

SECT. VI.

S. 6.

I Will adde these two things concerning the Matter of Merit, having said all this about the Name. 1. All the duties and graces of a Believer are so far from meriting of God properly, and according to Commutative Justice, as we did God any good by it which should oblige him to a Retribution, that they do oblige us much more to God then we were before. For that which is a duty in one respect and a grace in another, is indeed a choice part of our mercy; and the more we do for God, the more we receive; not only by way of Reward, but in the very Duty: nay Doing it self is but in some respect a receiving from God, and in some respect, a means to further Receiving. When ever the soul is moved to Love, Humility, Thankfulness, Desire, &c. it receives this grace, and a pretious mercy it is: and in the exercise it receiveth more: To Love God is some degree of enjoying him: Even to give all we have for him at his Call, is a receiving from him. Honest hearers do understand this myserie, though Hypocrites and Pharisees do not.

2. Though I say that no Angel is capable of such proper meriting of God, yet I do not intend, that sinful man can merit as far as Angels or *Adam* in innocency might have been said to do: No nor that our working now, is in the main parts, of that nature as *Adams* then was. His was, *the perfect obedience of a perfect Creature, from the power of nature and that Grace which was without proper Merit, for the continuance of that perfection, and the attainment of more.* Ours is *the imperfect Obedience of a sinner freely pardoned upon his believing and repenting which obedience mainly consisteth in the Accepting of mercy, and using it for Recovery, and it is performed and accepted by Gospel grace, which is against or contrary to merit, and not only without it.* I will explain all by this familiar comparison. A Father hath one son at full age, who having the full use of Reason and strength, is able and fit to do him answerable service. He will give the inheritance to this son, because he is a son, out of meer Paternal Love, and not of merit of the son: yet because he is an honest vertuous man, he loveth not his son as a son so dearly, but that he would reject him if he were

were a wicked, rebellious son, such as God commanded the Jews themselves to put to death: And therefore he requireth his son to walk obediently and lovingly, as the son of such a Father should do, and not dishonour him, and then he will of fatherly love bestow on him the inheritance; but if he will not, he will disinherit him. Here the merit of the inheritance is no proper merit, but a Not-meriting to be deprived of it: but Rebellion is a proper merit of that privation. Yet the nature of the work, which is the condition, is answerable to the Age and parts of the son. Suppose the same father hath other sons, that be some of them little children, that can but go, and some sick in bed of hurts that they have catcht by their own folly, by falls, or burns, or cutting them, or the like: or suppose it possible that the forementioned son should fall back into such an infant condition upon his disobedience? Here now the Father hath Commands, Promises of Reward, with conditions and threatenings as well as to the other, but of a far different nature. For here the Father saith to the sick or wounded Child, *If thou wilt take this medicine, though it be bitter for thy own cure, I will love thee, and I will give thee this or that*; and for prevention of more hurt, *If you will not cut you, or fall, or burn you with the fire, or the like, I will do this or that for you*. Our meriting at Gods hands is no more properly called Merit, then this of the child by taking meat or medicine offered to cure its own sores, and by taking heed of fire, and what else may endanger hereafter: and in some respects it is yet less then this.

But I perceive I have stood very long upon this term *merit* (the rather because the Accuser fastneth so much upon it) I will therefore dispatch what I have to say to the rest, with more brevity.

SECT. VII.

3. **T**He third term that I would have explained, is, *Worthy* or *Worthiness* concerning which, my meaning may be gathered from what is said in the last. I only adde these two Propositions 1. Being the phrase of the Lord Jesus and his Apostles, it is lawfull to say that Believers and Obedient Christians are worthy

of eternal life, and that we must believe and obey, that we may be accounted worthy, and that there is a certain Evangelical worthiness of Gods Love, and so of the Reward, which consisteth in our sincere Faith and obedience. For this is plain Scripture.

