

not going out of themselves, and by odious Words, as being for *Justification by Works*: When it is they themselves that overthrow all *Justification*, and the Gospel, as *Justifying us*, and *Justification by Faith* it self, calling it *Id Credere*, and a *Work*: Ridiculously, making *Id Credere* and *Faith*, to signify diversely: And tell us not when it is the *Phrase*, and when it is the the *Meaning*, that they oppose. If it be the *Phrase* that they oppose, they condemn *Christ*, and the *Scripture*; that say, Men are *Justified* by their *Words* and *Works*. If it be the *Sence*, let them tell what that *Sence* is, which they accuse; and not confound the *Controversies* of the *Name*, and of the *Thing*. Those that they reproach, Renounce all *Works* for *Justification* or *Salvation*, that arrogate the least part of the *Office*, *Merits*, or *Grace* of *Christ*; or that make the *Reward* not of *Grace*, but of *Debt*: Yea, all that Honour not *Christ* and *Grace*, more than if he had not required them; and did not, as dwelling in us by his *Spirit*, cause them, and make them acceptable to *God*: But we will not renounce *Christ* living in us, nor the use, and worth of the *Image* of *God*.

CHAP. III.

To moderate Mens over-hot Censuring the Erroneous.

Reconcil. **H**AVING enumerated a Century of their Errours, I shall next tell you, how, and why, notwithstanding all these gross Corruptions, you should moderate, and regulate your Censure of the Men, and of other such.

Ortho. You have told me sufficiently what to think of

of them, when you have told me what they hold ; I must neither judge of the Faith by the Man, nor forbear judging of the Man by his Faith. Can any man judge too hardly of men that overthrow all Religion ? They seem to me to be Atheists, Infidels, Anti-Christians, Prophane, and open Enemies of all that is Holy and Good, save only the Name of God, and Christ, and Free Grace, and that Good which they oppose.

This Character of them, I gather from your own Words.

I. They deny the only true God, and feign or make us another God : The true God is Holy, and hateth sin : But they feign a God, who is the maker of sin ; yea, that made his own Son the greatest sinner in the World, by making all the sins committed by all the Elect, to be really his sins, and so making him the worst of men.

II. Yea, whereas Devils can but tempt men to sin, they feign God to translate our sins themselves Essentially on Christ, and so to make him a sinner that could not be tempted to it.

III. They make us another (pretended) Christ, and so deny the true Christ, and so are Anti-Christ. The true Christ had no sin, but only became a Sacrifice for our sin ; which were laid upon him, no further than to suffer for us. But they feign a Christ, that was a hater of God, an Atheist, a Servant of the Devil, and the greatest sinner in all the World, and yet sinned not himself.

IV. They deny God dwelling in us as Love, and Christ living in us by his Spirit, by feigning us to be never the better for his Grace and inward Operations, as to any furtherance of our Salvation ; as if the Life of Christ within us, were not saving.

V. They deny the great Ends, and use of a Saviour, to save us from Sin, as a means to save us

us from Hell, and as the means of our Glorification; and as a Prophet by his Doctrine and Example, to teach us how to seek and obtain the purchased Salvation.

VI. They deny the Holy Ghost, by denying that his Sanctifying Work and Grace, must be esteemed and used as a furtherance of our Salvation: Because Christ hath saved us by himself already.

VII. They deny the Gospel, while they deny it to be the Law or Donation of God, which as an Act of Oblivion, is his Instrument of our Justification and Pardon; our Title to life (for Titulus est fundamentum juris;) And as the Instrument of our virtual Justification.

VIII. They do as Anti-christians, deny Christ's Prophetical Office, by which, by Doctrine and Example, he teacheth us what we must do to be saved; And his Kingly Office, by which he maketh Laws to Rule us, or to Judge us by, as the imposed term of Life and Death.

IX. They deny the Law of Innocency, and forge another of their own instead of it, which nameth Christ as instead of us.

X. They hold all the Elect Lawless, and so no Subjects of Christ, while they say, they are under no Law.

XI. Hereby they deny God and Christ's Government by Law.

XII. They have no humiliation for sin, and say, they have no sin; for since Christ's death, it is none of theirs.

XIII. They hold, that there is no such thing as sin in the World (of the Elect) because Christ took it from them (before they were born or had it;) and he hath none now in Heaven.

XIV. They deny all Justification by Faith, and say, that it is not by Faith, but by the Object of Faith only.

XV. They

XV. They make Christ no true Mediator, but such a surety as was a party in the Bond with us, and suffered for his own sin, and was condemned by that Law of Innocency for us.

XVI. They deny Justifying Faith it self, while instead of it they feign a meer belief that we are Justified.

XVII. They harden ungodly men in their damning presumption, obtruding on them a belief, that they are Elect and Justified, tho' ungodly; and telling them, that this is coming out of themselves to Christ, and that they cannot believe this too soon; and that Christ hath Repented, Believed, and been Holy for them.

XVIII. They directly fight against all mens Salvation, by telling them, that they ought to do no Duty inward or outward, as a means of their Salvation, lest it be against Christ and Free Grace which saveth them. And that nothing that they do, can do them any good, nor any sin, possibly can do them any hurt, because they are already perfect, and saved only by Christ.

XIX. They expose Christianity to the scorn of Infidels, by telling men, that it consisteth in that which every novice in Logick or Reasoning, knoweth to be impossible; that one mans Sins, and one mans Righteousness, should be made anothers: Not only so far as that others partake of the Effects (Christ of our sins in sufferings, and we of the benefits of his Righteousness) which we all maintain; but that the thing it self, is essentially thus transferred: And so the Accidents do transire a Subjecto in Subjectum: And whereas Sin and Righteousness, are Accidents in the three predicaments of Habit (or Privation) Acts, and Relation, they feign the Habits, Acts, and Relation, of odious deformity of all the Elect,

to become in themselves the Habits, Acts, and Relations of Christ: And the Habits, Acts, and Relations of perfect Righteousness in Christ, to become essentially the very Habits, Acts, and Relations of every Person Elect.

