

my reciting these Testimonies, is to be a Pill to Prejudice, and open mens ears to Scripture-proof. It is not a few, nor only the unlearned and ungodly, who are mastered by prejudice in these disputable things. Were not the Power of prejudice wonderful, we should not see the Divines of one Nation all Lutherans, as *Denmark, Sweden, Saxonie, &c.* and of another all Calvinists, as they are called; and of so many all Papists: and none or so few to depart from the way in Credit where they live. I confess I find in experience, that it doth more with most objectors, to cite the plain words of a Divine in Credit, then of *Peter or Paul*: When I mention what Christ saith, they make a puff at it, and say, *That is your Exposition? but what say such and such Divines?* As if Scriptures and humane Authority were of the same account in *England* as in *Italie*! I speak not this of all; but of too many: Nor do I speak it to accuse them, but as the necessary reason of my following task, which they who know not our common case, may judge superfluous and vain.

The opinions which are excepted against in me, are those which are supposed to ascribe too much to man and his Actions in the matter of Justification. Which are especially these following.

1. That we are justified by believing the truth of the Gospel, and accepting Christ as offered therein, that is, as an entire Saviour, to save us from sin it self, as well as from guilt and punishment, and as a King to Rule us: and so that subjecting the soul to Christ by Consent to his Kingdom, is an Act of Faith whereby we are justified, as well as resting on him for Justification, or apprehending or accepting pardon and righteousness. And that it is utterly void of Scripture-warrant to say, that It is only the Accepting of Christs sacrifice, or Imputed Righteousness, which is the justifying Act: or else, only the resting upon it for Justification. Or that though *fides qua Iustificat, Receipt Christum ut Regem*, Faith which Justifieth, taketh Christ for Lord; yet *Qua Iustificat*, as it justifieth, it taketh him only to Justification.

The ground of my opinion here is misliked, which is this.

2. Faith doth not Justifie qua fides, or qua hæc fides, as this Faith, that is, as it is an apprehending or accepting of Christs righteousness, nor is our Right to each particular Benefit of Christ particularized and constituted by the particular object apprehended by Faith, as

Impressions



*Impressions are made on the soul in sanctification, and individuated by individual objects, and specified by special objects; and so it is not as an Instrumental efficient cause that Faith Justifieth (for such it is not) nor yet formally from its natural act of Reception of such an object.*

But Right to Christ and Life being a Moral effect, and conveyed by a Moral cause and way, that is, by a Law of Grace, or conditional Promise or gift; therefore the formal reason of Faiths Interest in our Justification is, as it is the Condition of that Promise by us performed: and its Essence, or Physical act, (the Acceptance of Christ and life) commonly called its instrumentality, though it be the Reason why it was chosen and preferred to this office of being the Condition of the Promise, yet is it but its aptitude to the office, and so the remote, and as it were, material reason of its Interest in our Justification, and not the formal Reason. And therefore so far as it is a Condition of pardon or Justification, it must needs be the pardoning or justifying act: And therefore it being the undivided and undistinguished acceptance of Christ as Christ; that is, as Lord-Redeemer and Saviour, which is by Scripture made the Condition of our Right to Christ and his benefits, it follows, that we are justified by receiving him for Lord, as well as for Justifier by satisfaction, and that it is besides and against Scripture to say, that Faith Justifieth as an Instrument, or as it hath the Physical respect of an act to such an object; that is, as it apprehendeth Christs righteousness, and resteth thereon, or as it is Faith in Christ as a Justifier.

3. As that Faith which is the Condition of our first Right to a state of Justification, is the accepting of Christ as Christ, and so as King, and so contains the entering our selves by Consent into the Relation of subjects hereafter to obey, and a disposition and resolution to obey; so in those that survive, sincere obedience, (which is the performance of this Covenant) is the Condition, 1. Of our not losing our state of Justification, or of continuing it. 2. Of our particular pardon of particular sins, (at least renewed Repentance is such.) 3. And of our great Justification by Sentence at Judgement. But it is but a meer remote and secondary part of the Condition, in some subordination to faith, whereof it is a fruit. So that there is more required to the continuance and consumma-



consummation of our Justification, then is to put us into a Justified state at first.

4. The performance of the Conditions of the New Covenant, for Justification and salvation ( by Faith, Repentance, sincere-obedience ) are a personal, evangelical righteousness ( commonly called Inherent ) ; and therefore is it called our righteousness, because it is the performance of the Gospel condition, ( rather then from its Relation to the Law or Covenant of works, which it violateth by its imperfection ) seeing who soever believeth and repenteth is *non Reus*, not guilty of the non-performance of the Condition of Justification, and he that also sincerely obeyeth to the end, is not guilty of the non-performance of the Conditions of Sentential Absolution in Judgement.

It is not that Law ( commonly called Moral or of works ) which faith, *Obeys perfectly, or else dye* ; which judgeth me righteous because of my Inherent qualifications, or imperfect obedience : but it is that Law, which faith, *He that repenteth and believeth shall be forgiven, and he that sincerely obeyeth, ( both naturally Moral, and supernatural precepts ) and endureth to the end, shall be saved.* This Law or Covenant pronounceth me righteous, upon my imperfect performances.

