

quod scholaſtici dicunt ex opere operato. Valent ergo ſacrificia oblata ad remiſſionem criminum & peccatorum id eſt reliquiarum qua in nobis remaſerunt poſt indulgentiam Culparum. Et part. 1. page 108. Coniungimus Contritionem & ſatisfactionem qua perfecte Deo Reconciliamur peccatores per bona & pœnalia opera.

9. Coſterus Enchirid. cap. 7. de Meritis honor. op. page (mibi) 286. Obſervandum eſt ſcripturam quando de Retributione loquitur, eadem verborum formula uti cum agit de Juſto reddendis premiis, qua utitur cum improbis ſupplicia denunciat, ut clare perſpiciatur, non minus nos bonis actionibus æternam felicitàtem, quam malis & flagitiſis promereri æterna ſupplicia. Et p. 288. Ita opera noſtra propter Chriſtum, qui nobis cen membris utitur, & ſpiritum ſanctum inhabitantem, & per nos operantem, digna ſunt cœleſti premio. Et p. 289. 2. Intelligimus ex dictis rationem hanc Juſtitia qua Deus æternam vitam Juſtis in mercedem operum donat, ad utramque quidem Juſtitia partem aliquo modo pertinere. In ea tamen magis elucere diſtributivam, qua perſonarum dignitatem intuetur, quam Commutativam, qua operum æquabilitatem conſiderat. So that he takes the reward to be partly, though not principally according to Commutative Juſtice. And page 294. 3. Conſiderantur ut effecta à filio Dei, atque inhabitante Spiritu ſancto, qua Conſideratione equalitas invenitur inter opera & premium, verumque meritum atque Juſtitiam.

10. W. Byſhop againſt Perkins Reformed Cathol. of Merit ſaith, Auſtin ſaith, That the Reward cannot go before the Merit, nor be given to a man before he be worihy of it, for, (ſaith he) what were more unjuſt then that? and what is more juſt then Godd. de mor. Eccleſ. c. 25. where he concludeth that we muſt not be ſo hardly as once to demand, much leſs ſo impudent as to aſſure our ſelves of that Crown, before we have Deſerved it. Seeing then the Proteſtants by this their proſtor, renounce all ſuch merit and deſere, they muſt needs alſo renounce their part of heaven, and not preſume ſo much as once to demand it, &c. and much more after on the ſame point; making a Geometrical Proportion neceſſary, and to be in mans Merits, though not an Arithmetical.

11. Baillius Catechiſ. part. 4. qu. 17. ut. in Riveti Cathol. Orthod. To. 2. p. 312, 313. (I will not tire the Reader in vain with reciting the like words of each Author.)

12. Lindanus in Panoplia lib. 3. cap. 20. & ſequentibus.

13. Sal-

13. Salmeron *ad Galatas disputat.* 15, 16, 17, 18.
 14. Becanus *Tract. Compend. ex Manuali lib. 1. cap. 19. de bonis operibus.*
 15. Maldonatus *Disput. de Sacrament. Tom. 2. p. (mihi) 85, 95, 96, 98, 189. Idem in Luke 17. 7, 8. & sapissime in Mat. & Mar. & Luke, &c.*
 16. Genebrard in *Psal. 18. ver. 13. p. 107. & in Psal. 142. p. 894. & page 741.*
 17. Pererius in *Rom. cap. 6 Disput. 10 num. 53.*
 18. Joh. Arboreus *Theosoph. lib. 2. cap. 17 fol. 31, 32, 33.*
 19. Pintus in *Ezek. 37. page 422, 423, &c.*
 20. Lombard *sent. lib. 2 dist. 27. C. D. E. F. & dist. 11. D.*
 21. Bonavent. in 4. *dist. 15. qu. 5. p. 1. art. 1. & 2 sent. dist. 27.*
 22. Marsilius in 2. *qu. 18 art. 3. Concl. 2. & 3.*
 23. Francisc. *de Daventria Exeget. Contr. Confessi. August. f. 46.*
 24. Gregor. *de Valentia in Thom. Tom. 2. disp. 8. qu. 6. & de Gratia Divina cap. ult.*
 25. Albertus in 1. *dist. 41. art. 2. ad 2^m & ult.*
 26. Gabr. Biel. in 3. *sent. dist. 27. & in 4 sent. dist. 14. q. 1, 2.*
 27. Ferrariensis *contra Gentes cap. 149. dub. ult.*
 28. Adrian *Quodlib. 7. qu. 4.*
 29. Almain in 2. *& in 4. frequ.*
 30. Nicol. *de Orbellis in 2. sent. dist. 27. just as Aquinas he answers, and out of Ricardus.*
 31. All the Sorbonists in *Artic Parisiens. à facult. S. Theol. Parisiens. determinat. art. 4. &c. Certâ & firmâ fide credendum est, peccatorem non solum fide, sed ex operibus justificari, &c. Opera merentur vitam eternam & per consequens iustificat hominem: Nos damnatur propter mala opera, ergo iustificamur propter bona. Vid. Calvini hoc artic. Confut.*
 32. Pennottus *Propugnacul. Libertat. human. Lib. 6. cap. 13. n. & 19 per totum: where he labours to prove that both Justification and perseverance are Merited de Congruo: and answers Dominic. a solo, who contradicteth that Merit.*
 33. Capreolus *Defens. Theol. Tho. lib. 2. dist. 27. goes the same way as Aquinas, and speaks as exactly to the point as any of them, maintaining Meritum Glor. de Condigno ex Proportionem Geometricâ etsi non Arithmeticâ, vel ex equalitate proportionis etsi non Quantitatis; and laboriously answers Durandus.*

See how Mr. Wotton Defence of Perkin page 288, 289. charges Andradius.