XX. They do (like the Papists that hold Transubstantiation) teach men to renounce common sense and reason, in believing that no pain, or loss of Grace, is a punishment (tho' but castigatory) to the Elect, because all punishment is suffered by Christ. As if Christs threatening [whom I love, I rebuke, and chasten] were a denying of himself.

XXI. They deny the very essential principle of self-love, while they teach men to do nothing for their Salvation.

XXII. They consequently teach men to do nothing for their Lives, Health, or any Corporal good; to Plow, or Sow, or Labour. For if they must do nothing for the good of the Soul, much less of the Body: For Christ is sufficient for both.

XXIII. They hereby, destroy all Preaching, and all Charity to others: For we must love others, but as our selves; and if we may do nothing as for our own good, then not for any others.

XXIV. They read in Scripture, above Six Hundred Texts, that speaks of Inherent, and Acted Personal Righteousness, joyned with the promises of life and Gods acceptance, and threatnings to them that have it not: And yet they by putid Contradiction, say, It is a Righteousness that maketh no man Righteous, tho' but in tantum, subordinate to the meritorious perfect Righteousness of Christ: And that we are Justified never the more for it, than if we had it not. And so it is, as Learning that makes not Learned, or likeness that maketh not like, &c. That is, It is Righteousness, and no Righteousness.

XXV. They

XXV. They make the Baptismal Covenant, and the Lords Supper, to be no Covenanting, or to have no Condition: And yet their own Church-Covenants have Conditions, and are of Works.

XXVI. They deny all the Scripture-promises of reward.

XXVII. They deny and reproach Heaven it self; a great part whereof is in the perfection of Holiness, while they make Holiness here, and the Exercise of it to do us no good, or save us.

XXVIII. By all this, they would make, 1. The Concord of Christians impossible, as if they must agree in all this Errour. 2. They harden Papists in contempt and scorn of Protestants. And, 3. They notoriously militate for the Kingdom of Satan.

And now tell me, whether there were ever damnable Hereticks in the World, if these be none?

Reconcil. Many that hold some of the fore-mentioned Errours, yet hold not all the rest: All speak not so grossly, as some do. Therefore lay your charge, but where it is due.

And all are not properly Hereticks, that hold the same Errour that Hereticks do. If all Errour were Heresy, all men were Hereticks.

Ortho. But he is a Heretick, who subverteth the Fundamentals.

Reconcil. If he do it directly and knowingly, he is an Infidel: For he is not to be called a Christian, or a Believer, who denyeth any thing Essential to Christianity. But you must distinguish between, 1. Denying the Words, and denying the Thing signified by them. 2. Between denying Directly, and denying by Consequence.

1. When Words are used in diverse Sences, he that denyeth them in one Sence, denyeth them not in another: And he that mistaketh the

E

meaning

meaning of a Word, may deny the Word, and yet hold fast the matter signified by it. And he that speaketh the greatest Errour in *Terms* not understood, may mean and hold the truth.

2. And Consequences not discerned, will not prove a man to be a real Heretick, or one that holdeth not the truth, which by such consequences he subverteth: Therefore all Pacificators conclude, that Consequences are not to be charged too far, when not understood.

Ortho. *Who knoweth mens minds but by their Words? What ever they be to God who searcheth the heart, they are damnable Hereticks in foro Ecclesiastico.*

Reconcil. I excuse not the *Words* which I have largely accused: I would save others from them, I confess it is *Words* that the Church must judge of, and judge by. But it must be *Words* as significant of the *Matter*, and of the *Mind* of the speaker. And therefore the Church must try the speakers meaning by informing and convincing questions and explications. I pray you tell me, when you are Catechizing your Parishioners (young or old) do you meet none that in ignorance speak words that subvert the Foundation? And yet when you better search their meaning, you may find that they mean better than they speak. I write against all their dangerous words, especially to save others from being drawn by them to error, and to Prevent the error that the Church and Gospel may receive thereby.

Ortho. *But if they defend them, they are Hereticks: For how else shall we know whether they deny not Fundamentals?*

Reconcil. I will tell you how; Ask him first, whether he believe the Fundamental Truth? If he say,

say, yea: Ask him whether if he knew that his Consequence contradicted or subverted it, which of the two he would let go? And by that, you may know which it is that he holdeth fastest.

For Instance, Ask such a one as Dr. *Crispe*, whether he would hold that Christ was really a sinner, and God made him such, and the Essence of all our sins were his, and none of ours, if he knew that this were inconsistent with the perfection and Office of Christ, and the truth of the Gospel? Ask him whether he would hold that the sin of the Elect cannot possibly do them any hurt; nor any Duty that they do, be any means or help to their Good or Salvation, if he knew that this were contrary to the Gospel and Free Grace, and tended to mens damnation? Ask him whether he would hold that our inherent and acted Righteousness did not make us so far Righteous, and no whit furthered our Justification or Salvation, if he knew this were a contradiction, and against Christ?

Ortho. By this Rule, we shall judge none Hereticks, but Infidels; for who will expressly renounce Christianity but they?

Reconcil. The Word *Hereticks*, is variously used as men are inclined: 1. Of all that are stiff in any hurtful Error, against sound Doctrine; and so all or most Christians are Hereticks. For all have many Errours, and all men are too stiff in their own conceits. 2. For those that consequentially subvert Essentials.

Amesius is not singular, who saith (in *Cas. Consc.*) that *Theology* is so concatenated, that every Error by consequence (near or remote) subverteth the Foundation. I would except only Genealogies, Chronologies, Topography, Grammar, & some Prophecies & Positives: But of meer morals it is not improbable.

3. For all that Schismatically separate from the Apostolical Churches and their Communion, and gather Sects to themselves, for the promoting of their Errors; I provoke you to name to me any Text of Scripture, that calleth any by the reprov'd Name of Hereticks, that did not separate from the Catholick Church? Though all Schismaticks be not Hereticks (for some cause divisions in the Church, and yet depart not from it): Yet all Hereticks in scripture-sence were Schismaticks; for *algeas* signifieth not only the choos'ing of a new Doctrine, but also a new separated Sect and Church, for the promoting of it.