5. This righteousness is not our universal righteousness, nor the matter of our Justification against the Accusation of violating the Law of works, nor any part of satisfaction for such violation: but only it is first the Condition of our Interest in that righteousness ( of Christ ) and consequently a special particular righteousness, constituting us truly righteous ; but only *in tantum*, so far as not to be chargeable with the final non-performance of the conditions of the new Covenant ; that is, not to be guilty of final Impenitency, Infidelity, Rebellion, or Hypocrisie. And in judgement, it is only against this false accusation that we must be justified by it, as the matter of our righteousness ; and against the charge of violating the Law of works, or being in general sinners, it is Christs righteousness that must justify us, as the only meritorious cause or matter, and this of ours no otherwise then as the Condition *sine qua non*, of our Right in it : Yet when in order to our final universal Absolution, the question comes to be, Whether we have any Right in Christ or not ? And so whether we per-

formed

formed the  
Right ?  
Conditions  
ry matter of  
the particular  
bels, or Hy  
have no Rig  
Christ and  
sonal Right  
are now laic  
rently righte  
dient.  
And thou  
in this mat  
which, 1. I  
causes of  
Absolution  
be so much  
ture to follo  
The main  
The Accept  
which is the  
as the taking  
Redeemer,  
ance, or no  
fication at  
cially ende  
And le  
forcing th  
you to hav  
I cannot h  
not under  
what I cite  
blame. 3  
ny of the  
cause. 4.  
no more to  
ly do, thou



formed the Condition of that grant or Promise, which giveth Right ? Here that Faith and Repentance, which first are but Conditions of our Justification by Christ, do next become the very matter of that righteousness whereby we are Justified, against the particular accusation of being Infidels, Impenitent, or Rebels, or Hypocrites, and such as never performing the Condition have no Right in Christ. So that it is only in subordination to Christ and his righteousness, that we are to be justified by personal Righteousness : As it is in subordination to him, that we are now said to be constituted *in tantum*, personally (or Inherently righteous) by our being sincere Believers, penitent and obedient.

And thus I have truly given the very summe of my judgement in this matter, which is accepted against by some Brethren ; In all which, 1. I make neither Faith, nor any act of man, to be the least causes of our justified state, or of continuing it, or of our final Absolution. 2. Nor do I take works of Obedience to Christ to be so much as present in our first Justification, but in order of nature to follow it.

The main thing that I find offend, are these two. 1. That I say, The Accepting Christ as King, and Teacher, is part of that Faith which is the Condition of Justification, and so justifying as well as the taking his righteousness. 2. That I say, Obedience to God Redeemer, is a secondary part of the Condition of the continuance, or not losing of our justified state, and of our final Justification at judgement. It is therefore these two that I shall especially endeavour to prove that I am not singular in.

And lest you should imagine that I wrong any Authors by forcing their words, or leaving out any thing. 1. I will suppose you to have the books at hand to peruse the whole context, which I cannot have time to write, or suppose concern me not. 2. I will not undertake to reconcile all other passages in any book with what I cite, but if I force their words, I am contented to bear the blame. 3. I will annex the conclusion which I gather from many of them, lest you say, I cite each one as approving my whole cause. 4. But all shall drive at the proofs of this Truth, that *I give no more to Works, then the most eminent Reformed Divines ordinarily do, though perhaps I give less to Faith and Man.*



## SECT. II.

**B**Efore I come to any particular testimonies, let me tell you, that I suppose that I have virtually the consent of all Protestant Divines, and that in sense and substance they say as much for Works in the matter of Justification as I do: And that this may appear, I will mention 14 particular Doctrines that all Protestants (for ought I know) agree in; every one of which, I suppose, containeth in it as much as I maintain in this; much more all together.

1. The first common assertion is this: *That all the Faithful have a true inherent righteousness, consisting in internal Graces or holyness, and external obedience, and that it is in an evangelical respect, that this is esteemed Righteousness and Accepted, seeing the Law requireth perfection, and curseth all that continue not in all things to do them; and our best Works are mortally sinful in the sense of the Law of Works.*

This being the common Doctrine of Protestants. 1. What wants it of giving as much to man in point of personal Evangelical righteousness, as I do? 2. If it be truly and not equivocally righteousness, it must needs have a Metaphysical perfection inseparable from its Essence. 3. If it be truly righteousness, then we are truly justified by it, beyond all doubt: that is, 1. We are constitutively justified by it *in tantum*, so far and no further: Not constituted universally righteous by it; but we are constituted evangelically inherently righteous, so far as that extends. For it is a meer contradiction to say a man hath a righteousness that Constitutes him not righteous: that is, He is righteous, and he is not righteous, in respect to the same righteousness.

