I except against what you have asserted, in these particulars. 1. You say a man is not united to Christ before effectual calling, thereby I understand you, that he is not united to Christ in any sense, whereas I affirm he is united to Christ before effectual calling in the senses which Mr. Rutherford does assert, before mentioned. 2. I understand you mean that in effectual calling a man is not united to Christ till he does actually accept of Christ the head by an act of faith, whereas the head unites the members to itself before they can reach up to the head. 3. You make union to be the same with communion, and to consist in a participation of privileges. Now as to the second thing, that in effectual calling there is a complete union with Christ before the act of faith, I do affirm, upon these reasons.

Argument 1. From the utter impotency of the soul without and before union with Christ to any good act, for union standeth in indivisibly; it's a conjunction of two in one, a half one is none; if we put forth an act of faith to lay hold on Christ before we be completely united to him, we put forth a good act, and bring forth good fruit before we be in him, and before we be good trees; but we cannot bring forth good fruit before we be good trees; and we cannot be good trees before we be in Christ. Matt.7:18, Jn.15:4-5. Therefore we do not put forth an act of faith before we be so completely united to Christ, so united to Christ as to live by him. "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." Jn.11:26.

Argument 2. In our regeneration we are merely passive, our faith is not then active, but in our regeneration we are completely united to Christ; ergo, we are completely united to Christ before the act of faith. The major is proved from, Eph.2:1-3, as dead men are passive to regeneration, and dead men we

are till we are regenerated. The minor is proved from the joint concurrence of regeneration, conversion and union with Christ, which are all wrought together and at one time.

Argument 3. If we be united first to Christ by an active faith, then an active faith is the cause of our union with Christ, but an active faith is not the cause of our union with Christ, therefore by an active faith we are not first united to Christ. If active faith were not the cause of the union of the human nature of Christ with the Divine, then it is not the cause of our union with Christ; but active faith is not the cause of the union of the human nature of Christ with the Divine; ergo, no other cause can be assigned of our true union with Christ, than of the union of our nature with the second person, viz., for as the Divine nature assumed ours, Jn.1:14, so the person of Christ takes us to mystical union with him.

Argument 4. If our union with Christ be first by an act of faith, then it is by a work of ours, {though a work of grace,} but it is not by a work of ours, ergo, if it be by a work of ours, it is not of grace, but it's of grace, and if by grace, then is it no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace. "But if it be of works, then is it no more grace, otherwise work is no more work." Rom.11:6. These are Mr. Cotton's arguments.

Neonomian. I'll answer your arguments another time, pray hear mine now to confirm the truth. The Scriptures expressly affirm, uncalled, unconverted ones to be united to Christ.

Antinomian. It's true in respect of the union in effectual calling, but yet not in respect of their hidden, federal, and relative union, which Mr. Rutherford speaks of.

Neonomian. The Spirit of Christ, and faith in him, are the things whereby God has ordained us to be united with Christ.

Antinomian. We grant it in respect of our union to Christ in effectual calling.

Neonomian. I see you will throw off all my arguments by Mr. Rutherford's unhappy distinction of unions; therefore I will name no more of them for the present.

Antinomian. The Assembly is full on this point, that our union to Christ is before the act of faith. Shorter Catechism. Q. 29. How are we made partakers of the redemption purchased by Christ? A. By the effectual application of it to us by his Holy Spirit. Q. 30. How does the Spirit apply to us the redemption purchased by Christ? A. By working faith in us, and thereby uniting us to Christ in our effectual calling.

The Spirit first comes as a bond of union, and works faith to unite by its act; in the first union by the Spirit we are passive, made new creatures, new born, receive spiritual life. In the second we are active, put forth lively acts, and lay hold on Jesus

Christ, and all Gospel grace. And if the Confessions say we are united to Christ by his Spirit, and by faith, as you acknowledge, then there is a union by the Spirit, which is effective of that which is by faith.

You say my mistake is, in thinking all grace is wrought by Christ as an actual head; you mean grace comes not at first from Christ as our head, but as a designed head; therefore you find fault with my founding our union on Christ as our head. Where I say, Christ is the head of his Church, i.e., the Fountain of all spiritual sense and motion; a man cannot have spiritual eyes of faith, unless he have this spiritual Head, &c. I am not alone here, for Mr. Norton and others make Christ as our Head, the Fountain and Spring of all spiritual life and motion. The person of Christ Mediator, is the first saving gift actually applied to any elect person. The motion of the Spirit upon the Soul is from Christ the head.

DEBATE XII.

OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

Neonomian. We having formerly discussed the doctrine of justifying righteousness, I desire we may now enquire into the nature of justification by faith; for Mr. Antinomian has this error among the rest. That the whole use of faith in justification, is only to manifest that we were justified before; and faith is no way necessary to bring a sinner into a justified state, nor at all useful to that end.

Antinomian. I must hear your proof, Sir, before I enter upon my defense.

Neonomian. You put this objection, is not believing required unto the justification of the ungodly? Answer. An ungodly person after he is justified does believe; but you will say it is an act of Christ by faith. Answer. Then Christ does not justify alone, &c. Nay, I say more, Christ does justify a person before he does believe, &c. He cannot believe that which is not, but he is first justified before he believes, then he believes he is justified.

Antinomian. My words were these, an ungodly person after he is justified does believe, but you must understand, it is not the faith of the person that does simply and properly justify; but it is that Christ in whom he does believe, he believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly. It is he that justifieth, that is Christ. It is not believing that justifieth; mark well that phrase, he that

justifieth, justification is an act of Christ, not an act of faith. How often is it said, it's God that justifieth? Justification is an act of God, and not of ours, faith is an act of ours; it's God by his grace efficiently justifies, and imputeth the righteousness of Christ; we are materially and objectively justified by the righteousness of Christ, and by that alone; and this I say is before a sinner believes efficiently, because the object must be before the act of the recipient organ. A man sees because there is light to see, which illuminates the organ; especially such a light as takes off a privation of sight, and restores the habit, so that justification in regard of application must be before believing; the first application in the order of nature, is to an ungodly man, by that name, that he may believe, who is thereby made to believe that he may be justified, for in justification we are both passive and active; as Maccovius says.

Calvin. Mr. Norton has this objection. If we are justified by faith, then faith is in order before justification, and consequently the act is before the object, whereas on the contrary the act depends on the object, and not the object on the act; to this effect Bellarmine, who distinguish between the being of justification, and our being justified, i.e., between justification as taken in an abstract sense, viz., without the receiving subject thereof, viz., a believer, and justification taken in a concrete sense, i.e., together with the believer.

Justification considered in the abstract sense, taken simply in and of itself, which signifieth remission of sins, and righteousness to acceptation prepared for, though not yet conferred upon the elect, has before faith a being not only in the purpose of God, but also in the Covenant between the Father and Mediator, and in the purchase of Christ. This truth held forth in the Gospel makes the object of faith, and thus the object is before the act. The grounds of this distinction or distinguishing between justification actually procured, and actually applied. Justification was in God's decree before faith, before sin, yea, from all eternity. Gal.3:8, Rom.3:25. The actual procuring of justification as considered in itself, gives a being to justifying faith; justification is compared to a garment, our being justified to a garment put on.

Justification of the elect is absolutely and actually procured for them by Christ's satisfaction before faith. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." Col.2:14. The hand writing of ordinances cannot be limited to the Ceremonial law only, because it had respect unto the Gentiles then living, to whom the Ceremonial law belonged not, God has declared his acceptation of Christ, whereby he has actually procured justification for the elect before faith. It is no small part

of the ministry of reconciliation, that God imputed unto Christ the sins of the world of the elect before they did believe, and will not impute them unto the elect. "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." II Cor.5:18-19. This great Gospel truth is of special use to beget justifying faith in the heart of a sinner. The same the Apostle confirms concerning their reconciliation, Rom.5:10, that it was wrought for them when they were enemies, i.e., unbelievers.

Here is a twofold reconciliation mentioned, one at the death of Christ before Paul, or the Romans, some of them at least, were believers, the other at conversion. The first reconciliation, though it was virtually wrought before by the Lamb slain {in God's appointment and acceptance, together with his own consent} from the beginning of the world, Rev.13:8, yet it was not actually wrought until the death of Christ; for this satisfaction sake God imputes not sin unto the redeemed, {for he cannot impute sin to Christ and the elect both,} yea, he accepteth us in the Beloved, Eph.1:6, loving the persons of the elect, Rom.11:28, though hating their sins, and also their state under the curse of the law. Rom.6:14, 7:6, Eph.2:3. The second is wrought at our conversion, when the enmity of nature is slain by the infusion of grace.

Neonomian. You ask, but what does faith serve for? You answer, it serves for the manifestation of that justification which Christ put upon a person by himself alone.

Antinomian. Adding, that he by believing on him may have a declaration and manifestation of his justification. Faith is the evidence of things not seen, Heb.11:1, a man is justified, and that by Christ alone, but it is not known to him; it is an unseen thing. Well how shall he see this? The text says, faith is the evidence; by faith we apprehend it, and rejoice in it as we apprehend it to be our own. I tell you in another discourse, whatever the Scripture speaks concerning faith justifying, it must of necessity be understood objectively or declaratively, one of these two ways; either faith is said to be our righteousness in respect of Christ only, who is believed on, and so it is not the righteousness of its own act of believing; or else you must understand it declaratively, i.e., whereas all our righteousness, and all our discharge from sin, flowing only from the righteousness of Christ alone, is an hidden thing; that which in itself is hid to men, does become evident by believing; and as faith does make the righteousness of Christ evident to a believer, so it's said to justify by its own act declaratively, and no

otherwise.

Neonomian. He says, we do not believe that we may be justified, but because we are justified.

Antinomian. Yes, we do believe that we may be justified declaratively; I say there, though faith itself cannot be called our righteousness, yet in respect of the glory that God ascribes to it, that it seals to men's souls the fulness of righteousness. How can you consider a person, a believing person, and withal an ungodly person? When persons are believers, they cease to be ungodly; but if men be not justified till they do believe, Christ does not justify the ungodly, but rather we must believe on him that justifies the righteous. But as I said, we do not believe that we may be justified; but we do believe, and truly believe when we are, and because we are justified. So that still it stands firm, we are not justified, we are not in Covenant, we partake not in the Covenant by any condition we perform, till which performance the Covenant cannot be made good unto us; but we are in Covenant, and Christ makes us to be in Covenant for his own sake, without any condition in the creature. God will have mercy on whom he will, without anything in the creature to partake first.

Neonomian. He says, God does add never a tittle of pardon itself more to him that is a believer, than to that person not yet converted to the faith, &c.

Antinomian. He still gives you but part of my sense, and misrepresents it, my words were these. Beloved, for my own part, I cannot conceive any other considerable difference between the plea of Christ for a converted person, and the unconverted elect, but this circumstantial difference, namely, that the value of his blood is of equal force to believers and unbelievers being elected, saving that the believers have this privilege, that the Lord Christ pleads for the manifestation of this discharge unto this converted person, but pleads not for the present manifestation thereof unto the unconverted elect person, till such time as he shall be called to the faith, and by that faith that thing be made evident which before was hid. Now follows what he would blacken me with.

I say the pardon of sin by the blood of Christ, is as full for the unconverted elect person, as fully passed over in grant, to that person as to the believer himself; God does add never a tittle of pardon itself more to him that is a believer, than to that person not yet converted to the faith, in regard of the substance of the pardon itself, and this I clear as a great truth, if any will give themselves the trouble of reading it, which I stand to.

Neonomian. He says, faith as it takes hold on Christ's righteousness, does not bring this righteousness of Christ to the soul, but does only declare the presence of that righteousness,

that was there even before faith was, and there denies faith to be so much as an instrumental cause of our justification.

Antinomian. I added, that I did abhor to walk in the clouds in a truth of so high concernment, as you too much do Sir, and that I knew I had many very catching ears about me, such as you are. I said, that faith as it lays hold upon the righteousness of Christ, &c., as he has told you; and the reason of that saying, I gave in as plain words, that there is no person under Heaven, reconciled unto God, justified by God through the righteousness of Christ, but this person is justified and reconciled unto God before he does believe; and therefore faith is not the instrument radically to unite Christ and the soul together, but rather is the fruit which follows and flows from Christ the root, being united before-hand to the persons that do believe. Show me how any person un-united to Christ can believe, and how any one that is un-justified can be actually united to Christ, as he must needs be before he can believe.

Neonomian. He tells you that justification is from eternity in several places.

Antinomian. You know that to be a false charge, for I have told you a man cannot be said to be justified before he has a being. I have often enough told you in what sense I apprehend justification to be before faith; but deny not the justification by faith spoken of by the Apostles, in the true sense of it according to my best understanding, I have told you that justification is first in its provision, is fully procured and provided; and it's first in grant, gift and application, applied unto us before we make application of it by an act of faith, whereby we do not bring it into the heart, but the grace of God does, which we see, behold, and improve there by faith manifesting and declaring our justified estate, whereby our consciences are freed from guilt and condemnation; hence I call it justification in conscience. Mr. Rutherford, who wrote against the Antinomians says, there is a justification in the mind of God eternal, and a justification in time terminated in the conscience of a believer. That justification is actually and absolutely procured for the elect before faith, and shall infallibly be applied to them all in time, seemeth to reach the scope intended by the godly learned, whose spirits have more particularly laboured to hold forth the whole truth in this precious part of soul-reconciling doctrine, and soul-supporting mystery of the Gospel. To say, that we are justified by virtue of a singular promise in the court of conscience, and in our own persons, {in which sense the Scripture constantly says, we are justified by faith,} is not {that I know of} affirmed by any. And for this he quotes Chamier, we are verily persuaded that our sins are forgiven before we believe, for we deny that infants do believe. And Perkins, who says, Christ is first justified, i.e., acquitted of

our sins, and we justified in him. And Dr. Ames says, the transaction between God and Christ was a certain previous application of redemption, and our discharge unto our Surety, and unto us in him, which to that secondary application to be performed in us has the respect of a kind of efficacious pattern; so that that {the application to him} is the representation of this {application to us} and this is produced by virtue of that. And he says, hence our discharge from sin and death, was not only established in God's decree, but also in Christ, and granted and communicated to us in him before it could be perceived by us. Rom.5:10-11.

Hence the Father and the Son are said to send the Spirit to the performing of this application, Jn.14:16, 16:7, and in the chapter of justification, he tells us what the sentence of justification is. 1. It was in the mind of God, as it were conceived by him by his decree of justifying. "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." Gal.3:8.

2. It was in the Christ our Head, pronounced when he rose from the dead, "to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." II Cor.5:19.

3. Virtually pronounced in that first relation which ariseth from faith ingenerated in the heart. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom.8:1.

4. Expressly pronounced by the Spirit witnessing with our spirits our reconciliation with God. "And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom.5:5.

Hence it appears that the doctrine of our justification before faith is not an error, but a great and glorious truth, and it is no prejudice to the doctrine of justification by faith, but the foundation, ground and reason of it; neither is it any door opened to licentiousness, an unbeliever having no more confirmation or encouragement to persist in sin thereby, than by the doctrine of election, which gives none; but as Mr. Norton says, it's no small part of the ministry of reconciliation, that God imputed to Christ the sins of the elect before they did believe, and will never impute them unto the elect.

Neither is my speaking of faith's taking hold of Christ's righteousness, and saying, that it brings not Christ's righteousness to us, but presupposes it given and granted, such an absurdity as you would make it. For Dr. Ames, says very distinctly, justifying faith precedes justification itself as a cause

of its effect, but faith apprehending justification, necessarily presupposes and follows justification, as the act does the object about which it is conversant, and this I take to be the true notion of justification.

That great man for holiness and learning, Chamier, says, I deny that faith is the cause of our justification, for then our justification would not be of grace, but of ourselves, but faith is said to justify, not because it effecteth justification, but because it is effected in the justified person; and in another place he says, faith does neither merit, obtain or begin our justification; for if it did, then faith should go before justification, both in nature and time, which may in no wise be granted; for faith itself is a part of sanctification; now there is no sanctification but after justification, which really, and in its own nature is before it.

I think, Sir, I have cleared myself sufficiently from the charge of error in this point, viz., that our justification is in being before faith. And now, Sir, before we proceed to the other part of your charge concerning the manner of faith's justifying, let us hear your arguments against justification in any sense going before faith.

Neonomian. One real difference between us is, whether we are justified before we believe? Which I deny; for, we are justified by faith, which is the common language of the Holy Ghost. Rom.5:1, Gal.2:16.

Antinomian. We own it, and say too that we are justified by faith, and this does not prejudice, but confirm what we assert.

Neonomian. Faith is enjoined as an effectual means of justification by Christ.

Antinomian. We deny not that faith required in the Gospel, and wrought by the Spirit, is as an effectual means of application of justification; but therefore it follows not that it's in being before, that which is not in being cannot be applied.

Neonomian. The Gospel denounces and declareth all condemned till they do believe.

Antinomian. The Gospel declares only their state of condemnation under the law, the Gospel properly condemns not; and we own that every one by nature is a child of wrath, and in the sense of the law is a condemned person; and every one is shut up under the law, as the Apostle says, till faith comes, this New Covenant blessedness belonging to him, is not yet made manifest, nor is his nature and state changed.

Neonomian. Unbelief is the cause why men are barred from justification, and remain obnoxious to misery.

Antinomian. It is God that justifies, and no sin can bar God's act of free mercy in pardon of a sinner, in the pardon of unbelief as well as of other sins, when God will justify. It's very

absurd to say, sin bars God's act of pardon. It's true, unbelief influences a sinner as to his own acts, and will be charged upon him as his fault, and will aggravate that condemnation which he has under the law, because from his own corrupt will and affection he will not receive pardon and life that is set forth in the general and indefinite proclamation thereof made in the Gospel; and therefore Christ says, "ye will not come to me that you may have life." Jn.5:40. They could not enter by reason of unbelief. "And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief." Heb.3:18-19. Unbelief on our part does keep us from Christ, but hinders not on God's part, that effectually draws all the elect, justifying of them, and working faith in them. "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Rom.8:29-30. The whole unregenerate state is a bar, till God break it by regeneration, which is a free work of grace, as justification is an act of grace, and must be found wherever a sinner is justified by faith, and that in order thereunto.

Neonomian. The other question in difference between us is, whether the use of faith in justification be only to manifest our justification, which we personally had before. This you affirm, and I deny. And add, that faith justifies by receiving Christ, and therein answers the ordination of God, who has promised to justify the believer by application of Christ's righteousness in this gracious effect of it upon a guilty soul.

Antinomian. You alter the terms of my expression, to make for your own turn. My words were these. Question. What does faith serve for? Answer. It serves for the manifestation of that justification which Christ puts upon a person by himself alone, that you by believing on him may have the declaration and manifestation of your justification.

And I say, that it is not the condition without which we receive no benefit from Christ, but rather a manifestation thereof. My words are not, that the use of faith is only a manifestation, but I say, rather a manifestation of benefits received, than a condition of receiving benefits. And I say, it is a declaration and manifestation. And what is the promise in the hand of faith, but a declaration of the grace of God in the justification of a sinner, and thereby a manifestation of it unto the conscience? Whereby justification comes to be in the bar of conscience. For I say, where the condemnation of a sinner is by the law, there the absolution of the sinner is by the Gospel, but condemnation of a sinner is in conscience by the law; therefore

there his absolution is by the Gospel, and that's by a Gospel-sentence pronounced and believed, which sentence is God's declaration, and faith sealing to the truth of it, applies it, and is the echo of the said declaration in the soul. And you say faith justifies as receiving Christ, and you say well, Christ is received in the believing of the Gospel-declaration. The declaration in the Gospel is, life by Christ. "And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life." I Jn.2:25. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," I Jn.5:11, and this is the witness of God which he has testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God has the witness in himself. It should be testimony, this very believing is a testimony of the truth of the promise, and his part in it, as by the latter part of the 10th verse appears, he that believeth not makes God a liar; and as the truth of the promise concerns himself, verse 12, he that has the Son has life; this believing he says is having the Son as declared in the promise and record, that takes in the declaration believably. And this is apprehending, and applying, and relying on the promise, and Christ in it, both as truth and goodness. Believing is our *modus receptus*, or manner of receiving, and we do believe that we may receive and apprehend him unto justification.

You add, and say first, faith justifies by receiving of Christ; but you say, its application of Christ's righteousness as to gracious effects, you mean only. You do not deal aboveboard, you are not for the application of Christ's righteousness itself imputed to us, and put on by us in believing. We have noted your error in this kind already; you'll not have Christ's righteousness imputed to us for our righteousness, according to all the language of the Scripture, but only the effects given us, as effectual calling, sanctification and glorification, so that the righteousness of Christ justifies no otherwise than it sanctifies and glorifies; for it does these as effects. But I pray express yourself more clearly how faith justifies, or what part faith has in justification according to your sense, without so much ambiguity.

Neonomian. The difference is not, whether faith or any other grace be a jot of the meriting righteousness for which we are justified.

Antinomian. But it is, whether faith, or any other grace be a qualifying condition for justification; if it be so let me alone to prove it a meriting righteousness, whether you call it so or no.

Neonomian. Nor whether faith, or any grace, add anything to the vain of Christ's merits. These I deny.

Antinomian. No wonder, for you have rated Christ's merits, how much their value shall be; as to its validity; but there are other things as rewarding at least, that must give right to the benefits procured by Christ's merits, which you call your

subordinate righteousness.

Neonomian. Yea, I add, that if Christ's righteousness could be applied for pardon to the vilest sinner before he believes, it would justify him; but God has declared that it shall not be applied to unbelievers.

Antinomian. That's not, for God has declared the contrary, that he justifies the ungodly; and if justification as God's act be not applied to us first, before we are believers, there would never be any believers; for justification is the cause of sanctification, and not vice versa, but justification by faith, i.e., justification as applied by a sensible gracious act of ours, is after sanctification, and we must distinguish in application of righteousness between God's acts and ours, for God must apply grace before we can partake of it.

Neonomian. Nor whether we are justified the same moment as we truly believe in Christ, and the blessing is not suspended for any time longer. This I affirm, because God justifies us by the promise as his instrument; and this promise declares that he will justify him that believes.

Antinomian. You'll own then that we shall not stay for the benefit; if we perform the condition, God will pay ready money; but the qualification must be first in us by nature. But why I pray? Is it not manners at least to give God the honor of being first in this work, and say, we believe in that moment we are justified?

2. I find now you will not have faith to be the instrument of justification, but have found out another; whereas you find fault with me, that I will not have faith the instrumental cause of justification, in its being no more than a passive receiving instrument; and you'll have the promise to be the instrument declaring justification; and what can faith do, but receive this declaration, and thereby declare to the conscience of the sinner what the Gospel instrument declares.

Neonomian. Nor whether an elect person once justified by Christ, shall be kept by Christ's care in a justified state.

Antinomian. You do not suppose then that justification is certainly durable in its one nature, that it is an everlasting righteousness, but that it is losable in its own nature, and needs a continued flux of supply as our graces in sanctification. As thus, a traitor pardoned by the King is not unalterably pardoned, but shall be kept by the King's care in a pardoned state.

Neonomian. Or whether God has decreed, that the elect shall certainly believe, and so be justified?

Antinomian. But has he decreed that the elect shall never be justified in any sense before they believe, or that faith should be wrought as a qualifying condition for justification?

Neonomian. Nor whether true faith be an infallible sign

of justification.

Antinomian. But you make it nothing else to us, if it justifies as a condition, if your condition does not federally merit the promise, it's nothing to God, but an infallible sign whereby he sees when to justify us, and to us that we are justified by him. And what is this better than a manifestation, you making it only a manifesting condition? You're excellent good to multiply 'whethers' to no purpose; you might bring in a 1000 'whethers' more, and say, it's not the question, whether it be further to the East or West Indies, nor whether Britain be an Island or Continent.

Neonomian. I'll come to the point, and tell you the truth, though faith be no way a meritorious cause of a sinner's justification, yet God has promised to justify all such as truly believe.

Antinomian. That's true; so he has promised to sanctify and glorify them.

Neonomian. And requires faith as an indispensable qualification in all whom he will justify for Christ's merits.

Antinomian. This now is to the purpose; now we see how faith justifies as an indispensable qualification; a greater condition than was laid upon Adam a thousand-fold. For a clearer understanding of a justification of a sinner by faith, let these three acts be considered, the one looked at to succeed the other in order, not in time. First, God actually imputes the active and passive mediatory obedience of Christ unto a believer, Rom.4:6, therein God is freely given. Secondly, the soul having before in order of nature, not in time, received Christ as its Head and Saviour, by the same faith receiveth his obedience as the matter of its righteousness; herein the soul is taking. Rom.1:17, 6:11, Gal.3:13. Thirdly, God hereupon {in the court of conscience} judicially declares and pronounceth the sinner to be righteous, and to have right unto eternal life by virtue of the promise. Rom.3:22,30. By this act of grace the person of a sinner is justified in himself really, yet not inherently, but imputatively, &c. Faith acknowledges, that we are justified for the righteousness sake of another, viz., Christ God-Man; acknowledgeth our justification is free; and renounceth our own righteousness.

You see the justifying nature of faith is metonymically ascribed to it; as the eye is said to be the light of the body, because it lets in the light; so faith as the spiritual eye sees the glory of Christ, as the ear lets in the justifying promise declaratory. Hence it's said, this is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, which is to acknowledge him by faith as he is revealed.

Mr. Norton tells you, we are justified by faith alone, i.e.,

faith as it is justifying is not a work, Rom.4:5, because we are not justified by our own righteousness, i.e., the righteousness whereof we are the subjects. 2. Because we are justified by the righteousness of another, sometimes called God's righteousness, whereof God is the Ordainer, and whereof he who is God-Man is both the worker and subject. 3. Because we are justified by a righteousness that's made ours by imputation, not by infusion, but as Abraham was justified. 4. Because we are justified by a righteousness that is actually procured before we believe; our righteousness is compared to a garment which we put on by believing, Rom.13:14, Gal.3:27, yet faith never took stitch in it.

Calvin. That faith justifies not as a qualifying condition is manifest. 1. Faith as a quality is a work of the law. The law commanded faith a leading duty in it, but no man is justified by the works of the law. Rom.3:28. So Johannes Wolleb, this proposition {we are justified by faith} understood legally with the Papists, is not true, but blasphemous; but understood correlatively, is true. 2. That which cannot stand with grace in justification, cannot have any influence on justification as such; but for faith to have any causal influence as a work on justification, is inconsistent with grace. The minor is proved. Eph.2:8. 3. That which gives no more to faith in the business of our justification, than to other works of sanctification, cannot be true; but to make faith to justify as a qualification, gives no more to faith than to other works of sanctification, ergo, the reason is, because the Scripture does peculiarly attribute our justification unto faith, and in a way of opposition to all works of sanctification. Rom.3:28, Gal.2:16, 3:11. 4. If you say, that faith justifies only as an antecedent condition, not at all meritorious, then it's no more a condition than our coming into the world, or acts performed by us before faith; and it gives no more to faith than to the works of nature, as worldly carnal sorrow, legal repentance, and such moral acts as carnal and unregenerate men daily perform; such as you call your preparatory disposing conditions, and they are the cause of faith, as much as faith of justification, and consequently the causes of justification. 5. Whatever justifies as a federal condition is meritorious, but faith justifying as a qualifying condition, upon which life is promised, justifies as a federal condition. The major is true, in the account of all; for the condition need not to be adequate to the reward in intrinsic value; though it be never so small, yet upon performance of the condition the reward is due debt. And indeed all conditions in contracts and covenants are proper meritorious causes, by virtue of the compact and agreement made between the Covenanters. For the minor, if it justifies as a qualifying condition, it must justify as a federal condition, or mere antecedent condition; and if you say as an antecedent condition,

it's at best but an indispensable condition; which we call no cause. 6. The Scripture does sufficiently explain itself in what it says of justification by faith, when it says we are redeemed, saved, justified by Christ, by his blood, by his death, &c., that the Spirit of God, when it says we are justified by faith, intends not any moral or physical causality in faith as a qualification, but only by virtue of its object.

Mr. Bradford the holy martyr reasoneth thus, as the Israelites were healed by beholding the brazen serpent, so are we saved by believing in Christ, but the looking up, of itself did not procure health to the Israelites, but the promise made in the object, which was the brazen serpent, therefore in the same manner are we saved by our faith and spiritual looking upon the body of Christ Crucified, not that the action in itself of believing, as it is a quality in man does so deserve, but because it taketh that dignity and virtue from the object Jesus Christ. Augustine compares our souls to lanterns, that have no light in them of themselves till Christ shines there.

The latter Helvetic Confessions, says, chapter 11, because faith does apprehend Christ our righteousness, and does attribute all to the praise of God in Christ, in this respect justification is attributed to faith chiefly, because of Christ whom it receiveth, and not because it is a work of ours. We do justly say with St. Paul, we are justified by faith without the works of the law, yet to speak properly, we do not mean that faith by itself, and of itself does justify us, which is but only as an instrument whereby we apprehend Christ who is our justice. But if we say it justifies conditionally, we must say it justifies of itself. What was accounted to Abraham for righteousness, not the action by which, but that which he did believe; or faith, not in respect of itself apprehending, but in respect of the object apprehended. Faith taken as a quality does not justify us, &c.

The Papists tell us, that faith does not justify as an instrument in apprehending the righteousness of Christ, but as a proper and true cause it actually justifieth, by the dignity, worthiness, and meritorious work thereof, and say these words in Scripture, being justified by faith, by faith, they give an actual force and power in faith to justification; and then says the Jesuit, faith is a work; we are justified by faith, ergo, by a work. To this he adds, that faith is our justice itself, ergo, not the apprehension only of righteousness, this he builds upon, and tell us, that faith justifies us efficiently and meritoriously as a proper, efficient and meritorious cause. And Bellarmine tells us, that if we could be persuaded that faith does justify, in a capacity to procure our justification, then we would never deny that love, fear, hope, and other virtues did justify as well as faith. Now to avoid the absurdities, they are forced upon by the Protestant arguments;

they have two shifts.

First. That this merit is not from us but from God, because faith is the gift of God's grace, and therefore though we be justified by merit, we are justified by grace too, and that it is of grace that our faith merits. Second. They say, that faith merits justification, not of the worthiness of it, but by the fitness of it; and this is that which our Neonomians say, that it qualifies and disposes us to justification, so that the justifying a believer is the doing a thing that is fit and meet to be done, the person being disposed and qualified thereunto. It's sad that Protestants should now come to lick up the Papists vomit, and re-assert those gross errors in fundamental truths, that all our orthodox and famous opposers of the Popish heresy have refuted and decried by one consent. But that this error might the better be swallowed by Protestants, the subtle enemy of truth and mankind forges it again, gives it a good heat, and brings it upon his anvil, polishes it, and makes it much more plausible to look upon.

The Arminians say, faith justifies properly; the very act of believing is imputed to us for righteousness, being accepted of God, and accounted to us as the whole righteousness of the law. So we are justified by faith in the sight of God, not by its merit, for they ascribe all the merit of justification to Christ, but only they ascribe to it a conditional, subordinate righteousness by virtue of the ordination of God. For Arminius says that faith itself as an act performed according to the command of the Gospel is imputed before God, in or unto righteousness, and that in grace, when it is not the very righteousness of the law. I shall give the refined and sublimed notion of this Arminian doctrine from a man of no small dexterity in pleading for it.

He says, that, that which God precisely requires of men to their justification, instead of the works of the law, is faith; or to believe {in the proper and formal signification} he does not require of us the righteousness of Christ, for our justification; this he required of Christ himself for it, that which he requires of us for this purpose, is our faith in Christ himself, not in the righteousness of Christ, i.e., in the active obedience of Christ; if Paul had certified and said to men, that the righteousness of Christ should be imputed to men for their righteousness, it had been quite beside his scope, which was plainly to make known the counsel and pleasure of God concerning that which was to be performed by themselves {though not by their own strength} for their justification, which he affirms from place to place to be nothing else but faith, or believing. To have said thus unto them, that they must be justified by Christ, or by Christ's righteousness, and withal not to have plainly signified, what it is that God requires of them to give them part in Christ's righteousness, without which they could not be justified, had

been to cast a snare upon them, rather than open a door of life and peace; and hence proceeds to prove, that Abraham's faith, or believing itself, was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he palliates it thus, that he understands it but as a means of coming at the righteousness, but he defends this proposition, that we are justified by faith. Now see what the Neonomian says expressly of your indispensable qualification; though you, Sir, always will look one way while you row another.

The question in one of you is plainly asked and answered by a great leader and guide among you. When it is said that faith is imputed to us for righteousness, is it faith indeed that is meant, or Christ's righteousness believed on? A strange and bold question, if it be not faith itself that is meant. The context is so far from relieving our understandings, that it contributes to our unavoidable deceit and ignorance. Read over the texts, and put but Christ's righteousness everywhere instead of the word 'faith' and see what a scandalous paraphrase you will make, the Scripture is not so audaciously to be corrected.

Calvin. Now I shall show you how by the Orthodox Protestants, this doctrine of Neonomianism has been opposed as antichristian and destructive to the grace of God. The learned Mr. Pemble gives the anatomy of this doctrine, after that he had shown that Faustus Socinus, Michael Servetus, and Arminius, were the forgers, next to the Jesuits, and propagators of this doctrine. Arminius says he branches out his opinion in three distinct propositions. 1. Christ's righteousness is imputed to us. 2. The righteousness of Christ is not imputed for righteousness. 3. Believing itself is imputed for righteousness. The same is the opinion of his fellows, the Remonstrants, of Gisbertus Voetius, Peter Bertius, Simon Episcopius, &c., with whom Bellarmine agrees in their interpretation of Romans 4. In sum their opinion runs thus. God in the legal Covenant required exact obedience of his commandment, but now in the Covenant of Grace he requires faith, which in his gracious estimations stands instead of that obedience to the moral law, which we ought to perform; which comes to pass by the merit of Christ, for whose sake God accounts our imperfect faith to be perfect obedience. This assertion {exactly Neonomianism} and in place thereof we defend this proposition.

God does not justify a man by faith properly, imputing unto him faith in Christ for his perfect obedience to the law, and therefore accounting him just and innocent in his sight, which we prove by these reasons. I'll but name them. 1. We are not justified by any work of our own, {though given by grace,} but believing is an act of our own, ergo, not by believing. The major is manifest by Scripture, which teach we are saved by grace. Eph.2:5, Tit.3:6, Rom.11:6. The minor is evident, that faith is a

work of ours; for though Christ says this is the work of God, &c., Jn.6:29, yet our adversaries will not conclude thence that faith is God's work within us, and not our work by his help; for they will say, it's not God that believes, and Christ that repents, &c. They have two shifts. 1. We are not justified by any work of our own, done by our own strength, but by the aid of grace. A. This distinction of works done without grace, and works done by grace was devised by one that had neither wit nor grace, being a trick to elude the force of such Scriptures as exclude them indefinitely to our justification, &c. Wherefore, it's without all ground in Scripture thus to interpret these propositions. A man is not justified by works, i.e., by works done by the power of nature before and without grace. A man is justified by grace, i.e., by works done by aid of grace. 2. They say, we are not justified by any works of our own, i.e., by any works of the law, but by a work of the Gospel such as faith is, we may be justified by. There's no ground in Scripture for this distinction; nor in reason, for both tell us that works commanded in the Law and in the Gospel are one and the same for the substance of them. Lk.10:27, Deut.6:5. What sin against the Gospel that is not a transgression of the law? Is charity one, does not the law command it? Is faith one, does not the law enjoin the same?

Objection. But it commands not faith in Christ. Answer. It does, for that which commands us in general to believe, commands us to believe whatever God shall make known to us.

Argument 2. God only accounts that perfect righteousness of the law, which is so in deed and in truth; but faith is not the perfect fulfilling of the law, ergo, here our Neonomians will except and say, they differ from the Arminians in saying, that Christ only has merited that our imperfect righteousness shall be accepted instead of perfect, which has worse absurdity in it, as shall appear.

Argument 3. We are not justified by two righteousnesses, existing in two divers subjects; but if we are justified by Christ's righteousness, and the work of faith, we are justified by two righteousnesses, existing in two subjects, ergo, I shall only leave with you the opinion of the orthodox Protestants concerning justification by faith, who have strenuously opposed the Papists, Socinians, Arminians and Neonomians in this point. He is justified by faith who excludes the righteousness of works, and apprehends the righteousness of Christ, wherewith being clothed in the sight of God, he appears not as a sinner but justified, so that we interpret justification simply an acceptance whereby God does account us for righteous ones who are received into his favor; and we say, that it {i.e., acceptance} is placed in the remission of sins, and imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

Justification has two parts, remission of sins, and

imputation of Christ's righteousness. Remission of sins is that part of justification, whereby he that believes is freed from the guilt and punishment by the passion of Christ, Col.1:21-22, I Pet.2:24; imputation of righteousness is the other part of justification, whereby such as believe, having the guilt of their sins covered, are accounted just in the sight of God through the righteousness of Christ. II Cor.5:21, Psal.32:1-2, Phil.3:8-9. The form of justification is as it were a kind of translation of the believer's sins unto Christ; and again, Christ's righteousness unto the believer, by a reciprocal and mutual imputation. Justification is the gracious sentence of God, whereby for the sake of Christ apprehended by faith, he absolves a believer from sin and death, and counts him righteous. Rom.3:22,24. Christ is the adequate object of faith as it justifies; faith also upon no other account justifies, but as it apprehends that righteousness for which we are justified; and that righteousness is not in the truth of any axiom to which we give assent, but in Christ alone who was made sin for us, that we may be the righteousness of God in him. II Cor.5:21. Hence those sermons in the New Testament are so often repeated, which show justification to be sought only in the person of Christ. Jn.1:12; 3:15,16; 6:40, 47, Rom.4:5; 3:26, Acts 10:43, Rom.3:26.

A sinner is justified by faith, not properly as it is a quality or action, which by its own dignity and merit deserves at God's hands remission of sins, or is by God's favorable acceptance taken for the whole and perfect righteousness of the law, which is otherwise required of a sinner, but only in relation unto the object of it, the righteousness of Christ which it embraceth and resteth upon.

Justification is a gracious act of God upon a believer, whereby for the righteousness of Christ imputed by God, and applied by faith, he does freely discharge him from sin and curse, and accept him as righteous in the righteousness of Christ, and acknowledge him to have a right unto eternal life.

Westminster Larger Catechism Question 73, asks, how does faith justify a sinner in the sight of God? Answer. Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces that do always accompany it, or of good works, which are the fruits thereof; nor as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof were imputed to him for justification, only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness.

Question 33 of the Shorter Catechism states it thus. Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone.

Whom God effectually calleth he freely justifieth, not by

infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself the act of believing, nor any other evangelical obedience as their righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith, which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God.

Church of England Article 11 states that, we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own merits and deservings, wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, &c.

The righteousness of Christ, as its Christ's, and performed by him, so it is ours; it's ours therefore, I say by way of right, because by the decree of the Father, and purpose of the Son it's wrought for us, though not in our possession, as to sense and acknowledgment of so great a benefit bestowed; and this acknowledgment ariseth from faith. The righteousness of Christ is said to be imputed to us, and his merits to be applied by faith, not before God, but in our consciences; as there is a sense of it begotten in our hearts by faith, and an acknowledgment of the saving application from the love of God which we taste by faith, and spiritually perceive justifying of us, and adopting us to be his sons; from whence ariseth peace of conscience. Whence the righteousness of Christ is said to be imputed to us by faith, because it is not known but by faith that it is imputed to us by God; and then at length we are said to be justified by that kind of justification and absolution from our sins, which begets or produceth peace of conscience.

Dr. Twisse, speaks of justification in a double acceptation. 1. As the righteousness of Christ is applied to us before faith and repentance, by reason of which righteousness we obtain efficacious grace to believe in Christ and repent. 2. He understands justification to be that notification that is by faith made to our consciences, or in the court of conscience; and this is {says he} that imputation of Christ's righteousness, remission of sin, justification and absolution, which follows faith.

There's none of us {says he} say that wicked vicious person, allowing themselves to live in their sins, are bound to believe Christ died for them; for my part I think otherwise, that whilst all are commanded to believe in Christ, they are not bid presently to believe that Christ died for them, but rather to rest themselves upon Christ by faith, to renounce themselves and their own works, and cast themselves down at the feet of mercy; this is only properly called faith on Christ, the other is only faith concerning Christ.

Hence Mr. Norton has these words. These are both truths, justification has a being before the elect do believe; and that the elect are not justified before they do believe. Justification is the object, faith is the act; or being actually justified is an effect; faith is the instrumental cause, the cause is before the effect.

Johannes Maccovius distinguishes justification into active and passive. Active justification signifies God's absolution of a guilty person from guilt for the sake of Christ's satisfaction, and accounting him righteous for his righteousness imputed. The differences between this and passive justification by faith, are, this is one undivided act of God, absolution by faith is repeated. Active justification precedes faith, passive follows, &c.

A DIGRESSION CONCERNING THE NECESSITY OF REPENTANCE TO FORGIVENESS.

Neonomian. Gentlemen, if you please, for a diversion after this arduous attempt that I have made to bring in the true doctrine of the Catholic Church, let us make a little digression for our recreation, and treat upon a point that has not so much difficulty in it; for having got in faith to justify as a qualifying act, I doubt not now but to pleasure some of its relations, and find them a place in justification too.

Antinomian. Stay, not so hasty; I do not find you have yet attained your end about faith; cry not victory yet, but however, gentlemen, seeing he is for a digression, let him have it, for he has been in digression from truth all along. I know not how he can digress from the way he has been in hitherto, but by coming into truth.

Neonomian. You judging we are justified before we do believe; it's no wonder if you tell us, we are forgiven before we confess sin and repent; and therefore I would enquire of the necessity of repentance to forgiveness.

Antinomian. As a qualifying condition, gentlemen, this is no digression, for it's the right line and method that Bellarmine and all the Papists have taken in handling the doctrine of justification, first to bring in faith to justify as a work, and then to bring in other graces and duties in the like manner, only faith being granted the honour to leading the way. According to these Papists, whosoever says, that a man is justified only by faith, and that nothing else is required to our justification, let him be accursed, &c., faith is not the only cause of our justification, but

there are others also, as hope, charity, alms-deeds, &c., the Apostle excludeth not all works, for then faith itself should be excluded from justification, because it is a work, and if justifying faith do except every law, then the law of faith also should be excepted. Look and see how Bellarmine has got your remedial law by the end, as I thought I should find indeed all your doctrine in the original.

Neonomian. But he does not speak fully to the case in hand.

Antinomian. But he shall speak fully to your mind. For he adds further, that such works therefore only are excluded which go before faith, which are done only by the knowledge of the word, and by the power of free-will without grace, not such works as are of faith, and proceed of grace. But all I fear is, that you may not allow us so much as Bellarmine; you will have some qualifying condition before faith to justify us, whereas he does in a measure exclude all works before faith; and he calls not that a merit in plain English, though it's so in some countries; I cannot tell how your language expresses it.

Neonomian. You're a pragmatic, for my business in this digression is with men of more orthodox principles, who yet seem too doubtful in this point. I shall state the point between these.

Calvin. Then, Sir, I find the province will fall upon me wholly to discuss this point with you, unless the Board will be pleased to appoint a person of better ability.

Board. No Sir, by no means.

Neonomian. I shall state the point then, and show you wherein the difference is not.

Calvin. I pray, Sir, be briefer in stating points, for I find you bring your adversary out of breath in stating of points, and when you have stated them, nobody can tell but by conjecture where you are; in this way of stating points, you may run over the Encyclopedia Atrium, in telling us where the point is not, for it can be but in one place.

Neonomian. But you must look where a thing is not, as well as where it is, before you find it. I'll tell you, it is not, whether faith or repentance be any part of the meriting righteousness for which we are justified.

Antinomian. True, Bellarmine will not allow faith and repentance to be any part of Christ's righteousness, for which we are justified, but only a meriting righteousness by which we are justified.

Neonomian. I told you, gentlemen, I would have nothing to do with this heterodox fellow.

Calvin. It is a strange thing, Mr. Antinomian, that you cannot leave this business to me.

Antinomian. I am willing to give you ease, that you may

keep your lungs till he comes to the question, for he will tire you before you come at it.

Neonomian. Nor is the question, whether the habits of faith and repentance be wrought at the same time in the regenerating principle.

Antinomian. You mean you will not discuss this point, and therefore tell us not whether you affirm it, or deny it; and what you mean by the regenerating principle is very doubtful, whether a principle within us or without us? Whether a principle by nature or by grace? It's a new term, to say, we are regenerated by a principle; it must be sure some principle in our nature that regeneration must spring from.

Neonomian. Nor whether convictions of a lost estate, and some degree of humblings and sorrow are necessary to drive a soul to Christ?

Antinomian. The law is a school-master to bring men to Christ, to cast them into a desperate condition, that a Saviour may be acceptable to them, that's Christ's end; but it's no federal condition of justification by Christ, nor the effects of it being the condemnation of a sinner, which condemnation, and sin itself are alike conditions, a cause which does not, that's none at all in the sense of logicians. Convictions, humblings, sorrow for sin before regeneration and justification, are splendid vices; you have subscribed the doctrinal Articles, and Bellarmine excludes such works which are before faith, done by the knowledge of the law and the power of free-will.

Neonomian. Nor whether there be an assenting act of faith, before there be an exercise of repentance, under the power of the Word, which must be believed in some degree before it operates such effects.

Antinomian. You should have put in this question, and said, nor whether there should be hearing of the Word before there is repentance under it, and you should tell what faith you mean, whether historical, or common credulity, or saving faith, &c., and whether you do not mean that natural men do grow up from a regenerating principle under the Word, into saving grace by degrees?

Neonomian. Nor whether ingenuous sorrow for sin in the sense of actual pardon be after that pardon?

Antinomian. That need not be brought in to prevent our mistaking of the question, for none that has any brains can blunder so as to think a man can be sorry for sin in the sense of actual pardon, before it is; it must be after that; this whether is next a-kin to a bull.

Neonomian. Nor whether repentance, as it consists in fruits meet for it, as external reformation, a fruitful life, and the like, must follow pardon; it being against the tenor of the promise

that forgiveness should be suspended so long after a man believes and repents in his heart.

Antinomian. You had better have put the 'whether' thus, whether pardon is not to come in between repentance and its fruits? Or whether repentance with fruits appearing, or repentance without fruits appearing, be the condition of pardon? And to what degrees of growth repentance ought to arise before a man is qualified for pardon? And how long in an ordinary way a truly repenting sinner must expect to continue unjustified? And what time is limited in the tenor of the promise for suspension of forgiveness after faith and repentance? For there's some time it seems with you that forgiveness is suspended after faith and repentance.

Neonomian. Nor whether justification be equally ascribed to faith and repentance? For we are said to be justified by faith, which imports that repentance is but a disposing condition, and faith a receiving condition; repentance without faith is unavailable, as faith without repentance is impossible; faith seems to complete all, and in a manner to comprehend all. These things the orthodox divines are agreed on.

Antinomian. That is orthodox Neonomians, of which none are orthodox in these points. But Mr. Calvinist, now he begins to bear up towards the question, I will leave him to you.

Calvinist. What do you mean that orthodox divines are agreed of in this question, that justification be equally ascribed to faith and repentance, or not equally? Or where is it that orthodox divines do ascribe justification to repentance at all? You say that when we are said to be justified by faith, it imports repentance as a disposing condition, and faith a receiving condition, i.e., both disposing conditions, for receiving if it be merely passive, is a disposing condition; your distinction is without difference, disposing and qualifying is all one; but it seems one cannot do without the other, and they are both qualifying federal conditions of justification. But your meaning is plainly this, that repentance does previously qualify us as a condition to the receiving justification by faith.

Neonomian. The seeming difference is, whether a sincere purpose of heart to turn from sin and idols to God, be absolutely necessary to forgiveness of sin?

Calvin. It's not a seeming, it's real. You slip off from the question now, and take to other terms, and ambiguous ones too. 1. Why keep you not to the word repentance as you began. 2. Why use you the term absolutely necessary? Your terms should have been disposing condition to justification. And this is the question, if it be truly stated according to your own sense, whether repentance be a qualifying condition to justification?

Neonomian. The other parts of repentance are excluded

out of the question by what you heard before, and this is that part on which the word lays a strict stress, from hence are works meet for repentance, Matt.3:8, and conversion refers to this as a principal part of it.

Antinomian. Then you will have the question to be, whether a part of repentance be a qualifying condition to justification? But let it be which part you please, the first part or second, an inclination or resolution to repent in full purpose of heart, or repentance itself. The question is, whether repentance under any consideration of it, as an act of ours, graciously bestowed or not, be a qualifying condition of justification? This question you must hold to, and not start from the terms; and I hold it in the negative. Be sure in all your arguments you conclude the question.

Neonomian. I will prove then, as repentance lies in a sincere purpose of heart to turn from sin and idols to God, it is necessary to forgiveness.

Calvin. Is not this base shuffling of the cards? Will you never lay aside your double-dealing? Now instead of qualifying condition we must have the word necessary, as equivocal a word as can be used. Necessary has as many acceptations, as the word "church" has with some men. A thing may be necessary antecedently, and necessary consequently. It may be necessary antecedently many ways, as remotely and primarily; necessary in respect to order only; as necessary if you go to France to cross the Sea, but not the cause of my going to France, nor the condition, but as the way. And there is a necessity in respect of causality, as the material causes are necessary antecedents to the effect. And so there are remote necessities a great while before you come to what follows; as a boy must be an apprentice before he be a Councilman or Alderman. And there are consequent necessities, &c.

Neonomian. I mean, that repentance is a disposing condition, but it's not a condition as faith is; for that is the receiving and completing condition.

Calvin. The Council of Trent tells us, that the Catholic faith is this, when the Apostle says, a man is justified by faith and freely, those words are to be understood in that sense which the Catholic Church has always held and expressed, that we are therefore said to be justified by faith, because faith is the beginning of man's salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God, and come to the fellowship of his children. And so Bellarmine, faith does begin justification, and afterwards assumes to itself hope and charity, &c., it does perfect it. And so you talk after them, and much more, in saying that repentance begins justification, and faith completes it. The first point of justification they grant

to be faith alone, but the accomplishment of it is not without the joint procurement of obedience. In a larger sense, as promise is an obligation and the thing promised, called a debt; so the performers of the condition are called worthy, and the thing promised is called debt. Yea, in this meriting the obligation to reward is God's ordinate justice, and the truth of the promise, and the worthiness lieth in our performance of the condition on our part.

Neonomian. That which God commands in order to forgiveness, can include no less than that which is necessary to forgiveness, but God commands repentance in order to forgiveness; ergo, repentance is necessary to forgiveness. Acts 2:38, 3:19.

Calvin. I told you that 'necessary' is not to be admitted as the term of your question, because it's equivocal. We all allow repentance a necessary concomitant or effect of forgiveness; and it's necessary, necessary by a subsequent necessity, it's necessary by virtue of Gospel precept, necessary by virtue of the relation and connection that Gospel promises and precepts have to each other, but not necessary as a qualifying condition unto justification. Let me put your syllogism into intelligible terms.

That which God commands in order to forgiveness, is a disposing condition to forgiveness; but God commands repentance in order, &c., ergo, and here I deny the major, for God commands sinners to hear the Word, in order to faith and repentance; but hearing is not a qualifying condition. Peter bids Simon Magus pray, that the thoughts of his heart may be forgiven, but not as a qualifying condition to pardon. So the anointing the blind man's eyes with clay and spittle was not a qualifying condition for healing antecedently, nor the touching of Christ by the woman that had a bloody issue. Those things that God does, or commandeth us to do in order to receive blessings, are means chosen by himself to give us the blessings in, and both the means and blessings are graciously provided in the promise, the fruit whereof is the gift of both, even to will and to do. But repentance is required in order to forgiveness. By this you may mean at least in order thereto by way of meetness to fit a man for pardon before he has it. To this I answer, you fallaciously change the term justification into forgiveness; for though justification includes forgiveness, yet justification is not always meant by forgiveness; for justification is a single act of God, and a person once justified is always so; but by forgiveness is meant often, especially in the Old Testament, a renewal of the sense of our justified estate, the shining of God's face upon us after falls and relapses into sin; and thence we pray daily for pardon without a supposition that when we pray for pardon, we are not in a justified estate; neither do think when we have

prayed for pardon, we are ever the whit more disposed and fitted in God's sight to receive it, but wait upon God for it with a great sense of our loathsomeness and unworthiness in ourselves, flying to Christ and his righteousness to be covered with it in believing, by which imputed righteousness alone we look upon ourselves as disposed for pardon.

Your places mentioned prove not what you design, viz., that in our first forgiveness, which is our justification, that repentance is required as a disposing condition to the receiving it. Acts 3:19, speaks but of the public manifestation of the righteousness of the Saints at the last day; not that they stand unjustified till that day, viz., the day of refreshing, and of Christ's second appearing, verse 20. And as for that place, Acts 2:38, he commands Gospel duties but to be performed as effects of the promise, in performance of the mercy promised; the words of the next verse show, for the promise belongeth to you, therefore repent; and repentance is there no more a disposition to forgiveness than baptism; and the end of that ordinance is to show that forgiveness belongs to us already, for it's the seal of the promise; and to be baptized into forgiveness is no more than to be baptized into the seal and confirmation of the Covenant of promise or forgiveness, which you believe belongs to you, as the Covenant is called the Covenant of circumcision, Acts 7:8, and a seal is not of a pardon to be wrote, but of that which is wrote and signed already.

Neonomian. Repentance is a grace to which pardon is promised; and upon the working of it forgiveness is given, and impenitency continues guilt wherever it reigns.

Calvin. Forgiveness is promised to persons, not to graces and qualifications. Forgiveness is given to true penitents, and those to whom forgiveness is given are truly penitent, and both repentance and remission of sins are given; it may be we perceive repentance first, but God gives remission first; for so long as there is none of the grace of forgiveness bestowed there will never be true Gospel repentance, the grace of the promise must be bestowed first by Christ exalted to God's right hand. God says, he had pardoned David before he repented; and what was it that moved him so kindly to repentance, as is mentioned, Psal.51, but the sense of pardon? The Lord had told him by Nathan that he had put away his sin.

Neonomian. How much of the Bible must I transcribe, if I quote all places to prove these? Ezek.18:30, Acts 3:19, Mk.1:4, Lk.13:3.

Calvin. The Papists have quoted as many as you can think on, but could never yet carry the point. As to that place of Ezek.18:30, it has been spoken to already. It supposeth not that they had any qualification for remission by repentance, for they

were to make them a new heart first; a condemned sinner be sure can never do that work, nor work at it. God must perform the promise of grace in breaking his heart of stone by the revelation of pardoning mercy, and make him a new heart before he can have a heart to repent. Acts 26:18, imports no more than that the Gospel is the power of God to salvation, and thereby sinners are raised from darkness to light, i.e., from the darkness of a natural state to the light of grace, thereby in Christ's own light they see light; the words are in the infinitive mood is here put for the genitive case, governed by foregoing; the light a sinner is brought into, is the light of receiving remission of sins, the Gospel promise seen and applied by faith, is that light in the soul wherein it is brought unto God; the first act of the soul in saving conversion is believing, for the soul cannot turn from sin to God by any act of repentance that's saving, but by Jesus Christ, and faith in his blood; therefore in order of nature forgiveness must be had before there can be coming to God, and therefore Ephraim cries for turning; the Saints through grace know they cannot come at God but by and through Christ, and therefore their complaints were so great, and repentings so heavy, when God hid his face from them. I need not treat upon the other places, they are all of the same strain. Acts 5:31, is against you; Lk.13:3, will not prove the Gospel a law, as I shall have occasion to show.

Neonomian. The sin against the Holy Ghost is unpardonable, because it's impossible to bring the committer of it to repentance. Heb.6:6.

Calvin. The falling away is not in respect of the power of God, but in regard of the will and pleasure of God, whom he will he hardens. When God has left them to despise Christ, and to crucify him again, as it were, to put him to open scorn and contempt, not sinning ignorantly, but presumptuously; there's no repentance; the reason why there's no repentance, is because there's no forgiveness, neither will they seek after it.

Neonomian. Are all these things consistent with pardon before repentance? Can I be subject to perish and pardoned at once?

Calvin. Yes, a traitor may be in the cart, and have the halter about his neck just when the pardon comes.

Neonomian. Can God command repentance under a promise of pardon, and suppose I must be pardoned before?

Calvin. Yea, he always does so, he performs the promise to enable us to obey the command, and he annexes the promise to encourage us to the duty. The performance of the promise to us is the true necessary condition of our performing any duty to God acceptably.

Neonomian. And does God do all before, and nothing

after?

Calvin. Yea, he does abundantly more than we can ask or think, before and after too.

Neonomian. There's no saving faith that includes not this purpose in it, and so says Dr. Owen.

Calvin. Whatever you quote out of Dr. Owen, the world knows he was against you in this point, his whole book witnesseth that he never said that faith justified as a qualifying grace, much less repentance; there may be many things in faith that toucheth not upon that nature of it, whereby it has more to do in its peculiar office in the justification of a sinner than any other grace.

Neonomian. Without this purpose we do not accept of Christ as the way to God.

Calvin. A man does not walk about without his arms, therefore he goes upon his arms and hands.

Neonomian. We cannot receive Christ as King without this repentance of heart.

Calvin. No, nor without faith neither, what trifling is here?

Neonomian. Without this purpose of heart no man accepts of Christ for sanctification.

Calvin. Therefore you will say, Christ justifies us by infusing righteousness, by making us righteous inherently, for which he declares us righteous, which is an old decried Popish error.

Neonomian. A resolved purpose to continue in sin and rebellion against God is damning, let men pretend what they please.

Calvin. I say more, there's no venial sin, every sin is damning in its own nature, and a sin repented of without forgiveness is damning; and the very repentance of a natural man which you would have condition him for grace, is damning.

Neonomian. It's not to be allowed that it should not be necessary to renounce our sins with our hearts, in order to pardon; when it is necessary to renounce our own merits or righteousness.

Calvin. We reckon it our duty under the highest obligation of preventing grace, and great and precious promises, and from the greatest sense of duty, to renounce our sins with all our hearts, but dare not do it in a way of qualification of ourselves for forgiveness, least we should make those repentings and humblings our merits, as the Papists do, whereby Christ profits them nothing; and under presence of holiness they lose their righteousness, pretend to renounce one idol, and set up another.

Neonomian. I will tell you how the Assembly and Dr.

Owen are of my mind.

Calvin. You may spare yourself the labour, for they are point blank against you, and so are all Protestants that are not tainted with the doctrine of the Jesuits.

Neonomian. I think there's never a barrel the better hearing of you, come let's be gone.

DEBATE XIII.

OF THE NECESSITY, AND BENEFIT OF HOLINESS, OBEDIENCE, AND GOOD WORKS, WITH PERSEVERANCE THEREIN.

Calvin. How do you, Mr. Neonomian, are you well, methinks you look a little moody.

Neonomian. It would disturb any orthodox man's spirit to see how error prevails; I profess I am almost weary of this club, if this be your Calvinian Club, I do think I must betake myself to some other, you know, where I shall find more soundness in doctrine.

Calvin. O pray, Mr. Neonomian, let not disputants be angry with one another; disputation should be for information of the judgment, not for the gratifying pride and passion; put another question, it may be we may agree in that.

Neonomian. I will try you once more, and if you boggle there, fare you well. Gentlemen, note that whatever I shall speak now of any act of grace, except penitent believing, refers not to the forgiveness of sins, or the sinners admission into a justified estate. The benefits that I here speak of, are not the forfeiture of pardon, the possession of heaven, and some other particular blessings, as increase of peace, returns of prayer.

Antinomian. I find now you clapped two conditions into one; why had we not these conditions twisted together before? Methinks you incommoded yourself in not doing it yesterday, for united strength is stronger, but you reckon faith and repentance, reach no further than the first justification, I think the Catholics are of your mind for that. You talk of forfeiting justification, the meaning in English, is falling away from grace.

Neonomian. Some men's brains had need be taken out and washed in vinegar, for there's no making them understand; it were well that you were better studied in terms of art.

Calvin. Mr. Antinomian, sit down and hold thy peace

awhile, you'll never leave till you have put the gentleman into a fustian fume, and then we shall lose his good company; pray go on, Mr. Neonomian.

Antinomian. I smell him where he will be.

Calvin. Nay, not yet neither.

Neonomian. I tell you then, if I may be permitted to speak what an error this Antinomian holds. He says. 1. Men have nothing to do in order to salvation. 2. Nor is sanctification, a way of any person to Heaven. 3. Nor can the graces or duties of believers; no, nor faith itself do them the least good to prevent the least evil. 4. Nor are they of the least use to their peace or comfort. 5. Yea, though Christ be explicitly owned, and they be done in the strength of the Spirit of God. 6. And a believer ought not to think he is the more pleasing to God, by any grace he acteth, or good he doth. 7. Nor may men expect any good to a Nation by their humiliation, earnest prayer for reformation of a people.

Calvin. Now Sir you have a Roland for your Oliver, here's a long and strong inditement laid in against you, I wish you a good delivery, Mr. Antinomian.

Antinomian. As I take it, there's about seven things you charge me with, I pray make your integration by parts, and I shall be abler to give my answer.

Neonomian. You have told us, seeing all things are settled by Christ for us of free gift; I say, all we do is for Christ himself, and not for ourselves. Christ comes and brings justification, loving kindness and salvation. What needs then all this travel for life and salvation, seeing it is here already? But seeing we get nothing by it, &c.

Antinomian. By this you prove, that men have nothing to do in order to salvation. Gentlemen, I must crave your patience, to hear that part of my discourse that you may judge of it. It was upon John 14:16, "and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." I was saying, how near has Christ made the way unto the Father? Thus near that he that believeth shall be saved. Let me be bold to tell you, you are in as full a state of justification before God. Now mark, I was speaking of passing from one state to another in justification; and do you not remember what he said? That whatever he should speak now referring to any act of grace, except believing penitently, refers not to forgiveness of sins, and now he allegeth what I said upon that account to prove a change about sanctification. You are in a true state of salvation, you that are believers, are as those that are already in Heaven, believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved; such a near way Christ is, yet still people will be caviling, where are good works all this while? What justified by faith alone! Saved by

Christ alone! Let me tell you, if Christ be the way, {of justification, and the only federal condition of eternal life, i.e., of all salvation in faith and holiness,} then works are not the way, except they be Christ, but must we not work? Yea, but for other purposes, the Lord has propounded other ends, {not meriting your salvation,} for which you are to work, ye are bought with a price, that's done; therefore glorify God in our bodies, being delivered out of the hands of your enemies, {our state is secured, our safety past,} we serve in holiness and righteousness, &c., do we serve toward deliverance, then it's not past. We are delivered from wrath before we step a step in duties; we do not the duty to be delivered, but we do duty because we are delivered.

And now follows what he chargeth for such a fault, and take notice that I speak all along of the change of our state in justification by faith, and that works have nothing to do in, neither are we to look upon them as such. All things are settled by Christ for us of free gift, all we do is for Christ himself, not for ourselves, {i.e., to put ourselves in Christ's room, thereby to rob him of his glory,} if we do it for ourselves, we do but labour in vain; suppose we compass never so much good by doing, {thinking thereby to put ourselves into a justified estate,} it is but labour in vain, it was compassed before-hand for us, in the justifying righteousness of Christ. Christ brings salvation, enters into Covenant; what needs all that travel for life and salvation, i.e., with a design of purchasing it thereby, for all that is said is spoken to the price that Christ bought us with, and I instance in running for money, that a man need not run for a price that he has freely without; so that he that works for justification works in vain, for says the Apostle, the Jews that followed after the law of righteousness obtained it not, but ran in vain; and this the apostle means in that place, have ye indeed suffered so much in vain? Why? Because you obtained not your end thereby, not likely so to do.

Neonomian. But it's not your intention that nothing we do can merit, but not that they are required as the requisite means and way to obtain these blessings. You intend this, as you say, I will note one thing before I go on to make clear this thing, &c.

Antinomian. I will give you my own words and sense. The words he refers to are part of an answer to an objection. Objection. But this is a way to lead to a licentious life. Answer. I say the contrary, it is the only way to lead men into a more enlarged way of holiness than any way in the world, which I will declare to you by and by. We have shown that Christ is a safe way, a lightsome way, a near way; we will make good now that the consideration that Christ is a free way to all comers, is the only way to build up men to an enlarged course of holiness, more

than the greatest self-denial, frequentist prayer, greatest study, bearing down of the body, &c. And this will further appear, if we enquire how Christ is such a way, as there is no way wherein there is a quicker, wherein there is a better riddance of businesses and employments believers have, than in Christ; {now comes in what he quotes,} I will note one thing by the way, to make clear this thing, viz., it is a received conceit of many, that obedience is the way to Heaven; and that good works are not the causes of, but the way unto the kingdom. Let me give you a hint or two of another thing, or two, and lay down this position; there is no believer under Heaven, that does come to Heaven before he has served his generation, there is no person that is a believer and has received Christ, but that after he has received Christ he is created in Christ Jesus unto good works, that he should walk in them.

Here you may see I am for good works in a Gospel Way and sense, I say, he that sprinkles with clean water, that they may become clean from all their filthiness, writes his law in their inward parts, &c., so that I say {mark well my words} that sanctification of life is an inseparable companion with the justification of a person by the grace of Christ, but withal I must tell, that all this sanctification is not the way of that justified person to Heaven. It is the business of a person that he has to do in his way to Christ. Now I show that Christ is the way, and nothing else, {sanctification is part of the salvation wrought in Christ; and the Apostle calls the works of sanctification things that accompany salvation,} therefore I say this is no derogation from works, to say they are not the way to Heaven, but that they are concomitant to Heaven unto persons that shall come thither, {and now comes in what he rehearses,} the truth is, since redemption is managed by Christ, the Lord has pointed out other ends and purposes for our obedience than our salvation, {i.e., than purchasing or procuring, or qualifying conditionally in your sense, for Salvation,} in this sense, is not the end of any good work we do, {in plain truth good works are a great part of the salvation itself that Christ is the way to.} The ends of our good works are, manifestation of our obedience and subjection, the setting forth of the praise of the glory of the grace of God, and as such so actually glorifying him in the world, the doing good to others; to be profitable to men, the meeting of the Lord Jesus Christ in them, where he will be found according to the promise. These are the special ends that obedience is ordained for salvation, being settled firm before, to keep the true prerogative of Christ alone, that no righteousness of man entrench upon his privileges. Now judge you whether I detract from works of sanctification, as Mr. Neonomian would make me to do, because I allow them not that place in justification and salvation, which

he would have them have, and that belongs to Christ alone.

Neonomian. He puts this objection, we had as good sit still. He that works all day, and gets no more than he had in the morning, &c. Answer. Let me tell you, the prevention of evil, if there be reality of evil in it, obtaining of good, if there be reality of good, peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, pardon of sin, the infallibility of non-miscarriage, the light of God's countenance, all these you aim at, are abundantly provided for you, and established firmly on you by the mere grace of God in you before you perform anything whatsoever.

Antinomian. I intend no more than that we are blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ; and we can have no greater security of all these benefits, than in Christ Jesus; and that all performances upon account of our security is nothing to faith in Christ, who is the yea and amen of the promises; and therefore I show the vanity of proposing that to ourselves by our works which is done in Christ for us, and can be done by none else, if we have faith to see it; and yet I still show how great a thing salvation is, and good works in a due manner of performance, from true principles, and a right end. I showed that our perseverance depends not on our works, and that I am ready to maintain. I say, God has settled all things that appertain to life and godliness in his Son Jesus Christ, and upon you for his own sake, and settled everlastingly and unchangeably upon you; so that there can be nothing to make them more secure than the grant of God himself has made them; I showed, that a good child knowing he is heir, and has the estate settled on him, does not obey his parents in order to a better security for the estate than he has; he serves not now to get his Father's land, but to honor and glorify his Father, that has so freely settled the estate upon him. Without respect to good or evil the Lord has everlastingly established all that ever he meant to do. The Lord does nothing upon conditions in his people, as if he did refer himself still to these conditions, and did suspend what he did intend to do to his people till he did perceive how they carry themselves to him. All that I aim at is this, that it is not a vain thing to yield due obedience to anything that God requires, though the Lord intend not ye shall by your obedience gain life.

Neonomian. He says, when you fast, pray, mourn, keep the Sabbath, &c., your eye should be simply to the glory of God, and not to gain that which is already ours in Christ, &c.

Antinomian. All this I say still, if in these duties we think and propose to ourselves to obtain life, we are acted by the righteousness of the law, which is opposed to the righteousness of faith, &c.

Neonomian. He says, let subduing of sin alone for peace.

Antinomian. It is an easy thing to expose sermons, and any continued discourses to contempt, if men will pick out here and there an expression, and not show the reason and dependence thereof. My words are, how much filthiness is there in all your wrestlings? I say, how many defects and infirmities might you see. Could you but fall foul upon your own spirits for these infirmities and defects of your best performances, seeing the wages of sin is death, what can you run to then? None but Christ, none but Christ; whilst your acts in respect of filthiness proclaims nothing but war, Christ alone and his blood proclaims nothing but peace. Therefore I will give you this hint by the way, when I speak of the power of Christ subduing sin, because from the power of it in man, they are apt to think their peace depends upon their subduing of their sin. If their sins be subdued then they have peace; let subduing of sin alone for peace, let Christ have that which is his due, it is he alone that speaks peace, he is our peace, I mean not that subduing of sin should be let alone, but doing it for such an end that belongs to Christ alone. If you fetch your peace from anything in the world but Christ, you will fetch it from where it is not.

Neonomian. He says, I must tell you there is not anything you perform, when you have attained the highest pitch, that has any prevalency or availableness to produce or bring forth the least good unto your selves.

Antinomian. I say there is nothing you can do by which you ought to expect any grace to your selves in doing it. My meaning was, that our bare duties are not available to good in themselves; Paul may plant, &c., but God must give the increase; we may eat, drink and sleep, but not expect good from the things themselves, as in efficacy, so in respect of purchase and procurement; what does our righteousness profit God; therefore I add the words of the Apostle; you are not your own, you are bought with a price; Christ has redeemed us, that we should not henceforth live to ourselves, but unto Christ that died for us. Though some look at this as a discouragement, yet there is a spirit of ingenuity in a believer, that he will be as industrious to glorify God, and to do good to men, as if he did it for himself.

Neonomian. He says, if a soul gets under full-sail, filled with a stiff gale of the Spirit, when floods of meltings flow from it, if they can cry mightily, &c., hereby they think they shall get pardon, settle spiritual, civil and spiritual healings, &c.

Antinomian. I was showing how man's righteousness is exalted above what is meet sometimes when duties are accompanied with Christ's assistances by his Spirit; and said, to clear it up, that it's true indeed, whilst a believer's heart is over-cast with gross vapors, and is more than ordinary dull in hearing, flies low, and slow in praying, and is somewhat stiff and untoward

in fasting without measure; such righteousness goes usually for loss and dung. But if a soul gets under full-sail, filled with a stiff gale of the Spirit, &c., then follows what he rehearses; and then it follows, such courses some think will turn away, and reconcile God to a person of people; but under favor the attributing of such efficacy to this righteousness, though thus assisted by Christ's Spirit, is more than is mere, though Christ be explicitly owned as the Author of such assistances.

And this is a failing very ordinary among believers, to ascribe an atoning efficacy to their duties, especially when performed in the best manner, when it is hard to keep their hearts in the right frame; not so rightly considered that their persons and services when seemingly best performed have all their acceptation in Christ, and they are apt to think that they procure more at the hands of God when they seem to be carried forth, more than when they see as it were a withdrawalment of those assistances, and so spoil their best duties for want of due thorough renunciation of their own righteousness, and that of their best duties; whereas God never intended that any of our best graces or duties should be of an atoning nature, to rob Christ of the glory of his atonement. It may be, Mr. Neonomian, you never had any such experience of the working of corruption in your best duties, for the low esteem you have of Christ's righteousness, and the high valuation you have of your own, as appears by these discourses. But know, that the more we are carried forth in duty the greater is our temptation to spiritual pride and self-fulness.

Neonomian. His common phrase is, we must not work for life, but from life.

Antinomian. Yes, and it's a great Gospel Principle, being rightly understood; we must not work for life as a reward of work, for this was the tenor of the Covenant of works, but from life received, being dead in ourselves by nature, and in respect of the law condemned persons; we must work not to obtain eternal life by working, but having received life from it to work. Christ says, he is the life, the resurrection, and the life; where's the man that can work without life to work from?

Neonomian. But he understands this you'll say only of external duties, but not of the actings of grace; no, I could show you how he says the same of all graces.

Antinomian. You need not have troubled yourselves with that objection, for I do intend all graces and duties, for they must all be performed from a principle of life received, and not for mercenary designs and ends, thinking that thereby we deserve anything of the Lord, for when we have done all we are unprofitable servants.

Neonomian. He says, that is the proper work that God

has given to believing, not to effect anything to the good of man, but only to be the witness of that good to the spirit of man, and so give light to that which was hidden before.

Antinomian. You know my opinion, and it's with other divines, that there is justification in heaven and justification in a man's conscience and spirit. Justification in consciences and spirits of men is the manifestation of that act of God to a man's own spirit, by which a man comes to know, and consequently to rejoice in the justification of God; and so you may read the words, Rom.5:1, "being justified by faith," i.e., through faith having the justification of God evidenced and manifested to our spirits, we have peace with God. I contend not with them that say, it justifies instrumentally; so that I ascribe all the efficacy to Christ's righteousness, and not to the act of faith, as a qualifying condition to justify in the sense of actually or properly as you and the Arminians do, and in that sense I spake against its doing us good, that is in your sense of justification.

Neonomian. He says, if you have more ability than others in doing, let it not come into your thoughts, as an inducement to think better of yourself, as if you were more accepted of God, or pleasing in his sight.

Antinomian. I believe it is, or should be the spirit of the best of God's children, that they prefer others above themselves, viz., that fear the Lord; and think not that there's anything in them that makes them more accepted than others; but that all that have true faith are equally accepted in the Beloved, and that Paul's usefulness and apostleship rendered him no more justified than the meanest of the disciples of Christ.

Calvin. You see, Mr. Antinomian, as he is for the exalting Christ, so he speaks highly in the commendation, yea, and usefulness of holiness and good works; those diminutive terms that he useth is in respect of purchase, obtaining pardon, or being qualifying conditions for the bestowing of benefits. He holds Christ as the great condition both of grace here, and glory hereafter; though I confess, I wish Mr. Antinomian, you had spared many expressions, for which I fear the truth suffers, from the ignorant, and more learned of perverse minds, that make it their business to load the doctrine of free-grace with all scorn and contempt, and take all occasions to wound the truth, because of some rash or over-zealous expressions used by you and others, which it may be, had you foreseen, you would have prevented by not using them; or had you printed your own sermons, you would not have sent to the press. Mr. Neonomian. I pray let us have this doctrine delivered in your own words and expressions.

Neonomian. The truth is this, that though neither holiness, sincere obedience or good works do make any

atonement for sin, or are in the least meritorious righteousness, whereby salvation is caused; or for which this or any blessing becomes due to us by debt; yet as the Spirit of God freely worketh all holiness, and enableth to sincere obedience and good works; so the Lord Jesus has of his own grace, and for his own merits, promised to bring to Heaven, such as are partakers of true holiness, perform his sincere obedience, and do those good works perseveringly.

Antinomian. You allow Christ the honor of atonement for sin; but how far I know not, by what follows; his atonement reacheth not the breach of the new law conditions, but only so far as refers to sins against the old law, of which you will not allow, impenitency and unbelief be a breach; so that there must be some way in the new law found out to expiate and appease God for them without Christ's atonement. Beside, the conditions of it, it being only imperfect obedience, there will need nothing but the performance of the constituted condition, which whether perfect or imperfect, being performed as well as is required, though sinfully imperfect, leaves no place for sacrifice or atonement; hence you allow Christ's righteousness to have merited blessings with the same reserve, which you are not willing to speak out, viz., that Christ has purchased and merited, that we shall come under new and milder terms with God, or God rather with us. We thank you no more than we do the Papists, for saying, Christ has merited all, and is a cause, even as the creation was of the covenant of works. God's the cause of all, for he made all; so Christ has merited all that follows, whatever new laws and conditions follow, and upon which terms benefits become due to us {you should have said to mankind} by debt. We may challenge the privileges of compounding with God upon such terms as we like better than the former; but our failure in performing those terms that Christ agreed for, will bring us under new arrears to God. And for your saying, the Holy Spirit worketh freely the said conditional holiness, it helps not, which notwithstanding your setting aside the word merit. And as to the Spirit, you ascribe the free giving and working of it; you give no more to it than Adam had in the state of innocency, and not even so much, for God had given and wrought in Adam that strength of grace, whereby he stood, though only for an appointed time. You say, there is a promise made by Christ of glory, upon condition of their good works and perseverance. Your suggestion to us is of two covenants of grace procured by Christ for us. One, the promise of the state of grace and justification, provided we fulfil the conditions of faith and repentance, whereby we have the first justification. The second covenant is of a state of glory, upon condition of perseverance in good works; which condition if we fail of, we lose all the blessings of eternal life; so that our

glorification stands upon more hazardous terms than eternal life did to Adam; for upon one good work he should have entered into full possession of eternal life, and a confirmation therein; whereas we must stand upon the test all our days, and may lose all at last; for the works must be performed perseveringly, or else no penny for all the paternosters.

Neonomian. Yea, he must perform this sincere obedience, and do these good works perseveringly; and he appoints these as the way and means of a believer's obtaining salvation, and several other blessings, requiring these as indispensable duties and qualifications of all such as he will so save and bless, and excluding all that want or neglect them, or live under the power of what's contrary thereto, viz., as profaneness, rebellion, and utter unfruitfulness.