Ortho. *These Libertines are generally Separatists.*

Reconcil. You are historically mistaken: Dr. *Crispe* was a Conformist himself; and so have been many hundreds, who have held some of the forementioned mistakes. Have you read *Luther* on the *Galathians*? And *Epinus*, and *Gallus*, and *Ambsdorphius*, and *Schlusselfbergius*, and abundance such *Lutherans*, who damn *George Major* for saying, That Good works are necessary to Salvation, and that maintained, that they were hurtful to Salvation (tho' no doubt they meant, that confidence in them was hurtful). Have you read *Islebius*, that turned from *Antinomianism* to be a *Papist* Bishop, and helpt to rectifie *Luther's* Phrase, by calling him to oppose him? Have you read Learned *Beza* himself, and many, and many such excellent men, both *Calvinists* and *Lutherans*, of imputed Righteousness, and against Imputing Faith for Righteousness, and of the definition of Faith? Till *Camero*, *Placeus*, *Amyraldas*, *Capellus*, *Tessarardus*, *Codurcus*, *Blondel*, *Dallaus*, *Drelincourt* stopt them; and before them *Melanchthon*, *Bucer*, and after *Cargius*, *Olevian*, *Ursine*, *Parcus*, *Scultenus*,

Wende-

Wendeline, Ludovicus Crocius, Conradus Bergius, Johannes Bergius, Martinus, and such other great Divines stopt them in Germany: How many speak indefensibly? How many Bishops and Conformists in England, have held, and written unjustifiable words about Justification? Was Dr. Tully a Non-conformist? No, nor Mr. Rotorough, Mr. Walker, and many such, before the Assemblies times.

Though Dr. Gell, Mr. Thorndike, and many such did ill, in inveighing against *imputed Righteousness*, in undistinguishing words; yet too many by a very ill sence and sort of it, gave them too much occasion; which put so many Learned, Judicious Divines to explain it, of whom in England the chief were Ant. Wotton, Mr. William Bradshaw, Mr. Tho. Gataker, Bishop Davenant, Bishop Robert Abbot, Mr. William Fenner, and other Zealous Converting Preachers; such as John Rogers, Tho. Hooker, Tho. Shephard, and the New-England Churches against Mrs. Hutchinson, and Mr. Wheeler, that by Mr. Weld published the *Narrative of the Antinomian Errors*; and of the strange Monsters from Mrs. Dyer, and Mrs. Hutchinson, and her death; and of late, Mr. Benj. Woodbridge, Mr. Tho. Hotchkis, Mr. Tho. Warren, Mr. Graile, Mr. Jessop; but especially Mr. Truman, Mr. Gibbons of Blackfryers, and Dr. Stillingfleet. It is not a thing unknown, that it was not only such as you call Separatists, but many Bishops and Conformists, that in opposition to Popery, for want of distinguishing, have such words about Imputation, as encouraged the *Antinomians*. Therefore you cannot take all as Hereticks in the Scripture-sence, who hold the same Errors.

Ortho. Then we shall not know what *Heresie* is, if men do not segregate themselves to propagate it.

Reconcil. You may know what opinions are pernicious, (or if you will *Heretical*) when you know not whether the man be a *Heretick* that owneth them: Even the *Heretick Hereticating* Papists say, there must be an obstinacy against sufficient light of evidence. And all tenaciousness through prejudice, ignorance, or incapacity is not obstinacy. If your Schollar or Apprentice be seven years learning what you teach him, it may not by that be proved obstinacy.

The word *Heretick* is used as please the speaker, in various senses. 1. Some call all *Hereticks* that obstinately oppose any Opinion (or truth) which the Church determineth to be Believed. 2. Some call all *Hereticks* that gather any segregate Church to maintain or propagate any Error. 3. Some call all *Hereticks*, who oppose any Point essentiall to Christianity; though but ignorantly by remote consequence. 4. Some call those *Hereticks*, who deny some one essential Article of Christianity, directly and knowingly, while they own the rest. 5. And some call none *Hereticks* but those that joyn together, the denying of some essential Article directly or by plain evident consequence, and gather segregate Churches to propagate it, and do this obstinately against sufficient light: If you will use the Name, tell men which of these you mean.

Ortho. You encourage *Heresie*, by making it so hard to know a *Heretick*: May we not know them by their Doctrine?

Reconcil. You may know what is Error, and *Heretical*, when you know not the man to be an *Heretick*: do what you can justly, to save men

men from their Error, without unjust and uncharitable censuring of the persons. To which end I remember you of the writing of worthy Dr. Fowler, that *Holiness is the design of Christianity*: If then it prove that many of these that hold these bad opinions, are men of *sincere Holiness*; then Christianity in them hath reached to its design: Now I find that the most of them that I have known, seem to me to be persons of serious Holiness (notwithstanding their infirmities): They are Zealous towards God; they greatly honour Christ; they avoid known Sin; they live justly and charitably towards men; yea, it is the Piety and Strictness of the lives of many of them, which hath drawn many well-meaning ignorant persons to their Errors. *Bunnian*, an unlearned Antinomian-Anabaptist, wrote against the foresaid Book of Dr. Fowler; yet (abating his separation) I never heard that *Bunnian* was not an honest Godly man. If then he attained the design of Christianity, was he not a Christian?

Ortho. Could he be Godly that said and did so much against the Truth, and so much to draw men to his Errors?

Reconcil. There is no man without many Errors: And do not all desire that others should take that for Truth, which they take to be Truth? And how few be there in the world, that embody not with some Sect or Faction, for the promoting of their Opinions? And how few that do not over-vilifie and wrong those from whom they differ?

And *Bunnians* last preachings give me hope that he repented of his Errors; for he Zealously preached but the common acknowledged doctrine of Christ's readiness to receive and pardon converted sinners.

Ortho. *But unholy Doctrine will not make men holy, nor consist therewith.*

Reconcil. 1. It is Holy Doctrine, practically received, that maketh them Holy; and that which is Unholy, is received but notionally, and so prevaileth not against the power of truth. No doubt but false unholy Doctrine greatly tendeth to unholiness of heart and life; Therefore let us all do our best to cure it. But it is not the sharpest censures, nor the greatest fierceness, or foulest words, or punishments, that are the right or wisest way of cure: But the clearest explication of the Truth, and the most loving and meek instructing opposers, if God peradventure will give them repentance, to the acknowledging of the Truth.