2. This righteousness will undeniably justify him in judgement against the particular accusation of having not performed the condition of the new Covenant, that is, of being a final Infidel, Rebel, Hypocrite: And *Math. 25.* and many other Scriptures make it appear, that to judge men to have performed or not performed those Conditions (that is according to their Works evangelically) will be no small part of the work of Christ in that judgement. As therefore

fore we are c  
rits, and not a  
gelically, Inh  
Covenantants  
Initially (but a  
we bring forth  
shall be prom  
condemned m  
excepted sins  
and this for th  
nounced Belie  
dead, and ac  
of the Gospel  
are righteous

2. The lec  
in Judgement  
justified in Ju  
particular rig  
nyed but tha  
may any wic  
of that day  
work that w  
far Justifi  
man in Ina  
God, or n  
nels? No  
of not per  
of having  
Faith, R  
ness of ou  
will be ne  
concede  
their opin  
judged by  
be upon



fore we are constituted, pardoned sinners, purely by Christs Merits, and not any thing of our own ; so we are constituted evangelically, Inherently righteous, as being performers of the new Covenants Conditions of our Interest in Christ and Pardon, &c. Initially (but actually) on our first believing, and Progressively, as we bring forth the fruits of that Faith. And as at judgement we shall be pronounced Pardoned sinners, and therefore not to be condemned merely as sinners, (which term I oppose to the special excepted sins of final Infidelity and Impenitency, or Rebellion,) and this for the sake of Christs blood alone : So we shall be pronounced Believers, and sincere Obeyers, because we were so indeed, and acquit from all false accusations of non-performance of the Gospel Condition, because we did perform it, and therefore are righteous in that cause, against that accusation.

2. **T**He second common assertion is this, *That as every man may have a particular righteousness, and so a righteous cause in Judgement; so every man may be said most truly and properly to be justified in Judgement by a particular justification (if need be) by that particular righteousness, or justness of his cause.* No man ever denied but that the Devil himself may be falsely accused : and so may any wicked man : I do not say, that it is any of the business of that day to vindicate them from such accusations: It is another work that will be then in hand. But you may see that they are so far Justifiable as they are just ! If one accuse me of killing a man in *India* that I never heard of, may I not be justified before God, or man from that charge, by my innocency or righteousness ? No doubt of it. If therefore we be accused at judgement of not performing the Conditions of the Law of Grace, and so of having no part in Christs Merits, we must be justified by our Faith, Repentance and Obedience, as that matter or righteousness of our cause, and so of our persons. If any dream that there will be no use at judgement of any such Justification. 1. Yet they concede that such we may have, if it were useful. 2. I am far from their opinion, seeing, 1. It is the Law of Grace that we shall be judged by; and therefore our Absolution or Condemnation must be upon its Conditions. The Law is the Rule of Judgement.

*Legē Antonium  
Fayum in Ro-  
man. 4. 3. pag.  
223.  
Et G. Sobinum  
Exeges. Com-  
fess. August.  
Art. 4. pag.  
942.*



2. What can it else be ? 1. We shall not be justified or condemned by the Law of Works. 2. I will not exclude the mention of Christs satisfaction, but principally include it as supposed : but by the descriptions of that judgement expressed in the word, it seems it is not the business of that day to enquire, whether Christ have done his part, but whether we have done ours : not whether Christ have satisfied, but whether we have believed and obeyed him in Love and Gratitude ? The former being taken for granted, will not need a Judicial Decision. The judgement will proceed according to the Law which is *Norma Judicii*: But the Law which we shall then be judged by, supposeth Christ to be our Redeemer, and to have made satisfaction, and is founded on that ground, being the Lord-Redeemers Law : therefore the judgement according to that Law will suppose it too ; and as he made the Law as Rector on his Redemption Right, so will he Judge on the same Right in the same Relation. 3. The Scripture expressly tells us that it is according to our Works, that we shall be judged ; as we have well or ill used our Talents, which are the Redeemers mercies ; and as we have loved him, and manifested it to his members, *Math. 25. &c.* Therefore it is certain that there will be use at that day for a Justification, as against the Accusation of non-performance of the Gospel-Conditions. Whether the accusation it self will be actual, or only Potential and Virtual, is little to the matter : Christ tells us the Justification opposite to it shall be actual and express.

4. And what else can our Divines mean, when they so commonly say, that Works shall be then mentioned as evidences of true Faith, and shall Justify Faith ? By that it seems they suppose that Faith it self directly will be tryed, and Works in relation to it. This therefore is opposite to the (actual or virtual) Accusation, that we are Infidels and Rebels.

3. **T**He third common assertion is this, *That Repentance towards God, is a Condition without which we cannot be justified : The same many say of Love to God as our end and chief good, and Love to Christ as Redeemer, and thankfulness for his mercie, and desire after him.*

This

This granted  
fended with m  
ed Works fro  
Works. 2.  
nant, (no ma  
4. Or any cor  
not of Grace  
mean any god  
penance, and  
to the object  
be saved or ju  
dare any say o  
dels justificati  
and not Repen  
tance or Love  
say that Faith  
blame then w  
deny that Faith  
I give less to  
and do not sa  
When you kn  
ry Condition  
Mr. Blake, b  
far I will con  
sons for both  
Condition.