Antinomian. Gentlemen, you see how well truth is stated here. 1. Christ has promised to bring to Heaven such as are partakers of holiness, as a condition of his second new law; as if the promise of eternal life were not at once the promise of the life of grace and glory. 2. His way and means is a conditional qualifying means, obtaining the promise federally. 3. His means are two, sincerity and perseverance; sincerity must not be mingled with hypocrisy; for though other qualifications be imperfect, yet sincerity must be perfect, and must give perfection to all the rest federally. But a man is not confirmed in the state of grace, nor is it secured by one, two, or a hundred sincere works. His sincerity is not a condition to be depended upon if he persevere not; if he fall into evil works, or perform not good works sincerely, his heart has been hypocritical, he's gone for the present, he must begin again to be sincere and persevere, but will lose his condition and his hope upon it so often, that he is persuaded at last to leave trying himself, to get and keep sincerity, and perform sincere works, that he thinks it the best way to give it over till he is going to die; that he has no more to do than the thief upon the cross; for he reckons he can be sincere there for a spurt to help him at a dead lift, and has nothing else to do, and it will be no long work for him. And thus your doctrine comes to be the greatest doctrine of looseness and profaneness; your un-performable federal conditions, putting men upon an utter despair of ever attaining to any true allowable holiness. And it seems these are indispensable qualifications. The meaning of this can be no other, but a falling away from a state of grace; for if indispensable, then a breach of these conditions is not to be dispensed with. Now I say, if sincere obedience and perseverance be indispensable qualifications, after a man has begun in sincere obedience, and continued some time, and then fall into hypocrisy, or some such sin as David's, which was profaneness; or some such sin as Asa's, which was persecution; and Peter's,

in denial of his Master. These are sins of rebellion; what must such an one conclude? And what else can you now say to him, but that he is fallen from the blessing, and promised Heaven? He is in a state of damnation, all his former faith and obedience is lost. What shall a Minister say to him now under the deepest sense of sin? Saith he, I am certainly damned, I have fallen short of an indispensable qualification for Heaven. Nay, you tell me, Christ does exclude those that have any want of sincerity and perseverance, or such as have neglected it.

Neonomian. Say to him! I'll tell you what I would say to him; Jesus Christ died to save sinners, provided they repent, and believe they shall be justified, and provided they practice sincere obedience, and persevere in it, they shall be saved so as to go to Heaven; but all your justification signifies nothing, unless you persevere in sincerity. I would say to him, go, and repent, and believe, and persevere again in sincere obedience, and they you will see how it is; but never be so presumptuous as to believe you shall be saved till you have persevered, and all your comfort of Heaven lies upon this.

Antinomian. Those that know Christ, and have experienced the temptations of Satan, and the workings of unbelief in themselves, will tell you, that this is a soul-destroying doctrine, such as drives poor sinners off from God, brings them out of love with Christ, carries them back to the yoke of bondage, their own righteousness, and destroys them by security or despair at last.

Neonomian. This Antinomian is honestly zealous for the honor of free grace, but you may see by his discourse, that he has not light sufficient to see how God has provided for this in his rectoral distribution of benefits by a Gospel rule; come I'll tell you wherein the difference does not lie between us first. It's not whether God has decreed that the elect shall be holy and obedient, and so partake of saving blessings.

Antinomian. But yet he has not so decreed it as to all the certainty, but that their salvation depends on a contingent proposition, i.e., if they believe sincerely, work and persevere, they shall be saved, and they are to conclude nothing as to the goodness and certainty of their estate from the doctrine of election, redemption, and the great and precious promises believed, till they have sincerely and perseveringly obeyed, and then they may when the jitters are upon them, and death pangs, if they have their senses, but never before.

Neonomian. Nor is it a question, whether every work will fail to save a Christ-less unbeliever?

Antinomian. What mean you here? One would think you mean that some works will fail, and some not fail; but because I find after you affirm the question, I take it thus, that though a

Christ-less unbeliever can be saved by no works, yet he that believes in Christ is saved by some works, which is at the best very roughhewn divinity, hardly Protestant.

Neonomian. Nor is it the differ whether Christ has paid the price of temporal, spiritual and eternal blessings.

Antinomian. Ay, and much to purpose if we must pay upon an after bargain, and run the gantlet in a Covenant of works, and have no certainty of our salvation, but according to the payment that we make; and if we fail to pay rent duly whether we have money or no, we must be turned out of doors. Indeed, friend you sit at a hard rack-rent, and you must account for all dilapidations too, and its danger, but that you'll be turned out of all at last.

Neonomian. Nor whether the essential blessings of the Gospel become the inheritance of a believer as soon as he is united to Christ?

Antinomian. It seems the circumstantialia are not, the Apostle mistook, when he said, we are blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus; he should have excepted some and reserved them for good works; but as to those essential, how comes it that a man can have no more than is of a contingent proposition, the judgment whereof is opinion.

Neonomian. Nor whether it be the influence of the Spirit that we are holy, obedient, and enabled to every good work?

Antinomian. Nor would it have been the question, if Adam had persevered in the performance of the conditions of the law covenant, he would have done all by the influence of the Spirit.

Neonomian. Nor whether it is for the sake of Christ's merits and incense, and of free grace, that any grace or duty of ours is rewarded, or becomes the means of any benefit; these I affirm.

Antinomian. Yes, for it was through these merits and grace that God would suffer us to try for life in another Covenant of works, he might have taken the advantage of our breaking of the first Covenant, as he did upon the fallen angels; but Christ has merited, and grace has been so far free as to set up another Covenant of works, that we may try for it once more; as for your affirming or denying it signifies not much, men that are used to speak always with mental reservation, will resolve cases of conscience like the oracle of Apollo, that you'll come from them as wise as you went.

Neonomian. Nor whether any holiness internal or external, any obedience, work or duty, do at all merit the promise, or is the meritorious cause of righteousness, for which any promised mercy is bestowed; this I deny.

Antinomian. It seems you abdicate the word merit, but

if it be an honest reward as due debt, it is as good, the Catholics will bate you the word if you allow the thing, though you put a fool's coat upon it.

Neonomian. I own that all is of gift, though given in an order suitable to our condition in a state of trial.

Antinomian. So was creation and created holiness in Adam, and God's taking him into Covenant in an order suitable to his condition in a state of trial, but you see what his trial came to. We are miserable if our state in grace be such a state of trial.

Neonomian. Nor whether the law be a rule of duty? This I affirm and you too; though you deny any threatening or promise to back God's law, as to the elect.

Antinomian. We affirm it to be not only a rule of duty, but to stand in full force, as to all its promises and threatenings, that it still promises life to perfect obedience, and threatens death to the least disobedience in all without distinction, therefore we deny not threatenings and promises to back God's law as to the elect.

Neonomian. Nor whether the elect ought to be holy, and will be holy, this you own, but you place it wholly on the decree and Christ's care.

Antinomian. Gentlemen, observe now after all this noise he owns that I say the elect ought to be holy, and will be holy, but says I place it wrong; can I place it better than on Christ's care? I think in all our fears and doubtings we should cast all our care upon him by believing his truth and faithfulness in the promise, because he careth for us, and has said, he will never leave nor forsake us, I desire to have no better security for holiness and perseverance in it than the love of God, and the care of Christ; is this a fault?

Neonomian. You deny that God has required as it indispensably necessary to our inheriting any blessing promised to the elect.

Antinomian. In your sense I do, and if you stand so much on those terms, I shall justly call them into question, so far as is necessary in my sense; by works you here chiefly understand, as I take it, works after faith and repentance, are such works indispensably necessary to the inheriting any blessing promised to the elect? Is not union with Christ, faith, &c., blessings promised to the elect? What works was done before, and after the saving union with Christ, if they were indispensably necessary, how could infants be saved? And how do they inherit blessings that repent and believe just before they go out of the world? And how came the thief upon the cross to be saved?

Neonomian. You judge Christ has done all for us, and enjoins nothing for us to do in order to any good thing.

Antinomian. Christ has done all in the way of Covenant condition, and does not admit us to be rivals or partners with him in our best works; and how can I think that he enjoins us nothing, when I own we ought to be holy, and shall be holy? From what should it be but from Christ's commands and care to furnish us with rules, principles, and strength to be holy? Doth he not work in us to will and to do?

Neonomian. Nor whether a penitent believer shall be saved, if he die before he has time for further obedience.

Antinomian. Then your indispensable necessity falls to the ground; and it seems the first law of grace will save a man, and the second is not indispensably necessary; nay, it may be a kindness to die upon the fulfilling the condition of the first law by faith and repentance, before he comes to run the risk of fulfilling the condition of the second law by persevering works, lest he lose all again. I am glad I have done with your 'whethers,' let's come next to your 'neithers,' for we are as wise as we were before about our question.

Neonomian. I'll tell you then the real difference, whether faith and repentance be indispensably required that we may be justified for the sake of Christ's righteousness?

Antinomian. Gentlemen, do but take notice how fond he is of his first justification by works, which we dispatched the other day, and do declare we are not justified by faith and repentance in your sense, and that to be justified by faith and repentance as conditioning federal qualifications, though merited by Christ, is downright Popery, whether you call such conditions merits or no; and therefore in affirming it you assert Popish doctrine, and that will stand to, though all the divines in Town affirm it with you; and if what's done already will not be enough, we'll have the other touch upon that point when you please.

Neonomian. It's whether holiness or sincere obedience and perseverance, are the way to Heaven, and are required of the elect as the conditions of their obtaining salvation.

Antinomian. You should have told us what you mean by a way, whether the first way or second, remote or next, antecedent or consequent conditions; what salvation you mean, whether the salvation of justification, sanctification, or glorification; there's as much reason good works should qualify us for the salvation of sanctification, as for justification and glorification; how comes it to pass that all salvation is not obtained the same way? If we must obtain salvation by good works, we must do good works before we are saved. Do we not obtain all salvation in Christ? We are created in Christ Jesus unto good works; but I find you'll have nothing to be salvation but glorification, and that must be earned at our fingers ends, and we may lose all at last for all Christ, if we do not look the better

to it, to perform sincere persevering works till the last breath; the first justification though by works, gives no evidence for Heaven, you'll be sure to be far enough from the error {as you call it} of faith justifying evidentially. We say, Christ is the Way, Jn.14:6, and holiness our business in that way.

Neonomian. Or whether Heaven is promised to them if they persevere in holiness and sincere obedience, and the loss of Heaven threatened, in case they continue wicked and disobedient, or after grace turn apostates.

Antinomian. Observe what doctrine here is. 1. Here his discourse is limited to the elect. 2. He supposes the elect may lose Heaven. 3. That their obedience and perseverance are the conditions of their obtaining salvation, you take him for any salvation, for that of the first justification, which he makes to be by works; and perseverance the obtaining condition of his second justification. But I pray, what's the condition of persevering sanctification, which is salvation too? 4. He does not only suggest but express falling away from grace, for what is that when he suggests an elect person may fall away from grace, turn apostate, and lose Heaven? 5. He suggests that the elect person before faith must perform these works before he can be saved by justification; but this doctrine is nothing with him; this doctrine I deny from the bottom of my heart, notwithstanding his affirming of it. Is this right stating of truth and error?

Neonomian. The question is, whether the good works of a believer are rewardable of grace for Christ's sake.

Antinomian. The question has been clearly stated to your purpose long ago between the Papists and we, whether Christ has merited that we may merit? Whether you'll call your doctrine the doctrine of merit or not. We'll call a spade a spade, and Antichrist must not creep in amongst us again with his serpentine tricks to beguile us, as the devil did into paradise to rob us of our first righteousness.

Neonomian. Whether by the Gospel, as a rule of judgment, whoever is unholy, utterly disobedient, altogether willfully neglectful of good works, shall be condemned; this I affirm, and you deny.

Antinomian. 1. The Gospel is no law as it has to do with the unbelieving, wicked world. 2. It is no rule of judgment, that's the law only. 3. The Gospel did never condemn any elect person to eternal death; neither is any elect person as such under a contingency of salvation, whether he be holy or unholy; though as sinners, unholy and wicked persons they are, for as such they may be saved, and they may not, but it's not so with the elect as such.

Neonomian. Whether God has promised several blessings {distinct from eternal life} to the exercise of several

graces, and performances of several duties, as to the improvement of grace, &c. This you deny, and I affirm.

Antinomian. We ask all outward mercies for the sake of Christ with submission to his will; we reckon them not due to us because of our duties performed, and the connection of blessing {as you say} and duty, is but the connecting two blessings in the promise upon the same condition, for duty is a blessing to the saints, and part of that salvation purchased by Christ, and promised in the Covenant. I divide not what God has joined together, and call duty not a condition, and outward or spiritual good things the salvation; for I look upon the service of God to be the great thing we are redeemed to, the salvation bestowed on us, and not the condition of it.

Neonomian. Whether upon the acting such graces, and upright performing such duties, a Christian may not in the virtue of such promises, expect such blessings, and fear the neglect thereof as a bar thereto. This you deny, and I affirm.

Antinomian. And you affirm and teach a low servile spirit, and too bold to set aside Christ out of the promise, and challenge any mercy at the hands of God upon the account of duty; I think the best of the saints have always thought themselves less than the least of God's mercies, and all their righteousness, i.e., their sincere obedience and perseverance to be but filthy rags; but that's false doctrine with you, as I suppose we shall hear of ere long.

Neonomian. Yet allowing that God may sometime exert his sovereignty in giving some blessings to a believer not answering these rules, and he may exchange a blessing of a lower nature.

Antinomian. Rules of distributive justice in rewarding him according to his works; and if God must do it, he must fly to his sovereignty for permission to go beside this rule, and no more than in exchanging one good thing for another; there's no such dispensation in the Covenant of Grace. What if God should deny to give the blessing worked for, and give no succedaneum?

Neonomian. Whether God is not more pleased with a man in the exercise of grace and holiness, than when he neglects them, and does the contrary. This I affirm.

Antinomian. Let me ask you, do you mean in a way of benevolence or complacency? In respect of his person or his services? And do you mean, he is pleased for the duties sake, or for Christ's sake?

Neonomian. Now I shall proceed to confirm the truth, and the points are too many to admit enlargement, and many carry that evidence, that the whole scope of the Bible must be forgone when they are denied. Can two or three wrested texts over-turn the constant language of the Scriptures?

Antinomian. You should have first stated the question in clear terms, and let it have been but one, and not reserve to yourself your principal intention, and give us out twenty 'whethers' and 'neithers,' delivered forth in a heap of amphibologies, which having been sufficiently demonstrated to you, it signifies little for the discovery of truth to join issue with you upon such rambling discourses as you make; and it's easier to call Scriptures brought against you wrested texts, than to prove them so.

Neonomian. And it is strange, that all religion and human nature itself in a state of trial should be so fully struck at, from a gross concept that the infinite God cannot foresee and purpose events, unless it must null his government over reasonable subjects, and prevent his distribution of rewards and punishments by a stated rule.

Antinomian. Here is nothing but huff and bounce, to talk at this rate, of wrested texts, overturning the language of Scripture and human nature, &c. Now let me tell you, one of the wrested texts, which in its plain literal sense must overthrow your whole scheme of distribution of rewards and punishments in the way that you propose. "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Tit.3:4-7. I'll tell you what Mr. Beza says upon the place, "certainly not only the works of the ceremonial law, but all works are at once excluded, or else the antithesis of mercy would signify nothing here. But some will say, it's to be understood of works preceding faith, and therefore all preparatory works are excluded; and then tell us what it is to save; whether this be nothing else than to ascribe a faculty of deserving to a thing; he that says this, does manifestly wrest the Word of God? For so the benefit of our salvation is taken away from the righteousness of subsequent works as well as of precedent; which appears from the opposition made between works and grace; as also from our regeneration and justification by grace in the two next verses."

But you say, the Covenant of Grace is a rule of distribution of rewards and punishments according to works, {which you explain doing, performing actions on our parts,} which is to make the Covenant of Grace a Covenant of Works. And you insinuate, that human nature stands in a state of trial for salvation, as if something were to be done, and is expected to be done by the natural man, in order to the obtaining of grace.

Neonomian. What reflection is it on Divine wisdom, and

the glorious platform of the Redeemer's work and kingdom, that he cannot purchase benefits for sinners, unless he forbears to use them as motives to obedience? Yea, the whole of his serious pleadings with men must be a mockery, rather than he must be allowed to bestow his benefits in a rectoral way.

Antinomian. What a reflection it is on the wisdom, grace and power of God, that he cannot bestow his benefits freely, that he can act no way towards poor sinful and miserable creatures, but in a way of justice, in propounding rewards to their works; and these must be the motives to duty, that he will pay them well for their duties! And what reflection on the whole work of redemption, that all that sinners have got by it, is the procurement of an offer of salvation in a Covenant of works, by offering them to live upon the condition of doing; to allow him to have purchased benefits, but we must pay for them before we have them, and not be out of debt at the first payment neither. Christ indeed, you'll say, gives us the buying, and says, that he'll get little or nothing by it. He has set a moderate reasonable price upon them, but we must pay in such money as we have; yea, and all that we have, and because we have not the money to lay down at once, he allows us to pay by parts, {which is a favour,} but if we make a failure, that we persevere not in sincere doing, out of doors we must go; reprobate silver shall we be called, because the Lord has rejected us. Your meaning of a rectoral way I take to be nothing else but in a way of distributive justice, dispensing as King and Law-giver in the Covenant of Grace, making and executing this law, do and live; for you will not have the Covenant of Grace to run in this tenure, live and do. Therefore he must act no otherwise, than in a Covenant of works, do and live, and accordingly dispense rewards and punishments.

Neonomian. That you mistake me not, when I speak of holiness, I mean all good works, internal, external, praying, hearing, exact walking, alms-deeds, any act of obedience directed by the Word of God; by doing the same actions are intended, believing in Christ is doing; it is an action on our part, &c.

Antinomian. We know your meaning better than you have declared; and then why did you not plainly state your question thus, whether that Christ offers to save sinners, and continue them in a state of salvation on the terms or condition of doing? And you might have saved this labour of beating the hedge to start the hare. Believing is doing, it seems, and so it saves as a work.

Neonomian. My positions that I will prove then are as follow. Sinners have much to do in order to salvation, it's the scope of the Bible since the Fall. We have nothing to do in a way of atonement and purchase, but in order to our participation, we

must repent, believe, &c. All the revelations of God are descriptions of duty and benefits, but an injunction of duty in a connection with benefits, &c.

Antinomian. The whole scope of the Scriptures is not a revelation of a Covenant of works, or of many covenants of works, but of one Law-Covenant of works, and of one Covenant of Grace made by way of promise, and executed by free-gift; the righteousness thereof is the gift of righteousness for the condition; the promise is performed in gift; the gift of God is eternal life. You say nothing is required in a way of purchase and atonement, i.e., in the way of the first purchase; but where works are a prerequisite condition, it makes a second purchase, if but of participation. If I purchase a house for a child or relation, and lay down the price of 100 shillings, and tell him he shall have this house if he gives me 20 shillings of his own earnings, and this contract brought into covenants, this purchase will put him upon paying this contract-money, and demand his bargain; and his money is purchase money, though it be not the first purchase-money. So that you help not the matter at all, by saying in order to participation; and as to atonement, he needs none, if he perform the condition required; no, nor a Mediator, for Christ in your sense should be only the Mediator of the Old Covenant, but he is ill termed by the Scripture the Mediator of the New Covenant. You say, revelations are descriptions of duties and benefits; I say, discoveries and promise of benefits and duties. You say, an injunction of duty in a connection of benefits; I say, a promise of benefits, rather with connection of duties. But indeed, the Covenant of Grace is a gift of benefits in service and enjoyments, for duty is one of the great privileges we are brought into by the Covenant; and such is the connection of promised salvation unto sinners. There's the salvation of faith and holiness, and all the connecting propositions that is made use of, as that of Romans 10:9, and others import nothing, but that he that is saved by Christ partakes of all his salvation; if in justification, then in sanctification and glorification; but Christ never propounds privileges as motives to duty in your sense, by way of payment or reward for the duty done.

Neonomian. There's no one saving benefit granted a sinner, but upon supposition of duty.

Antinomian. What kind of supposition? Supposition of duty antecedaneous to it? This is false; faith is a saving benefit, and it's not bestowed with a supposition that any saving duty is precedent to it, so our union to Christ, gift of the Spirit, justification, yea, the grace of sanctification itself, are all saving benefits of the highest nature.

Neonomian. The influences of the Spirit and God's institutions have no causality in our salvation, if men have

nothing to do in order to be saved.

Antinomian. That is as much as to say, if we save not ourselves, the Spirit cannot save us. We must be our own saviours first, or the Spirit must make us our own saviours, that we may be saved. I told you Adam had been saved by the influences of the Spirit, if he had been saved in his innocent state, and it had never the less been a Covenant of Works.

Neonomian. On what account is it said, that we believe to the saving of our souls, Heb.10:39, and repentance to salvation? II Cor.7:10, I Tim.4:16.

Antinomian. Those expressions are descriptions of true faith and repentance given. As to that of I Tim.4:16, we deny not that the Covenant of Grace has many exhortations, directions, encouragements to duty, but not antecedent to the promise. The general promise is first participated of, before any duty is or can be performed; and after participation of the promise, consequent to it, and effects of it, particular duties and promises do follow.

Neonomian. The destruction of sinners under the Gospel is still laid to not doing, Jn.5:40, their not coming, not turning and repenting.

Antinomian. Yea, their blamable moral inability and perverseness is that which they are under the condemnation for, falling upon them in their apostasy, and so their refusing a remedy, is part of their condemnation under the Law. And therefore our Saviour says, such unbelievers are condemned already, they remain under the power and sentence of the first condemnation. Neither is the destruction of sinners laid to their not doing, but not believing in Christ. Believing is opposed to doing, because God will not have us to be saved by doing, and when a sinner comes, he is not saved by his act in coming, but by Christ to whom he is come. Neither does he come till he is saved by the Father's drawing him; and Christ finding every sinner before he comes, shows that he is a lost sinner, and never comes to salvation, till salvation comes to him.

Neonomian. If men have nothing to do for salvation, then Christ has no rule to judge them that live under the Gospel. Christ proceeds on the difference of men's carriage and tempers at the last day. Consider any description of the last day, you'll find God saves and damns with respect to men's neglect and compliance with the Gospel.

Antinomian. Your argument seems to run thus. Upon the same terms that man shall be judged at the last day, upon the same shall they be saved now. But men shall be judged by their works at the last day, ergo, saved by works now.

I deny your major, if that were true, you might have some pretense, that the Covenant of Grace was a Covenant of Works. There's a great deal of difference between Christ's

proceedings in the Covenant of Grace, and the judgment of the Last Day. 1. Christ in the Covenant of Grace comes not as a judge to condemn the world, but to save it. 2. Christ first saves his Church, and exerts his offices in that salvation, first, as Priest, to make atonement; as Prophet, to teach by his Word and Spirit; as King, to conquer and subdue their hearts unto himself, and all this is done before he rules and governs them. 3. Christ in the Covenant of Grace acts not in his regal power, as King of the world, but as King to his church; his Mediatorial Offices are all exerted towards his redeemed ones, in order to the saving of them. All final unbelievers are judged as such as are under the condemnation of the law; and their sins only judged the more aggravated, because of their refusal of a remedy. The Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from Heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance upon them that know not God, and those that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. The slighting and rejecting a remedy provided, is a ground of more severe proceeding in the way of execution of the sentence which the condemned person lay under before. How shall ye escape, that neglect so great salvation. The talents mentioned, Matt.25:21-28, refer only to the distinction that appears between professors. Some act from providential mercy only, some by special grace; some are carried no further than providential mercy will carry them, and therefore bring not forth real fruit unto God, and are not in Christ Jesus, have only common graces and gifts.

Neonomian. I could easily demonstrate, that if men have nothing to do in order to salvation, the ministry of Christ and his Apostles is all vanity and falsehood, &c. They are cold pleadings with sinners that are not backed with life and death.

Antinomian. It's easy to demonstrate that an unsaved person can do nothing in order to salvation; and if they can, the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles is false. For Christ himself says, without me ye can do nothing; and we are sanctified in Christ Jesus, and created in him to good works, and Christ worketh in us to will and to do, all this is salvation. The first true motive to a sinner is the salvation wrought by Christ already for sinners, in his death and satisfaction. The promise of Heaven is a secondary motive; but is not to be brought as a primary motive. The rendering life and death to working or not working is the preaching of the law, and of the letter, and makes the Gospel such a law as is the ministration of condemnation. And to conclude my answer to the proof of that position, that sinners have much to do in order to salvation; and to prove it in the negative, I offer this argument, that they that can do nothing in order to salvation till they are saved, have not much to do in order to salvation. But sinners can do nothing in order to salvation till they are saved, ergo, a sinner has not much to do

in order to salvation in your sense. I leave you to consider of it, and the evidence of it; for you cannot but apprehend the demonstration that is therein; for doing must be here understood effective. Such works you speak of, as appears by what follows.

Neonomian. True holiness, sincere obedience or good works, and perseverance, are the way to Heaven, and so necessary to the salvation of a believer, that without them he cannot be saved, and continuing in them he shall be saved.

Antinomian. I find you make holiness or sanctification, and salvation two things, whereas sanctification is a part of salvation. True holiness is the way to Heaven, but it's salvation as well as the perfection of Heaven. Holiness is the way to Heaven, as childhood, and then youthful age is to manhood in the full stature. Grace, it's a growing unto that perfection we shall have in glory, but it's not part of a conditioning way to Heaven federally. Heaven is bestowed on sanctified ones upon as free a promise as justification and sanctification; and we say it's our business in Christ the Way.

Neonomian. I shall give you divers arguments against your position. It's not saving faith that is not operative.

Antinomian. The eye is the most sensible part in the body as to the sense of feeling, yet does not see clearly. By virtue of feeling, faith brings forth fruits, but it does not justify by its fruits. Faith brings forth fruits, but it does not justify as fruitful; for that would bring us under a Covenant of works.

Neonomian. Obedience, good works and perseverance preserve us from contrary evils. Paul kept his body under. I Cor.9:27.

Antinomian. They have their usefulness in their kind; but we are kept from evils by the grace of God, and not by our works; grace also preserves us in them, and not they preserve us. What Paul says he did, he did for the Gospel-sake, I Cor.9:23, from a Gospel principle, the love of God, arising from the sight and sense of the grace of God in the Gospel; and for this end, the glory of God in the promise; and he said, by the grace of God I am what I am; not ascribing federal efficacy to inherent graces or duties.

Neonomian. Gospel-constitutions show that it contains promises and threatenings. It shows persevering holiness, sincere obedience or good works as necessary to salvation.

Antinomian. It is one thing what a thing contains, and another what it is. A house contains tables, libraries, bedsteads, men and women; but a house is not therefore a table, library, bedstead, a man or a woman. The Covenant of Grace sets up a government, a glorious King, has laws, directions, precepts, but it is not either of them. Whatever the Covenant has, and is inseparable from it, does not argue the Covenant to be the same.

A wise man is inseparable from wisdom as such, yet is not wisdom. A rational man has reason, yet that man is not reason.

Neonomian. Most of the promises and threatenings that refer to the state in the Bible, are evangelical promises and threats.

Antinomian. Christ in the Bible speaks two ways, by way of precept, and backing them with threats and promises. 1. As King of nations, and Governor of the world; so he deals with men as he will deal with them at last in a way of a Covenant of Works. Christ also governs his Church, where he has his peculiar right of legislation, and his government is double. 2. As to his mystical or visible body, his spiritual rule is according to the tenure of the Covenant of Grace. His government in respect of the mixed and political state, must be also mixed, because of hypocrisy. Christ's government of his Churches as visible polities and societies, is a mixed government, having in his house vessels of honor and of dishonour, for many are led to external conformity by his precepts and commands legally submitted to only, having not received evangelical principles. Precepts and promises of the Gospel work no otherwise with them than by a spirit of bondage, and come to them no otherwise than in the tenure of the Covenant of works, and thence the Lord Jesus Christ speaks in that manner to whole societies and churches, both under the Old Testament, and under the New. As to the Seven Churches of Asia, where there were many formal out-side professors, that never received the truth of the Gospel in the love of it, he tells them what they must expect in that mercenary and bondage-way of profession without life and love, wherein they did walk; yet he governs them as politic Head of his Church, they having given themselves to his government, at least in an outward profession, according to which he deals with them. And therefore the Apostle tells us, the law is not made for the righteous man, in respect of its threats and denunciations, but for the lawless, disobedient, ungodly, &c., or for anything contrary to sound doctrine, which is according to the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, I Tim.1:10-11, the precepts and commands of Christ therefore have a double aspect, evangelical and legal, as they are received by his visible subjects. Some receive them from law-principles, some from evangelical.

Neonomian. Gospel constitution contains promises and threatenings, which affect all of us as a rule of righteousness and misery, by these God governs; and men's hopes and fears should be directed by these as a rule. You not observing this, have opened a door to all licentiousness. Your whole scheme implies, that Christ does not distribute blessings and punishments by any rule that refers to the actings of men.

Antinomian. This is a round assertion, that the Gospel-Constitution is a Covenant of works, that Constitution that affects all as a rule of righteousness and misery, is a Covenant of works of the severest nature. But you say, the Gospel-Constitution is such, ergo, a Covenant of works, for that which affects as a rule of righteousness and misery, on the penalty of non-attainment to that rule; and God deals with men thus by hopes and fears, that men may be governed by them, as they find their righteousness, or fall into their misery, is such an account of a Gospel-Constitution, that I question not but to find as good in Seneca, and among many of the heathen moralists, and if that be my mistake, that I understand not such a Gospel-Constitution, I must declare I know no such Gospel-Constitution as yet.

Neonomian. If that Covenant of Grace be conditional, and faith and repentance are necessary to forgiveness, the substance of it must be granted.

Antinomian. If the Covenant of Grace be a moral law, and faith and repentance be the moral conditions to forgiveness, the substance must be granted; and it will be so indeed, you will still be leaping in and out of Covenant, from righteousness to misery, and from misery to your miserable righteousness, and between your hopes and fears, falling short of the righteousness of God, you will fall deplorably into eternal misery. But in what body of ethics do you find a rule of misery treated of? I think it is nowhere treated of but in the Neonomian Theology, no more than the rule of sin.

Neonomian. Most promises and threatenings in the Bible that refer to the state of souls, are evangelical promises and threats, and are not the sanction of the law of innocence, but of Gospel-grace.

Antinomian. The whole Word of God contains but Law and Gospel, and all matters of duty commanded refers to the one or to the other; and all duties enjoined with a connection of promises and threats, and so performed as such only, are legal, and must be reckoned as belonging to the law of works; but all evangelical duties are performed from a principle of grace, and not for reward or fear. But let us hear your proof.

Neonomian. Who can doubt this, if they consider that the Covenant of Innocency promised to nothing below sinless and perfect obedience.

Antinomian. It promised to man upon obedience which God required, and so it is in every Covenant; the obedience required is perfect in respect of the Covenant, let it be more or less that is required. No Covenant admits of any abatement or defect in the conditions required. If this be a Covenant of Innocency, your Covenant opposed to it must be a Covenant of Nocency, because, as you say, it admits of a contrary condition,

viz., a sinful obedience.

Neonomian. The threatenings of the Covenant of Innocency admitted no repentance, or after-relief to the guilty, they did fix the curse irrevocable in case of any transgression.

Antinomian. Who told you the Covenant of works would admit of no relief for the guilty? If not, how came any? How came it to pass that relief was given before the sentence was passed upon man? Surely if the Covenant could not admit of it by virtue of its Constitution, it could not have been just with God to have given it. As to repentance, it did naturally belong to the breach of God's law, and man's falling into misery. Indeed, it did not admit of repentance as an expiation of the sin, and a condition of life, no more does the Gospel; so that Law and Gospel are agreed in that. And as to the irrevocable fixing of the curse, grant it was so, yet not without admitting a relief, provided it might consist with the irrevocable curse, i.e., that the law might have its full satisfaction, both to sufferings and obedience, as it had in Christ. The sentence of the law is not repealed or revoked in the Covenant of Grace, but confirmed and fulfilled, whereby the guilty have their relief. The law is not against the promise, Gal.3:21, no, God forbid; it's well pleased with it, because it has all that it can require. The law is not dispensed with in saving sinners, it has its ends, Christ being the end of the law for righteousness to all that believe. The Gospel establisheth the Law.

Neonomian. No overture of life, or door of hope, or argument to conversion, with hopes of acceptance, could be framed out of those legal threats and promises, turn ye, turn ye, was not the language.

Antinomian. Nor from any other upon terms of the like nature, viz., do and live. And why was it, that no door of hope is open to man fallen, upon those terms? It was because he did not do, and now is dead, and he must live now before he can do; till grace give life, its but a conviction to him that God saith, turn you, turn you; for till God give him life, and turn him, "turn you, turn you," is but the triumph of the law; and all the turnings of a poor sinner in his natural estate, is no more than the turning of a dead carcass; it's dead still, there's no returning to life by turning, till the effectual voice of Christ prevail, who is the resurrection and the life.

Neonomian. See any one of the calls to faith and repentance, or holiness thus backed with promises and threats, be not evangelical.

Antinomian. Calls to faith and repentance, as commands to sinners to perform the acts and duties thereof upon threats and promises; and as those works that shall bring us into Covenant, are so far from being Evangelical, as they are highly

legal, yea, super-legal. Legal, for it makes a Covenant of works. What matter if God require not the same individual act as a condition of life, if he require another? What, if instead of forbearing to eat an apple, the condition be now to forbear the eating of a pear? What if perfect obedience was then required, and imperfect now? Both were obedience, only now you'll have a dispensation for sin to come into the condition, which reflects upon the holiness and justice of God, or power of God, that he did not, nor could give us life in a way of perfect obedience and sinless perfection, but must have recourse to sinful. Likewise the only obligation that lies upon a mere natural man to obey God, when he commands faith and repentance, is the law; for he is under no other law but that of works. It is also super-legal, to bring fallen man into Covenant upon working conditions, is more than was with Adam; he did not work himself into Covenant; God took him freely into Covenant without conditions; all the condition was perseverance for keeping him in Covenant, as yours is. God here requires works where there's no power. God gave Adam the power before he required obedience.

Calvin. In my approbation, gentlemen, you do but lose time. Mr. Antinomian argues at a mighty low rate; I will take his position and put it into right terms, and then see, Mr. Antinomian, how you like it. Salvation by Gospel-grace is so necessary to a sinner, for the working faith, obedience, good works and perseverance in the way to Heaven, that without it he cannot perform them, or continue in them.

Antinomian. So I like it well.

Neonomian. That's quite contrary to my sense, for I do not say that salvation by grace is the cause of sincere faith, and obedience, and perseverance; but that sincerity in performance of faith and obedience with perseverance is necessary as a cause of salvation. I spake before of coming into justification by qualifying faith and repentance, by the government of a rule of righteousness and misery, our minds being thereby affected with hopes and fears. I will now show you that by this Gospel-Constitution, persevering holiness, sincere obedience or good works are necessary to salvation.

Antinomian. I have told you, that if these be right, i.e., true Gospel-holiness, they be a great part of salvation, and they are no more necessary than a part is to the whole. All graces and duties are the necessary parts of a saved sinner. And there are two sorts of necessities, essentially necessary, and necessary as to well-being; as a man's rational is essentially necessary to a man; but there are many things as to integrity, ornaments and usefulness. Now I say, as these things are in salvation, or belonging to it; for being in their kind, for wellbeing, usefulness, adorning, &c., so they are necessary, but if you look upon them

and salvation as two distinct things, they are not necessary to give you right to any part of salvation.

Neonomian. He that made faith necessary to justification, has made obedience necessary to salvation.

Antinomian. It seems by you that justification and salvation are specifically distinct, which they are not; they differ but as genus and species; for salvation is the genus both of justification, sanctification and glory, and in the same kind as you make faith and repentance necessary to justification, so you may make your sincerity and perseverance. You do but tire out your selves and us in an ambiguous word, in which you would not have us know your meaning; but he must and cannot be mistaken in it.

Neonomian. He has as well promised Heaven to the godly man, as pardon to the believer.

Antinomian. As if a believer were not a godly man, and Heaven were not promised to him. A believer is a godly man, and the promise of all things that appertain to life and godliness through the knowledge of him that has called him to glory and virtue, glory and virtue are promised to him. II Pet.1:3.

Neonomian. And our perseverance in holiness and obedience is as truly our way to glory, as the Scriptures can describe.

Antinomian. It's one thing to be a way in the Covenant-state, and another thing to be a way to it. Salvation has its ways of degrees in it, sanctification is but a degree of glorification. When we are changed into the image of Christ, it's from glory to glory by the Spirit of God. II Cor.3:18.

Neonomian. Nothing of these merit Heaven; but he that merited Heaven, has peremptorily appointed these to bring us thither. Heb.6:10-12.

Antinomian. He that merited the end, has merited the means; and the means to work in such a way as shall not rob him of the honor of his merits. He has not merited, that we should deserve, but he must have the honor of all our salvation. The things spoken of, Heb.6:10, are all comprehended in salvation. He spoke of false-hearted professors before, now he was persuaded better things of them, that to them true salvation did belong, and that through grace that bringeth salvation they had truth of faith, and love to his name, which they shown in their love to his Saints; and therefore encourages them in the stability of the promises, from the truth and justice of God that made them, and that they should not fail of all in God's order; and therefore exhorts them to full assurance of hope; that God who gave grace, will give glory, and will withhold no good thing; and therefore encourages to persist in faith, and hope, and the true fruits thereof from the grace of God they had received, and

the stability thereof, as he exhorts to the practice of Christian duties, Heb.13:1-5, and verse 5, "for he has said, he will never leave thee nor forsake thee, so that we may boldly say, the Lord is my helper." Is not this salvation? And that there's rewards in grace, it's not denied, but they are all to Christ and his members, not upon the attaining of conditioning qualifications. And we deny not but the Lord Jesus exhorts to labour, and diligence, and perseverance, and rebukes slothfulness; and all these are benefits, {for so I call all Covenant duties that are connected to promises,} but all within the Covenant. The obtaining a Covenant-state, or continuance in it, is not to be ascribed to them, but they are to be assigned to our salvation, and to the fulness, perpetuity and permanency of the Covenant.

Neonomian. Christ declares in the Gospel they shall miss of Heaven, and eternally perish who are apostates, ungodly, disobedient, and unprofitable. This is not the doom of the Law.

Antinomian. That's false, for does not the Spirit of God say in the Gospel, the law is made for the lawless and disobedient, I Tim.1:9, and that it dooms whatever thing is contrary to sound doctrine. Denunciations against sin and sinners in the Gospel, is but telling the sense and judgment of the law. The Gospel, as such, cannot doom any to death, it being the declaration of a remedy; those that embrace it not, it leaves them as it found them; it found them dead, and so it leaves them, and their further penalty is from the law, of being more inexcusable for their rejecting the remedy; and says to them, how will he escape that neglects so great salvation, i.e., how will they escape that condemnation that they are under already?

Neonomian. It's not against every imperfect degree of godliness but ungodliness. It's not every defect of obedience but disobedience, not against every neglect of fruitfulness, but such as argues a dead and barren state.

Antinomian. These are such as are under the law; and whatever the word of God says to them, it's the law denouncing their doom, and by your own doctrine they are not come into the bounds of a Gospel-Covenant, having not performed the conditions of sincere obedience. On the other hand, you own, that these dooms and threatenings do not belong to those in Covenant, though they have sins, and failings, and falls, yet the Gospel does not doom them, nor the threats belong to them, because the Gospel admits imperfect and sinful obedience. But the law condemns the least sin even in God's children, and the Gospel admits of no sin, nor approves of it, but is to save us from it.

Neonomian. Art thou so unskillful in the word, as not to remember? "Now the just shall live by faith, but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of

them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." Heb.10:38-39. If any man draw back? Is this a threatening or not? Is it not true of all persons? Do not say the elect believer will not fall away. I think the same, but yet is it the less true, that even he shall perish if he fall away?

Antinomian. I wish you and I were more skillful in the Word than we are. Will you have such expressions as these to be part of the Covenant of Grace, which are sentences of death to hypocrites and unbelievers? Christ will send away many such at the last day, with I know you not, depart from me, &c., will you say, that will be preaching the Gospel to them, and giving them a law of grace? No, no; when Christ judgeth as Judge of all the world, he will judge but by one law, under which those will fall who have not obeyed the Gospel; though their punishment will be the more heightened, in that they have refused the Remedy. There are many things in the Scripture, as declarations of truths of one kind or another, description of persons, histories, miracles, &c., discriminations of persons and things, which are not to be reckoned the essentials of the Covenant of Grace, but for the usefulness and advantage of those to whom it does belong. If we make every work in the Scripture spoken of to be a condition of the Covenant of Grace, we shall not tell where to find it.

Neonomian. Salvation is promised to perseverance. Rev.2:10.

Antinomian. Perseverance is salvation; and in the promise is an Assurance of the connection of all salvation one part to another; for every one that is saved, is saved with all salvation, and it's an encouragement and motive to the Saints to hold on their way in growth of grace; not that by every step they gain in holiness, the more they shall be qualified for, and deserving what shall follow; but that still there are greater things behind, and that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed; that the Covenant of promise is full of promises, gifts and rewards. But the question between us is, upon what account they are made and received? Some say they describe men whom God does save by the effects of his grace upon them.

Neonomian. Not mere natural signs, but moral institutes. They are qualifications which God appoints as prerequisites to blessings.

Antinomian. Prerequisites to blessings and moral qualifications must be such as are not blessings of the Covenant; or else all this while you say just nothing, in saying, God gives blessings orderly one after another, and we are encouraged by the promise to go from one Covenant gift to another. Hence in perseverance and growth in grace, the Saints have the clearer

prospect of Heaven, which they hope ere long to live in as the crown of glory, and there to perfect and complete happiness and holiness.

Neonomian. They cannot add what's proper to Christ, but they signify more than concomitants; they are things without which the Gospel-rule will exclude men from Heaven, and condemn to Hell, let your pretenses be what they will. Rev.22:14.

Antinomian. They signify so much more than concomitants, insomuch that they are blessings promised, perseverance in obedience. I will write my law in their heart, and they shall not depart from me. When they come under this promise, of doing God's commandments, they are soon come also to what remains. When they are most holy, they are no more fit for the promise by way of moral qualification to entitle them to it, than they were at first conversion. We perform duties, walk in God's way, &c., not as entitling blessings, but as such which Christ has entitled us to; and so we receive the promise, not as entitled to it, but in Christ. In this sense is that place to be understood, Rev.22:14, "blessed are they that do his commandments," {they have one part of the blessing of the promise in a way of holiness,} they shall also have the privilege of the Tree of life in a state of glory. I find this word used so in John 1:12, "as many as received him, to them was given power {or privilege} to become the sons of God." So that obedience persevered in, gives title to glory here, no more than the first believing entitles to adoption, but that it's in the way to it. Such do enter by the gates into the City, but Christ is the way both of justification, sanctification and glory, both by way of condition to entitle us, and promise to bestow it; and they show such are entered by the door Christ Jesus. "I am the door." Jn.10:9.

Neonomian. Consider they have a relation to each other in Scripture-phrase, as seed and harvest, work and wages, they are declared rewardable, for they are worthy. Rev.3:4.

Antinomian. No works of the saints are rewardable of God in themselves, but in Christ; and as to their order of bestowing succeeding Covenant-blessings. They are called seed, because one good work grows up through grace into another, till we be fruitful in every good work, the fruitfulness in more and greater glory is the crop; all which fruitfulness is in Christ the Vine, the last which are the best, as well as the first; and for the worthiness spoken, Rev.3:4, it's strange that any Protestant should pretend that it's any other worthiness than that of imputed righteousness.

Neonomian. The Gospel declares no less than a connection between good works and glory.

Antinomian. What then? Are they therefore to be rewarded as meritorious or deserving? All things connected are

not deserving one of another.

Neonomian. God declares good works as rewardable of grace through Christ.

Antinomian. That which is rewardable of grace is not of debt; but for the worthiness of another, not for itself; therefore what you add cuts off all that you contend for. You say, through Christ is the walking in white, for which the saints are said to be worthy. Is the walking Christ's righteousness? Rev.3:4. So all rewards spoken of as given to the saints here or hereafter, is for the worthiness of Christ, for as all their duties are performed in and through Christ, so they are accepted and rewarded in and through Christ; and their works are no more rewarded for themselves, than accepted for themselves.

Neonomian. By perseverance we are to work out our salvation. Phil.2:12.

Antinomian. Working out our salvation with fear and trembling there denotes a continual maintaining a holy jealousy of ourselves, lest we should fail of the grace of God by trusting in ourselves; for its immediately added, for its God that worketh in you both to will and to do. All other places mentioned by you show this, that in the Covenant of Grace there is holiness here, and glory hereafter; it's all salvation; yea, there are promises of other things, godliness having the promise of the things of this life, and that which is to come. We deny not a connection of duties and promises in abundance, but both duties and particular blessings come in all by way of promise and free grace, so that works are not the condition of coming into Covenant, nor of abiding in Covenant with God.

Neonomian. I will sum up all, and appeal to thee, whether God does require any more of any sinners for salvation, than that they believe in Christ, repent of sin, persevere in true holiness, sincere obedience or good works internal and external; and if we do so, can we perish? Has not Christ provided all else? And does not the promise secure life upon doing of these?

Antinomian. Why do you say, whether God require any more? As if this was so little. I tell you, this is more than he required of Adam in innocency by faith and repentance, {according to yourself,} he required nothing but perseverance in him, when he had life and ability to act from and by it; but you will have a poor impotent dead sinner do all this for life. You say, if we do so, i.e., if we perform this as part of salvation, we cannot perish, our own works are our security from perishing. And as to other things necessary to salvation, Christ has provided them. So that the work is divided betwixt us, part of it to us, and part to Christ. But however, if Christ has not made so certain provision for us, and made any default on his part, we are secured of salvation by doing of ours; for the promise secures

life to us upon our doing these. If this is not to make the Gospel a more over-grown and swinging Covenant of works than ever the old law was, I have lost all my theological measures. And here we have the main difference between the first and last, that Christ stands by to see what's wanting. But his great business is to see us saved by our own works from first to last. As for faith, repentance, good works, sincere persevering obedience, internal and external, they are our federal conditions, upon the performance whereof the promise of all salvation in justification and adoption and glorification is due debt to us; and if Christ has done anything for us, it's due to us upon these terms, whatever he has provided besides.

Neonomian. Well, I will make you one challenge more, and so leave you. If any sinner believe not, and repent not, has Christ ever promised to save him?

Antinomian. Indeed, those sinners that believe not, nor repent not, he has not named them by name; but God forbid that he has not promised to save thousands that believe not, and repent not; for the promise is to Christ first to save his seed, and this is the promise, that Christ's office is to seek and save them that are lost. And I think all men are so, till Christ finds any, by giving faith and repentance to them, for which end he is exalted; and these are the sheep of his, which he has promised shall hear his voice, and shall come into his fold; these are among the chiefest of sinners, before they ever have faith and repentance, the Loammi, Hos.1:9, who shall become the children of the living God. Ay, but you say, will any decree or merit of Christ secure them? So that every poor impenitent unbelieving sinner is in a desperate condition. There's no decree of God, nor merits of Christ can save them; so that both decree and merits were all conditional, provided he believe, neither decree or merits can secure salvation to him. And do they not secure faith and repentance as part of their salvation, and so one part as well as another, and upon the same terms?

Neonomian. Again, if any penitent believer shall apostatize, prove ungodly and unfruitful, hate God, or neglect to love God and his neighbour wholly, &c., shall this man be saved? Has not Christ determined the contrary? Will his first faith save him?

Antinomian. I suppose you can mean no other than a true believer by your penitent believer. One that is godly, loves God, and is fruitful; if any such an one should apostatize, &c., wholly, i.e., fall away from grace. Here we can understand your meaning no otherwise, but that such a thing may be, and sometimes is, or else why do you not make the like supposition concerning the good angels? And what follows? Say you, shall his first faith save him, i.e., shall Christ that once saved him, save

him again? Has not Christ that has once saved him, determined to save him no more? These are pretty enquiries, deep school cases; and wherefore is all this but to show, that our security of standing and keeping in Covenant with God, and of all our salvation, lies not on electing grace, nor on the merits of Christ, but on our own works of faith and obedience. The resolution of these questions, you say, according to the scope of the word, will decide the main of this controversy; and I will tell you how much they concern the matter in hand. As to the first. If a man have a healthy body, and strength of nature to live till fourscore years of age, he shall not die a young man. And whether, if he takes the care of his own health and safety, God has not provided everything else for him? Or thus, if a man get a good estate, and hold it till he dies, whether this man can die a poor man? But our question rightly put, runs thus, seeing God has provided by his decree or promise, that this or that sinner shall have true grace, and he that has it, shall never finally lose it; whether his perseverance and security depends upon his works and actings, or upon the decree and promise? The Assembly on the perseverance of the saints, says, "they that are effectually called shall not finally fall from the state of grace, but certainly persevere; which perseverance depends not upon their own free will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election - the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Christ - the abiding of the Spirit, the nature of the Covenant of Grace, from which ariseth the certainty and infallibility thereof.

As to your second appeal, it has as much as this in it; if a man get up to the top of the monument, and throw himself down from thence, he will certainly break his neck. Or thus, if a good angel fall into pride and sin as Beelzebub did, he will be laid in chains of darkness in the same manner as he. If Abraham should blaspheme God, he would be tumbled out of Heaven. If a man wax on wings to his shoulders, and fly towards the sun like Icarus, the wax melts, and down comes he headlong. Such propositions as these are the rules of Christ's rectoral distribution with you, and the decree comes not in opposition; whereas the decree spoils the hypothesis; for do but assume upon the proposition, and you will find it so, that the decree spoils it as to the event.

God's rule of government is not a proposition founded upon an impossibility; neither is his decree as you would make it, subservient to his rule of government, but all his government and rules thereof are founded on, and guided according to his good will and pleasure in his decree. What you quote out of the Assembly's Confession, has nothing to do with the subject at hand, but all is against you; for none denies God's approbation of our obedience, the great uses and ends of it, the acceptance

of it, and rewarding it in Christ, &c. The ends and uses which they mention is not amiss to repeat, because you charge the same assertion on Dr. Crisp for his great error.

The Assembly goes on to state that, "good works done in obedience to God's commands, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith, and by them believers make manifest their thankfulness, strengthen their assurance, edify their brethren, adorn the profession of the Gospel, stop the mouths of adversaries, and glorify God, whose workmanship they are, created in Christ Jesus thereunto; that having their fruit unto holiness, they may have the end, eternal life."

And as for Dr. Owen whom you quote from page 222, of justification, he is there disputing against these tenents of yours, and grants the like uses and ends of our personal righteousness as the Assembly, that it's indispensably required by God, he approves of it and accepts it in Christ, it evidences faith, it's pleadable against Satan and the world. And after some explication of his meaning in these things, he says, "hence it appears how little force there is in that argument, which some pretend to be of so great weight in this cause, {among them you are one,} as every one, who say they shall be judged of God at the last day, in the same way and manner, and on the same grounds, is he justified of God in this life; but by works, and not by faith alone, every one shall be judged at the last day. Wherefore by works, and not by faith alone, every one is justified before God in this life."

This he answers, and condemns in the following proposition, or not far from it. That God pardons men's sins, gives them the adoption of children, with a right to an heavenly inheritance according to their works, which {says he} is not only foreign to the Gospel, but destructive of it. And you say, that forgiving, adopting and glorifying, &c., judicial acts of God as a Rector, is in a way of rectoral distribution of rewards. Luther on Galatians 3:22, says, "works done without faith are under a curse, though they have never so good a show of holiness. Wherefore so far off is it, that the doers thereof deserve grace, righteousness and eternal life, that rather they heap sin upon sin. After this manner the Pope works, and all merit-mongers."

DEBATE XIV.

OF INTENDING OUR SOULS GOOD BY DUTIES WE PERFORM.

Neonomian. The next error that I charge upon this Antinomian

is, that he says, no man ought to propose to himself any advantage by any religious duty he performeth, nor ought he in the least intend the profit of his own soul by any Christian endeavours, it being vain and unlawful to do anything with an eye to our spiritual or eternal good, though in subordination to God's glory in Christ.

Antinomian. I suppose you will not only charge but prove the very things you charge in those words.

Neonomian. I will, for you say, there is nothing you can do from whence you ought to expect any gain unto yourselves, &c., Christ has redeemed us that we should not henceforth live to ourselves, but to him that died for us, &c. The Scripture is plentiful in this, that no believer for whom Christ died, should have the least thought in his heart of promoting or advancing himself, to any end of his own by doing what he does.

Antinomian. Gentlemen, he deals with me as {you have found upon examination} he has done formerly, for I was preaching upon Romans 10:2-4, and was showing, that zeal of God proves not a man a child of God, and I told them, all aim at this, that you build not upon foundations that will fail you, when you come to trial, there is absolutely perfection enough in the righteousness of Christ alone for your rest and security, that you shall not need to trust to anything you do for life and peace. This is that which God calls you to, to go forth from your own righteousness, to rest solely and only upon the righteousness of Christ, if ever you mean to have comfort in this world, or in the world to come. I answered this objection; you will say, this is the way to destroy all righteousness and obedience whatsoever. What a man never a jot the better, though never so zealous after God, though his eye and aim be after God in his zeal! The world is grown to a miserable pass that obedience, zeal, and seeking after God be of no use at all, except a man himself be a gainer by his obedience; it's now as it was in the time of the psalmist, every one will be ready to cry out, who will show us any good? Psal.4:6. And if anything be proposed to men to be done, they answer, but what shall I get by it? Every one will be ready to shun such an office or employment that carry about with them a great deal of labour and expense of time, and brings in no profit. I must tell you freely, there's not one duty you perform, when you have attained the highest pitch, that has any prevalency and availableness to produce and to bring forth any, though the least good to your selves. You ought not to think to seek again to your selves by doing, or bring Christ to your selves by doing; you are not your own, says the Apostle, but you are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your bodies and spirits. Christ has redeemed us that we should not henceforth live to ourselves, but to Christ that died for us.

Now in this discourse I intend these things. 1. That our duties ought not to rob Christ's righteousness of the procuring virtue it has of all the blessings and good that we have. 2. That we ought not to perform duties from a mercenary principle, thinking thereby to obtain good things of God. 3. That we rest not in the duty done. 4. That duties barely considered in themselves, though of the highest nature, are not available to obtain anything of God, for what will our righteousness profit him? And when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants, and have done less than we ought to do; therefore there's no reason from our best duties why God should bestow any good thing upon us. 5. That we should do duties from a gracious spirit of ingenuity, for the glory of God, and free grace, not from a poor, narrow, and selfish spirit. Not but that I am for duty in a right manner, and for a right end.

Neonomian. He intends to forbid our intending our own good, though in subordination to God's glory, and laying no stress of meriting; for {says he} people may think here's a marvellous discouragement to persons, to do what God calls them to do, when they shall have nothing for it. I answer, when there is a spirit of ingenuity they shall be as industrious to glorify God, to do good to men, as if they did it for themselves. They shall do as much for good already bestowed, as if they were to procure it by their own doing.

Antinomian. Is this not to intend my own good, whereas it's not only to intend it, but to attend it, and walk in the highest comfort and enjoyment of it? As when Esau and Jacob passed mutual complements; Esau says, I have enough; but Jacob says, I have all. It is as plain as may be made, that we should in all we do mind and aim at the glory of God, and honor of free grace. For I said, except you mind chiefly, that all the duties you perform are for other ends and purposes than your preferment, viz., the setting forth the praise of the glory of free grace, and the serving the generation in which you live, and the study of good works, because they are profitable to men. I say, except you fall upon the performance of good duties for the common good and benefit, without having any such conceits, as what shall accrue to you thereby; you are not persons yet come to have that common spirit, and dead to the old spirit, as becomes believers in Christ.

I say here, chiefly, and therefore am not to be understood, as if I did mean, as Mr. Neonomian says, to forbid all intending our own good, but rather act as one that now has nothing to do in comparison; as to the securing of spiritual good things to myself, Christ has procured and settled all upon me. I have a goodly heritage, goodness and mercy shall follow me all my days; and from the sense of the greatness and fulness of

provision made for me in Christ; I will glorify him in soul, and body, and spirit, live to him, serve him, and my generation, not thinking that I can add anything by my duties to what Christ has procured and obtained for me; and in this sense it is, I say, that it is no discouragement because you cannot propound to yourself any possible gain, {i e., over and above what Christ has procured,} but whatever is the greatest and truest spur, or encouragement to duty, is already provided to your hand freely and graciously. I illustrate my meaning thus.

There are some children in the world that are very observant of their parents; and their aim is, that by reason of such compliance their parents may settle an estate upon them; but when a child knows an estate is already settled upon him, that it cannot be reversed, and he is not able to add to it, will such a child propose to himself in his obedience and observance, the obtaining that good his Father has already passed? He knows it is passed already, and cannot be by anything he does, firmer and stronger. He serves not now to get his Father's land, but he serves to glorify his Father that has so freely settled his land upon him. Hence you see plainly that I mean in respect of title, not in respect of possession and enjoyment, for so I say of believers that have the temper of Christ's true-bred children indeed. They in the Gospel of Christ find all things that do appertain to life and godliness, they find them all so passed over by God's goodness and free grace to them, that the lions shall want and suffer hunger, before they shall want anything that is good. Must they now labour to gain these things as if they were in agitation, or as if they were yet referred to their will, or to their good and evil walking, that as they shall walk so they shall speed? This is to argue, that God is yet to determine with himself how to dispose of those good things that he will bestow upon his people, and that he gives good things according to their good or evil carriage; and so the goodness of God to his people must depend upon his people's goodness to him, {which is as the morning cloud,} and as men's works prevail with God, so God will pour out his bounty upon them.

Calvin. Mr. Antinomian gives us a very good account of his meaning, and I wonder what Mr. Neonomian will offer to say, as if he forbids the intending our own good, though in subordination to God's glory, yea, laying no stress of meriting, whereas he is express as to both these. And by procuring and obtaining he plainly intends procuring or obtaining a title to heavenly things. But Mr. Antinomian, did not Abraham in his obedience unto God, Heb.11:9-10, look for a city which has foundations? And had not Moses, verse 26, in his self-denial an eye to the recompense of reward? How is it then that we should not think to gain or procure anything by our duties and

obedience?

Antinomian. The great things that the faithful mentioned in that chapter did by faith in the promise, surely entitling them to those great things they looked for; they did not esteem that their obedience added one grain to their inheritance by promise, any more than that the very service of God itself, and enjoyment of him was of the privileges promised, and they walked therein in expectation of further performances. Abraham looked for a city; upon what ground? Not of his obedience, but as being heir already of the promise of it. Moses had an eye to the recompense of reward, not as procuring it by his self-denial, but as being entitled to it by the promise believed, as already bestowed upon him by the gift and procurement of Christ, and thence was carried forth to his duty in love to God, and in honor of his free grace, as I have said; thence it was that no difficulties of affliction could discourage him, nor worldly preferments and riches allure him from his duty.

My whole design in the expressions mentioned by Mr. Neonomian was to caution believers against putting their duties in the place of Christ in order to life and salvation. And I have Mr. Luther for my president, speaking in the like case after the same manner. The true Christ neither calleth thee to reckoning for thy sins, nor biddeth thee trust to thine own good works, {but the false Christ, i.e., the devil in the likeness of Christ does,} and the true knowledge of Christ or faith disputeth not whether thou hast done good works to righteousness, or evil works to condemnation, but simply concludeth after this sort. If thou hast done good works, thou art not therefore justified; or if thou hast done evil works, thou art not thereby condemned. And I neither take from good works their praise, nor commend evil works; but in the matter of justification, I say, we must look how we may hold Christ, lest while we seek to be justified by the law, we make him unprofitable to us; for its Christ alone that justifieth me, both against my evil deeds, and without my good deeds. If I have this persuasion of Christ, I lay hold on the true Christ; but if I think that he exacteth the law and works of me to salvation, then he becometh unprofitable to me, and I am utterly separated from him.

Neonomian. He says, when you labour by prayer or seeking to prevail with God to take away his displeasure, &c., and to procure such good, you serve not God now, you serve yourselves.

Antinomian. I was speaking against selfishness in our performances, and said, if you suppose you fast, pray, mourn, or do any other religious services; if you apprehend your own turns are not yet served, there will be altogether a selfishness in the performance of these duties; selfish ends and motives will be

your load-stones, and they shall draw up your spirits in these services. As for example, when we labour by our fasting and prayer, and seeking the Lord, to prevail with God to take away his displeasure, &c., and to procure such good things unto us, do we serve the Lord or no? And do we not serve ourselves? Nay, you serve no God now, you serve yourselves, when only yourselves put you upon the performance of the duty; but you will say, I must fast and pray to get my sins pardoned. It's true, that as long as men think their sins are upon themselves they cannot be at rest, but still the consideration of these sins thus upon them must needs draw them out on these services, till some way be sought out to clear themselves of them. Where is now that sincerity and singleness of heart that men ought to have in the service of the Lord? If he could be but once resolved of this thing, that all this business of his is already dispatched to his hands, {viz., sin pardoned, and wrath removed,} then all this selfishness would quickly die; then you would serve God sincerely, the end of your duties would be the glorifying of God; then you would see that your prayers, tears, fastings and performances were not appointed to rob God of his service by serving yourselves, and Christ of his glory, by putting your services in the place of his blood, which only taketh away sin.

Calvin. You have now given very good satisfaction of your intention and meaning in those expressions Mr. Neonomian chargeth upon you as unsound, though some of your expressions barely taken may give some offence, which I think might have been spared, and the truth you intend clothed with more unexceptionable words; and on the other side, Mr. Neonomian, I think you may expose and banter most sermons of orthodox divines, if you will pick out here and there a sentence, and not give an account of the connection, upon what account such were spoken. But I pray, Mr. Neonomian, let us have the positive truth from you in this matter, and the state of the question.

Neonomian. You shall, for though we ought to intend God's glory as our supreme end in all our duties, and design therein expressing our love and gratitude to God for his benefits, with a great regard to public good; yet we also lawfully may and ought to strive after grace, grow in it, and perform holy duties and services, with an eye to, and concern for our own spiritual and eternal advantage.

Antinomian. You have delivered your opinion; in a discreet proposition, wherein you say the same thing as I do in the first part, but yet the second part does not run full enough, it should run thus; from this motive of the love of God, the promise of grace, and the procurement made by Jesus Christ, entitling us to all the blessings of the Gospel, we ought to perform holy duties and services, growing in all grace, with an

eye to the enjoyment of that full inheritance provided for us in grace and glory, ascribing all to the glory of free grace, and nothing to the procurements of our own works. And therefore I say, none ought to propose advantage to himself in respect of title to the blessings of the Covenant by any duty he performs, being heir of the promise by faith in Jesus Christ, all the promises being in him yea and amen; neither ought he to propound profit from any duty as such only, but in and through Christ, and in whom every duty is accepted, and from whom we receive the benefit; for whatever we ask it's in his name, and for his sake alone, {not for our duties sake,} we receive it. And that it is vain and unlawful to do anything with an eye to our spiritual or eternal good, as a proper effect by way of remuneration of our duty performed, for that cannot be in subordination to God's glory in Christ, but a robbing of him.

Neonomian. I will tell you then wherein we differ not. It's not whether we should principally aim at God's glory in what we do.

Antinomian. Is it not? But I will tell you more; we should not only principally, but altogether aim at God's glory in all we do. I Cor.10:31. According to your position many sins will be justified; as he that does evil that good may come of it. And Paul's persecution in his unregeneracy, wherein he principally aimed at the glory of God, thinking that thereby he did God good service.

Neonomian. Nor whether we should aim at public good with great concern; nor whether gratitude to God deserves our utmost service, and love to him should influence our aims and labours.

Antinomian. Gratitude to God should not only influence, but be the very procatarctic moving cause to us in all.

Neonomian. Nor whether we ought to renounce every thought of purchasing from God any benefit for what we do.

Antinomian. Therefore not to think to have the benefit for the work sake at all, for if so, it's purchasing in a law sense; to have it upon federal conditionality of the work done, is to have upon bargain, and purchasing terms, either in respect of the first right, or as to continuation of right, therefore we ought not to entertain, but renounce the least thought of this.

Neonomian. Nor whether carnal selfishness, or seeking of pleasures, riches, honor, &c., above spiritual and eternal good, be the undoing sin of the world.

Antinomian. Nor whether it be not the undoing sin of professors, there's no other to be expected from the world, and there's multitudes of sins more, of a grosser nature, undoing to the world.

Neonomian. The real difference is, whether the spiritual

improving and saving our souls, may be a motive with us to our religious endeavours? This you deny, and I affirm.

Antinomian. Not upon the grounds afore-mentioned.

Neonomian. Whether our souls advantage be not so joined with God's glory, that we ought to intend both as the scope of our life and labours.

Antinomian. Our souls advantage is so provided for in the promise of grace, that we intend it as the great thing bestowed on us for the glory of God, and not to be obtained by us, or gained by works and services. The true question betwixt us is whether we should do works as entitling us to, and gaining of life and salvation in subordination to the glory of God; this you and the Papists affirm, but I deny; because they are inconsistent, and can never be truly so according to the Gospel, whatever is pretended, or men may think of themselves, as Paul did in his unregenerate state.

Neonomian. To confirm the truth, I have proved before, that God has appointed graces and duties for that end, that we obtain those benefits; and if so, we then despise God's ordination, in not intending our obtaining the benefits, when we act those graces and duties, and we obey his will in doing them for that end.

Antinomian. We have shown that you have not proved it yet in your sense, by way of entitling us to, and continuing us in a Covenant state or standing. We have shown, that you make graces and duties nothing but a piece of drudgery and slavery, for a man to work as for his wages, and to be paid as he does his work, but make them none of the benefits of the Covenant of promise, which they are in an eminent manner. And therefore, you despise the ordination of God, and his constitution of the Covenant of Grace, who never gave them such a place in the Covenant, nor ordained them to such an end as you ascribe to them. Lastly, you despise therein the Lord Jesus, in giving that which is his place alone, to your graces and duties.

Neonomian. All promises and threats in the Word, directed as motives to obedience are foolish, if we must not intend {obtaining} our own good by our obedience.

Antinomian. Are they so? You are not the first that has reckoned the Gospel foolishness, and reproached the grace of God; God has chosen these foolish things to confound such wise men as you are, that can undertake to teach Christ a better Gospel, &c.

Neonomian. How are they arguments with the will, if we must not aim at advantage in doing duty?

Antinomian. It is one thing to have advantage by gift, and another thing to have such an eye to it as to look upon ourselves as earners of it by our work. A child that knows his

Father has settled an inheritance upon him, and will provide for him till he is of age to take possession; is there no motive to him to be dutiful to his Father, but an intending more gain and advantage to himself? Must his Father pay him for every errand he runs, and job of service he does? Must he look upon himself as earning and deserving his dinner every day, and for every duty and service his Father must say, Oh! thank thee my son, I will remember this service to give thee advantage for it? Or else this child will be sullen and dogged, and say, what profit is there in serving my Father? Such Christians as these you would make.

Neonomian. Christ calls with such motives. Matt.11:28, Ezek.18:32, I Pet.5:2,4.

Antinomian. Christ invites sinners to come to him for rest, he would give it them; he says not, go to your works and duties for rest, I am not against your taking all motives from Christ and the riches of his grace, but I am against burning incense to our own drags, as you would have us. That place of Ezekiel you mention, is nothing to your purpose, for turning and living there is the same thing; and whereas you say, what influence has such pleas, as I Pet.5:2,4, Col.3:25? Peter calls himself a partaker, {i.e., by faith,} of the glory to be revealed, and he chargeth other elders to feed the flock, and take the charge, not by constraint, but freely and willingly; and not mercenarily, but as he himself was taught by Christ, lovest thou me, feed my sheep; and he says, when the chief shepherd shall appear, you shall receive a crown of glory which he has purchased and promised, not which they earned and gained by their working. So Paul fought and ran, II Tim.4:7-8, not expecting to receive a crown as due to him for fighting and running, but as by faith beholding it purchased for him, and ensured to him in the promise; therefore he says, it's a deposit laid up for him even before his running; and so for all other believers as well as he; he expected not to make an additional advantage to what he saw laid up for him already, or thereby to make it surer than the promise had already made it; and as for other places where duties are called for, and ensuing benefits promised; its but a connection of the promised grace in the Covenant under sometimes different notions of particular commands and promises; whereas duties there are promises, and gifts of grace, and both together grace upon grace from the fulness of Christ; not that one has in it a virtue to gain the other, {which the spiritual man understands,} and Christ dispenses grace in the Word of his grace in this manner, more humanly speaking, which is of use to the weak many times, when he teacheth them to walk as Ephraim, by the conduct of a spirit of bondage, whilst they labour under weak and staggering faith, but such a frame and weak understanding of the truth ought not to

be commended as a virtue, and such weaklings are to be brought as soon as may be to more solid understanding, and higher principles to act from, and more noble aims and designs to the glory of God in Christ.

Neonomian. The Spirit of God approveth of holy men's regard to their own advantage.

Antinomian. Yes, for the whole Gospel is a sinners advantage, or else it were sad, and they must see it, or else they will never embrace it; but they are to see all this advantage is founded in Christ, and conveyed by promise and free gift to the praise and glory of God. Eph.1:6-8,12,19-20.

Neonomian. Moses, Heb.11:26, had respect to the recompense of reward, and this is given as the very cause why he esteemed the reproach of Christ above the treasures of Egypt.

Antinomian. I have given an account of that place already; it's said by faith, Moses did what he did by faith, refusing the world, choosing and esteeming Christ his great treasure, and greater than all riches and honors, even the reproach and cross of Christ; for in believing he eyed Christ himself, who was his, to be the great recompense of reward; he had enough to carry him through all difficulties, having Christ, and God in Christ, and this was the reason of his perseverance, for he endured as seeing him that is invisible; he did not see him that is invisible as a reward of his perseverance, but he endured because he saw him.

Neonomian. Paul governed himself by these regards. I Cor.9:17,24; II Cor.4:16-17.

Antinomian. Paul made it his business in preaching the Gospel to obtain the ends of the Gospel, but he does anticipate all that you would gather from his discourse, I Cor.9:17, for verse 16, he says, "for though I preach the Gospel I have nothing to glory of," and when he speaks of his reward, verse 18, truly it is as much as to say, I look for none for my work sake, not so much as from men, my reward is that I make it without charge, that as it comes freely from Christ, so also from me; he much less had any mercenary expectations of reward from God, &c., and verse 23, and all he does for the Gospel sake, that he might be a partaker, his participation of the grace of the Gospel was as much as he looked for, therefore he would not run at uncertainty, but by faith in the promise, as looking unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of his faith. Heb.12:2. As to that place, II Cor.4:16, for which cause we faint not; what is the cause? It's in the verse preceding, 14 & 15, the Spirit of faith was the cause; whereby knowing that he that raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise us also by Jesus; for all things are for your selves, that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God, for which cause we faint not, viz., from the

abundant grace apprehended by the spirit of faith, and looking at things not seen, thence it comes to pass, that the present afflictions are light, and shall be succeeded with an eternal weight of glory; it's an instance of the abundant grace redounding towards him for the inward and outward man, for things temporal and eternal.

Neonomian. We are doing for life, with an eye to gain by service such a legal and wicked thing as some represent it, sure the blessed Jesus would have admonished his disciples, and not answered them as he does. Matt.19:28-29.

Antinomian. This arguing would well enough become a Papist, but it is strange at this time a day from the mouth of a Protestant, but it's easy to see the Devil is at work to betray us again into our spiritual Egypt, our mouths opened too generally after the leeks and onions of their corrupt doctrine. Now we must go to work upon the terms of the old law, for life, not finally, as aimed at and travelled to as an aim or a goal, taken for glory, but for life as a premium of our works. That this is intended by you clearly appears by the application that you make of this place of Scripture, as if it justified the doctrine of merit. The disciples hearing our Saviour's discourse concerning a rich man, and how hard it is for him to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, they were amazed, and said, who then shall be saved? Peter hence concludes then surely poor men may better be saved; we are poor enough, and have left all for thee; what shall we have? And there is no doubt but something as yet remained in them of that legal spirit as prevailed in and among the Jews, expecting or enquiring after some proportionable reward to their sufferings, which spirit was not fully removed from them till after the resurrection of Christ, and sending down of the Spirit, when they came clearly to see the grace of Christ in the Gospel, but it was not Christ's time yet to remove all clouds and obscurities from the doctrine of the Gospel; he did it not in his own ministry, it was to be the work of the Comforter, the Spirit, as peculiarly belonging to his office after Christ's ascension. As yet they had not asked anything in his name, neither did Christ in the platform of prayer teach them so to do; as yet they were strangers to the mystery of the death and resurrection of Christ; as yet they looked that the Kingdom of Christ would immediately be a temporal and external. Now the answer of our Saviour imports these things.

1. That none shall lose anything by following him, though in parting with worldly advantages.

2. That those blessings that he bestows upon his true followers, are of another nature than they expected; they were of an eternal nature, and of a spiritual nature. For their outward enjoyments should be with persecutions, showing how much the

cross and reproach of Christ {as in the opinion of Moses} is to be preferred before the greatest worldly emoluments.

3. He shows them, though he abundantly rewards his followers, yet they ought not to serve him as such that were led by that principle, to serve for life and glory as for wages; but they must do all for his own name sake; they must not act from a principle of intending advantage, but for Christ's sake, for the love of his person, and for the sake of the love that he has shown us. I Cor.3:20-22. The Lord knows how vain the thoughts of his best people is apt to be, as if they must by their duties earn something of God; but there must be no glorying in men, and there's no need of it, for all things are yours already, the means of grace, the world, life, death, things present, and to come, ye are Christ's, and Christ God's.

Neonomian. Your argument from the vanity of proposing our own gain by labour and duties, because all is fixed and given already, is to make the decree an effectual means to overthrow the government of Christ, and brand all his offers to sinners with weakness and falsehood; should not poor sinners pray as they can apply the word with an eye to conversion? Should they not believe and repent with an eye to forgiveness and escaping of wrath? Why else should God encourage them with an offer of these upon such terms.

Antinomian. You go upon many mistakes. 1. You talk absurdly of God's decree overthrowing his government, as if the decree succeeded God's government of the creature; that which overthrows a thing comes after the thing overthrown; so God's decree in its proper nature, as a constituting immanent act, must succeed his government.

2. Why should not God's acting in a way of free grace be consistent with his most right and just way of proceeding in government, seeing the whole Gospel revelation asserts that it is so, and that therein lies a great part of the Gospel mystery, which natural men and carnal reason will not receive.

3. Is it any way absurd to say it's vain to propose our own gain by labour and duties, when the Spirit of God has expunged the efficacy of works as to procurement, out of the Covenant of Grace; works are our price and money. God says, we are to buy without price and money, Isa.55:1-2, and says, "why do you spend money for that which is not bread," i.e., spend your duties and labours, and get nothing by them? Because you make money of them, and reckon you make advantage of them, and pay a valuable consideration for the good expected, and will not receive it as of free gift; you will have all for the money of your duties; and hence you labour, and have not that which satisfieth; you ask and labour for things to spend upon your own lusts, as the proud Pharisee did.

4. You mistake in judging the offers of the Gospel are in a way of government, it's in order to Christ's gracious rule and government under which unregenerate sinners are not, till through grace they are translated into the Kingdom of Christ.

5. You grossly mistake my discourse, or willingly pervert my sense and meaning; I do not say but poor sinners at their first believing are very apt to lay too great a stress upon their duties, as if thereby they obtained a title to life and salvation, or made a considerable addition to what Christ has done and procured for them; this legal spirit I endeavour to take them off from, that they should serve God more under the conduct of the grace of adoption, Rom.8:14-15, and therefore say, except you fall to the performance of duty without such conceits of what shall accrue to you thereby, you are not persons yet come to have that common spirit, and dead to the old spirit, as becomes Christians. Such believers are acted more by a spirit of bondage than the spirit of adoption. The Apostle says, they that are led by the Spirit are the sons of God; and therefore so far as they are led by the Spirit act not mercenarily.

6. But to let pass your perverting my sense, you will have me to intend works answering the call of God to the unregenerate; and you say to this purpose they must be encouraged by rewards of their works; were it not rather to charge God as you say; when he shall promise them upon the account of their duties, when the Spirit of God tells us, they can perform none, being spiritually dead; and that which they suppose they do cannot please God, Rom.8:8, therefore cannot obtain anything from him. You say, must they not strive to believe and repent with an eye to forgiveness, and escaping of wrath? I say, not with an eye to their works of believing and repentance, but to the receiving of forgiveness and escaping wrath.

Neonomian. By your scheme the elect may be idle, and the non-elect do best when they despair; for there's connection between these benefits and these graces and duties.

Antinomian. I pretend not to the making schemes of the Gospel-mysteries, calculated to carnal reason, as you do; I leave that to you that pretend to be so skillful in it. But in answer to what you infer, I say, I preach not to men as elect, or not elect, but unto sinners; and I call them to look for the advantage of life and salvation in Christ, and not in their duties. But yet, as I told you, I call them to duty, and to the acting of it from higher and nobler principles than you do, not from such a slavish mercenary servile spirit as you would have them to act from. And I think the doctrine of free-grace is no ground of idleness or despair, but the contrary, the greatest encouragement to service, and preservative against despair in the world, unless it

be to such scheme-makers as you be, who charge God with weakness and falsehood, unless he save sinners in a way of a Covenant of works. And there's no such connection between graces and benefits as you plead for.