34. Sayrus *Clavi Reg. li. 10. Tract. 1. cap. 2. §. 4, & 6.* maintains satisfaction to God, and that it is principally to God, as distinct from Restitution which is to men only, and not to God. And this satisfaction they refer commonly to commutative Justice, *Aquin. 3. qu. 85. art. 3. solus li. 4. de Instit. q. 6. art. 1. Martin. Ledesma 2. 4. q. 18. art. 1. dub. 15. concl. 4. Navar. in Manual. cap. 17. num. 6. Pet. Navar. li. 1. de restitut. cap. 2. num. 22.* And Sayrus concludes that satisfaction is made even in Purgatory, if Care be not taken in this life that the heirs of the deceased make Restitution : though if they fail not through his default but their own, he takes it for a fable, that the soul in purgatory must satisfy. So *Adrian. Quodlib. 11. diff. 6. V. sylvest. verb. Testamentum : 2. quest. 9. solus li. 4. de Instit. qu. 6. art. 1. ad 1. in fine. Martin. Ledesm. 2. 4. q. 18. art. 1. dub. 15. concl. 4. page 232. Col. 2. Navar. in Man. cap. 17. numer. 68. Pet. Navar. li. 1. de Restit. cap. 2. num. 23. & lib. 4. cap. 4. dub. 12. num. 75. Henriquez li. 1. de poenit. cap. 6. §. 1. in annot. liter. A. Mich. Salon. in 2. 2. qu. 5. de Dominio art. 5. in princip. & in qu. 62. art. 1. in fine Gregor. de Valent. in 2. 2. disp. 5. qu. 6. punct. 2. Ludovic. Lopez. li. 1. in struct. confess. cap. 121. ut a Sayro Cit.*

See that gross
saying of
Tapperus cited
by Chamier de
Merito li. 14.
c. 1. §. 16.

35. Estius in sent. lib. 3. distin. 27. §. 5. per tot. page 85, 86. & li. 2. p. 376.

36. Joseph. de Voisin de Lege Divina, cap. 8. pag. 57, 58. ex Sepher Ikkarim Judæo.

37. Raymundus de sabundis Theolog. Natural. Titul. 82. page 126. where he saith that *premium debetur de Jure Naturæ, &c.*

38. The Rhemists on the N. Test. frequently : as Luke. 20. Mat. 25. Rom. 8. Rom. 11. &c.

39. Viguerius Institut. cap. 9. §. 3. vers. 1. & 3. 4. fol. 102. delivereth (as he useth to do in other things) the same as *Aquinas* (collecting together his dispersed sayings.)

40. Lastly, the Council of Trent. Session 6. though they purposely went lower then many of their Doctors formerly had done, yet say far more then ever I said : Yea *Bellarmino* (*ubi supr.*) affirmeth that they judged as he doth.

To name more were more easie then useful : He that will be at the pains to search the cited places of these, shall soon find, how far the Fear of God was from acting in the souls of Mr. *Eyre* and Mr. *Cr.* when they affirmed that the worst of the Papists do give no more

more to works then I, nor hold them Meritorious any otherwise then I, who wholly disclaim the very fitness of the Name, much more the proportion of our works to the Reward.

Let those Readers that know it not already, observe also that the Papists very much differ about the doctrine of merit among themselves : Inasmuch as our Moderate and Learned Divines, do even in the point of Merit of Condignity, take the difference to be but about the very name of Merit, between us and some of them, and not the Thing. Yet even these, whom our Divines use to cite as on our side, do give more, in words at least, to mans works then ever I durst do : For they think the name of merit to be fit, and so do not I : (besides that in their doctrine of satisfactions they go yet further and use more unseemly terms then in the former.)

The Divines that give least to Merit, as denying Condignity, are Scotus, Vega, Gerson, Stella, Cassander, &c. Yet these go further then I dare follow them.

1. Scotus affirmeth that *Meritum est Causa Instrumentalis respectu præmii, & per meritum acquiritur præmium*. I take mans works to be no Causes of the Reward, as such, nor to be Merits. (Vid. Scot. in 1. sent. dist. 17. q. 2. & in 4. sent. dist. 1. q. 5. fol. (mihi) 13. p. 2. he saith, *hoc absolute conceditur*. Et in 4. sent. dist. 14. qu. 2. fol. 124, 125. *Attritio est Dispositio sive meritum de Congruo ad deletionem peccati mortalis & inductionem Iustitiæ, &c. et postea : in illo instanti infunderetur Gratia, quia præcessit, meritum sufficiens de Congruo, &c. quare non Iustificabitur in ultimo instanti, &c. Vide etiam in 4. sent. dist. 2. q. 1. fol. 19. & dist. 13. q. 2. fol. 118. K. & dist. 22. q. 1. art. 2. fol. 169. & dist. 49. q. 1. fol. 263.*

2. Vega himself saith in *Opusc. de Iustific. q. 7. prop. 4. Fides & alia bona opera, quibus disponimur ad gratiam gratum facientem, Meritoria sunt ex Congruo ejusdem gratiæ & nostre Iustificationis. Et in Defens. Concil. li. 8. c. 8. Possunt peccatores fide, spe, dilectione, elemosynâ, pœnitentiâ & martyrio & aliis bonis operibus Mereri ex Congruo gratiam Iustificationis*. Where did ever I say this much ?