4. **T**He  
newed and c  
ast of Faith  
I never  
trary to St  
above one  
all our aft  
don then  
they expr



This granteth the thing that I contend for, or that men are offended with me for asserting. For in *Pauls* sense, I ever disclaimed Works from Justifying, that is, either 1. Mosaical ceremonious Works. 2. Or exact righteousness according to the first Covenant, (no man having such.) 3. Or any conceited to be such. 4. Or any conceited meritorious, and making the Reward to be not of Grace but of Debt, *Rom. 4. 4.* But if by Works, you will mean any good action, I say that as Faith, so in their places Repentance, and Gratitude for the offer of Life, and desire and love to the object of Faith, are Conditions without which we cannot be saved or justified. And do not themselves say as much? Or dare any say otherwise except the Antinomians, that are for Infidels Justification? If you say, *But Faith only is the Instrument, and not Repentance, Love, &c.* I *Ans.* I never said that Repentance or Love were Instruments of Justifying us. *Obj.* But you say that Faith is not, and so you level them. *Ans.* 1. Lay the blame then where it should lye, and speak the truth: say that I deny that Faith justifieth us as the Instrumental cause, and say that I give less to Faith, and so to man in Justification than others do; and do not say I give more to other acts, as Repentance, Love, &c. When you know that others make them *sine qua non*, and necessary Conditions as well as I. 2. I have told you in my account to Mr. *Blake*, how far I deny Faith to be an Instrument, and how far I will contend with no man that useth the word, and my reasons for both, and that I give it the honor of being the Receiving Condition.

4. **T**He fourth assertion warranting my opinion, is this, *That we are justified by Faith as long as we live, even by our renewed and continued Believing, and not only by the first instantaneous act of Faith.*

I never met with man that denied this: How absurd and contrary to Scripture is it, to say, that no man hath justifying Faith above one minute or instant of his life (as to the act)? Or that all our after believing doth no more to our Justification and Pardon than our Works do, (in their account, which is nothing, as they expressly say?) Am not I warranted from this Doctrine of theirs.



theirs then to affirm, 1. That Justification is a continued act ? 2. That there is more requisite to the continuance of it, then was to the beginning ? For it was one numerical act of Faith that sufficed (in its kinde) to the beginning : but it must be many renewed acts, even through our lives, that are necessary for its continuance : And certainly believing all our lives, or persevering in the Habit, and renewing daily the acts, is somewhat more then to perform the first act of justifying-Faith.

5. **A** Fifth assertion of theirs is this, *That renewed Repentance, especially for gross sins, is a causa sine qua non, or necessary Condition of our pardon for particular sins after Justification : Also that Prayer for pardon is the like Condition, and means to procure pardon : Also that Confession of sin is the like condition that God may forgive them : And that restitution of ill gotten, stolln goods (where it may be done) is the like Condition, to which end it is ordinarily urged, as from Austin, Non remittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatum : without restitution there is no Remission. (A cutting conclusion, saith Mr. R. Bolton, to all cut-throat Usurers.)*

Now let but any one of all these be granted, and I am warranted to say, 1. That somewhat else besides Faith is a necessary Condition of pardon of sin, which they say is essential to Justification. 2. That somewhat more is required to renewed and continued pardon, then to the first. 3. That therefore (absolutely and unlimitedly) it is not fit to say that pardon or Justification is perfect at once, or as long as we are sinners, and have more sins (*future*) to be pardoned, and more means to be used both for continuance and renewal of pardon. What man dare say, I will never pray for the continuance of my pardon, Justification, or Gods favour and Acceptance ? I hope many of those dare not do thus when it comes to practice, whose disputing principles lead them to it. And surely as long as means must be used, the end is not obtained (unless they were *media fruitionis*, in heaven:) therefore while you must pray for continued Justification and renewed pardon or Justification from the guilt of particular sins, all this is yet unobtained, and your Justification not of the most perfect kind.

kind. And  
cessary to  
begin it :

6. **A** Not  
from Grace,  
be justified;  
his justification  
that we fall n  
our and be co  
I know no  
them not to  
shall dye : a  
him, &c. A  
that sincere  
losing our  
words which  
haynous off  
cause it sha  
justification  
with such fi  
supposeth t  
intended for  
the end wo  
will not pur  
gently. He  
form duty,  
I think : A  
Redeemed  
perished fo  
unthankful  
falling aw  
called now  
had purpo  
should fru  
positions



kind. And yet I am deeply blamed for saying, there is more necessary to continue our Justification, and consummate it, then to begin it : and that it is not Absolutely perfect at first.

6. **A** Nother common Assertion of our Divines is, that, *If a true Believer should fall to gross Rebellion, and fall away from Grace, and from sincere Obedience to Christ, he should cease to be Justified; If he should lose his Sanctification, he should with it lose his Justification : And that it ought to be our care and daily study that we fall not away, and that on this motive, lest we lose Gods favour and be condemned.*

I know none but gross Antinomians deny this. And I blame them not to hold it, when God saith, *If ye live after the flesh, ye shall dye : and if any draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him, &c.* And will not this beyond all question, warrant us to say, that sincere obedience is a Condition of the continuance or not losing our Justification ? This is but the same thing in other words which they say themselves : and yet this is my great and haynous offence ! I hope these sober men will not say, that because it shall never come to pass that the justified shall lose their justification, it is therefore a supposition not to be put: yet I meet with such freaks in some Antinomians. The certainty of the end, supposeth the certainty of the means : and those means must be intended for that end : and therefore we may well suppose that the end would not be obtained without the means : and he that will not put such suppositions, is like to use the means but negligently. He that will not say, *If I should not forbear sin, or perform duty, I should miss of heaven, would scarce use them well, I think :* And he that scrupleth, to think or say, *If Christ had not Redeemed me, if God had not called me, and justified me, I had perished for ever. I think will be likely to perish, or is at least very unthankful :* and yet these suppositions are as impossible, as our falling away. It is impossible we should not be redeemed and called now it is past : and it was as certain before, that what God had purposed must come to pass ; and impossible that any thing should frustrate his decrees. Yet who knows not that such suppositions are not only lawful, but necessary to the right actuating



actuating of our mindes, and the Exercise of all Gods Graces in us.