Neonomian. And so the non-elect are in the same case with devils, there being no serious offer to them; nay, their case is worse than devils; for these offers are made to them with no design but to increase their condemnation. Nay, every sin of theirs is a sin against the Holy Ghost, i.e., every sin is alike that unpardonable sin, and not only that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

Antinomian. This is the Arminian plea for universal grace, and what is this but the smoke of the bottomless pit? I say, who art thou, O man, that repliest against God? You come now to prove your charge of God for weakness and folly. But if the non-elect be in as bad a case as devils, is God guilty of weakness and falsehood? A wiser man than you did not think so, when he said, God made all things for himself, the wicked for the day of evil. Prov.16:4. Neither was the Apostle Paul of your mind, as plainly appears by Romans 9:18-20. But let me return upon you, will you say that it was unrighteous with God to leave a part of mankind under non-election to eternal life and salvation? What, will you charge God with for leaving part of the angelic nature under it? You talk of an offer to the non-elect, and that offer, you say, must be serious, and if it be not offered upon such a condition as they can perform. But I pray, where's any offer of grace in the Gospel to the non-elect at all, as such? And show me any graces given, or Gospel duties required of the non-elect, or benefits promised to the non-elect upon their performance of graces and duties? It would not be serious indeed to call for graces and duties, or promise life unto them, or saving benefits upon performance of the said duties after the non-election was declared to them. Now you will not own there can be any serious offer made, unless the condition be equally performable by elect and non-elect, and both be alike in the next capacity of salvation, or else they are in the same case with the devils. And what if they be as eventually as unlikely to believe and be saved as the devils, why will you be presumptuous to charge God? May not God have mercy on whom he will, and harden whom he will, without giving an account of any of his matters? And what if the non-elect be in as bad a case as the devils, is God bound to be any better to them than the devils. For, say you, God must offer to the non-elect with the same mind and purpose of saving non-elect as well as of saving the elect, or else God is not serious in his offers. I deny that Gospel offers are made to elect or non-elect, but to sinners as such; and it's made indefinitely, that the election might obtain, and the rest are blinded. Rom.11:5-7. As

it was with the elect and non-elect Jews, so it is with the elect and non-elect of all mankind. And see there what God says, and that seriously, "at this present time," says God, "there is a remnant, {of Jews to be saved,} but according to the election of grace." What will you say but a remnant? How comes it to pass that the offer was made to them that belonged not to the election? You'll say God was not serious in his offer to them, when it was said, "unto you {the nation of the Jews} first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Acts 3:26. If the non-elect in this Nation cannot perform works {say you} upon the condition of which they may have the promise, God deals falsely with them. Whereas the Spirit of God gives us another account of these things, why notwithstanding this general and indefinite offer, but a remnant was saved, viz., the election had obtained it, for, says he, if it be by grace, then it is no more of works, {nor of him that willeth or runneth, but of God that shows mercy,} otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more of grace; otherwise work is no more works. What then, Israel has not obtained what he seeketh for, {or applying it to many professors, or others under a Gospel-ministry, such and such has not obtained what they pretended to seek after,} but the election has obtained it. The grace of God {not works} became efficacious through the election of grace. And what became of the non-elect? You'll say, God mocked them. No, go you on to mock God with your carnal reason, and hearken, for I will tell you, yea the Spirit tells you, the rest, the non-elect Jews were blinded, those that were saved, the grace of election obtained for them. But as for the rest, they who were not elected, they were hardened. And when you have done and said all about your serious offers, unless you hold conditional election, you must still continue to lay these foul charges and consequences upon God; for whatever offers are made, the nonelect will neither believe or be saved, and in respect of nonelection are in the same condition with the devils.

Now say you, then their case is worse than devils, these offers are made to them for no other design, but to increase their condemnation. But I will tell you, the design of preaching salvation to the world is that sinners may believe and be saved, not that elect sinners should be secure, or non-elect despair. But what is in God's mind as his reason in making so indefinite a proclamation of free grace in Christ to all? It is for the calling and gathering in of the elect, though an indefinite command of God makes the answer of it equally the duty of all that hear it by the law; and I will tell you, the truth of God's Word will stand against your carnal weapons and banter. Rom.11:8-9. The rest besides the remnant that were saved, were not only blinded but

hardened judicially, according to the word of the Lord by Isaiah, chapter 29:10, God having given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see. The Hebrew word denotes a deep sleep. It signifies a mind fixed and pertinacious in evil. God has sent or given them, says Paul, he has given them to drink down a spirit of stupidity; and see what follows, verse 9 & 10, notwithstanding the gospel preached, the non-elect fall under this judicial proceeding of God, viz., a spirit of slumber given them, eyes given them that they should not see, ears that they should not hear; their table becomes a snare, the free proclamation of grace a stumbling to them. Nay, you say then, every sin of theirs is against the Holy Ghost, i.e., every sin alike the unpardonable sin. There is no sin unpardonable in respect of God, i.e., such that God cannot pardon; but there are sins of the same nature and kind with them that are pardoned in some, that will not be pardoned in others. God's not pardoning a sin or person makes not it or him unpardonable.

The sin against the Holy Ghost is not therefore unpardonable, because it cannot be pardoned; but from the positive and declared will of Christ concerning it, that it shall not be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come; he has made an exception upon this species of sin, or individual sin, Matt.12:31-32, but for this reason no other sort or kind of sin is unpardonable; Christ that spake the one spake the other; all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men. Is it not a marvellous piece of impudence in you to draw this inference upon Christ, because sins in the non-elect are not forgiven eventually, therefore now all manner of sins in them are as unpardonable, as sins against the Holy Ghost.

Neonomian. To say no more, it will follow Christ has no rule of distributive justice, but his own eternal purpose, and men's regards to his promised benefits, are all forbidden, even when our respect to them, is that which subserves his government, and is supposed in all the methods of it.

Antinomian. You need say no more, unless it be to express your repentance for what you have spoken. What mean you by Christ's rule of distributive justice? Doth Christ offer salvation unto sinners, or dispense grace to believers in a way of distributive justice? Is not this to make the Covenant of Grace a law of works with a witness? It's true, Christ governs the world as King of kings, and Lord of lords; and this rule of distributive justice on the providential throne, and at his second coming, is and shall be the Law. But is this his rule of saving sinners? Doth he administer the Covenant of Grace in a way of distributive justice, according to men's obedience to commands, and regard to promises made upon such conditions? If it were so, sinners uncalled and called were all in a miserable condition.

Neonomian. And why should we intend the glory of God, the service of Christ, or the good of others? Are not these as determined as our own good? Has not God fixed and secured his own glory?

Antinomian. He has so; he has fixed it, and all our duties and blessings therein; and because Christ provided for his own glory, and the glory of God's free-grace in all that he has done, or is doing for us; therefore we are in a special manner to beware lest we rob him of his glory, by giving that which belongs to him to our own works, even the best we can do.

Neonomian. I could show that we cannot sincerely aim at our own good, but we therein aim at the glory of God; nor does God ever require us to intend his glory, but in a concurrence with an eye to our own salvation.

Antinomian. You should have said, we cannot truly aim at God's glory, but therein we aim at our own good; men must first aim at God's glory. But, men may sincerely aim at God's glory, and yet come short of God's glory and their own good, for so Paul did in his unregenerate estate, and so will every unregenerate man. How many men sincerely aim at their own good in many things, and yet have not a true aim at the glory of God? Do not all men say, who will show us any good, and seek it in corn, wine and oil? And did not the Jews aim at their own good in following after the law of righteousness. Rom.9:31.

Neonomian. I will tell you your mistakes.

Antinomian. I pray mend and recant your own gross errors first, before you undertake to be a corrector of others; it's not worth our time to attend your amendments.

Neonomian. Let me only tell you what those divines in the preface to Mr. Flavel's book against Antinomianism, {which they approve of,} inform us; that to say salvation is not the end of any good work we can't, and we are to act from life and not for life, were to abandon the human nature.

Antinomian. I suppose you quote your authority the rather, because that you think the preface was drawn up to expiate for a fault some of them had committed, and was well schooled for. But I pray let us a little examine whether those gentlemen be not mistaken, in denying that position, that we are not to act for life but from life.

For the first part, I am mistaken if they will deny, that all Gospel-acting is from life. In natural things life is always presupposed to all motion and acting. A dead thing cannot, nor is expected to move and act. As in the natural man, so in the spiritual; and as he must have life, so he must be alive unto God in Christ that acts; he must act from him, by virtue of him, through the power and influence of his grace, through the operation of his Spirit, from faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and

knows there's no acceptable duties or graces but to be acted from life as the fountain and spring of them; and indeed the first Adam acted from life. I pray make a thing act, if you can, that has not life to act from.

As for acting for life, the true meaning ought to be adjusted; that life should be our end and aim is not to be doubted, according to a right understanding of it. Christ propounds himself as life unto poor sinners, and says, I am the resurrection and the life. And so he is the life unto a believer; he that has the Son has life. Now it must be understood when we speak of working for life, we speak of a considerate sedate regular acting and working. Not acting and working as one that is scared and affrighted with the danger of life, death lying inevitably to his apprehension before him; not as scrambling to save himself in the water from drowning. Now a poor sinner awakened under the law, and seeing a little glimpse of Gospel-hope through grace shining into his heart, it may be bestirs himself with all his might, and ascribes much to every duty he does.

But we speak here of what the true spirit and disposition of a Christian is, he ought to arrive at by faith; the question is, whether he works for life? I say, he does, and he does not. He makes life his subordinate aim and end. But, he that has Christ by faith, does not work as if he had not Christ already; he does not work for life, so as to entitle himself unto life; some work for this end, as if he had not life already. He sees by faith that he is Christ's, and that all things are his, whether life, or whether things present or to come. He does not work for life, so far as to think thereby to keep himself alive, or maintain himself in a Covenant-state, so as by his works to continue his justification any more than to get it at first. He does not work for life in a way of remunerative justice; no, not for the continuance of life in a way of remuneration, for indeed herein lies only the difference between a legal and Gospel spirit; if the spirit that acted the first Adam before the Fall, {I speak not of a legal spirit since the Fall,} and the true spirit of a believer in Christ be compared together; for Adam then acted from life already given; he acted not as having no life, but acted for the continuance of life, upon the account of the working conditions enjoined, and expected life by way of remuneration, i.e., the continuation of life. Now such working for life as this we must reject, and such is intended, when-ever we say we must not work for life.

It's not to be understood, as if the spiritual man had not a sanctified rational end in all his actings, which we say is for the glory of God in free grace, for Christ in whom his life is; he acts from the life that is in Christ, and he is carried forth to it, and in it. He is created in Christ Jesus to good works, that he should

walk in them, looking unto Jesus, and looking upon all things as his in Christ, his business is to live unto Christ. I Cor.1:30,31; 3:22,23. To me {says Paul} to live is Christ, and to die is gain, i.e., I shall come to a further enjoyment of Christ. Theology is defined to be the doctrine of living unto God; so that in living unto God, and to God in Christ, a Christian has all things that appertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of God our Saviour, II Pet.1:3, Christ is our Alpha and Omega, of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to him be glory for ever and ever. Rom.11:36.

Now what need all this great ado about working for life, showing the danger of this doctrine, that it teacheth to abandon nature, and supposeth us to do no more than other men, and it makes all motives useless, &c. Whereas if men will not have perverse minds, they must own and acknowledge the same things that they oppose, unless they will deny their own reason. But when a spirit of contradiction prevails, there is nothing but quirks, sophisms and equivocations can take place with men.

And notwithstanding all your noise and authority, to work for life in the true sense, it is to act as by and under a Covenant of works; it's to work for life as wages, and to gain a right and title thereby, and such a principle will abandon the grace of the Gospel; it will teach to violate all the precepts and principles of the Gospel, it will elude all the promises, and lay a man under the full rigor of the law, and will never be any effective motive to acceptable duty. It is a fault itself that lies under the blackest mark, and of as dangerous consequence as any the Gospel cautions us against, and warns to take heed of seeking the establishing our own righteousness.

That true Gospel discourse of worthy Mr. Vink at the Morning-Lecture will tell you better things, on II Tim.2:19, wherein he shows, that Gospel grace is the best motive to holiness. He says that our business is to enquire after what we propound in our obedience. If it be to expiate for my past offences, or to merit undeserved favors, it must needs be abominable in the sight of God, being the highest act of pride or presumption that can be imagined, let our works be what they will {though the best are but filthy rags} if they be offered unto God by way of barter or exchange; they become most abominable, as if God stood in need of something that we have, to depart from iniquity, or to labour in holiness, in order to express our thankfulness unto God for his mercies in Jesus Christ, is most grateful and most forcible. Again, love unto God for all his glorious excellencies, especially for his mercy in Christ Jesus, is the best principle of holiness, and our departing from iniquity, and this love is begun and flows from God's love first. He that acts according to any of God's commandments out of

hope to merit by them, may act out of love indeed, but it must be then self-love, to obtain, as he vainly thinks, by his obedience eternal happiness. Our love of God should exceed self-love as far as God himself exceeds, which is infinitely. Our love of God is a virtue, and the foundation of the rest; our love of ourselves, thus taken, is a sin, a mother sin, the cause of all the rest of our sins, &c.

I am mistaken if I find not this doctrine of working for life according to your sense, exactly in the Council of Trent, Decree XVI. Grace proposes to the just the exercise of good works, by which eternal life is gained, as grace promised by the mercy of God, and a reward due to good works by the Divine promise. And it concludeth, this doctrine does not establish any righteousness of our own, refusing the righteousness of God; but the same is said to be in us, and of God, being infused by him for the merit of Christ.

Calvin. But Mr. Neonomian says in his reply, it's vain and false, Mr. Antinomian, that you say, that you are only against setting graces and holiness in the place of Christ.

Antinomian. He that reads my sermons must needs see the truth of that assertion; I have nothing to say to such as only depend upon Mr. Neonomian's report.

Neonomian. He reckons they are put in Christ's place, though they be affirmed but as means and conditions antecedently necessary by Divine appointment to obtain any blessing for the sake of Christ's merits.

Antinomian. And well I may, if men must be gracious and holy antecedently to any blessing, for the sake of Christ's merits, and by virtue of that antecedent grace and holiness do obtain blessings for the sake of Christ's merits; I think you outstrip the Papists here in the doctrine of merit.

Neonomian. His principles are that faith is not so much as an instrument whereby we are united to Christ or justified.

Antinomian. He speaks not there of faith as an instrument, but he does speak of it as such, where he says that faith is not the instrument radically to unite Christ and the soul together, but rather is the fruit that flows from Christ the root, being united before-hand {by the Spirit} to the persons that do believe.

Neonomian. That Christ brings us all good things when we are ungodly, so it's in vain to do anything to obtain these.

Antinomian. He speaks there of justification by faith alone, without works, saying that we are delivered from wrath before we step a step into duties; and we do not the duty to be delivered, but we do the duty because we are delivered; and seeing all these are settled by Christ for us, of free gift; all we do is for Christ himself; I say, that we do, we do for Christ, and not

for ourselves.

Neonomian. He says, obedience is not the way to Heaven, and sanctification is not the way to a justified person.

Antinomian. No, sanctification is not the way of justification; he speaks of the way of justification; we are not according to his divinity justified by inherent holiness or righteousness, though we are according to yours. And he tells you, sanctification is our business in Christ the way; for whatever duty is performed acceptably, must be wrought by faith in Christ Jesus; we are sanctified in Christ, Christ is the true way of sanctification.

Neonomian. He says, he should not have the least thought in his heart of promoting or advancing himself, or any end of his own, by doing what he does.

Antinomian. You know this thing is no new doctrine. Its use is to be one of the signs and marks of truth of grace, when we act in duty singly for the glory of God, and not for selfish and sinister ends and designs, but this is spoken to sufficiently before.

DEBATE XV.

OF THE WAY TO ATTAIN ASSURANCE.

Neonomian. The next error that I have to charge Mr. Antinomian with, is his doctrine of Assurance. Error. Assurance is not attained by the evidence of Scripture marks or signs of grace; or by the Spirit's discovering to us that he has wrought in our hearts any holy qualifications; but assurance comes only by an inward voice of the Spirit, saying, thy sins are forgiven thee; and our believing thereupon that our sins are forgiven.

Antinomian. What evidence do you bring of your charge?

Neonomian. You say, if you would know that the Lord has laid your iniquities on Christ, you must know it thus. Is there a voice behind thee in thy self, thy sins are forgiven thee? Dost thou see this voice agree with the Word of grace? Dost thou see it held out to most vile and wretched creatures as thou canst be? And upon this revelation of the mind of the Lord by his Spirit according to that Word, does the Lord give to thee to receive that testimony of the Spirit, to sit down with it as satisfied, that upon this thou makest full reckoning thou hast propriety in this particularly to thyself? If thou dost receive that testimony according to that Word, here is thy evidence, thou hast thy propriety and portion in this.

Calvin. And do you banter this doctrine as erroneous stuff? I would wish you to have a care, it's a tender point.

Antinomian. I will acquaint you with a little of my foregoing discourse. Let us see what kind of evidencing believing gives, it is not a revealing evidence, nor an effecting evidence, {these the Word and Spirit are,} but it is a receiving evidence; or it is an evidence as it does receive that testimony which the Spirit holds out, applying it to the heart; as the eyes receive the light, and the ears the sound, and if we ask a man how do you know such a thing, he will say, I saw it with my eyes, and heard it with mine ears. It is an evidence, as an officer in Court that speaks nothing of his own knowledge, but produceth records, and testifieth to the authenticity of the records. The life of evidence is materially in the records themselves, but the officer is an evidence, as he does assert the truth of such records. It is even so with faith, the Spirit of the Lord makes the records, and speaks the records to the heart. Now faith comes in and receives what the Spirit of the Lord has written. In brief, faith is an evidence as it does take possession of that which the Spirit of the Lord reveals, and manifests, and gives to a person; or as it does enter upon the deed of gift that the Spirit of the Lord does bring to the heart. Possession is a good evidence in law, {they say it's an eleven points,} let a man prove he has lawful possession, and he proves his title good. The Spirit indeed makes the title good, but faith makes good the entry and possession, so clears the title to us, though good in itself before; faith is nothing else but the receiving of Christ, and that enters upon the possession of him, and thus I proceeded to apply this to our purpose, as he has mentioned.

Calvin. I suppose you refer to what is spoken by the Apostle John, where he tells of God's record, "this is the record, that God has given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." Now our assurance that this life is mine or thine in particular is the Spirit's working by faith, whereby the soul of a particular sinner does appropriate this record or deed of gift to himself. Faith does two things whereby it arrives at assurance. 1. It is a witness of the truth of God; it attests the truth of this record and deed of gift. "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater, for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." I Jn.5:9-11. It receives and takes possession of it, and says, I have received the Son, and I have life, faith being a receiving act of the soul, as you yourself acknowledge, Mr. Neonomian. "He that has the Son has life, &c." This is so clear

and plain from the Word, that he who will deny it must deny the Scriptures. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." Jn.1:12.

Neonomian. Your sermon is to prove that love to the brethren, universal obedience, sincerity, &c., are not signs by which we should judge our state.

Antinomian. I say, they are signs that are not sufficiently satisfactory in themselves to full assurance, without this that proceeds from faith; for if you have never so many Signs. 1. They may be true, or they may not, without a witness of the Spirit to it, {though you declaim so much against it,} you cannot come to an assurance, but only to a probability, and you have not a certitude of judgment, only an opinion. 2. If they be true, you must believe them to be true, or else you have no assurance. A man has no assurance of the truth if he believes it not; and then how should you believe the truth of your signs, but by the truth of the Word revealed and believed. The Word tells you your obedience, love, sincerity, must be so and so; you believe the Word, but in comparing your qualifications with the Word, and the descriptions given of them there, you will find them fall so short, that unless the Spirit assure you there is the truth of grace in your hearts, you will be as much at a loss as to assurance as ever.

I propounded this question, how a person may know in particular his own interest in Christ? First I discovered the litigiousness and dubiousness of the way that many persons go for the satisfying and resolving of this case. I instanced in three marks, universal obedience, sincerity of heart, and love of the brethren; and some have conceived, that in the discourse I have directly struck at the heart of these particulars, as if I did attempt the overthrow of them; but mistake not, I spake only of their insufficiency, that they are weak through the flesh, to give a satisfactory resolution of the great case depending, they are of excellent use in their own kind, sphere and orb; but when they are set on work to do those things that are beyond their power, men do but entangle themselves instead of getting themselves loose. I have shown, as to universal obedience, according to propriety of speech, there is none of it in the world; and as it is practiced to this end it leaves the case very doubtful; in respect of many imperfections that attend, and in respect of the purposes of the heart, which are many times extremely corrupt, and that there is so much in our obedience common to unbelievers and hypocrites. As for sincerity, which as the Apostle describes, is simplicity and singleness of heart towards God, that we find the Jews that were enemies to Christ's righteousness, had a zeal for God; and you know what Paul says of himself, what designs he

had undoubtedly in singleness of heart to do God service. And besides, I show how false and deceitful we find our hearts upon self-examination. I spoke also as to love of the brethren which the Apostle John speaks so much of, if we understand how the Apostle describes it, and if a man examines his heart by these particulars, I know his heart cannot but tell him he is exceeding faulty in all these. But I do not determine peremptorily, that a man cannot by way of evidence receive any comfort from his sanctification; and I will give you somewhat further for clearing my judgment to you, which I know is according to truth; viz., that the Spirit of the Lord must first reveal the gracious mind of God to our spirits, and give us faith to receive that testimony of the Spirit, and to sit down as satisfied with his testimony, before ever any work of sanctification can possibly give any evidence. But when the testimony of the Spirit of the Lord is received by faith, and the soul sits down satisfied with that testimony of the Lord, then also all the gifts of God's Spirit do bear witness, together with the Spirit of the Lord, and the faith of a believer. So that I do not deny the use of signs and marks in sanctification you see, as you suggest.

Neonomian. Sermon 16. He calls it the revealing evidence of the Spirit, and endeavours to prove this immediate revelation.

Antinomian. That the Spirit is a revealing evidence, and works immediately, as it is the spirit or grace in all God's children, is not to be denied, and yet works immediately by the Word and means of grace too, and it works immediately so ordinarily; I do not mean that it works immediately by way of extraordinary revelation and inspiration when it works in this kind. But its way of ordinary working is mediatory by the Word, and immediately in the Word. I put this question, is there any evidences in the world by which persons may comfortably claim their interest in the privileges of Christ? Yes, there are two. The revealing evidence, and the receiving evidence. The revealing evidence is the voice of the Spirit to a man's own spirit, saying, son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee; and this will overcome all objections, and till the Spirit of the Lord come immediately himself, and speak this to the soul, all the world shall never be able to satisfy and resolve that soul, and till then all signs and marks are mere darkness and riddles. To clear up this, I say, the Spirit of the Lord is mainly sent into the world by Christ for this very purpose, to speak personally and particularly to the hearts of men, to satisfy them of their interest in Christ. That this was the main business of the Spirit, the Scripture shows, and holds out nothing more.

1. It may be cleared from the very attribute or title which our Saviour gives to the Spirit of the Lord. Jn.14:16; 16:7-

9,14. The Comforter; this is he by way of eminency, and the title imports, that the satisfaction and resolution concerning interest in Christ is the work of the Spirit. What is the occasion of all the trouble of spirit in tender hearts? God has forsaken me, says one, my sins are gone over my head, says another, &c., what will now cheer up the heart of such a person? It is that God will not lay thy sins to thy charge, &c. If the comfort of a person consists in the assurance of pardon, then the Spirit cannot be a Comforter, except it satisfies as to clearing up this truth, thy sins are forgiven.

2. Besides this bare title, you shall see the Spirit has this particular office, as that, wherefore Christ does testify the Spirit does come. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." Jn.14:26. "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come." Jn.16:13. Christ says, he shall glorify me, he shall receive of mine, and show it unto you. Mark those words, you see then wherein the comforting faculty of the Holy Ghost lieth, in receiving of Christ's, and showing those things to persons, which things are the glorious excellency of Christ in justification and forgiveness. Acts 13:38-39. And more fully of his office, to convince the world of sin and righteousness. Jn.16:8-9. And a person is convinced of righteousness when Christ's righteousness in justification is cleared up unto a person.

And whereas the Spirit may be conceived to comfort only in general; for there is a difference between the administration of Christ, and that of the Spirit of Christ. Christ came into the world to merit salvation, and comfort men in general; for though he merited comfort in particular to be applied by the Spirit, yet still in his ministration he did run upon general terms for the most part. But the Spirit is sent in Christ's room to come to every man's spirit particularly by himself, and speak that within a man's self, that Christ by the ministry of the Gospel speaks, but in general to men; therefore he says, if I go not away the Comforter cannot come. And now I shall show that the evidencing particularly unto a man's spirit concerning his interest in Christ is the proper work of the Spirit of God. Rom.8:14-15; I Cor.2:9-13; Eph.1:13-14. These places I opened, and applied to the matter in hand, clearly proving the evidencing office of the Spirit.

Objection. But suppose I hear such a voice, here is the doubt, how shall I know it's the voice of the Spirit? If the Word did bear witness to this particular voice of the Spirit, then I should be satisfied, &c. Solution. Let me not be mistaken. That

it is true the Spirit of the Lord never speaks to the heart of any believer, but he always applies according to the word of grace revealed, and the voice of the Spirit, and if the word of grace be in the soul, {as they go always together in the faithful,} they will agree as face answers face in a glass; but yet beware that you make not the credit of the voice of the Spirit depend upon the Word barely considered.

In brief therefore, as it is the testimony of God's Spirit speaking indeed according to the Word, that must satisfy us that we are the children of God; so it must be the same Spirit must assure us, that he is the true Spirit of God, and not of delusion. But still I say, this Spirit of the Lord speaks always to persons concerning their interest in Christ, according to the Word of grace; and it is most certainly true, that every voice in man speaking peace, being contrary to the Word of grace, that voice is not the voice of the Spirit of the Lord, yet it is only the Spirit of the Lord can satisfy the spirit of a man in this thing, that it is his own testimony, and not a spirit of delusion. You may understand the Word in a double sense, either for the word of the law, or else for the word of grace in the Gospel. Now mark, when we say it is the Spirit of God bearing witness with our spirits, according to the Word, that we are the sons of God; it's not the word of the law that agrees in this with the voice of the Spirit; the word of the law speaks nothing but curses. The Word in which the Spirit of the Lord speaks to his people, is the word of grace, and the word of grace is no more but this, as to the sum and substance of it, in this, or such like expression thereof. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses.

Neonomian. You see the Spirit's voice according to the Word is no more than according to the general account, that Christ came to save sinners; and also if any sinner have this inward voice, that voice is according to the Word, whether he be a regenerate person or no.

Antinomian. The Gospel declaration is indefinite, we say it's the peculiar work and office of the Spirit to bring home the promise in particular; it's not anything but the Spirit can appropriate the general promise particularly to anyone. I said also, that the Spirit of the Lord does both speak, and likewise give to men to credit and receive what he speaks. All the righteousness that ever man did {mere man} since the Fall, was never able to say upon good grounds, such a person is a child of God. Nay, to go higher, the very word of grace is not able to speak peace to a soul till the Spirit of the Lord will speak. When the Spirit of God will be silent, the word of grace shall not speak anything; if the Spirit blow, the trumpet makes a sound, but if it blows not, the trumpet makes no sound at all. As the Spirit of

the Lord will speak in the word of grace, so the melody of the word will ravish the ears and hearts of believers; but if the Spirit himself will be silent, there is no Music in the word of grace itself. No man under Heaven can say, God is my Father with propriety, but by the Spirit of adoption.

Calvin. Mr. Neonomian, I know not any just exception you can have against this divinity, there being so clear evidence for what is here delivered, from the Word of God.

Neonomian. He says, faith is the echo of the heart to the voice of the Spirit.

Calvin. In the continuation of Poole's Annotations, one of your vouchers has this on I John 5:10, he that truly believes has the effectual impress of this testimony upon his soul. What is that but the echo of it, speaking the same thing.

Neonomian. He means that faith does not evidence our pardon as it is a grace wrought in the soul by the Spirit, or a holy qualification, but only as it does assent to, and rest in this inward voice.

Antinomian. No, he does not place this evidencing nature of faith, which he speaks of, in it, as an act or qualification; for as such it evidences no more than any other grace; but faith has a peculiar evidencing nature in it, because it is a receiving grace, {he speaks not now of assent,} it takes possession of the promise, and would not you have faith to be assenting to and resting on the voice of the Spirit in the word? What would you have it be nothing at all?

Neonomian. He seems to own that sanctification is some evidence.

Antinomian. He does so, as was observed before.

Calvin. I pray, what is your sense concerning the way of attaining assurance?

Neonomian. The ordinary way whereby a man attaineth a well-grounded assurance, is not by immediate objective revelation, or an inward voice, saying, thy sins are forgiven.

Antinomian. I judge by this negation you set by these things from assurance, as having nothing to do ordinarily in it.

1. That no voice is heard any way by the soul, thy sins are forgiven, that is not to be believed by a direct act of faith. 2. That forgiveness of sin is not revealed to a believer by the word of promise believed. 3. That the Spirit of God has nothing to do in bringing the soul to appropriate and apply the general promise particularly to his own soul. So that here, as to our believing forgiveness of sin, neither the Spirit, nor the objective revelation of the Gospel, nor indeed faith itself in its receiving nature, has anything to do, but only as a sign and mark set upon the Soul.

Neonomian. But when a believer is examining his heart and life by the Word, the Holy Spirit enlightens the mind there to

discern faith and love, and such other qualifications, which the Gospel declareth to be the infallible signs of regeneration; and he adds such power to the testimony of conscience for the truth and in-being of these graces, as begets in a soul a joyful sense of its comfortable state, and some comfortable freedom from those fears which accompany a doubting Christian; and according to the evidence of these graces, assurance is ordinarily strong or weak.

Antinomian. I observe now, though you would let the Spirit have no hand in the evidence of faith, yet you need its help to enlighten about signs and qualifications. I pray, how does the Spirit enlighten here? Is it by any objective revelation, or by any inward dictate or intimation? And cannot the Spirit as well enlighten the mind to behold Christ in the promise by an act of faith, as to behold faith and love in ourselves.

2. You will not admit the declaration of the Gospel received and embraced by faith to evidence, but that it seems the heart and life must be examined by the Word as a rule; so that assurance must be wrought by the Word as a Law, not as a Gospel, so far as you are come up to a conformity to the rule, not a testimony of your interest in the grace of the Gospel.

3. You had need have the light of the Spirit to find an infallible sign in you too, though they be declared in the Gospel. Hypocrites pretend to them, and you cannot tell whether you are any better than a hypocrite, without an infallible voice of the Spirit, {according to your doctrine,} for you must know that you shall persevere in those qualifications, and it's impossible for a man to be assured till death, or can be assured of his perseverance till then, {all other signs will signify nothing,} without an infallible witness.

4. You must have a power added by the Spirit to the testimony of conscience, that it may witness the truth and in-being of graces. What's the reason it cannot witness the truth of our in-being in Christ, and add a power to our faith to believe even unto assurance?

5. All this examination, illumination of the Spirit, Gospel-declaration, &c., may at last beget a joyful sense or a reconciled state, you say; but according to you it cannot be assurance, because you cannot yet try by perseverance; the soul is in a little hope it's in a probable way to salvation, but cannot be assured he is in a sure state, or shall certainly be saved, because he must continue his justified state by his works; and therefore it's impossible for him to try and find so far as to assurance; because he has not persevered, you'll say, it may be, he must believe his perseverance, and be assured of it by faith; then, I say, there's as much ground to believe and be assured by faith of all our salvation.

6. You speak not of an assurance in all you have said, but of some comfortable freedom from doubtings, i.e., upon some probable grounds. This amounts to more than opinion at last, the only judgment of a contingent axiom; and you tell us elsewhere our state here is but of trial not decided, therefore there can be no assurance at all in this life.

7. You do well to add at last, that according to the evidence of these graces, assurance is ordinarily strong or weak, and may not that assurance be so, which we call the assurance of faith? May it not be strong or weak, according to the evidence that faith gives in being strong or weak faith? But now go on to your 'whethers' and 'neithers.'

Neonomian. I will show you wherein the difference is not.

Antinomian. So you may, and enumerate all things in the world by sea and by land besides. It is not whether the sun be the element of fire, nor how many regions in the air, nor whether spirits are material, nor whether the soul is from the hand of God? &c.

Neonomian. It is not whether the Spirit witnesseth by his miraculous operations to Christ, and the Gospel, which is a truth, and the meaning of many of the texts which you quote.

Antinomian. I do not know that we were like to stumble there, for we speak only of the Spirit's witnessing in its ordinary way, and so are all the texts to be understood, so far as they have been applied to our purpose.

Neonomian. Nor whether the Spirit as a worker of grace in the heart be an earnest of glory, and witness to our state.

Antinomian. Very good, then sure if the Spirit be an earnest of glory; it's an evidence of glory; for what is a greater evidence of a state than an earnest? Yea, you say it's also a witness of our state, if it be a witness it is by a testimony, and if it bear testimony, and such an one as we take to be a witness to our state, it is something to this purpose, Christ is thine, thy sins are forgiven; it must witness something that may beget in the soul a joyful sense of its reconciled state; there, contrary to you, assurance must come in the immediate objective revelation of the Spirit, by the Spirit speaking in the promise believed, God is thy God, Christ is thine, thy sins are taken away, or something to this purpose. Neither is this absurd, to say the Spirit speaks thus ordinarily by a voice, because it is so interpretatively, the Lord speaks when he causeth his Word to speak effectually unto the heart; and whatever truth of God is made efficacious by the Spirit, the Spirit speaks by it. If any word of promise become a truly comforting word, the Spirit as Comforter speaks by it; you have granted us here in a manner as much as we can desire in this point, excepting an equivocating expression, viz., as a

worker of grace; and whatever evasion you have there, this I will say, that you make the Spirit an evidence in its efficiency itself, as an efficient; whereas signs and marks are but evidences as effects. And is not the Spirit received in its first sensible efficiency in and by the promise a great evidence? Gal.3:3; II Pet.1:3.

Neonomian. Nor whether the Spirit witnesseth by and with the conscience, in the manifestation of our graces for assurance.

Calvin. It is a strange thing that you should make such a loud cry in the world against a man for error, when you in a manner say the same thing; and the Word of God asserts it so positively, that the Spirit is the Comforter, and witnesseth with our spirits that we are his children; and you say as the worker of grace, i.e., of all grace, and therefore of this grace; and if it works, it must be by some word of peace that it speaks and is believed; and you say it witnesses by and with the conscience, the conscience speaking in and by the Spirit; and how is the conscience made to speak peace more than by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, whereby an evil condemning conscience is taken away? What manifestation of grace works peace most, the manifestation of the grace of Christ, or of our graces? And these must appear to be the graces of Christ, and flow from him, or else they are no graces; the witness of the Spirit, and the intelligible believed voice of the Spirit, particularly applying the declaration of the Gospel of peace must be in all, and is the most settled ground of all comfortable assurance.

Neonomian. Nor whether the Spirit of God may in some extraordinary cases give an immediate testimony by a voice, or some equivalent impressions.

Antinomian. 1. You grant that sometimes the Spirit may witness by voice, or equivalent impressions. 2. The extraordinary cases you here speak of must be meant of some, not so usual in an ordinary way. 3. I would know whether then the Spirit is to be believed, and how its voice may be distinguished from the voice of a false spirit? 4. Whether when you speak of a voice you mean an articulate sound, or such a still voice as the Spirit speaks by, which is an impression of Gospel truth with a particular application to the soul; this, as you say, is equivalent to a voice, and it is the echo of the word of promise in the heart, and this is not an extraordinary nor unusual way, bringing souls to settled peace and comfort.

Neonomian. But then there was the truth of grace, though it was doubted before; and nothing utterly inconsistent with true grace, either in the heart, nor then appeareth to the conscience.

Antinomian. So that there is first a witness from ourselves, before there's witness from the Spirit; but how comes

it that this witness from ourselves has not credit enough with it to be believed? For if it has, whence comes doubting? Here's truth of grace, and nothing appears to the contrary, and yet the person doubts; doth any man doubts of anything, when he apprehends nothing to the contrary? And you say, there's the truth of grace before the Spirit witnesseth who wrought this truth of grace; do you not say, that it witnesseth to our state as a worker of grace?

Neonomian. I will tell you where the true difference lies. Whether none attain assurance but by the inward voice of the Spirit, pronouncing the actual forgiveness of sins, without manifesting their true grace and sanctification. This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. You should have made the first question, whether any assurance is attainable till death, because perseverance is one of your infallible marks, and all others signify nothing, unless we can take up upon that, and that must run out to the last moment before we can. We affirm, that there can be no assurance without knowledge that our sins are forgiven; assign an assurance without it if you can; and your assurance from marks must come to this if it be assurance. This must be by the Spirit's pronouncing of it, or no way; when you have found all that you can, it's God must speak peace, or else it will never be; and peace of reconciliation, however you banter God's reconciling the world, and the Spirit's bringing home the word of reconciliation. Whoever spake of the Spirit's manifesting forgiveness, without manifestation of the whole grace of God that brings salvation, in sanctification as well as justification? Both comes under the witness of the Spirit, and therefore you are besides the question, and state it not right.

Neonomian. The next question is, whether the usual way of attaining assurance, is by the conscience upon trial discerning and concluding through the help of the Spirit, that a man has those graces or signs which describe a man blessed and pardoned according to the Gospel. This I affirm, and you deny.

Antinomian. 1. That I deny sanctification to be a sign of justification is false, for that which is an undoubted effect is a sign of the cause, and an argument of it to conclude it by. 2. It's not the question, whether it be not the usual way of attaining assurance, *de facto*; such Gospel preachers as you are still putting them upon this way, and telling them there's no other safe way. 3. The question is, whether this be the only way? Whether another way ought not to go first?

Neonomian. I will now confirm the truth by some arguments. This is the way that God appoints to attain Assurance. II Cor.13:5; II Pet.1:10.

Antinomian. This is one way, who denies it, and a duty

required to examine ourselves? But where lies the critical point? It's in Christ being in us, try or see by trial whether Christ be in you; how? Look after the true evidence of it by finding out the thing itself, i.e., Christ received by faith, and witnessed by his Spirit, for Christ is in us these ways. 1. By his Spirit. 2. By faith. 3. By our mystical union, "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." Jn.17:23. Now this trial is by faith, for it is thus, do we see the things that are invisible? But suppose you say, the trial is by the fruits of faith; we deny it not, but we say, they are not only here, but to be understood; therefore the place concludes not against us, nor that place in II Peter 1:10, for the Apostle there tells us, we have all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that has called us to glory and virtue; and if all things, then assurance too, for its through great and precious promises that we are partakers of the Divine nature, and through them, as the Spirit is bestowed, so it comforts and ensures life and salvation to us. And as it works many gracious virtues and fruits in us, so it excites and stirs us up to increase and growth in grace, verses 5-7, and where these things are not, it is a sign that a man has no true savour of pardoning grace, lying under singleness of the great reason of Christ's death and satisfaction, of Christ, purging away of sin, i.e., by sacrifice, of his bearing of sin of old, so long ago; and it's no doubt but the real total absence of the fruits of faith, is a sign there is no faith; if these things be wanting, such an one is pure blind, or false-sighted, thinks he is something when there's nothing; but the difficulty is this, a man says, he has upon trial, these virtues, but is short-sighted; he looks close to himself, and passeth a wrong judgment, how shall he be convinced that he has them not? Or he says, he has them not; how shall he come to be satisfied that he has them? Who must resolve these difficulties? Is it not the Word and Spirit that must resolve it in believing? Therefore the rather give all diligence to make your calling and election sure; and how is that done? Why not in believing? Doth not Christ make our calling sure; is election to be known any way but by believing? And how is our calling, i.e., summons to believe? How is that made good, but by answering the call? For he says, doing these things, i.e., making calling and election sure, by getting a sure footing and standing in Christ by faith, you shall not fall or stumble, so as to fall; and an entrance shall be abundantly ministered; the words are so, an entrance into his eternal Kingdom shall be ministered to you. Now Christ he is the door, and a rich entrance into his Kingdom, ministered to everyone that believeth; so that the crisis of our state that the Spirit of God puts us upon in both places is, especially about our faith in

Christ, which faith is a witness in ourselves, and the Spirit witnessing with it, and all ways and means causing our faith to witness, and giving us light and evidence from the Word believed, to see the graces of God and fruits of the Spirit in our hearts.

Neonomian. This is the way whereby the Scripture saints were assured, they concluding their justification by their sanctification; and a state of peace by the truth of grace. I Jn.3:9,14,18. Thus David, Paul, and other saints, concluded the safety of their state.

Antinomian. This is one way, but not the only or principal way, the Apostle John tells often, that love, if it be true, and from a true principle, and root, is an argument of our regenerate state, but that it may be known to be such, it must be traced to the head, {it being but a stream,} to see how it flows from the love of Christ apprehended by faith, whereby we have our radical hold and standing. And as he says, verse 14, hereby we know we are passed from death to life, because we love the brethren. Yet lest he should leave us in the dark, and we should take false love for true, he tells us, there is another judgment to pass upon our love before we can argue from it, we must find that it flows from our perception of the love of God, in laying down his life for us, verse 16, and from thence should proceed our readiness to lay down our life for the brethren. In this we know, or are assured of God's love, in that he laid down his life for us. The love of God believed gives the original ground of assurance, and is the greatest, and the touchstone to another. A witness from men, from what is found in us, is something, but the witness of God is greater, I Jn.5:9, and the witness that he has given to us in the Gospel concerning his Son testified by the Spirit, and applied by faith, is that evidence upon which all firm assurance is radically built. And you shall plainly see, that John does not found our assurance radically upon love, but in faith; he says, for let us be sincere in love; and I will tell you whereby you shall attain to good assurance; in this, i.e., in what follows, in this, refers not to the foregoing verse, but to what follows, for in this we shall know, or be assured, that we are of the truth, we shall persuade our hearts; it's rendered well, assure our hearts, bring our hearts to assurance, by believing that whereby condemnation is removed; for says he, if this be not, whatever judgment we have of what is in ourselves, it may deceive us; and God knows enough in us to condemn us, for if our hearts labour under unbelief, and condemn us, whatever we find in ourselves will not give us peace; and God is greater than our hearts, therefore we must assure our hearts that way which will hold good in the eye of God's justice, i.e., by faith in Jesus Christ, verse 21, and, says he, if our heart condemn us not, we have

cheerfulness and boldness towards God; and how is it possible that the condemnation of our hearts should be taken off but by believing, and thereby persuading our hearts. But you will say, it may be that the word confidence is not used for to express our believing? But I will show you it is. See Hebrews 11:13. They all died in faith, having not received the promises, but saw them afar off, were persuaded of them, i.e., believed them, so as to be assured of them.

As for the rest of the saints you shall find all along that their triumphant assurances were by faith. Abraham. Romans 4:20-21. See the various phrases to express his full assurance of faith, he made no dispute or doubt about the promise; the English well expresses it, he staggered not at the promise, or through unbelief, he was not weak in faith, but was strong in faith, and consulted not with himself, secondary causes, or carnal reason, but was carried forth with a full gale of assurance. Job's assurance was the assurance of faith, "I know my Redeemer liveth," &c. Job 19:25. David under his greatest trial of banishment by his own son from the house of God, Psal.42:10, when challenged by his enemies at the highest rate, at which he was so disquieted, he calls up his soul to take up comfort in believing. "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? And why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God, for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God." Psal.42:11. Paul, Romans 7, where he tells how low he was brought upon self-examination, as to what he could find in himself, verse 18, I know that in me, that is in my flesh there dwells no good thing. See how he complains, verse 24, O wretched man that I am, &c., as much as to say, I am wretched in regard of the evil, sin, and corruption that I find abounding in me; but, verse 25, I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord; there is the root of his comfort, in the faith that he had in Jesus Christ, though there was this little small spark of holiness in him, a mind at least to serve the law of God, yet he trusted not to that; and you see, II Cor.12:7-9, when he fell into temptation and buffeting, was it his duties and services to Christ and his churches, that supported him? No, it was an objective manifestation to him received by faith, "my grace is sufficient for thee," but you will say, his rejoicing was in the testimony of his conscience, II Cor.1:12, it's true it was, and the testimony of a good conscience as to our hearts and ways is matter of rejoicing, but this was in Paul without confidence in the flesh, or ascribing anything to it, but by seeing all in Christ, and that all flowed down from the free grace and love of God, all his simplicity and sincerity of heart was seen by faith to be gifts of grace; therefore you see whensoever the children of God took any comforts and rejoicings from the fruits of the Spirit, they made not these as

the fundamental ground of their assurance, but a confirming and additional ground, and such as was very uncertain, insomuch that at some times they were at a perfect loss for them, yet was not without their rooted and grounded assurances in the darkest times, and under the obscurest providences.

Neonomian. The conscience is bound to condemn every man in whom the contrary to these graces do appear, yea, where it's evident they are wholly wanting. It's otherwise a seared conscience, I Tim.4:2, it's the candle of the Lord; now there can be no assurance where the conscience condemns. I Jn.3:19-21.

Antinomian. There is nothing but the sprinkling of the blood of Christ applied by faith that can take off the conscience from condemning, and without this all the works and duties in the world cannot do it; it's the law that obligeth the conscience to condemn; and the sense of our imperfections and weaknesses, and remainder of corruption may be where there is no condemning conscience; but wherefore is it? Not because of what they find in themselves, but from what they find in Christ; and it's a harsh doctrine that you teach from I Timothy 4:2, that all that cannot find works enough in themselves to conclude their state in Christ from, and hold it merely by faith in Christ, and thereby freed from condemning consciences, have seared, cauterized consciences, such as the Apostle prophesies of, that should abound in the Antichristian apostasy and seduction; and you subvert the doctrine of the Gospel thereby, helping to fulfill that prophecy, by what doctrine the text will tell you.

Neonomian. The Spirit witnesseth with our spirits, Rom.8:16, it does not witness before our spirits does witness; it is not a separate testimony from our spirits, but it concurs with our spirit as its instrument, our spirit witnesseth in the light of the Spirit, my conscience bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost.

Antinomian. What is this argument brought for, is this to prove that there's no assurance by the voice of the Spirit? And that the only way of assurance is by signs and marks? But you have brought in this place of Scripture as many men retain council in their case, they see some council only that they may not be against them; but the Word of God will not be bribed, this place is directly against you. The Apostle here tells us the very comforting office of the Holy Ghost, that it becomes a spirit of adoption, this is the Spirit of Christ, Gal.4:6, and what is it that it does? It teacheth us to call God Father; and how does it do this? It's by witnessing to us our relation, viz., that we are the sons of God; this is that which does assure us of our inheritance; if children then heirs.

Now I argue, that which witnesseth in the children of God, that they are the children of God, insomuch that from thence they can conclude themselves heirs, does pronounce the

actual forgiveness of their sins, and is the usual way of assurance, but the Spirit witnesseth in the children of God, that they are the children of God, therefore, there is a pronouncement of actual forgiveness by the voice of the Spirit, &c. For the major it's proved from Gal.3:26, the Spirit bestows adoption by faith in Christ Jesus, "ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" and verse 29, "if ye be Christ's then are you of Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," you'll allow the Spirit to witness, but not before our spirit, so that you'll have our spirits to be before the Spirit, the senior evidence. I deny it, for that which causeth our spirits to give evidence, is not the younger evidence, but the Spirit causeth our hearts to give evidence, ergo, now for the minor, that the Spirit causeth our hearts to give evidence, I prove from yourself; you say the Spirit concurs with our spirit as its instrument. Now the way of the Spirit's witnessing is by bringing to our spirit an objective manifestation of grace in the promise, and causing us by faith to make a particular application thereof to ourselves, and so we become by the witness of the Spirit to be the children of God by faith, in the same sense we are heirs according to the promise. Gal.3:29. Now therefore the Spirit must witness first as the worker of this assurance by the promise, that faith may witness; and you yourself said but now, that the Spirit witnesseth as a worker of grace, therefore as the worker of the grace of assurance. You say it is not a separate testimony from our spirits, I suppose you mean from our spirits testimony; your meaning I take to be, that they both witness one and the same thing; but that they are two distinct witnesses, is evident from the text; that which witnesseth with another is distinct from that other; and you say it concurs with our spirit; and you say our spirits witness in the light of the Spirit, i.e., in the light of its manifestation and evidence, and therefore the Spirit must witness first, or else our spirits must witness without evidence, which is impossible. So that all you have been saying in this argument, is against yourself and for us.

Neonomian. A testimony of the Spirit giving an evidence of pardon without any evidence of grace, is not according to the word of grace, for the word of grace never declareth any sinners are pardoned but believing penitent sinners; it is not as mere sinners the word pardoneth, but it flatly condemneth and leaves guilt on all impenitent unbelievers, as I have proved.

Antinomian. I marvel a 'divine' should speak at such a rate; as if an evidence of pardon were not an evidence of grace. Is not pardon the highest degree of grace? Is not the word of grace therefore so, because it is a word of pardon to sinners? And if you mean inherent grace, why may not the Spirit give

evidence of pardon to a sinner's evidence of it in an act of believing, before there can be any fruits of faith? Was it not so with the thief upon the cross, and many that God pardons just upon the last moment of their lives? And is it not so with many of God's children that can see no evidences in themselves? The Spirit strips them of all grounds in themselves, and that gives a full satisfaction in objective grace, with the full assurance of faith, that the creature may be laid low, and Christ may be glorified. I must tell you, that a mere sinner is the object of pardon, and not a sinner considered under any holy qualifications. The whole need not the Physician; Christ finds and pardons lost sinners, and there's no sinner applies pardon aright but as a mere sinner, though he has faith. But of this I have spoken before in our eighth conference, and twelfth.

Neonomian. Therefore if there be a voice, a true voice of God, carrying its own evidence, saying, thy sins are forgiven, it does at the same time and by the same voice, witness to the truth of our grace; because he forgives no other according to the word of the Gospel.

Antinomian. A true voice witnessing the forgiveness of sins, does consequently witness to the truth of grace in our hearts; for the closing with the evidence in a way of comfort, witnessed by the Spirit, does in fact witness to the truth of our faith; there's, "Lord I believe," likewise it witnesseth that Christ is ours, and that we belong to Christ; and if so, we are new creatures, and this we may be, and must be, before we can bring forth any fruits besides faith itself. But it's not for the reason you allege, which is as much as to say, Christ saves none but them that are saved already.

Neonomian. If the Spirit should say to an impenitent soul, thou art pardoned, while such, it is no promise in the Gospel, &c.

Antinomian. Is there no promise in the Gospel to take away the heart of stone, to give repentance? And neither of these is found till pardoning mercy make the way, and are never savingly found, till forgiveness is given, and in some measure of believing closed with; but you rove from the point of assurance that we are upon, go on to your next argument.

Neonomian. To have the ordinary way of assurance as its stated by the opposite error, is of dangerous consequence.

Antinomian. By the witness of the Spirit, and by the evidence of faith. I pray let us hear those dangerous consequences what they be.

Neonomian. Most saints must quit their hopes and assurances, for they never had this voice, though they have greater stamps of the Spirit, than any I ever knew pretend to this.

Antinomian. If any saints have hopes and assurance that is good in some degree, they need not quit them in betaking themselves to better, firmer and more lasting grounds of hope and assurance; the assurance may be the same, though better grounded and built. But they never had this voice, what mean you by this? Is there any true believer that never heard what the Spirit says to sinners? Is there any that hears not what God says in his Word? Do they not hear that are in their spiritual graves the voice of Christ, and live? Do you so impose as to stretch our meaning to an extraordinary audible voice? Then you do but like yourself; but yet you say, they have stamps of the Spirit; I pray how does the Spirit make a stamp and impression upon a sinner's heart, but by the application of the grace of the Gospel in believing? Is it not as many as received Christ, to them is the privilege of being the sons of God? And you say greater stamps than any you know pretend to this; you speak you know not what, in a scornful manner, as if you knew little yourself what belongs to a true Gospel spirit; I am sure if you did, you would not run out in this loose manner as you do, in a way of contempt of others. "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Phil.2:3-4

Neonomian. It makes all examination useless and vain.

Antinomian. It makes examination most useful and necessary, yea hereby becomes more profitable, advantageous and comfortable, when by sounding we find good bottom; we find we have not only life, but have it more abundantly.

Neonomian. It overturns one of the great pillars of faith, i.e., that God has assigned to the work of all grace on the heart.

Antinomian. What shall I call this assertion, Mr. Calvin?

Calvin. For shame, Mr. Neonomian. Leave off, what will you say, God's own Spirit witnessing in our hearts to the full assurance of faith, overturns his work of grace in our hearts? I am sorry to hear this evil communication come out of your mouth.

Neonomian. It makes Assurance impossible without this miraculous voice.

Antinomian. Are you again upon the high ropes and tender hooks? Is this intended to be any way a miraculous voice, only the voice of the Spirit as comforter in the heart according to the Word? Is it a miraculous voice for God to say unto the soul, I am thy salvation? Is it not the ordinary Gospel voice under the Old Testament and New Testament?

Neonomian. It hardly carries its evidence to a soul that has no grace at all?

Antinomian. You say a miraculous voice can hardly carry its evidence to a soul that has no grace at all. It is well you put in hardly, for you know it was carried to Paul in a miraculous voice; and it's a marvellous audacious expression, to say God can hardly carry grace and evidence of grace to a graceless soul; no not so much as miraculously; and cannot God give grace and evidence in the same moment of time, as to the thief on the cross, and thousands more in the word.

Neonomian. It's a way too far enthusiastic to be allowed in so stated a case.

Antinomian. You had best say the Apostle Paul in the whole 8th chapter to the Romans, and in divers other places, was too enthusiastic, and therefore those portions of Scripture that speak of the revelation and witness of the Spirit, and the assurances of faith, not to be allowed. I'll assure you, you are mighty magisterial to take upon you the decrying the witness of the Spirit at this presumptuous rate, openly and before the world. What account can you give of this another day?

Neonomian. It gives the devil a great advantage against sinners, to live in sin; and against honest people, if once they find cause to question this voice. Yea, it sets up the Spirit against itself, if any can boast of assurance by this voice, when their state is justly challengeable by the Gospel, as wanting all sight of Gospel marks.

Antinomian. If the grace of God that brings salvation unto sinners, is the casting out of the devil out of the heart, and the witnessing Spirit a mortifying Spirit, a teacher of holiness, and the greatest enlarger of the heart therein, as Romans 8:15, by how much the more it works as a Comforter, as the Spirit of adoption, bringing us into the liberty of sons of God, and showing to us that Christ is ours and we are his, yea by how much the more he makes us to see by faith in Christ, and how much the less he makes us to see in ourselves; but still shows us our own vileness and ugliness, corruptions, poorness of duties, even to the loathing and abhorring of ourselves, if then I say God is most glorified and his free grace, Christ is most advanced and his precious blood, and his glorious Spirit to be loved and admired, and we in the best and most Gospel-frame; then all that you have here spoken is burlesque, mingled with the enmity of your heart, vented against the grace of the Gospel and the Spirit of God.

Calvin. I must confess I cannot tell what to say of that saying, the witness of the Spirit by the voice of the Gospel, is giving advantage to the devil; I am sure it has a dangerous aspect. But I pray, Mr. Antinomian, do you condemn signs and marks as altogether useless towards the gaining of assurance, that he inveighs at so heavy a rate?

Antinomian. No, by no means; I allow the fruits of the Spirit to be of a marvellous use, as to confirming and comforting of ourselves, and very satisfactory to others; that our Saviour says, hereby shall all men know that we are his disciples; and, as James says, we must be convinced of men's faith by their work, or else we cannot take them to be believers. Yea, we expect of every one that we admit Church-members, that they should give a reason of the hope that is in them, according to the rule of the Gospel. This Mr. Neonomian is against, he will burlesque upon it, as much as he does now at the witness of the Spirit.

Calvin. Why it is not possible, Mr. Neonomian. Sure when you admit members into your Congregation, you are very strict in examining of them upon the fruits of faith, that you and all your Congregation may know, so far as the judgment of a rational charity will go, that they are disciples of Christ; though as those signs may deceive a man's own self, so others may be deceived in those that make profession of them.

Neonomian. I know no ground to stand so strictly upon my admission; I think if men be not grossly ignorant, or openly scandalous, they may be admitted to all ordinances; I can't try them for their perseverance, which is the greatest mark.

Calvin. But I read that the Churches in the primitive times were made up of those that were at least to visible appearance sanctified in Christ Jesus.

Neonomian. But the times are altered now, they were converted out of heathenism, we are all Christians.

Calvin. Aye, such as they be, such as your honest people, which the devil gets a great advantage against, to persuade to live in sin because of the pardoning grace of the Gospel, for whose sake you would have the doctrine renounced, and another Gospel preached. I see you do not set so much by signs and marks, but only to set them up in opposition to the witness of the Spirit.

Antinomian. I will give you my full sense of the doctrine of assurance. The certainty of a thing or proposition can be founded but upon one of these two bottoms, either upon an artificial or inartificial argument, {so called in logic;} an argument artificial gives me sensible or rational ground for what I am assured of, and it argues things from causes, effects, subjects, adjuncts, dissentienties, wherein are diversities and opposites, &c., but an inartificial argument is founded on testimony, and according to the faithfulness of him that brings it, it gives more or less ground of belief. This is reckoned in logic the weakest ground of knowledge, especially being human testimony that is brought; it may be a probable ground of believing, but is not an infallible one, and therefore the judgment

upon it usually goes no further than opinion, that which is of a contingency. But in theology, Divine Testimony is the greatest ground of certainty and assurance in the world; because he that speaks is unchangeably true, faithful, just and holy, he cannot lie. Now hence it is, that what testimony comes from God himself, it is to be believed, because it is so without reasoning any further, and is the greatest ground of assurance in the world; therefore I affirm, that the witness of God in his word, and the Spirit in the heart, firmly believed, is, and produceth the greatest assurance for firmness and durability in the world.

This is that which ought to lie in the bottom of all our assurance, this will hold above all in the hour of temptation, when all signs and marks fail; though our faith may be sometimes shaken, and our comforts and assurances eclipsed, so that our faith may hold but as far as a hoping or persuasion of a probability of our state and condition; yet, as Mr. Neonomian says, as the evidence is strong or weak, so our assurance is strong or weak. Now that faith still carries with it a hypostasis or demonstration of the thing believed, grounded upon the certainty, truth and infallibility of God, I am fully satisfied from that portion of Scripture that evinces it undeniably. "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Heb.11:1.

And as now for other grounds of comfort and assurance which arise from the visibility of the grace of God, and the fruits of the Spirit in the heart and life, I highly value them, as subordinate grounds of comfort and confirmation in assurance, these are seen by the reflection of the soul upon itself, being able in regenerate man to reason in a spiritual manner from causes, effects, subjects and adjuncts, &c., which he finds in himself, according to the rule of the word of God. This I call experimental assurance; and this is that which is so long attaining to, and when it is received, may be lost again in a great measure, as comfort therefore. And because many believers take this to be all the assurance they must look for, and their teachers tell them so, therefore they go mourning all their days, and are only supported by what degrees of assurance is in their faith, which they take not to be any; and their teachers tell them that faith has nothing of assurance in it, but, do suggest as if it were but the roving of the mind in uncertainties and probability, and that it is presumption for them to believe to confidence and assurance, though the Spirit of God does command and encourage it again and again, and that doubting is rather their virtue than sin; whereas so much as there is of doubting mingled with their faith, so much there is of sin and unbelief.

In true faith there is the promise more or less believed, i.e., the truth and goodness {because a promise reached forth a

truth which carries goodness in it to us-ward} is received; the reason of which reception is the certain truth and faithfulness of him that promises; hence there is believing a word, and believing a person. Hence believing has three things in it, according to the Apostle, Heb.11:1, the object falls not under the measure of sense and reason, therefore called things not seen, and things hoped for. 2. There is an express image of the things not seen and hoped for, brought to us in the promise. 3. There is a demonstration or argument of the reality and certainty of those things, and intention of bestowing them, taken from the truth and faithfulness of him that promises; faithful is he that has promised. Now that God has promised in general and indefinitely to save sinners, and that he is able and willing to perform it in his time, and to whom he pleaseth, may be a common faith only, and such as the devils have; but for a sinner to take up with the promise for himself, is the work of the Spirit peculiarly. Because there is no man spoken to by name in the promise, which advantage Abraham had; and the want thereof must be supplied by the Spirit's saying to the soul more or less plainly, this promise belongeth unto thee; whereby the soul is enabled to exert fiducially a believing the promise, and staying on the promiser for himself; and here lies the difficulty of believing, and the usual workings of unbelief. It's a marvellous thing to me, Mr. Neonomian, that you can have the impudence to quote the Assembly for your assertion, viz., that there is no other grounds of assurance but signs and marks; whereas they say so expressly, that a believer may be assured in this life that he is in a state of grace, and this certainty is not a bare conjectural and probable persuasion grounded on a fallible hope, but an infallible assurance of faith, founded on the Divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces unto which those promises are made, the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits. So that they make three grounds of assurance. 1. The infallible assurance of faith. 2. The inward evidences of graces. 3. The witness of the Spirit of adoption.

When you quoted this place, you had either forgot what you had wrote, or you quote it {retaining the Assembly first} least it should be brought against you. There are three great graces spoken of by the Apostle, I Cor.13:13, faith, hope, love; and the Scripture holds forth an assurance in reference to every one of these. First, the assurance of faith. Heb.10:22. Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith. This assurance of faith has a double respect. 1. To our persons. 2. To our services, that in both we are pleasing to God.

Secondly, there's an assurance of hope, Heb.6:11, faith has an eye to the truth of the promise, hope to the good of the promise; and the assurance of hope is that we shall certainly

receive that good.

Thirdly, there's an assurance of love, I Jn.4:21, perfect love casts out fear. How is love made perfect, and how does it cast out fear? "Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment, because as he is, so are we in this world," I Jn.4:17, i.e., as his love is sincere to us, so is ours to him {according to our measure} even in this life, and this gives us boldness, our assurance that all shall go well with us in the day of judgment; so this love casteth out all fear of condemnation in that day, which fear where it remains has torment, than which nothing is more contrary to assurance. In perfect love there is no torment, because there is no fear; and there is no fear, because there is an assurance of the love of God, in this love the soul does repose, rest and delight itself. There is a fourth thing spoken of, which is a full assurance of understanding. This is clearness of our apprehension about the things which we do believe, and upon which we fasten by faith and love. The light of the understanding shining upon the mysteries of the Gospel, and mixing with our other graces, bottoms the soul upon the strongest foundation, and raiseth it up to the highest pinnacle of assurance.

We may say of assurance in reference to these four graces, as philosophers do of the heavens, in reference to the four elements, that they are neither of the four elements, but a quintessence of a fifth essence; so we may say of assurance, it is neither faith, nor hope, nor love, nor knowledge, but it is a fifth thing, sublimated and raised, either out of, or above all those, i.e., when assurance is raised to the highest pitch, that it is a full assurance, from whence our joy is full; all a believer's sails are filled, being under a full gale, and having fair weather.

"The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom.8:16. The witness which our own spirits do give unto our adoption is the work and effect of the Holy Spirit in us; if it were not, it would be false, and not confirmed by the testimony of the Spirit himself, who is the Spirit of truth; and none knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God, I Cor.2:11, if he declares not our sonship in us and to us, we cannot know it. How does he then bear witness to our spirits? What is the distinct testimony? It must be some such act of his, as evidences itself to be from him immediately, unto them that are concerned in it, i.e., those, unto whom it is given.

He that expounds Romans 8:16, I think one of your vouchers, speaks admirably well to this matter. The spirit of adoption {says he} does not only excite us to call upon God as our Father, but it does ascertain and assure us {as before} that we are his children. And this it does not by an outward voice, as God the Father to Jesus Christ; nor by an angel, as to Daniel and

the virgin Mary; but by an inward and secret suggestion, whereby he raiseth our hearts to this persuasion, that God is our Father, and we are his children. This is not the testimony of the graces and operations of the Spirit, but of the Spirit himself. A man's own spirit does witness to his adoption, he finds in himself, upon diligent search and examination, some of the manifest signs and tokens thereof. But this testimony of itself is weak, and Satan has many ways and wiles to invalidate it; wherefore, for more assurance it's confirmed by a greater testimony, i.e., the Spirit itself, which first works grace, and then witnesseth it; he witnesseth with our spirits, and seals it up to us. This testimony is not in all believers alike, nor in any one at all times, it's better felt than expressed; he witnesseth to our spirits, {so some read it,} by a distinct and immediate testimony, and he witnesseth with our spirits, {so the word properly signifies,} by a conjunctive and concurrent testimony.

Paul means that the Spirit of God bears such a testimony to us, that he being our Guide and Master, our spirit does conclude God's adoption of us is sure. For our spirits would not dictate this faith to us of our own accord, unless the testimony of the Spirit go before; and he shows us how, for whilst the Spirit does witness to us that we are the children of God; he does also put this believing confidence into our souls, that we have the boldness to call God Father. And this is to be held always as a principle, that we never pray to God in a right manner, unless as we call him Father with our lips, so we are certainly persuaded in our minds that he is such.

David Pareus also speaks the same, and quotes the words of Chrysostom, "if a man, an angel, an archangel, promise anything, happily a man may doubt; but if the Spirit of God the Supreme Being, which causeth us to pray, and makes a promise to them that pray, and gives us a promise, bearing testimony to us within ourselves, what room is there for doubting?"

Faith is called an evidence; hence we learn, that the nature of faith stands not in doubting, but in a certainty and assurance. The Romish doubting of the essence of faith, is as contrary to true faith as darkness to light. Objection. But it seems doubting is a part or companion of faith, and who doubteth not? Answer. We do say so, but what then? We should not, God commands us to believe, and not doubt. Again, if faith be the substance of things hoped for, much more is it a substance to a believer; if it give those things a being which are out of him, much more does it give a permanent being to the believer himself, strengthening him to stand and continue in all assaults. "For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." Heb.3:14.

END OF PART 2

NEONOMIANISM

UNMASKED, PART III

DEBATE XVI

OF GOD'S SEEING SIN IN BELIEVERS.

Neonomian. There is a grand error, Mr. Calvin, which we would now deal with Mr. Antinomian about, everyone talks of it as very gross and notorious, and that is this, that God seeth no sin in believers, though he see the fact, neither does he charge them with sin; nor ought they to charge themselves with any sin, nor be at all sad for it; nor confess, repent, nor do anything as a means of pardon; no nor in order to assuring themselves of pardon, even when they commit murder, adultery, or the grossest wickedness.

Antinomian. Here's many things put together in this charge, and by an undue mixture, and wresting my sense and meaning, he has made it look as he pleaseth; but we must hear his proof, and then I shall be the better able to make my defense.

Neonomian. Note, that he speaks most of this concerning a person as elect, though he uses the word believer sometimes, because he alone knows he is elect by believing.

Antinomian. Do not you then, in alleging my words, make a confusion in my sense? For your way is to pick up my expressions here and there and put them together to make up that sense which you would put upon them.

Neonomian. You say, though such persons do act rebellious, yet the loathsomeness and abominableness and hatefulness of this rebellion is laid on the back of Christ, he bears the sin as well as the blame and shame, &c., and that's the only reason why God can dwell with those persons that do act the thing, because all the filthiness of it is transacted from them to the back of Christ.

Antinomian. I have vindicated myself already, as to those expressions in our debate concerning God's laying sin on Christ; but, lest you should have forgot what was said, I shall speak a little to it. Objection. How should God know every sin the believer has committed, and yet God not remember them? Answer. Though he remembers the things thou hast done, yet he does not remember them as thine, for he remembers perfectly they are none of thine; when he passed them over to Christ, they

ceased to be thine any longer.

My design has been in several discourses, and in that mentioned by you, that we must have Christ before we can be holy, as the root of all gracious qualifications, and that Christ is bestowed in a way of efficacy before we have him in a way of evidence; and God tells us whose iniquities were laid on Christ, even of them that were gone every one away as lost sheep, and turned to their own ways; the same thing that the Apostle speaks, Rom.5:8, God recommended his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners {it must be meant unbelieving and impenitent sinners} Christ died for us; and he says, verse 10, if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; that must be understood of our being in a state of enmity, before we come to a state of grace, this reconciliation is wrought by Jesus Christ. I shall give you my discourse as briefly as I may, that you may see my meaning.

Faith you know is the first of all gifts God bestows upon a soul, and all other graces they follow that faith that Christ does give to men. So that if there be not a believing, there can be no grace of sanctification at all, but while persons are departing from the living God, there remains in them an evil heart of unbelieving; and yet this is true, that while they are departing from the living God, and straying as lost sheep, their iniquities are laid on Christ, and the true meaning of the word {turn to our own ways} is, that men do what they list, and what is good in their own eyes; and yet it is the iniquity of these men, that have thus turned to their own ways, which the Lord has laid upon Christ.

From whence I lay down this conclusion. That this grace of the Lord's laying iniquity on Christ, is certainly applied unto persons, even while they are departing from the living God, while they are lost sheep, while they are turned everyone to their own way, before they have amended their ways. And because this truth is so hardly received, seeming to give so much way to looseness, as some calumniate, I endeavour to clear it, and that it is a most fearful injury unto a man's self, and a forsaking a man's own mercy, directly for a man to conclude, that there is no grace for me, because I cannot find such and such things in me, as universal obedience, sanctification, &c., and you shall plainly see where grace is applied unto persons, and to what condition of men, "thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them." Psal.68:18.

And then I open that where God is said to give his gifts to the rebellious, and use the said expressions which he rehearses, which amounts only to thus much in my sense, that

when the grace of redemption and the application thereof is first applied, it finds us lost creatures, lost sheep, rebellious ones, turning everyone to his own ways; which I also illustrate from Ezekiel 16:7-9, "I have caused thee to multiply as the bud of the field, and thou hast increased and waxen great, and thou art come to excellent ornaments; thy breasts are fashioned, and thine hair is grown, whereas thou wast naked and bare. Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy time was the time of love; and I spread my skirt over thee, and covered thy nakedness; yea, I sware unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord GOD, and thou becamest mine. Then washed I thee with water; yea, I thoroughly washed away thy blood from thee, and I anointed thee with oil."

What Qualifications can you find in blind-eyed and shackled persons, that are bound up under the bondage of Satan, even dead in trespasses and sins? What renewed qualifications in sanctification can you find in such persons, seeing the first work that God works upon any person, is to open the eyes to see him, and to see themselves. Now Christ must be present, because he is given to do this thing before it can be done. If it be the eye of faith, Christ is said to be the Author and Finisher of it; if it be the eye of God, we must all be taught of God; our Saviour speaks plainly, when he pointed out directly to the Jews, for whom he died and became sin, I came to save that which was lost; it's by the eye of knowledge, we must be taught all of God. And this is one part of God's Covenant, I will remember their sins no more.

What is that Covenant? I will be their God, and thy shall be my people; and your sins and iniquities will I remember no more. This is the substance of the Covenant, and Christ himself is given over to men; as much as to say, in Christ I will become thy God; in Christ I will remember thy sins and iniquities no more. This is the substance of the Covenant; Christ is this Covenant, and Christ himself is given over to men; in Christ I will become thy God; in Christ I will remember thy sins and iniquities no more; this have I given in him to you. But when does the Lord pass over this to persons? When they are first renewed. Have persons the knowledge of God and of themselves before the Lord makes this deed of gift over to them? Mark what follows, you shall see all the qualifications of sanctification must not only follow Christ given, but they are the very work of Christ himself after he is given; I will give thee for a Covenant to open blind eyes. Now although the end of things be first in the intention, yet it is the last in execution. If a workman be to build a house, the work must be prepared before the house can be built by him.

Calvin. I think, Mr. Antinomian, you have said enough to vindicate yourself from his first charge, I doubt not but that

our sins were all at once laid on Christ; Paul's sins were on Christ in the height of his rebellion and persecution, and Christ came upon him effectually to convert him, as the fruit thereof, even in the midst of his rebellion. He says the grace of laying sin on Christ, is applied to sinners while they are departed from God, and is the cause of the gift of Converting-grace; plain instances whereof were Saul and the jailor, whom the Covenant-grace took hold on in the height of their rebellion. But all this reacheth not the proof of your charge, which you call error here.

Neonomian. But he says, God has not one sin to charge upon an elect person, from the first moment of conception to the last moment of life, no nor original sin is not to be laid upon him, the Lord has laid it on Christ already.

Antinomian. You have been harping on this string already, I shall only repeat my words as spoken. I said, it is true, an elect person, not called, is never able to know individually of himself, that he is such an one that God has nothing to charge upon him, because, till calling, God gives not unto persons to believe, and it's only believing which evidences to men of things not seen. Things that are not seen, they are hidden and secret and shall not be known; I mean the things of God's love to men shall not be known to particular men till they do believe. But considering their real condition {in the eyes of God's justice} the Lord has not one sin to charge an elect person with; from the first moment of his life, till the last minute of it, there is not so much as original sin, the ground is, the Lord has said it on Christ already. Was there by one act the expiation of sin and all at once that were committed from the beginning of the world to the end thereof, how comes it to pass, that this or that sin should be laid upon elect persons, when they were laid upon Christ long before? I deny not, but, according to the sense of the law, and in one's conscience, they are charged, and sin is laid to their charge; but I speak of their real standing in the eye of God's justice, their sins were laid on Christ, and carried away by him.

Neonomian. He says, it's a voice of a lying spirit in your hearts, that says, that you that are believers, have yet sin wasting your consciences and lying as a burden too heavy for you to bear, &c.

Antinomian. The voice is not of the true Spirit, and therefore must be of the lying spirit. 1. If he lie under conscience walking sin, it seems to be a lying spirit that tells him he is a believer. 2. If he be a real believer, and sin lie so heavily upon his conscience, it's a sign that his faith is very weak, that it has not reached the blood of Christ to the purifying of his conscience, and that he lies under the spirit of bondage, quite contrary to the Spirit of adoption.

Neonomian. He says, was not David a justified person,

and did not he bear his own sin? After several things, he answers, I must tell you all that David speaks here, he speaks from himself, and all that David speaks from himself was not truth.

Antinomian. Why do you not tell those several things? My answer to the objection, as to the sum of it, was this. I know this objection seems unanswerable, as in several passages Asaph speaks to that purpose, and in that particularly, where he says, has God forgotten to be gracious? Has he shut up his loving-kindness? And will he be gracious no more? First, I would fain know, whether now, under the times of the Gospel, there be not many tender-hearted, religious people, that cry out of their own sins, and the weight and burden of their own sins upon their own spirits, as well as David? I must tell you, all that David said from himself was not truth. {And is it truth, when a sincere-hearted believer, through the power of temptation and infidelity, calls into despairing expressions?} Did Asaph speak well in these passages, to charge God, that he had forsaken him forever? David might mistake then, that God should charge sin upon him, and it may be he might charge sin upon himself, without any warrant or commission from God to do it. And does not Asaph, upon recollecting himself, Psal.77:10, acknowledge, that to be his infirmity, his sickness or spiritual disease, that he should think or speak at this rate of God? And are you so offended that I say it was Asaph's mistake? {It was by some mistake, that those words were said to be David's, when Asaph's.} Doth not the Spirit of God in Asaph say, that it was not only his mistake, but sin of infirmity?

Calvin. I think you have given a sufficient answer to that allegation of his, I pray let's hasten as much as may be.

Neonomian. I must confess I have not much to say against the answer; but he says, before a believer does confess his sin, he may be as certain of the pardon of it, as after confession.

Antinomian. Speaking of Christ's free welcome to all comers, this objection, among others, was spoken to; but must not he confess first, and be afflicted in his soul, before he can think he shall be received if he come? For answer, I said. 1. I deny not, but acknowledge, when a believer sins, he must confess his sins; and the greatest end and ground of this confession is that which Joshua speaks concerning Achan, "my son, give, I pray thee, glory to the LORD God of Israel, and make confession unto him," Jos.7:19, a believer, in the confession of sin, gives glory to the great God of Heaven and Earth, and that must be the glorious end of confession of his sin, that God may be owned as the sole and only Saviour. Except we do acknowledge sin, we cannot acknowledge salvation; we cannot acknowledge any virtue in the works and sufferings of Christ,

Christ might have saved his labour, and never come into the world; all that Christ did could not be acknowledged to be of worth to us if there had not been sin, from which Christ should save us. He that does indeed confess his sin, does indeed confess he had perished, if Christ had not died for him; nay, he confesseth, that nothing in the world but Christ could save him. 2. I grant that a believer should be sensible of sin, i.e., of the nature of sin. {But my main design is to show you, that confession of sin, is not the procuring cause of the pardon of sin.} A believer {i.e., a true believer} may certainly conclude, even before confession of sin, that reconciliation is made between God and him, the interest he has in Christ, and the love of Christ embracing him; I say, there is as much ground to be confident of the pardon of sin to a believer, {in respect of the fulness and freeness of pardoning grace in Christ,} as soon as ever he has committed it, though he has not made a solemn act of confession, as to believe it after he has performed all the humiliation in the world. {Not that I say, he ought not to confess sin; I say, he ought, and it is his duty; but speak of the ground and reason of pardon, as to God.} What is the ground of the pardon of sin? "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins." Isa.43:25. Here is full pardon, the fountain of it is in God himself; all the pardon in the world that any person shall enjoy, is revealed in his word of grace, and it's the most absurd thing in the world to think a soul should fetch out a pardon anywhere but from the word of grace.

Calvin. I think you have said enough to vindicate yourself, that you are for Confession of sin, and it's every believer's duty, but that we are not to understand it, or look upon it as the ground of God's pardoning our sins.

Neonomian. The sins he speaks of are adultery and murder; he brings in an objection, you'll say this is strange doctrine, suppose a believer commits adultery and murder, must he presently look upon Christ?

Antinomian. You speak not of my answer, which is, I confess the crime is great in this kind, and it may be for the present, the crime may silence the voice of truth itself; but whatever becomes of it, that Christ may have the glory of his grace, and the glory of that fulness of redemption wrought all at once, let me tell you, believers cannot commit those sins that may give just occasion of suspicion to them, that if they come to Christ he would cast them out.

Calvin. I think herein you have spoken very safely, according to our Saviour's own words, directed to actual believers, and unbelievers too, "all that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise

cast out." Jn.6:37.

Neonomian. But you will say all the promises of pardon do run with this provision, in case men humble themselves; in case men do this and that, then pardon is theirs; but otherwise it's none of theirs.

Antinomian. I answered another objection before this. Objection. In all this will you strike at all manner of meeting with God in humiliation and prayer, fasting and confession of sins? I answer, with the Apostle, do we herein make void the law? God forbid; the rather, we establish the law. May not a person come and acknowledge his fault to his Prince, after he has received his pardon under the hand of his Prince, when he is brought from the place of execution? Nay, may he not acknowledge it with melting and extreme bitterness of spirit, because he knoweth he has a pardon? It is but a sordid and gross conceit in the heart of persons to think, that there can be no humiliation for sin except persons be in despair. I say, when Christ does reveal himself to your spirits, you shall find your hearts more wrought upon with sweet meltings and relentings of heart, and breathings of spirit, when you see your sins pardoned, than in the most despairing condition you can be in. Many malefactors have been observed to be hard hearted, that they could not shed a tear at the place of execution, yet when they have heard their pardon read, have melted into a flood of tears. And so, I say, that heart that could not relent to see the filthy loathsomeness of sin, before he saw his pardon, after the knowledge of it, does melt into tears, and has such relenting, that none in the world has, but he that knoweth it. I say, the grace of God does teach men more duty than anything else in the world. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Tit.2:11-14. We must walk in all ways God has chalked out to us, but if we think our righteousness and our deep humiliation and large talents of the spirit, and sorrow for sin and our confession thereof, must make our way to the bowels of Christ, take heed lest you set up a false Christ. Then I bring in the objection and answer which you rehearsed, and go on thus; we have heard Arminianism exceedingly exploded; but if we conceive, that God in pardoning sin, has an eye to confession of sin, how is that doing of works for pardon of sin? And how far short this comes of Arminianism, let the world judge.