Ortho. *I am sure General Councils, and Heathens, Bishops and Emperors also of old, were severe against Hereticks.*

Reconcil. What will you say, if I fully prove, that Hereticks themselves, as such, did not more hurt to the Church, than the stir and violence used against them that were accounted such, hath done, and still doth? No, nor so much hurt: But what need I more proof of this, than what Popery hath done these 800. or 900. years in the World? Did Hereticks ever murder so many hundred thousands as the Papists did of the *Waldenses, Bohemians, French Protestants, Dutch, Irish, English, Polanders, Hungarians, &c.* by Wars, Massacres, Inquisitions, &c.

Ortho. *Those men were not Hereticks, but men falsely accused of Heresie: Why instance you in Papist Tyrants?*

Reconcil. And who think you will be Judge who shall suffer as Hereticks? Will it not be those that are

are uppermost, and get greatest strength? And are those usually the wisest: Who is the Judge, now in the *Turks* Dominions? and among Christians? who is Judge in *Muscovy*, where Preaching is forbidden?

Ortho. *But it is the Clergy that is the Judge of Heresie.*

Reconcil. And how small a part of the Earth is so happy as to have the major part of the Clergy, wise, sound, honest and orthodox? Where's the Clergy so powerful as in the *Roman* Kingdom? And where more erroneous, or more cruel?

Ortho. *But you must instance in times of the Churches Purity, and not in the time of Anti-Christ's Reign.*

Reconcil. Few of us are agreed, when the time of the Church-Purity ended, from the Apostles days; till the Fall of the *Pagan* Empire, there were great Numbers of Hereticks in the Church; and no Sword was drawn, or desired, against them, by the Churches: And yet all the Number of that time, mentioned by *Epiphanius*, hurt not the Church, so much as the Pride and Contention of the Clergy, even before *Dioclesians* Persecution, if *Eusebius* may be believed, *lib. 8. c. 1.*

And for long time after, the Church abhorred the use of the Sword, or Violence, against Hereticks: Or else *Martin* had not with such abhorrence, separated from the Bishops that were for the use of the Sword, against the *Priscilian* Gnosticks.

And whereas *Austin* is cited as the chief that changed his mind herein, his instance is but one, and it is usually abused. 1. It being not against Heresie, but Schism, that he writeth: The Donatists were Prelatical Zealots, that thought themselves the greater Number, and so called themselves

selves the Church; for being the supposed Majority in *Africk*, and having the truest Bishop, as the Papists and some Prelatists arrogate the Name of the Church on those Accounts: What Errour had they more than *Cyprian*, and all his pious Councils had, saving their Factiousness for their own chosen Bishop.

2. And it was not this Shism neither, that *Austrian*, was for Violence against, but to repress Force with Force; for the Donatists used Murder and Violence.

But come to the Times and Councils that suppressed Hereticks with the greatest Zeal. I have nothing herein to say against the Council of *Nice*; though some good men think that they had done better to tolerate the *Easter-Day* different; yea, and to have done less to stir up Disputes about One Substance: But do you think *Nestorius* did more hurt, by saying, That *Mary* was not to be called, *The Mother of God*; but, [*The Mother of him who is God*,] than was done by banishing him? Who was so far from being a Sectary, that he was the greatest Patriarch, and so deadly an Enemy to the tolerating of men, called Hereticks, that he began with urging the Emperour to prosecute them; and was justly so used for his Violence, as a Heretick himself: And being banished, set up so great a Party in *Syria*, and other Countries, to this day, called *Nestorians*, as continue the abhorrence of the Council of *Calcedon* and *Ephesus*, and the Church of *Rome*, and the great Divisions of the Christian Church, Would the tolerating of the accused Phrase have done so much Hurt as this?

And did the Bishops and Councils, that condemned his Adversaries, *Eutiches* and *Dioseorus*,
and

and banished him that was the second Patriarch of the *East*, do less hurt to the Church, than it would have done, to have patiently instructed them in what sense Christ's Nature remained *Two*, and to have granted, that in other sense and respect, they might be called *One*, as agreeing and united? When now the *Eutychian Jacobites*, by *Dioscorus* Banishment, fill the vast Country of *Abassia*, and many other Countries, in Divisions from other Churches, and Opposition to the Council of *Calcedon*.

And did the *Monothelites* do so much harm, by saying, that Christ might be said to have but *One Will and Operation*, (by Concord, called *One*) as all the Councils and Bishops did, by their condemning and prosecuting them, till the *Imperial Churches* were by it broken all to pieces?

And did the three Words in the Writings of *Theodoret*, *Ibas* and *Theodore Mopsuest*, do so much hurt, as the Councils that condemned these *Tria Capitula* did, by woful Divisions?

Or did they, that *Justinian* called *Corrupticola*, do more hurt, than he did, by murdering thousands, and wasting *Egypt*, and other Countries, by his blind Zeal against Hereticks? Surely there is no Comparison in the hurt.

Epiphanius himself recordeth how much hurt Hereticating Heat did, against *Andius* and others called Hereticks: And *Lucifer Calaritanus* was made a Heretick, for his inordinate Zeal against the *Arrians* themselves. And I think few now doubt, but the blind Zeal of *Epiphanius* himself, and of *Cyril Alexand*; and the Council that condemned *Chrysostom*, as if he were not hot enough against *Origin*, did a great deal more harm than good: And that *Atticus* and *Proclus*, by their Indulgence to the *Jonites*,

amites, were said to heal the Wounds that those mens Heats had made. And more than *Socrates* and *Zozomene* tell us, that the said *Atticus* and *Proclus* did the Church more Service, against the *Nova-tians*, by Gentleness and Liberty, than their Predecessors ever did by their zealous Fierceness.

The Church hath suffered much by Sects and Heresie, but, I think, much more by the ignorant Tyrannical Attempts of suppressing them, and of such as are falsely accused of them.