7. **A** Nother common assertion is, that, *The Faith which justifieth must take Christ for King and Prophet, and Sanctifier as well as a sacrifice for sin: and that this is required of God, as a matter of so great necessity, as that he will not justify us without it: yea it is no true justifying Faith without it.* Yet they say, we are not justified by it, because this is not the act which apprehendeth Christs righteousness: this is *fides quæ Iustificat*, but not *quæ Iustificat*: this is not the Instrument, nor the act related to that object which must justify.

And do they not here say as much as I? (Though I say not so much as they.) Either I understand it not, or else this confesseth that accepting Christ as Lord and King, is a Condition of our Justification, though it be not the Instrument of it? And did ever I say, it was the Instrument of it? If I deny the Instrumentality of another act as to Justification, doth it thence follow that I give more then they to this act?

8. **T**He next assertion which they own, is, *That the will of man cannot desire evil as evil, nor refuse that good which they see to have only rationem boni: that man cannot hate himself directly, and will his own damnation. Or at least, that a man may will his own salvation, or escape of Torments without saving Grace: and therefore that even an unregenerate man may be Willing to be pardoned, justified and saved from hell; but he cannot be willing to be sanctified, obedient, and healed of his corruptions. Also they affirm, that Gods Glory is his only or highest end in all his Works, and that he cannot intend the Creature before his Glory.* Rom. 14.9.

And if all this be so, is it not much liker, if we must needs make a distinction in the matter, that God rather intended the Accepting of Christ as King, to be more the Condition of our Justification, then the accepting him as pardoner or justifier? For the Condition and the benefit are usually thus different, that the benefit



fit, contains that which the party apprehendeth more good in, and the condition that which he is prone to apprehend some evil in, or some more difficulty or inconvenience: and in the condition the promiser useth to see to his own interest. If we suffer with him, we shall also be Glorified with him. Suffering is the Pill that must be licked down with the promise of Glory annexed: God would not say, if you will consent to be glorified with him, you shall suffer with him. If we confess Christ before men, he will confess us, or own us before his Father and the Angels; but if we deny him, he will deny us. Confessing him in dangerous times, is the pill that must be licked down with the promise of his owning us. These promises suppose that the party is willing of the thing promised, but not so willing of the thing conditioned; and therefore the benefit expected must procure the condition performed. God saith not, if you will consent that I confess you before the Angels, and not deny you then you shall have leave to confess me in dangers. Lay all this to the case in hand. I confess to assent savingly to the truth of the Gospel, which is the Intellectual foregoing act, is a matter of so great difficulty, that none can do it but by special Grace: But suppose believing the truth of the word, (if it be but with a common temporary faith) can you prove that those men cannot be willing to be pardoned by Christ and saved from Hell, without speciall Grace? What man is willing to be damned, or unpardoned? If disputing serve not turn, go try them, and believe them as far as reason requires you: ask all the Town, how many of you would not have your sins pardoned? How many would go to hell? Who can Imagine then, that the chief intent of the promiser, was to make that the main or only condition, which men are all willing of by nature, or can perform by nature (if that were all, and if they first believed the truth of the word) is it not much liker, that God principally intended that act that flesh and blood apprehendeth to be against them? and which they do most stick at? yea, and which tendeth most directly to the securing of the interest and honour of the Redeemer? that is, to take him for our King and Guide, and to obey him? Physitians use to say, if you will take me for your Physitian and trust me and take my Medicines, and follow my directions, I will cure you (if they can.) But they use not to say, if you are willing to be cured, or on condi-



tion you will consent to be well, I will be your Physitian, and give you this Medicine, perhaps bitter and unpleasant. Yet for my part I speak not this, as thinking it meet to make any partition in this business, nor to separate what God hath joyned: I think it fittest to say that it is receiving Christ as he is Offered, that is the condition, even whole Christ with the whole heart: even against his pardoning Grace, nature may rise indirectly and by accident: but if we were necessitated to make a difference or separation, and must make one only or chiefly the condition of Pardon, it seems it would be rather willingness to be ruled, then to be Pardoned.

9. **A**nother common Assertion is this, that 1. *Refusing Christs Reign and Government is a sin that certainly condemneth all that live and die in it.* 2. *And that Actual continuance in gross sin is damning.* As Mr. Shephard saith, sincere Convert, pag. 238. *Though thy good Duties cannot save thee, yet thy bad Work, will damn thee.* And pag. 246. *two things keep a man from Christ.* 1. Sin. 2. Self. And indeed the Lord Jesus saith expressly; *These mine enemies that would not I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me,* Luke 19. 27. And 1 Joh. 3. 8, 9, 10. *He that committeth sin is of the Devil; Whosoever is born of God sinneth not. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the Devil; Whosoever doth not Righteousness is not of God, &c.* Eph. 5. 5, 6. *Ye know that no Whoremonger, nor Unclean person, nor Covetous man, who is an Idolater, hath any Inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words; For because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience,* 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10. *Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not Inherit the Kingdom of God? Be not deceived, Neither Fornicators, &c.* Gal. 5. 19, 20, 21, 24. Rom. 8. 9, 13. All this is believed by our Divines, for they believe Gods word to be true.