2. But yet though Christ speak of such a worthiness; because the phrase is improper we should use it sparingly, and alwayes either avoid it, or explain it, where there is danger either of hardening the erroneous, or of offending the weak, by the incautelous use of it.

4. The same I say of the term *Reward*; 1. It is lawful to use it, because Christ doth it so oft: and indeed some more necessity of using this, then either of the former. 2. But yet it must be used with Caution and Explication, for the foresaid reasons.

5. But there is no word that we have made more quarrelling about in this business, then the terms *Righteous*, *Righteousness*, and *Justification*, even when we were agreed about the matter. It is inconsistent with my intended brevity, now to mention the divers significations, and uses of these words: Only in brief I shall lay down my thoughts, as far as is requisite to our present purpose, in these Propositions.

Proposition 1. I do not in these disputes about the *Righteousness* of Believers, take the word for that particular vertue, which is usually said to be a Constant and Perpetual Will of giving every man his due: But sometime materially for the Observation of the Laws: And most usually Relatively for *Non-reatus*, not guiltiness, either as to the *Reatus Culpe vel pœna*, in a legal and judi-ciary sense.

Proposition 2. It is not only agreeable to Scripture, and so warrantable to call men *Righteous*, because of their own Faith, Repentance and sincere Obedience, but also so frequently done in Scripture, and on such weighty grounds, that this phrase is to be used ordinarily by Christians, and not disowned or avoided.

Proposition 3. Yet where-ever any men are called righteous, because of their own holyness and obedience, it still supposeth the pardon of all their sin in the blood of Christ, which is called ordinarily, imputed righteousness: and this as supereminent above the other, as to their Justification, as I have before expressed.

Proposition 4. It is the Scripture phrase, and therefore warrantable to say, that *By our words we shall be justified, and by your words men shall be condemned. And that men shall be judged according to their works :* (*And to judge, is to justify or condemn*) And that a man is justified by his works, and not by Faith only; *Jam. 2. 24.* I am not now speaking of the sense of these texts, but of the warrantableness of this language, as being used by the Holy-Ghost. None therefore is to be charged with error, for the meer use of the words, unless it be proved that he useth them in an ill sense.

Proposition 5. Yet, though it be Scripture phrase, it should be used with great Caution; and the very phrase of *Justification by Works*, should be avoided or explained, where it may be an occasion of drawing men to ascribe too much to their works, or of offence to the godly: and we should more frequently use *Pauls* phrase, (which is not contrary to this) and say, that a man is justified by Faith, without the works of the Law. All things are not convenient, that in themselves are lawful.

Proposition 6. I had rather my self use this phrase, *We shall be finally justified, if we believe and sincerely obey;* which is all one as to say, *Faith and sincere Obedience are Conditions of our final Justification;* then this phrase, *We are justified by works, and not by Faith only*, for the foresaid reasons. And if I understand that the latter phrase, though it be the Holy-Ghost's, is offensive, I will avoid it: so be it I may have leave on necessary occasion to use these three phrases, which all our Divines, so far as I know, do allow.

1. *That sincere Obedience is a Condition of our final absolution in Judgement, and of the Continuance of our Justification here:* Or if the term Condition, and Continuing be offensive (though me thinks they should not) I would consent to disuse them both (except when by dispute we are driven to debate the Case, whether they may be used or no, or when I am urged to express what phrases I judge most proper.) Instead of *Continuance of Justification*, I would as willingly say, It is the Condition of *not-losing our Justification*; and instead of calling it a Condition, I am content to use the very words of Scripture, and say, *If we confess our sins, he is Faithful and just to forgive, and if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you, but if ye forgive not, &c.*

The second phrase that I would have liberty to use, is, *Our faith and sincere Obedience do themselves make us Righteous, our sins being freely pardoned in the blood of Christ*: All our Divines Confess an Inherent Righteousness. A Righteousness which will not so far make Righteous, is a most palpable contradiction; with me, its one thing to *Justifie Constitutive* (which goes before all kind of sentential Justification) and to *make Righteous*: seeing therefore I have their good leave to say, that faith it self and obedience, do make or constitute us Righteous, * I can forbear, if it displease them, to use the equipollent phrase, that *faith it self and obedience do Justifie*.