3. Vide & Alvarez de *Auxiliis*, saying too much, *disp. 59. & 60. per tot.*

4. Vide & stellam in *Luc. cap. 17. page 222.*

5. Gerson

5. Gerson saith, de Descript. Terminor. Meritum (in genere) est actus laudabilis factus ad bonum alterius, verè, vel interpretative, vel reputative pro quo exigitur premium: dicitur reputativè propter Deum, qui bonorum nostrorum non eget. Et meritum vitæ aternæ est actus laudabilis, &c. pro quo Dignificat Deus hominem ad vitam æternam. He saith also, Operum part. 3. fol. 329. A. Edit. Gromorsii, that God hath a Law, quæ non liget ad sui observationem: eam quippe deserens pœnam non incurrit: Impletio tamen ejus premium meretur & Coronam. Et fol. 319. 2. D. he saith that Vita nature (sine gratia) potest mereri bona temporalia; and that not ex pacto, sed propter quandam adequationem operum bonorum suorum de genere, ad bonum temporale, & sæpe de Congruo ad vitam Gratiæ disponit.

6. Melchior Canus Loc. Com. l. 12. pag. (mibi) 430. Duplices sunt operationes nostræ. Quædam quas nostro nomine reddimus, & quæ nostrâ Gratiâ Meritisque nituntur ut Eleemosyna & Jejunium.

SECT. IV.

I Will trouble my self and the Reader with no more of this work. Only that all this be not misused to the further alienation of mens minds from each other, then there is just cause, I say again that 1. All the Papists are not to be charged with the opinion of some: Soto and some others deny all merit of Congruity. Scotus, and many more Schoolmen and others, deny all merit of Condignity, save what is ex pacto: (vid. Scot. 1. sent. dist. 17. 2. pag. 178. (Edit. Venet. 1566.) Some of them, as Durandus, Ariminenfis, &c. deny all proper merit of Condignity, whether ex opere or ex pacto, and differ not from Protestants in this, any further then in the use of the name. Waldensis is so far against the name it self, that (as he is cited by many of our Divines) he saith, He is the most pious Divine and the best Christian, that acknowledgeth no merit at all. And Contarenus and Paulus Burgensis are content to go with him: And the rest of the Papists with Contarenus that held the conference at Ratisbonæ with our Divines,

Divines, for Reconciliation, did consent to lay by the very word Merit: and ours consented to forbear to say, we are justified by Faith only, and so we and they did wholly agree in the point of Merit.

2. Yea, I may add that their latter writers, especially the English, do seem more willing to withdraw from the higher sort, and to give less to Merits, then others formerly did. And I can truly say, that of all the Papists that ever I conferred with, I never yet met with two that did not disclaim merit with seeming zeal, and profess to trust in the sole merits of Christs. Though I confess I am jealous that this Reformation is not general in other Countries, but calculated to the *Meridian of England*: because the Jesuites and Priests know that the *odium* of the name of merit, is a great prejudice to their cause, therefore they do not here induc their proselytes so deeply with this Doctrine: However it be, I am glad it is so for the poor peoples sake. Their late Christian Moderator, mentioneth some late profession of theirs, wherein they profess that by Merit, they mean nothing but *Rewardable*: and Rewardableness no Protestant denyeth.

Many of them are content to deny the name of merit, to that of Congruity before Conversion. *Petrus à Sancto, Joseph in Suavi Concordia, pro scientia Med. Disput. 1. de Prædest. Sect. 4. pag. 35, 36, &c. saith, Assertio 1. Ex communi omnium Catholicorum Sententia prima Gratia non datur ex meritis naturalibus ipsius prædestinati, sed ex mera Dei liberalitate & misericordia, q. d. initium Iustificationis non esse ex nobis, sed ex Dei Gratia, &c.*

And *Franciscus à Sancta clarâ*, is so moderate as to say (pag. 135, 136. li. *Deus natura, Grat.*) *Non omnis promissio Conditiona inducit Titulum Iustitiæ Promissario: sicut in Scripturis dum promittitur peccatoribus Remissio si penituerint, Collatio Remissionis vel primæ gratiæ, non est ex iustitiâ, secundum omnes; quia requiritur solum ut dispositio ad illam, non ut opus sufficiens ad fundandum Iustitiâ. Iustitiâ ergo oritur ex Conditione solum quæ exigit quandam condignitatem operis, non solum aliqualem decentiam operis & operantis.* And indeed most or all of them disclaim this justice in their merit of Congruity. I would they would say plainly, It is no merit at all: and say the like of their merit of Congruity.

Bishop the Papist, against Perkins, art. de Justific. (in Wotton, pag. 243.) saith, We acknowledge very willingly, (as you have heard often before) that every sinner is justified freely of the mere Grace of God, through the merit of Christ only, and without any merit of the sinner himself.

One thing more I would say to prevent misunderstandings, and abuses of others. It will be exceeding necessary for young men, that have not read the Papists themselves, to gather what is their judgement from our most learned, judicious Divines, who knew what they said of them, and were not carried by passion or prejudice to wrong them: and not to take all for certain that every hot Preacher speaks of them at random; nor that some less judicious and more passionate writers do affirm: For, to speak freely and truly, many such there are that are better skilled in wounding than healing, in dividing, then doing our common duty against divisions, and in mis-reporting or straining words to the utmost advantage of the enemy of peace.

If you ask me who those writers be that I would commend to such, as dealing most candidly and truly with the Papists in this point, and from whom a young Schollar may credibly take an estimate of their Doctrine: I *Answe*r. Among many others, these seven I would commend to you for this use, as the faithfullest Reporters of the Popish Doctrine of Merit. *Davenant, de Instit. Aetnal. Woston de Reconcil. Chamier, de Merit. in Paustr. Vossius in Thes. de Meritis bon. operum. Camero, Prelect. &c. Dr. Field of the Church. and Bishop Usher.*

Not that I would disparage any other faithful men; but I will name to young men but few.