And is it not then undeniable, That 1. *Accepting Christ to reign over us,* 2. *And sincerely obeying him,* are conditions without which we cannot continue justified, (nor be justified

without th  
which doth  
then acc  
and must b  
fusing Chr  
things) m  
accepting  
no less the  
Divine Oro  
dience are  
lion and D  
they have  
He that be  
be damned  
ing whose  
fence hath  
that is me  
meant in  
that is part  
cepting him  
other parts  
one of wh  
it self. Fo  
tion, by th  
that believ  
condemned  
to be Ab  
demnation  
cation an  
quents: a  
ditions an  
demneth  
or a Priv  
vocation  
we can b  
edly kno  
lies, and  
the forme  
27. befor



without the first ) nor be justified or saved at the last day? that which doth *removere prohibens*, remove impediments, can be no less then *à causa sine qua non*, if that impediment must be removed, and must by that means be removed. But this impediment ( refusing Christs Reign, and disobeying him in absolutely necessary things ) must be removed, and that by the contraries: therefore accepting Christ to reign over us, and sincerely obeying him, can be no less then *à causa sine qua non*. And this being from the force of Divine Ordination in the Law of Grace, that subjection and obedience are made so necessary a means to that end, and that Rebellion and Disobedience is made so destructive, it must needs be that they have properly the nature of a condition: He that hath said, He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned: doth give us to understand, that it is the same believing whose presence hath the promise of Salvation, and whose absence hath the threatning of Damnation: Look what unbelief it is that is meant in the threatning, it is the contrary faith that is meant in the promise. But it is the not accepting Christ as King, that is part of the unbelief that condemneth: therefore it is the accepting him as King that is the belief that saveth ( supposing the other parts. ) And lest any should say, saving and justifying is not all one ( of which more anon ) Christ doth say as much of justification it self. For justification is confessed to be opposed to condemnation, by those that I speak to: And Christ saith, *Joh. 3. 18. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already.* Not to be condemned, is beyond all doubt to be Absolved, or justified ( and not a meer Negation of condemnation, as a stone hath: ) Now it is here evident that justification and condemnation are opposed as the effects or consequents: and believing and not believing are opposed as the conditions and Antecedents. Now it being *a not believing* that condemneth, it is past doubt, that it is *a not believing* to justification, or a Privation of the same faith that justifieth: Else were the equivocation so great, as to leave the words not intelligible: so that if we can but find out the nature of one branch, we may undoubtedly know the other: Know but what is the condemning unbelief, and you may easily know what is the justifying faith. Now the former is most expressly told us by the Judge himself, *Luk. 19. 27. beforecited.* The sentence of Condemnation is past on them,



for not receiving Christ as King: *These mine enemies that would not that I should Reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me, Joh. 1. 12.* As many as received him, that is, believed, have power given them to be sons: And here as many as received him not as King, are condemned as enemies

Nay, observe in the Text in hand, that the reason why Unbelief is the condemning sin, is because it is the privation of that faith which God hath made the condition of Justification and Salvation. And therefore it is said: *But he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed.* There is much more in this, *because he hath not believed*, then if it had been barely *because he hath sinned, or is a sinner*: though both may be true. For the Law of works condemneth every sinner, simply as a sinner: The Law of Grace condemneth every unbeliever and impenitent Rebel, that obstinately to the end refuseth recovering Grace: And it is the latter that this Text speaks of: Else it would have said, he is condemned already, because he is a sinner, or hath broke the Law of works. But some learned men tell me, to this, that unbelief is sin, and therefore there is no condemnation but by the Law of works which condemneth for all sin? what need a New Law to condemn us for one sin or more, when the old condemneth for all? *Ans.* Though all unbelief be sin, yet all sin is not unbelief. And therefore we may well distinguish between sin, as sin in general, and as this sin in special which God hath, if final, excepted from pardon. The Law condemning all sin, prohibiteth not the Gospel, to adjoyn a special condemnation of one sin: Nor is it absurd that one duty should be doubly a duty by the common Precept of the Law, and a special Precept of the Gospel, nor that one sin should have a double Condemnation, common as a sin by the Law of Works (though yet that will hold great dispute) and special, as the rejecting of the remedy by the Law of Grace. And it was not the prime intent of the Law of Grace, to condemn men for unbelief (which you say the Law doth;) But to offer a remedy from former condemnation, the promise being the Principal part: but yet that this promise might not be slighted, it seemed good to the promiser to annex a threatning, that the refusal of the remedy might be doubly condemned. And were it only the threatning of a non-liberation, non-remission, it were a true and proper penalty, when Liberation and

and Remission  
Grace. If th  
all the Rebel  
Arm, and  
die without n  
demned by  
demned as re  
condemnation  
a non-remissi  
unmeet by a  
thing now for  
bels, and who  
another thin  
came in by th  
accordingly  
I am carried  
that as there  
all sinners as  
abslveth all  
want of faith  
ry remediless  
as sinners in  
reason of na  
fore it is pass  
unbelief, b  
mult needs b  
should Re  
for, &c.  
One othe  
words expr  
condemnation  
ness rather  
heard, tha  
that he th  
and that  
preilly sai  
ing unbe  
Guide,  
light, bec