Calvin. I think none that understands the Gospel,

though he takes confession of sin to be a great duty, but thinks as you do, that none is pardoned for the sake of confession, and that if a believer sinneth, he has an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, who is a propitiation for all sin; and in the faith of this he ought to go to the throne of grace with confession and humiliation, though it's not so easy to perform a duty in faith after relapses into sin; yet whatever duty we perform ought to be done in faith, and we ought to go to beg pardon in the faith of it. "But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord." Jas.1:6-7.

Neonomian. He says, there is nothing but joy and gladness. Objection. But some will say, believers find it otherwise; there is no such joy and gladness, they are often oppressed with sadness and heaviness of spirit. Answer. There is not one fit of sadness in any believer whatsoever, but he is out of the way of Christ, &c. I say, the soul is first satisfied of forgiveness of sins, before there is that real kindly, mourning in those that are believers.

Antinomian. I was speaking upon Christ being the only way, and, among other commendations of Christ as a way, one was, that he is a pleasant way. To illustrate which, I alleged Isaiah 35:8, "a highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those, the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." A highway shall be there, viz., in the wilderness and dessert, that should rejoice and blossom as a rose, and the ransomed of the Lord, verse 10, shall return and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads. Nothing but pleasure; it is compared to Lebanon, the sweetest place in the world; to Carmel and Sharon, places of great delight. Look into the last verse, and see what a way of pleasure Christ is unto all those that receive him, "and the ransomed of the LORD shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." {Then follows what he chargeth me with.} Behold the mirth that is in the way of Christ; there is nothing but joy and gladness. Objection. But some will say, but believers find it otherwise, &c. Answer. There is not one fit of sadness in any believer whatsoever, but he is out of the way of Christ; {to which I add as follows, which he mentions not,} I mean, in his fits of sadness, in respect of his jealousy of his present and future state, he is out of the way of Christ; he enjoys not him as he ought, while he is in such fits, therefore the Apostle puts believers upon rejoicing always. Phil.4:4. There is matter of nothing but joy in him; while there is mournings in believers,

there is meltings in those mournings, and more joy in the mourning of a believer, than in all the mirth of a wicked man. Believers weep for joy, {according to the proverb,} and never mourn more genuinely, than when they see the joy of the Holy Ghost, in the freeness and fulness of the Lord Christ, poured out upon them; there is never any more genuine mourning for sin, than that mourning when the soul is satisfied of forgiveness of sins. I say, the soul is first satisfied with forgiveness of sins, {i.e., it ought to mourn in the faith of forgiveness, if the mourning be kindly and of a Gospel-nature,} before there is that real, genuine mourning in those that are believers.

Gentlemen, I crave your pardon, that I give you the trouble of hearing me repeat so much of my former discourses; but I am fain to do it for my vindication, he having so rent and tore my sermons in sunder, on purpose to expose them, and my name; yea, I wish that were all, that it be not the very Gospel-grace itself, that he bears such a spleen to, else sure he would never make such a scorn of solemn and serious truths of Christ.

Neonomian. I shall not spare you for your whining; you say, God does no longer stand offended nor displeased, though a believer, after he is a believer sin often.

Antinomian. I was showing from John 14:6, that Christ is the way, the only and effectual and infallible way, from all the wrath of God to all that do receive him. 1. From the affection of wrath; let me tell you, {would to God you could receive it, according to the manifest evidence of Scripture,} God does no longer stand offended with a believer, though a believer, after he be a believer, does sin often, {and where is the believer that does not sin often,} when he has once received Christ; and unto them God says, anger is not in me, Isa.27:4, and, he shall see of the travail of his soul, and he shall be satisfied, i.e., pacified. Isa.53:11. The travail of the soul of Christ makes God such amends for the sinfulness of all believers, that he can no longer stand offended and displeased with them; if God remain offended with them, there is yet some of their sinfulness to be taken away. Except God will be offended where there is no cause to be offended, {which is blasphemy to speak,} he will not be offended with believers; for, I say, he has no cause to be offended with a believer, {you must always understand this in regards to a believer's standing in Christ, as to God, he being satisfied,} because he does not find the sin of a believer, to be the believer's own sin, but he finds it the sin of Christ {i.e., by way of imputation; so I always mean,} he was made sin for us; he laid the iniquities of us all upon him; the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin; he bear our sins in his own body on the tree; but if he bear our sins, he must bear the displeasure for them; nay, he did bear the displeasure, the indignation of the Lord; and if he

did bear the indignation of the Lord, either he did bear all, or but a part; if he did not bear all the indignation of the Lord, then he does not save to the uttermost those that come to God by him, Heb.7:25, I say, not to the uttermost, because here is some offence, some indignation left behind; and for lack of taking of this indignation upon himself, it lights and falls upon believers; so that you must say, Christ is an imperfect Saviour, and has left some scattering wrath behind, that will light on the head of a believer, &c.

Calvin. I pray, Mr. Neonomian, what is the truth in this point? It is you must set us right, and show us all our mistakes.

Neonomian. The sins of believers have the loathsomeness of sin adhering to them, which God sees and accounts the committers guilty thereby.

Antinomian. What do you mean by the loathsomeness of sin? Is not sin in all its respects loathsome; and is it not loathsome, as it is contrary to the preceptive part of the Holy Law? Is there any fine, sweet, precious part of sin? Did not Christ bear sin of the deepest die, most loathsome sins? Is it any otherwise loathsome than as a transgression of the law? And this was that which Christ took away. But how? Not that they were subjectively removed from us, for that the inherency of them in great measure remains in us, and God knows it; but before the eye of justice, all sin of a believer, as he stands under the sanction of the law, is taken away, i.e., as to the condemnation and wrath that belongs unto him, he is freed from it by the blood and satisfaction of Christ.

Neonomian. And they ought to charge themselves with it, so as to stir up themselves to repentance, and renew their actings of faith on Christ for forgiveness.

Antinomian. They ought to be always sensible of, and humbled for the constant indwelling, and frequent breaking forth of their sins and corruptions, but always beginning in the faith of the blood and satisfaction of Christ, and therefrom exercise repentance and humiliation, or else their humiliation and repentance will not be of a right nature, nor attain a right end; and we own such actings of faith and repentance ought often to be renewed by the best of God's children.

Neonomian. Nevertheless, they ought not thereby to fear their being out of a justified state.

Antinomian. Therefore to believe they are in a justified estate, and not to cast off the spirit of adoption, and betake themselves to a spirit of bondage; and if they ought to believe their justified state, then they ought to believe their freedom from condemnation; for a justified state, and a state of condemnation, are the highest in opposition, indeed the one totally expels the other.

Neonomian. They must not fear their justification further than their faults give them just cause of suspecting that sin has dominion over them, and that their first believing on Christ was not sincere.

Antinomian. As to suspicion of the truth of believing, our way is not to charge sin upon ourselves, as lying under the wrath of God for it; this will work in us the highest despair, or such degrees of unbelief as tend thereto; but in case of such suspicion, upon reflecting on our former acts of faith, we must believe; we are to amend weak faith, or faith suspected not to be true, by believing firmly and confidently on the pardon of God and blood of Christ; the way to believe, is not to charge the wrath of God upon ourselves, and to put ourselves under the law, but to flee for refuge to the hope set before us.

Neonomian. But I will show you wherein the difference is not. The question is not whether a believer does by new sins fall from a justified estate.

Antinomian. Therefore a believer ought not upon his new sins, to look upon himself to be under the wrath of God; for a state of justification, is a state of freedom from wrath.

Neonomian. Nor whether God does, upon new crimes, judicially charge the Christian with those sins he had pardoned before, though he may present to his view some former sins for his further humblings.

Antinomian. You here grant that a believer, upon falling into relapses or sin, is not bound to disbelieve the pardon of former sins. The reason is, that God does not judicially charge former sins already pardoned; and if so, he is bound to believe God does not. And has he ground to believe God will not charge judicially sins formerly pardoned? Has he not then abundant ground to believe, and the same ground to believe God will pardon this sin also? And is there a foundation in the Gospel to believe the pardon of some sins, and not of all? You own, that God may present sins to a believer's view for his humbling, where he does not judicially charge; and so do I, and you shall see this one concession will cut down all your design in this chapter.

Neonomian. Nor whether a believer ought to question his justified estate, upon any sins that do not give just suspicion that sin has dominion over him or his faith, was not true.

Antinomian. Hence then so long as a believer's state of grace holds, he is not to question his justification, upon any sin; and he is no further to question the pardon of his sins, or ought to charge wrath upon himself; and I would ask, whether upon any such just suspicion, he ought not now to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and lay hold on the pardoning grace and mercy of God in Christ for life and salvation?

Neonomian. Nor whether any sins past and sins present

at his first believing be unpardoned.

Antinomian. If so, why should he not believe that all sins future are forgiven? For there's the same reason of the forgiving all as one; Christ bore all his sins at once; and he can believe on Christ for pardon of one sin, but he believes the pardon of all, if the faith be good. If upon the first believing, of all sins past, and present are forgiven, why not upon an after act of faith, after a believer has sinned, for the pardon he then looks for is of a sin past or present? And do you think any man can truly believe any one sin is forgiven, and not all?

Neonomian. Nor whether our renewed acts of faith, humiliation, repentance, fasting, or reformation, do merit pardon.

Antinomian. No; but if it tantamount to it, it's as bad; it's no matter what you call it, if the thing be the same; a federal condition of works upon which the Covenant-promise becomes due, is a merit.

Neonomian. Nor whether a principle of life given at our first conversion, will finally fail to exert itself in due humblings for repeated enormities and in holy resolves.

Antinomian. But it is a question, whether there may not be repeated humblings for repeated enormities, and such as you call holy resolves, without a principle of life? 2. Whether you can make up such an evangelical, imperfect, sincere, persevering obedience, for a condition of the Covenant to a man that falls into repeated enormous crimes? 3. Whether that principle of life will not produce as well repeated acts of faith, as humblings and resolves? 4. Whether those humblings and resolves be worth a rush without faith? 5. What you will call due acts of humblings and resolves? What measure they must reach to produce a pardon? 6. What you mean by a principle of life?

Neonomian. Nor whether the same degrees of humblings be necessary for all crimes, and in all persons, and in all times.

Antinomian. Then there are pardons at several rates, and it will be difficult to adjust the several degrees of penance, according to those varieties of respect; it will be hard to know how far a believer must go, before he may dare to believe he is pardoned; and it's hard that a believer must pass through so many humblings and resolves before he may believe his pardon.

Neonomian. Nor whether any gross miscarriage should cause a saint to condemn all past experience, and conclude his graces to be counterfeit; each of these I deny.

Antinomian. You need not have brought in one gross miscarriage here in question, when you past before repeated enormities. I would enquire whether a gross miscarriage or an enormity be perseverance; if it be relapse and nonperseverance,

he has reason upon your hypothesis to conclude his graces counterfeit; for having cut off that sign and distinguishing character of true grace; he must begin again to try for that mark which may hold a while till the next gross miscarriage; and where is his true grace then? Must not all precedent experiences be condemned?

Neonomian. Nor whether a sense of pardon ought not to affect and melt the heart?

Antinomian. But it is whether a sense of pardon does not affect and melt the heart, as the natural, gospel, and effectual means? And all other humblings, without faith of pardon, are not merely legal, generating to bondage, and ineffectual to reach the end?

Neonomian. Nor whether some true penitents may not sometimes be too much dejected and overwhelmed with sorrow for sin.

Antinomian. But it's a question, whether true godly sorrow, such as is produced by faith in the blood of Christ, can be too much, or overwhelm any true believer? Whether, if it be too much, it will obtain pardon, and not lose its end, as well as when it is too little? Whether, when it is too much, it be not a work of supererogation, and may not have the pardon of some other sin yet to be committed cast into boot?

Neonomian. Nor whether a general exercise of faith and repentance do not answer the Gospel rule of forgiveness, as to sins of ignorance and surprise? These three last I affirm.

Antinomian. It seems you allow there's a general pardon, that will serve to believers for some sins; those, I suppose, you will call venial. I would fain know, whether, in the justification of a sinner, there be any sins particularly excepted, that are not pardoned in the first grant? And whether he must have a new justification upon the commitment of some sins, which the first did not reach? Whether the general exercise of faith and repentance, so far as to answer the Gospel-rule, be a sufficient condition for justification from some sins, and not from all?

Calvin. Well now, gentlemen, we have danced pretty fairly about this point, with your whethers; let us dance back again, or else we shall be giddy, and the world turn round with us.

Neonomian. My brains are more settled than so; I will lead him another dance yet. Mr. Antinomian, come dance with me again; you know little of my mind yet, I will tell you the real differences. Whether an elect sinner be at any time a guilty person in God's esteem? This you deny, and I affirm, I have proved it in our debate.

Antinomian. This is not fair; you have taken a great

leap back to begin with, from a believer, to an elect person; which you say you have proved in former debates, we have answered; and therefore need not harp always on one string.

Neonomian. Whether the remains of sin defile us. This I affirm, and the Doctor denies, against all Protestants, who prove it of original sin against the Papists.

Antinomian. If you understand defilement, as to our justification, I say, the remains of sin do not defile us; if it be understood in respect of sanctification, you will see, gentlemen, that I shall assert sin's defilement of the best of our duties so much, that it makes them as dung; and yet this Neonomian is so audacious, as to say, this he affirms, and the Doctor denies, and that he goes with the Protestants, when every ordinary Christian may see that he goes with the Papists in everything, and opposes me in this point of the saints defilement by sin.

Neonomian. Whether a justified person, falling into gross enormities, is defiled thereby, and contracts guilt upon himself thereby. This the Doctor denies, and I do affirm.

Antinomian. You have not proved one word that was said of the guilt of a justified person; i.e., it's one thing to contract guilt of conscience, and another thing to be judicially condemned. Said you not that God may present to a Christian's view former sins, for further humblings, where he does not judicially charge sin? A believer may have guilt then upon his conscience, and not be guilty before God. 2. Do you not say, a believer ought not to question his justification, but upon such causes as make him question his state and truth of faith? 3. Where is it that I say, any sin does not defile, especially gross enormities? If they need the fresh applications of the blood of Christ by faith, they do defile, and defile conscience too; but the blood of Christ reaching the conscience in believing, washeth away this guilt and defilement, where your humblings and resolves will not.

Neonomian. Whether God esteems the repeated abominations of believers not to be their own crimes, and they not to be sinners, but they are Christ's sins? This the Doctor affirms, and I deny.

Antinomian. Your affirmation and negation is not worth troubling ourselves about, were it not to undeceive such as are deluded by you; we have told you our minds already sufficiently about that we do affirm, that all sins and abomination of every elect person was laid on Christ by God, and accounted his judicially; and that in justification, the justified person has not his sins, not one from the first moment of his justification, imputed unto him before God; whatsoever contracted guilt he may have upon his conscience at any time, by reason of relapses, is but God's presenting former or present sins to his view for his

humbling, without judicial charging of him in the Court of Heaven.

Neonomian. Whether a justified person, upon new provocations, is charged by God, and ought to charge himself as guilty and defiled, so as in God's appointed way to repent, believe and renew his Covenant, and be earnest with God for forgiveness? This the Doctor denies, and I affirm.

Antinomian. In part I deny it, and in part I do not. 1. A justified person, upon new provocations, is not charged by God, as under, and liable to the condemnation of the law, under wrath and curse. It's one thing to confess guilty to the fact, and confess a man's self under the sentence; the former ought to be, but the other ought not. A man that's a felon may come to the bar, and confess himself guilty, when he has the pardon in his pocket. Do we not assert, that it's our duty to confess sin, repent, &c., but these things must flow from faith, fixed on the pardoning mercy of God in Christ, or else all our humblings and resolves what do they signify? Do we not assert faith and repentance? Renewing our Covenant is exerted in God's way, and not yours.

Neonomian. Whether all sins past, present, and to come, are actually pardoned at once? This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. Among all these enquiries about the state of the question, I think you are nearest to it now, for now you speak plainest; and I shall speak my mind as plainly, that all a justified persons sins are pardoned at once, as well those that are to be committed, as they that are committed already.

Neonomian. Whether God has required new exercises of faith and repentance for their actual pardon? This you deny, and I affirm.

Antinomian. He requireth not new exercises of faith and repentance as federal conditions of actual pardon, it is always in and through and for the sake of Christ at first and afterward; and by faith renewed, this grace is manifested anew unto the soul, and repentance follows thereupon, as a fruit thereof; pardon renewed to justified ones, is but in taking of the present view of their sins {as you say} that God has set before them, he makes them to hear joy and gladness, Psal.51:8, i.e., a repeated manifestation of their pardon in believing.

Neonomian. Whether a believer ought to be assured of the forgiveness of his repeated provocations, just when he has committed them, and before he has humbled himself, renewed actings of faith on Christ, repeated his Covenant, prayed for pardon for Christ's sake, as after he has thus done? This you affirm, and I deny.

Antinomian. This that I affirm is, that there is the same ground of believing pardon in Christ to a justified one, before his confessions and humblings, as after. 2. That his assurance of

pardon after these humblings, is not grounded upon them, but the promise and his free and full justification. 3. That he is to betake himself to these humblings in faith of the promise of pardon, or else all the rest will leave him as they find him. 4. And after you have muddled and confounded the clear Gospel as much as you can, you tell us there must be a renewing our actings of faith in Christ, and praying for pardon for Christ's sake; which is as much as to say, all is in Christ, and must come from him, and that a justified one is Christ's, and therefore is emboldened to draw nigh to him in full assurance of faith, as a merciful and faithful High Priest; and this faith carries him forth to true sorrow for sin, repentance, humiliation, to exalting free-grace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Neonomian. Now you shall see the truth confirmed, and I have said so much before to clear this point, that I shall only speak now the substance of it.

Antinomian. All you have said has tended to darken any truth of the Gospel you have taken in hand.

Neonomian. God does see and charge a believer with his new enormities as his sins, and not Christ's. II Sam.12:9. David's sin is an evil; it was in God's sight; it's charged by God on David.

Antinomian. I have always told you, that imputation of sin, in the Gospel sense, does suppose the sin imputed is not his to whom it is imputed by commission. David committed it, though Christ bore it. The Lord so far chargeth the best of his people as to reprove them for sin; this is an act of grace in order to recover them. Sin is sin in its true nature still; Christ died not to save sin, but the sinner, that sin should not be judicially charged on him. You say, God does not judicially charge a Christian with some sins, though he may present them to his view for his humbling; if God should judicially charge any sin, there must be a new sacrifice of atonement before it could be forgiven; when the Apostle says, who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect; there's no doubt but there's enough to lay to the charge of the elect, even before and after faith, both by the word of God, and their own consciences, and by Satan and wicked men; but there's nothing shall be charged upon them so as to affect them, in a way of judicial proceeding against them; nay, God is in Christ reconciled to their persons, notwithstanding all his rebukes in his Word and Providence. God's seeing is in a way of Omniscience, so he knows and sees all things; his eyes run through the whole earth, beholding the evil and the good. He sees in a way of grace, the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous. Psal.34:15. He sees in a way of justice and judicial proceeding; and in this sense, seeing and charging sin are understood by us, as opposed to not seeing.

Neonomian. "Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance." Psal.90:8. I hope Moses was not mistaken.

Antinomian. Moses speaks of man in general in that chapter, in respect of his Fall, and the effects of it, in God's execution of the sentence of the law upon him, verses 6-8; we question not but it's that Scripture's-sense wherein all the world is become guilty before God. And that God, in a way of displeasure, does hide his face, or set men's sins in the light of his countenance, especially in his dealing with a Nation or Church, or any mixed people. God's management of general government being according to the Law, and not according to the Gospel. Hence all God's rebukes in a way of anger, are vastly different from such as are in a way of love and fatherly affection. But all threats and denunciation of judgment, wrath and indignation, belongs to the law and its sanction, and not to the Gospel, though it be upon the account of the neglect and despising of it.

Neonomian. A believer ought to charge himself with his own sin; God commands this, when he calls to confession and humiliation.

Antinomian. A man ought so far to charge himself, as to acknowledge his sin and see his misery, or else he will never prize mercy; and so did David. "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight; that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest." Psal.51:4. But David fled from the judicial charge of sin, from the sight or apprehension of God's displeasure, he got from that charge as soon as he could. God never made despair a way of salvation. Confession of sin, and charging a man's self with sin, is marvelously different; for the first may be from the Spirit of grace, but the other is from a spirit bound under the law. Those despairing fits that Job and Heman sometimes fell into, I look upon them to be instances of the saints infirmities, the weakness of their faith, and God's dealing with them in a way of trial and humiliation, in withdrawment of the usual light of his countenance and favour from them; besides, that the saints under the Old Testament, in regard of the darkness and legality of that dispensation, might be said to be charged with sin in a more seeming judicial way than Gospel-grace does admit. God in a sense might be said to remember sin, in regard of the repeated sacrifices, and execution frequently of external and temporal calamities, of the manner of punishments for sin after the tenor of a law or Covenant of works.

Neonomian. New transgressions need renewed pardon; all sins are not pardoned at once; to say nothing how impossible it is. Christ would never teach his own people to pray daily for

pardon, if it did not need it, and it could not be repeated. Matt.6:12.

Antinomian. If pardon of all sins be not at once, then no man is justified at once; for he that is not pardoned for all sins, is not justified, but lies under condemnation; besides, so often as he sins he is unjustified, and if unjustified, fallen from grace; for where there's no justification there's no sanctification. And as to our Saviour's teaching his disciples to pray for pardon daily, it's easily answered, that pardon of sin in Scripture-sense, is to be understood of God's manifesting pardon and forgiveness to justified ones; it's of the grace that we receive in Christ from day to day, it's the lifting up of the light of God's countenance upon us, and the Sun of righteousness shining with healing in his wings or rays of grace. How many other benefits that a believer has in Christ, does he daily pray for? As for the Spirit of adoption, sanctification in Christ Jesus, who is as surely made to us sanctification as justification; all the blessings that we have in Christ, we pray for; and its needful that we have them in Christ, or else we can't pray in faith for them. You say, it's impossible God should pardon all sins at once; and yet God says, "this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Heb.10:16-17. Doth he say that he will remember {against a justified one} only his sins past and present no more? What comfort then is it to a justified one? He may say, according to you, it's true I am justified till today, but tomorrow God will remember my sins against me; I cannot live in the comfort of forgiveness for any sins, but past and present. What you allege of David, Lamentations and Job, are nothing to the purpose; you have answered it all yourself in your second, that God does not, upon new crimes, judicially charge the Christian with those sins he had pardoned before, though he may present to his view some former sins for his further humblings. And so he commits those new crimes you speak of, God presents them to this view, for his further humblings; and I will add, in order to the quickening his addresses to the throne of grace, in the faith of forgiveness, and drawing forth and enlarging his heart in the love of the Lord Jesus in sense of his love, seeing much is forgiven him.

Neonomian. Humiliation, confession, sorrow for sin, new resolutions, and looking to Christ for healing, are the duties of saints upon new faults, in order to repeated acts of forgiveness, &c.

Antinomian. That these are our duties at all times, even when we fall not into notorious relapses, we deny not, even when and whilst we live in the faith of our present pardon and forgiveness; and upon our relapses, our recovery is by the same

faith which carries us forth to performance of these duties, in order to the mortifying corruption, and giving glory to God in all his attributes, for strengthening power against sin, and joy in the Holy Ghost; which comfort in believing, in restoring of joy and gladness, in the sense of our justification and salvation by Christ, is the forgiveness intended.

Neonomian. If a man were thrice stung; must he not thrice look to the brazen Serpent?

Antinomian. No doubt of it; the brazen serpent was a type of Christ, and looking to it was the type of a sinner's faith. When a sinner has Christ in justification, his life is in him, and he must live by the faith of the Son of God; God renews the expressions and manifestations of his free pardon, unto believers, from time to time; accordingly, it's received by faith, to our daily healing and comfort, the virtue of Christ remains the same, it's our faith that is repeated.

Neonomian. Believers ought to be more assured of pardon, and joyful after the renewed acts of repentance and faith.

Antinomian. They ought not to take up their assurance from their own performances, but from the free grace in the promise received by faith, and ought not to suspend faith, till they have repented and humbled themselves; this were to pray and repent in unbelief, which makes it all vain and void.

Neonomian. It's otherwise against that wise order which God has stated for a due reverence to him. Num.12:14-15.

Antinomian. God has no order of due reverence to him, established in the Covenant of Grace, but paternal; and that's by a spirit of adoption, as a Son honoureth his Father; and there's none of this without faith in the fatherly love and compassion of the Father. God has nowhere ordered that his children should put themselves into the hands of his severe justice when they have sinned, and conclude themselves unjustified for a considerable time, before they look to Christ for healing; they that were stung in the wilderness, did not go to use a great many medicines first, but were immediately to apply themselves to the brazen serpent for healing; and so should believers upon all their falls. Miriam's being shut out of the camp seven days, was no argument that God had not forgotten her before the seven days were up. God makes some of his people, in their falls, examples to others, as to outward afflictions, of which they had, in the days of the Old Testament, a more penal aspect and more judicial, than we ought to make them to have in the days of clearer Gospel-grace, as I can make appear divers ways.

Neonomian. The people of God have had those sad fits which you condemn, when sin greatly breaks out, they do well

become them; Paul calls a contrary frame, under guilt, a being puffed up. I Cor.5:2.

Antinomian. You basely slander the Doctor in making as if he were an enemy to the serious Gospel remorse of God's children, from a right principle and due frame, as we have made appear. 2. Paul nowhere calls faith, in pardoning mercy, a puffing up; that's from a spirit of security and insensibleness which we have in the acts of sin and after, till the renewing our acts of faith. 3. Paul nowhere commends a guilty frame or sadness merely from guilt. But II Cor7:10, in the case you mention, absolutely condemns such sadness and sorrow as you commend, as such which is contrary to true godly sorrow; sorrow from guilt only is according to the world, and works death.

Neonomian. Consider God remits or binds in Heaven, according to what his Church does justly on earth; either the pardon of the non-repenting offender is suspended, or censures are vain.

Antinomian. God's remitting or binding in Heaven is variously understood; not to enlarge now upon it. I do not apprehend that a justified person, falling into sin and censured justly by a Church, is therefore unjustified before God; if so, he is fallen from grace in the highest sense. Nor if he be a hypocrite, and in his hypocrisy be reconciled to the Church in his hypocrisy, that therefore he is justified in Heaven, or before God's justice; no, I distinguish between the Lord, and the Church; a man may be righteous before God, and not before the Church, & vice versa; but I apprehend, to bind in Heaven, what the Church does justly on earth, is to confirm and bless his own ordinances to their designed end and purpose, either to the bringing home a lapsed justified person, or to discover him to be a hypocrite, and therefore they shall not be in vain.

Neonomian. Need I give you David's experience, Psal.32:3,5, "when I keep silence, my bones waxed old."

Antinomian. That place is impertinently quoted; if you read the whole Psalm, you will find that it begins with the true Gospel-blessedness of a believer, and after tells you what a miserable condition he was in, when he fell under guilt, and acted not faith concerning his justified and pardoned state; the frame he speaks of, as contrary to his sadness, was a frame of faith and prayer; and what was his faith acted upon, but on the forgiveness of his sins, as verses 1 & 2. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the LORD imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile." Psal.32:1-2.

Neonomian. The Assembly and Congregational Elders, do both declare God does continue to forgive the sins of those that are justified.

Antinomian. The Assembly says, Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to his Father's justice on their behalf. And they say, in answer to that question, what is justification? A. Justification is an act of God's free grace unto sinners, in which he pardoneth all their sins {therefore them that shall be committed, as well as those that are committed already} accepteth their persons righteous in his sight, not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, {therefore not for their act of faith, or their sincere obedience,} but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ, &c. Therefore he never forgives for the humiliations or sorrow for sin, which they exert; and whereas they say God does continue to forgive, it's as much as to say, God continues them justified from all their sins; which justification falls in by way of application to their souls and consciences, in manifestation of pardon, as their sins are committed; and in saying, that they never fall from their justified estate, they do as much as say, that there is not a moment of time wherein their persons are not justified before God; and to say any man is in a justified estate, and not in a pardoned estate at the same time, is a contradiction and nonsense; it's one thing to be pardoned and free of condemnation in respect of a man's person, and another thing not to have the sense and comfort of it; and after this manner only any sin of a believer is unpardoned, when his heart is overwhelmed with darkness and unbelief from the deceitfulness of sin; besides, God hides his face and the light of his countenance from him in fatherly displeasure, {i.e., in tender love, it is called displeasure, but by a catechresis, a father corrects his son in great love,} and believers may not have the light of his countenance restored unto them {they say not their justification restored} until they are humbled in themselves and confess their sins, {in faith, for without faith, i.e., without Christ apprehended by faith, their humblings and confessions cannot please God,} and renew their faith and repentance. And they say, the justification of believers under the Old Testament, was in all those respects one and the same with the justification of believers under the New.

As for your quoting authority for praying for pardon, I think you might have spared yourself the pains, if you understand pardon in this case as it ought to be understood.

Neonomian. I will tell you your mistakes.

Antinomian. Your charge of mistakes are as little to be valued as your charge of error. Come, gentlemen, let us adjourn for this time.

Calvin. The Scripture is most express in this point, that God sees no sin in justified ones, i.e., so as to set their persons

in the eye of his justice, and to deal with them as such who are under his vindictive wrath. The Psalmist says, he is a blessed man whose iniquity is forgiven, whose sin is covered, and to whom the Lord imputes not iniquity, Psal.32:1-2, and what can be meant by covering here, but hiding our sins from the eye of God's justice by the imputed righteousness of Christ, in the same sense as David prays, hide thy face from my sins? There's the face of God in his justice, as well as in his mercy; nay, when Moses speaks of the wrath of God, against persons or people, Psal.90:8, {"thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance,"} he calls it, setting their iniquities before him, and their secret sins in the light of his countenance, of such as are consumed by God's anger, and God's wrath troubleth them.

What is the meaning of that famous place? Micah 7:18-20. {"Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger forever, because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea. Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old."} Is it not, that God seeth no sin in justified ones, where the prophet says, who is a God, like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, transgression and sin, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger forever, because he delighteth in mercy. Now, when he has pardoned iniquity, will he charge it again? No, he will cast all the sins {of justified ones, such as he has pardoned} into the depths of the sea. How shall their sins then be found any more in the deep fathomless ocean? They shall not be found, the iniquity of Israel {i.e., the true spiritual Israel} shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found, for I will pardon whom I reserve, Jer.50:20, and those days are there spoken of when the clear discovery of grace of the New Covenant shall be made, which the same prophet foretells, Jer.31:32-33, and the Apostle to the Hebrews quotes, 8:12; 10:17, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and for their sins and iniquities I will remember them no more." And what means that of good Hezekiah, when he speaks of himself, "behold, for peace I had great bitterness, {in respect of temptations, darkness and afflictions; but what was his comfort and support,} but thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption, {God had added some years to his life,} for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back." Isa.38:17.

And what was the great intention of the living sacrifice of the scape-goat, in the day of atonement, and after the high

priest's charging all the sins of the congregation solemnly upon him? He was sent into the Land of Forgetfulness. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited, and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." Lev.16:21-22. Was it not to point out God's non-remembrance of the sins of justified ones? That as Christ died and answered the type of the slain goat, in satisfying for sin, so he carried away the remembrance of our sins from before the Lord; he was delivered for our offences, and rose for our justification; and the Apostle lays the stress of carrying away of sin upon his resurrection and life. "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." Rom.8:34. "And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." I Jn.3:5. He was manifested to take away sin, to carry it quite away from before God, into forgetfulness, as the true scape-goat.

Neither will we part with that famous portion of Scripture, as an unmovable bottom for this truth, if there were no more, notwithstanding all the false glosses that have been put upon it by such as would curse where God will bless, I mean Numbers 23:21. "He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel." Which is plainly to be understood of spiritual Jacob and Israel, under the Old and New Testament; such God has commanded to bless, and they shall not be cursed, but blessed; there is the shout of a king amongst them, therefore as there is no enchantment or divination, so no new coined divinity can be against them, to bring them under God's wrath and curse. I add what follows.

Because I hear a certain minister in town has lately charged this publicly as an error, to say, God sees no sin in his people; he should have first charged the Scripture with error, and refuted it; and then he should have charged that divine with error, who commented on the Epistle to the Romans, in continuation of Mr. Poole's Annotations. See what he says on Romans 8:1. No condemnation, or no one condemnation; he does not say, there is no matter of condemnation, or nothing damnable in them that are in Christ, there is enough and enough of that; but he says, there is no actual condemnation. Jn.3:18 & 5:24. There is a meiosis in the words, more is understood than expressed; he means, that justification and eternal salvation is the portion of such; the positive is included in the negative; it's God's condemnation only, from which such as are in Christ are

exempted; they are nevertheless condemned and censured by men, and sometimes by their own consciences.

And on verse 33, "who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? &c." Who can implead such, or put in an accusation against them? There is nothing to accuse them of, they are justified. And there is none to accuse them, it is God that has justified them; the Supreme Judge has absolved them. This seems to be taken out of Isaiah 50:8-9, {"He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me? Let us stand together; who is mine adversary? Let him come near to me. Behold, the Lord GOD will help me; who is he that shall condemn me,"} they were Christ's words there, and spoken of God's justifying him; and they are every believer's words here, intended of God's justifying them; and seems to be from two reasons; one implied, i.e., God's electing them, the other expressed God's justifying and acquitting them.

And on verse 34, "who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, &c." His death frees them from condemnation; thereby he has made a sufficient atonement and satisfaction for all their sins; and which has long ago satisfied in Heaven for the sins of all the elect, may very well serve to satisfy the heart and conscience of a believing sinner here on earth; such an one may throw down the gantlet, as the Apostle does, and challenge all the world; let conscience, carnal reason, law, sin, hell, and devils, let them all bring forth what they can, it will not be sufficient for condemnation, and that because of Christ's death and satisfaction.

Dr. Thomas Jacomb, on Romans 8:1, says, we read it {no condemnation} the original will bear it, if we read it {not one condemnation} is as much as; such is the grace of God to believers, and such is their safety in their justified estate, that there is not so much as one condemnation to be passed upon them; suppose a condemnatory sentence for every sin, {I'm sure every sin deserves such a sentence, and in point of merit, 'tis so many sins, so many condemnations,} yet the pardon being plenary and full, every way adequate to the sinner's guilt, the exemption of the pardoned person from condemnation must be plenary and full too; so that if there be not one sin unpardoned, there is not one condemnation to be feared, {this now is dreadful Antinomianism with some men,} Jeremiah 50:20, "in those days, and in that time, saith the LORD, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found; for I will pardon them whom I reserve." 'Tis an allusion to a man that turns over all his bonds; searcheth into all the debt-books, to see if he can find any debt due to him from such and such a person; but upon all his searching he cannot find so much as one debt to charge upon him; so 'tis with

a pardoned and justified sinner. Imagine that God should be inquisitive to find out some guilt as lying upon him, he might indeed find out enough, {as he is in himself,} but as in Christ he is pardoned and justified; there's nothing to be found against him, therefore no condemnation.

What do you think now, is it an error to say, God sees no iniquity in his people? How can any dare to curse where God blesseth? This is to do worse than Balaam.

DEBATE XVII.

OF THE HURT THAT SIN MAY DO TO BELIEVERS.

Neonomian. I call to mind a most dangerous and licentious position of this Antinomian, and that is, that sin can do no hurt to believers. His error is this, the grossest sins that believers can commit, cannot do them the least harm, neither ought they to fear the least hurt by their own sins; nor by national sins; yea, though themselves have had a hand therein.

Antinomian. It is strange you should charge this is an error upon me, when as it is your own assertion; but you know the old proverb, the thief cries cut-purse first. In the very second conference he had this assertion. He is there showing that there was no need that Christ should bear any more than the punishment of sin, saying, all that endangered us was the threatening of the law, and this upon agreement, that upon his atonement we should be released; where is the need of more? The obliquity of the fact, as against the precept, shall not hurt, when the sanction of the law is answered, and therefore he that suffers as a sponsor for another, need not sustain in himself the filthiness of the crime, to make him capable of giving satisfaction. But go on to your proof.

Neonomian. He says, they need not be afraid of their sins; they that have God for their God, there is no sin that ever they commit can possibly do them hurt. Therefore as their sins cannot hurt them, so there is no cause of fear in their sins committed, &c., there is not one sin, nor all the sins together, of any believer, that can possibly do that believer any real hurt. This he attempts to prove from Romans 7.

Antinomian. He has left out my true sense and meaning in these words, on purpose as he useth to do, to render my assertions unsound. Having been saying, that a believer's sins cannot hurt them, I raised this objection. Some will be ready to

say, this is strange, all the evils in the world that come, they grow up from the sinfulness of men. If man be afraid of anything, he should be afraid of sin, from whence all evils do flow. Answer. I answered, beloved it is true, sin naturally is a root of all manner of evil fruit, {observe gentlemen,} the wages of sin is death; but yet, {I say,} whatever sin in its own nature brings forth, yet the sins of God's peculiar people, they that have God for their own God, their sins can do them no hurt at all, and in that regard, there is no cause of fear of any of their sins that ever they have committed. This may seem harsh to some spirits that misconceive my drift that I aim at, which is not to encourage anyone to sin, but to ease the consciences of the distressed, there's not one sin, nor all their sins, can do them hurt, real hurt, I mean, they may do them supposed hurt. And, I suppose the Apostle, Romans 7, does personate a scrupulous spirit; that a believer under the multitude and prevalency of corruption, who was ready to cry out, O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death; but, says he, I thank God through Jesus Christ; that is, till a man look to Christ there is nothing but matter of bitterness to be seen as the certain fruits of sin, and there can be nothing but bitterness in sin, in regard of the evil that is like to follow it, but when persons can once look to Christ, the case is altered. What does he thank God for? He thanks God, though naturally a body of death grew up by sin, yet there is no prejudice can come to him through Christ. "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ, &c." Rom.8:1. No, you will say, no condemnation in Hell, but yet there is the remainder of sin in God's own people; so there will some evil or other fall upon the commission of sin. But mark what the Apostle says, verses 3, 4, "the law of the Spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus, has freed me from the law of sin and death, &c.," here, Christ stands for the deliverance of his people from condemnation, from eternal wrath, &c. Say some; yea, but says the Apostle, we are delivered from the law of sin and death; what is the law of sin, but what the law may do to persons for those sins which are committed by them? Now what can sin do when it is condemned, &c.

'Tis true indeed, every sin is a great debt, and we commit sins daily and hourly against the Lord, and the torments of Hell are the merit of the least sin in the world; for I speak not this to extenuate any sin, but to show the greatness of God's grace, and to ease upon good grounds distressed consciences. Therefore such as look upon these sins as un-cancelled, and these debts as true debts, it is true, so long these sins may work a horror and trembling in persons; but for believers that are members of Christ, they may read fairly all the sins that ever they have committed, they may read also the desert of these

transgressions which should be executed and inflicted on them, if they were not cancelled and blotted out. "I even I am he, &c." It is true, our sins themselves do not speak peace, but Christ bearing the sin and wrath that these sins do deserve, speaks peace to every believer. "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." I Cor.15:56-57. Though naturally sin has a sting, yet there is a victory over this sting, Christ is the death of it, and he took away the sting of it. It is true, before men come to see the light of the Gospel of Christ, their sins stare in their faces, seeming to spit fire at them; but as children will put one of their company into a hideous posture, causing every one that knows it not to run from him, so sin is set up by Satan with a terrible visage, as it were to spit fire in the faces of the godly and faithful, and seems very threatening and dreadful, but they are to know, there is no fear from the sins of believers, all the terror and fearfulness of sin Christ has drunk it, and in the drinking of it Christ himself was crucified, and in that regard, I say, all the terror, and ghastliness, and hideousness, as it is represented by Satan, is spent, and sin itself is dead. It is true indeed, a living roaring lion is a terrible creature, but in a dead lion there is no more fear, than there is in a stick or stone, to him that knows he is dead. While sin is alive it is fearful, and terrible, and deadly, but when sin itself is dead, then there is no more terror in it than there is in a dead lion.

Thus I speak of sin, not as it smiles upon a man with a promising countenance, before it be committed, for so it is most dreadful and odious to the faithful, as that which crucified their sweetest Lord, but as committed, and lying upon the conscience of a believer, endeavoring to drive him to deny the free grace and love of God, and the all sufficiency of Christ, for in this regard it is crucified by Christ, and so a believer need not be afraid of sin, the hand-writing of ordinances is taken away, and they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.

Calvin. Mr. Antinomian has sufficiently cleared himself in this point, for he has told us of the odious nature of sin itself, the natural hurt and evil effects of it; he has abundantly shown the hurt he means and speaks of, is the penal effects of sin in its condemning power, which condemning nature is taken away in the atonement made by Christ; he speaks of sins past, that lie upon conscience, so as to drive men from Christ, and the free pardoning grace of God; he speaks not of sin, as it comes with alluring smiles to tempt us to the committing of them, for so he says, they are most dreadful and odious to the faithful, as that which crucified our dearest Lord. Besides all this, he has made it appear, that you yourself have made an assertion, which no way

falls short, nay, to me it's far more condemnable than any expression that you have charged him with under this head. For he speaks only of the effects of sin, which, he says, are taken away, {as you do there,} in our Sponsor's answering the penal sanction; so far you justify all he says, but you say, that the obliquity of the fact, as against the precept, which is that sin itself shall not hurt; so that it must needs follow, that all the hurt of sin is only in the punishment, nay that sin in its proper nature and filthiness has no hurt in it, and that we need not the blood of Christ in justification to take it away. Now how comes sin as sin and fault to be pardoned, for there is no more of sin pardoned than Christ bore? But you say, there was no need of his bearing it, no more than as to the punishment, and then the obliquity and fault will do no hurt. I think gentlemen, that we may dismiss this point; the matter of charge proving so false an accusation, I shall not have patience to hear him any further upon it, and I think, gentlemen, you are ashamed of it as well as I.

Antinomian. Pray Mr. Calvinist have a little patience, and hear what he says to this point, how and in what sense he understands the hurt of sin.

Calvin. Well, I will do what I can with myself, but you must whip the top with him, for he will put me out of breath in answering his impertinences. I pray then go on, and tell us what you call truth in your usual dogmatizing way.

Neonomian. Truth; its true of believers, that if sin should have dominion over them, they would thereby come to condemnation.

Antinomian. How can you make a truth upon supposition of that which will never be? I can call that nothing but a rule of falsehood in logic, though there's a connection of antecedent and consequence. Such propositions are childish. When the sky falls we shall catch larks, throw the shaft of a quill over the house, and it will be a silver spoon. But it may be you mean, by the dominion of sin, the prevailing of sin; this I deny to be dominion in a justified one. You should have made this proposition, if a true believer be not in Christ, he shall come into condemnation. Would not this look ridiculous?

Neonomian. And though the grace of God will prevent the dominion of sin in every elect believer, and so keep them from eternal death; yet true believers may by sin bring very great hurt to themselves in soul and body, which they ought to fear, and they may expect a share in national judgments, according as they have contributed to the common guilt.

Antinomian. Here now you add a preservation from another hurt; and it's certain, that as sin shall not hurt them, as to the wages of sin, and penal effects, answering the sanction of the law, so it shall not have dominion over them, which you say

well in, grace has secured them from, and yet you begin with a bounce in your proposition, made up of impossibilities by your own concession. 2. You say, the grace of God prevents the dominion of sin, and so keeps them from eternal death, as if you thought the grace of God made no use of Christ in preserving men from eternal death. Has Christ not delivered us from the dominion of sin and eternal death too? But I find you will have as little to do with Christ in the salvation of sinners or believers. Notwithstanding sin cannot bring them under condemnation, nor under its dominion, the two great real hurts of sin, yet you would seem to say something contrary to me, and that is it does do them hurt in soul and body, which they ought to fear; we tell you. 1. It can do them no real hurt; it may do them supposed. 2. It does them no hurt directly, as to punishment or dominion, it may by accident, i.e., through the weakness of their faith lie upon their consciences, defile them, and drive them to warp from the free love and grace of God, this you would call good, and not hurt, for you would have them put themselves under wrath. 3. We speak of sins past yet lying upon conscience, and driving the soul from Christ; we speak not of sins not committed, those we should fear with a fear of watchfulness, and dependence on grace, for strength against them, and we say they are odious to the faithful. 4. We say true believers shall have a share in national calamities, which shall not be judicial punishments to them, but sanctified afflictions, and therefore no real hurts, though seeming ones.

Neonomian. But I will tell you wherein the difference is not.

Antinomian. What then? I must run the gantlet for my error forward and backward, with whether and neither.

Neonomian. Yes, if you will know the truth rightly stated, you must know it when it is not, as well as when it is; as they that look for that which is lost. It is not whether God will preserve elect believers from eternal condemnation, by keeping them from the dominion of sin.

Antinomian. But it is whether keeping men from the dominion of sin is the proper reason of their being kept from condemnation. Doth mortification of sin save men from condemnation or the strictest degree of holiness? It's true, that the will of God is our sanctification; but our sanctification did not die for us, and has no more to do in taking off condemnation, than Paul in taking off condemnation from the Corinthians; it peculiarly belongs to Christ to deliver from the wrath to come, and from all condemnation.

Neonomian. Nor whether a justified person be freed from the curse of the law, or the sanction of the law of works.

Antinomian. But it is whether he be free from the

sanction of your new law, which is a law of works too.

Neonomian. Nor whether a believer should fear his eternal condemnation, no further than his sins bring his sincerity in question, or lead to security or apostasy.

Antinomian. But it is out of question hypocrites and apostates were never believers. Whatever a believer does do, yet you own he ought upon some grounds or other, to be delivered from the fear of condemnation. We say it ought to be grounded on the faith of his full deliverance from condemnation, by the atonement and satisfaction of Christ. You say it ought to be founded upon his sincerity and perseverance, that when he is rid of all his hypocrisy, and has persevered to the end of his life, he may be free from fear of condemnation; but not before. 3. Where's the true believer but is daily complaining, and not without cause enough, of his unbelief, hypocrisy, security, backsliding? And if he should have no better assurance of the safety of his state, and freedom from condemnation, than his own sincerity and perseverance, he could not be freed from the fear of condemnation in this life, nor walk comfortably an hour.

Neonomian. Nor whether God may, in sovereign mercy, spare to execute those rebukes, national or personal, which a godly man's sins may expose him to.

Antinomian. You love to dance about in ambiguities. There is a great deal of difference between sovereign sparing mercy, and Covenant-mercy; God exerciseth sparing mercy and long suffering towards the worst of men, but deals with a true believer always in a way of Covenant-mercy; and whether he rebukes him or not, it's all from his Fatherly love and wisdom; God cannot deal with him but according to his Covenant relation. God indeed deals with nations, and mixed societies of men, according to his sovereignty; but the same visible dispensations are made Covenant-mercies to all true believers, within the compass of such providences.

Neonomian. Nor whether God may or can over-rule the sin of a believer afterward to his benefit; these I affirm.

Antinomian. It's not only out of question that he may or can overrule the sin of a believer, for his benefit, but that he always does do it, if he is truly belonging to God.

Neonomian. Nor whether the afflictions of the godly be the execution of the damnatory curse of the law, or any satisfaction or atonement for sins. This I deny, and add, that Christ alone satisfied justice.

Antinomian. But it's a question, what you mean by the damnatory curse of the law? Is then one curse damnatory, and another not damnatory? You mean afflictions are an execution of the curse of the law, but are not of eternal damnation. 2. You say, they are not any satisfaction and atonement; but if they be

execution of a curse, if but temporary, it cannot be avoided but they must be satisfying and atoning in one kind or another, in whole or in part. 3. You add, that Christ alone satisfied justice; if so, then he suffered the whole penal part of sin, and {this is all the Doctor says} that there remains none of it for a true believing member of Christ, to bear; and what's the reason you make such a noise, when here you yield all the Doctor intends, unless you equivocate, as you are want to do?

Neonomian. I perceive that you do not understand me, for I will tell you the real difference. It's whether, according to the Gospel-rule, if a believer should yield up himself to the dominion of sin, he should perish? This I affirm, and the Doctor denies, against plain texts, directed to believers.

Antinomian. A denunciation of death and damnation is neither a rule nor Gospel; it's very absurd to say that is a rule, if you live after the flesh; it's but a condemnation of what's contrary to the rule, and a denunciation upon a supposing of that aberration from the rule; suppositions are not always positions, that the thing supposed is ever in being, and they are used by way of argumentation; because the antecedent can't be, therefore the consequent can't be; or because the consequent can't be, therefore the antecedent can't be, & vice versa. There's in this kind of arguing, in respect of one part of the proposition, to take away or establish the other, as now in the proposition you boast of. If a true believer {for so you should say} yield up himself to the dominion of sin, he shall perish; but a true believer shall not yield up himself to the dominion of sin; therefore, he shall not perish. Make but the proposition into a syllogism, that it may argue, and it will prove, that a true believer shall not perish, because he shall not yield up himself to the dominion of sin. I deny that the Apostle there speaks, Rom.8.13, of true believers, but useth an argument to unhinge any loose professors from vain hopes, and to show that they are not in Christ. For verse 8 says, "they that are in the flesh cannot please God," and to such as are in the flesh, he opposes them that are in the spirit, and having the Spirit of Christ are his. Therefore, he says, all such are debtors to live after the Spirit, and not after the Flesh; for if ye that are professors do live after the Spirit, do really live after the Flesh, you are in a perishing state, you are in the Flesh. Now the Apostle's arguing looks two ways. 1. To prove they that are in Christ shall not die; they that shall not live after the flesh, shall not die; but a believer in Christ, shall not live after the flesh, ergo, he shall not die. 2. By way of discovery, he that lives after the Flesh, is in the Flesh, and cannot please God, and therefore must die in that state, if it continues; but you or I live so; therefore, the Apostle speaks it by way of trial of the truth of our state, and in-being in Christ. 3. Where is it that the Doctor

speaks so favorably, as you would have him, of the dominion of sin? You have not referred to the place. The nearest is page 429, where he has these words, "forget everything that seems worthy in you or done by you, and let all your triumphing and glorying be in the free grace of God, in Christ; and look upon yourself only in that, and nothing else; as the martyr did, none but Christ, none but Christ. If you have more ability than others, in doing, let it not come into your thoughts, as an inducement to think better of yourself; as if you were more accepted of God, or pleasing in his sight. Are you sinful in respect of the prevalency of corruption? Are the temptations of Satan mighty? Let it not come into your thoughts that you are worse or less than others; for iniquity shall not part Christ and thee, if thou be once joined to him." Where is here the saying, that if sin has dominion over a believer, he shall not perish? But this is all along your way, to forge the horse shoe first, and then nail it to what foot you please.

Neonomian. Whether a believer falling into such sins, as idolatry, murder, &c., ought not to awe his soul against security, with lively thoughts of damnation; and if he continues long herein; ought not he to suspect the state of his soul, as in danger? This I affirm, and the Doctor denies. Thereby he renders the Gospel-threatenings, as urged by the Spirit on the hearts of believers, to be all foolish.

Antinomian. Where does the Doctor lay down this position, by way of affirming or denying? It's only a chimera of your own. We leave such believers to your management, till the grace of God change their hearts, and teach them better things. 1. It's very rare to find such true believers that fall into such sins, and live securely in them. 2. If nothing but lively thoughts of damnation will keep him from such sins and security in them, I shall leave him under the sanction of your Gospel, till it shall please God to call him into his grace. And surely he ought to suspect his state, if nothing arouses him but lively thoughts of damnation, {I should rather have said, killing thoughts of damnation,} for when the law comes, sin revives, and the sinner dies in the thoughts of damnation. But this is one of your new terms of art, the lively thoughts of damnation, it's like your rule of sin, &c. And such stuff is your speaking of the urging of Gospel threatenings by the Spirit, on the hearts of believers; as if threatenings were Gospel, or the Spirit of grace and adoption did work that way upon the hearts of believers, to produce holiness, viz., by urging Gospel-threatenings. I am sure your positions are exceeding foolish and absurd.

Neonomian. Whether Christ is at liberty sharply to afflict a justified person for provoking sins, though he be secured against soul-destroying judgments. This I affirm, and the Doctor

denies.

Antinomian. You affirm, that Christ satisfied justice; therefore, as your afflictions are not expiatory in whole or part, therefore they are not for sin in that sense that you urge for sin. And who is it that says, Christ is not at liberty to afflict them for sin in another sense, sin being the cause and the root of all evil fruits that spring up in the faithful? Therefore, there must be mortifying of it, as well as satisfying for it. God does not afflict his children for sin, by way of satisfaction, but for the mortifying of it; and who says Christ is not at liberty so to do? And thus you go on, imposing upon us what you please.

Neonomian. Whether a believer, falling into great sins, ought to fear God's present rebukes for such sins. This I affirm, and the Doctor denies.

Antinomian. He ought patiently to bear present rebukes, it's not proper to say he should fear them; yea, he ought always to maintain a filial fear of God and his goodness, not to live in a slavish fear and avoid sin, for fear of the lash; he ought always to have a due Gospel fear to preserve him from sin, even when he does not fall into great sins; and if it's only the fear of punishment that keeps men from sin, or reforms them, when fallen into it, there's no true grace of God in the heart; David says, God's rod and staff comforted him.

Neonomian. Whether great offences be a real hurt to a believer, and brings on him much present harm. This I affirm, and the Doctor denies. The case of national sins is included in these.

Antinomian. Here how you come to fight with a man of clouts; which you yourself have made; for we said not that sin is no hurt; for if so, why should our whole doctrine be to show that it needs healing? It's the hurt of the daughter of Zion; why is it said that we are healed by the stripes of Christ? And that sin, even remaining in God's people, makes the best of God's peoples services and duties as dross and dung, by reason of its mixture with them, which you condemn for an error? We say, let us not be mistaken; we do not say we must not be afraid to sin, but that they that have God for their God, need not be afraid of the sins they have committed, in regard of the penal effects.

But that sin naturally is a root, bringing forth all manner of evil fruit. The wages of sin is death. We distinguish of fear, a natural fear, an affection in men by nature, that they cannot be freed from; there's a religious and godly fear, which is an awful reverence of the majesty of God, and keeping a convenient distance, such as the creature ought to keep, it's opposed to sauciness. And there's a turbulent fear, a fear of disquietness, that which the Lord endeavours to take off from his people.

All such fear, the Apostle says, has bondage, and perfect

love casts it out; and the same Apostle says, as I say. "These things I write unto you, that ye sin not. But if any man sin {i.e., has committed sin} we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is a propitiation for our sins." I Jn.2:1-2. Therefore you charge us falsely to say our meaning is, that sin, in itself, is no hurt, and in its nature does no hurt. But we say as you, that Christ satisfied justice for sin, and overrules the hurt of it for our good, so that through grace it does us no real hurt; Christ has taken away the sting of sin, and the condemnation of sin. The real hurt of sin lies in the dominion of sin, and in the penal effects of it, they that have God for their God cannot give up themselves to the dominion of sin; they cannot have a love for it, because they are under grace; and as to the penal effects, they are taken away by Christ, or else his satisfaction to justice was imperfect. Now all other effects of sin, as hiding God's face, his paternal chastisements, in outward afflictions, eclipsing our graces and duties, come under a promise, that though they are not joyous, but grievous to a gracious mind, yet they shall, through God's grace disposing them, tend to our good, in making us the more partakers of God's holiness, to mortify sin, to humble us and empty us of ourselves, and to bring us to an higher exaltation of Christ and dependence upon him, yea, to more watchfulness, carefulness and circumspection in our ways. Hence God's people have their frequent complaints against sin, as to its indwelling and hindering them from doing the good they would, groan under the body of sin, and desire Heaven to be altogether rid of it, &c.

But when we say, sin cannot do us real hurt, and we should not be afraid of it, we mean only of sins already fallen into, that the disturbing, disquieting guilt of them should not lie upon our consciences to obstruct our comforts, and rejoicing in Christ; they should not drive us from Christ, to deny the love and free grace of God and the all sufficiency of Christ; for if he that has God for his God lies continually under an embondaging fear of sins past, he would always labour under a servile, slavish frame of spirit, without comfort all his days. We need not repeat what has been said to vindicate ourselves from this unjust charge.

Neonomian. I'll tell you your mistakes, because there is no eternal condemnation lies against a believer, therefore there is no penal present affliction.

Antinomian. It's all condemnation; Christ has taken away its condemnation that makes hell, and if God's people be under it here, they must have a degree of it; Christ died in vain, as to our present state, if it were not to take away condemnation from us here; we cannot be justified before God and lie under condemnation too. Is a believer only justified from future

condemnation, and not present? And it's no mistake, to say, because a man is freed from eternal condemnation, therefore present afflictions are not penal; but it's a necessary consequence. Why did Christ bear our sorrows, and carry our griefs, but that our afflictions should not be penal?

Neonomian. Whereas there's much hurt below hell, and that it is not hell that follows the sin of a believer, is not from the innocency of sin, but the grace of God that brings him to repentance, and faith in Christ for remission.

Antinomian. I thought there had been no hurt lower than hell; I suppose you mean, there's much hurt on this side hell; but improprieties are natural to you; condemnation for sin in this life, is much hurt, and a degree of hell, and is the same in kind; and therefore if God's people be not freed from it here, they cannot expect to be freed from the lower hell. 2. The reason why hell {you say} follows not the sin of a believer, is not the innocency of sin; this is one of the black-mouthed charges you lay upon us, that we make sin innocent, because we say, sin was laid on Christ, and he has borne all the penal effects of sin. Why say you not the same of the Apostle, who says the strength of sin is taken away, and the sting of death, {whereby it or lesser afflictions cannot hurt,} is taken away? These abominable reproaches fall not on man, so much as upon the truths of the Gospel, which Christ has a controversy with you for. And that hell follows not the sin of a believer, you say, is from the grace of God; and why may it not be from the grace of God, that no penal effects follow the sin of a believer? That grace that prevents or delivers from the greater evil will also from the lesser.

Neonomian. Because all sufferings for Christ work for good, therefore all sins against Christ can do no harm.

Antinomian. All sufferings of a believer, from the hand of Christ, as well as such as are in a way of persecution for Christ, shall work for their good; and therefore whatever befalls them by reason of sin, shall be for their good; and whatever is for our good, according to the wise disposing of God, is not for our harm, though it be so for the present in our own apprehension.

Neonomian. Because God can and does over-rule these to some good at last, therefore they do no harm in the meanwhile nor in any degree.

Antinomian. We speak not against the hurt of sin in its nature and natural effects, nor the seeming hurt of sin and the effects of it; but how evil soever it be, through the grace of God over-ruling it, all the seeming, yea, real hurt that it does at present, shall be for good, and is good in the wise way and end of God, though not apparently so, yet the promise is to be believed.

Neonomian. Because a believer is freed from the curse

of the law, therefore no Gospel threatening of Christ can reach him.

Antinomian. Where no curse of the law can reach, there nothing you call a Gospel threat can do a real hurt; for that is not what we call so, but what the wise God does make so.

Neonomian. Because some good men are sometimes humbled and awakened by sin, as it's an evil, therefore to them it is not evil.

Antinomian. Whatever is for humbling and awakening of a sinner, is good to that sinner, and no real hurt; that that is simply wrong, either natural or painful may be good, in order to an end, as to cut off a leg or arm is naturally wrong and painful, but in order to the saving of the whole body, it is necessary; many causes act not its capacity to enter, but those external, and that is when a thing produceth an effect by an external direction and government, that it has no internal disposition to, nor it may be an immediate agent might not intend or design. The enemy did Jason a kindness, when, by a thrust of a sword, he opened an incurable wound that the physicians could not cure. So commission of sin, through Divine disposal and the promise of grace, serves to lay open some latent corruption or other in the children of God, which becomes of great benefit and advantage to them.

Neonomian. The Assembly is of my mind, they say the threatenings of the law are of use, &c.

Antinomian. But you leave out what you please; they say, although a true believer be not under the law as a Covenant of works, to be thereby justified or condemned, yet it is of great use to them to inform them of the will of God, and the threatenings to show what sin deserves, who denies all they say? But observe, they say a believer is not under the law for condemnation.

Neonomian. But they say that saints may, through temptation and the prevalency of corruption, fall into grievous sins, and continue therein for a time, and incur God's just displeasure, and grieve his Spirit, and come to be deprived in some measure of their graces and comforts, have their hearts hardened, their consciences wounded, hurt and scandalize others, and bring temporal judgments upon themselves.

Antinomian. All this is granted, and yet we are not affected by it; in our true sense and meaning, we say sin is hurtful, and bears all manner of evil fruits; but, through the victory that we have in Christ, sin shall not bring upon us the curse of the law, nor condemning penal effects. Castigations proceeding from a fatherly hand, are the privileges of his adopted children, whether it be exercised in outward afflictions, or inward withdrawals. And this is the hurt that is all along spoken of; we

intend not sin in its own nature, and those effects that naturally proceed from it, nor the aspect it has upon ourselves or others, in all which it carries odium and mischief with it. The sole reason why it hurteth not in a way of condemnation, is from the propitiation and advocate-ship of Jesus Christ, in whom, and by whom, that hurt is taken away which we speak of.

Calvin. But Mr. Neonomian says, he has not wronged the doctor in this charge, nor misrepresented him.

Neonomian. I say, he does very oft say and frequently attempt to prove, that sin can do no hurt.

Antinomian. In what sense does he speak it? Does he intend sin in its own nature has no hurt in it? Or that it can do no hurt in its penal effects? Hurt must be understood in one of these senses.

Neonomian. I never designed to charge him with it in the first sense, for he says sin is a lion, there's its nature; and a dead lion, there's its calmness; and, because it's dead, it's not to be feared; it's a traitor, that's its nature; and bound hand and foot, that's its inability to harm.

Antinomian. But you say, he makes sin innocent to the elect; that's to change the nature of it, not to remove the effects; a traitor may be bound and be a traitor still, though not to be feared.

Neonomian. He has said too much to make it harmless to the elect.

Antinomian. It must be harmless to the elect, so far as Christ bore sin for them, or else he bore it in vain; but if the Doctor had thought sin had no hurt in it, he need not have insisted so much upon Christ's bearing sin for us, that sin might not wound us to death.

Neonomian. I tell you, I do not charge him for saying sin, as to its own nature, has no hurt in it.

Antinomian. Where lies the fault then? Is it in saying sin, as to its penal effects, can do them that are in Christ no harm?

Neonomian. He says not so, and yet those are most of the hurts that come for sin.

Antinomian. Mark, gentlemen, he denies, that this is his meaning, he says not those very words and syllables, but what is it that he proves his position by, viz., there's not one sin, or all the sins together, of a believer can do him the least real hurt; he proves it from Romans 7. After complaint against the remaining of corruption in him, he thanks God, through Christ, and says, there's no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus; and from Isaiah 43, "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgression, &c," where he says, what prejudice can that do that is blotted out? Every debt of a believer is a cancelled debt;

so that the Lord himself has nothing to lay to a believer's charge, it is Christ was wounded for his people's sins. Isaiah 53. It's true, our sins themselves do not speak peace, but Christ, bearing sin and the wrath that these sins do deserve; and again, though naturally sin has a sting, yet there is a victory over this sting; Christ is the death of it, as he took away the sting of it. Now let any impartial person judge, whether this be not the hurt of sin which the Doctor intends; and, besides, that you judge it to be his meaning, appears. 1. Because you say, he means not this hurt in respect of the nature of sin; and if so, it must be in respect of the real pernicious effects of sin; for a believer sees hurt in sin, and complains of it, but as to its nature, which is odious in itself, or to its effects. 2. It appears, that you judge his meaning is such, because you say, that by his doctrine of Christ bearing sin, he makes sin innocent to the elect. Whereby, you make the innocency of sin to lie in the punishment of it, and thereby justify Dr. Crisp's expression, how improper soever it be or erroneous. 2. You say, that penal effects of sin are most of the hurt that comes by it, according to what doctrine we have already charged you with. The great sign of the truth of grace, that is usually given, is the fear and hatred of sin, from the very nature of it, its contrariety to God and his law; and that it's the greatest sign of an hypocrite to abstain from it, only for fear of wrath and hell.

And, you tell us upon what principles he goes, that God has no sin to charge upon an elect person; though a man sins, God reckons not his sin to him, &c. Whereby you show where your grudge is; it's against the doctrine of imputation more than against the Doctor, for anything he has said.

As for your instance about poisoned wine, you say yourself, he speaks not by way of exhortation, but doctrinally; therefore exhorts none to take poisoned wine, but cautions them against it, again and again; and as for any that have, through weakness and inadvertency, he tells them their antidote, as the Apostle John, "my little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins." I Jn.2:1-2.

DEBATE XVIII.

OF GOD'S DISPLEASURE FOR SIN IN THE AFFLICTIONS OF HIS PEOPLE.

Neonomian. The next great Antinomian error, is, that none of the afflictions of believers have in them the least of God's displeasure against their persons, for their sins.

Antinomian. We must proceed in our ordinary method, let us know what you ground your charge upon?

Neonomian. He affirms, except God will be offended, when there is no cause to be offended, he will not be offended with believers, because he does not find the sin of a believer to be his own sin, but the sin of Christ.

Antinomian. But he in the next words quotes places of Scripture to prove what he says, he has made him sin for us, he has laid upon him the iniquities of us all; the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin; he bare our sins in his body, &c., and from these he argues thus, if he bear our sins, he must bear the displeasure for them; and he did bear the indignation of the Lord; and if so, he did bear it all, or but part. If he did not bear all the indignation of the Lord, then he does not save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him, as Hebrews 7:25. I say not to the uttermost, because here is some indignation and displeasure left behind, and for lack of taking this indignation upon himself, it lights and falls upon believers. So that either you must say, Christ is an imperfect Saviour, having left some scattering of wrath behind, that will fall on the head of a believer; or else you will say, he is a perfect Saviour, and takes away all God's displeasure; then there remains none of it upon the person of a believer. Now why had you not answered his argument for what he said? Yea, why had you not brought in the next objection made, to clear up his meaning, but quote only so much as may leave your reader under prejudice?

Yet you will say, is not God displeased and offended at the sins of believers, when they do commit them? Has Christ taken away the offence of sin by his death? No, therefore do not mistake yourself, there may be easily a mistake for lack of serious pondering the words I speak; I have not said, God is not offended with the sins a believer does commit, but that God stands not offended with the persons of believers for the sins committed by them; he has that everlasting indignation against sin as ever. And as there is the same contrariety in sin against

his nature, so there is the same contrariety in God's nature unto sin. All contrarieties have a mutual contrariety against each other, as water and fire, &c. As sin is contrary to the nature of God, so there is an abhorrency of God to that sinfulness, {here see with what ground you could say, that Dr. Crisp makes sin innocent,} but there is no offence of God to the person that commits that sin, because the offence of God for that sin has spent itself upon the person of Christ, there remains none of it to light upon the person of a believer, Christ having borne all this offence for sin. Though in our natures, and in the sinfulness of them, there is matter of displeasure, yet in Christ, for all this, God is well pleased with us. And yet there is none of God's indignation against sin lost in all this, for he is satisfied for this his offence in his Son, more than in our own persons.

Neonomian. And he says, but are not the afflictions for their sins?

Antinomian. Come, I will tell you, he answers that objection. He says, I answer, no, afflictions are unto believers from sin, but not for sin. What is the meaning of that will you say? This, God in afflicting believers does not intend to punish them, as now laying on them the desert of their sin; for that is laid upon Christ, but he does afflict them in part, to be a help to preserve them from sin. I say, all afflictions to believers are to keep them from sin, rather than punishment unto them for sin.

Neonomian. He says, that at that instant when God brings afflictions upon them, he does not remember any sins of theirs, they are not in his thoughts.

Antinomian. That which he asserts is from plain texts of Scripture, how dare you banter and expose so great a truth as this? It is in that great place, Jer.31:33, declared to be the great promise of the Gospel, by the Spirit of God, Heb.10:16- 17, for the LORD says that he remembers our sins no more; you say, he does; who are we to believe, God, or you?

Neonomian. He says, Christ being chastened for our sins, there's nothing but peace belongs to us.

Antinomian. The words were thus, I see the Scripture runs wholly in this strain, and is so full in nothing as in this, that he has generally discharged the sins of believers. Oh then take heed of falling into the error of the Papists, that say, that God has taken away the sin, but not the wrath of God due to sin, but that he has forgiven our sins, but not the punishment of sin; but consider, that as our sins were then upon Christ, he was so bruised for our iniquities, as that by his stripes we are healed, and the chastisement of our peace was so upon him, that he being chastised for our sins, there is nothing but peace belongs to us.

And can you deny the truth of a plain place of Scripture,

the chastisement of our peace was upon him? Doth it plainly appear that this is the true meaning, that our peace was fully made by Christ, and accordingly he is called our peace? Christ says, in the world we shall have trouble, yet this full and complete peace of reconciliation is made, and Christ promises the comforts of it in believing, peace I give unto you, &c.

Neonomian. He says, if we tell believers, &c., except they perform such and such duties, except they walk thus and thus holy, and do these and these good works, they shall come under wrath, at least God will be angry with them. What do we in this but abuse the Scriptures? We undo all that Christ has done, we injure believers, we tell God lies to his face.

Antinomian. It is not for you to expose a man's words, when they are proved from Scripture and sound reason. Why had you not taken his argument he brings, to prove that God will not be angry and be wroth with his people that are true believers. God, says he, has made such an oath, that the earth shall be drowned with water before it be broken, that he will not be wroth with his people, nor rebuke them anymore; and upon this account, it is he says, that such as tell believers, except they do this or that, &c., they will come under wrath and condemnation, do abuse the Scriptures, and give God the lie; nay, he says, we do not only, so much as lies in us, to make God a liar, {the Scripture says unbelief does so,} but we offer an insufferable affront unto Jesus Christ, and strike at the very heart of the office of Christ's Mediatorship. If we say, God is wroth with believers for whom Christ died, for what end did Christ suffer death? I say, that if this principle be truth, that God will be wroth with his people, then Christ died in vain, for God could have been but wroth and angry with his people if Christ had not died; to bring the people of God under wrath and vengeance again, is to take away all the virtue of the death of Christ, and to make it of none effect.

Now why do you not answer this argument? This is the childishest thing in the world, to say, he says so, and he says so, why do you not tell people why he says so, and confute his reasons? But you think you have done enough, if you have exposed a doctrine, by saying, this or that man that professes to hold it, says so and so; therefore what if a man speak truth never so weakly, and absurdly, must the truth be reckoned error therefore?

Calvin. Mr. Neonomian, you have fixed your anathema upon Mr. Antinomian's opinion in this point, viz., for holding that the afflictions of believers do not proceed from the judicial or vindictive displeasure of God against their persons, for their sins. You hear he says, God is displeased with their sins, and does afflict them, to purge out sin from them, that they may be

partakers of his holiness, &c., which seems to me to be very sound and orthodox doctrine, agreeable to the Scripture, and the analogy of faith.

Neonomian. Truth, though God is not so angry with his people for their sins, as to cast them out of his Covenant-favour; yet by their sins he is so displeased, as for them to correct his children, though he speak instructions by his rebukes.

Antinomian. You say, though he be not so angry, you make degrees of anger in God thereby, as if God were partly pleased, and partly displeased with his children; and if so at one time, then at another {we speak of the persons of believers} there being always sin in them for a reason here; and if so, Christ was not our full peace, he did not reconcile God fully to us, therefore made imperfect satisfaction; for if there remains some part of the debt yet unpaid, Christ did not pay all. Again, to be under the penalty of the law for sin, and the execution thereof, though but in part, is so far to be under the curse; but there's no believers in whole or in part, under the curse. Again, God, you say, is not so displeased with them as to cast them out of Covenant; if not, then they continue in Covenant with God; if in Covenant, then he has always a Covenant-love towards them, then he always acts in a way of Covenant-love towards them, even for their amendment and not destruction, when he afflicts them not in a way of wrathful displeasure for their sins. But if you say, against their sins, we allow it, and God is always angry with sin; sin itself was never pleasing to God, and therefore he purgeth it out in sanctification every day; and hence spends many a rod upon them for their profit, as a good Father upon a child that he dearly loves. Some earthly fathers may correct for their pleasure, that is, to vent their anger and passion; but God, the Apostle says, corrects for our profit, Heb.12:10, and he says, "for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth," Heb.12:6, i.e., loveth at the very same time. God's divine love to the persons of believers cannot be abated in the least. It's true, God may alter his carriage towards them, and deal so with them, as to make them consider their ways, and to humble them, or to point out some corruption God will have mortified; this is all love in God, and not displeasure. God's seeming displeasure is a fruit of his unchangeable loving kindness towards them; and whatever you say, if I stand secured of God's Covenant favour, I am sure God cannot be angry with me, whatever his sensible carriages are. God's people, whatever God's dealings are with them, they do not take anything to be done in displeasure, till through temptation they begin to suspect their Covenant-state. Do but clear up to an afflicted person God's Covenant-favour, and I'll warrant you he will not say God has afflicted him in his displeasure; and therefore you will say God is

displeased with their persons, for their sins, i.e., punisheth them for their sins to satisfy his displeasure thereby, i.e., his justice; if so, it's clear the consequence is unavoidable, as to so much of my punishment for sin that I bear, Christ did not bear, besides it must be in its degree expiatory and satisfactory to God.

Neonomian. You mistake my meaning still; I will tell you where the difference is not. It is not whether God ceaseth to love a believer when he sinneth.

Antinomian. That is the thing which we say, that God has an unchangeable love to the persons of believers, and cannot love and hate at the same time; and to ascribe changeable passions or affections unto God, is akin to the heresy of anthropomorphism.

Neonomian. Nor whether the afflictions that befall a believer proceed from the vindictive justice of God as an enemy.

Antinomian. We agree, with you, in it; why do you condemn us as erroneous? This is the great thing we plead for.

Neonomian. Nor whether God can bless the sorest judgments for sins, to the future good of a believer. This I affirm.

Antinomian. I do not only say he can, but that he does so always, and not only for his future but present good, though the believer may not yet know it for the present.

Neonomian. Though were it not for our sins, God would effect that good a milder way.

Antinomian. This is strange talk; for the good is the taking away, or rooting up of our sins, if you understand by, and for sin, from sin, we differ not; as I weed my garden, why for the weeds, i.e., from the weeds, to pluck them out; were it not for weeds I would not weed it; but if you say its revenge upon the good herbs, it's false, it's for their good.

Neonomian. And I doubt whether every good man may be said to get profit by all sorts of afflictions, for every degree of good is not equivalent to the hurt; and sometimes God punisheth sin with sin.

Antinomian. Now instead of a believer, it's a good man; some of your good men that have as much faith as they brought into the world with them; nor by all sorts of afflictions, it seems there's some can't have good in them towards God's children, and every degree of good may not be equivalent in the same kind, as the gaining a greater measure of contentment, separation from the world, submission to the will of God, you say it's not equivalent to the losing my house and all my goods, by fire, in an instant. And what if God suffers his people to fall a first, and second time, and third too; how can you dare to say, that the hurt it does them is greater than the good? It's enough that God's rectoral rule of government of them, is, that all things shall work together for their good; and though sin has no good

in itself, yet through God's wise disposal it shall work for good.

Neonomian. Nor whether some sensible calamities may fall on a good man, not so much in a way of rebuke for sin, as to try his graces, prevent sin, or bring glory to God, by a testimony of truth.

Antinomian. These are very good reasons you have added; let me add, for his increase and growth in grace.

Neonomian. Yet I believe the very Martyrs did not so glory in the joyful cause of their sufferings, as always to neglect a humble reflection on what sin of theirs might justify God, as a hidden cause of their hardship.

Antinomian. There's none of God's children, but as they own themselves less than the least of his mercies, so own, that by the last of their sins, they have deserved the greatest calamities; but truly a Martyr could never go joyfully to sufferings, if he thought God called him to it to punish him for his sins, to expiate some hidden sins; this would be sad martyrdom indeed. No, the Apostles rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer for the name of Christ; they had no suspicion, it was a punishment of them for their sins. As to a humble reflection upon sin, and what it deserves in itself, yea and we for it, if God should deal with us according to our sinful deserts; I think others of God's professed children, as well as Martyrs, have it, or else they have little grace in their hearts, and little acquaintance with the pardoning grace and mercy of God.

Neonomian. I will show you the real difference, whether God be at all displeased with believers for their abominations. This I affirm, and the Doctor denies.

Antinomian. You should have told us what you mean by God's being displeased, whether you mean an immanent displeasure of his divine justice, or a providential carriage towards them, which they are apt to call God's displeasure through temptation. 2. When you speak of God's displeasure towards believers, whether you mean their persons, or their sins; we say, God is never displeased with their persons, they being reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; and in Christ, God is fully and everlastingly well pleased with them. Indeed in the way of your scheme, there's something in what you say, the righteousness of the new law being imperfect; and therefore there is room left to expiate our sins and imperfections, in obedience by our sufferings. 3. You make strange kind of believers, such, it seems, as fall ordinarily into great abominations, act and live in, I suppose, sins of the greatest magnitude; the Doctor means a better sort of believers.

Neonomian. Whether God at any time, or by any afflictions, expresses his displeasure against his people for their sins. This I affirm, and the Doctor denies.

Antinomian. You need have made but one 'whether' of both these, unless you distinguish between God's displeasure, and expressing his displeasure, as between immanent and transient acts; and what signifies your affirming or denying, when there's no consistency in yourself, and all your affirmations and denials are in equivocal expressions? For you grant, God casts not believers out of covenant favour; he ceaseth not to love them when they sin. Nor do afflictions proceed from his vindictive justice. That he can make afflictions for their future good. We say he does do it, and for their present good too. And that they may fall upon a believer to prevent sin and try his graces, we say they do so always more or less. Let all this be told a believer in an affliction, and he will say, blessed be God, I find all this that befalls me is from a gracious God in Covenant; God is not displeased, but deals with me as a tender Father.

Neonomian. I will confirm the truth; you must know that there is none of all this but Dr. Crisp meaneth it of the unconverted elect, for their sins are off from themselves as much as believers; their sins do them no hurt, nor is God angry with them, though God says, he is angry with the wicked every day.