And because it will not only shew Mr. *Crandons* and Mr. *Eyres* unworthy dealing with me, but may be a means to keep the younger Schollars from misapprehensions of the true state of the Controversie herein between the Protestants and the Papists, and so may prevent the guilt of much sin many waies, I will here annex the words of one of these Divines, (faithfully translated, for the use of the English Reader.)

Davenant, (de Instit. actuali cap. 53.) thus opens the state of the Controversie.

What the Adversaries hold concerning this, and what is to be held according to the Rule of Verity, I shall next shew. And seeing that on both sides in this Controversie, the Authority of the holy Fathers is wont to be pretended, it will be worth the labour to premise in a few words, what occurreth in them, which may seem to favour either the Adversaries or us: This therefore in the first place must be granted, that the words merit and meriting are frequently used by the Latine
** Fathers.*

* *Fathers.* Hence the Papists, because they often find the word merit * *And the like*
 in the writings of the Fathers, cry out, that they are all against the *by the Greek*
 Protestants. But they make themselves ridiculous, who in a question *Fathers.*
 about the most weighty point of Faith, do rest on one word, and that
 evilly wrested besides, yea against the mind of all the Fathers. For
 with the Fathers, To merit, signifieth nothing else, then To obtain or
 get some benefit from God, a good work mediating (or being a
 means thereto). And merit signifieth With them nothing else, then
 A good work ordained of God to Reward, (or to be rewarded).
 Therefore to merit eternal life, is to do those works which according to
 Gods Ordination are the means of coming to it. If any man will in
 this sense call the Good Works of the Regenerate merits, to wit, be-
 cause they are Ordinated of God to the Reward, and shall say, that the
 Regenerate do merit life eternal, because, walking in the way of Gods
 Commandments, they at last, God rewarding them, obtain the Crown
 of Eternal Glory, in the manner of speaking he agreeth with the Fa-
 thers; and in the thing it self with us, in both he differeth from the
 Papists. ——— And if, leaving the Fathers, we descend to the
 antienter and sounder Schoolmen, we shall finde with them also that this
 word merit doth denote only works grateful and acceptable, and doth
 not include either any Condignity to the Reward of eternal life, on
 the part of the Works, nor Debt on Gods part, according to Justice,
 properly so called. Parisiensis in Tract. de Merit. thus writeth, Of
 this Which is commonly said, that some works are meritorious of eter-
 nal life, and that by every work done in charity, a man deserveth
 eternal life, it no way seemeth that by the Condignity of any work, a
 man can deserve eternal life.

Aquinas, though he grant merit of Condignity in Words, I. 2. q.
 114. a. 3. yet indeed he denyeth it, When he excludeth from this me-
 rit equality of Justice. For he teacheth ib. a. 1. Justice is a certain
 equality; and therefore simply Justice is between them, who have
 simply an equality. ——— But in those, in whom Justice is se-
 cundum quid, and not simply, in them also the reason of merit is not
 simply. ——— But it is manifest, that between God and man there is
 the greatest inequality ——— and therefore there can be no merit of
 man with God, but upon presupposition of Divine Ordination; that
 is, so that man may obtain that of God as a Reward, by his own work,
 to which God did depute to him the vertue of working. From which
 words I gather, that Aquinas by merit even of Condignity, did mean
 nothing

nothing else, then a work that should obtain the Reward by Gods Ordination, without equality of value to the Reward, without Debt of Justice in God to give the Reward. Whence he saith, fine art. ad 3. That our action hath not the nature of merit, but upon presupposition of Divine Ordination, and that God is not made a Debtor simply to us, but to himself; in as much as it is due that his Ordination be fulfilled. Durandus, by a meritorious act understandeth nothing else, then an act ordinable to Reward and expressly denyeth, that merit of Condignity strictly taken, can be in man to God. To these I may add, Scotus, Gregory, Occam, Gabriel, Alfonsus, and very many other Papists of best note, who professedly taught that the Works of the righteous done by the help of Grace, had yet no intrinsecal Condignity to eternal life, but as to this Reward, they wholly rested on the gracious acceptance and promise of God. We will not therefore have any Controversie with the Fathers, nor with these sounder Schoolmen, about the bare word merit, (though it be much better and safer to abstain from this word) but we will contend against the latter Papists, who so defend merit, as that for these Works which they call merits, they affirm God himself to be in Justice a Debtor to men, and do make a Condignity or Equality between these merits of man, and the Reward of Eternal glory. So far Davenant.

And if Protestants can so far digest such words of those of Aquinas which I cited, by the help of other explications, as to profess that we differ but in words from him, (who speaketh more harshly then most of the ancient Schoolmen) I leave it then to the enquiry of the learned, and moderate, what the number of the Papists proportionably may be, that we agree with, or differ from in this point: And if Protestants will have no Controversie with Fathers and such Papists about the bare name of merit, I leave it to consideration, with what peaceableness and sobriety Mr. Cr. and Mr. E. did write, and how like to Protestants they dealt, in making me a Papist, who disclaim the very name of merit: yea, in saying, that the worst of Papists maintain no other merit then I do, who deny all, properly so called.