The third phrase that I would have leave to use, is that of God, *we shall all be judged According to our works*, or, to what we have done in the body. If they can bear mens use of this phrase, they can bear all that I intend or desire: and I think it apter to expresse my thoughts by, then the other, *we are Justified by works*: for it is to the Justification at judgement that I have chief respect, when I speak of the 'interest of Obedience' in our Justification.

Propos. 7. The word Justification is usually by many Divines taken only for Gods first Remission of sin at our Conversion, and his then Accepting us as Righteous: And when we dispute with men that do and will understand the word *Justifie* in no larger sense then so, we must needs grant them, that (according to that sense) we are not justified by any Positive works of external obedience; no, nor by any act (or habit) of faith it self, performed from the time of the first act till death, but by the very first instantaneous act only; so that in their sense of *Justification*, I grant them, as to the exclusion of man, much more then they desire.

Some other phrases there be that I had thought to have said something to, as being Justified for faith or obedience, or because of them, and by them, and of trusting to them, with other the like; but having done that which I account most necessary, I shall pass by these, for brevity sake.

And thus I have given, for the satisfaction of all offended, Censorious Brethren, a true Account of my judgement, how much I ascribe to mans works, both in sense and terms. I begun with the, later, being about a Confession, where verbal differences have

Joh. Crocius
de Injustific.
Disp. 6. p. 231.
Non nego Cre-
dentes Justos
Constitui per
inherentem ju-
sticiam: non
nisi per istam
justos constitui
nego: sed affir-
mo Justos con-
stitui tum per
Justificationem
tum per sancti-
ficationem.

Joh. 16. 27.
Gen. 22. 16,
17, 18.
Luk. 19. 17.
Mark 7. 29.
For this saying
Rev. 7. 15.
Sic TOTO
Mat. 25. 34,
35.

have the least and last place : but had I been opening the doctrine of Justification, I would have begun with the former, (which I say, as fore-seeing some will carp at that) I have been so far from hiding any part of my Judgement, which I may conceive distastfull to any, that I have said more for holiness and obedience, then ever I said before, and as much as I could possibly find at present ascribed to them in my mind. But I do again profess, that I hold not all this with that tenaciousness, nor full certainty, nor conceit of necessity, as I do the Articles of my Creed, or first generall Confession : and that if I find any word here contrary to it, or the Scripture, I will revoke it. And I shall thankfully receive the instructions of any Brother that will manifest to me any error, in sense or word, which I am far from daring to imagine that I am free from. In the mean time, as I can unfeignedly say, that I can bear the differing Judgements of my Brethren in love and peace, so I could wish they could do by me : but if they cannot, there is no remedy : I bless my God that bears mine Errors, when my dear Brethren cannot bear his Truth.

1 Ioh. 3. 22,
23.
2 Chron. 34.
27.
Rev. 3. 10.
Pl. 9. 9, 17.
Rev. 3. 4.
Eze. 18. 27,
28, 29.

CHAP. IV.

Additions to the former Confession, on occasion of the sight of Mr. Caryl's Epistle to Mr. Crandons Book; tendred to Mr. Caryl for his satisfaction, in the points wherein he declares himself offended.

WHEN I had written this far, I received Mr. Crandons whole book (having before seen the Monster, *sine Capite & Cauda*) when I opened it, I found such a name written in its fore-head, as I had thought that dunghill deserved not to be blest with, *viz.* Mr. Joseph Caryl, with his Epistle perfixt. His name in whom I trust, and whose Truth is dearer to me, then the esteem of man, even Jesus Christ, is above all names : and none have names so honorable, as to disgrace his Truth and Wisdom, with the children of Wisdom, by setting those names in the ballance against