Ortho. But the Errours of former Times must not stop our Zeal against Error, nor reconcile us to Heresie.

Reconcil. But why do we not enquire how far, even the godly Orthodox-Ministers, in these times, also have been guilty of occasioning that which they justly reprehend?

I have seldom observed any Heresie or Errour to rise up, but what the Orthodox were a culpable Cause of: The Chief Rise of *Anabaptistry* hath been by our most vile Abuse of Infant-Baptism, 1. Receiving all Infants of *Atheists* and *Infidels*. 2. And that, on an unproved Title, and on the perfidious Vows and Sponsions of God-fathers and God-mothers, that never owned them, nor intended to perform their Vows. 3. And forcing Ministers to baptise them against their Judgments. 4. And worst of all, instead of causing them at age, solemnly to renew their Christian Covenants, cheating thousands of ignorant Souls, with a Ceremony, called, Confirmation.

So have the *Separatists* risen from the Corruptions of the Clergy and Church, and their wicked Lives, and Tyrannical Impositions and Persecutions.

And so have these *Antinomians* risen, first, From
the

the *Papists* False Doctrines, about their Good Works; and next, From many godly *Protestants*, seldom, and unskilful opening the Mystery of Redemption and Grace, and preaching almost all for Humiliation, and too little of the wonderful Love of God, revealed in *Jesus Christ*; till Dr. *Sibbes* and such others, led them into another strein: And, thirdly, by their unskilful Managing the Doctrine and Controversies of Justification; till the *Breme* and *French* Divines abroad, and *Davinant*, *Ant. Wotton*, *Bradshaw*, *Gataker*, and such others at home, taught them to speak more distinctly and solidly, (which *Le Blanck* hath done above all before him.)

And they, that by Unskilfulness have occasioned other mens Extreams, should not be over-rigorous against them.

Enquire into the Temper and Lives of most of this sort of men, among us of late, [even Dr. *Crispe*, *Lancaster Town*, *Walter Cradok*, *Saltmarsh*, *Den*, *Hobson*, and such other] and you will find, that though they had their Temerities and Blemishes, they were in the main, Men, far from wicked and prophane Lives; much more, Mr. *Walker*, Mr. *Roborough*, Mr. *Crandon*, Mr. *Eyir*, blind Mr. *Troughlar*, Dr. *Tully*, and such other that came too near them.

I will now instance more largely, in one, who, in the Fervour of his Zeal, Preach'd at *Pinnars-Hall*-Lecture, and after printed a zealous ignorant Sermon, against such of us, as judge not as confusedly and erroneously as himself; when I had avoided Preaching on any such Subject, and Printing what I had long before written on it, lest I should revive the Strife; and yet he is known to be a worthy vertuous Man.

I will

I will give you yet another Proof, that such may be serious godly Men, who Preach a Doctrine, *quoad Verba*, Heretical or Anti-evangelical. The Renovation of an unsanctified Soul, requireth a Change so great, on all our Faculties, as must turn a meer natural man into a spiritual; and give a man a new End, new Principles, and a new Heart and Life; and this by Divine transforming Influence: But to cure one of these Erroneous Men, there needs not so a great Renovation, but only the better informing of an ignorant mans Judgment, that was carryed away by Education, Prejudice, the Veneration of his chief Teachers, and the weakness of his own dull undistinguishing Mind; yea, perhaps, the Cure of his Ignorance, in Grammar or Logick, in some one word, may make him Orthodox.

Could you but get out Prejudice and Ignorance, so far, as to teach these men but Two or Three Distinctions, in all likelihood, it would cure them, *E. G.*

1. To distinguish between a Surety antecedent, and subsequent.
2. To distinguish between the Righteousness of *Christ*, given or imputed to us *in se* it self, (one mans Accidents made anothers) and his Righteousness given us in its Effects and Benefits, reputed the sole meritorious Cause.
3. Between Justification by Efficiency, (principal and instrumental) and justifying us constitutively, (as Matter and Form) justifying by Grant in Law, or by Evidence, or by Witness, or by an Advocate Defence, or by Judicial decisive Sentence, or executely; and these, as supposing actual or legal Accusations.
4. Between the Law or Covenant of Innocency

cy with *Adam*; the Mediatorial Law or Covenant to Christ; the Common Law of Grace, made with *Adam* and *Noah*; the Covenant of Preculianity with *Abraham*; the Political Law of *Moses* to the Jews; and the Law or Covenant of Christ, of Grace, of Faith, by which Christ doth Govern, and will Judge his visible Church. Get unstudied dull heads, but to understand these four distinctions, and you cure them without a new regeneration: And doth not this prove that they are Godly?

To instance no more, but in the first; an Antecedent Surety is either, 1. A party in the Bond; 2. Or an Instrument of the party Bound.

1. If two persons be bound disjunctively (this or that) to a Duty or a Penalty, the bond is answered if either of them perform it. If the Law to *Adam* had either said, thou, or Christ for thee shalt perfectly Obey, shalt dress the Garden, shalt take *Eve* for thy Wife; or that thou or Christ shall suffer for not doing it; then Christ's performance had antecedently freed us from Guilt and Punishment.

2. Or if the Law had said or meant, thou shalt Obey or Suffer by thy self, or by thy substitute or *per alium* as a man may pay his debt by his Servant, or appear by his Attourney; then Christ's Righteousness or Suffering would have proved us guiltless.

But a *subsequent* Surety, who, after the guilt, doth voluntarily, as a Mediator, undertake the discharge of the guilty, is no strict or absolute Representative, but, as a Mediator, purchaseth the Captive, to receive his Grace on the terms, and to the ends, which by a Law or Covenant of Grace, the Mediator shall appoint.

C H A P. I V.

My Reasons against a tedious needless Confutation.

Sect. 1. **T**HE chief thing that I intended next to be done, that is, To Confute the Hundred Errors before named; I am, on further thoughts, discouraged from performing: 1. Because, upon perusal, I find that I have already done it so oft and largely in many Books unanswered, that repetition is like to be disgracefully nauseous: 2. And they that will neither answer nor read what I have written 34 years ago, or 20, are not like to read what I shall write now.