and Remission is given to all by a conditional Grant or Law of Grace. If the State or a King make an Act of free pardon, *that all the Rebels in such a Countrey shall be pardoned that lay down Arms, and accept of pardon by such a day, and those that do not, shall die without mercy*: Here you may say, they were before condemned by Law as Rebels: But yet they were not before condemned as refusers of pardon. 2. Or if they had, yet before their condemnation was not peremptory and remediless. 3. Nor was a non-remission any part of their penalty. 4. Nor would it be unmeet by a new Act thus again to condemn them. And it is one thing now for the Judge to hold an Assizes to try who were Rebels, and who not, and accordingly to condemn and justifie, and another thing to hold an Assizes to try which of these Rebels came in by the day, and accepted the pardon, and which not, and accordingly to condemn and justifie. To return therefore whence I am carried by this objection, it is evident by this Text, *Joh. 3. 18.* that as there is a common condemnation by the Law of works, of all sinners as sinners; so the Law of Grace dissolveth that, and absolveth all believing sinners, though sinners: but excepteth the want of faith, and so specially again condemneth by a peremptory remediless condemnation, all final impenitent unbelievers: not as sinners in general, but as such sinners in special: And that the reason of its condemnation is *because they believed not*, and therefore it is past doubt, that look what unbelief is the condemning unbelief, by this special Gospel condemnation, the contrary must needs be the justifying faith: But unwillingness that Christ should Reign over men, is the condemning unbelief: Therefore, &c.

One other Argument let me take up from this text, whose next words expressly say the things we affirm Ver. 19. *And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.* Before we heard, that he that believeth is justified, or not condemn'd: and that he that believeth not (with that same faith) is condemned, and that *eo nomine* because he believeth not: And here it is expressly said that this is the condemnation, that is, the condemning unbelief, that Christ is come as a light, which is to Teach, and Guide, and Reform, and men loved darkness rather than this light, *because their deeds were evil*, which this light Discovered, Re-



proved, and would have Healed. May I not then by the warrant of this Text say on the contrary. [And this is the Justification, that is, the Justifying Faith, that Light is come into the world, and men love this Light better then darkness, that their deeds may be made manifest and healed of the evil.] Mark here also, that to love the Light is justifying Faith. Love to Christ in Accepting him as Redeemer, is Faith it self, and not to be excluded in Justification.

To what is here said, adjoyn the Arguments which I have briefly given Mr. *Blake*, to prove that to receive Christ as King and Prophet is justifying Faith.

And as I have said this much in matter of Faith, so I might as fully have shewed that on their Concession, by the rule of contraries, Obedience must be a Condition of our continued and final Justification and Salvation.

10. **T**He next Concession of our Divines that I shall mention, is this, they commonly teach, *That sincere obedience is a condition of salvation*; though some of them deny it to be a condition of justification. Now they say in this as much in sense as I do, & on that ground I may well be warranted to say it is the Condition of our Justification at Judgement. For, 1. Justification at Judgement is part of salvation in that stricter sense, as it is ordinarily used. 2. Justification at Judgement is the adjudging men to salvation: It is to try and Judge who are heirs of salvation and who not: And therefore undoubtedly the same thing that is the Condition of their salvation, is the Condition of their Justification. If you hold your Lands by a Deed of gift, the Judge will by the same Deed decide the Controversie for you, and pass Sentence on your side, when your Right is questioned. 3. Saving and Condemning are as frequently opposed in Scripture, or as plainly as Justifying and Condemning. 4. Mans works are as strictly excluded by *Paul* from saving him, as from Justifying him (in that sense as he takes works in his exclusion) and saving is as strictly reserved as the effect of free Grace, as Justifying is: Nor is it any more dishonor to Christ that men Justifie themselves, then that they save themselves: Christ will have no partners in his

*Vid. Georg. Can.  
lxxi, Epitom.  
Theolog pag  
264, 265.*

his honour  
4. 4. and 4.  
6, 13, 14, 1  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9  
meaning of  
vation, and  
between the  
other. For  
both. Only  
first being  
nal obedient  
for he exclu  
acknowledg  
ded from s  
cluded from  
or as contin  
A learned  
is no proper  
we are justifi  
tels me, th  
Sentence. I  
cutive senten  
clare by a  
by a decidin  
an answer  
who was Ju  
of another  
but Virtu  
Judge tha  
by justifie  
fore men.  
and that  
that Chr  
steth in i  
solving;  
them, is  
not Chr  
every id  
of in the



his honour in either. See for this, *Rom.* 3. 23, 24. compared, *Rom.* 4. 4. and 4. 13. and 4. 16. and 5. 17, 18. and 6. 23. and 8. 1, 2, 6, 13, 14, 17. *Heb.* 11. throughout, *Tit.* 3. 4, 5, 6, 7. *Eph.* 2. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. All which places fully shew that it was never the meaning of the Apostle to make Obedience a Condition of salvation, and not of Justification at Judgement; or so to distinguish between these, as to exclude works from one, and not from the other. For so far as he excludeth them, he excludeth them from both. Only I still confess, that when Justification is taken for our first being Justified only, it must needs go before works of external obedience, but that is not *Paul's* meaning in excluding works, for he excludes them from saving as well as justifying. It must be acknowledged therefore, that in what sense they are not excluded from saving, as Conditions, in that sense they are not excluded from being Conditions of our Justification at Judgement, or as continued.