Learned Dr. Field in the Appendix to his third Book of the Church, citeth many Papists, as saying the same with us about Justification and Merit, and he approveth even of Stapletons Doctrine; and he there tells us, that the Papists and Protestant-Divines at the conference at Ratisbone, fully agreed in the point of Justification,

Justification, and concluded to repress the very term of merits: cap. 11. & 12. *vid. etiam li. 5. Append. part 3. p. 2.*

Chamier cites *Sotus*, *Latomus*, *Gropperus*, *Andradus*, *Gregor. de Valentia*, *Hofius*, as speaking against merit of Congruity before Justification: the Council of Trent, as neither affirming nor denying it; and *Durandus* as denying proper merit of Condignity, and *Conrad. Chirgius* as following *Sotus* in affirming it, to be only *ex pacto*.

Chemnitzius, *Exam. Concil. Trident. in qu. 4. de bonis operib. p. 185.* (cited also by *Davenant*) saith thus, *In the Reconciled, Good Works do please God for the Mediator, and have rewards corporal and spiritual in this life, and after this life: but of the free Promise of God, not that God is made our Debtor for the perfection and dignity of our works: And in this sense our (Divines) do not abhor the word merit; as it was used by the Fathers.*

See also what is cited out of *Bucer* and *Calvin*, in the same place by *Davenant*, p. 572.

Vossius Thes. de mer. operib. p. 66. saith, *We dare not wholly condemn the word (or name of) meriting, as being used by very many of the ancients, and used by the Reformed Churches in their Confessions, as the Augustane and Wettemberg: yet we think it fitter to speak as the Scriptures, especially when the word merit is ambiguous, and especially in our age, is dangerous in respect of pride.*

Mr. Wotton de Reconc. cap. ult. p. 399. 403. brings in many Papists against merit of Congruity (and so against our being by works put into a state of Justification); and taking it to be no merit, but a meer disposition that went before Justification. As *Capreol. in 4. d. 14. q. 1. o. 3.* *Antonius Pathuss. li. de grat. & prædest. c. 6. & de lib. arb. cap. 6.* Et *Domin. Sotus*, & *Petrus Sotus li. de Instit. Sacerd. lect. 9. de pœnit.* *Hofius in Confess. Cathol. c. 73.* And *Suarez* saying, d. c. 37. n. 2. *Hac est communis sententia Theologorum.* And *Bellarmino* and *Vega* confessing that it is but a controversie about a word: And p. 400. he saith; *Some perhaps will expect that I debate this opinion of the Papists about merit of Congruity: But it seems to me a thing not to be done, because I have made it clear, that it belongs not to the Faith of the Church of Rome, of which alone I hold controversie with the Papists.* And shewing that the speeches of some particular Papists gave our Divines occasion to dispute this question, he concludes, *But for me,*

me, I think I ought to be pardoned, if I do knowingly and purposely abstain from that disputation, of which there is no footstep in the Council of Trent: in so long, and so artificially and accurately composed a Definition of Justification.

And thus I have truly shewed, both in word and deed, how far the Papists go beyond me, in the Doctrine of merit; and yet have given you the Judgement of our most learned Divines, concerning the true state of the Controversie (in part) lest any should be provoked by mistake, to think that we differ further then we do. For my part I am in this matter of the same Judgement as *Davenant*, and just so far as he, do I differ from them, in the point of merit and Justification by works, if I be able to understand his meaning and mine own: and this I cheerfully and unfeignedly profess: But every angry man that out-goeth him, I cannot accompany.

CHAP. VII.

What it is that I mean by Antinomianism: And what I take to be the truth which it opposeth.

THere are yet two parts of my task remaining, which I undertook, in reference to the offended Antinomians, before I come to the exceptions of the Orthodox. The first is, to acquaint the world what it is that I call Antinomianism: Mr. *E.* and Mr. *Cr.* would perswade men that I mean the Protestant Religion, and that an Antinomian and an Anti-Papist with me are all one. Were it but to convict these men of falshood, I would say nothing to this; it being as needless to impartial men, as to convict a Mahometan of error: But because I would leave no room for unbrottherly jealousies, nor matter of this kind for unconscionable censoriousness to work upon, I will freely declare what are those opinions which I take to belong to the Antinomians, as differing from

from the Protestants : Though as I know every Antinomian holdeth not them all, so I will not call them Antinomians that hold but some of the lesser and more innocent ; (though I think the least be very bad.)

And that what I shall mention are indeed the Antinomists opinions, I appeal to the Reverend Ministers that have conversed with them, especially about London : as also to the writings of Dr. *Crispe*, *Town*, *Cornwal*, *Eaton*, *Den*, *Saltmarsh*, and the rest well known among us : as also to Mr. *Welds* Rise, Reign, and Ruine of Antinomianism and Familism in New-England : as also to the writings of our Divines against them : especially Mr. *Gataker*, Mr. *Burges*, Mr. *Rutherford*, Mr. *Bedford*, Mr. *Geree*, Dr. *Taylor*.

And that you may see what I hold, as well as what I disclaim, I will give the two extreames in two Columnes, and that which I take to be both the Truth and the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, in the middle.

Antinom.

Truth.

Papists and others
in the other extreame.

1. Pardon of sin, Reconciliation, and Justification are Immanent Acts in God, and from Eternity : So that even before men believe, yea before they did sin, yea before they were born, yea before ever Christ dyed for them, the Elect were Actually Justified, pardoned, and Reconciled to God; though not manifested

1. God did of his own good pleasure Decree from Eternity, to do all that he doth in time : and particularly to give to certain Individual determinate persons, saving faith in Christ, and thereupon pardon, and Justification, or Right to Impunity, and to life. But this Decree is no Actual Justification or pardon, nor gives them the said Right ; but supposeth it not yet given ; else God could

1. God did not from Eternity Immutably and peremptorily Decree the actual, absolute Justification, pardon or salvation of any Individual persons, but only of Believers in general, or men if they will believe, never decreeing infallibly to cause any Individual persons so to Believe: or at least he was moved by the foreseen marks.