In my *Confession of Faith*, Printed 1655. I have so largely opened this Controversy, about Justification, Faith, and Works, in necessary distinctions, and many score self-evident Propositions, and many score Arguments, and abundance of expresse Texts of Scripture, and above an hundred Testimonies of Protestant Churches Confessions, and eminent Divines, that I find very little needful to be added: And why should I think they will read more that will not read that?

In my Apologies, I have Answered them that have opposed, and have had no reply.

In my Treatise of *Justification*, I have done it over again.

In my *Catholick Theology*, I have thrice overdone the same by Explication and Confutation distinctly.

In my Treatise of *Justifying Righteousness*, in a Disputation, and an Answer to Dr. Tully, and to Mr. Cartwright, I have done the same, perhaps too largely.

In

In my *Methodus Theologiae*, I have opened the Case methodically and briefly.

In my *Life of Faith*, I have clearly explained it: And must I expect no Answer, and yet do all again?

2. But my great dissuasive is, that it will swell the Book to so great a magnitude, that few will read it; should I cite all, or most of the plain Texts of Scripture that confute them, how great a part of the Bible must I Transcribe? Yet do they lay Salvation on points that no one Text of Scripture mentioneth.

Sect. 2. 1. If I should cite all the Texts that prove that we are truly Sinners, though Christ hath been a Sacrifice for our sin, and that the guilt of *Fact* and *Fault*, on us, is not taken off by Christ's taking the penalty; but we are verily sinners still; How great a part of the Bible may I recite to prove it?

Sect. 3. 2. If I must prove that Christ is and was no sinner, by true imputation of our sin, as to the guilt of *Fact* or *Fault*, but only as a Sacrifice bear the Penalty; it would be a reproach to the Adversaries, to need a Confutation of their Blasphemy, and all the Gospel would confute them.

Sect. 4. 3. Should I cite all the Texts that prove us to need, and have an Inherent and Act-ed Righteousness by Grace, besides Christs Personal Righteousness Meriting for us, above six hundred Texts of Scripture expressly prove it; and how tedious and needless a work is this?

Sect. 5. 4. Should I prove that All Righteousness, so far maketh Righteous; and that *making Righteous*, is a Justifying, which goeth before Judging us Righteous; and that it is a putid contradiction,

tradition, to say, that any Righteousness doth not make Righteous, *in tantum*, School-boys would turn it into a derision of the opposers.

Sect. 6. 5. Should I prove by Argument, that no Accident can by ye same numerically in divers Subjects, nor *transire a Subiecto in Subiectum*; and so the Habit, Act, and Relation of Righteousness in Christ's Person, cannot in it self be our Habit, Act, or Relation, unless our Persons, and Christ's, be really the same; every novice in Logick, would be too much occasioned to insult over the ignorant gain-sayer.

Sect. 7. 6. Should I prove, that to Justify Efficiently by making Righteous, and to Justify Constitutively (being our Righteousness) and to Justify by Plea, or by Witness, or by Evidence, and to Justify in Estimation or Account, and to Justify by decisive Sentence of a Judge, and to Justify Executively, and to Justify privately in Conscience, and to Justify publicly before Rulers or the World, or more publicly, at the Bar of God, are several senses, of the Word *Justification*, and several sorts; what man of sense would not pity the Confounder that denyeth it, and talk, as if the Word had but one sense?

Sect. 8. 7. Should I prove that by *Imputing*, Paul meaneth truly *accounting a man Just that is so*; reckoning that to him which he hath, and not feigning him to have what he hath not; even Dr. *Crispe* hath spared me that labour, venturing to say, that the contrary sense of *Imputing*, maketh God a Lyar, or deceived. God never judged a man Righteous, that was not first made so.

Sect. 9. 8. Should I prove, that by *Works*, Paul meaneth those that make not the Reward of Grace, but of Debt; and *James* meaneth those that are the effects of *Free Grace*, and purely subordinate to

to Christ, as commanded by him ; the exprefs Texts do make it needless.

Sect. 10. 9. Should I prove, that Christ is our King, and Ruleth and Judgeth by his own Law, and hath not made us Lawless, and all Judgment or Rule is now committed to him, and that the very Law of Nature, is now his Law ; and also the Law of Supernatural Revelation, called by *Paul*, the *Law of Christ*, the *Law of Faith* and of *Grace* ; and by *James*, the *Law of Liberty* ; the whole scope of the Gospel, saveth me that labour.

Sect. 11. 10. Should I prove, that Christ in *esse objectivo*, as the Object of Faith, is the very specifying form of that Faith it self ; and so, that to be Justified by the *Object* as such, and not by that Faith it self, is a notorious putid Contradiction ; or should I stand to prove that *Faith* it self, is said by *Paul*, to be Imputed for Righteousness in meer subordination to the meritorious Sacrifice and Righteousness of Christ, and in conjunction with Free Pardon and Adoption purchased by Christ ; how needless a work is this made by the Text ?

Sect. 12. 11. Should I stand to prove, that Elect Infidels, Atheists, or wicked Men are not Justified, while such (save as God maketh them Just by Conversion & Pardon) all the Scripture tell us, it is needless, and that Eternal Electing to Justification, is not Justifying ; nor yet Christs dying for us, till He be given to us, as well as for us.

Sect. 13. 12. Should I stand to prove, that men shall be judged according to their Works, and that God is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him ; and that Christ hath frequently promised Rewards, and that the same Salvation, which, as to *Value*, is no Debt, but meerly a Free Gift of Grace through Christ, is yet, as to the Order of Conveyance,

given on *Condition* as a *Reward*, that *Fatherly Love* may attain its ends by *Sapiential* means, and not only by *Power*; *Morally*, producing *Moral Effects*, in conjunction with *Love* and *Power*; and thus, that the pardoning and saving Acts of the Covenant, impose *Conditions*, as receptive qualifications, which yet are all the Effects of *Grace*, the whole Scripture maketh this a needless task.