Antinomian. Solomon says, Prov.14:22, "do they not err that devise evil?" And that "violence covereth the mouth of the wicked." Prov.10:11? And that "he that hideth hatred, with lying lips, and he that uttereth a slander, is a fool." Prov.10:18. You thought by that time all your concessions were put together, that the error you charged the Doctor with was dwindled away, and it would not blacken him enough, according to your intention; and therefore now you will accuse him for his meaning, that all that he speaks of believers, refers as well to the unconverted, as the elect. Now to show the world how little like a gentleman, scholar or Christian you carry yourself, see Doctor Crisp, out of which you take your charge against him, in the very entrance of his discourse, what is said.

He shows from John 14:6, that Christ is the way from all the wrath of God to all that do receive him. 1. From the affection itself, of wrath; let me tell you, God does, no longer stand offended or displeased, though a believer, after he be a believer, do sin oft; yet, I say, God no longer stands offended or displeased with them, when he has once received Christ; and unto them God says, "anger is not in me." Isa.27:4. And does he not expressly mention believers in these very places you quote out of him? Now I see it's impossible to escape your accusations, for you have so addicted yourself to say one thing and mean another, that whatever any says, though never so plainly, whom you are minded to accuse, you'll say he meant another; and so you run on with your cuckoo's.

Neonomian. I still affirm that God is displeased with

believers for their abominations.

Antinomian. Some abominable believers out of doubt, some that you will have called believers, when as they themselves know in their consciences that you slander them.

Neonomian. If he be displeased, it must be for their sins; he oft affirms it, and he forces his people to own it. Psal.60:1,3; Isa.5:25.

Antinomian. There is nothing to be concluded, that God is angry with the persons of true believers, from those expressions that refer to a National Church, when there is a mixture of believers and unbelievers; God always when he speaks to such, in a way of anger, has respect to the generality or prevailing party, according to which he does in external ways of his providence carry himself towards the whole.

Neonomian. God was angry with Moses. Exod.4:14.

Antinomian. No man of sense would bring that of Exodus 4:14 to prove God was angry with Moses in your sense; for Moses was then in converse with God, who was calling him to a great undertaking, whereat Moses was surprised and pleaded his own insufficiency; which plea of his, when it savored of unbelief, God rebuked; not that there was in God penal anger against his person; but he rebukes his sin that he might not go on in the same sin and unbelief, and its spoken after the manner of men; and so often in Scripture God's rebukes of sin in his children by Word or Providence, is termed his anger, because it's so against sin, and seems to be so with their persons, by God's carriage to them many times in their apprehensions; and yet for all that, whom he loves he loves to the end. And so God loved the persons of Moses and David, even when they sinned, as you say yourself, that God ceaseth not to love a believer when he sinneth; if not, then he is reconciled to their persons, however his sensible dealing may be with them, and all proceeds from that love. And therefore why do you blame Dr. Crisp for saying, that at that instant, when God brings afflictions on believers, he does not remember any one of their sins? It must be understood thus, as he explains it, that God remembers not their sins in a way of judicial proceeding; marking iniquity, it is called therefore God's dealings in this kind with his children, and are called in the Gospel-language, corrections and chastisements; not for destruction or hurt, as all penal evils be, but for reformation and amendments, &c. Doth he not speak as plainly and distinctly as may be, that he does not say, God is not angry with the sins of a believer, but that he is not wroth with their persons?

Neonomian. That place, Psal.89:32, &c., proves what I say.

Antinomian. That place is on the Doctor's side, and against you; for it only holds forth thus much, that God corrects

his people from sin, not for sin in a way of vindictive wrath; for its a promise to Christ, and the seed there spoken of, who are redeemed ones and believers; God says, in case of sin, he will visit their iniquities with a rod, to kill and destroy sin in them; but as for his loving-kindness, it shall never depart from them. You could not have mentioned a place of Scripture more directly against you. "Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips." Psal.89:32-34.

Neonomian. There is that place, I Cor.11:30 & Rev.3:19.

Antinomian. The Church-members of the Corinthians might not be true believers, for ought you know; for they were of those that ate and drank unworthily, and accordingly, in the Apostle's phrase, did eat and drink damnation unto themselves, but what hinders, but a child of God may die under an affliction, which is laid upon him to cure some corruption or other? It's not too late to partake of God's holiness upon a death-bed in a higher measure than before. And as for those that were sick and weak, but recovered, there is no doubt, if they were true believers, but it tended to the curing their spiritual sickness. It is a strange thing that a surgeon must act always as an executioner, have his commission from justice-hall still, when he comes to a patient to open an ulcer, or to cut off a mortified hand or leg; and he cannot do this in love, and all tenderness and compassion to his patient, but in anger and wrath, and to punish and torment the poor creature for his faults. As to what is said by Christ to the Churches, Revelation 2 & 3, Christ speaks to body-politics, to mixed congregations that had many corrupt professors among them; and he speaks to them as such as were for the greatest part of many of them over-run with hypocrisy and formality, and what is it he calls them to, but Reformation? So is that place, Amos 3:2, its spoken to a professing apostatizing people.

Neonomian. The Assembly and the Savoy assert this; and in the Assembly's Large Catechism. How does Christ execute the office of a King? In rewarding their obedience, and correcting them for their sins?

Antinomian. But what follows? Preserving and supporting them under all their temptations and sufferings, is that in a way of wrath and indignation? They say, for their sins; so say we too, in their sense, if to denote the end of the chastisement, for healing; but it's not for punishing in a way of vindictive justice; which is your sense, or else you would never make this sputter, whatever presence to the contrary you make. God's displeasure is with the sins of believers, not with their

persons; and this is paternal displeasure, because there is love to their persons, as the cause of dealing with them in the way of any seeming displeasure.

Neonomian. I will tell you the Doctor's mistake, because God laid our sins on Christ to make atonement for forgiveness of the elect, therefore God cannot be offended with the elect for them, before they repent.

Antinomian. Your mistakes are willful, and foul ones too, or else you would not act so dishonestly. This doctrine of laying sin on Christ, you are always bantering; take heed it prove not of dangerous consequence to you. Has the Doctor spoken one word of the unconverted elect in this matter, or of the elect before they repent? But your spleen is moved, because he founds the security of believers from the wrath of God towards them for sin, upon Christ bearing sin, and making full satisfaction for it; you cannot brook it, that Christ's righteousness should have this honour. I will tell you one thing, if you have no better security from wrath, than the evangelical righteousness you show in this book, I can say, without a spirit of prophecy, the wrath of God abides on you.

Neonomian. Because God does not hate the believer, as an unreconciled God when he sins, therefore he is not at all displeased with him because of the Gospel-sins.

Antinomian. Because God manifests displeasure against the sins of his people, therefore, say you, God is displeased with their persons; that's your mistake, it's not in the nature of God to love and hate the same object; neither has God such affections as we have. If God hate not as an unreconciled God, he can do nothing towards that person, but what are the effects of love; there's few earthly parents can correct a child, but it's in their mind wholly to do them good, and to free them of some ill habit or corruption; the child calls the Father's carriage anger, and it looks so to him, in a wise Father; but all this while his heart yearns toward the child, and longs to be kissing it.

Neonomian. He thinks, because a refiner is not angry with his gold, therefore a holy God is not angry with rational offenders.

Antinomian. The persons of true believers are precious and honourable in the sight of God, ten thousand times more than gold can be, and securer from the anger of God than any gold can be from the refiner's anger. I suppose your rational offenders are your abominable believers.

Neonomian. Because God will not hate a believer so as to damn him, therefore he cannot be angry with his people so as fatherly to chastise them.

Antinomian. If God cannot hate a believer so as to damn him, then he cannot punish or afflict him in this world with

the same affection wherewith he does damn any one; but all that befalls him in this world proceeds from the same affection of love that saves them from damnation; as to God, there's the same cause of the afflictions and chastisements of believers, as there is of their glorification; they all proceed from his eternal and unchangeable love, from the sure mercies of the Covenant of Promise, and therefore are all in a way of benefit and advantage towards them; God loves a child of his as much in its infancy and nonage, as in its grown state, though his carriage is different, the diversity of state requiring it. And as to Fatherly chastisement, if you understand it aright, we deny not but such are those of God's children; but you must know the Spirit of God tells us, the comparison will not hold but as a small illustration of it; for God's thoughts, affections, designs, are not as man's; a father may correct a child in anger and passion, and so for his pleasure, as the Apostle says, but God never does so. A woman may lay aside natural affections, and forget her sucking babe, yea, murder it; but as God cannot lay aside his innate love, so he cannot forget to exercise it in all things.

Neonomian. Because God afflicts from sin, therefore he does not afflict for sin.

Antinomian. If you mean from sin and for sin in the same sense, that sin is a reason of affliction in some sense or other, we deny it not; but if you mean it be a judicial cause of affliction, as it is in a wicked man, we utterly deny it; for such must be atoning to the law, transgressed in part or in whole; the law designs not the salvation of the sinner in any of its executions, but its own satisfaction in his destruction, it looks not at his amendment, but ruin; and therefore if you mean, that God, as a Father, does so afflict, we deny it; for to say so, were to make him change, to invalidate the satisfaction of Christ, and make him worse than an earthly father.

Neonomian. As if he could not rebuke for what is past, if he resolves not against their amendment for time to God.

Antinomian. God resolves their amendment, and therefore chastiseth; and God rebukes their sins, and shows man that he has transgressed, that faith be exercised the more lively on the propitiation of Jesus Christ, who satisfied God for sin, and that they may the more admire the free and pardoning love of God, and that his dealings are so favorable, it's the Lord's mercy we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not, and that sin may be made more sinful and hateful to them.

Neonomian. The Doctor was led into this opinion, by not considering that anger and displeasure be not passions in God, but a will of correcting, and are denominated from the kinds and degrees of correction.

Antinomian. Quite contrary; he took up his opinion,

because he believed they were not so; and that God's correcting his children, is from his love and good-will; and that, whatever the degrees are, the specific nature is, in full character, distinct from punishments in anger.

Calvin. 1. There is no reason why God should exact the debt of sin, in the suffering of believers, because Christ has fully satisfied his Father's justice for their sins. 2. Their sorrows and afflictions cannot carry a curse in them, and therefore not the wrath and displeasure of God; for he has borne their sorrows, and carried their grief; not that they should not have sorrow, but that their sorrows should have nothing of the sting of sin, the curse of the law in them. 3. They are under the grace of adoption; therefore chastening is the fruit of adopting-love. Heb.12:6. And it's one of the good things God has allotted to them as children, and that for many great ends. 1. To be partakers more and more of his holiness in general, verse 10, for their profit and advantage. 2. To be conformed unto Christ therein, who learned obedience by suffering, Heb.5:8. To fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in his mystical body. Col.1:24. 4. That we may have fellowship with Christ in his sufferings, and therein be conformable to his death. Phil.3:10. 5. That as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolations may abound by Christ. II Cor.1:5. 6. That we may learn patience, that excellent grace; for tribulation worketh patience. 7. That faith may be tested, the trial whereof is better than gold. I Pet.1:7. 8. That we may be weaned from the world, prize and long for Heaven more; therefore through many tribulations we must enter into Heaven. Acts 14:22. These and many more great reasons may be assigned for the afflictions of God's children, and not to be reckoned to be for sin in your sense.

Mr. Calvin, in his Institutes, is very large on these things, and says, in the very bitterness of affliction, it is our duty to own and recognize the tenderness and bounty of our Father, because then he ceaseth not to promote our salvation; for he afflicts not that he may kill or destroy us, but rather to deliver us from the condemnation of the world. From the Doctrine of Justification by Christ's righteousness, we gather. 1. To condemn the proud Papists, that seek justification by their own works and righteousness inherent in themselves. 2. There's no comfort to a Christian's soul like this. The assurance of the sufficiency of our redemption, Rom.8:33, God having accepted his Son's righteousness for us, will not hold us any longer trespassers, but he disables his own justice from making any further demand. Hence there is nothing comes upon the saints from God's revenging justice, but all our corrections are medicinal from God's fatherly love, to purge out that sin out of our nature which he has already pardoned to our person.

DEBATE XIX

OF THE BEAUTY OF SINCERE HOLINESS.

Neonomian. I am now come with a charge of a monstrous error upon Mr. Antinomian; I believe it will stink in your nostrils as soon as I name it; it is this, that the greatest holiness in believers, though wrought in them by the Holy Ghost, is mere dung, rottenness and filthiness, as in them.

Calvin. I pray let us hear his own words, for the Apostle Paul speaks to that purpose. Phil.3:8-9.

Neonomian. Aye, but the Apostle Paul does not mean as he does, he has perverted the Apostle's words to a wrong sense. He says, know, that the motions and assistance of the Spirit, be pure, holy and without scum in the spring, to wit, itself; yet by that time these motions and assistances have passed the channels of our hearts, and been mixed with manifold corruptions, even the whole work becomes polluted and filthy, and filthiness alters the property of the pure motions of Christ's Spirit, &c.

Calvin. Do you charge this for error?

Antinomian. If you please, Sir, you shall have my whole sense, the sum briefly of what I spake. I was preaching from Phil.3:8-9, and I opened that text according to the sense of the best interpreters; and I showed that the Apostle demolishes all glittering and rotten materials, wherewith he had, and others still do, erect a fortress of security and a place of delight. He declares his end in so doing, that he might lay a sure foundation, and build upon it with other materials than hay and stubble. Now I showed, that which he cast away, was all things, not only what he was or could do before he received Christ, but even all things whatever also he has been able to do since he received Christ, though assisted thereto by the Spirit of Christ, as Beza well observes. As concerning the Apostle's end, for stripping himself naked of his most specious works in general, it is to be clothed with white robes, even the garment of salvation; but more especially he declares his end. 1. It's for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ, i.e., of Christ's excellencies known; to the knowledge of which I could never come, till all I was, and am, plainly appeared loss and dung; my own righteousness was a thick film over my eyes, that I could not see Christ's worth. 2. A gaining and winning Christ, is a second end, as long as his own obedience was in esteem with him, and seemed anything better than dung in his eye, he could never get Christ. 3. That he might

be found in him, i.e., at the great day of appearance. That this is the meaning, is plain by the Apostle's own expounding himself, not having mine own righteousness, and my doctrine. That things, even the most blameless walking according to God's law, not only before, but after conversion, or receiving Christ, is truly counted loss and dung, by Paul's eye; and such an one will be willing to suffer the loss thereof as dung. Those places were brought in proof. Isa.64:6; Lk.17:10.

And I showed this determination was not to be of some things only, but of all; not only things directly against the precept, but all civility, morality, the most exact obedience, with the highest assistance of the Spirit, and straightest aim at a right end, &c., must be counted and sentenced but as loss and dung. But let me not be mistaken; here I do not say, that the motions themselves of the Spirit, as his, nor the ends and enlargements of the heart, as his, or the ends aimed at, as prescribed, must be thus accounted or sentenced; but the whole work as done, and when done by a sanctified person thus assisted and qualified, when such a person looks at the work so done by him, he must see nothing but mere loss and dung. Loss, because that he forfeits life and bliss on earth and heaven; there is sin enough in it, if God had nothing else but what he could pick out of the best work to lay to his charge; I mean, in regard of the desert of such a work in itself considered; under the notion of such loss must it be looked on, and as dung also, which comprehends the causality of such loss in these works, all things of ours, even the best, are of this nature; I say, therefore all our righteousness, at best, is such a menstruous cloth in God's eye, and so certainly in itself.

Let us consider what it is to suffer the loss of all things.

1. There is a passive suffering, the loss of all things, when a person is violently bereft of all.
2. There is an active or voluntary suffering, the loss of all, i.e., he was contented to take shame to himself for his best actions, and account himself worthy to be cast out and destroyed, and to be his own judge, to pass not only the sentence of confiscation of all, but of condemnation on his person, saying, O wretched man, that I am, &c., and so to stand stripped stark naked of all things, and all pleas they can afford him, so that not to have a word to speak for himself, that his mouth should be stopped, except it be in impleading all that ever he had done, as making against him far more than for him. And I came to the third thing, to show how all things, even the most blameless works after renovation, are loss and dung. For illustration sake, you must distinguish between that which is the Spirit's in works after renovation, and the whole work after we have done it; and now followed what he rehearsed, &c. Where I show, that though the motions and assistances of the Spirit be pure and holy without scum in the spring, yet by that time they

are mixed with our manifold corruptions in doing, and have passed through the channels of our corrupt hearts, the whole work becomes polluted and filthy, as pure water passing through a dunghill, &c. And this I evinced from James, who says, that whosoever fulfills the whole law of God, and yet offends in one point, is guilty of all. And Paul who says, when I would do good, evil is present with me; and complains thus, O wretched man, that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death? And he does not fly to his good works, but to Christ, a refuge against all, I thank God, through Jesus Christ.

Objection. But ought we to refrain therefore from doing righteousness? Answer. It follows not; but therefore we must refrain from glorying in it, or stroking ourselves for our righteous doings; rather take shame to ourselves when done, and so glory only in the Lord; and though good works, as done by us, are but dung in themselves and in God's eye, yet must we be careful to maintain them, Tit.3:8, and David, who confesseth, that his goodness extendeth not to God, but to the saints. "O my soul, thou hast said unto the LORD, thou art my Lord, my goodness extendeth not to thee; but to the saints that are in the earth, and to the excellent, in whom is all my delight." Psal.16:2-3. It's no good plea, that because a man cannot be wholly clean, therefore he will be more filthy than needs; because your child will be dirty, do what you can, yet shall he therefore go and flounder in the gutter like a swine.

Calvin. I perceive the sense of Mr. Antinomian fully, for he says. 1. That the graces of the Spirit come clean from the Fountain. 2. That when they come into the channels of our corrupt hearts, they become mixed with the dirt and filth of them. 3. That thence our best duties and services become polluted. 4. That thereby they are not pleadable for righteousness before God. 5. We have no cause to boast ourselves, after duties to stroke and commend ourselves as if we had done a great matter, but to go off from duty with humiliation and shame. 6. That all or any compared with the holiness and purity of God, in respect of our coming short of what is required, the mixture of sin working in us, makes this duty and work done, as it is in itself considered, to be but dung.

Now, Mr. Neonomian, what do you think or say of your duties when they are done? When you have spent a day in fasting and prayer, would you not at the end of the day, desire the Lord to pardon the iniquity of your holy things, your wanderings, vain thoughts stirring of manifold corruptions, would you not say as Daniel, "O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name, for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies." Dan.9:18. Ought we

not to abhor ourselves and duties in dust and ashes, and say, Lord, if thou mark the iniquities of our best duties, they are enough to condemn us forever to eternal wrath? How often is this spoken and thought by the best of God's children? Or would you go off the duty like the proud Pharisee, commending and stroking yourself for what you had done, saying at last in your heart, I have prayed well this day, preached well; though there was some imperfections, yet there was as much as God requires of me to the fulfilling the new law; I have performed the condition, and God must accept it for the sake of my evangelical righteousness?

Antinomian. I answer an objection. Some will say, that God often shows his approbation of good works, which he could not do if they were all dung. I answer, whatsoever is not of faith is sin, but to a believer all things are clean. So through this faith in Christ, the whole filth and dung of our works is extracted by Christ, and he presenting the same purged by himself alone, they become accepted with God, Rev.3:4, but simply the works themselves as done, though never so well, are abhorred of God, and Christ never takes them to purge them, till we ourselves wholly renounce them, by counting them loss and dung; and that acceptance procured by Christ, imports only a liking that God takes to them, no efficacy in themselves.

Calvin. You see that Mr. Antinomian says, that though simply and in themselves as works performed by us, they are by reason of imperfection, and mixture of corruption, to be accounted loss and dung; but yet as we are in Christ, and perform them in Christ by faith, they have acceptance with God through his merits, satisfaction, and intercession; it is in him alone that both our persons and services are accepted with God; our spiritual sacrifices, which are our duties, that we are here speaking of, are said to be acceptable to God, but how? By Jesus Christ, I Pet.2:5, and certainly in themselves, and out of Christ, they are no better than dung; we are made accepted both to persons and services only in Jesus Christ.

Antinomian. It is granted originally and per se, that the best righteousness obtains nothing, but rather charges with a new account, yet instrumentally it obtains what is desired, being well qualified as before mentioned. To which I answer, if it be no more, then I heartily desire that we should heartily say and express as much, that the people may clearly understand and remember so much, and be guided explicitly to the Fountain itself Christ alone, for certainly whilst Christ is suppressed, and these instruments are reached out, without relation to Christ, who only fills them with all that runs through them, they are but mere empty pipes, and dry channels, though never so curiously cut out.

Calvin. And is not this great truth, and Gospel, Mr. Neonomian. Your carping at this doctrine plainly shows, that you set forth for another Gospel. I perceive, wherever anything exalts the grace of God, and the righteousness of Christ, you strike at it as standing in your way, and this under a presence of advancing holiness in the way of legal worthiness. You also deal most unjustly and disingenuously with this good man, in falsely representing him, and in not acquainting us with these things, whereby he fully declares his meaning, and adjusts it agreeable to the analogy of faith. Now because you expose the Doctor so much for what he says of the graces of the Spirit of God being once mixed with our corruptions in a duty; this duty in itself at best is as dung, ceaseth to be the Spirit's, and becomes our own, our flesh being like the viper's stomach, that turns the wholesomest food into poison.

See what excellent Mr. Beza says in his Confession. It is not to be allowed, that works are a cause of salvation, in the whole, or any part, for if it were so, certainly there would be but a crazy foundation of our salvation. We must of necessity acknowledge; that the water and foundation from which it flows are akin, because the thickest darkness yet remains in our understandings; it would come to pass, if God should in his strict justice enquire into the best works of a man, there could be no other thing determined of them, but that they be the mere pollutions of God's gifts; as it often falls out, that a river, otherwise clear and limpid, is infected with the filth of the lake through which it runs. Rom. 7:15, 23. Now what think you of this? For my part I verily believe, that Doctor Crisp took his very way of expressing and illustrating these things from this very place of Mr. Beza. Now unless you will condemn this learned and approved divine for error in this point, I see not that you can accuse this Antinomian, as you call him.

I will show you the opinions of a divine, who I hope you dare not call unstudied and unlearned, it's of the famous Doctor Anthony Tuckney in his Sermons upon this text of Philippians 3:8. He says, all things, which includes more than all, that was before mentioned. If you ask what I answer, according to our divines, whom I am not ashamed of, or of their judgment, all his own inherent righteousness, and best works, after conversion, his labouring more abundantly than they all, his conversion of many souls, his holy and unblameable conversation, as Zanchi upon the text, which he sufficiently makes out to be here included, both from the universal, as being intended to express more than was before expressed of his morals and zeal before conversion, and from the present tense, now that he is converted, he judges so of all that he was and is, as dung and dross, as Chrysostom, and by what he says, verse 9, &c.

And to throw you quite on your back, I will show you a passage in the Assembly's Confession, which you would not see, of good works. When we have done all we can, we have done but our duty, and are unprofitable servants; and because as they are good, they proceed from the Spirit, and as they are wrought by us, they are defiled and mixed with so much weakness and imperfection, that they cannot endure the severity of God's judgment. Yet notwithstanding the persons of believers are accepted through Christ, and their good works also are accepted in him, &c.

Now, Sir, seeing the doctrine which you so peremptorily call error, is so clearly proved to be truth, let us hear what you have to say, in stating and defending your judgment; and I pray Mr. Antinomian, do not spare the rod of correction.

Neonomian. Truth, though the present sincere holiness of believers be not perfect, according to the precepts of the Word; nor valuable by the sanction of the law of innocency, nor any atonement for our defects; and we still need forgiveness, and the merits of Christ, for acceptance thereof, yet as far as it prevails, it's lovely in itself, and pleasing to God, and is not dung or filth.

Antinomian. We shall divide your canon into two parts, the negative and positive; you tell us what it is not, and first note, that you change the terms; for the Doctor speaks of works performed by us, when a duty is performed, and becomes a composition of the pure graces of the Spirit mixed with the corrupt indwelling motions of our own hearts; and hence he distinguishes between grace flowing from the Spirit, which is purely holy, and grace acted and performed by us through the assistance of the Spirit, therefore we must keep you to the Doctor's terms, viz., to our sincere works, or sincere holiness, taken in that sense. This being premised.

You tell us these works are imperfect, and not according to the Word, therefore so far sinful; for whosoever keeps the whole law, and offendeth in one point, is guilty of all, Jas.2:10, and so I say of any duty, if it fails in one point, it's chargeable with breach of the whole law, so the duty, as performed as such, and all its accompaniments are all is dung and filth.

You say it's not valuable by the law of innocency; that's said before, for what is not according to God's precept, is condemned by God's law, by every law of God; it's so far from valuableness, it stands under a sentence of condemnation. God never accepted or owned imperfect obedience as such, and in itself; neither is it consistent with his pure nature so to do.

You say it cannot make atonement; if it stands for acceptable righteousness and holiness, it must make atonement for its defects and sinful pollutions; the High Priest was to make

atonement for his own sins before he could be accepted, so in this case, that righteousness that cannot atone for its own sins, if there be any, cannot be acceptable to God; but you say, this righteousness cannot make atonement for its sins, therefore in itself can never be acceptable to God.

You say, we still need forgiveness, and the merits of Christ, for acceptance of these works. 1. Then I say they are sinful, or else would not need forgiveness. 2. They need the merits of Christ, and therefore not acceptable righteousness in themselves, they are as dung and stink in the nostrils of God, the best works in themselves are such; whatever is not capable in itself, to make itself acceptable in the sight of God, if it has no relation to another righteousness, it stinks, and is abominable in the nostrils of God.

You say, so far as it prevails its lovely, i.e., not at all of itself. Observe still what we say, no good work of a believer prevails to acceptance of us; and if not, it prevails not at all, and that which prevails not to acceptance, is not lovely in itself, for nothing is lovely to God but what he accepts; and hence you conclude, it is not dung or filth; but from what you your self have said, it can be no other than dung; whatever cannot be accepted of God without forgiveness, and the righteousness of Christ, to make it acceptable, is in itself and out of Christ dung. But I perceive what you aim at, that it is a righteousness that comes in for a share with Christ, and in part it prevails to acceptance, though not altogether, and here you fall in with the Council of Trent, as in all your doctrine. That the grace of justification and acceptance is not only the favour of God, and by the merit of Christ, but that our works prevail in some degree.

Neonomian. I will tell you wherein the difference lies, it is not whether holiness, or the best acts of a saint, be such, or so perfect, as to atone for his sin, or procure a state of pardon.

Antinomian. This is a strange kind of talking about a saint's good works, atoning or procuring a state of pardon, as if there could be a saint before he is in a state of pardon. And as for those works that need atonement, and cannot make atonement for themselves, they are in themselves but pitiful menstruous rags, dross, and dung, for non-acceptation with God makes all works such, though seemingly never so good.

Neonomian. Nor whether our holiness can make us accepted with God without Christ.

Antinomian. Then it is not worth a pin in itself without Christ.

Neonomian. Nor whether the holiest action of the holiest saint is such, as not to need forgiveness.

Antinomian. That which needs forgiveness is sin, and therefore filth, but according to you, the holiest action of a holiest

saint is such, according to yourself.

Neonomian. Nor whether by the sanction of the law of innocence, sincere holiness could be accounted holiness, all this I deny.

Antinomian. There could be no other holiness counted holiness by the old law, but sincere holiness; but imperfect sincere holiness was not accepted there, nor in and by itself, in any other law, or Gospel, as such.

Neonomian. Nothing under that law but perfect conformity to the precept was holiness, whereas Gospel grace makes a great difference between true holiness, though imperfect, and what formally wickedness, between sincere love and enmity, sincere faith and utter unbelief.

Antinomian. If perfect conformity was the holiness of the old law required, it's an argument that nothing will serve the grace of the Gospel but a holiness answerable to it in perfection; and whatever difference you make to be between imperfect true holiness, and formal wickedness, I tell you, the formal difference between perfect holiness and imperfect, is sin, for this imperfection lieth in sin, a coming short of moral perfection can lie in nothing but in some degree or other of sin. But is it the Gospel makes the difference between virtue and vice? Sure it's the law does that.

Neonomian. The real difference lieth here, whether the sincere holiness of a believer's heart and actions be really dung and rottenness? This the Doctor affirms, and I deny.

Antinomian. The Doctor affirms, that the works, services, or performances of a believer being full of imperfection, and mingled with sin, are not acceptable to God, but through faith in Jesus Christ, and compared with the pure holiness and justice of God, and the righteousness of Christ and his holiness in which he stands, are and ought to be accounted by him as loss and dung.

Neonomian. Whether sincere holiness, so far as it prevails in our hearts and actings, be truly lovely in itself, and pleasing to God, according to the grace of the Gospel, and is not dung. This I affirm, and the Doctor denies.

Antinomian. The question is, whether holy works performed by the best men, be not polluted with sin, and whether they can be truly lovely, and pleasing to God in themselves out of Christ, according to any grace of the Gospel, and therefore are not as dung? This I deny, though you affirm, and a thousand more.

Neonomian. What is spoken of holiness of any mere man on earth since the fall, is spoken of sincere holiness for perfect holiness none had.

Antinomian. What has been spoken of holiness that

God has accepted, is of true holiness, i.e., sanctification in Christ Jesus. Sincerity may be where there's no true holiness; Paul had sincerity in his supposed holiness, he verily thought he did God good service in persecuting the Churches; good ends and meanings which a carnal man may have in his mind, are not enough to make an action good.

Neonomian. I have room but to expostulate.

Antinomian. Because you cannot find a good argument to bring in; you might have had more room if you would, and it would have been more for your honor, so as you had served truth in it; but go on with your expostulation.

Neonomian. Is that dung which is the effect of regeneration in the soul?

Antinomian. You should have said, the effect of the Spirit; for regeneration itself is not an efficient, but an effect, and that which is the efficient of regeneration is so also of all the vital acts in a regenerate person; now we have told you before, that the pure graces of the Spirit passing through the corrupt channel of man's heart, becomes in a duty like defiled puddled water, and such duty in itself only considered, is as dung in the sight of God, and ought to be accounted so by us.

Neonomian. Is that dung which is so often honoured with the name of the Spirit itself, and called the spirit of love, prayer, &c.

Antinomian. You should have named the places where our works are called by the name of the Holy Spirit of God; as for the spirit of love, that is the disposition of love, and as to the spirit of prayer, where it's taken for the Spirit's helping our infirmities, it is spoken of as distinct from our prayers themselves.

Neonomian. Is not that more lovely which is called the Divine nature. II Pet.1:4.

Antinomian. The Divine nature there, is the Spirit of Christ received by faith, for it's given in many great and precious promises, and whatever of Divine nature we receive, it is of God, and in conformity to and participation of Christ, all which is pure, as flowing from the Spring, but when it comes to be exerted and put forth by us in our duties, becomes impure, and mixed with the corruptions, so the whole duty in itself is but an unclean thing.

Neonomian. How amiable must that be which is the new man after God's image. Eph.4:24.

Antinomian. Take the new man created after God, distinctly considered, as it comes from God, it's a pure creature; but this hinders not, but the regenerate man is made up of the old and new man, and all his actions and duties partake of both, and therefore polluted; for Paul said, the old man hindered him

from doing good when he would, for then evil was present with him; the same may be said of the new heart. Ezek.18:31. The law in the members is warring against the law of the mind in every part and faculty of soul and body.

Neonomian. Are those works dung to which we are created in Christ Jesus. Eph.2:10.

Antinomian. We are created in Christ Jesus unto good works, to be performed in Christ Jesus; so far as we are in Christ Jesus, and our works in Christ Jesus, they are not dung; neither does the Doctor say they be, but when performed out of Christ in ourselves, and in themselves, they are but as dung. Christ is made our sanctification, and all that holiness in us that is accepted, it's not only in and for his righteousness, but it's performed in the life and power of Christ our sanctification; therefore he says, I Cor.1:30, that what we are we are in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, &c.

Neonomian. Or is that filthiness which renders saints the excellent of the earth. Psal.16:3.

Antinomian. Doth not David say, verse 2, "my goodness extendeth not to thee?" The original words {if you understood them} is fuller, as to the sense intended, though shorter than the translation, my goodness is not to thee, or nothing to thee, and the LXX has it, thou hast no need of my goodness. Do you say, is that filthiness which renders the saints excellent? I had thought it was the grace of God, Christ's righteousness, and the inbeing in Christ, that had rendered them excellent, not their own works.

Neonomian. The imitators of Christ?

Antinomian. Scholars that write after another, may make very sorry work mere scribbling, that the Master, though he finds reason in himself to accept, would, if he did not, tear it all to pieces.

Neonomian. Was not this it for which Caleb was said to have another spirit, and upon account whereof we must love the godly, as begotten of God?

Antinomian. Was Caleb's works his spirit, or his works flow from his singular spirit; his spirit was a spirit of faith, through which he did so great things in Christ Jesus, and so the works were accepted. The foundation reason of our love to the saints, is Christ loving them, and their relation to Christ; every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him that is begotten of him, and by this we know we love the children of God, when we love God. I Jn.5:1-2.

Neonomian. Is it not pleasing to God, to which he has made so many promises, and for which he commends Moses, David, &c.

Antinomian. As God is not pleased with any persons, so with no works, out of Christ, neither has made any promises to any such out of Christ, all the best works are cast forth as filth, and odious, if done out of Christ.

Neonomian. Calling them a peculiar people, it's no small thing that Christ is so pleased with his spouse.

Antinomian. They are peculiar, because purchased, and have peculiar blessings and privileges, and bring forth peculiar fruits in Christ Jesus, Jn.15:5-6, without me ye can do nothing, and if a man abide not in me he is cast forth as a branch that is withered, and any work that is done out of Christ, is but dung, as I Cor.3:12-13. If a man in Christ build hay, stubble, his works will be burnt, and he suffer loss, though he may be saved. Christ is pleased with his spouse his Church, because he has loved it, and washed it in his own blood, and therefore she is comely; but as for what she is in herself, and as to her works in themselves, and done out of Christ, she is but black, as the tents of Kedar, &c. Song.1:5.

Neonomian. Can that be dung which is a meetness for glory, an honor to God, and credit to religion?

Antinomian. Our meetness for glory is all from grace, there's nothing that flows from ourselves, no work done out of Christ, can contribute to any meetness, all our meetness is in Christ Jesus as made unto us righteousness, and sanctification, and we grow up in him in all things; as for our relation unto men, we say with the Apostle, they are profitable to men, and be a means that they glorify God on our behalf, but God has no direct honor by them, if not performed by faith in Christ.

Neonomian. How can that be acceptable to God in Christ, if it be filthiness?

Antinomian. Good works are good in their kind, but comparatively, and in themselves, because of the mixture of sin and corruption, they are in the sense of the Spirit of God but filth; you may as well say, how can Paul be acceptable to God through Christ, who says, in me dwelleth no good thing? Must persons and actions be free from all adhering corruption, by reason whereof they in themselves are abominable to the pure eye of God, before they be made acceptable to God through Jesus Christ? This is like your constant doctrine; persons, and actions, must be good first, before they have benefit by Jesus Christ.

Neonomian. Wickedness will never be accepted with God for Christ sake, though imperfect goodness shall.

Antinomian. No imperfect goodness can be accepted as righteousness with God for Christ's sake. Christ never so much as purchased, that any of our best graces or works should be accepted as our righteousness, and it cannot be accepted unto

holiness out of Christ; and the Doctor never said, our good works wrought by faith in Christ are dung, so as not through Christ to be accepted unto holiness; but imperfect works are no more our righteousness for acceptation with God, than wickedness, neither in their nature, for Christ's sake.

Neonomian. Read what is spoken of sincerity and uprightness, will it agree with what's mortal poison?

Antinomian. Moral sincerity and uprightness may, and so is all out of Christ.

Neonomian. What a reproach is it to Christ, to call his life in us, and the beginning of glory by this title?

Antinomian. The life of Christ in us, is by the faith of the Son of God, and we are crucified with Christ to all that's done by us, and therefore account it dung and dross in comparison of all done by us; and works give us not title to glory, though grace begins it.

Neonomian. Nay, to make his triumphs in us so low, as that all he has improved his members to, is mere filthiness.

Antinomian. The triumph of Christ in us, is the casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.

Neonomian. It's well if the Scriptures can escape clean, if all the works of the Spirit are thus debased when they pass through men.

Antinomian. The Scriptures are clean in themselves as from the Spirit, but the works done by us are not Scripture, though they be in some measure conformed thereto.

Neonomian. But I less wonder that Doctor Crisp should speak thus of the righteousness of the Saints, as in them, when he says, the enemies of Christ may have sincerity and singleness of heart towards God.

Antinomian. Doth not he prove that Paul in his unregenerate estate was blameless as to the law's righteousness, Phil.3:6, and what Paul did against the Churches, he verily thought that he ought to do it. Acts 26:9. Was not this sincerity at least in his apprehension, had he not an eye in what he did to the glory of God? The Jews also had a zeal for God, but you wrong him in charging him for saying, that singleness of heart may be in the enemies of Christ; for he acquaints us what it is from Ephesians 6:5, singleness of heart is a doing what he does as unto Christ, and for the Lord's sake. And he says, the best shall find it difficult to find it in all they do.

Neonomian. I will show you the grounds of the mistake, because our goodness extends not to God for his profit, therefore he regards it not no more than dung and filthiness.

Antinomian. Notably hit, you should have said, because

he chargeth his angels with folly, therefore he will admire the righteousness of them that dwell in houses of clay. Job 4:18-19. A holier man than you could say, "if I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me; if I say, I am perfect, it shall also prove me perverse. Though I were perfect, yet would I not know my soul, I would despise my life." Job 9:20-21. "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" Prov.20:9.

Neonomian. Objection. Doth not Israel say, Isa.64:6, all our righteousness is as filthy rags? Answer. But that is spoken of persons, and not of real holiness; it's the same as Mic.7:4 & Isa.1:6, corruption had invaded the very priests, and the generality of the best professors, &c.

Antinomian. But where have you this notion upon the place? I will tell you where you had it, viz., in the Assembly's Annotations on the place. The Annotator takes notice of variety of opinions about the meaning of this place, and to increase the number, he brings in his singular opinion that has less ground than all the rest. He tells us, by righteousness some understand legal rites and sacrifices, but so performed by them, that they found no grace or acceptance, but were abominable in God's sight; and the Jews extend it further to their good works, which were so ill done out of vain-glory, or by corrupt grounds and ends, that they were as filthy rags in God's sight, such were the Pharisees, &c. Lastly, many of ours draw it in further, and take in all the best works and actions even of the best performed, in the best manner, as not free from some default or defilement. And thus both divers of the ancients, and very many not Protestants only, but Popish writers also, and not a few, do both expound and apply the place, and these latter, {viz., the Popish writers,} with those ancients, giving testimony thereby unto the truth herein maintained by us against those of their side, that do herein deride and oppose us.

Is this interpretation so generally received by learned Interpreters, ancient and latter, both Papists and Protestants, by the annotator's own Confession, and so eminent a truth which the Papists oppose, maintained against them by it? And shall we desert so plain, natural, and useful an interpretation, and one so generally agreed on by learned Protestant interpreters, to embrace one single man's opinion that sets by the text as altogether useless to those great purposes for which the Protestants have used and refuted the Papists by their own authorities, as the annotator himself acknowledgeth? And for what sense and interpretation must we part with it? The received sense, our Annotator's design is to wave that received sense upon any terms, though he will not flatly deny it, but tells us of a more genuine sense, and what's that? 1. It's that which is not commonly received, and therefore he is single in it. 2. It's a

tropical sense, he makes the abstract put for the concrete, and what need of such a sense, when there's no reason to suppose such a trope in the words? And that's against the general rules of interpretation. He says, that which induced those both ancient and later writers to bring within compass of this doom, in this place, those defects and defaults adhering to, and alloying the purest practices of the most sincere, seems to have been, because the Prophet says, our righteousnesses, as speaking in his own person, &c. He says, the words may well be understood, with those Jewish Doctors, for those semblances of holiness and righteousness that was among them, {so that by our righteousness may well be understood, our hypocrisies,} but he rather recommends his genuine sense, and what's that? The prophet has a very remote meaning, viz., he speaks of our righteousnesses, and he means righteous men, and not righteous men neither, but wicked and corrupt men, briars and thorns, such as the Prophet Micah speaks of, Mic.7:4, plain briars and thorns; and now here's a plain text of Scripture merely shamed off, and delivered up into the hands of the Papists, and so we shall trick off one text after another, till they have got them all.

I acknowledge that which the Jewish interpreters say, the Prophet personates the Church in this prayer; but then he personates the very best of them, as well as the very corrupt and degenerate part, for after the Churches desire, that God would wonderfully appear for her deliverance and reformation, as formerly he had done, Isa.64:1-3, she lays the case of two sorts that were among them before the Lord; the holy and sincere, and the corrupt and apostate part, the basket of good figs, and of rotten figs; for the best part, {they were not profane, nor hypocrites,} but are characterized, as waiters upon God, partakers of special grace, as appears by the application the Apostle makes of verse 4, in I Cor.2:9. The Prophet insists upon the description of them, that we might not be mistaken; and suppose that he meant the profane or hypocritical part, they are such as work righteousness, and God meets, that rejoice in God's ways; and though they are under national wrathful calamities, yet such as should be saved; which must be understood of spiritual salvation, for they were to take their share with others in the captivity, and external calamities in them were continuance; hence the holiest and best prostrate themselves, and acknowledge their faith of salvation was not built upon any righteousness or worthiness of their own. For the nation had not only sinned, but they had sinned and fallen short of their duty in their best performances, and we are so far from pleading or rejoicing in our own righteousness, or holiness, {for in the Old Testament dialect, personal holiness is often called

righteousness,} that we are all as an unclean thing, we are polluted with so much sin and corruption, and our very righteousness and holiness are as filthy rags, our goodness is as the morning-dew, we fade as a leaf towards autumn, and our iniquities have withered us. We see, the whole Nation, under the biting winds of thy displeasure for its iniquities; and then he proceeds to show how great a scarcity there was of those that were sincere, for there's few that call upon God, there's none, i.e., but a very few comparatively, {there was never so an apostate time but there's some, as in Elijah's time,} that calleth upon thy name, i.e., sincerely and earnestly, so as to stir up themselves to call upon God; then she proceeds to confess sin, and bemoan herself in regard of desolating calamities, acknowledging God's justice and sovereignty, but appealing to his mercy, and their interest in God as a Father, O Lord thou art our Father. Its most evident then the Prophet mostly personates the choicest, though the least part of the Church, who is set forth here, flying to the throne of grace, and renouncing her own righteousness, even her best duties, accounting them as filthy rags. We are, says she, all of us, even the holiest among us, as filthy rags; he does not say, we are absolutely an unclean thing, as all wicked men and hypocrites are, but that we are, as if it were so, in respect of the prevalency of corruption, and present decay, and thy dealing with us as if thou wouldst cast us off, and all our righteousness as a filthy garment, i.e., all our righteousness, of what sort soever it is contaminated, as removed as unclean and polluted before the Lord. The import is, that God's children see so much corruption and pollution in their best duties, that they dare not plead them for acceptance before the Lord. And how many ten thousand times has this place of Scripture been thus applied by the saints and Churches of the New Testament? What expression is more frequent in their prayers, and more eminently exalting the grace of God, and the righteousness of Christ? It's not only the Gospel spirit of Ministers, but of all true Christians, that leads them to the practical improvement of this portion of Scripture; and shall the universal spirit and sense of all believers in all ages be condemned by one or two singular men, that are for crying up their own righteousness, and will not have it to be filthy rags, or dung? I apprehend, there's not a little also in putting the plural number, which the seventy-two explain universally so, that there's no righteousness of ours, inward, or outward, before regeneration, or after, that hold the test before God in itself for acceptance, much less render us acceptable to God. I will set against your annotator the Dutch Annotations, who upon this place say, all our righteousness, all our best works, or whatever good we might have done, are as a cast garment, if they should

be examined according to their own nature, according to the rigor of the Law, out of Christ. Phil.3:8. See on the contrary what we are in Christ Jesus. "And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." Rev.19:8.

Neonomian. Objection. The Apostle says, "yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ." Phil.3:8. Answer. If this place speaks of Gospel righteousness, as his own things which he counted dung, it does not prove that holiness is dung.

Antinomian. Did I not speak of holiness abstractly considered, and of duties and services performed by us, and mingled with sin, are reckoned dung because they cannot render us acceptable to God, for imperfect righteousness cannot. Holiness entire without defect and failure is one thing, and holiness mixed with so much sin and corruption, as is in our hearts and duties, is another.

Neonomian. All that it can infer, is, that in comparison with winning Christ, it was esteemed as dung.

Antinomian. That is as much as to say, that your own righteousness is but as dung in comparison of what you shall gain by it; your bargain will be so good, your money bears not proportion to the estate that you have bought with your money.

Neonomian. And who must not own, that compared with gaining Christ, the best thing in us is vile, compared with his righteousness, yet it must not be vile in itself?

Antinomian. So far as anything is sinful its vile, and so far its unprofitable to the end that I employ it; its vile in both those cases; our duties are vile, because it's impossible they should be a justifying righteousness, or recommend us to God, therefore a Christian looks upon them vile upon this account; we speak not against duties, but for them, but they must not presume to be our righteousness for justification. Upon this account they must be reckoned dung, it is not enough to say, compared with Christ's righteousness, as if Christ's righteousness were better, and had a preeminence in justification, and ours next to it, but that our righteousness has no share at all in that matter, for God never intended that the most eminent graces and virtues of God's people should ever be a righteousness to justify them, because they are upon this account rejected, as bricks are to the making a brass kettle, {"the god Mercury is not to be fashioned from just any piece of wood," Horace,} a man cannot cut out the wheels of a watch with a broad ax out of a rock.

Neonomian. As rivals with Christ we must hate Father

and Mother.

Antinomian. Yea, and if they go to set themselves instead of Christ, or to claim an inferior degree of share in being a righteousness, or patching up a righteousness for us.

Neonomian. Though I own the imputed righteousness of Christ for our justification, yet I think to ground it on this place, is a damage to the truth, and therefore I add, that a Gospel holiness, or righteousness, is not here intended by dung.

Antinomian. How you own imputed righteousness, has been already made manifest, and that you do not own it in other sense than in that which is no owning of it, but denying of it, has appeared; but it seems you are now such a friend to that doctrine, that you would not have Scripture to damage it, and that grounding it here on this place has been a damage to it. The Assembly at Westminster has done damage to the doctrine of Imputation, in grounding it on this place, {Large Catechism, Question 72; Shorter Catechism, Question 33,} and Dr. Ames in his Medulla; and Dr. Owen, you also have done damage to this doctrine of Imputation, by grounding it on this text, {Treatise of Justification, pg.526,} Mr. Calvin, Mr. Beza, Mr. Zanchy, and all you Reformed Protestants, you have thought you had a mighty place to ground the doctrine of Imputation upon, and now our divines, especially this gentleman, and a great train at his heels, bear witness against you, and say, you have done a great damage to the doctrine of Imputation, by making use of this place of Scripture to prove it. Now I see others are mistaken as well as I.

Calvin. I observe gentlemen, that you all sit astonished to see that at such a time of day, here should be so bold an assertion made, to overthrow the doctrine of the Gospel, and to make this text of Scripture no better than dung, because it asserts all our own righteousness to be dung in the point of Justification. I think Bellarmine, or Socinus, could not have made a more gross assertion. There is a Gentleman, whose face I think I see among you, whom I would request to undertake Mr. Neonomian in the opposition that he makes against this portion of Scripture; I think I remember where and against whom he once made a strenuous defense of it. Gentlemen its Mr. Antisozzo, {Vincent Alsop, 1630-1703,} I speak to, I pray, Mr. Antisozzo be pleased to appear in this great debate that lies before us.

Antisozzo. I pray Sir excuse me, here are more Ancient divines, Mr. Zuinglius, and Mr. Musculus, &c., and later Dr. Owen, whose judgment Mr. Neonomian ascribes much to.

Calvin. Indeed, Sir you cannot be excused; at which all cried, Mr. Antisozzo.

Antisozzo. Gentlemen, I will assure you, it is not

convenient by any means that I should appear in this cause now against Mr. Neonomian. He is my special friend, one whose learning and judgment I will as soon subscribe to, by an implicit faith, as any man I know, besides there's a particular reason that is not convenient to publish.

Calvin. Sir, those things are but your modest evasions, the society will not be satisfied, unless you undertake Mr. Neonomian in this point.

Antisozzo. If it must be so, it must be so, Mr. Neonomian look to your hits, for I will assure you I will not spare you; I will have none of your shifts and tricks, none of your whethers nor neithers; I will have the question fairly stated; the main question will be, what was that righteousness which the Apostle renounces, from having any place in his justification before God? Upon this one hinge turns all the controversy betwixt us.

Neonomian. I answer, the things which he renounceth were Jewish privileges, and that conceited Christ-less righteousness which he once valued as those dogs at present did, but it was not that Gospel holiness which by the grace of Christ he was now partaker of. There's an objection I know lies against this assertion, and it is this; how does both these appear? I answer, from the whole scope of the chapter.

Antisozzo. I suppose then we shall join issue, and your objection which you make was but a question, which you ask yourself and answer. We say and affirm, that the righteousness which the Apostle renounces, is whatever inherent righteousness he had attained or could attain, whatever obedience he has performed or could perform to the commands of God. That which he calls his own righteousness, he tells in the next words.

Neonomian. Thereby he intends not sinless obedience nor Gospel sincerity, but a life not to be blamed by the rule of the Jewish pedagogy, that's his righteousness.

Antisozzo. It was that which is from law, from a law, from any law indefinitely; now a righteousness which is from a law, is such an one as the law urgeth, and presses upon and prescribes to the conscience; but that, without question, is an internal conformity of the soul to the holiness of the law; but this the Apostle rejects, therefore he rejects internal and inherent righteousness. Who doubts but when he says his own righteousness, it is his own righteousness; and this is not to be fetched from some sorry conjectures which men {when they are in straits} invent to avoid present ruin, but from stable, fixed, constant use in Scripture; my own righteousness is as my own or your own works taken for real sincere conformity of heart and life to a law; and this is the fixed use in Scripture. Gen.30:33. My righteousness shall answer for me. You Mr. Neonomian would

paraphrase upon it thus, my roguery shall answer for me. "My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go; my heart shall not reproach me so long as I live," Job 27:6, my righteousness I hold fast, i.e., you would say, my hypocrisy I hold fast, Matt.5:16, that men may see your good works, i.e., in the new glossary, your complement. "O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name; for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies," Dan.9:18, we present not our supplications before thee for our righteousness; the Church must not mean real righteousness, but the skeleton of obedience. Now if the Apostle designed only to reject his own hypocrisy, he was not so barren in expression, but he could have fitted it with its proper name. The Apostle expressly renounceth whatever he had attained before and after his conversion, verse 7, the things that were gain, these I accounted loss for Christ; but is that all? No! Yea, doubtless, I do account all things but loss, I do now account, I have accounted, all things in Judaism loss when I was first convinced; and I do now account all things, even mine own righteousness, loss and dung for Christ; and there the Apostle riseth higher in his earnestness, verse 8, yea, doubtless, did I say that I once looked upon all as loss for Christ? I will speak a bolder word than that, I count all but loss, dung and filth, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness; and the little value he had for his own righteousness further appears, that it was in reference to the day of judgment.

Neonomian. My own righteousness can signify no more than my Pharisaical righteousness, or that wherein I placed my righteousness.

Antisozzo. I beg your pardon, Sir, it signifies more than that wherein he placed his righteousness, whilst a Pharisee; and a great deal less than that wherein he placed his righteousness after conversion, in order to justification; but if the Apostle renounced whatever he placed his righteousness in, then either he placed it in inherent righteousness, or not; if not, how dare you place it where he durst not? If he ever did place his righteousness in it, then he here openly declares to the world that he renounces it.

Neonomian. But there's no necessity to understand this of inherent Gospel-holiness, for that is not his own righteousness which is of the law, which is opposed to that which is by the faith of Christ; an external righteousness serves most men's turns very well; and this is that whereby the Pharisees expected to be justified.

Antisozzo. The Pharisees were generally bad enough,

and you need not make them worse. It's a sin, we say, to belie the Devil; it does not appear that the Pharisees expected to be justified before God by an external obedience only, without sincerity. As to Paul, whilst he was a Pharisee he was no hypocrite, he everywhere vindicates himself, Acts 25:8-9; I Tim.1:13; Acts 23:1, and others of the Pharisees were sober, conscientious men. And the discourse of Paul's Master Gamaliel, shows, he had a great deal more religion in him, than most of those who carry on a design to rail at them for hypocrisy.

Neonomian. But I'll tell you what his righteousness was, circumcised the eighth day, of the seed of Abraham, and it consisted only in some external rites, sacrifices, privileges, &c.

Antisozzo. This proceeds upon a double false supposition. 1. That the Apostle renounceth nothing but what he retained while a Pharisee. 2. Whatever he renounced did constitute his Pharisaical righteousness. 1. I must cut him off from circumcision, that was no part of his own righteousness, unless you have a spice of the doctrine of imputing the righteousness of another person for justification. 2. For sacrifices, the Apostle mentions them not, knowing they were the visible Gospel of the Jewish Church, and did lead to Christ. As to his being of the stock of Israel, of the seed of Abraham, &c., they might expect some favors thence; but that any were so far bewitched as to believe, that all the stock of Israel and the nation of Abraham should be justified, cannot be proved. 4. For civility and blamelessness of conversation, it may be it may go a great way in your account.

But I find you take but little notice of it here, but place Paul's righteousness, which he renounced, with that of Baal's priests, the concision, his rejection of Christ, opinion of Jewish observation, and abuse of the Mosaic frame, a fine parcel of righteousness; he surely misnamed it; he should have called that his wickedness and villainy. But whatever Paul was or was not, whilst a Pharisee, it makes no great matter to the business in hand, seeing he has so freely and openly disowned whatever was his own righteousness after conversion, in the matter of justification before God.

Neonomian. But righteousness by the faith of Christ is internal righteousness, Gospel-holiness, this is not dung; and this was not of the law opposed to the faith of Christ; nay, this is by the faith of Christ, Acts 15:9, and we are created in Christ to this holiness, &c.

Antisozzo. Ay, but proof, proof, is wanting; it's called being born again, rising again with Christ, &c., but proof, proof, is wanting; for we think that those expressions do not denote that righteousness whereby we are constituted just in the sight of God, but holiness and sanctification of nature, which the

Gospel evidently distinguishes from that righteousness whereby we are justified. Paul who rejects the righteousness of the law in the matter of justification before God, rejects also inward purity and holiness of mind for that purpose. Does the righteousness of the law, signify one thing in the New Testament, and another in the Old? Doth it signify real, substantial, internal righteousness in the Old, and external ritual righteousness in the New? Sincerity in the one, and hypocrisy and ceremony in the other? This is very unaccountable.

Neonomian. But the Apostle tells us, that by his own righteousness, he means the righteousness of the law; and by the righteousness of God, the righteousness of faith.

Antisozzo. I see you are for finding out an antitheses in the words, as somebody else was. The Apostle's words are very clear, but you find it necessary to obscure them, and deprave the truth. But thus far we are secure, that the Apostle has repudiated his own righteousness from justification; and that we may not doubt what that was, he tells us, it was that of the law; the righteousness of the law is what it commands and prescribes, viz., an exact conformity to the Law of God, in spirit, soul and body, so far as is attainable. He assures us in the next place what he owns and adheres to, viz., the righteousness of Christ, which is called the righteousness of God. He further acquaints us how we come to be interested in this righteousness, it is by faith; and that we do not willfully and ignorantly mistake this faith, for the doctrine of Faith he assures us, it is believing, by which we become assured of this righteousness. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom.3:24.

Neonomian. I will set a cross upon you the next time I print my book, Mr. Antisozzo; and, if you please, let us hear what Dr. Owen says; I wish he had undertaken the point in Mr. Antisozzo's room, he would have been more favorable to my opinion; for I prove my whole scheme out of him, especially my conceptions about the doctrine of Imputation.

Calvin. I pray Dr. Owen let us hear your sentiments in this great point, and with as much softness as may be; for Mr. Neonomian thinks Mr. Antisozzo was too hard and sharp upon him.

Dr. Owen. I shall reduce what I have to say to that admirable text, Phil.3:8-9, to the ensuing heads, which deserves to be written in every Bible in letters of gold, though Mr. Neonomian with some others, lay it so low. 1. That which the Apostle designs in this chapter is to declare what it is on the account whereof we are accepted with God, and have cause to rejoice; and this he fixes on in general, viz., an interest in and participation of Christ by faith, in opposition to all legal privileges

and advantages wherein the Jews boasted. 2. He supposeth that unto our acceptance before God, wherein we are to rejoice, there is a righteousness necessary, and whatever it be, is the sole ground of that acceptance. 3. He declares, there is a twofold righteousness that may be pleaded and trusted unto to this purpose. Our own righteousness, which is of the law. That which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith, these he asserts as opposite and inconsistent, as unto the end of our justification before God. 4. Placing the instance in himself, he declares which of them it was he adhered unto, and placed his confidence in. And in handling this subject, some things engaged his holy mind into an earnestness of expression in the exaltation of one of these, viz., the righteousness which is of God by faith. A. This was the turning point whereon he and others had forsaken their Judaism; this therefore was to be secured. "We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law, for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Gal.2:15-16. B. Hereupon there was a great opposition made to this doctrine in all places by the Jews. C. The weight of the doctrine itself. 5. Hence in many other places of his writings, but especially in this he treats of these things with a greater earnestness and vehemency of spirit than ordinary; thus, he speaks of the excellency of the knowledge of Christ. In his expression of all other things that are our own, that are not Christ's, whether privileges or duties, however good, useful, excellent, they may be in themselves; yet in comparison of Christ and his righteousness, and with respect unto the end of our standing before God and acceptance with him, with the same vehemence of spirit he casts contempt upon them, calling them dogs meat.

Neonomian. Pray, Sir, does the Apostle with vehemency renounce works wrought in faith, evangelical works?

Dr. Owen. Answer. In the matter of justification, the Apostle opposes evangelical works, not only unto the grace of God, but unto the faith of believers. 2. He makes no distinction that works are of two sorts, some excluded from justification, and not others; but he expressly rejects his own righteousness, i.e., his personal inherent righteousness, whatever it be and however it be wrought. 3. He makes a plain distinction of his twofold estate. 1. That of Judaism before conversion. 2. He proceeds to give an account of himself and estate after conversion. The words of Davenant on this passage, in my judgment, are sober and weighty. The Apostle here teacheth what that righteousness is whereby we are accepted before God,

viz., which is apprehended by faith. He shows the cause why it is ours by right, {i.e., the Apostle shows it in this place,} because we are inserted into his body, and coalesce with him into one person; therefore his righteousness is reputed ours. For whereas some begin to interpret our being in Christ, and being found in him, so as to intend no more but our profession of the faith of the Gospel; the faith of the Catholic Church in all ages, concerning the mystical union of Christ and believers, is not to be blown away with a few empty words and unproved assertions. The answer then is full and clear unto the general exception, viz., that the Apostle rejects our legal, but not our evangelical righteousness. 1. The Apostle rejects neither absolutely, but in comparison of Christ, and with respect to the special end of justification before God or a righteousness in his sight. 2. In that sense he rejects all our own righteousness, but our evangelical righteousness, in the sense pleaded for, is our own inherent in us, performed by us. 3. Our legal and evangelical, in the sense pleaded for, is the same. 4. The Apostle rejects, in this case, all the works of righteousness that we have done, Tit.3:5, but our evangelical righteousness consists in the works of righteousness, which we do. 5. He disclaims all that is our own. {See more in my Treatise of Justification.}

Here the society was adjourning, but that a worthy divine acquaints Mr. Calvinist, that he saw Mr. Richard Vines in a corner, whereupon Mr. Calvinist returned. There is none here but has a venerable esteem for that famous divine, unless Mr. Neonomian, who will however {if he finds he is against him} be so ingenuous as to knock under the table. Sir, we beseech you lend us your help here against this confident Neonomian, and new Divinity, and in defense of the Apostle Paul, whose doctrine he is making dung of, trampling it down as mire in the streets.

Mr. Vines. {"Christ, a Christian's Only Gain; the Excellency and Desirableness of the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, Above all Other Things whatsoever," 1660, by Richard Vines.} After the Apostle had in the beginning of this Church fortified the Christian Philippians with a caveat against such as did yet stand upon and pretend their circumcision, and their Jewish prerogatives, in opposition to Christ; after this, he gives a threefold account of himself. 1. He shows what account he had of himself in respect of those privileges that others did insist upon, &c. 2. He shows what account he had of himself, when Christ was discovered to him, &c. 3. He shows what account he had of himself, in respect of perfection.

You have heard what reckoning the Apostle had of his own righteousness in his unregenerate state, and upon the discovery of Christ unto him, he came to a loss of all that which before he counted gain. Now, in this verse, he goes on to show

you what account he had still of Christ, and of all things besides Christ, after some strength, and experience he had of Christ; yea, doubtless, any more than so? Yea, and more than that, I account them still; it is a rhetorical speech, wherein the Apostle riseth higher in his expression with greater overflow of affection, verifying all things besides Christ as loss and dung; he repeats it three times over, {a note of affection,} I count all things loss, I have suffered the loss, I account them but dung, and then it is for Christ, and that Christ who is my Lord. Suppose the Apostle had been thus spoken to, 'tis true, you forsook all your former gains, and you professed all should go for Christ; yourself, your wealth, your zeal, your righteousness in the law, you valued all as nothing, while Christ was new and fresh in your memory, and before you had tasted of his yoke and cross. But what say you now, Paul? Now you have been beaten with rods, stoned, shipwrecked, &c. II Cor.11:25. What now Paul, are you of the same mind still? Is not your courage cooled? Nay, doubtless, {says Paul,} I did, and I do, I am not changed, I do account all things, I reserve not one thing to lie between me and Christ; not my good works, not anything within me, nor without me, that I value or esteem; my righteousness, my obedience to the law, my fasting, my scourging, I count them but loss and dung for Christ, &c.

That gracious duties and performances of a man in the state of grace, are to be disclaimed in the matter of his justification, or his righteousness before God. The Papists will not hear this doctrine; for though, with much ado, they will quit their good works, that are done in an unregenerate state without and before faith; yet those works of a regenerate man, that are besprinkled with the blood of Christ, {here's your doctrine, Mr. Neonomian,} they will have them come in for their justification, for thus they say Christ merits for us, that we may merit for ourselves; that Christ is our Saviour, by making us our own saviours; Christ is our Justifier, by making us justify ourselves; he gives us money, and we lay it down, what is this? It is to keep up good duties, {say they and you,} which otherwise would fall to the ground; whereas the true spring and whetstone of obedience to God, is faith and love, and thankfulness upon the apprehension of the pardon of our sins; let a man have Christ for his righteousness, and let a man be ungodly if he can; the love of Christ constraineth us, &c.

Proof of doctrine. 'Tis for the gaining of Christ, that a Christian counteth all things in the world as dung, and suffereth the loss of all things. It's a strange trade, that a man must lose to gain; he must be a beggar and bankrupt, that he may be rich; he must be nothing, that he may have Christ. Yea, his works after grace received; all that I did know, and all that I do know

still, I do count them but as dung, that I may win Christ. There is nothing can be done in a man, that proveth him to be out of wrath any further than it proveth him to be in Christ. In this argument lies all the strength that Christ is yours, and that you are Christ's, what other arguments otherwise you have, that will not prove this point, are all but fallacies, and your hopes are but hopes of sand. Dress up yourselves in the best attire you have, virtue, civility, learning, excellent parts, let them paint over the rotten face of corrupt nature never so curiously, will all this prove, that you shall be saved? The Apostle counteth all this but stuff and lumber, trash, loss and dung for Christ. Can you climb Heaven by any ladder of nature's erecting? What ladder reacheth to Heaven, but Jacob's ladder, which was a type of Christ?

Let me come to the graces of God's Spirit. They prove, that you are out of the state of wrath, that you shall be saved; but how do they prove it? Not as the causes thereof. Does your grace, that is in you, satisfy the justice of God, and redeem you from the curse, and pay the ransom? Is it your title for salvation? Do you pretend to have him upon the worth of your graces? Like a man that's questioned about his land, goes about to prove the worth of the land by the wax with which his deeds are sealed, the seal is more than the wax, therefore the Apostle says, not only we are translated, but hereby we know we are translated. Now how does grace signify to you, that you are out of wrath? As it evidences you to be in Christ, and so the sign bringeth you to the cause. If they prove but unto you the work of grace in your heart, and that you are in Christ, you need ask them no more, they have done enough, they have settled you upon a sure ground. The least dram of grace is worth a 1000 ton of such kind of stuff of moral righteousness, which may be in you and not prove you to be in Christ. A little seal is worth a cart-load of wax, because it seals more to me than the wax is worth; so the least dram of grace, wrought in a man that is in Jesus Christ, is worth a world of moral duties, because it seals evidences, pardon of sin, favour with God; therefore examine yourselves that you take not a human-faith for a saving-faith, &c.

That I may be found in him, that I may know him. In these two expressions is comprised that which he calls the gaining of Christ. To be found in Christ, that he refers to justification, or the making a sinner righteous before God; therefore he says, not having mine own righteousness, but the righteousness of God, which is the faith of Christ. To know Christ, refers to sanctification, as it is expressed in three things; the power of his resurrection, the fellowship of his sufferings, conformity to his death. That I may be found in him, &c. In this verse you have two great things expressed; union with Christ, that I may be found in him; righteousness with God, having the

righteousness of God. There is a distribution of righteousness into two sorts, legal, evangelical. These two sorts are first described what they are; legal, mine own righteousness, which is of the law; evangelical, the righteousness of God, which is by the faith of Christ. 2. Being described, they are opposed the one to the other; the one is of the law, the other is by the faith of Christ; they are set contrary, because they cannot be had together. 3. There is a disclaim of the one, not having my own righteousness, which is of the law; and an adherence to the other, the righteousness of God by faith in Christ.

Doctrine. In the gaining or having of Christ, the first thing is union; this word in Christ notes union, as II Pet.3:14, be diligent, that ye may be found in him; union must be before communion; Christ is a great mystery; Christ and his people are all like one great tree, he is the stock and root, and they are the twigs, planted in that great stock; and they two live like one great body, as the head and members; they are alike, as man and wife are one flesh, so Christ and his people are one spirit; as man and wife are one person in law, so are Christ and all that are in him; they cannot be cast into Hell, because the sentence must light upon Christ, before it falleth upon them.

Antinomian. How does this agree with your doctrine, that the state of men in this life is not eternally decided, but they are in a state-trial, as subjects in trial for eternity? The grossest divinity that ever Protestant delivered, before which both the true Protestant doctrine of election and redemption and union to Christ must fall to the ground, if it be true.

Mr. Vines. I come to the 2nd thing in the words, the distribution of righteousness into legal and evangelical. Doctrine. There are two sorts of righteousness, legal and evangelical, the one of the Law, the other of the Gospel; for that which we call righteousness with God, is the same which we call Gospel or Evangelical righteousness, which is plain. "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, the just shall live by faith." Rom.1:17. Now do not stumble at this, do not think I mean {as you do Mr. Neonomian} that there are two sorts of righteousnesses which a sinner may be justified by, for by one righteousness we are justified with God. Rom.5:18. But when I say there are two sorts, it is to be understood thus; there are but two sorts of righteousnesses by which life at any time has been attained, there never was a third righteousness whereby a man should be righteous with God, ever propounded to man standing or falling. Where's your subordinate righteousness now? There are, there have been, there can be no more; the one is his own, the other is that which is called the righteousness of God. Now to describe these two sorts of righteousness. See Romans 1:17 & 10:10-11. These two, doing

and believing, are the characteristic words that describe these two sorts of righteousnesses, of the Law and of the Gospel. The righteousness of the law is only for the perfect man that never sinned, because it must be doing.

Neonomian. I could show there's no one saving benefit granted to a sinner, but upon supposition of his doing.

Mr. Vines. But I tell you, the righteousness of the Gospel is for a sinner, a sinner overwhelmed and overspread with sins.

Neonomian. But I say throughout my divinity, that the Gospel excludes sinners; and that the righteousness of Christ belongs to none but those that are first meet for it.

Mr. Vines. The righteousness of the Law is an exact compliance with the law of God in every tittle; the righteousness of the Gospel, is the righteousness of another, the righteousness of God in him; of another, in another. Now take this for a rule, what righteousness soever it be that justifieth a man with God it must be perfect, whether it be a righteousness of the Law or the Gospel. Again, it must be his own. Now that it is our own, it is not meant as if the Gospel righteousness was not ours; though it be not our own originally, yet it must be ours derivatively from Christ; it is not our own, being in us, but it is ours by imputation, imputed or accounted to us; it is not our own by works, but it is ours by faith; it is not our own of ourselves, but its ours of God.

Neonomian. Hold, not too much of that doctrine; you make us to be as righteous as Christ. This doctrine of imputing the very righteousness of Christ to us, I cannot down with; it's Christ's righteousness, but it cannot become ours but in the effect.

Mr. Vines. But I say the righteousness we stand upon must be perfect, and it must be ours; legal righteousness is perfect, if a man fall by one sin, whether in doing or misdoing the ladder is broken. On the other side, the righteousness of Christ, it is perfect; if it be not perfect, it cannot be righteousness; 'tis made a sinners by imputation.

Neonomian. My whole book is to prove this man's doctrine to be false.

Mr. Vines. Come on then, I will come to the demonstration, that there are but two sorts of righteousnesses, and by this point I must drive you and every man up into a corner; for a man must be brought to a choice of one of them, and if he standeth upon one of them, which is by the law he falleth, the point will drive you to a necessity of Christ and faith. Now that there are but two, will appear thus, the righteousness of the Law, and the righteousness of God, are described, named, distinguished. Rom.10:6-9. Now, mark, in Scripture you find these phrases and expressions; grace, free grace, Christ or redemption of Christ, the promise of the Gospel, faith, the

righteousness of God, you may find all these upon one file ranked together.

Neonomian. Ay, but I value one, if joined with a duty and benefit, before all those, according to my logic.

Mr. Vines. On the other side you shall find the law, works, our own righteousness, debt, our wages by debt, boasting and glorying; these make another file. There's no third, all must come under one of these files; if it be one, it's the righteousness of God by faith of Christ; if it be the other, it's the righteousness of the law by our own works. By this 'tis plain that there are but two sorts of righteousness. And, consider, the two Adams were certainly but two common roots, and the foundation of two Covenants, the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace.

Neonomian. Stay there, I deny all that doctrine.

Mr. Vines. But I'll go on, the Adams being two, consequently the Covenants are two, and consequently the righteousnesses are of two sorts, and no more. You confound Law and Gospel; learn the difference between Law and Gospel, {it is of the greatest consequence,} most useful to the conscience of man in the world, to the settlement of an estate in regard of life and salvation to his soul; law promises life and salvation to the doer, upon condition of perfect and perpetual obedience. The Gospel freely promises justification to everyone that believeth in Christ.

Neonomian. But this believing is doing.

Mr. Vines. This Gospel righteousness excludeth works as any cause in the world, by which you should be justified with God. Many will be looking for good tidings from the Law, which is only brought to you, as the olive-leaf in the mouth of the Gospel. Doctrine. These two sorts of righteousnesses are inconsistent and opposite the one to the other, not having mine own, but having the righteousness of God. The Scripture is full of their oppositions and contrarieties; for if you mark, it's said to be of the obedience of one by which we are made righteous, not the obedience of two, viz., mine own and Christ's together, but one directly. "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom.5:21. And do you see everywhere a plain opposition between faith and works, the law and faith, works and grace? 1. It is excluded as matter of our righteousness with God; for that which is the matter of our righteousness with God is the obedience of Christ. Now to bring your own righteousness into this place, as the matter of your righteousness with God, is to mingle your obedience with Christ's. So it's not the obedience of one but the obedience of two. 2. It's excluded as the motive to move God; if you bring your own righteousness into this place, you mingle it with free grace. "Being justified freely by his grace

through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom.3:24. If you make it any motive you must bring it into the place of Jesus Christ. 3. It's excluded as the instrument which should receive the righteousness of God; if you bring it into this, then you bring it into the place of faith; for faith is only the hand that taketh hold of the Gospel righteousness; therefore, he says, the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ. Now if there be no room for these three, it followeth 'tis thrust out a doors.

Neonomian. Then you may thrust me and my book both out of doors, for it has been my design wholly throughout my book to establish this righteousness of our own these three ways. 1. To join it with the righteousness of Christ in justification, under the name of subordinate righteousness, and a condition, &c. 2. To foist it into the grace of God as a motive under the name of meetness. 3. To give it the same place and nature in justification, as faith, in that I make faith to justify as its doing, and as a working condition.

Mr. Vines. Out of this description we shall take up four points. 1. They that are in Christ have righteousness with God; there's an emphasis in the words, they that are in Christ have the righteousness, the only righteousness, &c. The Papists say, we have righteousness by works; we say we have it by imputation, yet they that have this righteousness by imputation, have it truly, and they are made righteous by it. They have this righteousness with God; mark, they have that which sets them right with God, into a state of favour and acceptation, that which discharges all guilt and condemnation. They have that which freeth them from every charge, every indictment, every sentence of the law of God; they have that which setteth them into friendship and peace with God, that which entitles them to eternal life and heaven. They have that, which although it does not take away the being of sin, yet it setteth them as free from hell as Adam in innocency, and setteth them upon a sure center; that righteousness wherein we stand, out speaks Adam, even Adam in his first integrity.

2. This righteousness which they have in Christ is the righteousness of God; this is a phrase frequent with the apostle Paul, and is almost peculiar to him. Now, mark, that righteousness whereby a poor sinner is made righteous with God is the righteousness of God, i.e., of a person who is God. "Behold, I will bring it health and cure, and I will cure them, and will reveal unto them the abundance of peace and truth." Jer.33:6. Not his essential righteousness, it's only that righteousness which is from God; that which God imputeth to us, that which he has provided, appointed and approved to be a satisfaction to his justice; that's the righteousness of God which God has made to

be so to us, and that is Christ. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." I Cor.1:30.

3. This righteousness of God is by faith; God has appointed this humble grace of faith to be in the hand of the receiver, which taketh hold of this righteousness of God. But now you must consider this faith not {as Mr. Neonomian does} as a habit or quality, but consider it in the office it has, as it is an instrument taking hold of Jesus Christ. Not, I say, as a habit for the worthiness of faith itself; for though it be said, by faith, it is not said, for faith; by it as an instrument of God, for hereby you come to the promises, and to Christ. It is a self-denying faith that casteth out pride, and self, and works, and cometh naked and poor to the rich promises of Christ, and there hanged, taketh hold and clasps fast.

4. This faith by which you have the righteousness of God is the faith of Christ, or {which is all one} of the which promises hold forth Christ, they are the object of this faith by which you have the righteousness of God; it's true, the object of faith is the whole word of God, and that does not justify because it works faith; the eye seeth other things besides the brazen serpent, but as it healeth it looketh to the brazen Serpent only, &c.

Now I come to the description of the other sort of righteousness. 1. There is a righteousness called our own, which is of the law. 2. Our own righteousness which is of the law is to be utterly disclaimed, our own in opposition to the righteousness of God which is by faith of Christ. As the righteousness of God is the very same with that which is by the faith of Christ, for they are all one; so our own righteousness is that which is of the law. Now that there is a righteousness which is called our own is evident from the righteousness of the law.

1. The righteousness of the law is nothing else but a conformity to the law. "But if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right." Ezek.18:5. "And the law is not of faith, but, the man that doeth them shall live in them." Gal.3:12. The duties which is the matter must be done with all the mind and strength, and all the soul. 2. What is meant by our own righteousness? It is that whereby we walk in some conformity to the law of God; and if you will have works done from a natural principle or power by the strength of moral virtues, by men out of Christ, this is indeed within ourselves, and this is our own righteousness, like that the Apostle calleth his gain before he knew Christ. But then for holy duties or works that are performed, which flow from a principle of renewing grace, this {say the Papists} is not our own righteousness. For the clearing this point, all your works that flow from sanctifying graces, in conformity to the law of God, all these come under the name of our own righteousness, not because it

is of our selves efficiently, but it is ours subjectively inherent in us. As Adam's righteousness, his own, though it came from an inward holiness and righteousness given him of God. Are not the fruits of the Spirit, as love, joy, temperance, are they not our own? They are our own or God's. If our own, then I have the point; if the righteousness of God, then you are justified by the fruits of the Spirit, and not by the righteousness of Christ imputed, which is the greatest error in Divinity. If the Apostle in this text had said, not my own righteousness, but the righteousness of God which is by repentance, love, hope, the fear of God, holy duties, then the Apostle had carried it clear against us; but he brings nothing that we have to join in concurrence to the righteousness of God and Christ; therefore, the Apostle leaves all our inherent graces and the works that issued from them in this text, to come under the name of our own righteousness. As the sin of the first Adam that was personally in guilt was likewise ours, so the righteousness of God is subjectively in Christ, and by imputation ours. Consider, then, all those works that proceed from sanctifying grace in you in order to conformity to the law of God, they may all come under this name and notion of my own righteousness.

Doctrine. 2. Our own righteousness is utterly to be disclaimed, that we may be justified by the righteousness of God. Mark the Scripture. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference." Rom.3:21-22. "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." Rom.4:6- 7. Christ pulleth down the righteousness of your selves, which had the chair before; the servant must not sit in the king's chair; so grace, though it be that whereby you may walk serviceable to God, yet you must not set it in the place of Jesus Christ. Yet the Apostle would not be without holiness, sanctification and obedience. One in Christ has virtue, holiness, &c., but how? As serviceable graces to walk with God, not as his righteousness with God; when the sun shineth the moon is put out, not out of her orb or course, but {as I may say} from her rule. So the righteousness of God when you come to be justified, does not abolish holiness and sanctification {for they are and must be there together} but the setting up obedience in the place of Christ's righteousness, as a cypher, is pulled down from the place of rule. How does that Apostle say, not having mine own righteousness? I answer, not having it as my righteousness with God, then I should put mine own in the place of Christ, not having it as concurrent with Christ.

That would make my righteousness co-partner with him, not having it as a motive to move him, then I should put my righteousness in the place of free grace; not having it as the instrument whereby I take Christ; no, for then I should put other graces in the place of faith. Well then, in a word, having holiness or righteousness as a stock to walk in the way of service to God, not having it as a means to buy my soul out of Hell. So you see the difference, that still we have it, and yet we have it not.