A learned man here gives me a twofold answer, 1. That there is no proper Justification at judgement, but only a declaring that we are justified. *Repl.* 1. And another as learned Animadverter tells me, there is no other Justification but the Judges judicial Sentence. It is hard pleasing all Divines. 2. To declare by a Decisive sentence is most properly to justify, and more then to declare by a Narration. All Judicial Justification is but a declaring, by a deciding Sentence, who is just in Law. This is therefore as good an answer as to say, No Judge doth justify: He doth but declare who was Justified before. But the Justification he had before, was of another sort, *viz.* Constitutive, and as to that, of Sentence, but Virtual: The contrary therefore is a sound arguing: Every Judge that by Sentence declares who was just in Law, doth thereby justify them, that is, by Sentence. 3. I will believe God before men. 1. God telleth us frequently, that we shall be judged, and that according to our Works: It is an Article of our Creed, that Christ will judge us. And Judging is the *Genus* which existeth in its *Species*, which are well known to be Justifying or Absolving, and Condemning: therefore to say, We are not justified then, is to say, either we are condemned, or not judged. 2. Doth not Christ expressly say, *Math.* 12. 37. *But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgement: For by thy words thou shalt be justified*



ed, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned. It is a hard case among Christians and Divines, that these plain truths should meet with so much opposition.

The second Objection is, that Obedience is indeed a Condition of salvation, but not of Right to salvation : ( for they are forced to confess that to Justify, is to give Right to Impunity, and so to salvation ; and so it is all one thing : and therefore if works be the Condition of our Right to salvation, then also of our Justification.)

Reply. 1. I still confess that our first Right to salvation is before external works, ( but not before Repentance and Love to Christ.) But it is our adjudged, consummate, and continued Right, that the Question doth concern. And 1. hear our Teacher, Rev. 22. 14. *Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have Right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in by the Gate into the City.* 2. It is a mistake of the very nature of a Condition, which causeth this Objection. The Condition is *Promissionis vel Testamenti Condicio* : The Condition of Gods Grant, or Christs Testament : And the Promise or Testament, is to convey Right, and not natural beings directly : and therefore the Condition is ever a Condition of the Right conveyed by the Promise. A natural Qualification, vulgarly called a natural Condition, may be said to be the Condition of the thing in its Physicall being, (as the dryness of Wood and its proximity to the fire is of its burning.) But a Civil, Moral, Legal Condition, is ever a Condition of Right; it being Right that Laws and Promises do convey. He that calls for proof of this, will not much honour his understanding by the demand : Especially in respect to our present case.

11. **A** Nother common Assertion, equipolent to what they blame in me, is this, *That Faith Justifieth the Person before God, and Works Instifie the Faith.*

This is in sence as much as I give to Works herein. For to justify the Faith of the person, is to justify the person so far, when his Faith is questioned. If his Faith be not questioned (actually or virtually) and there be no use for Justifying it, then shall not his works Justifie it at all : If there be use for such a Justification

of



of his Faith, ( whether against an actual or implied potential accusation ) then himself is justified by the Justification of his Faith ; that is, as to that Cause, and against the accusation. Nor is there any Justification of a mans cause, which Justifieth not the Man as to that cause : Nor any Justification of the man in Judgement, but by Justifying his cause. Only there is great difference between cause and cause : between the question, Whether he be universally righteous ? and Whether he be in this point and thus far righteous only ? And I never affirmed that man is further justified by his own Faith and Obedience, as the matter of his righteousness, at Gods bar, but only *in tantum*, as to this particular cause. Yet I say, it is a Cause of great moment, and which our universal Justification hath a dependance on, as on a condition. When the question is, Whether we have performed the Condition of the Promise that gives right to Christ or not ? as to this cause, our performance is the righteousness by which we are Justified. And this is the Truth of God, which men maintain in other words, while they oppose it in these.

12. **A** Nother common Assertion is that [ *James* by Works means a working Faith, when he saith we are Justified by Works, and not by Faith only. ] Thus Mr. *Pemble*, and the most of our Divines. I believe as well as they, that *James* speaks of Works as effects of Faith, qualifying it or proving it fit to justify : but yet I believe verily that by Works he means Works indeed, having mentioned them no less then 12 times in 13 or 14 verses. But suppose the meaning be that a working faith Justifies, and not a faith that will not Work : If they place no reason of its justifying, in this modification (that it be working) the scope of *James's* discourse confuteth them, and the reasons that he brings are made void and vain. It never was in his mind to take pains to prove the necessity of such a Qualification of Faith, as is no means, no not so much as a Condition, to the end in question, but is a meer concomitant.

But if they mean, that Faiths working nature, is any means or Condition of its justifying, they say as much as I. For example ; A man is promised his freedom if he pay 100 l. currant money. That it be money, is the substance of the Condition : but that it