that Truth. As Gods Truth and Grace is it that makes mens names to be honourable and pretious with his people, so that if they do but stumble and fall upon that Truth, it will break their names in pieces ; but if it fall upon them (while they strive against it) it will grind those names to powder. Which I speak not as censuring the name of this Reverend man, but as one reason of my security of the Cause of God, what names soever shall countenance its opposers. Yet I confess I more envy Mr. *Crandons* Errors the honour of this prefixed name, then of all his Arguments ; or then I envy this Reverend name, the honour of being prefixed to such a volume. I have received a Description from pious fame, of the soul of Mr. *Caryl*, so unlike to the soul of this Ranting Disputation, that I hereby do crave of our Christian posterity, that when we are all in our graves, and another world, they would not so wrong this excellent Man, as to conclude them to be of kin, because of this connexion. If you say, *He hath given us just occasion so to think* ; I desire you both to look upon his disowning the *personal reflexions*, which are the beginning, middle, end, if not all ; and also to consider, that the most peaceable dispositions are usually most tractable ; and you know not what importunity might have done with your selves : I mean not of such a Comet as Mr. *Crandon*, but of the higher and more illustrious Planets of our Orbe. Learned and pious men, must love and honour the pious and Learned : and therefore their Temptations have the greater advantage. Nor do I in the least suspect that this godly man hath done any thing against his Conscience, to please others ; though perhaps he might be the more neglective of his own name, and might do that which of himself he would have Judged inconvenient ; as the *sad Resentment of Theological wars*, mentioned in the beginning, and the *little check to his thoughts, in giving an explicate Testimony to the work*, mentioned in the middle, may perswade us to conceive. Yet because his approbation of the doctrinall part of Mr. *Crandons* discourse, and that in the particulars mentioned, do signifie that he is of his Judgement in these Doctrinals, and that he is offended at my doctrine in those points, I do unfeignedly profess to bear so much Reverence to the name of Mr. *Caryl*, that I take it for my duty to tender him satisfaction in the points wherein I have given him offence. For though I have no expectation

Station that he and I should ever be of one Judgement in this world, if he approve the Doctrinall points maintained in Mr. Crandons book, as knowing the strong conviction and perswasion of my own mind, concerning the unsoundness of some of them, and knowing that Mr. Caryl is confident on the contrary, before he would commend their vindication as worthy of publick view; yet lest I be misunderstood, and our differences may seem to be wider then they are, and especially because I do easily confess that some indigested, unexplained, and incautelous words of mine in that offensive Book, might give him and others cause of offence, and so the fault is partly mine. I am obliged to do my part, for the Removall of the offence. His words which call me to it, are these, *It is a duty to contend for the faith which was once delivered to the Saints, and yet the Doctrinall points therein maintained and vindicated. The present freedom of Believers from the curse of the Law, and their free Justification by faith without works, yea without faith as it is a work, through the alone satisfaction of Jesus Christ, are of such moment, and so fundamental in Religion, for the comfort of poor souls, that I cannot but Judge any Essay tending to the clearing of them, much more this large and elaborate discourse, profitable for the Church of God, and worthy of the publick view.*

That which I shall do for the satisfaction of this Pious Man, is,
 1. To Declare whether I do indeed deny free Justification by faith without works, yea without faith as it is a work, through the alone satisfaction of Jesus Christ. 2. To Declare how far I deny or maintain the present freedom of Believers, from the curse of the Law. And consequently, whether I deny the faith once given to the Saints, or any thing Fundamentall in Religion, for a Christians comfort: and whether Mr. Crandon may be said to have vindicated these Fundamentals from my opposition. 3. I shall presume to give a few Reasons (though contrary to my former intention) which perswade me to think that Mr. Crandon hath not vindicated these Fundamentals, and that his discourse is not profitable to the Church of God, nor worthy the publick view, either because it is large and elaborate, or because it tendeth to the clearing of the truth.