Antinom.

feſted ſuch, nor Juſtified in conſcience or feeling.

Truth.

could not Decree hereafter to give it: Juſtification is not therefore an Immanent act, nor is any Eternal act called Juſtification in Scripture, nor any Infidel or impenitent ſinner, ſaid to be Juſtified.

Contrary-Extram.

works of men to decree this for them: and ſo the Cauſe of the difference, between them and others, is originally of themſelves.

2. *Jeſus Chriſt was ſo the publick perſon, containing in Gods Account all the Elect, that they did in Gods Account, or in Lawſenſe, obey, and perfectly by obeying, fulfill all the Law in Chriſt: So that God and his Law do take them thereupon, though yet unborn, as having perfectly in Chriſt obeyed. (Mr. Cr. ſaith few conſiderable men own this.)*

2. **I**Jeſus Chriſt being God and man, and by the Union of natures in one perſon, being capable even in the humane nature to merit for others; did as the ſecond Adam, perfectly obey the Law, and by that and his ſufferings did merit of God, all that good, which ſhould after be conferred on the Elect, (or any others) for that conſideration; but we did not in Gods account or the Laws, obey our ſelves in Chriſt: nor did he therein perſonate any man more then other; nor did God intend man the benefits immediately, but in his time and way.

2. **C**hrift (ſays ſome) was ſo obliged as a Creature to keep the Law, as that he did it for himſelf, or at the utmoſt that he might be a fit Redeemer, as having no guilt of his own: But he did not obey for us, ſo as to merit any thing for us at Gods hands thereby: And as a Creature, he was incapable of meriting at Gods hands, for himſelf or for us: (ſo ſome of our moſt learned Divines ſay.)

3. *Jeſus Chriſt ſatisfied Gods Juſtice as in the perſon of all his*

3. **I**Jeſus Chriſt, as the publick Sponsor, did bear the puniſhment deſerved by the ſins of the world, and

3. **T**HE Socinians ſay, that Jeſus Chriſt did not undergo any

Antinom.

his Elect; so that in Law-sense and Gods account, They themselves did satisfie in and by Christ; and it was to them all one as if they had satisfied in their natural persons, so that Christs sufferings were the proper full execution of the threatning of the Law to man: and so acquits them ipso facto, on the meer suffering; and so it is theirs as paid or suffered by Christ, and Accepted by God, without or before any further means of conveyance or Application, to give them a right in it, or its fruits. (This opinion is inconsistent with the former: for if we perfectly obeyed in Christ, what need we to suffer for disobedience in Christ? at least

Truth.

and made to his Father a satisfaction sufficient for the sins of all: But this he did in the person of a Mediator, that undertook to bear this penalty, and not in the person of the Elect, or any particular sinner, so as that in Law-sense, they themselves might be said to have satisfied in him as fully as if in their natural persons they had born the whole penalty of the Law, for every sin: And he being not himself the offender, but the Mediator, Christs sacrifice was not the proper fulfilling of the Law according to the sense of its Threatning to man, but a valuable consideration, on which God might grant pardon and Grace to sinners in his time, and on fit terms, with the honour of his wisdom, Justice and Mercy. And so being a refusable payment: it was accepted but to those ends which the Gospel manifesteth, viz. that men might have pardon and life given them by a Law of Grace in and with Christ: and not be pardoned ipso facto, on the satisfaction: Though satisfaction strictly respecting God as Legislator and

Contrary Extream.

any penalty for our sins as the meritorious or promeritorious Cause; but only as occasions: and that he did not make any satisfaction to Gods Justice for us: but only suffer from the cruelty of wicked men, and not as from a Just, offended God: and set us a copy or example of Patience by his death, for our Imitation. Others say, that Christ did satisfie for sin; but so equally for all men, that he had no special intent in his dying, of communicating Pardon, Justification, and the other benefits of his death, any more to his Elect, or any known Individual persons, then to all the rest of the world: And that he intended

least for any sin except original, if for that? I will not call this opinion properly Antinomian, because some of our own have spoken too incautiously about it: but indeed it is this or the former, that must animate all their errors, and is the very life and soul of them all: so that they cannot be avoided, if one of these be held.)

and Rector *per Leges*, be for all men: yet if you take the word as comprizing all the ends and intents of God and the Mediator, so, as God did specially intend the infallible justification and salvation of his Elect, by Christ, so did Christ-dying intend the same; and therefore to give them faith to that end. But we must still carefully distinguish between that which Christ offered and God accepted as Rector and Lawgiver; and his further Intendments as Determiner of Events, and so as the Elector of his chosen.

no more but to give out a conditional pardon to all, without determining to cause any infallibly to perform that condition, and so be actually partakers of those benefits.

4. **V**Vhen Christ had suffered and rose again justified, All the Elect did in Law sence and Gods account rise justified in Christ: and so their justification before God is completed: and they are as righteous as Christ himself was righteous, as having the same righteousness, by being then reputatively in him, when he was justified.