Sect. 14. 13. Should I prove the distinctness; 1. Of the Law and Covenant of Innocency. 2. And of the Law and Covenant of Mediation. And, 3. Of the Mediators Law and Covenant of Grace imposed on us, and sealed in Sacraments; And that the same is both a Law and Covenant, and that the Covenant of Grace, is the Instrumental Gift of Pardon and Justification; How much of the Bible must I transcribe?

Sect. 15. The like I may say, of most of the rest, which I doubt, I have been too large in proving in all the six, or seven, or eight Books before named. I thought also, to have distinctly answered the Printed *Pinners-Hall* Lecture; but he that cannot find it more than fully answered, in the foresaid Books, either never read them, or Answers to such a man, will be vain.

And I am sorry, that the same hand in another Lecture, elsewhere publisheth, that [“That any are brought to believe in Jesus, is as great a Miracle, as the Resurrection of Christ from the dead”] p. 223. “And after [There is not a greater Instance of the Power of God in the whole World, than this, in bringing over the heart of a sinner to believe in Christ.]

It grieveth my Soul to think what Scandals are thus given by good Men to Papists, Infidels and prejudiced Scorners, and what work they will make with

Chap. 4. *tedious, needless Confutation.* 63

with it. No doubt but Faith is a great and difficult Work, and wrought by Almighty Power: For God hath no other Power, but Omnipotency: *omnis Dei Potentia est Omnipotentia, quia Infinita.* Gods Power is his Essence: But the *Instances* and *Demonstrations* of it, are as various as the Effects. Your Finger or Tongue, moveth not, but by Omnipotency: But every Motion or Fly, is not as great an Instance or Demonstration of Power, as Faith is. Nor *Faith* so great an Instance as the making of Angels, Men, Heaven and Earth, Sun, Moon, and Stars, their Natures, Motion and Order: Divines have hitherto taught, that Power is eminently manifested in Creation and Natural Preservation, tho' with *Wisdom* and *Love*; and *Wisdom* Eminently manifested in Government, and *Love* in Glorifying (tho' they were conjunct in each) Man cannot work Miracles, and that so great. And I do not believe that God damneth all unbelievers, as for want of an Act as great as the motion of the Sun, or making the World.

And if it be a Miracle, and as great a one as Christ's Resurrection, How can any believer doubt at all? Why was Christ's Resurrection Preached by the Apostles, so much as the Proof of the Truth of Christianity, and not the Faith of every believer? Then we need not go far to prove the Christian Verity: Every poor Boy or Woman that believeth, hath the fullest Proof, and as great and miraculous as Christ's Resurrection. Why send we not Infidels and Doubters to this Miracle, which is about them in all ages in thousands: Over-doing is undoing.

And yet no doubt, the Author saith truly, that *Faith in Christ is so hard a Work*, that he that never found it hard, hath none (or hath it but in the seed,

and yet unrooted, or untryed. But alas! Infidels find it too hard to them.

To conclude, Instead of the larger part of the Proof or Confutations which I intended; 1. I shall with this, Annex a brief Treatise, resolving a multitude of Controversies about Justification, which I have laid by, about Fifteen Years.

2. I refer you to the foresaid former performance of it.

3. Were I not disabled by Pain, and the approaches of Death, I would be ready to Answer any sober, rational Objector.

A Post-script.

Sett. 1. **VV** Hereas divers say, they were drawn in to prefix their Names to this Drs. Book, because they were told, that the Errors were expunged : Upon perusal, I find that it is no such matter ; but in *Vol. 3. Ser. 3, 4. &c.* the Author rather more frequently inculcateth the worst of them, *viz. [That sin cannot hurt any that are Elect, or that Christ dyed for.]* And that *[in 1. Joh. It is a powerful means to keep them from sinning, to believe that if they sin, it can do them no hurt.]*

Sett. 2. The Text drew him to use the *Name of sinning. [I write to you, that you sin not.]* But did not the Contradiction of it to his Doctrine convince him, while he read the Text against sinning ; judge whether he took not the thing to be impossible ? He saith, Tho' such do Murder, commit Adultery, Blasphemy, Idolatry, or any such thing, they are no Murderers, Adulterers, &c. or Sinners ; because it is Christ's sin, and not theirs, and cannot be his and theirs too ; so that they may live in the Act, but cannot sin.

Object. *But it was their sin once, before it was Christ's sin ?*

Ans. No ; He saith, that it was Christ's sin, if not from Eternity, at least above Sixteen Hundred Years before we were born. And he that had

no being, could have no sin: And Gods foreknowledge of future sin, maketh not sin: Nay, he could not fore-know, that which would never be; so that indeed, Christ could not take our sin as his, which was not ours, nor ever would be at all: And if he had, yet I hope they will not say, that now in Heaven he is the greatest sinner. And so, there neither was, nor is, any sin in us or Christ.

Sect. 3. But as he repeateth this Errour, I will repeat my Lamentations and Warning to this tempted *Sect.* Hear it as *Speculatoris Tubam*, the Watch-mans Trumpet, that would deliver, if it may be, more than his own Soul.

1. Is it possible, that that which is evil, and the greatest evil it self, can be *in us*, and done *by us*, and do us no hurt?

2. Can that do no hurt to the Elect, that maketh such calamitous Confusions in the World? What, that which filleth the Earth with the darkness of Ignorance, Idolatry, Infidelity, bloody Wars, Persecutions, Torments, Flames, Famine, Malignity, and yet do no hurt to any that are Elect, no, not while they are such themselves?

3. Did *Paul* call himself mad against the Saints, unworthy to be called an Apostle, a wretched man, for that which did him no hurt?

4. Did *David* write all the lamenting Words of *Psal. 51.* and many others; and *Asaph*, *Psal. 77.* &c. for that which did them no hurt?

5. Did God pronounce all the Curses, *Lev. 26.* and *Deut. 27.* &c. against that sin that will not hurt the Elect that then lived?

6. Are the recitals of the *Jews* sins and punishments, *Psal. 78.* and 105, 106. &c. of things that cannot hurt the Elect?

7. Did

7. Did God send the *Jews* into Captivity to *Babylon* for sins that do the Elect no hurt; even for penitent *Manasses's* sins?