1. For the first of these, I have spoke my thoughts already, as my mind did then dictate to my Pen: and because I am so far from dissembling my Religion, as Mr. Cr. most confidently affirmeth

firmeth me to do, that it very much grieveth me, (next the obscurity of my own understanding, and my defectiveness in embracing and improving those truths which I know) that I cannot tell how to make men fully understand my mind, and see the best and worst of my thoughts, in matters of Religion; I shall add a few more words, though no more in sense, as being for matter a Repetition of what is said.

Conclus. 1. I have ever held, and do hold, that at our first believing, we are Actually and Absolutely justified from all our sins, without exceptions, by faith in Christ, without the works of the Law, or without works in *Pauls* sense.

Conclus. 2. I have ever held that faith it self, as a work, in *Pauls* sense, hath no hand in our Justification, nor salvation; much less is it the cause thereof, *quâ opus*, as such a work.

Conclus. 3. I have ever held to this moment, that even those positive works of external obedience to Christ, which all that live after their first believing must perform, or perish, are not so much as conditions of our first Actuell Justification, no nor existent till after it.

Conclus. 4. I have ever understood most of our Divines, when they speak of Justification by faith alone, to mean by Justification, Gods first putting us into a justified and pardoned estate, upon our first believing. And if so, either I give no more to works to our Justification then they, or else I know not my own thoughts. I say therefore as they use to do, *Bona opera sequuntur Justificarum non precedunt Justificandum*, and therefore they cannot Justifie. Which Reason can hold of Iustification in no other sense then this,

Conclus. 5. I ever thought that it is no Merit or Dignity, or value of mans works, or his faith either, which is the least Cause of his Justification in the last Judgement, or the continuance of his Justification here; much less of his first being justified.

Conclus. 6. I do not believe that man is any way, by any act of faith or obedience, any true cause of Gods pardoning or justifying him: principal or instrumentall.

Conclus. 7. I never went about to give works or duty, any part of that interest in our Justification, which our Divines do frequently give to faith; viz. to be the instrument of our Iustification. For indeed I deny so high an honor to both.

Conclus. 8.

Conclus. 8. Much less dare I admit the least thought into my soul, of giving the least part of Christs honour or office, either to faith or works, so far as I am able to discern it; nor did I ever feel a desire in my soul so to do: for though I know I have in me the seed of all sin; yet it is no wonder if this sin be so far suppressed, as not to act sensibly, when both Christs interest and mine own do lye so full against it. And if any Brother will manifest that I have given the least of Christs honour or office to mans works or faith, in word or writing, I protest my self unfeignedly willing to receive his information, and that upon such receipt, I will publickly recant such words, and desire such writings may be committed to the flames.

Conclus. 9. Nay, one main reason which constraineth me to differ from my Brethren, and to deny that faith is an instrument of Justification, is, because I dare not give so much of Christs honor to man, or any act of mans, as to be an efficient cause of pardoning himself.

Conclus. 10. I conceive therefore that the difference between me and them, is not that I give any more indeed to works than they, but that they give more to faith than I, and consequently to man: and that if I be guilty of levelling or equalling faith, and obedience too much, as some think; it is not by bringing up works too high (to be instruments of Justification as they make faith) but in taking down faith too much, by denying it to be the justifying instrument; and consequently in too much abasing all acts of man, which yet I do not see that I am guilty of.

Conclus. 11. I ever held that it is onely faith, and not works, that is the receiving of Christ, and that faith being the onely receiving Grace, (wherein no meer moral duty or Grace doth participate of its honor or nature) it was therefore by God peculiarly destined, or appointed to the office of justifying, as fittest to the glorifying of Free-Grace, and of God-Redeemer therein.