But why is our own righteousness, that is inherent in us, to be disclaimed? 1. Because it is a way impossible for a sinner to go to Heaven by, or to be righteous by; that ladder is too short, though it seem long enough to you that have some fragments of the Law. 2. Not having it, why? Because there is another righteousness {and not this} which is called the righteousness of God. There is another Adam, and that Adam has another righteousness for all to believe in, a Gospel righteousness which is not of the law. There is another Covenant God has appointed whereby a sinner must be just; now because there is another, not this. 3. Because one of these voids the other; if I have the righteousness of God, then mine own is void; if mine own, then the righteousness of God is void. As the Apostle says of grace, if works, not grace; and if grace, not works.

Calvin. Reverend Sir, we must from the bottom of our hearts most sincerely acknowledge, that it is a great piece of service that you have done to Christ, his Gospel, Church, and poor lost sinners, in this ample and distinct testimony which you have born to the truth; not only in plainly discovering Mr. Neonomian's corrupt and illiterate interpretation of this great portion of Scripture, and vindicating of it, but also in that you have subverted his whole scheme, laid open the rottenness of the principles he has so boldly asserted in his book, and showed the dangerous tendency of them.

Neonomian. This gentleman is much mistaken, and I could show where his mistakes lies.

Antinomian. You show his mistakes!

Neonomian. I believe him an able man, and that sometimes he was of my judgment, because Mr. Baxter dedicated his Aphorisms to him, and acknowledged that he was a fit censor of his doctrine.

Antinomian. It's true, one would think that piece of flattery and many others, had been enough to engage Mr. Richard Vines to subscribe to Mr. Baxter's opinion; but it was sufficiently known that instead of so doing, Mr. Vines seldom preached a sermon, wherein he did not make a strict inquisition after the Neonomianism that lay in his way, and cracked it as a man will crack a nut.

DEBATE XX.

OF GOSPEL AND LEGAL PREACHING.

Neonomian. I have this error further to charge upon Mr. Antinomian, viz., Gospel preaching {he says} is to teach men that they were as much pardoned and as acceptable to God always, as when they were regenerate; and while they are ungodly they had the same interest in God and Christ, as when they believe; neither can sin any way hinder their salvation or their peace; nor have they anything to do further either of them, Christ having done all for them, before any holy qualification or endeavour.

Antinomian. Here is a long charge, whether it be true or not, in part or whole, it will appear by the proof.

Neonomian. Crisp says, the more light and glory of the Gospel shineth in the true intention of God to his people, the more should they have joy and gladness; why may not then a believer say, the Lord has been bountiful to me, God has done everything in Christ, and taken away all things that can disturb my peace and comfort?

Antinomian. What is this to prove your charge? What is this to prove that I say, a man is as much pardoned and as acceptable to God always as when regenerate, while he is ungodly, &c? There's not any part of your charge here proved; for I speak of a believer, and that God has done all for him in Christ; and dare you say otherwise? But hear what I said, which you hide, lest your charge should appear false, at the first sight; you take only the concluding words of my sermon on Romans 10:2-4.

Objection. You will say, you know many of the people of the Lord Jesus, that walk sadly and disconsolately, not having this joy and gladness. I answer, there is nothing hinders the joy of God's people, but their sins; those, as they conceive, stand as a separation betwixt God and them. Oh they stand as a cooling card in all their joys and mirth. But when they return to Zion, they shall rejoice, in that they see that the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, has taken away all their sins, the scapegoat having carried them away into the land of forgetfulness, in that they see that all their transgressions are blotted out as a cloud, &c. When they shall come by the sight of the glory of the Gospel, and the light thereof, to behold this state, that Christ has brought them into, then all matter of sorrow and sighing shall fly away, and the bitterness of it shall be taken away; and then that which was the occasion of that bitterness shall vanish too. I do not say, that he is no believer, that has not this perfectly; far be it from

me, so to say; there are, that are believers, that are weak in faith, and there are believers strong in faith; the more the light of the glorious Gospel shines, &c.

Calvin. Mr. Neonomian, I wonder what a Gospel you preach, or would have others preach? Is not sin the hindering-cause of spiritual joy? Is it not God that blots out our sins, and remembers them no more? Is not the faith of this, the ground-work of all true joy? Have not some believers less, and some more, according as their faith is, and the light of the Gospel shines into their hearts? And do they not, by virtue of this joy and peace in believing, return to their rest? And may they not say, the Lord has dealt bountifully with me, as David did? May they not return to their rest, and sit down in the comforts of the Holy Ghost? The Lord has done all for me in Christ; who has made him wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. Is there anything you can rejoice in, but what is done for us, or wrought in us by Christ? That sin is taken away in the atonement and satisfaction of Christ, the great cause of my disturbance.

Neonomian. He says, here is first deliverance, and then service is the fruit of this deliverance, not deliverance the fruit of service, the tenor of the law runs thus, first do, and then live. The Gospel says, first live, and then do; do not think God gives Christ upon condition.

Antinomian. What's all this to the proving of your charge of error? It reacheth not the terms of your charge, if it were error. But, 2dly, where is the error? Doth he not clear it from plain Scripture, which you take no notice of, viz., Zacharias's Song, Luke 1:74-75? Do we serve God acceptably, before we are delivered from sin and Satan, through redemption and application? Can we serve God in holiness and righteousness, before we be delivered from our enemies? Will you run at all Scripture and Experience? Is it not true, that the law said to man, that had life and power concreated with him, do, and thou shalt live? And can this be the tenor of the Gospel, to say to a dead sinner, do, and thou shalt live? Can a man, dead in trespasses, do anything? Were it not madness to say to a dead corpse, walk, and thou shalt live? Doth not Christ first come as the resurrection and life to a sinner, before he can do anything? Do you think, that Christ comes to a sinner upon condition of anything he can do in his natural estate? What is more plain, than that life is the principle and cause of action, and not action of life? Christ himself says, a man must have life before he can believe; it's first in nature. "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." Jn.11:26. Now is the giving of Christ for life, the condition of our having life? Or our doing before we have Christ or life, the condition on which we have Christ and life?

Calvin. I think you have gained nothing, nor yet made any proof of your charge, unless you think it be in this, that the Doctor says we must live, before we can do. If you take that for an error, I pray do you try your skill the other way, to make men do before they live; and if you can attain to that art, either in naturals or spirituals, you will be the wonder of the world.

Neonomian. He says, the freeman of Christ has this freedom, Christ does all his work for him, as well as in him, &c., Christ does all for them, that God requires to be done.

Antinomian. You must know it is this I said. A freeman of Christ has this freedom, Christ does all his work for him, as well as in him. He that is in bondage under the law, must do everything himself, and that he does, he must do perfectly; that is an unsupportable thing and heavy bondage, for a man to have more laid upon him than he can bear. The freeman of Christ, considering that he is weak, poor and unable to work, Christ does all his work for him. The Holy Ghost tells us, he has done all our works in us, Isa.26:12, and in the margin it is rendered, for us. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom.5:19. Their freedom is, that they stand righteous in the sight of God by that which Christ has done for us; that they are as righteous as if they had done it in their own persons, &c. Thus I treat concerning the obedience of Christ unto a satisfactory righteousness on our behalf.

Objection. Doth not this take off men from all manner of obedience, and all manner of holiness? Answer. It takes them off from those ends that they aim at in their obedience, viz., the end for which Christ's obedience served, viz., our standing righteousness; as it concerns us in point of justification, consolation and salvation. We have our peace, we have our salvation only by the righteousness Christ has done for us; but this does not take away our obedience nor services in respect of those ends for which such services are required of believers, to glorify God, to evidence our thankfulness, to profit men, as ordinances to meet God in, to make good what he has promised; so far we are called out to services, and walking uprightly, exactly, strictly, according to the good pleasure of God; and in regard of such ends of services, there is a gracious freedom that the freemen of Christ have by Christ, i.e., so far as services and obedience are expected at a freeman's hands, there is Christ by his Spirit, present with such persons, to help them in all such kind of services; so that they become strong in the Lord, and the power of his might, to do the will of God. Mark what the Apostle speaks, I am able to do all things through Christ strengthening me. Of myself I am able to do nothing, but in Christ, and through Christ, that strengtheneth me, I am able to do all things, &c.

There's much more to this purpose. Now judge whether here's any ground for his accusation. He slanders me to the world, as if I taught a doctrine of licentiousness, and were against all duty; but it will appear otherwise plainly enough, if an impartial man reads my sermons, especially that sermon on I John 2:1-2.

Neonomian. He says, man will be mincing of this truth, and tell you, if you walk close to God, and if you refrain from sin, especially from gross sins, God will love you, and then you may apply these and these promises unto yourself; but God speaks plainly, before they had done good or evil, Jacob have I loved; the grace of God is passed over to men, as they are ungodly, &c. This is the grace of God revealed; he has exhibited it freely to men. Has the Lord given us commission to preach this Gospel?

Antinomian. In my discourse from I Jn.2:1-2, this objection is answered, viz., there are many that admire and adore the doctrine of the free-grace of God; and yet are notoriously known to live in all manner of lewdness and licentiousness, and upon this ground, because their sins are laid on Christ. The sum of the answer is, I confess I never knew any such monsters, &c. There are many taxed for such; but I cannot say anything to the truth of this charge by mine own experience, &c. But it may be there are such, and Paul speaks of such in his time, &c. But if there be such, I must tell you they are the greatest monsters upon the face of the earth, &c. And I dare boldly say they are the greatest enemies to free-grace, and that open drunkards, harlots, and murderers, come infinitely short of them in abominations, &c. But admit this, that the grace of God has been abused; has not the whole Scripture been abused, Law and Gospel? Is not Christ set for the fall and rising of many in Israel? Is he not a rock of offence? But in the meantime shall the children want their bread, because the dogs catch at it, &c? Shall not the Gospel be preached, because some abuse it?

Objection. But you will say, it may be done with caution and limitation. Answer. But let us not be more wary and cautions than God would have us to be, to put mixtures of men's doings to the obtaining the grace of God, while the Lord himself does pour out his grace to men simply for his own sake, without consideration of anything in them, men will be mincing this truth, &c. Then follows what you rehearse. And what does all this amount to, but what the Apostle John expressly speaketh, I Jn.4:10, and the Apostle Paul. Phil.2:13; Eph.2:22. That God's love and grace is the cause of all that which we do to his praise, and not our doing the cause of God's grace and love to us? Where grace first prevails, it finds a man a dead sinner, and raiseth him to newness of life; and such an one will not, nor shall abuse the grace of God to licentiousness. Now let all men judge how you have proved your charge, by what you have alleged from my

sermons. Where is it that I say, Christ believes for us, or repents for us? All that I say, is the words of the prophet, he works all our works for us in respect of mediation, and all our works in us in respect of application; he works us to believe and repent, &c.

Neonomian. He talks of justification and union to Christ before faith.

Antinomian. You fetch the same things over and over; these doctrines have been spoken to already, under the heads of justification by faith, and union.

Neonomian. But he tells us, ministers ought not to preach damnation; he says this likewise batters to the ground that way of urging men to holiness, which some hold forth; that if men do not these and these good works, and leave these and these sins, then they must come under the wrath of God, &c. The love of God constrains the faithful, and not the fear of wrath.

Antinomian. And is not that good doctrine, that the grace of God only teacheth holiness; and that a believer is not under the law, or the terrors thereof, for the learning of holiness, but under grace; and are not they the words of the Apostle? And does he not lay the constraining force of the love of God on our delivery from wrath, and tells us, that this is one great end of Christ's dying for us, that men henceforth should not live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them? It's a most grievous thing to see how you fly in the face of plain places of Scripture, with no small scorn and contempt. And these are my words concerning such preachers. They ought rather, after the example of the Apostle, to excite them to these good works, because they are already freed from wrath. Certainly this that I have delivered proves this sufficiently, that the appearing of the grace of God does teach men to do the will of God effectually; the love of God constrains the faithful, and not the fear of wrath. But to conclude, do not mistake me, in the meanwhile, I have no thoughts as if wrath and vengeance were not to be preached and made known even to believers; yea, beloved, wrath and vengeance is to be made known to them, and that as the deserts of sin, and as the means to keep men from sin; but not in that way men do ordinarily think, I mean thus, wrath and vengeance are not to be revealed as if believers were to fear them, or as if believers should come under them. But as believers are secured and freed from them, that so they should fear to commit and fall into sin, and not for fear of coming under wrath, but out of love, because God has been so gracious to them, as to deliver them from the weight of so heavy wrath and displeasure, &c.

Calvin. Have you no greater error remaining to charge Mr. Antinomian with? Methinks it seems as if you had pretty well spent your powder and ball, and we have spent a great deal of time in these debates which you have caused, and it will be time

now {as most of the society have told me} to put an end to them.

Antinomian. With all my heart, Sir, and I reckon myself obliged to render my thankful acknowledgments, that you have heard us with so much candor and patience.

Neonomian. I can't be ungentle neither, Mr. Calvin, you know me better than to think so; but I have one only humble request to make to you and this society, that before we finally part, you will hear me instruct Mr. Antinomian in the right way of preaching, and show him the true difference between Gospel and Legal preaching.

Antinomian. Sir, I doubt not but we shall differ as much about Gospel and Legal preaching, as we have done about the doctrine to be preached; for if we cannot agree about the doctrine that is to be preached, and that which is most for the exaltation of Christ and good of souls, it is not likely we should agree about preaching; therefore for that, as I conceive, it's a needless point {Mr. Calvin} for us to enter upon, because we must be necessitated to speak over the same things again in handling of it; however, if Mr. Neonomian be fond of such a discourse, I shall take the pains to give him my sentiments, and show how greatly he is mistaken; but for the present, I think we have proceeded as far as is needful in the foregoing debates; in which truth and error is so fully argued and cleared, that any unprejudiced person, that has a competent measure of understanding in the things of God, may easily thereby judge and conclude, what is Gospel, and what is legal preaching, and what exalts Christ most, and what least.

Calvin. Sir I think you have spoken much reason in what you have said; and I am of your mind that it would be impertinent, and but to what has already been done, to enter upon a debate about preaching; and I shall add, that it's not so proper for this Society as for the other yonder; and, besides, our amanuenses complain of the dearness of paper. I must tell you, the Calvinian Society is reduced to a small number, and are at a low ebb in the world at this day. But, I hope, the time is at hand, when the smoke that now fills the temple will be scattered, and the temple of God opened again, and the Ark of his Testament shall be seen. As for you Mr. Antinomian, you may now depart in peace, and rest in your grave till the Resurrection.

Antinomian. Yes, Sir, with all my heart, if Mr. Neonomian gives me no further disturbance; if he does, I shall soon be raised without conjuring, for I shall not lie very deep in the earth. However, if I do not, Christ lives, and shall triumph in his glorious Gospel over all opposers; and I find that there are not a few that will appear faithful assertors and defenders of these truths {against the most vigorous adversaries} through the assistance of God's grace, which are awakened thereto by

this attempt that has been made to set up another Gospel, and to feed us with the leeks and onions of spiritual Egypt. But before I depart, I would do one thing, i.e., I would make my will, if you think I am capable of it, and it is this, that a great grave be dug, and that Antinomianism, Neonomianism, Pelagianism, Popery, Socinianism and Arminianism be buried therein, 50 cubits deep.

Calvin. Who would make you executor?

Antinomian. I have such a respect for Mr. Neonomian, notwithstanding the pick he has had at me, that I would constitute him my executor, and this Society the overseers of my will; with this proviso, that if Mr. Neonomian do refuse, or do not well and truly execute this my last Will and Testament, in the agreed judgment of this society, that then the whole trust shall devolve upon the said society, which I doubt not but they will endeavour faithfully to perform.

Calvin. Mr. Neonomian. Will you accept of this executorship?

Neonomian. I do not know what power he has to dispose of the goods of other men; I take it to be great presumption in him, if not dishonesty, to dispose of other men's proprieties, seeing he renounceth them all.

Antinomian. Sir, I crave your pardon; I must confess, Mr. Calvin, he has given me a just rebuke; for when we met in the Utopian fields, finding me anonymous, he was so courteous as to lend me, or rather impose upon me, the name of Mr. Antinomian during my short converse here; he having two names himself he could lend me one for a little while, which as you see for conversation sake I have made use of, with an intention to return it; yea, in the meantime did declare, and did plead it against all men, that it was Mr. Neonomian's propriety, and, therefore, I now return it to him accordingly.

Neonomian. No, no, Sir, I gave you that name as your propriety, it best expressing your opinions.

Antinomian. Then, Sir, you will grant I have power to bequeath it in my last will, and I bequeath it to you.

Calvin. But by your favour, Sir, it's a judged case, and therefore you have not power to bequeath it; if you borrowed it, it's honesty to return it before you depart.

Neonomian. What do you mean by a judged case?

Calvin. I mean that Mr. Neonomian has before this society sufficiently given us to understand that his opinion is, that the moral law is vacated, and a new law brought into the room of it.

Antinomian. And more than that, there are certain divines in this city, great friends to this society, that have excepted against his principles as highly Antinomian. Therefore, take it as your own by law.

Calvin. Now, Sir, your great antagonist is withdrawn, I shall deal plainly with you, and briefly sum up the heads of these things wherein it has manifestly appeared, by the foregoing debates, that you have given abundant cause of just offence by your late writings. 1. That you have unjustly charged and misrepresented Dr. Crisp, by yourself, owned to have been a holy man. 2. That you have falsely stated those things which you call truths and errors. 3. That you have vented your own erroneous tenents, and endeavored to prove them agreeable to the Articles, Confessions and our Orthodox Protestant Writers, by perverting their sense, or misapplying what they say, when as they are most repugnant to you.

As to the said Doctor, you charge him unjustly with those things which are directly false; I shall give an instance or two of it. You say, this is one of his errors, that he says, that if the elect should die before they believe, yea, when they are under the dominion of sin, and in the practice of the grossest villainies, they are as much the sons of God, and justified, as the saints in glory. Whereas he expressly denies the truth of this charge in his vindication he makes of himself against some, who in his life-time, had reproached his doctrine and ministry as you do now.

They say, that I should affirm, that if an elect person should die a whoremonger and adulterer, &c., in all kind of profaneness, he shall be saved. He appeals to his hearers, whether ever they heard him preach any such doctrine; and declares it a gross, notorious and groundless slander. And his following words are, I said before, and say again, that there is no elect person, suppose him to be capable and come to years, shall die before he is called, i.e., before the Lord give faith to this person to believe, and in some measure frame him to walk by the Spirit according to the rule of the Gospel.

The second false charge is, that he should make Christ the real blasphemers, murderer, &c., and that he was so accounted of the Father. Whereas he asserts and vindicates the innocency of Christ's person; he says only that Christ was accounted a transgressor from a real transaction or imputation of our sins to him, in which doctrine the Scriptures are most full and express.

You likewise charge this error upon him, that Christ is offered to blasphemers, murderers, and the worst of sinners, that they remaining ignorant, unconvinced and resolved in their purpose to continue such, they may yet be assured they have a full interest in Christ; and this only by concluding in their own minds upon this offer that Christ is theirs. That Christ ought to be preached to the vilest of sinners, and they constrained to come unto him, is sound Gospel-truth, though you condemn it for an error. And is it possible a man of conscience can slander a

man {whom he owns to be holy} with such a notorious falsehood? That he should assert that Christ is offered to men, that they remaining ignorant, unconvinced and resolved in their purpose to continue such, might be assured of their interest in Christ, concluding only in their minds that Christ is theirs; this we have proved to be a notorious slander. Many other falsehoods have been proved.

As for misrepresentations they run throughout the whole book. 1. Of Dr. Crisp that you may abuse and expose him.

2. Of other noted writers and confessions, you have horridly misrepresented them to serve your turn, in asserting error and condemning of truth. In misrepresenting Dr. Crisp, you have either perverted his meaning, and only partially rehearsed his expressions, or else condemned what truth he asserts, and defends as great errors.

As to the first, we have sufficiently made it manifest in some instances in the first part, and it has abundantly been proved in the whole progress of our debates. And here it is not amiss to add a word or two to what is said to your error in the sixth debate, that you make a great cry and noise about, viz., that Dr. Crisp should say, that Christ, while he bore sin and was under the punishment thereof, was the object of God's abhorrence. The Doctor's words are that all that hatefulness and loathsomeness of sin is put upon Christ, that he stands as it were the abhorred of the Father for a time. 1. You leave out the words "as it were." 2. You improve this to a hatred of the person of Christ, and a separation of his natures, upon his using the word separation, as exegetic of forsaking, both Scripture expressions concerning sin and Christ. 3. You hereby manage your design of beating down the doctrine of Christ's bearing God's wrath and curse for us, as you do the doctrine of his bearing sin. 4. As to the word abhorred, upon a diligent enquiry we find it to be a Scripture expression concerning Christ, yea, and of Christ, under his sufferings of wrath and curse for sin; for though God never hated his person in the highest of his suffering {neither is it necessary any judge passing sentence on the worst criminal should hate his person} yet, his Father dealing with him in a judicial way by the eye and hand of justice, in this present state, and standing under the charge of sin, and thereby clothed, as it were, with filthy garments, is said to be as it were abhorred of God; and it's not only included in the word forsaken, the Syriac word Sabachthani, and taken from Psalm 22, where the word is used, signifying dereliquit, deseruit, and so rendered by the LXXII and the Evangelist; abhor being used by Classic Authors in the sense of being averse to a state or condition, and from that aversion to turn away from it or a person in it; so God having purer eyes than, in his justice, to behold or endure iniquity,

forsook and turned away, as it were abhorring his Son, standing under the charge of sin in that state and condition. And accordingly, as Christ considered in this respect and state of guilt and condemnation, is brought in prophetically by the prophet, speaking those words, and are actually applied to himself, by himself on the cross. Matt.27:46. So we see in another famous prophecy of this same state of his suffering, this word 'abhor' is used by our interpreters most properly. "Thou hast cast off, thou hast abhorred, thou hast been wrath with thine Anointed." Psal.89:38. The Hebrew has it with thy Messiah, and has it rendered abhorred, thou hast contemned or despised; and it's observable, that three such highly significant words should be here used in one verse, as expressive of the unspeakable weight of God's wrath and curse that lay upon him; thou hast deserted, thou hast abhorred, thou hast dealt in fury of wrath with thy Messiah.

In Dr. Abbot's defense of the Reformed Catholic, we have the following passages, the Prophet says, the Lord did lay upon him our iniquities; the Lord would break him, and make him subject to infirmities, that we may understand that God did not only leave him to the hands of men, but himself counted him with sinners, by the bearing of our sins, and therefore dealt with him himself accordingly. So that he had cause to cry out. Thine indignation lieth hard upon me, and thou hast vexed me with all thy storms. Lord, why abhorrest thou my soul, and hideth thy face from me? Thy wrathful displeasure goeth over me, and the fear of thee has undone me. Yet as touching the person of Christ, we acknowledge, that he was excepted from sin. In the margin, he quotes Psal.89:38, applied to Christ.

As to the rest of the misrepresentations of the said Doctor, {which we take up too much time and paper to rehearse,} I refer you to the particular debates. And as to your charging the truths, that he affirms and insists on for error, I shall mention briefly some principal ones under the next head.

As to the second thing in which just exceptions lie against your book, we have this to charge, that you have not in all that is material, fully and rightly stated truths and errors.

1. You have not rightly divided truth from error, but confounded them one with another. 2. You have condemned truth for error, and asserted error to be truth. 3. You have stuffed your positions with ambiguous words and terms, that instead of stating, you have perplexed them; and so that when you seem to speak one thing, it's most apparent you mean another. Let me but give a few instances of many, that are more largely and particularly demonstrated in the debates.

1. According to this threefold falseness, you state truth and error in your 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 chapters, in the doctrines of

Christ's bearing our sins, and punishment for them.

2. In the doctrine of imputation of Christ's righteousness, you plainly deny it to be any other than as to effects; which is no imputation at all. That there was no change of person betwixt Christ and us; that he suffered not in our stead; that spots remain in justified ones, as they stand justified before God, and therefore not perfectly justified; and then imputed righteousness must be imperfect.

3. You condemn it for an error, to say, the Covenant of Grace, as to us, is not conditional; and that faith is not a federal condition of it; and to say, the Covenant of Grace was made between the Father and Son, as the second Adam, and with the elect in him; or that this Covenant-transaction is pleadable by us. If all this be error, what truth is there in the Scripture and the Assembly?

4. You condemn this for an error, to say, Christ is to be preached to the worst of sinners, before they are willing to deny themselves, and renounce all their sins and idols.

5. You insinuate a condemnation of all union to Christ before an act of faith.

6. You insinuate persuasion not to belong to the nature of faith, and make faith and repentance to justify, as qualifying conditions.

7. You insinuate a condemnation of this great truth, asserted by our Lord Jesus Christ himself, that he is the way, truth, and life, in justification, sanctification, and glory. Jn.14:6.

8. The sum of what you design is to condemn this great Gospel-truth for error; that a believer is not to work from life, but for life.

9. You condemn all ways of assurance, besides by-signs and marks found in us, among which perseverance is the greatest. Here you condemn Assurance, arising from the direct act of faith and immediate witness of the Spirit, by itself, or in and by the Word.

10. You charge that great truth to be an error, that God sees no sin in justified ones, and to say that sin cannot hurt them in a way of condemnation, and that the afflictions of God's people are effects of God's vindictive-justice, and his displeasure against their persons.

11. You condemn the Protestant true acceptation and interpretation of Philipians 3:8-9.

To these I shall name these admired principles of yours, famous at Rome, as some instances of the third thing. 1. That every sin is not damnable. 2. That the moral law is vacated, its sanction being changed, *ibid*. 3. That the eternal condition of men is not eternally decided in this life, but they are in a state of trial here for eternity. See to reconcile these three heads of

doctrine to the Assembly, and reconcile the first to the Larger Catechism.

Question 152. What does every sin deserve at God's hands? Answer 1. Every sin, even the least, being against the sovereignty, goodness and holiness of God, and against his righteous law, deserves his wrath and curse, both in this life, and that which is to come, and cannot be expiated, but by the blood of Christ.

2. Reconcile the second to Confession. The moral-law does forever bind all, {therefore its sanction remains,} as well justified persons as others to the obedience thereof, and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator, who gave it; neither does God in the Gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen this obligation. Who is the Antinomian now?

3. Reconcile the third, rotten, ill-worded principle to the Assembly. The perseverance of the Saints depends not upon their own free-will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father, upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ, the abiding of the Spirit, the seed of God within them, and the nature of the Covenant of Grace; from all which, ariseth the certainty and infallibility thereof.

With what conscience can a man solemnly subscribe to these Articles, Confessions and Catechisms, and yet assert these principles? But you ascertain our estate here, only by doing; you say you can show, that there's no one saving benefit granted a sinner, but upon supposition of doing, that it's not given him to will or do, but upon supposition of doing; nor to be justified or persevere, but upon supposition of doing. So the whole, and the certainty of a believer's state, depends wholly upon doing; he is under a perfect Covenant of works, and his state is a state of trial for life, upon his doing, as Adam's was; but a worse, and has more to do, and is less able.

Lastly, as to the great fundamental principle on which your new scheme is founded, viz., that the Gospel is a new law with sanction, though, I hope, I have spoken enough to convince you of the unsoundness of it, yet because I would not be wanting in anything wherein I may contribute to your further illumination, I'll only present you with one remarkable piece of Protestant antiquity in this point, and it is an Article in the Confession of the Holy Doctrine, which was proposed to the Assembly of the Council of Trent, in the name of the illustrious Prince Christoph, Duke of Wurttemberg, and Count Montbelgard, Jan. 24, 1552.

Concerning the Gospel of Christ.

Although many precepts of the law of God are contained in the writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles, and Christ himself teacheth, that we are not to render evil for evil, nor to look upon a woman to lust after her; and many other precepts of the like nature. Yet we must not think, that the Gospel of Christ is a new law, whereby, as the Fathers of old under the Old Testament, were saved by an old law, so men, now under the New Testament, are saved by a new law. For unless thou understand the word law, generally for doctrine, as the prophets several times are wont to use the word law; certainly the Gospel of Christ, properly, is no law, as Paul is wont to use the word law, but is good and joyful tidings concerning the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only Expiator of our sins and appeaser of the wrath of God, our Redeemer and Saviour. Neither are the precepts of the law, which are contained in the Apostolic writings, a new law, but an explication of the old law, according to the mind of the Holy Ghost, which are not darkly contained before in the writings of the Prophets, but are repeated in the ministry of the Gospel of Christ, that the severity of God's law, and the corruption of our nature, being plainly laid open, we might be excited to enquire after and embrace Christ, revealed in his Gospel; and that we should be acquainted by what rule our life of faith in Christ should be directed. Wherefore, if we ought to speak properly concerning the Law of God and the Gospel of Christ, even as we are not to make Christ a new lawgiver, seeing he has not made a new law, nor erected a new politic kingdom on earth; so neither is the Gospel to be turned into a new law, which offer eternal salvation to the performers thereof. But we think, that it is most certain, that there is one and the same natural and moral law, both of the Old and New Testament; and eternal salvation is not to be had by men under the Old or New Testament for the merits of the works of the law, but only for the sake of the merits of our Lord Jesus.

Christ rehearses out of Isaiah, his office, for which he was sent into this world, saying, the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, in that he has anointed me; he has sent me to preach the Gospel to the poor, &c., here Christ teacheth, that it is not his proper office to give a new law which might terrify and slay miserable sinners, but to preach the Gospel, that might quicken and comfort them. "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal.4:4-5. That people who received the Old Testament, were held under certain shadows and figures of things before the coming of our Lord, according to that wonderful and most exactly ordered distribution of times. Yet in it there was so great a predication and fore-publication of the New

Testament, that no things may be found in the Evangelic or Apostolic Discipline, although lofty and divine precepts and promises, which were wanting to those ancient books.

I here conclude, only adding the exceptions of some ministers against your doctrine and principles.

The substance of some exceptions made by divers London ministers against Mr. Daniel Williams's book, entitled, Gospel Truth Stated and Vindicated.

1. We find truth and error is not rightly stated in several particulars, chapters 2, 5, 7-8, 12, 16, 18-19, and in other places.

2. Under a color of opposing some old Antinomian errors {which we from our hearts abhor} he falls in with them in their main principle of vacating the sanction of the moral law, as appears from the preface, pgs. 6, 7, and in other places, contrary to Article 7 of the Church of England, Assembly Confession 19, Larger Catechism Question 97.

3. That to supply the room of the moral law, vacated by him, he turns the Gospel into a new law, in keeping of which we shall be justified for the sake of Christ's righteousness, whereby he boldly strikes both at Law and Gospel, making qualifications and acts of ours, a disposing, subordinate righteousness, whereby we become capable of being justified by Christ's righteousness contrary to Article of the Church of England, 11, 12, 13; to the Assembly Confession, 11 & 16; Large Catechism Q. 70, 71; Shorter Catechism Question 33.

4. He denies the Covenant of Grace to be made with Christ as the second Adam, and in him, with all the elect as his seed, contrary to the Assembly Larger Catechism Q. 31; Shorter Catechism Q. 29; and that the Covenant is pleadable by us as its made with Christ.

5. He teacheth, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed only as to effects, with a purchase of a conditional grant, viz., this proposition, he that believeth shall be saved, contrary to the doctrine of Imputation and Redemption. Article 11, 17; Confession 11; Larger Catechism Q. 68, 70, 72, 73; Short Catechism Q. 29.

6. He asserts, that forgiving, adopting, glorifying, and conveyance of every promised benefit, on God's terms are judicial acts, as a rector in a way of distribution of rewards, contrary to Article 11 & 12; Assembly Larger Catechism Q. 70, 72, 73; Shorter Catechism Q. 29.

7. He perverts and wrests many eminent portions of Scripture from their plain and received sense, which has been

given by the best Protestant interpreters, in particular those that follow, Phil.3:8-9; Jer.31:31-33; Heb.8:10-11; Isa.64:6, with divers others.

And they further add, these are a few exceptions against the above said book of Mr. Williams's, among many more, of the like nature, which may be made to appear.

In this undertaking Mr. Williams does, as a seeming antagonist to the Antinomians, and the many that he does call so, broach his anti-evangelical principles, endeavoring to hide them as much as may be under ambiguous terms, perverting and undermining the whole Protestant doctrine in the main fundamental points of it, as they have been truly stated and hitherto maintained in the 39 Articles, Westminster and Savoy Confessions, the Assemblies Larger and Shorter Catechism, and by our best divines, ancient and modern, since the Reformation hitherto. As if his own name, and the names of some others, obtained by his art and industry, were enough to weigh down all other authorities whatsoever, and to set up his new scheme as the standard and true measure of all Protestant doctrine. Therefore, we thought ourselves bound in conscience to declare our judgment herein, as a timely caution to all that shall read the aforesaid book of Mr. Williams, &c.

This Paper of Exceptions, drawn up and subscribed by several divines, was delivered in to a full assembly of Ministers, by the hand of Doctor Isaac Chauncy, October 17, 1692.

A POSTSCRIPT.

Reader, having finished my Dialogue, I am necessitated to add a word or two by way of Apology.

1. To clear myself of an imputation of concurring with certain Ministers in exerting a Synodical Jurisdiction, &c., I must acquaint thee, that I have never been accessary to any such proceedings, they being utterly contrary to my judgment; what they have done since October 17, I am a stranger to, and know not but by hear-say.

2. Whereas it has been reported, that matters were so adjusted, as that an end was to be put to all writing in this controversy; I must say, I know of no such agreement; something there was which might give some ground to such a report, the history whereof I shall for some reasons, forbear now to relate.

3. Whereas some have been offended that I have continued to write book after book, &c., all is no more than the answer of one book sent forth and recommended to the world;

and therein I challenge the common privilege of all men, to reply to any published book that I think meet, and it's not in the due power of any men, or society of men, to abridge me of it, how much soever they disapprove thereof; and I am so far from loving contention, that if Mr. Williams has done, I have done opposing him; but {notwithstanding all subscriptions to Orthodox Articles, formerly or lately} if he continue to maintain his doctrine, as disagreeable to Scripture and the Articles of the Church of England, and the Confessions and Catechisms, he must expect to meet with opposition, maugre all the premeditated fury and rage that has been from time to time expressed by the assertors and defenders of the said doctrines, both in pulpit and press, with all the ignominious marks of reproach and contempt, which they have branded their opposers with.

4. I cannot, but in honour to a reverend brother, make a particular remark upon the great pains he has taken in his sermons, {to expose one upon this account, in the height of bitterness,} and to print them for his cognizance. Not to say anything now of his invective reflections on the congregational practice, or the wrong representation which he has given of the matters at present in debate {as another reverend divine has also lately} but only to admire that a minister of Christ can appear solemnly in the presence of God, to vent so much of his own spirit. I understand one sermon to be wholly taken up in setting all the black characters upon one man, as he could gather together, {who he means, all the town, that has heard or read the sermon, has judged,} portraying a person to be an airy, imagined piece of spirituality, drawn over corrupt, rotten, putrid flesh, an angry, tumefied piece of proud flesh, with many such characters; which they that are desirous to know more of, may see in the original. This ignominious usage I shall say no more to, but only, that though I have a sinful, deceitful heart, and know myself to be worse than any man knows me to be, and shall always, I trust, abhor myself before the Lord; yet if this be to be vile in the eyes of men {bad or good} to defend the truth according to my conscience, and the talent God has or shall give me {as he calls me to it} I shall be yet more vile; but still looking upon what I do to be mixed with so much of human frailty, hypocrisy, and all corruption lurking in my naughty heart, mingling itself with the best of my duties and services, that I count them all but loss and dung for Christ, as the Apostle. I could give many convincing reasons why, {among many others,} it did least become this reverend person to launch forth into these waters of Marah, with a presence to a sweetening spirit of meekness, from the temper which he has manifested formerly, as well as now; and why he is a most incompetent judge to pass sentence upon my procedure about matters in controversy {as I

do declare all the subscribers to be, and he in a more especial manner} not only because he is of the party engaged in this carnal contention about words only {as he would have the world to understand it to be, since it could not be made an imposition as at first designed} but also because he always, as it were has asserted, that he ne'er heard one side nor would, saying, that he never read Mr. Williams book {though he has subscribed to it} and therefore always refused to hear or argue any allegations against the doctrines contained in it. Now is it possible that such an one should give a true verdict concerning matter of fact, or pass a just judgment upon either party, who is declaredly so biased.

I could say much more of this nature, should I proceed to give a true narrative of behaviors and passages that have attended the carnality of recommending Mr. Williams, his book to the world by subscriptions, which I shall forbear to do, unless I see I am provoked to it. In the mean time I commend this cause, and the weak management of it on my side, to the God of truth, that weighs the spirits and judgeth righteously. And in honour to that reverend divine, I say no more to what he has so angrily preached and wrote, but am ready, notwithstanding, to ascribe it to that infirmity, wherein {it's possible} some men think we are too much alike, and to bear a due reverend respect to him. But if, upon further provocations, I find I am forced to vindicate myself from these abuses, and that in so doing, some men find that which does not kill them makes them stronger, let them thank themselves for it, as they may for all that they would make me so blame-worthy in.

A BRIEF REPLY TO WHAT MR. DANIEL WILLIAMS HAS CHARGED MR. J. N. WITH, IN THE PREFACE TO HIS REPLY TO DR. CRISP.

Finding myself traduced by such as seem never to live so pleasantly as in the fire of contention, who are ambitious to expire in the arms of fame, and this wholly owing to what Mr. Daniel Williams has published in the preface to his late book, called, A DEFENSE, &c., it's but needful I give the reader a true and impartial account of my concern in those matters, for which I am quoted and thus treated.

The first particular for which I am charged is in reference to Dr. Crisp's works, viz., Mr. Nesbit, from credible hands, informs me, the Assembly of Divines, desired to have them burnt. In answer to this, I shall give the impartial account of this story, with the circumstances that accompany it, and then leave my censors to the judges, how unfairly I am treated in this matter. Soon after this reverend author had appeared by the press, in the present controversy, I told him, I had been in some company, where his opposition to Dr. Crisp's works was occasionally mentioned. To which one {naming to him both place and person} replied, they had been sufficiently answered by the Assembly, for they burnt them. The same passage being repeated, where he and several other Ministers were present, it was moved, that one should write, to know of Dr. W. at Oxford, who was able to give a full account of the truth or falsehood of this report; which was accordingly done; and the answer returned and made known to this author before his printing, was in sum thus, though many of the Assembly did not approve of them, yet there was no such thing as a vote against them, that ever he heard of, or remembered. Now why this account, {from a person that Mr. Williams was satisfied knew the whole of the affair,} should be omitted, and the other occasional report printed, is not easily conceivable, except we knew the meaning of the reason I had from him {when expostulating his unkindness in this action} viz., the Doctor's answer was not so much to the purpose, therefore omitted. But they that know nothing of this, are prone to conjecture, it seemed designed to make my name loathsome to them, by whom, he can't but know, I desire to be approved. However, I hope my soul has been better dieted, than to improve for just reflection what is here offered by him.

The next passage is in reference to his own book, viz., Mr. N. {though I never requested it} in my house declared, if Mr. M., and three more had subscribed, he would not have been unwilling to do it; and he desired me to add {Congregational} to the divines in and about this City, who forbear to subscribe only for prudential considerations, which I refused. I must acknowledge the freedom and familiarity I had, for some time {through our near neighborhood} in this author's company, encouraged me often to speak my thoughts without being requested to it, and that without the least jealousy of having what I discoursed with him in private, made public by the press, and I not once acquainted with it; and I see had I come to act the part of a plotter I had been discovered by an unsuspected informer. As to the whole of what past in this private conference, it was with me of so little moment, that in a few days it was buried in forgetfulness; so that when, by a friend, these passages were queried of me, I remembered neither, but denied both; till

sometime after, seriously reviewing what discourse I had with him about this concern, I remembered, that at my parting from him, I desired the word {Congregational} might be added, he having before told me the names of several of that persuasion that were, to his knowledge, cordial for what he had done.

As for the other passage, I have not once, or twice, but often solemnly protested to him, I did not remember any particular so much as like it; which answer I thought the most becoming denial to a man of his character, but it seems it was not to the purpose, and therefore omitted. Sure I am, Gospel-truth, when truly stated, carries more demonstration in it, than to need such undue methods and unmanly weapons for the defense of it.

The last passage is, he told Mr. Hume that if one or two passages were rectified he would subscribe my book. To which report I shall only make this short return, that I may be a stranger to myself, through the deceitfulness of my own heart; but if my heart does not deceive me, I never had such a thought, nor uttered such a word, nor is it easy to conceive the thing so much as probable; for the only time I discoursed with Mr. Hume of this subject, was before this author's defense, &c., was published; and at that time I did expostulate with him, why he would be a subscriber to the former? To which he replied, what should I do, when followed daily, and pressed to it? But seeing that after all hopeful endeavours, yea articles and subscriptions for truth and peace, our debates, by these methods, are revived and condemned to be continued. I shall conclude, concerning this book of strife {finding my sense must be known of it} and that middle way hypothesis {if any} advanced by it, as the judicious and learned Francis Turretin, after long trial of it and the consequences that followed it, has published. We do not think that a different mode of expression should be cause of litigation with any person, provided the sound doctrine be preserved; but if this matter be a little more seriously weighed, it will easily appear, it's not a controversy about method, but under the pretext of a new method, a new doctrine is introduced. Although this new invented method would appear most accommodated to the ears and humours of them that hear it, &c., yet there are many absurdities in it, and inextricable difficulties, &c., therefore long ago condemned and rejected by the churches; which was not done without weighty reasons, as he there shows, to whose judgment, in this matter, I subscribe, John Nesbit.

FINIS.

A REJOINDER TO MR. DANIEL WILLIAMS HIS REPLY TO THE FIRST PART OF NEOMIANISM UNMASKED, WHEREIN HIS DEFENCE IS EXAMINED, AND HIS ARGUMENTS ANSWERED; WHEREBY HE ENDEAVORS TO PROVE THE GOSPEL TO BE A NEW LAW WITH SANCTION; AND THE CONTRARY IS PROVED.

By **ISAAC CHAUNCY, M.A., LONDON, Printed for A. Barnard, at the Bible in the Poultry. MDCXCIII.**

A Rejoinder to Mr. Daniel Williams his Reply.

Reverend Sir,

You say you are misrepresented, in my saying, you hold the vacating or abrogating the old law.

This is no false charge, or misrepresentation, for if the sanction be changed, as you expressly say, both in the former book and in this, the law is vacated, it ceases to be a judicial rule, and what passage you refer in your former book, relieves you not, where you say, the holiest action of the holiest saint needs forgiveness; for upon your hypothesis, there is general pardon purchased conditionally, which faith and sincere holiness entitles us to. The old law itself is laid aside, as that which will never trouble the believer; Christ has satisfied that for him, but it is the new law which the believer must be tried by; which is the Gospel law, and has another sanction to the preceptive part of the law, which the covenant of works had prescribed. This new law, you say, fixes new terms, viz., true repentance and faith unfeigned, to be the terms of pardon; which terms, you say, the covenant of works admits not, so that the terms or conditions being changed, the sanction is changed. What remains then but a new law, the righteousness of which must be our justifying righteousness; for there's no justification by any law without fulfilling it, by performance of that very righteousness by ourselves, or another, which that law requires. And though you say, we are bound to the duties of the moral law, yet you say, the use of faith and holiness, in respect of the benefits, is not from their conformity to the precept {so that conformity to the

precept of the old law has nothing to do as righteousness in the new law} but their conformity to the rule of the promise, which can be no other than the rule of the new law. Hence it is manifest, that with you this new law is distinct, both in precept, and sanction; therefore it's out a doors. Lastly, none can deny, but that how good soever the precept of a law is, if the sanction be vacated or changed; so that it ceaseth to be a judicial rule, it ceaseth to be a law; and where a law ceases to be a judicial rule, there's no trial to be made thereby of men's actions, no judicial proceedings thereby, nor justification or condemnation by it; whatever we are, in respect of another law, our righteousness must be judged of and tried by the law in force; and this is your plain judgment. You say, if men have nothing to do for salvation, then Christ has no rule to judge them who lived under the Gospel. So that men under the Gospel are judged by a rule of doing, which is your rule of the promise. And again you assert, consider the description of the last day, and you'll find God saves and damns with respect to men's neglects and compliance with the Gospel. You say, it's true, the sanction of the law of works is removed. Your granting, that we deserve wrath, in respect of the covenant of works, and that the law is a rule of duty, &c., is nothing, for it is not mere satisfying that law will save us, or the righteousness thereof, but a compliance with and obedience to a new law. You say, the law cannot hinder our relief by Christ, from the sentence. Christ stands between us and that law, that we may be saved by another. Forgiveness you say, is not by sinless obedience, {we say, it is by Christ's, which is sinless obedience,} but it is by our imperfect obedience that must follow. You say also in this reply, were not the Gospel to be a rule of judgment {a judicial rule} I cannot see how there can be a judgment day, it must be only an execution day; for by the law of Adam no believer could be acquitted; that law must be altered by the lawgiver, to admit satisfaction {which is a strange expression, as if Christ could not satisfy Adam's law, without altering it, the law must be vacated if Christ satisfied and fulfilled it,} and that it is by the Gospel only he has enacted the way how this satisfaction shall be applied, and that way enacted is your new law that comes in the room and stead of the old law, vacated. Therefore, I beseech you, consider your own reputation more than to say, I misrepresent you, in saying, you hold that which your words show, your scheme must contain, and you know in your conscience is your principal. Again, you charge me for misrepresenting you, whereas you say, Christ's sufferings are the foundation of our pardon; that our sins are forgiven for Christ's sufferings. By my saying, your fundamentally is only a remote causality, by something else besides them.

You know, whatever you say, to palliate it, that you

mean Christ's righteousness is our legal righteousness; but our faith and obedience, our evangelical righteousness, which you own under the name of a subordinate righteousness. Very natural, when you say, for the sufferings of Christ our sins are forgiven, and explain it thus, without them sin cannot be forgiven. How can an indispensable condition be more plainly expressed; as thus, the going out of my door is the indispensable condition, of my going into Cheapside. How so? Without going out of my house, {which is in another street,} I cannot go into Cheapside. You say, it's strange that anyone should infer, that you deny the righteousness of Christ, to be the sole meritorious or material cause of our pardon, which in judicial acts are the same.

It's one thing to be a meritorious cause of pardon, and another thing to be our very sole justifying righteousness. I can say Christ's righteousness is the sole meritorious cause of sanctification, for which we are sanctified, as well as for which we are forgiven; and yet we are sanctified by the Spirit; and so for which we are adopted. Hence you will say, Christ's righteousness is a meritorious cause for which we are pardoned and justified by the Gospel-law, the condition whereof you make meetness, {which is required, or rather bestowed upon sinners is only a meetness to receive the effects,} this meetness is the evangelical righteousness; this is the condition we shall be tried by at the last day, and this is the law condition upon which we receive the effects of Christ's righteousness; not the righteousness itself neither; and is not this meetness a material cause in the Gospel law of our receiving these effects? Why then has it not the same place in respect of the new law as Christ's righteousness has, in respect of the old law, so that there must be at least two righteousnesses requisite to our complete justification, one righteousness to answer the old law, and another to answer the new? And indeed here Christ's righteousness is made by you most properly the subordinate righteousness, because it is the order unto, it's only in order to another righteousness. In the most favorable sense, you make the righteousness of Christ to merit salvation conditionally, and evangelical to merit salvation according to personal fitness, for all law meetness is meriting, either in respect of the remunerative or minatory part of the law. All that you say over and over helps not, nor covers you from those that know your dialect; nor your saying, that Christ is the foundation of your plea, for I may found a plea or argument upon a thing that is not my plea, or at least my chief plea, and how do you found it? Why, for the sake of Christ, accepted against excluding bars. You say, whereby you have permission now to come in with your evangelical righteousness. You speak here just as in your other

book, to this point, and I understand you still as I did then, and you know you mean as I have represented your meaning, but you would not have the people understand what you mean; and therefore you throw in an abundance of expressions, thereby to hide your opinion, but instead thereof they lay it open. What is more plain than this?

You assert that the terms of the Gospel by the promise do make us capable of being justified and saved for the merits of Christ. Now here's your true sense of being forgiven for the merits of Christ, i.e., when we are made capable by the righteous meetness of another law, we shall be absolved in the old law sense, by the righteousness of Christ. And mark that all along, it's forgiveness only comes from Christ's merits; there's no positive righteousness of Christ, in active obedience, is reckoned to us; this positive righteousness whereby we stand just in the eye of the law, in your sense lies wholly in conformity to the rule of that promise, which is the new law righteousness, and you use the word merits still, in the way of procuration, not satisfaction. You say we are justified only by Christ's merits, as the sole procuring cause or righteousness for which we are justified {to which you should add, that the reader might take your full sense} by the righteousness of the Gospel law.

That which you call the fifth misrepresentation, and is your fourth, I am not convinced of, but that my inferences are truly drawn, according to your natural sense and meaning of what your expressions and what your principles must bear. 1. That you make the great end and use of Christ's righteousness to secure us from the old law; Mr. Baxter calls it our legal righteousness, and therefore our justification is not an immediate effect of that righteousness, but of our evangelical righteousness. 2. That he merited only that we might merit, i.e., that he procured our justification by evangelical righteousness; you will not call it merit; call it what you will, it's a law of meetness; and a law meetness I think, gives a claim and challenge of pardon; and if we should pray in your dialect, we should pray thus, Lord, I am meet to be pardoned for the righteousness of Christ. 3. That you make faith and repentance the meritorious cause of pardon and glory by the new law, and that's true, for all conformity to, and compliance with the conditional preceptive part of a law gives right, a legal right to remuneration, and the benefit becomes a reward of debt; and if so, the meetness is a merit, from or by a subsequent action. All these, though you say, you disown, yet in what you declare, you say but what you said before, and from whence the same consequences will follow, viz., that God requires a meetness in a sinner for justification, and that this meetness is a federal condition.

1. You say, Christ satisfied justice and merited pardon and glory, i.e., he satisfied justice in respect of the old law, and merited pardon and glory, to be bestowed as rewards of obedience to another law.

2. The sinner thus partaking of them, is as fruits of his death; and this is all done for his sake.

3. You say, God in Christ has declared a way and order how he will dispense his benefits; this way is by another law, in which he acts in a way of distribution of justice, upon performance of law conditions, and therefore you say, Gospel conditions have no other use to our interest in these benefits than a compliance with the stated rule of the distribution of pardon and glory. Adam's obedience had no other use than a compliance with the stated rule of God's distribution of life promised, and pardon and glory is no other than life promised. So that you make your law to be every whit the same in appearance, with a covenant or law of works; the condition works out the reward of debt; but this is all the difference, that man fell under the first covenant of works by creation, but under the second by redemption; he was redeemed from the curse of the old law that he might be justified by another law covenant; and this is your plain meaning, as you say, and these things you do but say over and over again in this book, as in the former. And what does this conditional grant of these effects import, but that we should have justification, adoption, &c., upon the performance of obedience to another law? Which is as much as to say, Christ purchased another law, and obedience to it must let us into pardon by Christ. This purchasing conditional grants and propositions, is a new sort of divinity, suiting the highest degree of Arminian doctrine, and will strike at the nature of absolute election, which gives ground of suspecting you also in that point, as well as what you say of the save-ability of the non-elect; though I acknowledge you often assert absolute election; but how well that principle will comport with indefinite redemption, upon a conditional grant, let the rational judge. You go on again, and say, as from chapter 10 of your first book, when sinners are pardoned, the whole meritorious cause of that pardon, is that atonement; and what is required of sinners, is only a meetness to receive the effects. You need quote no more, to give us an account of what you mean in these things; if the reader desires to be further confirmed in the truth of my representation of your principles, let him read pages 4,5, of your reply.

You quote passages in pages 30, 31 of my book {for the first head} from whence you say, I endeavor to render you one, that thinks faith or other graces did merit the pardon of our sins; which you say, is contrary to your declared judgment. Reply. I grant you deny merit; and I profess, sir, I would not willingly wrong you by any false imputation; but this I tell you, it signifies not much to deny a name to a thing whose nature requires that name to be named aright; a federal condition performed does bring a man into the claim of the benefits promised as debt, your own word gives the performance of the condition, being a merit for meetness; and you making this meetness federal, I know not how it can be avoided but it will be merit.

You quote proofs, that you do not call this meetness merit, but you call Christ's righteousness the merit, as this; there is a righteousness for which a man is justified, and this is only Christ's, but you'll say, there is a righteousness of meetness upon which a man is justified for Christ's righteousness, i.e., the qualifying condition of the person whom this mercy is promised to, he must have a conformity to the rule of the promise; and it's by this we are justified for the righteousness of Christ. To what purpose is it to deny repentance and faith, to be meriting righteousness; when according to your scheme, it can be denied in no other sense than in respect of the covenant of works? The satisfaction of the breach whereof you acknowledge to lie in the righteousness of Christ conditionally, i.e., for all that shall conform to the rule of the promise, which rule is the perceptive part of the new law; which conformity you call, with others, subordinate righteousness, entitling us to another righteousness; and it's this righteousness, you say, we shall be judged by at the last day. Now sir, I say, that righteousness which believers shall be acquitted by in the day of judgment, that is the righteousness that they were justified by, and the righteousness of that law which they shall be judged by. Let us but a little consider how near this subordinate righteousness comes to the Papist's notion of merit, and if their merit be not as small a thing as your meetness and new law conditions of justification by Christ's righteousness.

Hear what Francis a Sancta Clara, our countryman tells us. Merit is a free action, accepted to some reward; merit of meetness is a free action, which by reason of some congruity our fitness is accepted to a reward; merit of worthiness is a free action of a man performed in grace, which from justice is accepted to a reward. Now the question is. 1. Whether that personal qualification, which you require of meetness for justification by Christ's righteousness, be not exactly the Papists merit of congruity? Upon which is their first justification. 2. And the sincere imperfect preserving obedience the not their

conditional merit, or of worthiness? Which is their second justification.

See the Council of Trent, Decree 5. The beginning of justification of the adult, proceeds from preventing grace which invites to dispose themselves, consenting and cooperating with it freely, &c. The manner of this preparation is, to believe willingly the divine revelations and promises, and knowing one's self to be a sinner, to turn from the fear of God's justice to his mercy, to hope for pardon, and to begin to love him, hate sin, purpose to be baptized, &c. Decree 7. Justification follows this preparation. Decree 8. When a man is justified by faith, and gratis, it ought to be understood, because faith is the beginning, and the things that precede justification, are not meritorious of grace; and in another place, they condemn those that say, a man may be justified without grace, by the strength of human nature, and the doctrine of the law. What is it that you say of your doctrine of meetness, which they will not say in behalf of your congruity? And Scotus tells us, that an act is not meritorious precisely, because it comes from grace, but because it is accepted of God, as worthy of eternal life, as you say it's the promise made to that you.

Bellarmino disputes concerning the conditions of justification, the merit of meetness he ascribes to the works of him that is to be justified, i.e., that meetness for justification by repentance and faith, previous to justification and capacitating for it, or disposing to it. The other, viz., merit of condignity, is ascribed to the evangelical sincere obedience of one justified by the first justification, whereby he merits the second justification; and though you will not own the name merit, yet in your scheme, your first justification by meetness, or upon meetness, and the second upon persevering imperfect obedience, is the same justifications that Bellarmine means, for the Jesuit says thus, the perfection of our righteousness and justification is not from faith but from works, for faith does but begin justification, and after it has assumed to itself hope and charity, it does perfect it. And again he says, good works merit without all doubt, yet not by any intrinsic virtue and worth in them, but by virtue of God's promise, and is not this as much as you say again and again, it is the promise that gives right to benefits upon our conformity to the rule of the promise. And Calvin states that, they are forced to deny the intrinsic worthiness of works, and grant the righteousness of works is always imperfect, while we live here, and wants forgiveness whereby our failure in works may be made up. He makes it appear, that a promise made with a condition of a work, brings this to pass, that he who performs the work is said to have merited the thing promised, and may challenge his reward as debt in law.

It signifies not much whether you suppose the first grace to be saving, or mere moral endowment; the Council of Trent condemns them that say, a man may be justified without grace, by the strength of human nature, and the doctrine of the law; if you make the first grace a qualifying meetness for justification, in order thereto, it is the Papists doctrine.

Thus you see your sheltering yourself under the absoluteness of the first grace, will not do. 1. Does God give the first grace absolutely? Then all other graces conditionally, for the first grace comes from the same federal condition that all does. 2. The giving the first grace is the giving eternal life begun. 3. Either the first grace is through Christ or not; but it is strange to say, that Christ gives inherent grace to one that's not united to him {but as his designed head, as you phrase it} and to one in a state of condemnation, and should make a change in his nature before a change of state. 4. Then sanctification, {if faith be any part of it,} must be before justification, contrary to the best Protestants, and what you have said.

Your 8th exception is, that I say it is the doctrine of imputation that you banter; and you tell us what you say of it in your book, where, when I come to the places you quote here, you will see my remarks on your sayings, and so as to the 9th and 10th it will be spoken to in its proper place; and as to the 11th and 12th, I am of the same mind I was, I shall not spend time in vindication; and I leave the considerate reader, who understands himself, whether I do not give a fair amount of your opinion, whereof, by the quotations of yours, out of your former book, you give sufficient confirmation.

As to the stating questions in difference between us, you do it not fairly, the first you say is from your preface, whether the elect are required to believe, that they may be justified? This, you say, I deny. You should have quoted the place; I say there are commands in the ministry of the Gospel unto sinners, to believe and obey the Gospel, that they may partake of the benefits of that justification by Christ's righteousness, but not to perform it as a moral condition, that thereby they may be qualified for justification, or made meet for it as you say.

You say it is not whether the Gospel be such a law, that the acts of obedience to it stand in the place of works, so as for them we are saved; but whether the Gospel assure salvation for Christ's merits, to such as obey it, and their active exclusion of salvation to such as disobey it? This you say you affirm, and I deny. I'll tell you what I say, the Gospel cannot be a law commanding obedience as a federal condition of the promise, but upon performance of it the promise must be a reward of debt; and if the promise be justification for the merits of Christ, then it's due as debt upon the said obedience; and though you say,

justification for the righteousness of Christ, yet that justification must be the reward of obedience required in that law.

It is not whether we are justified by our faith as an act of ours, as if they {you mean repentance too} as works or qualifications, were a jot of that righteousness for which, or by which, we are justified, this I deny. Who says you say it's that righteousness of Christ, to which you annex your faith for, or by? But for and by this righteousness we come to be justified by our faith, and repentance, the duties required in another law, which you tell us is the Gospel rule {i.e., your law} that a man must be a penitent believer whom God will justify, for the righteousness of Christ. This you say you affirm and I deny, and that with good reason, that our faith and repentance must be previous, qualifying duties to our justification. So that a sinner must repent and believe in a state of condemnation, before he is justified; and it's no more than this, that for Christ's righteousness which is our legal righteousness, we shall be justified by or according to our evangelical.

Your next particular is the same; and I say as before, God does not justify us as a judicial act for any duty or act, though wrought by the Spirit. You say, it is not whether we are justified upon believing before any works, which follow the first act of saving faith. No, for the Papists own their first justification to be so; but you say, if faith should be ineffectual to acts of sincere holiness, and to prevent apostasy and utter ungodliness, would we not be subject to condemnation by Gospel rule? This you say you affirm, and I deny. Let us examine this then, and see what is affirmed. 1. That there's a possibility true justifying faith may be ineffectual, and so there may be a falling away. 2. That till faith has brought forth sincere persevering obedience we are not fully and certainly justified; we must be justified by the second justification, before we be secure. 3. That apostasy and utter ungodliness is prevented by a Gospel rule of condemnation that we are made subject to; it's a fine way to prevent apostasy to lay us under a rule of condemnation, you mean a sentence. For my part I cannot see how these things hang together, nor know what you mean by a rule of condemnation, but in the sense of the law working wrath, which is quite contrary to the nature of a Gospel.

You say and we say, that holiness and good works are necessary to salvation; but that I deny they are indispensable means of obtaining the procession of salvation through Christ. If I say they are necessary, it is enough, though I may not own them to be indispensable means in your sense, as a law condition is an indispensable means of the reward; and if they be indispensable means, the thief upon the cross could not have been saved, and hundreds more, but that I doubt not, but God

saves in the like manner.

It is not whether justification, adoption and glorification be acts of God's free grace, which I affirm. But you said otherwise, that forgiving, adopting and glorifying, and the conveyance of every promised benefit, given on God's terms, are judicial acts of God as a Rector, i.e., as you after say, that grace is so dispensed, by way of judicial rectal distribution of rewards &c.

But the question is, you say, whether it pleased God to leave himself at liberty to justify the unbeliever, while such, and glorify the unbeliever and wicked, and also to damn the penitent godly believer; this Mr. Crisp affirms, and you deny. You should have shown the place where I said it, that your charge might have fastened by a demonstration. I marvel you blush not at such things as these. 1. Where have I that expression, of God's leaving himself at liberty? It's one of your terms of art, not mine. 2. That he justifies the ungodly, is what the Spirit of God says; and therefore I may. 3. But I say in justifying him, he sanctifies him; and whatever a sinner is, he is justified as such, not as made holy and sanctified, unless you'll confound justification and sanctification as the Papists and Quakers do. 4. But when did I say, that God does glorify an unbeliever, and a wicked man; or damn the penitent and godly believer? Or that in the Covenant of Grace he has made any such exception, that he may or will do so? I suppose that you must mean by leaving himself at liberty. This, you say, is these men's free grace, while they deny the Gospel rule or law. These taunts and falsehoods are well enough, it seems, in your mouth; it's suitable to the rest of the prittle prattle in this preface.

You say the question is not, whether God has not as to us absolutely promised and covenanted with Christ, that the elect shall believe, and all men believing be pardoned, and so persevere in faith and holiness to eternal life; which you affirm. Here then you allow that there is an absolute covenant of grace {for whatever distinction you would make between the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace, there's no man of sense can deny, that the covenant of redemption is a covenant of grace} and if God has absolutely promised to, and covenanted with Christ, that the elect shall believe and be pardoned, this must stand absolute to the end of the world. But by your favour, though I am for the absoluteness of the covenant of grace, yet it was not absolute but conditional to Christ; that faith and pardon and perseverance, as promised to Christ for the elect were conditional, and the condition was, that he should make himself an offering for sin, bear it, and make full satisfaction to the law by his righteousness active and passive, and make intercession for transgressors, and therefore though you affirm here, yet I

deny. But the question is {you say} whether there is a covenant which requires our true believing consent to the terms of it, to the condition of pardon and glory, and supposes this true consent in the actual bestowing these benefits? This Mr. Crisp denies, and you affirm.

1. I deny that there are any more covenants of grace than one, and say, that the covenant between the Father and the Son, was that original contract which was displayed and made manifest in the Gospel of the Old and New Testament, and in whatever is required in this display is absolutely promised. For if there be two covenants where in the same things are promised, and to the same persons, the first absolute and the second conditional, the one must certainly be vacated by the other. For if I promised to a person, or to another for him, to give him a house freely, and afterward make a covenant bargain with him that he must pay me 20l, or 20s per annum, the first covenant is vacated; or if I am bound to stand to my first promise, the second agreement falls to the ground. 2. Likewise observe what you affirm, that God has made terms as a condition, i.e., federal of pardon and glory. So that here is brought in a covenant of works, to intervene betwixt the absolute covenant, and bestowing the benefits, absolutely at first promised. Now men may see plainly what you mean when you talk so much of pardon for and by Jesus Christ; this pardon is one of the benefits bestowed in your new law judicially, by way of remuneration to the performance of the terms of duty required.

It is not whether faith be the only grace by which we receive and rest on Christ for justification, and that it is Christ received by faith does justify, which is the sense of the Protestants, when they say we are justified by faith alone; this you affirm. Yes, you do in your sense, I he that Christ justifies here, as much as is needful as to legal righteousness; but there is another righteousness, viz., evangelical, that puts in for a snack, viz., that of the new law. And you do much misrepresent the Protestants, for they say, Christ's righteousness is all our righteousness, of one kind and another that we are justified by, a righteousness without us, and not by any within us, any act or qualification whatever. But the Papists say with you, the Council of Trent does anathematize those that say a man is justified without the merit of Christ, by which Christ did merit for us, or is formally just by that; and they curse also anyone that says, that he is justified only by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or only by remission of sins, without any further grace.

But let's have the query then; it is, you say, whether he that can truly believe to justification, must be in part a convinced, penitent, humbled sinner; and this you affirm, and say I deny. You should have told the place and my words. It's possible I may

deny it in your sense, and I will prove how that you must deny it in my sense, i.e., that legal convictions and humiliations are no federal conditions of faith; for you say, that the first grace is absolutely given; and if so, there's no federal conditions of it. Why do you not bring in hearing the Word, as a federal condition of faith, for it comes by hearing?

Why do you not bring in a man's having his senses and understanding, and many more things? And now you talk of humblings, let me mind you what you say, you tell us of the sum of the Popish principles our divines oppose. 1. They think that by attrition {or a selfish legal fear of punishment} men do merit charity and faith, which be the beginning of sanctification; and that this begun sanctification is all our first justification.

What do you say less than they, setting aside the word merit, and they say as to that of congruity its scarcely so? Nay some are against a merit of congruity as being any merit but only a disposition and meetness of the subject, such as you would have, and we may put their attrition to your rumblings, as a meetness for faith. See what the Council of Trent says. Paul says, a man is justified by faith and gratis, it is to be understood because faith is the beginning, and the things that precede justification are not meritorious of grace; see now how you abuse the Papists. Nay I'll tell you more, for I would give the devil his due; you abuse the Papists in charging them for making this begun sanctification all their justification. The words of the 7th Canon of the Council of Trent are, that justification follows preparation, which is not only remission of sins, but justification. And in the 10th anathema, they curse them that say that a man is justified without the righteousness by which Christ did merit for us. Now I think you ought to ask the Papists forgiveness for slandering of them.

The authors of the Rhemish translation of the New Testament and its commentary on Romans 2:3, grant, that the beginning of our justification, which they call the first, it is merely of grace; neither can we do acceptable works before we be justified, but in the second justification, which is, the increase of the former justice a man may vary by good works. So again they say, works done of nature before our faith; but works done by God's grace, may and are joined with it, as causes of salvation; and in these points the Protestants oppose them. I could fill a volume with it if need were, but it's enough to say, you are missed taken in telling us what the Protestants oppose them in.

You say also that I say, that pardon is rather the condition of faith, nay pardon is the cause of faith. Nay, I say rather, for if a federal condition must lie between giving and receiving, giving is the commercial condition of receiving, and not receiving of giving. 2. The object must be before the act of

the organ, pardon is the object applied by faith, application before there is an object, is a contradiction. 3. The promise of pardon is the ground in reason of our believing, they're in his grace, and therein does the truth and faithfulness of God appear; and the apostle says, faith comes by hearing this word of promise, i.e., is wrought by it, and he opposes the works of the law, and the hearing of faith in justification, Gal.3:2,5, and what is that acceptation but of faith, which the apostle speaks of, "this is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." I Tim.1:15. And what does it accept, but that fateful Gospel saying their mention, that Christ came into the world to save sinners, and the chiefest? It's the grace of God working in this promise, that has brought faith in the hearts of thousands. 4. We say with all soundest Protestants, that justification in nature is before sanctification and the cause of it, and therefore of faith, because faith as a grace wrought, is a part of sanctification. It's enough for you, to hold up that you call error, and give it name, and so let it go.

"It is not whether sanctification taken strictly now follows justification; this I affirm." If you affirm this, you should not make so strange of my saying, pardon is the condition of believing. What you hide under strictly I concern not myself; sanctification is sanctification, and if justification goes before it, you allow it only in a conditional sense. Therefore I conclude, pardon is rather a condition, yea I say not merely of order, but such a condition as is an influential cause. But go on, stating your difference.

"But whether effectual vocation make a real habitual change in the soul, and that this vocation is in order of nature before justification; this Mr. Crisp in the letter, and I affirm, with the Assembly." As to the letter, I must tell your answer to it is short and ungentle; and as he did Bellarmine, who said Bellarmine you lie; when you say, it was rather to serve a turn than to argue; it spoke truth weakly, and other things erroneously and ignorantly, &c. It justifies a necessity of dealing a little more roughly with men of your country and association. But to our point in hand; it need not be inquired, whether you take effectual vocation in the active or passive sense, seeing you say it's such as makes a real habitual change in the soul, and seeing it makes such a change, it must be a change of sanctification, and this, you say, is before justification; how can that be, when you had said before, that justification is before sanctification strictly taken? What kind of sanctification, I pray, is effectual calling? Is it not so in a strict sense, when you say it's a real habitual change in the soul? Is this not turning from darkness to light, raising us together with Christ or being born

again? But all this must be done before the relative change; a man must be free from the reigning power of sin, and alive from the dead with Jesus Christ our Lord. See what the Assembly says in the Larger Catechism, Question 67. "That effectual calling is the work of God's Almighty power and grace, whereby out of his free and especial love to his elect, and from nothing in them moving him thereto, he does in his accepted time, invite and draw them to Jesus Christ, &c., and they are hereby made able and willing freely to answer his calling to accept and embrace the grace set forth and conveyed therein in," i.e., then they are effectually called, when they have embraced the pardoning grace of God asserted and conveyed; which shows the preciousness of that grace working the effectual calling consummated in believing and embracing the Gospel proclaimed; the Gospel grace in the promise, is always that which works first upon the sinner, moves his heart, and draws it forth in believing.

"It is not whether our sincere faith and love, &c., are imperfect, and so can be no meriting righteousness; which I affirm." You affirm they are imperfect, and so do I; but not therefore that they can be no meriting righteousness; for the merit of righteousness does not depend upon the perfection of the duty or service in itself, but its perfection in relation to the law that requires this; if the duty required be never so weak, little, and lame, if I have such a degree as the law requires, it's perfect as to that law; the law requires a poor man to pay a shilling to a tax, it's as good obedience as another man's that's required to pay 20 pence. Many instances might be given, the Papists say, merit lies not in the value of the action, but in God's acceptance. The Council of Trent says, our works are meritorious of eternal life.

"Whether faith and love, &c., are disobedient even in a Gospel account, and so incapable of being conditions of any of its promised saving benefits?" In the sense of the Papists they be not, but be accepted of God for this end, to be federal conditions of a law covenant; they are perfect in that kind and relation, and merit the benefit; but we say, though any of our gifts of grace or duties are accepted in Christ, yet they are not accepted to any merit or worthiness of any other grace; federal conditions and worthiness of all grace and blessings bestowed on us, are only in Christ; and hence faith and charity and other gifts of grace, though they have a conditional connection one to another, yet they are all of promise, and can't be federal conditions of any promised saving benefits.

"Mr. Crisp says, I am against the articles of the Church of England and the Assembly; I am sure he'll never prove it, and I profess the contrary; but I am sure he's against all the confessions of faith that we will own as orthodox." Reply. How

your principles agree with the said articles and confessions, upon a partial examination, let others judge; it is not your saying, you profess the contrary, will satisfy the world, especially when you have the confidence to suggest such a false thing of me in the same breath. That you are sure I am against all the confessions of faith that are orthodox {but indeed you say, which we call orthodox} that we, I suppose, are, you and your schematics; and then what they account orthodox, I shall not trouble myself you go on and say, "in the strength of Christ you'll sustain the utmost persecution at the hands of these angry men; and while God enables me, they shall not overturn the Gospel by their unscriptural abuse of the blessed names of the righteousness of Christ, and free grace and the Gospel way of application."

Reply. Enduring persecution is no infallible argument that a man's principles are good; if it were, Papists and Quakers then have more to say for the justification of their principles than ever you had, or are like to have; and let the wise judge, how near akin yours is to theirs; and whereas you insinuate, as if you had suffered persecution from the angry men {as you call them} who have conscientiously contended earnestly for the faith. Impartial men will {if they do weigh and consider duly what you have done and said in these matters} determine which side has been the persecutors, if reproaches and false imputations be persecution, and God will judge one day whether you be a champion {as you would be accounted} for Christ or against him; the day will reveal it; it's not enough to brave it out before the world, a judgment at man's day will not serve our turns; he that judge is you and I is the Lord, and therefore consider what you do, while you call so much upon the name of God in Christ, to countenance your confident undertakings in this affair.

You say, "there's a mystery in it that one explication of the text should be pretended for a reason against my whole book, and so countenance all Dr. Crisp's errors, which they profess they dislike." Reply. There's no mystery in it, that any faithful minister or people should not only be highly jealous of, but exceedingly blame such a book, and the author which shall rob them of so high an article of their religion as the true nature of the doctoring of imputation of Christ's righteousness, and for the maintaining hints of therein, must rest so eminent a portion of Scripture out of their hands as to its genuine and plain meaning, upon which thousands of the most eminent saints in all ages have lived, and do live; no, compact confident, they will not lose that sense of that portion of Scripture which you oppose; they will tug hard for it first, and it will stand in the hearts and prayers of God's children maugre all opposition. And whereas you say, you hear Augustine is of your mind, I'll tell you what an author of none of the least name tells me, concerning his opinion, that whatsoever

is of his own righteousness is excluded there; and that Paul speaks not of the law of circumcision or on circumcision, but of the precepts in which it is said, thou shalt not covet.

You proceed to vindicate yourself against the charge of not being against the articles and confessions, and pitch upon the doctrine of imputation for an instance worrying you know you differ from them; and your stating your judgment in that point sufficiently evinces, though you do it after that perverse manner which is usual with you, to make your principles look sound. You say, you will state that case, viz., of imputation. It is not whether Christ was a public person, as a mediator in his undertakings, and so transacted all for sinners, that they might be pardoned and saved by his undertaken satisfaction and merit; this I affirm; but whether we are so represented in Christ, as that we are in law sense; they that undertook to atone and merit; this I deny.

Reply. What do you mean by a public person, as a mediator? Did he stand in such a capacity as to represent, undertake for, and stand instead of the elect? Were they federally in him as his seed? For so the Assembly say they were. See the Confession, "Christ was made as the Head and Saviour of his church, the heir of all things, unto whom God did from all eternity give a people to be his seed." So the Larger Catechism, "the covenant of grace was made with Christ, the second Adam, and in him with all the elect, as his seed;" but you say he only transacted for sinners as a mediator; but do you mean such a mediator as is a surety; if so, the persons for whom he is a surety are federally in him, for he takes the debts upon him, stand in their room and stead, and they federally in him accounted, and to all intents and purposes he is entertained, as comprehending all their debts in him. A man may be a mediator, and treat with both parties at variance; but not take the whole calls upon, so as to treat and engage, and make payment in the room of the offending parties. But let us hear what your question is.

"Whether we are so represented in Christ, that we were, in law sense, those that undertook to atone or merit? This I deny." Reply. I will appeal to all men of sense in the world, whether they can tell by your stating this question, whether you own or deny Christ to be a public person, representing the elect. He as a public person as mediator, and representative so as nobody ever said any person did represent another, viz., that we are, in law sense, they that undertook to atone and merit. A person comes to be bound, as surety, to a creditor for a hundred debtors in Ludgate; he becomes debtor, and is accepted in the room of all and every one, they all pay, and are discharged in him. Does the law reckon that all these men were sureties, are that they atoned or merited? But that in the surety's atonement and merit, they being all represented by him, their persons are

accepted and their debts paid. Does anybody look upon the debtor to be the surety because the surety stands bound? Or because the surety pays or undertook to atone and merit? I would fain know whether this be not perverse perplexing a question instead of stating of the it?

You go on, stating, "nor whether Christ was a surety for us, in a bond of his own, to pay our debt to the full {or more} that we might in a due time and way be released? This I affirm." Reply. If Christ came under obligation to pay our debt absolutely, he represented not as if he obtained our release but conditionally, upon future terms to be performed by us or some others; for then his suretyship was not for us, but to purchase conditions for us.

"But whether we were joint parties in one and the same bond with him, and so we were actually acquitted when he made satisfaction? Therefore God could enjoin no terms of application to us for justification and glory, nor suspend the same upon those terms. This I deny." Reply 1. What mean you by joint parties in one and the same bond? Do you mean the bond of debt to the law, by reason of the obligation of doing and suffering? There we stood bound as principles, and not being able to discharge, Christ became bound as surety; we were never bound as sureties nor Christ as the principle. But if you mean that both were bound to pay the same debt, we do affirm it.

2. What do you mean by an actual acquittance? Is it not meet that he that has his debt satisfied, should have an actual acquittance, by their surety for them? There's no man pays a debt, his own or another's, but he will have an acquittance, according to the terms of payment, if they were such as you suppose, viz., to purchase a discharge upon other terms. But you say, if Christ were actually acquitted, and the elect in him, God would not come up on new terms with the sinner for justification and glory; this is as much as to say, Christ paid a fine for sinners, that they might be brought to lower terms with the justice of God by a milder law. How defective are you, when you tell us, your meaning is, that Christ's righteousness is our only justifying righteousness whereas here you own, that it obtained not our full discharge, but only the bringing us under new terms; upon which justification and glory are suspended; is not the performance then of those purchased terms, our immediate justifying righteousness?

3. That which you affirm in this first part is pretty unintelligible, but according to my understanding it amounts to no more than that Christ died for our own good only, which is consistent with all the Socinian notions of imputation. But as that

which you say you deny, I want it to be un-riddled, viz., that Christ was joint covenant party with all the elect, in Adam's covenant, so as the rest of his posterity was, and consequently fell in him, as they did. Or do you mean that all the elect in Christ satisfied the law, and all Adam's posterity breaking it in him? And this I suppose you deny. Now, as unto this point, if I have your meaning, I will tell you what a great divine said in answer to a Socinian, "the first Adam was by God's institution a public person {having shown that God's pleasure is the first rule of righteousness} hence in him sinning the world sinned. The second Adam is not only by God's institution a public person, but also and infinite person, because God; this public person doing and suffering was as much as if the world of the elect has suffered. If the first Adam, a finite person, was by God's institution in that act of disobedience, a world of men, why should it seem strange that the second Adam, being an infinite person, should be by God's institution in the course of his obedience, as the world of the elect? He being infinite, there needed no more than God's pleasure to make him the world of men, yea 10,000 worlds. That which is infinite knoweth no bounds, but God's will. His obedience was legal, the same in nature and measure which are, by the first covenant stood bound unto. Thus his obedience was more acceptable to God than the disobedience of Adam, was detestable; yea more acceptable than the obedience of Adam {understanding both as public persons} had he continued in the first covenant."