4. **C**Hrist might be said upon his Resurrection to be justified himself, so far as he might be said by suggestion and imputation of our faults to be guilty. But no individual person was actually justified in that his justification. And though even as the publique person, he might be said to be then justified, yet he never was so the publique person, as that we were really or reputatively then actually existent in him, nor consequently justified in him: No man being in him, united to him, or

4. **T**He Socinians make our righteousness to consist wholly in our own holy Qualifications and actual obedience, and the pardon of sin without any satisfaction to Justice: And therefore that as the sins of the World were never charged upon Christ, so far as to cause him to undergo the penalty for them; so

stified. So that as truly as Christ himself was righteous by his obedience, satisfaction and resurrection, so truly and perfectly with the very same righteousness are all the Elect righteous, though yet unconverted, and the grossest sinners, or persecutors of the truth; yea as Righteous when persecutors, as when penitent and believers: for even believers can be no more righteous then Christ himself.

a Member of him, but by Faith. But when they exist by faith, then they are in him the head: And as to the bearing of sin or punishment, and the satisfaction of Justice, Christ was in the place of mankind in general, and not of the elect only: so may it be said of his rising from that punishment, though it was for the Elect specially, as to the intention of their Good. Our Righteousness therefore before we believe cannot be said to be in Christ dying or rising actually, but only causally, as the effect in a meritorious cause, not yet legally applyed to our selves.

he could not be said to be justified from any such charge upon his Resurrection, when he overcame the suffering. And so that his Resurrection was but to confirm his Mediatorship and doctrine, and put him in a capacity of Ruling and teaching us, and not the conquest of any penal sufferings.

5. **C**hrist is the only person Covenanted with by God: Or the New Covenant is not made to us, but to Christ only, and with him: Or (as others say, that would seem more understanding) The New Covenant is not made

5. **A**s the eternal will of the Father and son, concerning mans Redemption, may be improperly called a Covenant between the Father and Son, and the promises of a Saviour to the world, may be called a Covenant to man concerning a Redeemer: and the propheticall predictions or promises made before Christs incarnation, and directed as to him incarnate, may be also improperly

5. **I**esus Christ only undertook on his part to satisfy Gods Justice for the sins of all alike, and with equal Intention of their Good. And God only gave him the World as his purchase hereupon, that he might propound

made with us immediately and directly, but only as we are in Christ, and so consequentially and indirectly with us. (Hence it would follow, that there is no promise to us, but only for us to Christ: and that there is no duty imposed on us by the Covenant, but only on Christ: and they profess that Christ is the only Undertaker, and the Condition is required only of him, and not of us, and therefore say that it is his sin if we break Covenant, and let him see to it: Nay, how can we break or keep Covenant with God, if none be made with us? Or how can we be said to be in Covenant with God?

6. The

ly called a Covenant then with the Son; so we readily confess, that there was a peculiar Law imposed on Christ incarnate concerning our redemption, and peculiar promises made to him on condition of his performance of his part for our Redemption; and that this is fitly called a Covenant between God the Father and the Mediator; and that the giving of the Elect to Christ to be infallibly drawn to believe, and so to be justified, adopted, sanctified and glorified, is part of the matter of that Covenant. But that is a distinct Covenant from that which is made to man: There is, besides that, a new Covenant or Law of Grace enacted by God Redeemer, which determineth on what terms justification, and salvation, & other subordinate benefits shall be due in Law-sence, and so prescribeth man his duty and the condition, & giveth him right to the benefits: According to this Law shall we be judged. And this is not made with Christ, but with us. God doth not promise Christ to pardon him or us, if Christ will repent, believe, &c. in the Gospel sense. It is a most weighty & needful thing for every Christian to see the Covenant between the Father and the Redeemer, and that between God and the Redeemed, in their true difference.

pound the terms of Mercy to them, contained in the New Covenant made with man: viz. That whosoever will Repent and believe shall be saved: and so leave it to their Natural Free-will, assisted with an indifferent, sufficient, universal, non-distinguishing Grace, to fulfill the conditions. But God never gave the Elect to Christ, antecedently to their own Believing, any more than others. Nor did Christ undertake, or purpose by any distinguishing Grace to draw them any more than others to believe.

6. The

6. **T**he Covenant of Grace is Absolute; and hath no proper condition, as to us, but only as to Jesus Christ: The only Condition was, that Christ should make satisfaction for sin: and that is performed: There remaineth therefore no more condition to be performed. God doth not require faith or repentance of us as Conditions, but promise to give them as blessings. We do but receive what he hath engaged himself to give. (The reasons they give make Christs own satisfaction to be no more the condition then our Faith: For that was Gods gift, and God

6. **T**he Conditions of Gods Covenant with the Mediator are performed already: 2. And we confess that as God hath revealed that he hath elected some determinate persons infallibly to be saved, so he hath revealed his decree to give them faith and new hearts, absolutely, without any proper Condition on their part: And this revelation may be in several respects called a prediction, a promise, or Covenant: But this is not the Covenant or Law of Grace, which conveyeth pardon, justification and right to glory: None being named in it, or so described, that they can know that it at all belongs to them, nor can plead any right from it, till it be already fulfilled, by the giving of the thing promised. 3. But the New Covenant or Law of Grace which conveyeth Right to impunity and Salvation to men, is conditional properly: and faith and repentance are properly conditions: and no man shall be justified by this Covenant without them. Not that God expecteth that the Elect perform this Condition by the power of Natural Free-will, without his special grace; nor that it is uncertain to God, who will believe: But his Law of Grace as well as of Nature, being his means to rule the world, and to convey salvation to his Elect in a way sui-

6. **G**ods Covenant or promise of Grace is only conditional; and the condition to be performed by Natural Free-will, assisted only with a General sufficient Grace, by all that will have the thing promised. There is no such thing as special Election to Faith, but only an Election of some to salvation, because God foresaw they would believe when others would not: Nor is there such a thing to be found in Scripture, as an absolute promise of Faith or the first saving Grace to any. The Scriptures usually alleged for this are all perverted. Nor doth God give special differencing grace.