8. Are all God's threatnings in the whole Scripture, even such as Christ's Words, *Joh. 15. Heb. 6. Heb. 10.* and *Rev. 2,* and 3. against things that are so harmless? Must we serve God acceptably with Reverence and Godly Fear, because he is a consuming Fire; and because it is a fearful thing to fall into the Hands of the living God, if no sin can possibly do us any hurt?

9. Doth not this opinion contradict every Article of the Creed, every Petition in the Lords Prayer, and every one of the Ten Commandments?

10. If it be no hurt to be tormented with possessions of the Devil, to be Lunatick, Blind, Lame, Dumb, Torn, &c. Why is Christ so Praised for healing such, and why appealeth he to his Works against unbelievers?

11. If it be no hurt to be mad, what is *Bedlam* good for? Or to be tormented with *Stone, Collick, Convulsion,* or any Disease; why will these Phanaticks seek to Physicians, use Medicines, and groan in Pain? *Possidonius* would confute his Tongue by a sower-face or a groan; when he said, *O Pain, thou shalt not make me confess that thou art (malum) ill, or bad.*

12. Why do we not take up with the three first Petitions in the Lords Prayer, if our own Interest be not next to be regarded and prayed for?

13. Why pray we for our daily Bread, if there be no hurt to want it; or for the pardon of sin, if punishment be impossible, or hurt not; or against temptations and the evil one, and evil things, if they be no such?

14. Should

14. Should none pray but Reprobates, if others have no hurt to deprecate?

15. Why should we compassionate the poor, or sick, if sin do no hurt to them?

16. Why do men Plow and Sow, and Labour, and Eat, if Famine hurt not, and Labour do no good, because Christ hath done all?

17. Why do Ministers Preach so much against sin, if it can do no hurt?

18. What is it that we are to repent of, if sin do no hurt?

19. Why must fasting, and watchfulness, and resisting temptations be used against Lust, and other sin, if it can do no hurt?

20. What is Baptism, the Lords Supper, Confession, and Absolution then for?

21. Why then should we exhort each other daily, lest any be hardened by this deceitfulness of sin?

22. Why is he called Least, in the Kingdom of God, who breaketh the least Commandement, and teacheth men so?

23. Why is the Education of Children so great a Duty, and he that spareth the Rod, hateth his Child, if sin will do them no hurt?

24. What is God's Governing Justice good for, in punishing sin, if it hurt not?

25. Why must Rulers be Just, and a Terrour to them that do evil, if sin do no hurt?

26. How can that hurt any other Elect Person, that hurteth not the sinner himself?

27. Why is it worse to be cast into the Sea with a Mill-stone, for scandalizing the least, if that scandal cannot hurt them?

28. Why do Libertines labour to escape Prisons, Banishments, Fines, or Hanging for sin, if it can do them no hurt?

29. Why

29. Why is man's nature afraid of Devils, and the Serpents seed, if they cannot hurt us?

30. Why hurt we others by Self-defence, and War, if nothing can hurt us?

31. Why hath God put *Fear* into our Nature, if nothing can hurt us?

32. Was it no hurt to the Elect to be long the Devil's Servants, and to have our Conversion so long delayed, as with many it is?

33. Is sin worse than suffering, if it can do no hurt?

34. Is it no hurt to live and dye in terrible fear of Gods displeasure, and in doubts of our everlasting state?

35. Is it no hurt to have Faith, Love, Desire, and Joy, weak, and to have still the remnants of unbelief, and other such like sins?

36. Is it no hurt to lose some degrees of Love and Holiness, which we have had?

37. Is it no hurt accordingly to have the less of Glory in Heaven?

38. Why are these men for Separation and Church-Discipline, if sin do no hurt?

39. Why pray they for Reformation, and Church-prosperity, and the Thousand Years Glorious State, if sin be so harmless a thing?

40. If all that Christ Merited, be really the Elects, immediately on his purchase, are not all the Elect in Heaven already; yea, before they had any being; whence then is all the gross Ignorance and Errour, and blind Defence of Satans falsehoods, under the Name of Christ and Truth? Why censure they Conformists and others that differ from them? If all that Christ hath, be already ours, and we are as perfect as he, what can Duty, or more Grace, or Heaven, add to

to us? And why would they have men read their Books, to do no good, and avoid no evil? Is it to make up any imperfection in the Obedience or Righteousness of Christ?

41. Did Christ redeem us from under his own Government, and the Law of Grace? Are we not under the Law [of Christ and Faith, and Liberty] to Christ? Or is there any transgression, if no Law? Or is it Law that we shall not be Ruled and Judged by?

42. Is it no greater Mercy and Grace, to make us like our Saviour in Holiness, and Gods Image, and the Divine Nature, than not? Are Christ's Graces his dishonour?

43. Is it not a vile abuse of his Grace, to condemn it, because it is our own? And to take *Righteousness* to stand against *Free Grace*, if it be but our own? And to pervert *Pauls* Words, that *accounted as dung his own Righteousness*, which he sets in competition or opposition to Christ, calling it that Righteousness which was of (*Moses*) Law; when at the same Word, he sets against it a Righteousness also made his own, which is by the Faith of Christ. Could Christs Righteousness Justify us, if it were not in some kind of Causality (meritorious, material, or formal) made our own: Can an Accident of another Subject be an Accident of us? And will not distinct personality continue to Men, as well as to Angels for ever? We abhor the thoughts of any Righteousness that is of our own possessing or working, otherwise than as given and wrought in us, by the Merits of Christ, and the Free Gift of undeserved Grace; or any that must not by the same Divine Power and Grace be continued. And all that pretendeth to the least part of the Office or Performance

formance of Christ ; but only what he freely giveth, and which advanceth the Honour of his Merits and Love, and tendeth to Please and Glorify God, and attain the designed End of Redemption and Salvation.

AS to the Twelve Names that are prefixed to the Book, I leave it to themselves, to speak their own Cause : Only I can say, that one of them taketh the Words, if mean't, as they are written (and indeed inculcated) to overthrow Christianity, and Humanity. And I doubt not, but some of the rest are of the same mind, and had not read the Book, or the Preface, so as to know what was in them.

FINIS.