4. That which you affirm of the imputation of Christ's righteousness here, is no more than what you say everywhere, importing no more than as to its effects; but your expression is strange, in saying Christ's righteousness is reputed by God, as that which pleads for our purity, &c., which seems to import that it does not actually plead, but that God is willing to reckon it a kind of plea, so that the imputation you here intend of Christ's righteousness is to Christ himself, and not to the sinner, but do tell us what you deny.

You say it's this, "that it is imputed as our formal righteousness, and so we may truly plead, that we ourselves, as his elect, did legally by proxy as our Christ, satisfy and merit all, and without the interposal of the Gospel rule, we have a legal title to glory by Adam's covenant. This I deny, as that which excludes forgiveness, makes Christ's sufferings needless, denies any proper satisfaction, and destroys Christianity."

1. You seem to deny Christ's imputed righteousness to

be our formal righteousness, for Christ's righteousness we reckon to be, as it were, the matter of our justification, and being imputed by an act of grace, becomes our formal as well as material righteousness; for if it became not by imputation our formal righteousness, it's not our perfect righteousness; for matter and form are the essential causes of the effect.

2. That we in Christ, satisfied the justice of God, I know no sound Protestant but will affirm, and that legally. Mr. Baxter says over and over, Christ's righteousness was our legal righteousness, but you will deny, that we legally satisfied in Christ. May not a debtor plead that he legally paid the debt in his surety, though not with his own money?

3. You cast reproach upon the suretyship and federal headship of Jesus Christ, by calling him a proxy and attorney, as our surety and representative. A proxy is vicarious, an inferior person that's employed to do business in the name and by the authority of a superior, so that he is his vicar or substitute. But is a father, that pays a son's debts, and purchases the estate for him out of his mere love, pity and compassion, the sons proxy? Or if a man purchases an estate for his heirs forever, is he a proxy to the children yet unborn? And yet their estate is bought and paid for in him, the original right and title lies in him as the purchaser. Or a rich man, who undertakes for the debts of a hundred poor prisoners in Ludgate {suppose the King, or another great person} out of mere pity and commiseration, is he their proxy? Is he not their benefactor and patron? I wonder how you can speak these things without a suspect in your own spirit, when you do so manifestly cast dirt upon Jesus Christ; may not I justly say that you banter the doctrine of imputation?

3. But you say Christ cannot satisfy and merit for us, without the interposing of a Gospel rule; the meaning whereof is, that Christ has not legally satisfied for us till we have done something in conformity to the said rule, that may give validity to the satisfaction of Christ, and make it pleadable as such; so that Christ has neither satisfied nor merited, till we make up the accompaniment whereby it becomes legal.

4. What mean you by a legal right to glory by Adam's covenant? If you mean by Christ's satisfaction and obedience to Adam's covenant, we have our legal right to glory, we say it; for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believes, and through his righteousness we have a right to glory by Adam's covenant; Christ's righteousness is our legal righteousness, as it respects the perfection and justice of God in

that covenant; and it's our evangelical righteousness, as it's in the behalf of, and bestowed upon undone sinners.

But you say that this doctrine excludes forgiveness; why? Because it brings in forgiveness merely upon Christ's righteousness alone; but how makes it Christ's sufferings needless? When it lays all upon the righteousness of Christ, imputed as the matter and form of our justification? Or how does it deny proper satisfaction when it makes Christ's righteousness all the satisfaction? And your doctrine makes it but an improper and remote satisfaction, yea and imperfect. And lastly, you say, it destroys Christianity. This is so gross a charge, as that it is to be exploded with detestation; if the imputation of Christ's righteousness, as our legal and evangelical right and title to life and salvation, destroys Christianity, we may burn our Bibles. But you go on.

You affirm, "that all sinned and died in Adam, and in Christ are all made alive, owning Christ's influence, both real and public, as before explained." Reply. All this is nothing to the point, you own not hereby imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity; but that sin and death are only effects of Adam's first sin, influential; you own not that all men were legally condemned in Adam, as a public federal person, standing in their stead; in the same manner you always speak of the righteousness of Christ, as influential to our forgiveness; and that the imputation of it is only bestowing the effects.

"But whether we were in Christ before faith, as we were seminally in Adam, before we were born; which his federal headship did suppose the being thus in Christ before faith; I deny." Reply. You here grant our seminal being in Adam; and that Adam's federal headship supposed it, and therefore we were seminally and federally in Adam before we were born. Why speak you it not positively, whether it was so or no? That we were federally and seminally in Adam, and that our sin and death was in him; there we lost original righteousness, and thence the imputation of his very first sin to all his posterity, by virtue of our federal standing in him, and by reason of our being seminally in him, the corruption of the whole nature was in him, and naturally descended to us? If it be so, why are not the elect as to righteousness and life in the same manner in the second Adam, federally and seminally before they believe, i.e., before they are born again, in him federally, as to righteousness, and seminally as to the new nature, Christ being their righteousness and sanctification, where as the apostle runs the parallel so fully and plainly as he does in Romans 5?

But all this is but shuffling the cards to make people believe your principles are what they are not; most of whom

cannot tell what you hold, when you have darkened and confounded the question, by your manner of stating it. You say, I object against the denying of the doctrine of imputation; why do you not deny the charge, but only distinguish so upon it as to confirm it? If your principles are truth why do you not speak them out {but fill us with your cloudy expressions and distinctions, which you charge for us} why speak you not plainly, that you deny the Suretyship of Christ, as you know you do? That you deny Christ to be a public person, in the sense as the soundest Protestants have always held him to be; which you do here in effect positively do, that we were neither federally nor seminally in Christ before believing; which, if so, I am sure you must deny the whole doctrine of imputation, and what you pretend to can be no more than what the Socinians to. And how can you say you are not against the Confession, and I am, when the Assembly says, that Christ is ordained of God the Head and Saviour of his church, &c., unto whom he did from all eternity give a people to be his seed, and to be by him in time redeemed, called, justified, sanctified, glorified. In the same manner they speak in the Larger Catechism Questions, 30, 31, 32 as above rehearsed. And in the Shorter, Question 18, in stating that man's sinfulness consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin.

The learned Mr. John Norton of Boston in New England, successor to the Mr. John Cotton, observes, when writing against Pinchin the Socinian, "I grant that all mankind are one with Adam, by a natural union, as proceeding from the same root; but I fear Mr. Forbes doth stretch out our natural union with Adam to a personal, to the end that he might make Adam's personal action to be ours by imputation. The scope of Mr. Forbes is to prove the imputation of Christ's passive obedience, and that only in his death, to be the matter of our justification, &c. We consent to Mr. Forbes, as to the argument taken from the comparison, but dissent from him as concerning the restrictions, the reason of the comparison being founded upon the conditions of the persons and Divine Institution, it holds betwixt such acts as the first and second Adam acted as public persons. Adam therefore being in that act of disobedience, only a public person, hence that act only is imputed unto his seed. But Christ being in all his acts of obedience a public person, hence therefore all the acts of Christ's obedience are imputed to his seed. As upon supposition, Adam's continuing in obedience {because he had then continued a public person} all the acts of his obedience, even to the finishing of perfect righteousness, had been imputed to his seed, according to the nature of the covenant of works, unto their attaining of justification by the law. The union between Adam and his posterity was not personal, nor only natural, but mystical; it was a conjunction of the person of Adam, and all

contained in his loins in one spiritual body, by the institution of God, whereby he was as their head, they as his members, to stand or fall with him standing or falling."

Mr. Norton sums up Pinchin's errors under three heads.

1. In his denying the imputation of the sin of the elect unto Christ, and his suffering the punishment due to their sin, contrary to II Cor.5:21; Gal.3:13; Isa.53:5-6, thereby leaving the elect to perish in their sin. 2. Denying that Christ, as God-Man Mediator, obeyed the law, and therewith that he obeyed it for us, as our Surety, contrary to Gal.4:4-5; Matt.5:17-18; Heb.10:7-10, compared with Psal.7:8; Rom.3:31, thereby rendering Christ both an unfaithful and insufficient Saviour, and spoiling the elect of salvation. 3. Denying the imputation of Christ's obedience unto justification, contrary to Rom.5:19; Dan.9:24, thereby leaving all that are ungodly under an impossibility of being justified. 2. Destroying the very being of a sinner's righteousness, by taking away the obedience of Christ unto the law, and imputation, which are the matter and form, i.e., the essential causes of justification. 3. Placing a sinner's righteousness in a fictitious atonement or pardon of sin, such as in effect does man naught; not only deny itself to be the effect of it, but denies, yea defies the very being of the Mediator, by the obedience of Christ to the law for us; the first holds all of us in our sins, and retains the full wrath of God abiding upon us; the second takes away the Saviour; the third takes away our righteousness and justification, what need the enemy of Jesus, grace and souls add more? And I am sure this Socinian speaks as plausibly of these doctrines, which he opposes, as you do; yea and more.

In the 39th page of your book, you pretend to some answers, to what I affirm in some things; as that I deny the covenant of redemption to be a distinct covenant from the covenant of grace. I own it, and make good my denial elsewhere, therefore will not attempt do what has already been done.

You blame me, page 44, saying, that pardon is not promised to faith and repentance, as things distinct from the promise, but pardon is promised together with faith and repentance to the sinner. And herein you say, "I confound a promise of grace, and promises made to grace, and affirm the Gospel covenant is but one promise."

Reply. 1. I do affirm, that the promise of the Gospel in its original grant and comprehensive nature is but one, as the promise of the covenant of works was but one, viz., life. So in the covenant of grace 'tis life, the Spirit of God is express in it, "this is the promise which he has promised us, even eternal life," I Jn.2:25, and, "this is the record {or testimony} that he has given us, eternal life, and this life is in his Son." I Jn.5:11. Now eternal life contains all justification, sanctification, adoption and

glory. 2. I affirm that in this promise is justification, faith and repentance promised. 3. That in this promise justification, faith and repentance are inseparably conjoined. 4. That in and under this promise are multitudes of gifts bestowed in a way of connection one to another, and have their particular promises pointing distinctly to them; but that these gifts are no federal conditions one of another. 5. I say, if you speak of these gifts of righteousness and life, as in a way of conditionality, 'tis Christ's righteousness is the proper federal condition of life, and pardon is rather the condition of faith and repentance than they of pardon. I say so again, if given be the condition of receiving, it is true; but giving is the condition of receiving, for faith is but the sinners receiving pardon. Is not the giving of pardon then rather the condition of faith, which is the receiving of it, than faith of pardon? "And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us." Lk.1:76-78. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43. So for repentance, the cause is rather the condition of the effect than the effect of the cause; but for forgiveness received by faith is the cause of all true Evangelical repentance. See this saving repentance and remission, both given by one hand of promise, Acts 5:31, preached together by commission. Lk.24:47. How strange soever you make of this divinity, it is built on the Rock Christ Jesus, and you cannot shake it, nor all the devils in hell. You say, I wretchedly missed taken the nature of the first promise, as if it excluded all terms of our interest in the blessing of it.

I know not what the first promise is, if it be not a blessing; and if the first promise be absolute to us {as you say the first grace is} then it excludes all terms to be wrought by us, to interest us in the blessings of it, unless you intend that a natural man is to perform these terms in his natural state; and then the first grace is not absolute; and as for the first promise, concerning the seed of the woman, it was absolute, and saved our first parents as such, for it was all their Gospel as I know of, and therefore they by it had remission, faith and repentance, without bringing the two last into a federal condition; for if God had intended to bring them in as such, it is most likely he would then have mentioned them as such, Adam just coming out of a covenant with federal conditions.

In answer to what I say of a legal grant, you say it is out of my element. Be it so, others may not judge it so, though you do. Mr. Antinomian says, a grant may be legal two ways, either

by free grace, from a person's good will and pleasure; and so God's giving us, both grace and glory is legal, because it gives us an undoubted, unexceptionable right. And a legal grant is a law covenant grant, when the gift is bestowed upon the performance of federal conditions, as grace and glory is bestowed in and for Christ and his righteousness; both these grants we have first in election, choosing us in Christ; and in the eternal compact between the Father and the Son. You say what I speak of, Tit.1:2, will appear not to be eternal, but before many ages, and not to exclude Gospel conditions if Christ be our great Gospel federal condition, I say it does not; for God's purpose and grace was given us in Christ, and were to be bestowed in and through him. But who told you that "before the world began" was but before many ages, it is sure before the times or ages of the world; and what can be supposed to be so but eternity, when Christ rejoiced in the sons of men; and I think I have a good interpreter on my side, for Beza saith, on Titus 1:2, in his judgment the word "before the world began" cannot be referred to the first promise, made to Adam, Gen.3:15, much less to that of Abraham; but, says he, before the ages of the world, does denote all series of time or ages, i.e., before this world was, according to Jn.17:2, &c. In this same sense runs the Assembly's Notes, Poole's Annotations continued.

What I say of the Gospel being no law with sanction, I shall not trouble the reader with here, but handle it in its proper place; and therefore pass by all you say on this matter. As for what you speak about that position of Mr. Baxter's, I likewise leave the learned to judge, whether you have solved it. I shall hardly set that and other things in a greater light, unless you provoke me thereto, as you insinuate by further endeavours to set other men in the light or dark, to as great reproach as you can cast upon them.

You say I make Mr. Richard Baxter to speak orthodoxly, by saying, when once a transgressor is sentenced by a law, he falls into the hands of prerogative, and the Prince may do with him what he pleases, i.e., either execute him or pardon him. God also might have put repentance into the condition of the law of works, and said, if you do not eat, or repent of thy eating, you shall have your reward; you should have added, the reason of my so saying; it was upon your saying, the law of works admitted no repentance. I tell you, if God had intended salvation by a law of works, wherein repentance should have been a condition, he might have put it in at first; but God never intended to accept repentance as a federal condition of any covenant, nor our imperfect condition; and so I say again, with a non obstante all that you have or can say against it; and I must stand to that rule which Mr. Norton takes, "this great principle is all along to be

kept in mind, and occasionally to be applied, as in answer to this question."

Question. "What is the supreme and first cause why justice requires, that sin should be rewarded with punishment due thereunto, according to the law?"

Answer. "The free Constitution of God, the principal and whole reason of this mystery depends upon the good pleasure of God; for who can deny that God could have saved a man in another way? But he would save him thus, and no otherwise than thus. This serves not only as a sword to cut, but as a leading truth to loose the knots of carnal reason. The good pleasure of God is the first rule of righteousness, the cause of all causes, the reason of all reasons; and, in one word, all reasons in one reason. And how does this make the following saying orthodox, viz., being that Christ the mediator, and faith in Christ are only means of the restoration of men to God by holiness and love, therefore it must be said from the nature of the thing, faith, holiness and the love of God, are more necessary to salvation than either faith in Christ or the sacrifice of Christ Himself." Now if I had said that this position were God's Constitution, viz., that holiness and love to God wrought in us, should be more necessary means of salvation than the faithfulness of Christ, or the sacrifice of Christ, you had said something, or that it were the Constitution of God, that Christ in all things should not have the preeminence, whether in the heavenly or earthly sphere. "And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Col.1:18-20.

Therefore to say, holiness in grace or glory is more necessary than Christ's Mediatorial Representation, is to magnify the creature above Christ himself. But because you say you would not have spoken the words yourself, but endeavour to explain them as charitably as you can, I do not think it convenient to give you any further trouble about them; but I must remark, that it is not so fair in you to charge all upon me as my sense, which is spoken by an interlocutor in a dialogue.

AN INQUIRY WHETHER THE GOSPEL BE A NEW LAW.

Sir, you begin thus, reader, though I did not once call the Gospel a law in all my book, only in my preface calling it a law of faith; yet because the whole of Mr. Crisp's book runs on this, I shall

insist most on this head.

Reply. Whether you called the Gospel a law or no, it matters not; I know you kept yourself here, as in many other points within your trenches, yet he that reads your book is very blind, if he sees not this to be the cornerstone of your whole scheme; and by your now appearing in a defense of that principle, as your professed opinion, you have not only dealt more candidly with your reader than in your former book, but have also justified me to the world, in these things. 1. That I endeavored faithfully to represent your opinions, and did so in this point. 2. That I wronged you not in saying, your art lay in concealing your tenents from your less intelligent reader, under ambiguous and equivocal expressions, which I called by a plain English name that you seem to be offended at. 3. In that I treated you under the appellation of a Neonomian {which is an Antinomian in the truest sense} and that you have in this reply proficently owned yourself as such, and subscribed to the truth thereof, which for your own reputation I would not have had you to have done.

1. In handling this question, I shall in the first place remark upon your stating the question; and show its true state. 2. I shall answer your arguments, by which you attempt to prove the Gospel a new law. 3. I shall show what Law and Gospel is? 4. I shall give my arguments to prove that the Gospel is no new law. 5. I shall show the beginning and progression of this great error, viz., that the Gospel is a new law.

THE STATING OF THE QUESTION.

Sir, you tell us, in what sense you hold the Gospel not a law; and from thence it follows, that in a sense it is not a law, and therefore in mine it may not be a law. You say, you do not hold that the Gospel includes nothing besides this law. Reply. Here is your old tricking again; the question is about the Gospel being a law, and you say it includes something that is not a law; it includes the covenant of redemption and absolute promises, as if the question were, whether a scabbard is a sword. And you say, the scabbard includes a sword; but, by your favour, a law as such, cannot include an absolute promise, for there's no promise but conditional in a law; but yet an absolute promise may include a law, as that, "I will write my laws in your hearts." There maybe {you say} prophecies, histories, doctrinals, &c., yet these may be called adjuncts. Of what? You should have told us whether of law or Gospel, or of the Gospel as a law. The histories of Christ are Gospel, and the prophecies of him, and whatever in doctrinal brings good news to sinners, but belongs to the promise

and exemplification thereof.

You say, page 19, "nor do I judge it a law, in that sense our divines fix on Socinians and Arminians." Reply. No you apprehend our divines abuse them, but yet it hinders not but that you may judge it a law, in this sense of the Socinians and Arminians. I have told what yours is, let the reader judge whether it be so or no; for they hold justification by acts of obedience to this law but as you do, nor do they hold that we are justified thereby, as Adam should have been by perfect obedience.

You say, nor do I take it in the Popish sense, which the Socinians and Arminians espouse. Reply. The Popish sense of merit is renounced by the Socinians and Arminians, as well as by you, and as much, for ought I can see. The popish sense is very plain from the Council of Trent, {Anathema 20,} cursed is he that says the Gospel is a promise, without a condition of observing the command, and this, I am sure, is your sense.

You proceed, "it is not a law that supposes a moral ability in sinners to perform its precepts, &c." Reply. It's an unreasonable law that requires duty of those that have no ability to perform it; and that law that makes a condition, and promises ability, concludes not the subject till the power is given; and when all comes to all, it is but a comprehensive promise both of the duty and benefit to be received by it.

You say, it's not a law that extinguishes the law of nature, which has its special precepts. Reply. If the law of nature be the law of Adam, you say it vacates it; for if it strips it of its sanction it ceases to be a law, for sanction is the laws ratification as such.

Again, neither does this law require anything of us as a condition of Christ's coming into the world, nor of the first grace to the elect. This the covenant of redemption secures to the Catholic church by promise. Reply. Whoever talked of our doing anything, as a condition of Christ's coming into the world as our Redeemer, but believe it {as weak as you say Mr. Crisp is} he presumes to tell you, that you are bold to attempt to prove the Gospel to be a law with sanction; if you allow that the first grace is absolutely given, and what is given by electing grace is secured by election to the elect; it's an inconsistent principle that redemption secures nothing but conditionally, for where the absoluteness of any thing is secured, it is secured to as to cease to be conditional.

Nor is it a law of obedience, whereto it renders any promised blessings a debt; all is free though sure; its free as to procurement or price, yet it is as sure by promise as if it were by debt; the price was Christ's obedience and sufferings, all comes of gift, yet in this way which God appoints to give it. Reply. This

amounts to thus much, that now you have dwindled your law quite away; for that obedience that renders not the promise a debt, can be no law with sanction; for by the same reason that the punishment is due to me upon disobedience, the promise is due upon obedience. You say, it's sure by promise, so every promissory covenant makes blessings sure; but that which is sure and free, cannot be by law conditions.

You give us a very long and confused account of your new law, the sum whereof is, that upon believing and persevering in sincere faith and holiness, life and salvation is promised, and upon non-performance death and damnation threatened. The sense is, do and live; the very same essentials as to matter and form; the matter, the duties and promises, or sins and punishment; the form is the connection of these together by the sovereignty or authority of a law giver. You say, "that you mean by saying, the Gospel is a law, that God in Christ commands sinners to receive Christ with a true operative faith." Reply. We grant the Gospel does so command, but is it a condition required of the creature, to be performed in and by his present abilities? Must he have this first grace given before he performs the condition, and by him that commands it? Yet must this command be a law with sanction? No, this command carries with it to the elect nothing but a gracious proclamation of free-mercy in Christ, and effectual operative means to bring a poor sinner from under a law with sanction, to life and salvation. Rom.5:1. The wages of sin is death, he lies under this law-condemnation; he is condemned already, Jn.3:36, the Gospel calls him not to come under another condemnation, but it calls him to the gift of God; what's that but eternal life through Jesus Christ; besides God's commands in the Gospel are gracious, it's to such duties which the same grace promises, and there's no middle between being under the law and under grace, under a gracious command and a legal, they are excluding one of the other.

You say, upon their believing they shall be united to Christ; therefore they must first do something before union to Christ, that they may have the benefit of union, make the fruit good, and then the tree afterward, contrary to one of the fundamental maxims of our Lord Jesus Christ. You proceed and say, it threatens, if any die unbelieving, impenitent, &c., they shall be barred from these benefits. Reply. The meaning is, they shall die under the condemnation of the law they are in already; as much as to say, a physician offers a sick patient a remedy, he refuses it, and dies of his disease, will you say the physician brought him under a law, with sanction? Many such instances might be given; the King sends a pardon to all the condemned prisoners in Newgate, suppose it be upon condition of

acceptance; some will accept not, will the court not try him upon a new law? No, there's no further trial, he is executed upon the sentence before received; and so are all those places to be understood that say, he that believes not shall be damned. If you say by what law; I say not by a new one, but by the old law. I own, as I believe there are degrees of glory, according to the degrees of the vessels of honor greater or lesser; so there are degrees of wrath, which the law will execute according to the degree of sin; and the law will look upon rejection of Christ, as the highest degree of disobedience; therefore are those expressions, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom than for Chorazin; some shall be beaten with fewer, some more stripes; some counted worthy of sorer punishments than others; but all this is by the law, not by the Gospel; and unbelief and impenitency are sins judged and condemned with all their aggravations, severely enough, by that law, you need not doubt; there needs no new law to do it. Your referring yourself to the Assembly will expose you a fraud, for they never intended any such thing, that the Gospel is a law.

You say, here's the essentials of a law, God is our ruler and we his subjects. Reply. Are ruler and subjects the essentials of a law? That's strange logic; the ruler in his legislative power is the efficient; and so in his executive, in application of it to its ends, and the ruled are therefore called subjects, because under subjection to both; the law is essentially distinct from both. But go on.

His will revealed in a way of government, here's the precept that binds to duty; here's a promise made to them that comply, and a threatening denounced against such as rebel. Reply. These look like essentials of a law of works, such as Adam's law, there was God's will for duty in a way of government revealed, a promise to him if he complied, and a threat denounced, in case he did not; now then, that law which has all the essentials of a covenant of works, is a covenant of works; but your new law, by your description, hath all the essentials of a covenant of works.

Therefore you say, this is a law of grace, and it's made by our Redeemer for fallen man. Reply. Say you so? That which is made and executed in a way of judicial proceeding is not a law of grace; for grace and judicial proceeding is diametrically opposite; but you say it's a law in a way of government, by a law therefore of judicial proceeding. 2. You say it's made by our Redeemer; is it made with our Redeemer? I suppose you must mean so, because you say for fallen man, then Christ covenanted in our stead, which you deny elsewhere, and he is to perform the conditions for us.

You say, "all the benefits of it are founded on Christ's

righteousness, as the immediate cause of them." Reply. And where are the duties founded in man's natural power and will? No, you'll say in election absolutely as to the first grace; well then, here's the benefits secured in redemption, absolutely I hope, and the first grace in election; now if you can tell us where to get security for after graces and perseverance, we should have this whole covenant absolutely secured. Effectual ability to perform the duty {i.e., the first duty} is provided for, you say, in election; but is after-duties provided for there? If so, election is the sole covenant condition for duty and redemption for benefits; thus you may mangle the grace of God.

Again, you say, God does not fix on these terms for any worth in them, or profit to them. Reply. It is true he did not fix on Adam's terms for any worth in them; what proportion could the forbearing an apple bear to eternal life, or what profit would it have been to God, if Adam had let the apple hang on the tree, or persevered all his days in holiness?

The Gospel is the instrument or sign by which this will of God is expressed; this is not the language of God in Adam's law. Reply. An instrument in this sense is a law, deed or conveyance, engrossed or enrolled, which is but a small adjunct to the law. The Scripture of the Old and New Testament are called instruments, because they are the enrollments of this will of Christ and his Testament ratified by his death; and you say the Gospel is a sign, the seals of the covenant are signs, but the covenant of grace is not a sign, unless you mean it signifies God's will and pleasure in government, and so did Adam's law, and was the language of it.

It fixes that rule of the premise; which Mr. Crisp is at a loss to know. Reply. And so are more than I; for you say, it's not the promise nor the precept, where to find a rule for the promise in the law, I know not, if it be not in promise or precept, will you say it is the connection of precept and promise? If so it's the rule rather of the law; is it God's rule to dispense with, or our rule to claim by? It may be you mean both, precepts and promises are despairing at least, therefore what your new term is, I suppose you do not know yourself, no more than your other new rules of sin, which is anomia, and misery. Since instead of clearing the question you have confounded it, I will take the true state of it from a man that would speak his mind more intelligibly in these matters.

THE QUESTION STATED.

"My true sense is that the covenant of grace is such a law, as

that the sincere acts of faith and obedience, and perseverance therein are the conditions upon which eternal life and salvation is promised, with a penalty of eternal death, threatened upon the non-performance; only I say that sincere faith and repentance are the moral qualifying conditions of the continuance of our justification and enjoyment of Heaven." And this is a true account of the notion how yourself understands the Gospel to be a new law; and I could prove from your own expressions, even to every word here in this account, you might therefore have spared yourself and me the labor about your confused stating the question.

Reply. Before I answer your arguments, I shall premise a few things. 1. It being a great end of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the covenant of grace, to restore fallen man, and in so doing to magnify the law, he makes full atonement for the breach of it, brings in everlasting righteousness, procures new obedience to the prospective part of it, teaches it by his grace, and works it by his Spirit; and whereas in the covenant of works, obedience was the way to, and condition of the promise, he makes the promise the way to, and condition of obedience, commanding no more than what he had promised.

2. When we say the Gospel is not a new law with sanction, we deny it not to be a Testament that has its ratification in the death of Christ the testator, wherein also the law of works had its sanction, in respect of penalty, for all those that shall be saved by him, as to satisfaction for their sins.

3. That rule and government which Christ exercises over his Church, as it comes to him by right of redemption, so that obedience we give to him that is part of that eternal life which he has purchased and restored to us, and both his government and our subjection thereto is of promise, and none of the least blessings and privileges of the covenant of grace.

4. As the matter of all precepts, requiring sanctity and obedience of heart and life, moral and instituted, absolutely considered, primarily belong to the first law of works, and so are binding in a natural relation unto unregenerate and regenerate, as they are the commands of God the Creator, and the least transgression requires a punishment due to the breach of the whole law; so our obedience becomes Gospelobedience. 1. From our being restored to it in Christ, the second Adam. 2. In that it flows from a new life given, we must live before we can do. 3. From the end of performance, it's not for life, as a law-reward of it, but for the sake, honor, duty to come and enjoyment of Christ, and in the most grateful returns of his grace and love to us. 4.

It's performed from higher motives and obligations, viz., that great love wherewith God has loved us, constraining us to the highest love and expressions thereof to him.

5. As for all sin and disobedience {even impenitence and unbelief} to any commands of the Gospel, it's condemned by the law; and everyone under the condemnations of impenitence, unbelief, rejection of Christ, or disobedience in a natural estate, are therein under the law; but there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, I mean to their persons, though all their sins also are condemned by the law.

Secondly, I proceed now to your arguments.

Mr. W.'s argument. 1. The Gospel is called a law, by the Spirit of God. Isa.42:4; Mic.4:2; Rom.3:27; 10:21; Jas.1:25; 2:12; Psal.19:7; Gal.6:2; Rom.8:2.

Reply. As to the places quoted out of the Old Testament, as Isa.42:4; Mic.4:2; Psal.19:7, I have shown, that {Hebrew text} signifies doctrine, and instruction, and sometimes is taken for the whole revealed mind and will of God in the Word, and it is called by the name of law, as a part for the whole, both Law and Gospel, in that place, Isa.42:4, a prophecy of Christ; it's a promise, that the isles shall wait Christ's doctrine, and receive all commands from Christ, whose precepts may be called laws, though of another nature that had a law with sanction; the perceptive parts of the Gospel are often called laws, especially in the Old Testament; but this makes not the Gospel itself a law, though it contain many precepts. That of Mic.4:2; Psal.19:7, has the same answer; those places explicate themselves by the word of the Lord; the Lord shall go forth of Zion, and the word of God from Jerusalem. So that law signifies no more than the word preached, both Law and Gospel; it were easy to show how it's used at large in the Proverbs and Psalms, and elsewhere, not under any distinct considerations of Law or Gospel. We have shown the covenant of grace is exhibited only in a way of promise and free-gift unto sinners, as such, takes them into covenant with God, not upon any terms of their doing, perfect or imperfect, performed in their own or another's strength, though it takes them into the kingdom where Christ rules and governs them, and from which kingdom goes forth all the word of the Lord, both Law and Gospel. Lastly, the Old Testament speaks often prophetically of the Gospel in its own terms and dialect, as by priests, sacrifices, &c, Isa.66:21; 56:7; 60:7, &c.

That of Rom.3:27, where the apostle says, that boasting is excluded; by what law? By the law of faith, and maybe taken for an ordinary rhetorical figure, called anadiplosis; and Beza says, the apostle does here say, the law of faith, instead of faith, because the adversaries of grace were always wont to have the

name of the law in their mouths, for which reason our Lord calls faith, a work, Jn.6:29, and on which place he says, they are plainly ridiculous who from hence will argue, that faith is a work, and that therefore we are justified by works. But if any that contend for a further account of the meaning of this expression.

1. It is the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ's righteousness which he opposes to all law righteousness, as Romans 4, or other doctrine that teaches contrary. 2. It may be taken for the nature of faith, the power and efficacy of it; the nature of it and its power in the soul, is to make a man renounce all inherent righteousness; in the same sense is law taken, Rom.8:2, the law of the Spirit of life that is in Christ Jesus, viz., i.e., the nature, power, and efficacy of it. So Romans 7, the law of sin is no more than the power and prevalence of it, whereby it captivates us. James 1:25, the law of liberty in no other than the Gospel doctrine of freedom by Jesus Christ, Jn.8:36, from the law moral and ceremonial for justification, yea, he speaks to them as such {says Beza} on whom no yoke of ceremonial bondage was laid, {as Peter, Acts 15:10,} yea, such as the moral law could not retain as servants under fear, but the Spirit of God forms them into free and voluntary obedience. Hence it's plain enough, that the apostle opposes the Gospel to the Law with sanction, which enforces obedience from the threats thereof. So Beza carries, this assertion of liberty, says he, is very fitly added, {having shown he spoke of the moral law before, which he called the royal law in its full sanction, as appears from verses 8-10,} foreseeing we are made free by the Son, by a much better right the Lord requires of us the fruits of righteousness, rather than of those who remain under the tyranny of the law of sin, &c., so that from these expressions of James, here is so little pretense for a plea to make the Gospel a law with sanction, that the apostle seems strenuously to argue against it.

I wonder that place mentioned, Rom.9:31, the law of righteousness, is plainly the law of works; for it was righteousness by this law they sought after, but lost their labor, not seeking after a righteousness to satisfy the law by faith in Christ.

You argue also from Gal.6:2, this is spoken of a particular precept, {which are frequently termed laws or instructions,} "bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ," or his command, yea, from an obligation so to do, {an obligation to obedience and thankfulness is sometimes called a law of love,} and what was the obligation? Christ bore our burdens, Isaiah 53, therefore we should bear one another's burdens, as he carried our griefs and sorrows; be followers of Christ as dear children. Beza and others refer it to Jn.13:34-35, "a new commandment give I unto you, that you love one another

as I have loved you," i.e., I give you a new motive and principle to act obedience from; and this is contrary to a principle and spirit of bondage and fear from a law with sanction; and this new commandment is called the old, as to the matter of it.

Mr. W.'s second argument. Men's behavior towards the Gospel is expressed by words that denote it to be a law. Rom.10:16; II Cor.9:13; II Thes.1:8; I Pet.4:17. Reply. You said, though the Gospel be a law with sanction, yet it contains in it absolute promises. This I deny, as a contradiction. But I affirm, that an absolute promise may contain in it law-precepts, as that promise, I will write my laws in your hearts; the Gospel sets up the law-precept as rules of sanctity and obedience, and calls for a conformity to them from better motives and principles; yet upon better promises, not such as provoked to obedience, by rewarding the work performed in our own strength, but such as promised the very obedience itself. Therefore nobody denies obedience to the Gospel, and subjection to it from the grace of adoption, as children, not as slaves under the rigor of a law. Those places that speak of taking vengeance on them that obey not the Gospel, II Thes.1:8; I Pet.4:17, they show only that the curse of the law will fall more heavily upon them for disobedience to God in the Gospel, impenitency and infidelity being sins the law of God does condemn and judge; and Christ will come at the last day clothed with law-vengeance, which is called flaming fire, and will proceed against all sinners, those that are ignorant of God, and those that are disobedient to the Gospel, and judge them by one and the same law, though some that have added to their other sins the rejection of Christ, and so lie under aggravations of their sins, and are become more inexcusable, may be accounted worthy of sorer degrees of punishment, and judge thereto by the same law.

Mr. W.'s, third argument is that justification is a judicial act, therefore it must be by a law. Reply. The Gospel gives nothing but benefits to sinners; faith is one of the great benefits, and there is a connection of benefits of different nature in the Gospel-gifts, but our right to all as a federal condition is in Christ, and its safe enough to speak of Gospel-worthiness and rewards, but they are founded in Christ, not in any law-righteousness of ours.

Mr. W.'s, fifth argument. If God have no Gospel-rule, besides election and distinguishing mercy, to confer glory by, then God will not, nay cannot save the nonelect, though they should believe in Christ. Say not they will not believe, for hath not God declared that he will save them if they believe?

Reply. First, here you change the terms, putting rule for law, and God's rule for man's; therefore you conclude not the question. 2. You make a pro-syllogism. Your argument should

regularly run thus, if God hath Gospel-rule, besides election and distinguishing mercy, to confer glory by, then the Gospel is a law; but God hath other Gospel-rules to confer glory by, besides, &c., therefore, your consequence is denied; for if you will have God's way of conferring grace or glory to be a rule to him, the particular application thereof depends wholly upon his good will and pleasure and the manner itself, and that's the rule of all rules; and so the rule of conferring grace and glory is all one; but suppose that God's manner of conferring glory be the rule you mean, God never propounded but two ways of doing it, one in a way of free grace and absolute promise, and the other in a way of debt to us by a rule of justice; now your consequence will sink, for God's rule in bestowing grace and glory upon sinners, is to do it in a way of free grace by promise and gift, and not in a way or by the rule of a law or distributive justice.

For your minor it's this, that God has a Gospel rule, besides election and distinguishing mercy, to confer glory by; which you prove thus, if God hath not, &c., then he cannot nor will not save the non-elect if they believe, but he will save the non-elect if they believe; therefore this argument necessarily supposes, that God has a rule of salvation altogether independent of election and distinguishing mercy, whereby others may be saved if they will; and you take it for granted, that the nonelect will believe, for you say, say not they will not believe. Your minor is flatly denied, for that general proposition, he that believes shall be saved, concludes not that a non-elect person shall believe or be saved, it's false logic so to do; there's no more in it than in this proposition, every man is a rational creature, therefore if a horse be a rational creature, he is a man. This convex proposition has a verity in the connection, but determines not any truth in the antecedent or consequent, that a horse will ever be a man or a rational creature. So here, he that believes shall be saved; therefore then, if the non-elect believe they shall be saved. If Judas believed he should be saved, but this says not that Judas will believe or be saved. Yet you say, hath not God declared he will save them if they believe? I say, nowhere, he hath not said, I will save the non-elect person if he believe, more than he has said a horse shall be a man if he can use reason or speak, or a man shall be a horse if he have four feet. There's hundreds of such instances; the fire consumes all combustible matter; if I throw my coat or cap into the fire, it will be burnt; but this does not determine that I will throw it into the fire, or that it will be burnt, but rather the contrary that there will be neither one nor the other, therefore how bold and illogical is it for you to conclude, that God will save the non-elect upon a performable of an impossible condition? For whatever hath no other foundation than an impossible condition, can never be; but

the salvation of the non-elect can be founded upon nothing but an impossible condition; for it can have no other condition, according to you, but believing, and this is impossible, because, according to you, also faith is from election, and therefore it's a contradiction to talk of saving the non-elect, or God's making a rule to save them upon supposition of their having that which he never intended to give them. The general proposition runs thus, all men that shall believe shall be saved; a general contradiction here will not divide truth from falsehood, viz., no man shall believe and therefore no man shall be saved; but to divide truth from falsehood and fix it on a subject, the contradiction must be special or proper, and then that general axiom and application, specially or properly, makes this syllogism, all men that believe shall be saved; some men shall not believe, as non-elect, or Judas, therefore some men shall not be saved.

Now see how well you agree with the Assembly in this point, chapter 10, section 4, where they say "non-elect one's, though they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, and yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved."

You say that forgiveness is an act of sovereignty, and how you will reconcile that to what you say before and after I know not. 1. That it's a judicial act by a rule of judgment; if so, it's not in that respect a sovereign act, wherein God is free to give faith and forgiveness to whom he will. 2. You say, he has not left himself free to give forgiveness to whom he will of the adult, without faith, and therefore God must come under a law to give forgiveness in the way of a law, whereas the same sovereign grace that inclines him to one does also to the other, and both faith and forgiveness are the free gift in the promise, in a way of showing forth his righteousness.

Mr. W.'s sixth argument. The apostles, with all the saints, may be arraigned, as fallen from grace, and turned from the Gospel, if it be no rule, according to which God applies Christ's righteousness, for how should Peter, say, repent and be baptized?

Reply. I see no consequence here at all; the argument, to me, seems to run thus; either the Gospel is a new law with sanction, or else the apostles are fallen from grace, and what's the reason of this forced argument? The apostles preached, that men should repent and be baptized. I suppose you will make baptism too to belong indispensably to the new law, as a condition; and but I pray, does the Gospel, requiring and calling for Gospel duties, make the Gospel a new law with sanction? Are not Gospel duties from Gospel quickening and enlivening a poor dead sinner to obey the Gospel commands of Christ, quite contrary to that of the unbeliever? He does not deal with him as

a person under a moral power to answer them, and therefore putting him under trial by his natural strength, as all laws do; but Gospel commands are as Christ's voice to Lazarus in the grave, Jn.5:25, and I pray by what law are dead men capable of coming to life? The Gospel is the power of God to salvation, not the power of man. You allege the jailer's words, Acts 16:30, what shall I do to be saved. I wonder you should insist upon the words of a man that knew not Christ, and knew no other way of salvation than by doing. Paul indulged him not in this opinion, but taught contrary, exhorting him to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, which the apostle always opposed to doing; faith being a grace that excludes works of any law, yea, itself as a work; it will ascribe all to Christ and free grace; it's new doctrine, that a command to believe, should be a command to work for life, as the obedience to a law, when it calls men from under the law; and it saith, that a believer, is not under the law, but under grace; but according to your tenents it should read, you are not under the old law, but you are under the new law. You instance in Gal.2:16, there, does not denote a priority in time of faith to justification, but of the end of faith; we should believe, for this end, that the grace of justification by Christ's righteousness alone may shine into our hearts, by the light of faith, that we may have peace with God in our consciences through the Lord Jesus Christ; and so we do not only in our first believing, but in all other acts. And this hinders not but that God's gracious acts prevent ours and causes them; God's love let forth to us constrains us, and is the reason of our loving him. Justification may be considered as terminating on our persons, and terminating in our consciences; in this last sense the apostle speaks; but note what is the antithesis, and not the works of a law. If he had not meant the works of every law, he should have distinguished, and said, not by the works of the old law, but by the works of the new law; it's strange he should keep the Galatians in the dark, about the works of the new law; it was but works that they looked for to join with Christ in justification. I am confident this very distinction would have satisfied all the Neonomians of his time.

Mr. W.'s seventh argument. The Gospel is at least part of the rule by which Christ will judge the world; this must be a law if it be a rule of judgment.

Reply. Your argument is, that rule, by which God will judge the world, is a law, but the Gospel is a rule by which God will judge the world; therefore, I deny the minor. 1. You say, part of that rule; I pray what's the other part? Will the rule of judgment have two parts? Do you mean the old law will be another part? Or will God judge some by the old law, some by the new? 2. It's not likely that God will judge the world by any more than one law, and that, the law of creation, and that by

which he governed the world; that law which has been the standard of righteousness from the beginning of the world to the end. 3. It's likely to be that law that all the world are become guilty by; they shall not be guilty by one law and judged by another. 4. It's likely to be that law that men's consciences accuse or excuse by. 5. It's likely to be that law that will reach Jews, Christians, infidels, and all that never had the written Law or Gospel. 6. If the Gospel be a law then, to try by, it must cease to be a Gospel, for it will bring execution of indignation and wrath, no good tidings; I suppose you will not say, the sentence, go ye cursed, is Gospel.

Well, you say, the work of that day is not to try Christ; no sure, I believe not; but Christ must sit upon his throne judging the world. "Nor whether Christ's righteousness was imputed to all that believe; but will be to decide the cause of all men, to silence all apologies &c." 1. I suppose you mean to decide the state of believers, which has been undecided till then. 2. To prove that the rest of the world had not faith.

As for the first sort, I would know whether their trial will be before the resurrection or after? Before it cannot be, they must be raised first; and those that die in Christ shall rise first. And it's said, blessed and happy are they that have part in the first resurrection; and how shall they be raised? Incorruptible, in glory, like to Christ as his appearance immediately carried up into the air to meet the Lord. Is it likely that now they are clothed with all this glory, at the resurrection, they shall come to stand a trial for justification? Surely their state will be fully decided, before Christ will raise them in this glory. But you say, their faith must come to trial whether it has been sincere; but undoubtedly that will be fully resolved before the resurrection; or how shall the elect be gathered from all parts? And how shall Christ distinguish the saints from others to raise them in glory?

But you'll say, this trial will be by the new law at the resurrection of the unjust.

1. Shall they not be raised in dishonor, with their consciences accusing them by the old law? 2. How few, in comparison, will there be of the millions of wicked that can be justified by the new law that never heard a word of it? 3. Those that have heard of it, never owned it, or were under it; they must be tried by a law that nature has brought them under. 4. All their sins against God's commands are judged by the old law; for in the moral law, God is declared a God that shows mercy unto thousands. 5. The proclamations of mercy rejected, are but aggravations of the sins of those that are condemned already, and make them more inexcusable. In this sense the men of Nineveh, and the Queen of the South, shall rise up in judgment against some, and condemn

them; not that their actions shall be a law to try by, but that they will be matter of aggravation to such as had greater means of grace than they had. Rejections of pardon do not bring condemned persons to a new law to try them by; it leaves them but under the former law and condemnation, with a greater torment upon their minds and consciences. For my part, I look upon your whole hypothesis about the day of judgment, to be very raw and indigested, and that you suppose it will be like man's assizes when all men shall be brought to a personal trial, good and bad, all in mixture, and believers as well as unbelievers must be arraigned, and hold up their hands at the bar, and stand upon their delivery; whereof some upon a formal trial shall be justified, others condemned.

I COME TO SHOW WHAT A LAW THAT IS, AND WHAT GOSPEL IS.

What a law is. The word Lex is with some a ligando, because it binds to duty and obedience; with others it is a legendo, because among the Romans, when a law was made, it was exposed publicly, that all might read or know it, and this was called the promulgation of the law, because it gives everyone it's due, by commending and forbidding, upon a penalty expressed or understood. Hence it is not only regulative justice, {which describes but the perceptive part,} but it's regulative sanction whereby justice does proceed in a way of distribution to justify or condemn, and thereby to give everyone his due, if wages of sin be due, to pay it; this is the primary and strict sense of Lex. In a larger sense it's taken for doctrine, a custom or usage, &c. "Hearken unto me, my people; and give ear unto me, O my nation, for a law shall proceed from me, and I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the people. My righteousness is near; my salvation is gone forth, and mine arms shall judge the people; the isles shall wait upon me, and on mine arm shall they trust." Isa.51:4-5. And is often used for doctrine or institution in the Proverbs and Psalms; sometimes for the law of God strictly taken, sometimes for the law of Moses, and sometimes for a particular law or precept, as Exod.12:49; sometimes for the doctrine of the revealed mind of God in his word, Psalms 119; and sometimes for a manner and custom, as II Sam.7:19. They have also divers other words for particular statutes, precepts, commandments; in treating of which, I shall not detain the

reader.

2. A law in general is an explicit injunction of obedience by a rightful power, with a penalty annexed. Duty may be owing where it's not by any positive law prescribed on penalty. There are these things necessary to a law. 1. That there be a legislative power lodged somewhere; that it be sovereign, whereby the first reason of the law is the good will and pleasure of the lawgiver. 2. That this sovereign power be rightfully exerted, or else the law is but an usurpation. 3. That the subject under this law be capable of performing it, or else the law is tyrannical. 4. If a promise of reward to obedience be expressed or implied, it becomes a law-covenant; but concerning the nature of that more may be said elsewhere.

3. In a law there are but two parts, the preceptive part and sanction; which is binding the subject to duty, upon the authority of the lawgiver, and on pain of curse denounced for the transgressions thereof. You often reflect on me for being ignorant of what sanction is; I must tell you, I understood sanction before you began to study, at five years old, as you say you did; and if any one speak of life and death distinct from the precept, it's you, when you talk of continuing the duty and removing the sanction to another law; for the removing the sanction from a law, is the taking away all the binding nature of it; and these things are inseparable from a law with sanction.

1. Every such law requires perfect obedience to the conditional precepts of whatever kind they be; if the law require of me a small matter or a great, it abates not one jot or tittle of what it requires, and my performing that is perfect obedience to the said law. If the King's law requires one-shilling poll tax of me, 11 pence, 10 farthings half farthing will not pay my due, nor be accepted. Hence, whereas the law requires the full duty without the least abatement, so if I make the least default of what it requires, I fall under the curse of it; and he that is thus by the least default, whatever his compliance or obedience is besides, is under a curse unavoidably, the whole penalty falls upon him. Thus much for a law in general, whether divine or human, none allows an imperfect performance of conditions required in the said law, but condemns it.

4. The law of God is a strict injunction to man of obedience to all his revealed mind, and will come upon pain of death. The original record of this law was in man's heart, concreted with him; Adam had by nature the things contained in the law, a few dark remains whereof continue in fallen man in his

sinful condition; this not only comprehended those precepts which the Jews call the law of nature, which are the same among all men, and in every place, but it requires exact obedience to any particular, or more peculiar precepts that God afterward should require obedience by, of any one person, or sort of people, even God's extraordinary commands, such as to Abraham of offering up his son. Again, it does not bind only to the external acts of obedience but to the internal, and the principle from whence it flows. Matt.5:21- 39. This principle and internal heart conformity man had at the first. All prescription of duty belongs to the law, and this we must hold, if with all the reformed we will maintain the law's perfection, as contained in its compass all virtues and duties of holiness. Hence whatever is a transgression of ours in a defect of obedience to any of God's precepts, that were or should be given, the very least, though but in a defect of faith or love to God in the heart, is condemned by God's law; and will any man say that God has commanded faith and repentance at any time to man, and that was not implied in the law at first given to man. Does not that law condemn every disobedience, impenitence and unbelief, and if it condemns the sins it commands the duties. The law of creation condemned all sin, which could not be but by the fall, and hence commanded all contrary duty, and therefore repentance in case of sin.

5. This law was twice solemnly promulgated. To Adam in paradise, in which promulgation God did bring him upon the trial of his obedience in one particular precept or prohibition, as a part of his revealed mind and will; and likewise declared the penalty of the breach of the whole law in that sin. 2. On Mount Sinai, which law was but a recognizing and transcript of the said original law, writ in man's heart, but so as to be expressive of the fallen state of man; in which law, though but a brief summary in ten heads what was that obedience to God at first required of man, yet therein its abundantly declared, that man by a moral obligation was bound to observe whatever God enjoined as a duty to sinners in faith and repentance, and in all matters of instituted worship under the Old or New Testament, in the first table, and most especially in the first and second commandments; though those particular commands as to the Mosaical Institution were alterable, yet they being the revealed mind and will of God, for the time being, men lay under a moral obligation as the principle and foundation of that obedience. So wherever God commands and requires any duty in the Gospel,

the law primarily obliges us to obedience, and will revenge all disobedience and imperfection, if we are not secured from its curse in some way of perfect satisfaction and obedience; there needs no other law with sanction to try and execute a transgressor by. This is the law by which all the world becomes guilty before God; by which he governs the world, condemns every sin in the very regenerate, and every impenitent unbeliever; and by this law, and it only, Christ will judge the world. Neither does the greatness and aggravation of any sin, remove it to the trial of another law, as in refusal of Gospel remedy, but leaves men the more inexcusable under a higher degree of punishment inflicted by the same law; and whereas that place, Rom.2:16, is alleged to prove the change of the law-sanction, and that it is not the law of nature but the law of the Gospel by which Christ will judge the world. The allegation is grounded on a manifest mistake, for mark what is said, verse 16, in its next coherence it belongs to verse 12 {for verses 13-15 are shut in by a parenthesis} and then the sense is plainly thus, as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel, i.e., according as I have preached, that Christ shall judge the world by the law; for he says two sorts of men shall be judged by the law, such as had never no law, but what was written in their hearts, and such as had the written law; and Christ shall judge them both, according to the truth of the Gospel which he had preached, Acts 17:31, and this is according to the account Mr. Beza gives of the text.

6. Hence the law of God is but one from first to last, indeed in this one law there are many precepts, ten in the Mount Sinai law, and those ten contain multitudes of duties in other places of Scripture more particularly expressed; and upon this foundation of obedience is built all the ceremonial laws and judicial, which had but a temporary sanction; and no more hath the instituted Gospel worship, and are but branches that fall off, but our obedience to them for their time is moral, because they are the command of God, and that moral duty to conform to the revealed mind and will of God, remains, and will be our glory in Heaven, though particular circumstances and actions wherein this obedience is now ordinarily expressed, will cease; hence it was not needful that Christ should exert his perfect obedience in those circumstances and actions which do attend all the varieties of states, stations and relations that we are in, neither would it have been essential to Adam's perfection if he had stood, nor will

it be to glorified saints.

To conclude, the law of God is perpetual, and it's an eternal truth, do and live, as that the soul that sins shall die, not one jot or tittle of the law shall pass away till all be accomplished, heaven and earth shall pass away first, Matt.5:18; not that it is vacated when fulfilled, but established; and our Saviour tells us, that he that will break one of the least of these commandments, and teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; what must they then be called, who tell us, God has vacated this holy, righteous and good law, and brought in another in the room of it, that dispenses with little sins, and makes them not of a damning nature.

The law is the whole rule of obedience which God gave to the church under the Old Testament. It was a perfect and complete rule of obedience, which God required of his church; the moral law is the foundation of the whole, both Ceremonial and Judicial. By virtue of that covenant made with Abraham it was accompanied with a power and efficacy in enabling unto obedience. The law in itself as merely receptive and commanding, administered the power and ability under those that were under its authority, no more do they mirror commands of the Gospel. Under the Old Testament, it enforced obedience from the severity of its sanction.

II. CONCERNING THE GOSPEL

What Gospel is. The English word Gospel comes from good, god, or ghost, and spell, which signifies a word or saying, so that Gospel is as much as a good word, a comfortable word or saying of God, or the Spirit, the proper signification of it is a good message, or joyful news; and so it's used by Aristophanes and Appian, and in that sense is used Matt.11:5; Rom.10:15; Lk.2:10-11. The LXXII uses it expressly for good tidings, II Sam.4:10, and so Isa.52:7. The Gospel that we are to believe as the glad tidings of the kingdom of heaven. Mk.1:15; Lk.2:10. The publication of Christ's doctrine. I Cor.4:15; Rom.1:1. The Gospel of ages or eternal Gospel. Rev.14:6. I know no place that is used otherwise than for acceptable news, and glad tidings, and nowhere in the sense of a law or law-covenant; and it can be no otherwise, because to whom are these glad tidings brought, but to poor sinners, that are fallen under the law, become guilty before God, utterly hopeless and helpless in themselves? And by the said law, or any law that requires the least degree of holiness as a federal condition of life and salvation. Christ himself, Lk.4:18, from Isa.61:1, tells us who he came to preach Gospel good tidings to, it was to the poor, broken hearted captives, blind, imprisoned. The Hebrew word is of the same signification,

"O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, behold your God!" Isa.40:9.

2. Now then the Gospel is a manifestation of the grace of the covenant, the good news and glad tidings of life and salvation, promised in the covenant of grace to transgressors of the law, that lie under the curse of it, and was promulgated immediately after the fall {before the sentence was passed} by way of promise, without the least mention of a new law or law conditions to be performed by man to invest him in the said promise; the promise was to Christ and of Christ, that he should destroy the work of the devil, and spoil principalities and powers, and give life to the world, that the devil by his subtlety and malice had plotted to destroy; and as he thought had effected the total ruin and destruction of. The like promise was to Abraham 430 years before the law.

The manner of this salvation was soon exemplified in sacrifices, in Adam's family, as types of Christ the great sacrifice for sin; they were continued in the families of the faithful and after the flood, and in Abraham's and the patriarchs till the Church of Israel was erected and organized in the wilderness, when the whole ceremonial service was established, the economy whereof was but an entire type of Christ and the Gospel in the tabernacle and temple, state of the church; so that the whole service was no more than their Gospel, wherein Christ was daily preached to them, which Gospel of theirs labored under much faultiness, comparatively to what it was afterward at the appearance, and by the ministry of Christ and his apostles. "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." II Tim.1:9-10. "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." Eph.3:5-6.

1. This Gospel brings life and immortality to light by the promise, which was not so clearly discovered before Christ's incarnation and ministry. Eph.3:5. He appears to be the great sacrifice so long fore-typified, as likewise the great priest that was to come, after the order of Melchizedek, and the great prophet Moses prophesied of, to him gave all the prophets

witness, and John the Baptist pointed him out, as the Lamb of God that took away the sins of the world; and that he had received the Spirit without measure. The history of Christ's life, doctrine, death and exultation are imminent proofs of these glad tidings, from whence the four evangelists are rightly named. The witness and ministry of the apostles contain likewise the same, whereby there is the giving the knowledge of salvation, Lk.1:77, and that through this knowledge we should have all things pertaining to life and godliness. II Pet.1:3.

2. The promise of the Gospel to us, contains all good news, being free and absolute to sinners {such I Tim1:15; I Jn.5:11; 2:25} of Christ and of eternal life and salvation in him. Promises of the first grace freely and graciously bestowed on us as of faith, Eph.2:8, the Spirit, Lk.11:12-13, the new creation, Eph.2:10, and free justification, Ezek.36:25, the new heart, verse 26, a promise to make us to walk in his ways, and that we shall be his people; in the same sense, a promise to be taught of God, Jn.6:45; Isa.54:13; yea, the bringing us into a true Gospel obedience to the law, Jer.31:33, the making Christ our wisdom, righteousness and sanctification, I Cor.1:30, whereby obedience to God's law is graciously given us, Psal.110:3, the promise of perseverance, that we shall not depart from God. Jer.32:40.

3. The promises made to Christ, and of Christ, wherein our absolute salvation is wrapped up, so as to be a covenant, Isa 42:6; 49:6, 53:11,12, promises to him of the throne and dominion of David, in a spiritual sense, such as concern his priestly and prophetic offices, as Hebrews 7 & Psalms 10, to instance in all would be long.

4. All the names of Christ, as Messias, Jesus, Emmanuel; the account of his nature, of his offices, of his office in general, Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour; of Christ in particular, of his prophetic, priestly, kingly offices; his exercise of them, and his excellent Spirit which he showed therein, full of meekness, compassion, wisdom and zeal. All this is Gospel, and good news to sinners.

5. The gracious free invitations that are made to sinners, as Isa.55:1; Matt.11:28, with promises for encouragement. Here is high and rich Gospel.

6. The promise of principle and strength to perform every duty required, of his Spirit, to work in us to will and do of his good pleasure; of God's love shed abroad in our hearts to constrain us, of life itself; and that he will be the resurrection and life; of love, springing from the love of God; of making us good trees, that we may bring forth good fruit, is all wonderful Gospel.

7. All the discoveries Christ has made of his Father; his eternal election, his transacting with him in a covenant way, showing us the mystery of the Father, revealing him, by his glorious designs to glorify his justice and mercy in such a way of salvation; his designs to magnify his law, and make it honorable; to exalt his Son Jesus to be a Prince and Saviour, and give remission of sins; to exalt his free grace in this salvation by a free justification, adoption, sanctification, and glory; and in doing this, justice should lose nothing of its due, is all great and glorious gospels.

8. That in all these great and precious things, there is such a connection together that one encourages and leads to another, promise leads to duty, and duty to the receiving of promises, grace leads to glory, and that perseverance is as infallibly settled in electing grace, and as absolutely as the first grace. This is admirable Gospel.

9. The great and clear discoveries that are made of the evil of sin, of the dangers sin leads to, and sinners are in and running into, by continuing in sin, and laying open the strict nature of the law, that it dispenses not with the least sin, it requires still perfect righteousness and holiness, and sentences the sinner to eternal death and damnation for it; and therefore it's impossible, that any flesh living, by ordinary dissent from Adam, can be justified by the works of the law; it's a gracious and necessary piece of Gospel to take off a poor sinner from the love of sin and fondness of his own righteousness, which every sinner by nature is apt unto, and to set up the Lord Jesus as the only name whereby he can be saved, and to show, that he is able and willing to save to the uttermost, whereby a sinner becomes dead to the law, and married by faith unto Jesus Christ. This is in the glorious Gospel of God and our Saviour; it is the light of it that shines into the heart does this.

10. It is good news and glad tidings, that the grace of God in the Gospel does not make void the law, but establishes it, Rom.3:31; neither is the law against the promise, Gal.3:21, though that he that is under a law for justification, is under a curse, and that by the economy of the grace of Christ in the New Covenant, the Law and Gospel to sweetly harmonize. 1. In that the law has been fulfilled in Christ as to all righteousness, it has a full sanction as to every believer in the active and passive obedience of Christ; their delivery from the curse of it being by this, that he was made a curse for them; all their sins are condemned in his flesh, he bearing them on the cross; the law

has its end as to all righteousness and complete perfect holiness in Christ; believers are all complete and perfect in Christ as to the law. 2. It's good news that Christ's death was not only the satisfying of the law and justice of God on the account of our sins, and, together with his active obedience, the merit of grace and glory; but that this same death of Christ was the sanction and ratification of all the grace of the New Covenant, as a Testament, being by the death of the Testator, and as a law to Christ, which he lay under by his Father's injunction to perform. And this is the sanction spoken of, Heb.8:6, and more fully explained, verses 9, 15, 16, 17, compared with Heb.10:7. 3. It's good news to a believer, that God hath provided a way for him to come into an acceptable obedience through Jesus Christ, to the law of God, because the grace of the Gospel causes him to love the law and the commands of Christ in the Gospel-way of performance. He says, oh how do I love thy law; oh that my ways were directed to keep thy statutes; and he desires, that now God would grant him his law graciously, see Psalms 119. For the grace of God in the Gospel writes the law in his heart in a true love to God with all his heart, and a love to the law of God, and to the holiness, justice and goodness of it, and his great desire is now, that in Christ Jesus, and conformity to him, God's law may be honored, and therefore he looks up on the very performance of holy duties accordingly, as his benefit and privilege by the grace of the Gospel. Christ is sanctification to him, he is created in Christ Jesus to do good works, he is redeemed from all iniquity, Tit.2:12- 13, and taught by the grace of God to deny all ungodly and worldly lusts, &c., from love and faithfulness to Christ to keep his commandments; and this new Gospel restored principle of obedience is the new commandment spoken of, Jn.13:34; I Jn.2:7-8; II Jn.1:5, not that it was materially a new covenant. 4. Lastly, it is great and good tidings, that Jesus Christ is set on the holy Hill of Zion; that he is King, Head and Governor to his church; and that he has provided particular right laws, rules and precepts for them to walk by, according to the original design, purity and intention of God's law; and that now the law of God goes no longer out of Mount Sinai, but out of Mount Zion, and the word of the Lord from the heavenly Jerusalem. Isa.2:2-3; Mic.4:1; Heb.12:18,22,23. And its Gospel, that all power is not only given to Christ in his Church as King thereof, but all power in heaven and earth is committed to him, as to governing providence, and that he shall judge the world at the last day. These things are all the good tidings of the

Gospel, ratified in the covenant of grace, graciously, freely and fully bestowed on us in the Gospel, and upon no federal condition of our own performance, either before or after conversion.

ARGUMENTS THAT THE GOSPEL IS NOT A NEW LAW WITH SANCTION.

Argument 1. If Law and Gospel are especially distinct, then the Gospel is not a law, nor the law a Gospel, but law and Gospel are specifically distinct, therefore the Gospel is not a law. The consequence of the major is undeniable to any one that understands the nature of genus and species. The revealed tidings of salvation were never but by two ways to man, by works and by grace, that is called law, this Gospel, and they are contra distinct; and the law can no more be called Gospel, or the Gospel a law, then a man may be called a brute, or a brute a man.

1. Law and Gospel-grace are opposed expressly by the Spirit. Jn.1:17. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Here is not a law and a law opposed, but a law and grace essentially differing; for an old law and a new do not differ essentially, but accordingly linked, in the like manner and for the same end; Christ and Moses are opposed, Christ as a Son, to Moses as a servant, one being a minister of the law, the other of the free grace of the Gospel, Heb.3:5-6, as mediators, one of a legal administration, that veiled the grace of the Gospel; Christ such a mediator of the New Testament, who brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel. II Tim.1:10. Upon the account of this specific difference of Law and Gospel, it is at Mount Sinai and Mount Zion, or Jerusalem that is above, the heavenly are exposed to the earthly in that spiritual allegory of Hagar and Sarah, applied, Gal.4:24-25, which opposition between these mounts is fully and admirably managed by the apostle. Heb.12:18-22. To this let me add the specific difference that is made between those that are under one and the other. "For sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace." Rom.6:14. "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Jn.1:17. There are some under the law, and some under grace; he says not some under an old law, some under a new law; but what's the condition of them under the law? Sin reigns unto death; but as to those under grace, grace reigns through righteousness {i.e., of Christ, not of works of our obedience to any law} unto eternal life. Lastly, the opposition made between the works of the law and the grace of the Gospel, is in the point of justification; the works of the law, or any law, are peremptorily

rejected by the apostle in the point of justification; so that if grace justified in a way of works, grace and works here could not be opposed. See those two famous places that peremptorily reject all works of what kind soever, of what law soever, from justification, Rom.3:20; Gal.2:16, where it is said that by the works of a law, no flesh living shall be justified. It is reasonable to think, that if the apostle had intended we should or could be justified by any law, that he would not have told us by what law-works? Would he have spoken so universally of all law-works? Are not all good works, towards God and man, commanded in the law? But are some works of one law and some of another law? This remark of mine, about leaving out the prepositive article, showing that the works of all laws are indefinitely here meant, you would blow away as a cobweb, for your words are, upon such cobwebs, in the face of the plain scope of the Bible, does this cause stand. Cobwebs are fit enough to catch flies in; but I never fear an adversary that spits at arguments instead of answering them. Where's the argument, you say, because in a few places the article is not put in? You should have said, therefore the apostle excludes every sort, when he plainly excludes only one sort, as appears by the whole context. Rom.3:27.

"Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom.3:20. There's no justification by the works of a law; and know you not that which is denied to the genus as such, is denied to the species; and though he mentions a law of faith, verse 27, in the sense or senses which have been above mentioned, yet it is manifest that he absolutely denies justification to faith as a law-work; for else, why had he not excluded faith as a lawwork, when he excludes all works? And when he shows all works are excluded, he says, where is boasting then? Says he, it is excluded by the nature and power of true faith, which will always lay the creature low, and exclude all manner of boasting that may be in us; he says not, we are justified by faith as a work of the new law; but saith, that faith stands up against all such works, and law-justification; and this is witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, i.e., by the Mosaical ministry, as well as the prophets, where the prepositive points at law, in a peculiar sense; but what is it that's witnessed? It's that the righteousness of God is manifested without a law, any law for justification by Gospel grace. You mistake if you apprehend we make this our great argument, to prove that the Gospel in its nature is not a law with sanction; it is the plain scope and design of the apostle, in all those places where he disputes against justification by works, that we argue from, and make use of this observation, as a corroborating argument, that his plain intent is to exclude, not

only the works of the moral law, but the works of any law; for the apostle deals with the Galatians, which hankered after circumcision, and under pretense of observation of some of the Mosaical Ceremonies, would have introduced the works of the law to share in the matter of their righteousness. And therefore, by using law in the largest and most comprehensive sense, he casts out all law works as conditions of justification; and this is the sense Mr. Beza hath of the Apostle's scope on Romans 3:20, "St. Paul having proved the world to be guilty before God, and liable to His wrath, he concludes that which he undertakes to prove, viz., that no man could be justified by the works of any law; for having disproved one part of the disjoined proposition, he establishes the other, viz., seeing we are not justified by a law; therefore, only by faith in Christ alone, Christ apprehended by faith, as the Gospel teaches that we are both justified and saved; therefore, that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every believer; which was the state of the question, as laid down in the beginning of the Epistle. He tells us what does further show or demonstrate these things duly considered, that in this verse, by the naming the law without an article, all doctrine is understood, whether written or not, which does command or forbid anything, as the series of his arguments, and that effect which he ascribes to the law, in discovering sin does prove; you may see much more in him to this purpose; the works of the law are called the doing of those things, which the law commands, as they are done by us, or not done by us, not as simply commanded by the law." Now I suppose you will not call this learned man's arguing here a cobweb. It would have been easy to show upon what probable reasons the prepositive is added or omitted, in most places of the Epistles where 'law' is mentioned, which to avoid prolixity I must now omit. It's enough at present that it is left out in these eminent places, where justification by any works of any law, is utterly denied and condemned. It's frivolously objected by you, that the omission of the article here, argues not, because the Socinians would improve the leaving out of 'the,' Jn.1:1, against the deity of Christ; and say the word was a god, not the God; a God by office, {as one preached at P.H.,} whereas it's in that text an argument against them, and there is doubtless a great force in it; for as Mr. Baxter says by the first words, the word was in the beginning, the eternal essence of the Son is asserted. 2. By the next, the word was with God, where the article is expressed, and the person of the Son is distinguished from the person of the Father, God without separation. And in the third enunciation, he affirms, that the Word was essentially God, the same in essence with the Father; and if the article had been added, it had affirmed the Son to be the same person with the Father. It's no small matter,

therefore, in the declaring this divine mystery, that the article is first added, and then afterwards omitted, to show Christ is God, though not God the Father. See what an argument yours is, because the Socinians will make a false inference from the leaving out 'the' from John 1:1. Therefore it must be Socinianism to argue from Romans 3:20, because the pre-positive is left out, and law used indefinitely, that all laws are understood, and justification by all law-works are excluded. And whereas, you say, the text speaks directly of the law of Moses; if you mean thereby the moral law, it was essentially the same with the law of innocency; and the denial of justification by one, is also a denial of justification by the other; and so by all doctrines, requiring duty, as Mr. Beza says.

What you say of Galatians 3:11 militates against yourself, whereas you say, was every law given 430 years after Abraham? Is not the Apostle express in the three first chapters that law was the Jewish law? Do you not mean moral and ceremonial, and judicial, for these parts were the Jewish law; or as most the law of nature together with it. Reply. Were not these all laws of duty that God made, and all comprehended in the law of nature, requiring universal obedience to God in all things, that he should ever command?

But observe that justification by Christ, which is the same always in the Apostle's sense as justification by faith, is opposed to justification by the Law of Moses, which was the way the Jews looked after, partly by sacrifice, partly by their obedience to that law in the preceptive part; and thus they followed after that law of righteousness, Rom.9:31, and attained it not, because they sought it not by faith, but as it were, by the works of the law, verse 32. Mr. Beza, refuting Erasmus on that place, saith, "Erasmus wrongs the Jews, in that he thinks that they looked upon the salvation they had, to have been by works only, the grace of God excluded; for the contrary to this assertion appears by the prayer of the Pharisee, that the Jews had no other opinion of merits and grace than now our Sophists have, which conjoin freewill with grace, and faith with works. And indeed this was the stumbling block. I might go through Paul's Epistles to evince this, that all sorts of works are opposed to grace in justification." And this is the point he deals so roundly with the Galatians about, viz., their Judaizing, in joining works with faith in justification; not so much the ceremony of circumcision, which at another time he admitted of, but because of the reason why they knew that the Galatians thought circumcision so necessary, viz., as a work of the law; therefore he testified, that if they were circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing; and thereby they were obliged to keep the whole law for justification; because obeying it in one point would not serve, they could not be

justified partly by Christ, and partly by some partial obedience to the law; and there was as much reason to plead for a Mosaical imperfect obedience, to join with the sacrifices in justification, before Christ, as there is now for an evangelical imperfect obedience to conjoin with Christ's righteousness.

Lastly, grace and free-gifts are by all men opposed to all conditional claim, upon performance of a duty required by any law; and the Apostle always makes this debt, Rom.4:4, let the conditional part be never so small, it's a debt. Hence the Apostle places both eternal life and the righteousness by which we are justified, all in free gift to us. Rom.5:15,16,21. Yea, he directly opposes the Gospel gift of eternal life {which comprehends grace and glory} to any law with sanction, i.e., any law that pays death as the wages of sin; for the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ, &c. Now if your new law makes death the wages of any sin, then the Gospel gift of eternal life is opposed to it.

You say, "the benefits are not given us for our faith, but upon believing." Reply. For and upon, in a covenant sense, are the same, as to convey an estate upon the payment of five shillings is a bargain, and a good contract, though the estate be worth hundreds. You say, "if a man says, I will give you a thousand pounds, provided you will come and fetch it; is it not free gift?" I suppose it's reckoned so by him that is able and willing to fetch it. But the case may be so, that if some men offer me one thousand pounds, I will not fetch it to have it, and then I may not be able. One may offer one thousand pounds to a man that lies with broken arms and legs in the bottom of a deep well, provided he will come and fetch it, especially when he knows nobody can set his limbs and help him out. And how oft do you say, the first grace is absolute? And to say the same thing is absolute in the power of another, and make it a condition by law with sanction unto me, is the greatest absurdity in the world. And I tell you, that if a rich man offers a hundred pounds to a poor man, lame and blind, and in prison, and the king makes a law he should come and fetch it, or else be hanged, it would cease to be a free gift.

Argument 2. That which is a law with sanction curses everyone under that law, with an irretrievable curse upon the first transgression of the said law; but the Gospel does not bind anyone under a curse irretrievable, by the Gospel, upon the first sin, or many sins committed against the grace of it; therefore the Gospel is not a law with sanction.

The major is very manifest, that there's no law that pardons a transgression of itself; for it is a universal maxim concerning not only the law of creation, but of all laws. Gal.3:10 from Deut.27:26. The apostle says, he that is under law is under

a curse, provided he does not all things that are written in the book of the said law that he is under. Suppose you speak of your new law, the condition whereof you make faith and sincere-obedience; lowered conditions and imperfect obedience; and these are the all things contained in the book of this law; then immediately upon the publishing and promulgation thereof all unbelievers are irretrievably condemned by that law. The wages due by that law to every unbeliever, upon his first unbelief is absolute death. And the said law cannot relieve him, because he has not done whatever was written in the book of this law; it's true one law may relieve us in respect of another, in some sense at least as to the curse of it, but no law relieves from its own curse, therefore if the new law curses unbelief, it curses the unbeliever irretrievably, upon the first act of sin in that kind.

The minor is plain, because the Gospel does relieve from the curse that lies upon men for unbelief, {being in its proper nature a transgression of, and disobedience to the first law,} there's no sin or curse but the Gospel gives relief, though aggravated by the rejection of a remedy; all laws, with sanction, give the due recompense {constituted by that law} to the transgressor of it in any one point, therefore sin is always, in respect of that law against which it is, unpardonable, for therein the nature of that sin is adjusted, and the punishment that is made due to it. Hence therefore, if the Gospel be a law with sanction, everyone that appears upon trial to have transgressed it after its promulgation, less or more is under the curse of it, and that person which any law has once cursed, it can never bless; therefore this position puts thousands under a most certain, hopeless and helpless condition by the Gospel.

Argument 3. That which is a law with sanction, if it contain a promise of benefits upon obedience, is a covenant of works; for upon the same grounds that the punishment is the wages due in case of disobedience; upon the same is the benefit due, in case of obedience; the same law makes one a debt as well as the other, for whatever is of law is of debt, either upon the account of sin or of righteousness; the law was the same upon both accounts to Adam, life had been a reward, and wages due as well as death; therefore the apostle argues so strenuously against all kind of works, Rom.4:4, to him that works there is a reward, not of grace but of debt; and he excepts not him that works according to the new, but to him that works, whether according to the old or new law; the reward to him that works by any law, is debt by the said law.

Argument 4. If the Gospel be a law, its either the same law with the law of nature, or a distinct law from it; but its neither the same law nor a distinct law from it, therefore no law with sanction. The necessity of the consequence in the disjunction

cannot be doubted by any man of reason. The minor is thus demonstrated. It's not the same law with the law of nature; this you will not say, because you call it a new law; and if it be the same law, then you have no pretense to evade all the consequences that will be drawn upon you from the doctrine and arguments of the Apostle Paul, therefore I doubt not but I am secure of you as to this part of the dilemma.

Therefore I come to the second, that which must be essentially the same law with the old law, is not a distinct law from it, but your new law must be essentially the same with the old law, therefore it is not distinct from it.

Your new law can have no essentials distinct from the old law, for if it has the same essentials its the same law, the same matter and form, and the same integral parts wherein they consist. The parts of a law are condition and promise, in case of obedience, and threat in case of disobedience, the connection of these makes the form; all this you will allow. Hence there is the same law-nature in one as in the other, and therefore it's a law in the same way and manner, and a man under it must be dealt with in a law way and manner; obedience to God was commanded there, and so here; disobedience to God forbidden there, and so here; life promised there upon obedience, and death threatened there upon disobedience, and so here, and what obedience is there which is not commanded in the old law? And what disobedience that is not forbidden there? But you will say the old law commanded perfect obedience, and the new imperfect. 1. The new law would not certainly command what the old law forbade, but the old law forbade all imperfection in obedience and cursed it. 2. Whatever the degree of obedience is that any law requires, it's perfect, in regard of that law that requires it. 3. It should be strange if God should make that which is imperfect, sinful, condemned obedience by one law, to be perfect obedience, and justifying by a new, and so set law against law.

Lastly, as to the promise, it's the same, for it was everlasting life, both in the old covenant and the new; the manner of having it by works or by grace, alters not the nature of the thing itself. A house in itself is the same whether I purchase it or it be given to me. From all which I conclude that this pretended new law is no other than the old law furbished up again, that in itself it must be essentially the same, works and justification by them, that if there be some little difference in modalities it makes no essential change than is in a man that wears one colored suit of clothes one day, and another on another day. I argue, that covenant that bestows the grace of the promise without a previous condition, is not a new law; but the covenant of grace bestows the grace of it without previous

conditions performed by us. Therefore it bestows eternal life unconditionally; ergo, for it bestows the first grace {according to yours} unconditionally, which is eternal life. "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." Jn.17:3.

Argument 5. If there be no need of a new law, God is so wise he will not make a new law, if there be no need of it or use for it, then the Gospel is no new law, but there's no need or use of a new law. Minor. There's no need or use for it, neither in respect of the Law or Gospel dispensation of justice or of grace. 1. There is no need or use in respect of law or justice, because the old law is a sufficient rule for distributive and commutative justice, it condemns every transgression and disobedience eternally, it has provided curse and condemnation enough for the greatest and most aggravated sin, for unbelief in the least and the highest degree, and so for impenitency; all the world is guilty by this law, God rules the world by it, and will judge it by it, there is not the least or greatest duty but is here commanded, which is or shall be the will of God, not only in the way of moral duty, but in all matters of instituted worship under the Old and New Testament. Lastly, in respect of justification and reward, if God had intended to have given life as a reward of the works of any law, he could as easily have done it by the old law, and sure would never have made a new one to have done it by. 2. There is no need of a new law in regard of the dispensation of the grace of the Gospel, because what the Gospel does, it's in way of delivery of man from the curse of the law that they lie already under; and here there is no need of law, because it's done all in a way of free grace. Pardon of a condemned prisoner must come merely from the good will of the Prince, it's inconsistent with his prerogative to be bound to it by a law; therefore God reserves this prerogative, he will have mercy on whom he will have mercy. And it's needless in respect of the condemned person, because there's need of nothing but a free proclamation of grace and mercy to a condemned prisoner, and if he refuses it, it's at his own peril, it's his choosing; but to remain in the status quo, under the law, that he was condemned by, and to be executed according to it.