Antinom.

Truth.

Contrary Exream.

God knew it before hand, as well as he knows who will believe.) It is but a description of the person whom God will save, that we call a Conditional promise (say they,) and not such indeed.

table to their natures; it seemed good to him to make his Promise or Law of Grace general and conditional, that the benefit might be freely accepted, and freely rejected, and the blame of mens perishing, as being unpardoned, might lie upon themselves, and be charged on themselves in Judgement, according to this Law. As also that Ministers might make a general offer of Christ, and pardon to all, and have grounds to invite all to come in: with many other weighty discernable Reasons: It is not this conditional Grant therefore by which God distinguisheth man from man, till themselves distinguish by performing the condition: But it is Election, and the absolute promise of faith to the Elect, & the giving them that faith, which first makes the difference.

grace to any, to cause them to believe, unless as by the good improvement of their Natural parts, or of Common grace, they first difference themselves from others by being better prepared for that special grace: else God should be an Acceptor of persons.

7. **V**Nion with Christ, and consequently Justification, go before Faith: For the spirit is given us before Faith: Else how could we believe: and the Spirit flows from Christ as our Head to us as his Members:

7. **T**He Scripture never mentioneth any Union with Christ, or Justification before Faith: but the contrary. That degree of Spirit, which is promised frequently to them that believe, flows from Christ as head to his Members: But that degree of the Spirit which is only to work Faith, is given by God who elected us, and is called his drawing us to Christ: And it is the ingrafting us into Christ, and bringing

7. **T**HE Spirit is not at all given to cause men to believe: but only helpeth them by a general sufficient Grace. Scripture ever putteth the giving of the Spirit after believing, and not before: They that will have

Antinom.

bers : and therefore we are Members of Christ, and United to him, and justified before we believe.

Truth.

ing us to him for Union, and giving the grace, which is the Condition on which Christ is given to us in Union : and not a consequent of Union with him. The Spirit for Union flows from electing Grace before Union and Justification.

Contrary-Extrem.

have the Spirit, must first believe by the help of the Gospel and Common Grace.

8. *God loveth his Elect as well before their Faith and Conversion, as after. He is unchangeable, and doth not love more or less now, then he did from Eternity : And therefore he loved Paul as well when he was murdering the Saints, as when he suffered for Christ himself : and loved Manasseh as well in his Witch-crafts and Idolatry, as when he repented. It is therefore legal and blasphemous for Preachers to say, that God hateth the Elect unconverted,*

8. **H**OW Love is in God, is past our reach to know properly or exactly : But as we ascribe Love to him after the manner of men, so must we conceive of the manner of it, denying all humane imperfection in it : As Gods Love is taken for his Will or Decree to do good to his Elect, so it is eternal, and never varied. 2. But as God hath made a general Law for Government, and that Law may change its moral acts as men change their state or actions, without any change in God ; and that Law determineth what shall be due to men, as well as from them ; and what the Law doth, God doth : therefore when men are wicked, God is, as it were, their enemy, in Law-sense, and may be said, as Rector according to Law, not to Love them, but to hate them, in that the Law doth not speak good of them but evil, and give them no Right to life, but to death. And when upon

8. *God hath in propriety of speech, that which we call in man Love, Hatred, &c. at least by an Analogue of Attribution: And his Love is not his Essence, nor a Denomination from without, &c. but an affection or proper Act of his Will : and this God really changeth, as men change, and become more or less lovely in his sight. Nor is this any diminution of the honour of Gods Immutability, nor contrary to those Scriptures that proclaim him unchange-*

Antinom.

Truth.

Contrary-Exream.

or that he loveth them after, any better then before. (And according to this Doctrine they must hold it blasphemous, to say, that Christ reconciled the Father to sinners, or procured any Love to them, more then was to them before; or that God loveth us in Christ, or Accepteth us in the beloved, or is well pleased with us in his Son, being as well pleased before: Nor can we stir up any to duty by the Apostles motive, that with such sacrifice God is well pleased, he being as well pleased without it. Nor may we think a man in a regenerate state, any more happy then the unregenerate, as being better

conversion, the Law gives men Right to Life, and God is, as it were, obliged by it to do them good in special, he may be said, as Rector, to Love them in special, whom before he hated. So that the change is not in God, but in the sinner, and the Law. 3. Also Gods immanent Complacency, Approbation or Acceptance, called his Love, as it is not his Essence simply considered, but an extrinsecal Denomination of it from the object, so is it necessary, both that we diversifie that denomination, according to the diversity of objects, and say, He Loves the Believer who is Lovely, and hateth all the workers of iniquity, *Psal. 5. 5.* and not that he loves the wicked as well as the Godly: and also that we change such Denominations when the objects change, and say, He loves the same man when Godly, better then when wicked; because it is from the object that we denominate God as Loving or Approving. And so our Divines of the Assembly make Accepting, which is an immanent act, a part of Justification in time, after Faith. 4. Executively: as the Affect is denominated from the Effect, God may be said to love more or less.

able. For all those Scriptures speak of a Moral change, and not a Physical, and must be understood according to the subject they treat of. God is not fickle or unconstant, or culpably mutable, as men of levity are: He never changeth, but in sufficient cause: This is all that the Scripture intendeth: He is not vitiously mutable. But to make God naturally unchangeable in his Will or Affections, or Estimation, as well as in his Essence, is to abase his nature: It being baser, as Physical Agents, to be or act alwayes alike, then as Free-Agents, to vary our Actions as there is cause: A stone is not more excellent