You'll say, there's need of a new law in respect of new obedience. Answer. I say no; for God's law is still perfect in respect of the rule of obedience. The Gospel requires no other obedience materially than what the law required. The Gospel makes provision in the dispensation of free grace for all obedience that the law requires, for the perfection of is in Christ, for our conformity to it through its promise, teaching and new creating, and writing that law anew in our hearts which the fall had blotted out. Well, to conclude this argument, the apostle

expressly says, Rom.3:21, "now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets," i.e., by the whole Old Testament, as the Jews were wont to divide it; and therefore by faith, &c., for distinction from law, in the sense that he took it in, when he said, without law; new obedience is obedience to the law, from a new life, principles, strength, and for new ends.

Argument 6. That which is inconsistent with the grace of God in the Gospel, is not to be admitted; but that the Gospel should be a law with sanction is inconsistent with the grace of God in the Gospel, ergo, the minor is easily made manifest. 1. From the nature of a law, that's to enforce obedience; where a thing is freely given, its expected it should be freely received and not enforced. 2. It's inconsistent with showing mercy to poor, lame, blind cripples, to grant them relief upon unperformable conditions. Yea, it is also an abuse of justice to the law, that lame men should walk before their limbs be restored; I pray did Christ heal the diseased, restore the lunatics, raise the dead, cast out devils, by a law? 3. If it be consistent with the grace of the Gospel to act by a law in saving sinners, it must be before regeneration or after; not before, for then they will come under no law, they are out in rebellion against all law, nay they are already in the custody of the law, and therefore not capable of coming under the terms of another. 2. Their salvation must lie in delivery of them from the custody and curse of that they are under; which cannot be by making terms with them, but with the law offended that detains them; therefore it must be mere grace without a law, that must open the prison doors to them. 3. You say, the first grace is absolutely and freely given, therefore the sinner can come under no terms of law in order to the bringing him into a state of grace, for terms of a law laid upon any supposes a power and ability in them to perform the said terms, if they will, and that they can both will and do if they will. It's not a new law after regeneracy, for then grace begun would cease to be free grace afterward; Christ is not only the author, but the finisher of our faith and obedience; our perseverance and standing in grace would not be so secure as its beginning, the grace of the covenant would not be homogeneous, one part would be free and absolute, the other conditional and upon terms; but the operation of the Spirit and promises of aftergrace, they are all of the same nature first to last, as God begins so he perfects and completes the new man; he works all our works in us, all-a-long, in the same way and manner as they are begun.

Argument 7. If the Gospel be a new law, it was made as soon as the old law was broken; and, as new as it is, it must be that law by which the patriarchs antediluvian and postdiluvian were saved. This consequence, I suppose, cannot be denied,

because we are saved even as they, and the Gospel was preached unto them. But there was no such new law from Adam to Paul's time. 1. The Gospel was not delivered to our first parents in the terms of a law, but absolutely so to Abraham. The apostle is most express in it, that there was no law given to his time, that could be a Gospel, i.e., that could give life to sinners. Gal.3:21. If there had a law been given which could have given life, verily righteousness had been by a law; and now I pray except not at my reading "a law," indefinitely understanding any law, for our translators render it so; and I must tell you they should by the same reason have rendered in the same manner, and then the text had been uniform in the translation as in the original, if there had been a law {any law} given, which could have given life, verily righteousness had been by a law, therefore your new law was not given before Paul's time, but the Gospel was, therefore the Gospel is no law with sanction.

Luther on this place says thus, "though those words of Paul be never so plain, yet the Papists have this wicked gloss always ready, that he speaks only of the ceremonial law, but Paul speaks plainly, and excepts no law, whether moral or ceremonial, or any other; wherefore their gloss is not worth a rush. And contrariwise we affirm, that there is no law, whether man's law or God's law that giveth life; therefore we put as great a difference between the law and righteousness as between life and death, between heaven and hell; and the cause that moves us so to affirm, is, that the apostle says, the law is not given to justify, to give life and to save, but only to kill and to destroy, contrary to the opinion of all men naturally, &c. This difference of the offices of the Law and the Gospel keeps all Christian doctrine in its true and proper use."

This witness of Luther I can set against all the testimonies you bring from any whatever, who hold or have held the Gospel a law with sanction, as you do; divers may speak of it under the terms of a law of faith, or understanding by law the precepts of the Gospel; but if they plead, that the true and proper nature of the Gospel is a law with sanction, as you do, I do renounce their opinion, and do oppose them therein, as I do you, it being as such fundamentally destructive to the Gospel, and the whole nature of the grace of it.

Luther on Galatians 4:4, speaks thus, "now, whereas Christ in the Gospel giveth commandments, and teacheth the law, or rather expounds it, this pertaineth not to the doctrine of justification, but of good works. Moreover, it is not the proper office of Christ {for the which he came principally into the world} to teach the law; like as it was to heal the weak, to raise up the dead, &c. These are indeed excellent and divine works; but yet not the very proper and principal works of Christ. For the

Prophets also taught the law, and wrought miracles. But Christ is God and man, who fighting against the law, suffered the utmost cruelty and tyranny thereof; and in that he suffered the tyranny of the law, he vanquished it in himself; and afterward being raised up again from death, he condemned and utterly abolished the law which was our deadly enemy, so that it cannot condemn and kill the faithful any more. Wherefore the true and proper office of Christ is to wrestle with the law, with the sin and the death of his elect, and so to wrestle, that he must suffer and abide all these things; and by suffering them in himself, conquer and abolish them, and by this means deliver the faithful from the law and from all evils. Therefore to teach the law, and to work miracles, are particular benefits of Christ, for which he came not principally into the world. For the Prophets, and especially the Apostles, did greater miracles than Christ did. Seeing then that Christ hath overcome the law in his own person, it followeth necessarily that he is naturally God. For there is none, whether he be man or angel, which is above the law, but only God. But Christ is above the law, for he hath vanquished it; therefore he is the Son of God, and naturally God. If thou lay hold upon Christ in such sort as Paul here paints him out, thou canst not err nor be confounded. Moreover, thou shalt easily judge of all kinds of life, of the religions and ceremonies of the whole world. But if this true picture of Christ be defaced, or in anywise darkened, then followeth a confusion of all things. For the natural man cannot judge of the law of God. Here faileth the cunning of the philosophers, of the canonists, and of all men. For the law hath power and dominion over man. Therefore the law judgeth man, and not man the law. Only the Christian hath a true and a certain judgment of the law. And how? That it doth not justify. Wherefore then is the law made, if it do not justify? Righteousness before God, which is received by faith alone, is not the final cause why the righteous do obey the law, but the peace of the world, thankfulness towards God, and good example of life, whereby others be provoked to believe the Gospel. The Pope hath so confounded and mingled the ceremonial law, the moral law, and faith together, that he hath at length preferred the ceremonial law before the moral law, and the moral law before faith."

Argument 8. If the Gospel be a new law, then we must have a double righteousness for our justification; but we have not a double righteousness for our justification, therefore the consequence is good. 1. From most of your concessions, that we have the righteousness of Christ, and that which you call subordinate. {You should rather have said as Dr. Owen argues, that Christ's righteousness is the subordinate, it being in order to our justification by a new law.} Mr. Baxter, and others speak more distinctly and say, a legal and evangelical righteousness;

but, in truth, it must be two legal righteousnesses; for, there is no law but must have a peculiar distinct righteousness from that of any other law, whereby man under it must be justified, and all the righteousness that serves for justification by another law, has nothing to do in our justification by the said law; and therefore there must be two distinct righteousnesses and two distinct justifications, as there are two distinct laws. Unless you say that the old law is vacated, which is a contradiction; if you do but own, that Christ is the end of that law for righteousness to everyone that believed, and then it cannot be vacated, for a law vacated and a law in force is a contradiction, and a law fulfilled to every jot and tittle to every believer remains in force. Therefore it remains, that we have two righteousnesses for justification, and both legal, because all law righteousness is legal; Christ's single righteousness is indeed legal in respect of the law, and evangelical in respect of sinners, it being to them the gift of righteousness; so with us the same thing differs only respectively. 3. There must be as distinct righteousness for justification, as there is unrighteousness for condemnation; but each law has its distinct unrighteousness for condemnation.

The minor is easily proved, that we have not two righteousnesses for justification, for if we have. 1. Christ's righteousness is not enough for our justification unto life, contrary to the Scripture. 2. All the Popish doctrine will unavoidably come in at this gate, which is wide enough for it. 3. Our own works, call them what you will, let them be faith and sincere obedience, imperfect holiness, &c., must come in for a share in our justification, contrary to Titus 3:5, and an hundred places of Scripture besides, nay, for the whole of our justification by the new law; for the righteousness that answers that, must be distinct from the righteousness that answers the old law; and to enervate this doctrine, many have wrote to very good purpose, in particular that most worthy divine, Mr. John Troughton, in his *Lutherus Redivivus*, a book worth every Christian's having.

You say, page 25, hath the Gospel Covenant no sanction? What think you of Hebrews 8:6? Reply. You might have said Hebrews 9:15-16, for I said not that the Gospel Covenant has no sanction; it has a sanction, as a testament in the death of Christ, in which the law is satisfied for us, and upon which the better, absolute and clear promises are founded; and herein was that calling placed, the establishment of the promises of life and salvation, on the sure conditions of Christ's righteousness, and not of our performances.

You say, what will become of Dr. Owen's law of justification? Reply. His law of justification is the law that Christ came under, in doing and suffering, the fulfilling God's will for

the justification of a sinner; this was the law that was in his heart; for the doctor's words are, not that he did as a King constitute the law of justification, {as you say,} for it was given and established in the first promise, and he came to put it in execution.

You say, it's one thing to be justified for faith, and another to be justified by it. Reply. I say so too, if it be in the Apostle's sense, by faith be in opposition to by works; but if you make faith a law-condition, then this by comes for, and it signifies just as much as being justified by works. And thus Mr. Bulkly in your own quotation is against you, for he says, if we make the commandment of believing to be legal, then the promise of life, upon the condition of believing, must be legal also. And so it must needs be upon your hypothesis, that the Gospel is a law. You often say, the Gospel-law is not a law of works, and that Paul said so. What is so said either by the Apostle or you, the Gospel is denied thereby to be a law with sanction or law-covenant, for if there be no works as condition to it, there's nothing but promise; but where is your sincere, conditional, imperfect obedience, if there be no works? It's absurd to say the first grace is a condition required of us, because you grant it absolute.

You tell us what Dr. Owen says on Psalm 130, this is the inviolable law of the Gospel; i.e., believing and forgiveness are inseparably conjoined, which has nothing of your sense in it. Concerning faith's being the condition of a law with sanction, he says nothing; he means no more but that they are connexed by God's constitution. So there are many things, connexed in the promise, as faith and forgiveness, faith and repentance, faith and love, justification and sanctification and glorification. I could quote you hundred places out of Dr. Owen, where he militates against this very principle of yours, page 407, "the apostle speaks not one word of the exclusion of the merit of works, only he excludes all works whatsoever. Some think they are injuriously dealt withal, when they are charged with maintaining merit; yet those that best understand themselves and the controversy, are not so averse to any kind of merits, knowing that it's inseparable from works. Those among us who plead for works in our justification, as they use many distinctions to explain their minds and free themselves from a coincidence with that of the Papists, they deny the name of merit in the sense of the Church of Rome, and so do the Socinians. See more, pages, 408, 409, where he shows all works before and after grace are excluded.

What you quote out of my honored father's book, I see nothing contradicts me, if rightly understood; had not your doctrine been contrary to his, {though I hope I should defend

the truth, according to my light and conscience, though against my own father,} I should never have given you the least opposition; but it's not human authority must turn the scales in these matters. You quote men's transient expressions that speak of a Gospel-law and conditions in a sense that may be borne with, when they approve themselves clear in all main points; others speaking in such a dialect in sermons and practical discourses; to show that such things as God has conjoined, man is not to sever. As for the two great divines, besides Dr. Owen, I mean Dr. Goodwin and Mr. Clarkson, I know them to be expressly against your notion of the conditionality of the covenant, and by what you quote out of them, it appears to be so. See Dr. Goodwin's, judgment about conditions, whether faith be a condition, Sermon XXXII, page 301. "I would have this word laid aside, I see both parties speak faintly, Perkins on the Galatians, and another, there is danger in the use of it, a condition may be pleaded. In those expressions, if a man believes he shall be saved, import, that he that does so, shall be saved in the event, which the elect only are, to whom he gives faith. My beloved, the nature of faith is modest, it never makes plea for itself; if it were a condition, a man might plead it before God; and the making it a condition, seems to me, to import as if there were an universal grace; and that it is the condition terminates it to this man and not to that." What Mr. Clarkson says, is nothing to your purpose, for he says, "the first blessings of the covenant are promised absolutely, and subsequent blessings, are in some sense conditional, not that God makes a conditional bargain with us, but because Divine wisdom has made a connection between these blessings that they shall never be separated, &c."

LASTLY, I SHALL GIVE AN ACCOUNT OF THE BEGINNING AND PROGRESS OF THIS NEONOMIAN ERROR.

This doctrine was first forged by the Pharisees of old, who did not believe themselves justified by perfect obedience to the moral law, their owning the sacrifices and other types {their Gospel} being a sufficient evidence that they acknowledged themselves great sinners, and far enough from perfect obedience; they only thought that obedience that they did perform, was through the merciful nature of God accepted to justification of life, and that their sins expiated by sacrifices.

For not only the Scriptures give us full assurance of this to be truth, but it is easy to show what the opinion of the ancient and later Jews were, in this matter. 1. They placed their

righteousness, not in perfect obedience, but in sincere obedience. So Paul, before his conversion, Acts 26:5; 23:1, the Jews went to establish their own righteousness and their imperfect obedience, as such, in conjunction with the atoning sacrifice for their justification. And Menahem Recanati says, know that the life of man, in the precepts, is according to the intention that he has in doing them; but they say, faith is the cause of blessedness, and, therefore, the cause of eternal life. Thus the author of *Sefer ha-Ikkarim*, implies that faith justifies as righteousness itself, for, says the same author, our father Abraham praised, by reason of his faith; for it is said that he believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. And that this doctrine was that which Paul contended with the Judaizing Christians about, and the false teachers among them, I doubt not in the least, and am very apt to believe, that it was these Neonomians that lay that charge upon Paul's doctrine; that it was a doctrine of licentiousness, and made so great a cry against it, for Antinomianism; or as being destructive to the righteousness of the law and obedience thereunto.

Philip, a presbyter and hearer of Chrysostom, tells of a heretic, then living, that held this opinion, that the Gospel was a law. The next I find it charged upon, is Pelagius, as one of his grand heresies. And from the Pelagians, said Dr. Leydecker, the Papists have taken up this principle. In the Council of Trent, they curse all them that say the Gospel is a promise without condition of observing the commands; and them that say, Christ is given for a Redeemer, and not a lawmaker; and they curse them that say, they just ought not to expect a reward for their works. Peter Soto tells us, the Catholic Church does hold, that Christ gave a new law. The same says S. De Clara, it is generally held by all the Jesuits. Bellarmine in his *De Justificatione*, contends that the Gospel, as such, is a law; and that it contains proper laws, with threats and promises, and requires obedience as a condition of life, and of the accomplishments of promises, which are so conditioned; and that merits cannot be otherwise defended, which the Papacy holds. Gregory de Valentia tells us, they reject the usual distinction of Law and Gospel, viz., that the law promises are conditional, and the Gospel promises free and absolute; he calls it a fiction. Mr. Foxe, in his *Acts and Monuments*, gives this following account of the Papist's opinion in this point, they say, Moses was a giver of the old law, Christ of the new. Thus, imagine they, the Gospel to be nothing else but a new law, given by Christ, binding to the promises the conditions of our doings and deservings, no otherwise than to the old law; and so divide they the whole law into three parts, the law of nature, the law of Moses, and the law of Christ, to the fulfilling whereof they attribute justification. And thus they leave

the consciences of men in doubt, and induce many errors, bringing the people into a false opinion of Christ, as though he were not a remedy against the law, but came as another Moses to give a new law to the world.

Dr. Robert Barnes, who suffered martyrdom in Henry VIII's time, 1540, vigorously opposed the Popish Bishops in this point; as appears by his excellent treatise of justification. In defending justification, by faith alone, according to the true meaning of the apostle Paul, hath these passages. "It were but lost labor for Paul to prove that works did help to justification; for that the Jews did grant, and required no more; but that which they stood upon, was, that works might not be clearly excluded. But here, peradventure, it will be said, that Paul condemns the works of the old law, but not of the new law; are you now satisfied in your consciences? Think you, that you have now foiled Paul's argument? Think you to be thus discharged before God? Go boldly to the judgment of God, with this evasion, and doubt not but then you shall find St. Paul strictly and strongly against you, and your new works, as ever he was against the Jews and their old works. Briefly, what works can you excogitate to do, which be not in the old law, and of the old law? Therefore he speaks of all manner of works; for the law includes all works that ever God instituted, the highest, best and most of perfections; what works, in the new law, have you better than those of the old law? But grant that there be certain works of the new law which be not of the old; yet have you not, nor can prove that these shall justify; for there can be no more goodness in these works, than were in the works of the old law, for they were to God's honor, and the profit of the neighbor, and yet you grant that they cannot justify. St. Paul disputes against them that were christened, and had works of the old law and of the new; yet concludes, that Christ alone justified." Mark his argument; if righteousness comes by the law, then is Christ dead in vain, &c. Where he proceeds to enervate this doctrine of Neonomianism.

From the Papists the Socinians took up this doctrine, as Dr. Leidaker shows, styling them, our new Pelagians. They do indeed {says he} exclude ceremonial works and the works of the Jews, who oppose the Gospel, but when they may seem to differ from the Roman Catholics in the doctrine of merit, they answer, that Paul excludes works of the law not interrupted by sin {i.e., perfect persuading works} or merits, not those that are performed according to the mild law of the Gospel, and he takes notice how Dr. P. Barrow, a divinity professor in England, was among the first of ours that deferred the true doctrine, and an assertor of this doctrine, that the Gospel is a new law, showing that no man was ever justified by a perfect observance of the law, but by that observation which depends upon mercy, and

includes pardon of sin, the regenerate do perform that law. This treatise of Dr. Barrow, the Arminians, when they began to spring up, highly applauded, says Dr. Leidaker; his words are, they changed the very Decalogue into a covenant of grace, confounding it with the Gospel, asserting a covenant of works; saying, that notwithstanding the giving Christ, God might have set up again a covenant of works, but he would not, because of the weakness of the flesh; therefore in the room of the rigid covenant of works he substituted a milder covenant, mixed with goodness and grace, in which faith with imperfect obedience to the law might be accepted for perfect righteousness unto life. These doctrines Arminians began to vent, but Simon Episcopius taught them openly, whom Curcellius also followed as his master, and more lately Dr. Limburgius, who asserts, that the Scripture nowhere teaches Christ's righteousness is imputed to us; and says, this error {so he calls the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness} arises from a false opinion, that Christ gave full satisfaction to vindictive justice for all the sins of the elect, and bore their punishment in their stead, and fulfilled the law for them; that the Gospel contains no precepts, but in respect of the elect are mere promises, &c., which doctrine of Limbergius {says the said learned author} was almost Socinian, as he shows how this man excludes not all works from justification, but only the works of the new law. He shows how the Remonstrants, the Dutch Arminians took up with this doctrine; how it prevailed in France, which after the endeavors of Meliterius and Corducus, Camero's triplex fiedus, gave the greatest occasion to, which Cocce[^]s and his followers opposed, and lastly showed how it has prevailed in England, in opposition to which the labors of Dr. Owen, in his Treatise of Justification, and of Mr. John Troughton, in his Lutherus Redivivus, is highly commended by him.

From all which it does appear, that this is no new error, but an old one, ever since Christ and the apostles time, and has been a leading principle to all doctrines, contrary to the free justification of a sinner by the righteousness of Christ alone, apprehended by faith, and the foundation of the doctoring of free-will, and the natural power and ability of fallen man to do good works that are pleasing unto God, and in some way or other, in part or in whole, rewardable.

He that will see a full account of this doctrine, from the positions of the Jesuits, and a clear refutation thereof, and all their arguments they bring for it, even more than you do, let him read, the learned Christoph Pelargus, *Novus Jesuitismus*, printed in 1608.

Divers passages in your reply and its preface, wherein you lie open, I have omitted remarking upon. 1. For brevity's sake. 2. Such as concern others; I leave to them. 3. As to all

material points, in deference, you will see my mind elsewhere. I shall only note, how weak and absurd the reason is, you give, for your desiring the testimony of so many to your book, viz., because the people do often value names more than arguments. The people must be led by an implicit faith, as in days past. Can Protestants think this reason is for their honor and safety? But I spare you; and do assure you, my design hath not been for contention, in contending for what I have thought to be the truth; but my cordial desire is, that all may issue in the unity of the spirit of truth and peace, and what collateral expressions have fallen from my pen, from first to last, that are justly disrelished by you, or any other that fears the Lord, ascribe it to human frailty, which I am liable to; and usually may be seen in contests of this nature, how just soever they be. Excuse my plainness of speech throughout, and allow something to every man's natural temper and disposition. Sir, I am willing to be, notwithstanding all that has passed,

Your faithful friend and brother in the Lord, J. C.

EXAMEN CONFECTIONIS PACIFICAE, OR A FRIENDLY EXAMINATION OF THE PACIFICK PAPER

Chiefly concerning the consistency of absolute election of particular persons with the universality of redemption; and the conditionality of the Covenant of Grace. Wherein also the NEW SCHEME is clearly declared.

“Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with divers seeds, lest the fruit of thy seed which thou hast sown, and the fruit of thy vineyard, be defiled. Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together. Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts,

as of woollen and linen together.” Deut.22:9-11.

LONDON.

Printed, and are to be sold by Richard Baldwin, near the Oxford-arms, in Warwick- Wayne, 1692.

Sir, One of your Pacifick Papers falling into my hand, upon the first sight I took it for an Empyrick's bill, finding upon a deliberate consideration, that he was not offered to the world as an arcanum, and the patients referred to a box with the doctor's arms and seal upon it, with a direction to kill himself by an implicit faith, and that the ingredients and preparation was so plainly set down, with the approbation of noted physicians; I began to conclude, that surely there must be more of art in the said prescription, that I was at first aware of; especially observing so much plainness of heart, and good meaning attending the author, that he seemed to aim at common good in it, desiring not to keep anything as secret, under Chemical and Enigmatical marks or terms, for his own profit and honor, as some have done the same medicament before him, who have told us, that it was composed, for he tells us plainly what the confection is. Hereupon I thought, according to your true intention and meaning, I might take the liberty which you have given to all the world in exposing it, to examine the said prescription, whether it does comport with the rules of art, by which physicians prescribe, and apothecaries prepare their noble medicines; seeing now every nurse will be tampering in it, and take the liberty to themselves, to add, detract and alter as they see good, to the great hazard and danger of the distressed patients; I shall therefore endeavor to inform myself, as much as I can, from yourself concerning the preparation, {you speaking so much of the usefulness of it,} of this so much applauded medicament and accordingly examine it by the rules of art and I crave leave to ask you some questions, in order thereto.

Question 1. Sir, I pray favour me so far, as to tell me your opinion in some great points of religion, wherein you differ from many of our divines. Are you a Neonomian?

Answer. Sir, you know there are two sorts of those that oppose Arminianism; one that is a high sort; and the other the moderate sort, that are for the middle way in these controversies; and I confess myself one that have wrote several pieces so- called.

Question 2. You are the better able to inform me truly and plainly of the principles those moderate men hold, and go upon; I have known several of that persuasion that are very shy in speaking clearly in these points what they hold; and therefore use many ambages and subterfuges to hide their principles, still seeming to speak in the dialect of others to whom they are quite contrary minded. I apprehend you are a gentleman of much ingenuity, and plain-heartedness, and therefore I make the bolder with you?

Answer. I shall not deny your request, nor frustrate your expectation. We that are of this sort, do hold, election to be of particular persons, {not the choosing believers to be saved with the Arminians and Lutherans,} but the choosing persons to believe; and as to redemption, we hold that to be universal. The Scriptures say, Christ died for all and every man; God so loved the world, &c.

Question 3. As to your first principle, I have no hesitation about it, but I do much doubt about the second. 1. Whether there be any such thing as universal redemption? 2. If there be, I cannot see how universal redemption will compare with particular election? I pray show me how they will consolidate?

Answer. There are two or three distinctions you must be careful to observe. Of Christ in the flesh, and Christ in the spirit. What Christ has done in the flesh, he has and must have done for all, and the direct and immediate fruit of it belongs to all; for he took upon him our flesh, not as the flesh of the elect, but as the flesh of mankind, the nature of men, not of angels.

Question 4. I pray Sir, how does Christ's doing for us in the flesh, differ from his doing for us in the spirit? I thought, what he did for us in the flesh, was done by him for us in the spirit; so that Christ cannot be divided here; whence the parts of your distinction seem to be in conflict?

Answer. No, the work of Christ's redemption {being by his blood} was wrought for us through his flesh, {in which all mankind have union with him,} and that is therefore universal; while the benefit that does directly and immediately issue from the giving us faith and repentance, is the work of Christ through the Spirit, {in which his members only have union with him,} and is particular to the chosen.

Question 5. I pray Sir, what is your second grand

distinction?

Answer. You must consider the death of Christ as redemptory, propitiatory and satisfactory for sin, which hath pardon, its immediate, direct, and {I think} the only fruit; and the condition itself performed by some, which is not the fruit of Christ's death, as a perpetuation, though by way of redundancy it comes by it.

Question 6. I pray Sir, what is redundancy, and how?

Answer. I will tell you, though I cannot peremptorily, as thus; in all things whatsoever we pray for, suppose it be for fair weather, {as we have for such occasions,} we ask it in Christ's name, for his sake, or through his merits; when yet it would be a strange speech, to say, Christ died, that we may have fair weather; when yet, in some sense there's a truth in this; for if Christ had not atoned God, by his satisfaction for sin, no blessing could be obtained for, or by any; so that immediately, indirectly, or some way, by way of redundancy, such blessings come.

Question 7. Pray Sir, your third distinction?

Answer. The purchase Christ made, was a purchase for us, and for himself. His purchase for us, was, that we should be pardoned upon condition; he purchased for himself a power to give us that condition, that our pardon may be complete; and there is accordingly a redemption by price and by power; pardon upon condition, is the fruit of his redemption by price; but the condition is the effect of his redemption by power; repentance comes from this power of Christ, as a King, rather than a Priest.

Question 8. Does it not come from him as a Priest?

Answer. If as a priest too; it's by virtue of his intercession, rather than his oblation.

Question 9. Is Christ's intercession of less extent than his oblation?

Answer. Christ intercedes for nothing but according to God's will. His will is his decree, and it's from his decree of election that our faith and repentance comes; it's not from Christ's purchase by price, nor from the power of free-will.

Question 10. How comes it then?

Answer. It's from election, {which belongs to God, not as Rector, but as Lord of his own gifts,} working the same effectually in us. It is out of this treasury Christ gives it, not by virtue of a right to any from his death; not as a testator, but as an executor or dispenser of his Father's election. Faith and repentance is not the fruit of Christ's death, any otherwise than mediately or indirectly, and this way alone.

Question 11. What kind of pardon is that you say is the immediate fruit and effect of Christ's death?

Answer. Christ has procured for the world a general pardon; which none have benefit by, but he that believes and

repents; and I may call it a universal conditional remission.

Question 12. With whom was the Covenant of Grace made?

Answer. With man.

Question 13. How do you understand that?

Answer. With all and every man.

Question 14. The prophet says, it is made with the house of Israel?

Answer. The house of Israel there, is the whole world; all the nations that come in at the preaching of the Gospel.

Question 15. What is your thoughts concerning the law?

Answer. We are not freed from the law so, as we are no longer to obey it; but we are delivered so, as God will not deal with us according to it.

Question 16. How then does or will he deal with us?

Answer. I answer; by another law, a remedying law, the law of grace, the covenant of forgiveness, the law of faith; in opposition to the law of works. Christ said, I will redeem those lost creatures from the sentence of the law; but I will take them into my hands, or under my government, so as they shall not be lawless.

Question 17. Do you think the law remains in force still?

Answer. As a rule to live by, not to be judged by. We are judged by the law of liberty; we shall be judged by the Gospel. Blessed be God for that truth; we must be justified and judged by the same law; it's by the law of faith we are justified; and it must be by the law of faith we must be judged.

Question 18. Have we a double justification, first and second, as the Papists hold?

Answer. Yes, our justification is constitutive or sentential. To maintain, or have a conceit, that the sentence at judgment shall pass according to the law of works, is an error, and tends to subvert the Gospel, and practical Religion. It will be the great and only inquiry of that day, whether thou art a true and sound believer? If the devil put in his accusation, and says thou art a sinner, Christ will tell him I have put in bail for that, have you anything to prove the man no believer? He must be cast according to this law; I can read you the act.

Question 19. Pray, good Sir, I would fain hear it; you'll greatly oblige me by it; what, is it all one with Christ's will at his death?

Answer. It's Christ's act, or it runs thus, Father, I will that such an act be passed, which shall give pardon to all the world, and for all their sins; with this clause in the act, {the threat that is in the law of works to the contrary notwithstanding,} only I will have everyone that reaps the benefit of this act {which is laid in before} to receive the grace,

when promulgated with such a belief of it, as is working by love, showing itself serious and sincere. And I will that such a sincerity shall be accepted, {notwithstanding all their failings, nay, very much gross and long sinning, which they fall into through infirmity,} unto life and salvation. This is the tenor of this act; this will of Christ, that Law or Covenant of Grace, by which we shall be judged.

Question 20. And how are proceedings with the prisoner at the bar, according to this act?

Answer. As for this my servant at the bar, accused by you, {will Christ say,} when I was an hungry, he fed me, &c., i.e., by such works of charity as these, and such piety, and sobriety, or justice, and all other virtue, it does appear the man is a believer, and my disciple. These are evidences and manifestations of a sincere heart, and sound faith; therefore I declare him not guilty of the breach, but a performer of this law of faith, upon which he is tried.

Question 21. And do you look upon this as Justification?

Answer. The declaring a man righteous, according to the act he is tried by, is the most undoubted, proper justification.

Question 22. And what will the judge say concerning their sins?

Answer. He will say, as for this man's sins, and the sins of the whole world, I have myself bore them on the cross; I have satisfied for them by my death, in the behalf of all men; and this act is the declaration of a universal forgiveness {as of my will} upon these terms.

Question 23. When will this justification be?

Answer. In that day when you and I, and all the world, must appear before God in judgment; a day which, for ought we know, may last {as some learned divines have thought} thousand years, for thousand years, with God, is but as one day.

Question 24. Is it perfect righteousness we shall then be justified by?

Answer. We know that by law of grace, God expects we shall be righteous; and that he accepts of an Evangelical Obedience, according to this law, as perfection, for when all that is ill done, and all that is undone, is forgiven us, and not imputed; that which we have done, let it be never so little, it must, according to the law, be perfect. When it is not for the value of the work done, but upon the account of Christ's merits, that any man is accepted; whether my works be more or less, if I be found sincere it is all one, in regard of such acceptation; let me have wrought one hour, or twelve, my penny is still of grace, and our Judge is our advocate; and if there's anything to be accepted, {anything that can be produced as an evidence of sincerity, it will be accepted,} he will plead it for us, and be sure not to forget

us.

Question 25. Who is likely to plead against us at that day?

Answer. Satan will plead against us, but Christ for us; Satan will plead we have sinned against the Law and Gospel; but Christ will distinguish sinning against the Gospel, between the duty of the Gospel, and the condition of the Gospel; he will make it appear, though we have failed in our duty, {in respect of this or that particular precept,} we have not failed in the condition, and therefore we shall be cleared from the accusation of non-performance of the condition; and in order to this, and above all, I am persuaded of a fair trial. For God, who is infinitely good, will consider every one of us with grains of allowance, proportional to our several tempers, conditions, temptations, &c., and God send us a good deliverance.

Question 26. I pray Sir, give us the clear notion of your general pardon?

Answer. The term 'actual' used by divines, cloud the light I have offered; we usually distinguish between conditional and actual pardon; a conditional pardon is obtained, {we say, for all,} but an actual pardon, for none but the present truly penitent believer; we should, instead of actual, say absolute. The truth is, there is a pardon, an actual pardon, past long since; an act of grace; and actually standing pardon, and that universal; but this actual standing pardon being a pardon upon condition, it's, I may say, a pardon absolutely made good to no particular person, but upon condition performed; and when that is done, it is indeed a complete, absolute pardon. This is the fundamental understanding of the point discoursed.

Question 27. Is salvation possible to all mankind by this law of grace?

Answer. Yes, by this instrument of government, salvation is made possible to all mankind; or, whereby pardon and life are made attainable by all men upon the possible condition.

Question 28. I suppose that law is the rectoral rule of government, which a great doctor of that law speaks of; but I pray what or wherein is this possibly placed.

Answer. This is made a hard question, but I shall answer it easily. It is to be placed in the lowering the conditions to the capacity of all persons, having the power and use of their natural faculties, so that whosoever he be that lives up sincerely to the light he has, shall be saved. I add, that whosoever does but what he can, in order to his salvation, is sincere; and consequently the condition must be possible.

Question 29. Then others, beside the elect, may be saved if they do what they can?

Answer. No mortal does what he can, {every man can do more good, and less evil than he does,} I say, if he does sincerely what he can, {which all the elect only will surely do,} he shall have life, notwithstanding all imperfections.

Question 30. Then I suppose you judge many heathens may be saved, who have not heard of Christ?

Answer. It is an error {one of them called vulgar} which has reigned too long in the Christian Church, to think none can be saved by the name of Christ, who have not heard of him preached to them; the Jews will have none but Jews; the Mahometans, none but Mahometans; the Christian none but Christians; but I am hugely persuaded otherwise, that there's millions who have been, and thousands are living in the world, that have never known, and shall never know, how much they are beholden to Jesus Christ, until they come before him in judgment; and then they shall know it to their comfort, and Christ will stay for his thanks till that day, &c. To say any man shall be saved without Christ, is an error indeed; or shall preach up the salvability of the heathen, without this foundation; other foundation can no man lay, and the 18th article of the Church does anathematize that person.

Question 31. What point further do you recommend?

Answer. We must take heed, that we set not God aside as Rector and Lord; not so to advance and justify his Rectorship, as to exclude his Lordship in this business, and not so to advance and justify his Lordship, as to exclude his Rectorship in this business.

Question 32. But be you not very nice in distinguishing between God's Rectorship and Lordship?

Answer. Yes man, but here is the very mystery of the middle way; for, on one hand, they that old Christ died for all, procuring salvation upon condition, but leave the condition on man's free will, {on a co-operating with general grace procured,} they do excellently illustrate God's Rectorship, and justify him in dealing with us according to Gospel-law; but they exclude his Lordship. As on the other hand, they that hold that Christ died only for the elect, purchasing the condition as well as the benefit, and that there's no covenant but what's absolute; they do excellently advance God's Lordship, but in effect do exclude his Rectorship from having any hand in man's salvation. But as for those now who hold Christ has died for all, in purchasing pardon and salvation upon condition, which condition flows not from the power and co-operation of man's will, nor directly from Christ's purchase, but from election; these do most manifestly give God his glory, both as Rector and Lord; whilst they make him, as Lord, to give the condition to his elect; and as Rector, the judge of them, as of all the world, according to that condition.

Question 33. Is it not said, Christ laid down his life for the sheep? Appropriating redemption to the elect?

Answer. The meaning, is; because that when Christ has indeed died for all, to purchase a pardon upon condition; it is his sheep only that hears his voice, the elect only perform the condition, and reap the benefit of it.

Question 34. Are these things your own single opinions? Are they generally received by those that are called middle-way men?

Answer. I am a little troubled, to tell on my tale to the end; you know the difference at P.H., for these things were shown to the two brethren who are more eminent for this difference, that they would consent to the publication for a testimony; that though they differ in some points, yet they agree in the main truth of the Reformed Protestant Religion, &c., the one of them was willing {very willing} the other quite averse.

I find then, that your process, in brief, is this doctrine. Take as much of the doctrine of absolute election as you can get; universal redemption, all that is; federal conditionality without free-will, as much as will suffice, and of these make up an Evangelical Confession.

Men tell us this being duly prepared, it will reconcile all differences between Arminians and Calvinists; that it's the law we shall be justified by, both the first and second time; the law the world shall be judged by; and the law the heathen shall be saved by. We shall first examine the process; and if this panacea can be prepared, we may take occasion afterward to speak further to the unparalleled virtues ascribed to it.

It is duly to be weighed and considered, whether the ingredients be to be had? If they be, whether they are so consistent and comporting in their natures one with the other, that they are capable of blending together. As for absolute election, I have nothing to say against it; it's of a most admirable, transcendent nature, and is not to be had or found everywhere; but happy is that man that finds it, by making his calling sure. But as for universal redemption, I know there has been much disputing in the world about it; some arguing for it, and some against it. I will tell you plainly my judgment concerning it, as you have done yours. I cannot yet be satisfied that there is such a drug in the nature of things; to me it seems to be but such a thing as the pretended unicorn's horn, or the grand elixir of the philosophers; moreover, that if there be any such thing, the nature of it must be such, that none can rationally attempt to

compound it with Absolute Election of particular persons, especially seeing the process requires that they be compounded and brought together into a due composition, by a conditionality without free-will; and if these things be found to be as I apprehend, it will be in vain to make any further inquiry concerning the virtues or usefulness of the said noble confession.

We shall therefore briefly enquire, {not run through the abundance of arguments of this kind, pro and con, that have already been insisted on,} whether there is such a thing as universal redemption? And then, if there be, whether it will consist with absolute election, and a conditionality without free-will? And I shall use but some plain reasonings, that may carry a demonstration with them to ordinary capacity, and chiefly insist on the last thing, viz., their consistency.

1. Redemption is a word of a plain and known meaning; it's the saving of one from captivity or thralldom, wherein he is held, by paying a sufficient and effectual price, whereby the person becomes redeemed. It is easy to prove every word of this not only from Scripture, but from men's most ordinary understanding and acceptance of the word; but, for brevity's sake, I omit it.

2. I do suppose, that few will affirm, among them that are called Christians, that all men are saved. For if all men are saved, and none are damned; then Judas was saved, and the Sodomites, which the apostle says, are now suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Jude 7. I proceed to argue then thus.

1. That which never procures universal salvation, cannot be universal redemption, but there's no redemption procures universal salvation, ergo, there is no universal redemption. The minor I have granted, by all that will allow that there is a hell and damnation that Judas and the Sodomites are suffering of vengeance. For the major, I think it needs no proof; however, I will not beg its concession, but the demonstration of the major will lie here.

1. That price or payment which does not actually pass into, or terminate in salvation, is no redemption at all; and an attempt to redeem, is not redemption. 2. That redemption can be no larger than the salvation wrought; if it be but a partial salvation by the purchase made, it cannot in any sense be a universal redemption; the redemption must be as the salvation that is wrought by it; a sufficiency or goodwill pardon, and redemption itself, are two different things.

The word redemption is an abstract; it is but a word, unless we look for it in a subject, which we call a concrete; and, ergo, if there be universal redemption, it is or must be found in

the efficient, or in the effect of the same extent, for in conjugates there is a symbol of consentry arguments; universal redemption must be a cause producing a universal concrete; and this is grounded on an allowed principle; and universal justice must take in all the just persons in the world. So here, if there be but one redeemed captive from ultimate destruction, there is redemption; but there is not universal redemption of the captives, unless all of them be redeemed; nay if there be but one individual left behind.

If there be universal redemption, there is a universal redeemer. But there is no universal redeemer, ergo, no universal redemption. I judge there is none can see reason to deny the consequence of the major; for its easily enforced, being but arguing from the effect to the cause; and as the former argument was, from the cause to the effect.

I prove the minor thus, that there is no universal redeemer, from the mutual affections of relatives; the cause of sonship, is fathership; and of fathership, sonship; so the Redeemer is the cause of redeemed ones; and redeemed ones of a Redeemer; the correlate, the effect of the relation, and the relation of the correlate, vice versa; and likewise relative affection, is of as large an extent in one as the other. If a man say he is a father to all these ten sons, all those ten sons must own him for their father, as really so; but if his wife say he is not father to any one of them, his all is contradicted, the universality falls to the ground, for a general axiom is contradicted by a special, particular, or proper. So here, if Christ be a universal redeemer, the redeemer must be universal; and if it be true, that he redeemed all, it must be false, that Judas was not redeemed.

But I know what you are ready to say, viz., that the universal redemption that you intend, is conditional; and, that this condition to be performed, is not the fruit of Christ's death, and therefore not purchased by redemption, but is the effect of absolute election; the gift of which, though bestowed by Christ, yet is not the fruit of his death, as a propitiation. I think I take up your general sense clearly.

Against this I argue thus. That which is no redemption at all to some, is not universal redemption; but a conditional redemption is no redemption at all to some, ergo, your conditional redemption, is not universal redemption; the minor is of unavoidable truth, by this rule, that a general proposition is contradicted by a special; as thus, all men are redeemed, contradicted thus, some men are not redeemed, {by your own confession,} some, you say, perform not the condition; these can never be called redeemed ones; it's one thing to make an attempt to redeem, and another to be a redeemer; a merchant may attempt to redeem all the slaves in Turkey; but if his money

be not taken for any, he remains no redeemer; for redeemer and redeemed are relatives. Yea, if he obtains some, and bring them out of slavery, he is a redeemer of some, but cannot be a universal redeemer, unless he redeems all.

For the minor, that conditional redemption is no redemption. For it puts him but into a possibility of being a redeemer; makes him not actually so, whilst he stands under that conditionality; for the conditionality does not only lie upon the person to be redeemed, that he cannot be a redeemed one till the condition is performed, but it is a bar to the purchaser, that he cannot, in a good sense, be called the redeemer of such a person, till the said person has performed the condition; he must have his leave to be his redeemer. As for example, if I lay down a hundred pounds for the redemption of a person in slavery, upon this condition, that he will yield to serve me seven years after; I must have his consent to these terms, before I can redeem him; and therefore, upon this condition, I am certainly suspended from being a redeemer, and am no redeemer to the said person, if he refuse the terms; all that I have been, is but a profuser of terms. Hence, to be a conditional universal redeemer, is a contradiction; for, it is to be but a redeemer of some that perform the condition, and to be no redeemer at all to them that do not.

If Christ never intended universal conditional redemption, then there's no such thing; this must certainly follow, for sure none will dare to say that Christ did what he did, contrary to, or besides his intention; such are not worth disputing with. But Christ never intended universal conditional redemption. This appears to be true, upon your granting absolute election, from which Christ, as God, is not to be excluded, though as to the order of divine nature in the personality, election is primarily ascribed unto the Father; likewise the Father's will is eternally known unto the Son, and he comes, as a Redeemer, to do the Father's will, and no more nor less; therefore, what he sees and hears of the Father, that he does; and those he redeems, which the Father in electing grace has given him out of the world. Now Christ knowing electing grace, and taking his commission upon it, the Lamb's Book being but a transcript of the Father's will, he could never intend a universal conditional redemption; for it would have been a very vain intention, because the absolute election stands diametrically opposite to universal redemption, the absolute election being but of some.

Absolute election is an irremovable bar to the performance of the condition, by some; for the condition, as you say, proceeding from election, it must be cut off by absolute election, determining that a certain number should never have the performance of the condition.

Hence, I argue further, that which is contrary to the wisdom and goodness of Christ, is not to be allowed, or ascribed to him, but for Christ to purchase remission of sin, and salvation, {as you say,} upon a condition for all, is contrary to the wisdom and goodness of Christ; ergo, there is no such purchase; the minor only calls for proof. For Christ to purchase remission and salvation, upon a known, unperformable condition, is certainly not only inconsistent with, but contrary to the wisdom and goodness of Christ; and such is his purchasing for all, in your sense. You say that the condition is repentance and faith; and that thousands will not repent and believe. This Christ must needs know, because, according to your scheme, he took care to procure the condition for none, only the benefit upon the performance of the condition.

Again, because he knew the election, and that they would never have the condition, to what purpose was it for him to be at the expense of his blood such? And when he had done all, could not be a redeemer to them, because not elected. And, lastly, he knew they had no power to perform such conditions in themselves by freewill, as well as that they were not to be supplied from election or redemption; insomuch, that there is not a capability of having any benefit by redemption; and this assertion of yours, is, as if you should say, A.B. purchased an estate for me, and in my name, upon the condition, that I should take up the monument and carry it over the bridge.

Those that Christ never prayed for, those most certainly he never purchased remission and salvation for, upon any condition at all, but the non-elect he never prayed for; ergo, the major is manifest, by an argument from the greater to the less; those that he so loved as to wash in his own blood, he would most certainly pray for. The minor appears from Christ's own words, Jn.17:9, where he said that he prayed for them that were given to Him of the Father, that had or should receive his word, believing; and he said, he prayed not for the world; which world there must be understood of those that were not given to him by the Father, the non-elect, for he had no desire that they should be saved; and those whose salvation he prayed not for on earth, he interceded not for in heaven; and those he interceded not for, he purchased not with his blood.

Those whose persons Christ never redeemed to God by his blood, he never purchased life and salvation for upon condition; but the persons of the non-elect Christ never redeemed to God, &c., ergo, the major appears to be true; because the benefits provided in election and redemption, are no further than the very persons who are elected and bought. Now persons are absolutely bought by Christ, and benefits too, where the persons are so; when Christ purchases persons, he leaves

them not to perish upon conditions; but Christ never purchased the persons of the non-elect, for if he had, he had designed salvation for them, which the Father nor himself never designed. If he had brought them to salvation, he by that purchase had removed all rubs and hindrances out of the way and provided for all conditions; he would have been such a condition, that all conditions should have followed. Plus, he must have loved those in redemption, that he never loved in election.

Those that Christ purchased remission and salvation for, he did with the like intention and purpose. There is no ground to say, as you do, that Christ had a double love, a greater and lesser; an effectual love to some that moved him to redeem them; and an ineffectual love, and cold affection to others, that they should never reach salvation. The apostle speaks of his redeeming love, whom he loved, he loved unto the end. "Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end." Jn.13:1.

Such a purchase as leaves men under as great a condition of damnation, as of salvation, is not to be esteemed redemption; but a universal purchase, upon condition, is such, ergo, a condition lies equally both ways, {if man's will be left in equilibria,} therefore what can be said, even by Christ himself, concerning such, can be but be in a contingent axiom, and the best judgment of it, is but opinion. Now, is it not strange, that Christ had no knowledge of whom he redeemed, but that of opinion? And that in most he was deceived? Though you will say this argument does pinch hard upon those that deny absolute election, but not on you; if this do not, yet the next shall more strongly urge you.

That purchase of remission and salvation, upon condition, that leaves men under a certainty of damnation, is not to be esteemed redemption at all, but your purchase or remission and salvation for all, upon condition, leaves most under a certainty of damnation; i.e., really so, though they may not know it. I prove the minor which only calls for proof. For though you say there is condition, yet it is an impossible condition. 1. In respect of the men dead in trespasses and sins, and therefore, you'll say, cannot perform it themselves. 2. In respect of Christ, he never purchased the condition for them; it comes to none, you say, as the fruit of his death.

3. In respect of election, which is not universal, but absolute, and of some only; wherein it's provided, that none but a few shall have remission and salvation, and therefore none but they shall have the condition upon which it is granted. These are all your

own concessions.

I need not now say much about the composition of these ingredients, to bring them into a due mass, that they may become a useful medicament; there are artists that will tell you, that these things will never be compounded, though you ferment them, and pound them together never so long; and it is easy to see what a fumbling you make about it, and all your labor comes to nothing.

You say, it's no doubt but God and Christ may come major and minor in my construction; i.e., can love the greater and the less; but I judge, you mean, can love more and less; viz., that there's degrees in their love, you should have explained your meaning in that paradox, men will not be imposed upon by magisterial problems; you should have told whether the greater love be the special grace and love of God unto salvation; and the lesser, be the common goodness of God, which he shows, in giving life and salvation to all his creatures; but it may be that you mean this is the major amour, because most extensive; or you do mean the other is major, because more intense? Or do you mean an absolute redeeming love in Christ, is the major love? And a wishing well upon condition is the lesser love? Do you mean degrees in permanent or transient acts of God's love? Do you mean degrees in absolute electing love to the persons of the elect, or degrees in manifestation of love to them? But what are you here speaking of? Is it not God's love, and Christ's love, to remission and salvation? Are there degrees in it then? Did God elect some to remission and salvation, more, some less? You say that election was absolute; but you'll say, Christ loved some with a redeeming love to remission and salvation more, and some less. Believe it friend, more or less will not come into redemption, unless it were in election; everyone will tell you there must be equal proportions in election and redemption, and both must be of the same nature, as to absoluteness and conditionality, or else they will not mix. You will go on to prove your more or less of God's love, from I Tim.4:10, where the living God is said to be the Saviour of all men; which is meant only of common providence, as Acts 17:28, in him we live, move, and have our being; and in this sense he saves a man and beast, Psal.36:6; is it not said, that by him all things were made and preserved in their being, Col.1:16-17, and a savior in that respect, as all things were made by him, and for him, and upheld by his power, and hence comes the distinction of salvation, in the text, all things are saved, so as to be preserved by him; but he is a Saviour in a special manner, by way of redemption, to make them believe. I Tim.4:10.

You say the gentleman urged, Eph.1:7, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, &c., to

prove redemption and forgiveness of equal extent; which was done skillfully, like an understanding Christian and Scholar in Christ's school; like, at least, a noble Berean, for the argument runs thus, if whosoever has redemption through the blood of Christ, has remission of sins, then redemption and forgiveness are of equal extent, but whosoever {by the apostle} has redemption through the blood of Christ, has remission of sins, ergo, you answer not his argument, but bring another place against that, namely, II Cor.5:19, and so you endeavor to confound Christian understandings of Gospel-truths, instead of clearing up doubts that lie before them; the people must swallow all whole the teachers tell them, or be counted fancy fellows. I need not tell you the various acceptations of the 'world' in the New Testament. The 'world' is taken in opposition to the nation of the Jews, of which salvation was only for a great while; and it's in this sense plainly beyond all contradiction. I Jn.2:2. In II Cor.5:19, is plainly meant of men in the world, though not of the world, but given to Christ out of it, as in John 17. And the context gives us to understand, those that in due time were to be new creatures, and actually reconciled through the Embassy of Reconciliation.

Pacifick. If the gentleman's conceptions be true, that Christ hath purchased a pardon only for the elect; the apostle should not have said, reconciling the world, but reconciling the elect. And this is as much as to say, the Apostle Paul contradicted himself, if he means, Eph.1:7, that forgiveness and redemption are of equal extent, by mentioning the world; but there's nothing to be supposed to give ground to that consequence; whereas the elect being the best part of the world, are often called the world, by a frequent double trope.

Pacifick. The Scriptures say that Christ died for all and every man. Reply. You should have told us to the place where, that we might have considered it; until you do, we take it but as your saying so. You quote John 3:16, God so loved the world, &c. Do you mean the whole 'world' signifies everywhere, all and every man? The Spirit of God says, I Jn.5:19, the world lies in wickedness; does the world there, mean all and every man? What's become of the saints, of whom the world is not worthy? And again, our Saviour says, if you were of the world, the world would love its own, Jn.15:19, what think you of the world there? Is it all and every man? Where were the disciples Christ spoke to? If you would lay aside fondness of a nation, and impartially weigh Scripture according to the analogy of faith, you would not run upon these dangerous rocks, to hazards the shipwrecking your own faith, and that of your hearers.

Well, let us see how this text comports with your

scheme, God so loved the world, {i.e., by absolute electing love; ergo, all and every man was absolutely elected,} as that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him, {i.e., to answer the extent of electing-love, to procure the universal condition of remission and salvation;} by the world, you say this gentleman must understand the elect; and by the world, you understand all and every man; and by election, you understand absolute election. And what goes before God so loved the world, i.e., all and every man, with an absolute election, whence it will follow, that an unconditional universal election, providing all means of salvation in redemption and believing, must obtain a certain remission and salvation of equal extent with the election. And it does not {as you say} intimate, that there are some of those do believe, and some not; for God has but one sort of love unto remission and salvation; he does not pardon and save by quarters and halves; he did not love Jacob all together, and Esau a little minus; but loved one to salvation, and left the other in a perishing state to damnation, which was called hatred, and not little love. And if you understand by the world, all and every man, you must understand electing love of all and every man, and all that follows, to answer accordingly. But you say, the world must be more than the elect, all of the world, that God loves to give his Son for. And what's that, but the elect in the world? So that you confound yourself, out and in, and in and out again; we are like to make a fine composition by and by.

Pacifick. I will quote another text, "whom he did predestinate, them he called; and whom he called, them he justified, &c.," and why is here redemption left out of the apostolic chain, but because those that he had redeemed, are all the world? If this gentleman's doctrine were right, the Apostle would have said, whom he did predestinate, them he redeemed. Reply. Now here's the very mystery of Neonomianism; redemption must be left out of the apostolic chain; it has nothing to do there, any more than creation and the covenant of works. It may be Paul might forget himself here, but remembered himself in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and brought in redemption again into the chain. Why say you, was redemption left out, because all the world was redeemed? Well then, you see the Apostle Paul would not attempt to mingle absolute election and conditional universal redemption, why will you attempt it in this composition of yours? But all this while then it is probable you do but flounder about, for the Apostle does bring in redemption. You can't see wood for trees; does he not bring in justification? And does not redemption belong to justification? The apostle will tell you so in the same epistle. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom.3:24.

Pacifick. I shall use no more Arguments or Scriptures. Reply. No, I am glad you have done with them, unless you used them better, proceed then to your distinctions.

Pacifick. And because this gentleman thinks me singular, I refer him to the Church Catechism where the child answers, who redeemed me and all mankind. Reply. And I refer you to the Assemblies Short and Long Catechism, and the Church Articles.

Pacifick. There is a distinction this gentleman has not considered; a distinction of Christ in the flesh and Christ in the spirit; it's a Scripture distinction what Jesus Christ has done for us in the flesh, he has and must have done for all; the direct and immediate fruit of it belongs to all; for he took on him our flesh, not as the flesh of the elect, but as the flesh of mankind, the nature of man, not of angels. Reply. Christ in the flesh was it seems a poor weak thing, i.e., the Word made flesh, God manifested in the flesh, crucified in the flesh, his body and blood, common things belonging to all; but it was great things Christ did in the flesh, he bore our sins in the flesh, satisfied for our sins in the flesh, died and rose in our flesh, for by flesh is our natural body and soul, sometimes flesh, sometimes blood, is taken for the whole Christ. Did Christ condemn our sins in his flesh in vain? Or did he condemn the sins of the damned in his flesh? How come they now to damn them? But I'll tell you what Christ did in the flesh he did in the spirit, for during his doing what he did and does in the flesh, his flesh is not only united to his Divine Nature in the personality of the Son, but is anointed with the Holy Spirit without measure, Jn.3:34, therefore if what Christ did in the flesh were done for all, then what he did in the spirit was done for all; and what's the direct and immediate fruit, but giving life to the world? What will you call that? Is there a universal life to all and every man? But you have other immediate fruits you seem to intimate, that its being akin to all men as we are to Adam. I doubt you will not say he is being a public person and representative as Adam was of us, in his conversant standing and apostasy; for you say he took our nature, not as elect, but why did he take part of flesh and blood? Was it not for the elect? The Spirit of God tells us, because the elect, his seed, the children were partakers of flesh and blood, therefore he took part of the same. Heb.2:14-15. How can you say he did not take the nature of the elect, when he took the nature of the children; and the nature of man, because the children, the elect seed, were found in that nature, and not in the nature of angels, and they are called also his brethren?

Pacifick. What he does for us in the spirit, is peculiar to some, and if it be saving, it's to the elect only. Reply. It seems Christ in the flesh had one end, and Christ in the spirit another; Christ in the flesh more generous seeking the salvation of all;

Christ in the spirit more straight-laced seeking the salvation of some only; whereas Christ is the same in the flesh and in the spirit? The same yesterday, today, and forever, he was made flesh and dwelt among us, and his shining glory they saw, as of the only begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth; and of this full Christ in flesh and spirit, we receive grace for grace, without all this pitiful trifling. I wonder divines can talk at this rate, of a union of all mankind to the flesh of Christ, as much as you have with a man in the East or West-Indies. I pray what union with Christ's flesh, is that the Apostle tells us the church has, above all others in the world. Eph.5:30-31. I question not, but that is in his flesh and spirit too, after a mystical manner.

Pacifick. The giving us faith and repentance is the work of Christ through the Spirit. Reply. Christ does nothing through the Spirit separate from Christ in the flesh; it's the glory of Christ in the flesh, in respect of his humiliation and exaltation; yea, in power and efficacy that shines forth, and works in the Spirit; and is applied to us by the Spirit. The Spirit, when it works, it's the Spirit of Christ, and what has it to do? "He shall, saith Christ, glorify me, {i.e., God manifest in the flesh,} and take of mine, and shall show it unto you," Jn.16:14, what I have done and suffered, and procured; that faith and repentance and remission which I purchased for you. What ado is here; is Christ divided one part of him to those that shall be saved, and another to them that shall be damned? Is not this much like the meaning of the apostle, an accounting that the blood of the covenant wherewith we are sanctified a common thing. Heb.10:29.

Pacifick. The death of Christ, as its redemptory, propitiatory, or satisfactory for sin, hath this fruit; I speak of pardon, it is the direct, immediate and proper fruit of it, nay I may say, the only. Reply. This is the fruit of what Christ did in the flesh, which does thus belong to us all, but it's strange how learned men differ in these points. One learned in your law, will call this direct Antinomianism. He says, men are not forgiven immediately upon, nor merely by Christ's enduring sufferings, and yet you seem to speak to the clean contrary. I know you will say you mean both the same thing, though it be contrary in expression, but I pray tell how it is to be understood.

Pacifick. This pardon for all sin of omission and commission, and consequently a dis-obligation from all punishment of loss and suffering {passively} takes no less than a right to impunity and life, and this is held forth upon the condition of faith and repentance to all the world. Reply. Now you see what an immediate and direct is, in a Neonomian sense; it is mediate and indirect, for these great fruits you talk of, are upon the condition of faith and repentance, to come between pardon and the sinner; nay, you think it's the only fruit, there are no

special outward blessings which we have by Christ in the flesh, but pardon and impunity and that's no more than all the world has in the conditional grant; but whence comes this condition that gives the propriety that entitles to all? All the appearing glory of Christ in the flesh, is to a man as if he came into a rich beautiful country, he says, all this is mightily delightful to behold; oh, that I had money to purchase me an estate here; so I say, I pray tell me where I shall have the money that will entitle me to the fruits of what Christ did in the flesh?

Pacifick. The condition itself {performed by some} is not the fruit of Christ's death, as a propitiation; though by way of redundancy, it comes by it. Reply. Here is a flat denial of Christ's procuring by his death, faith and repentance; the first life of a sinner comes not by what Christ did in the flesh; are we not planted in the likeness of his death; alive unto God through Jesus Christ? Rom.6:11. Is not Christ the Resurrection and the Life? Have we not redemption through his blood? Our very having it by faith is through his blood; even forgiveness of sins. Eph.1:7. Was there not exceeding riches of power to us-ward who believe, which was brought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. Eph.1:19-20. Is not Christ our sanctification? I Cor.1:30. Are we not created in Christ Jesus? Eph.2:10. Are we not completed in him? Col.2:10. Is not the enmity of our hearts slain upon his cross; and our reconciliation wrought out upon his cross. Col.1:21. Heb.13:20-21.

It's strange to talk of faith in the blood of Christ, that was not procured by his blood; faith in Christ, and not through Christ; Paul was crucified with Christ, and Christ lived in him; and he lived by the faith of the Son of God, i.e., procured by the Son of God; how? By loving him, and giving himself for him; to purchase faith for him, Gal.2:20, and he gave himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity, {is not unbelief and impenitency iniquity,} and to purify to himself a peculiar people. Tit.2:14. Is faith and repentance spiritual blessings and benefits or no? If so, we are blessed with them in Christ Jesus. Eph.1:3. You say they come by Christ in some sense; how? By way of redundancy, thrown in some way or other, over and above.

Pacifick. If you ask me what is this redundancy, or how? I will tell you {though I cannot peremptorily} thus; as fair weather, {as we have collects for such occasions,} we ask is it in Christ's name, for his sake, or through his merits; when yet it would be a strange speech to say, Christ died that we should have fair weather. Reply. Here's a new way of things coming through Christ to us, pardon comes directly and immediately, but faith and repentance intervenes; and that comes by a sidewind, by way of redundancy; and it's well said, you cannot peremptorily tell how; nor nobody else, unless it be as fair

weather comes, and it seems the Church speaks strangely and improperly, when it asks it in Christ's name, and for his sake, in the same manner you will say it's improper and strange for a sinner to go to God upon his knees, to ask faith and repentance in the name of Christ, and for the sake of Christ; he must not say, Lord give me faith and repentance for the sake of thy Son's merits, who has bought and purchased me with his blood; and procured faith and repentance; and sure, what we have not through his merits, we have not by any virtue of his intercession; for the virtues of his death and intercession are of equal extent, whatever you think of it. And is it not a miserable thing to say divines trifle thus, with the great points of our life and salvation. Is not this the direct way to make atheists? Is not fair and seasonable weather, health, success in lawful undertakings, &c., very great mercies to believers, asked for in faith; and bestowed in and through Christ and his merits? Is it not the blood of Christ that has removed the curse? And are not all promises {of which rainy and seasonable weather are not the smallest} made to the church, in and through Christ? Are they not Yea and Amen in him?

Pacifick. Nevertheless, there's a truth in this, in some sense; for if Christ had not atoned, there could have been no blessing &c. Reply. Very good; so that Christ only removed bars against blessings; this is the old tune, Christ's redemption is in respect of blessing but a remote cause, he redeemed us by paying an old debt for us, but left us in status quo; he redeemed us from something but to nothing; he set the slave at liberty, and bid him shift for himself; he had not provided any estate for him, he must go and purchase that himself. You tell us some distinction must be here, {or no distinction,} immediately, indirectly, by way of redundancy; such benefits as these are benefits to some particular persons, you can't tell how; neither is it worth our while to trouble ourselves about it.

Pacifick. The purchase of Christ was a purchase for us, and for himself; for us to be pardoned; upon condition for himself, that he might give us that condition. Reply. First then, Christ was a purchaser for himself, a Redeemer of himself, and that absolutely to the obtaining a power that he had not before, and then he was a conditional Redeemer to us; but it seems now the condition comes in upon purchase, which was before but by way of redundancy; the composition will not hold I find; you'll never blend these things together; you do but do and undo.

Pacifick. There is a redemption by price and by power, pardon upon condition, is the fruit of this redemption by price. Reply. Christ's redemption was but one. You should have spoken more your own sense, if you had said redemption is absolute or conditional. Christ's redemption of himself from no power, to give

a condition, to a power, is absolute; but his redemption of the world was conditional, provided he would bestow this condition upon them. Now I would fain know of any intelligent person, where this condition lies most? Christ has purchased the bestowing a condition, and this power he has absolutely; then all and every man is redeemed, provided they have this condition; i.e., providing Christ will bestow upon them this condition, so that Christ has purchased salvation for all, provided he will perform the condition, i.e., bestow the condition upon them, and what does all this amount to, but at last the conditionality falls upon Christ; he has redeemed himself, and now at last pardon is to be bestowed in a way of mere sovereignty, or at least the conditional ground of it. To call it no worse, which is a mere Socinianism, at the long run. Christ has purchased a sovereignty to pardon, upon a sovereign dispensation to whom he will, and to whom he will not, all those that he purchased with his blood, they must be left, most of them, in slavery, notwithstanding the full price of their ransom be paid.

Pacifick. Repentance and faith comes from the power of Christ, as a King, rather than as a Priest; {and if as a priest,} it's by virtue of intercession. Reply. It is some way, and one not by virtue of all his offices, and his exerting them in his humiliation and exaltation? Christ is not to be divided in any of the virtues that flow from him to the elect, or those that are redeemed by him. Christ was King, Priest and Prophet, when he redeemed us in the flesh, {as you term it,} and he was only so to his Church. If he gives faith and repentance by virtue of his intercession, then he does it by virtue of his death, and propitiatory satisfaction and merits; for his intercession is for no more nor less than what he purchased by his blood. Heb.9:10- 19. You say that Christ intercedes for nothing but according to God's will, which is his decree of election; and I say, he intercedes for nothing but what was his own will in redemption, which was no larger nor narrower than God's will in election; he was as conformable in redemption to God's will in election, as he is in intercession; the will and purpose of God and Christ, are of equal extent in election, redemption, and intercession; and here if you fail in your proportions, you never make up your Pacifick Confession.

Pacifick. It's from the decree of election that our faith and repentance does come, it's not from Christ's purchase by price; it's not from the power of our freewill. Reply. This now is plain English. Faith and repentance comes from election, but not as purchased by Christ, nor from free will; but redemption is of all, upon condition of faith and repentance. See what is the true import of this assertion, that redemption is of all, upon condition, of God's giving them all, faith and repentance, which Christ knew he absolutely determined to give unto some only; and this is, to

call that conditional to all in redemption, which is absolute to some only in election. Where is the wisdom or justice of this, for redemption, whose saving efficacy is limited to some, and unchangeably founded on the decree of God, cannot be said to be conditional, and universal upon condition? It was but now, that you cast the conditionality upon the purchased sovereignty of Christ; now you cast it upon the absolute determination in election; and it runs thus, that Christ hath redeemed all and every man, provided electing grace, will give to all and every man faith and repentance; thence it is, you say, that the non-elect, if they believe, shall be saved; because it's said, that he that believes, shall be saved; but know that this inference arises from an error in logic, {unless it has a special application or contradiction,} ergo, the general proposition is not of elect, or non-elect, but runs indefinite, he that believes, shall be saved; therefore, if you come to apply, or contradict, so as to argue from this proposition, it must run thus, he that ever believes, shall be saved, but the non-elect shall never believe, ergo, shall never be saved. Now, Pacifick, I have your own opinion against you, to prove the minor; because faith and repentance is provided absolutely for the elect in election, but the rest are excluded, i.e., the nonelect, because the condition is not provided for them; and see how you get off the rocks, unless you get the help of free-will, which you expressly exclude.

But you say, Christ gives not faith and repentance, as Testator, and out of his own treasury, by virtue of a right to any by his death, but as a dispenser of his Father's will. Reply. This is gross reasoning, for whatever was his Father's will, was his; was his Father's will in election, but for the saving of some only, and Christ's in redemption, for saving all? He dispensed his own will; and in doing that, dispenses his Father's will. Jn.10:15. The Father knoweth me, and I know the Father, {signifying, affection, acquaintance, and action,} and what was the thing wherein they knew each other's mind? It follows, "and I lay down my life for my sheep," see what ensues, Jn.10:17,18, "this commandment have I received of my Father." Are not all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden in Christ? Col.2:3. And does not he dispense faith and repentance out of his treasure? Is not the very entrance into life, in and by Christ? "I am the door, {says Christ,} by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." Jn.10:9. You say no, he enters in first by election, that gives him the first grace and life, what is all the seventeenth chapter of John, but a transcript of the will and testament of Christ, adequate to the electing will of the Father, which he executed as a Testator and Executor?

Pacifick. That article in the agreement, {or covenant, as some call it,} between the Father and the Son, {when thou shalt

make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed,} is made good to him this way. Reply. Yes, we call it a covenant agreement, and will stand to it; and there are in it conditions and promises, which are all the parts of a formal covenant; and that part you rehearse, is one of the promissory parts, but do you take notice what is the condition of it? Christ making his soul an offering for sin, a propitiatory sacrifice, in which he bore the sins of many, so that justification and faith there promised, or merited by that condition, viz., that sinners should have both through the offering of Christ, and it became due under them upon that account. I shall not now enter into a distinct consideration of that great text.

Pacifick. In this way about them, does faith and repentance come. Reply. It is a way about indeed; and it's a sad thing, that a poor lost sinner should be sent the farthest way about, and not by Christ, who is the way, the truth, and the life; he must go to the election first, to seek his calling; and if he finds election, he may come to Christ.

Pacifick. A gentleman said, he never heard any divine say in the pulpit, as I did. I take it for a commendation, &c., what other divines say in substance, I said by way of cultivation. Reply. The gentleman might say so well enough and if this be your cultivating the truths of the Gospel, to confound and eradicate the main truths thereof, you shall be no gardener for me, you go on to tell us again what you delivered, we have heard it already, and therefore will not trouble ourselves to go over it again; but let us hear a little of your similitude; comparisons illustrate sometimes, but do not prove.

Pacifick. Pardon is agreed on by King and Parliament, the people know nothing of it; but it's a general pardon; if anyone will have the benefit of it, he must see what qualifications are required; and if he does or will not qualify himself according to the act, he loses the benefit, &c. Reply. But what if there be no qualifications required; usually acts of grace and indemnity, is of all felons, murders, rapes, treason's, &c., without condition, to be required of the jail-birds, or others; it may be, there may be exceptions and provisions, &c., but where a prerequisite condition is required, the pardon may be gracious and kind, but not free. And you say, God's pardon is perfectly free to men; it's an act of grace; no man does or can do anything to pacify God, or merit the same; it's all from the agreement between the Father and the Son, that Christ should fulfill the law, and satisfy for our sins; and the pardon thereby be granted on our behalf; while man does nothing himself, by way of cause {I must say condition} or active occasion thereto; and here I do bring off those that say, this act, law, or covenant of grace, is without condition. Reply. Now all this while you run on pretty well, if you

do not distinguish between the Covenant of Redemption and Covenant of Grace, as those of yours do; and we shall find you also to do; if so, to what purpose are all these great things, when there comes an after-clap, viz., a law with unperformable conditions for us to pass through? For we may not go immediately to Christ in the promise, nor so much as plead this Covenant of Redemption; its only pleadable by Christ; we must find out the condition of a later law-covenant, before we shall have anything to do with all that Grace and Satisfaction of Christ you speak of, which is intended for all the world; and as available for Judas, as Peter, till Peter entitled himself thereto, by performing the condition. If there be an act of general pardon with unperformable conditions in it, or such only, that none can perform unless the King give them, that act hangs all those that he gives not the conditions to; and therefore now consider whether such an act of pardon as requires such conditions as would, of on an impossibility of performance hang ten times more than it saved, can be called in any true sense, a general pardon? Suppose the King resolves in his own breast to bestow this condition {which according to you, not one of himself can perform} upon but ten or more, in a certain number, I leave you to consider what will become of the rest; and I pray answer the Arminians objections against it, if you can, upon your principles of absolute election, and universal conditional redemption; and a denial of a power and will in man, naturally to perform the said conditions. If you must fly to Romans 9, so can we, without your rotten crutches, and therefore your way, which you pretend to have chalked out between conditions and no conditions, will not do.

You say some are apt to think that the Covenant of Grace is not made with man, but with Christ in the behalf of the elect, &c. Reply. We do not say the covenant was not made with man, but with man in Christ; and so the Assembly says it was made with Christ as the second Adam; and the elect in him as his seed; and the Grace of God in that covenant is manifested in and by the Gospel; and why could not Christ be a Covenanter as a second Adam, the Head of the elect, and the Mediator of the covenant, as it referred to man; he was the covenant in divers respects, both the Covenanter, the Mediator, and Witnesser of it; therefore what you say of a mediator affects us not; this doctrine we shall stand by, as agreeable to the Scriptures; those of the Assembly are some which I suppose you mean, and I look upon all that you say against their doctrine, but as a handful of feathers blown against the monument. I shall but glance upon the gloss you make upon that famous text of Jeremiah 31:33, "but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their

inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people, &c.," where you say that this is not the covenant itself, but only a branch thereof, and an unconditional promise of the covenant, but not the covenant itself. Reply. But a promise of the covenant is often called the covenant by a decree; and by a metonymy, a seal of the covenant is called the covenant. You inquire what is this house of Israel, and you tell us it is the whole world; and the whole world you told us before, is all and every man; then see how it will run, this is the covenant I will make with the whole world, all and every man; I will put my law in their hearts and will be their God, and they shall be my people; hence all the world must be saved if God be true, for the promise is absolute, there is not a word of condition in it. If the law here be the new law you speak of, it's here absolutely promised {in your sense} to the whole world, though you would strain it to a condition to all people that will come in. Is there any such thing in the text? Besides, how is the covenant made with any upon condition, before the condition is accepted in a rich stipulation.

Pacifick. Next you proceed to the New Law, and in order thereto, tell us, that the law of works remains still as a rule to live by, but not as the rule we shall be judged by; there is a universal pardon in regard to the sentence of the law of works procured; past and declared in the Gospel upon condition of our faith and repentance. The law of nature is the normal office, but the law of grace, this act of pardon is the rule of judgment. Reply. There's no normal office in any law, but there must be a rule of judgment, else the law is vacated as such; you hereby therefore acquaint us, that the moral law is vacated, as to its law-nature and form, i.e., that it ceases to be a law with sanction; for sanction is properly the ratification of a precept by a penalty annexed; so that as you say it becomes no more a law to judge by, and another law provided, by which men are justified, and God will judge the world, and this law, is the law requiring faith and repentance, as the condition of it, to which the sanction of penalty is annexed. Hence it follows, though faith and repentance {as you say} is not the righteousness of the law of works, it must then be the righteousness of the new law, because it is the duty enjoined, which does entitle to the promise and makes it debt; for the same way as the non-performance of the condition does lay a man under the curse; the same way does the performance bring a man under the promise; but the non-performance of the condition does by way of demerit lay a man under the curse; ergo, the performance of the condition does by way of merit bring a man under the promise; so the reward must be of debt, both in justification and at the last day. What you say of being justified for the righteousness of Christ, that is but in regard of the law of

works, from which you are taken off, and brought into a new law; but besides you state the vacating the old law, and the condition of the new, very ambiguously, for the sanction, say you, is taken off by a conditional purchase and satisfaction, which amounts to thus much, that where the condition of the new law is not performed, the sanction of the old does yet continue; the old law is not satisfied for them, but the curse and condemnation of it still remains; they are necessarily therefore condemned by it; and if condemned, then judged by it; and this old law to them, is strict justice. Universal forgiveness is declared upon the fore-mentioned terms, that Christ has borne the sins of all the world, upon the condition of faith and repentance; which faith and repentance are the conditions of another law; so that a man must be justified in respect of two laws, by two distinct righteousnesses; Christ's righteousness, the condition of that justification. God has justified us upon, from the law of works, and a man's own righteousness of faith and repentance, must be his righteousness, whereby he is justified by the law of grace; for the performance of the required duty of any law, gives a man right to the promise and justification thereby. For you say truly, that the declaring a man righteous, according to the act he is tried by, is the most undoubted, proper justification. I like it well, that you speak of this redeeming law, with some consistent notions concerning it, if there be such a law. 1. That Christ's righteousness and satisfaction is imputed unto a man, so far as to the producing of this effect of his justification by this law, and therefore the righteousness of Christ is useful and beneficial, as to the quitting all scores upon the account of the covenant of works, if the sinner thinks he has any occasion for it. 2. But, secondly, that his justification is by the righteousness of the law he is tried by; which Evangelical Righteousness is faith and obedience; this, you say, the sinner shall plead, yea, Christ himself shall plead against Satan's accusations. 3. You do well in acknowledging that imperfect obedience to this law, is as significant and as procuring a condition, as perfection was in the old law. You say, that by law of grace, God expects we shall be righteous, {i.e., by the righteousness of the said law,} and that he accepts of an Evangelical Obedience, according to this law, as perfection. For you say, when all that is undone, and all that is ill-done, is not imputed; that which we have done, let it be never so little, must be perfect, according to that law; so that Christ's righteousness serves to pare off from our works all sins of omission and commission, and leaves inherent righteousness enough {though never so little} to be justified by, and this perfect righteousness too. And the plain truth of it, is, without this super-fine notion, all law-conditions, let them be never so small, weak and imperfect, {if no better be required,} they are

perfect righteousness, in respect to that law which requires them; being in their nature perfect conditions, even as much as the lawgiver requires.

For you say, that he that pleads for us, will distinguish between the duty of the Gospel, and the condition of the Gospel; between sinning against the Gospel, and I suppose this last is the rule of the promise, which one of yours says, is not the perceptive part of the law.

You say, Christ will make it appear, that though we have sinned against the Gospel, in regard of this or that particular precept, we shall be cleared from nonperformance of the condition. So that sin is set aside in this law, as of no concern, whether more or less; but the performance of a little condition, that may consist well enough with sin, is the righteousness of this law, which Christ will plead for us at the last day, and thereby we shall be justified.

As for the accusation which you say Satan shall bring in against the Saints standing at the bar, upon trial, at the day of judgment, of a thousand years, {as you suggest,} I will only ask you a few questions, to leave with you. 1. Is it reasonable, that they that are once justified, before the Lord, should run the risk of another trial, for life or death? 2. Do you not talk too crudely of the day of judgment, when you seem to suggest, the transactions thereof shall be after the nature of a general assizes, or jail-delivery amongst men? 3. Whether the Saints shall not be raised in perfection, incorruption, spirituality, I Cor.13:10, yea, in glory and power, and that in this state of perfection, spirituality and glory, wherein they shall be raised in the twinkling of an eye, be carried up to meet the Lord in the air, vs. 52-54, is it probable they should be returned to the bar, to stand upon their trial, whether they have performed the condition of the new law? And Satan, that black fiend, shall be permitted to come to accuse and confront them? 4. Whether it be likely this accuser of the brethren shall be permitted so to do, when the Spirit of God is express to the contrary, viz., that the old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, shall be bound during the whole time of the thousand years, and cast into the bottomless pit, and sealed up there; and that he shall not be permitted to be so saucy, as to affront the saints all that time; though it's probable, at the end of the thousand years, at the second resurrection, he may do much, as to the accusation of the wicked.

As to your last notion, of the salvation of the heathen, I shall wait longer before I speak to it. Till I find you are an adept, and have attained some degree of true Gospel understanding. 2. And if so, till some experiments have been made in the distributing of it, and lowering the conditions; and you shall tell us what is most proper to it? With what are the lowest rates it

can be afforded at? Or whether the nobler preparation will make such returns, as that the weaker and smaller part, prepared only by lowered conditions, viz., the doing the best a man can, {which you say never one has accomplished,} may be afforded for nothing, to infidels and pagans? And that if it should, it might not be of dangerous consequence to let it be known, because that Christians would think it hard, not to be saved at as cheap a rate, and upon as easy conditions, as heathens and infidels; and many of them as willing that Christ should stay for his thanks till the last day, as such can be.

FINIS.