Conclus. 12. This faith I difference from Evangelical obedience, as I difference the consent to a mans Sovereignty, from my obeying him as my Sovereign; or the consent to Marriage Relation, from the conjugal fidelity and obedience of a wife to her husband: or the taking a man to be my Captain, from obeying him, or fighting under him: or the taking a man to be my Physician, from obeying his counsel, and taking his Medicines: and

Repentance I take to be to our faith in Christ, as the breaking off from other Suitors and Lovers, and turning the mind to this one, is to Marriage : (though some other differences may be imagined, the word being taken variously.) So that I do no more (as I am accused) comprize all obedience in faith, because I Comprize a Love to the Redeemer, and a Consent to be governed by him, then I comprize all Conjugal Obedience and fidelity of a woman to her husband in the Marriage-Covenant or Consent, because I comprize in it Love to the man, and a Covenant of fidelity and obedience for the future. As I have said, Faith with me, is the Taking of whole Christ, (that is in all those Respects which are Essential to him as he is Redeemer and Saviour) by all those acts of the soul, which are of absolute necessity to the true Reception of such an object : that is, by Assent, Consent, Love to him, Affiance, which also have such further respective diversifications, as I fullyer before expressed.

Con. 13. I am very Confident that when *Paul* includes faith, and excludes works, he never meant by Faith any one single individual act, or any one onely sort of act in the strictest Physical sense, calling all the rest Works. And if any man will but tell me what one physical act he will tye Justification to, I will prove to him that he excludeth that faith which God includeth. Our own Divines ordinarily say, that Justifying faith hath three acts, *Notitia, Assensus & Fiducia*, And *Velle, Eligere, Consentire, Acceptare*, is the principal of all, which is not the same with any one of these. And *fiducia* is more then one it self And that Assent which is but one in *Genere*, is many in particulars, according to the many truths to be believed to the very essence of Justifying Faith. The Scripture expressly describeth it, as consisting in Assent, Receiving, Affiance, &c.

Con. 14. I am of opinion that those that take Justifying faith only for one Act in *sensu Physico*, do utterly lose and confound themselves in the doctrine of Justification, making it impossible for any man on earth to know which is the justifying faith : Not only because they have no word of God to direct them, by confining it to any one act, (without which they can do nothing), but also because the soul is so curious a piece in its essence & operations, & so much unacquainted with it self, and so defective in reflex Knowledge, that no man can so discern its acts, as perfectly to distinguish them, and

and to say when it is but one act, and when it grows to be two or three in meer physical sense. If you diversifie them by the Objects (which is the known way) yet are there in every object, at least, in the object of Justifying faith, such diversity of parts essential, integral, and of Accidents, and respects, and necessary modifications, that no man on earth can determine just how these do individuate or physically specific our acts? As if apprehension of Christ be Justifying faith, as they use to say, passing by the Ambiguity and Comprehensiveness of the term *Apprehension*, no man can tell us, whether to apprehend Christ, as God and as man, and as God and man in one person, and as the second person in Trinity, and as one that hath dyed, and by death satisfied, and as one that is Risen, ascended, intercedeth, hath power to forgive sins, and as one that by pardoning must save us from Hell, and give us Heaven, &c. I say no man can tell just how many physical acts go to this: much less can any prove that all this may be done by one physical act: or can any cull out any one, and say, that is the Justifying object and act, and reject all the rest, as not essentially requisite as well as that.

Con. 15. I think they that should attempt such a business, would horribly abuse the Holy Ghost, and would themselves forget what element they are in, speaking as *meri Physici*, when they are treating of moral subjects, both Ethical and Political: and they would be guilty of a base reduction of Gods holy notions and Law-terms, to the most vain Philosophy (which Mr. *Cranston* seems to be so zealous against), as well as of confounding Physicks with Ethicks and Politicks.

Con. 16. Themselves use to confess, that the Promise, and Christ himself, and the Righteousness of Christ, (if not also Justification thereby) are the objects of Justifying faith: To which I may truly add, the Veracity of God Revealing, the formal object of Assent, and the Bounty or Good will of God in Giving, as the object (as it were formal) of Acceptance, beside the several parts of the material objects, and invisible Glory the End, expressed fully in *Heb. 11.* to be as essential as any of the rest. And sure our old Physicks must be renounced before we can assert that but the two or three first objects alone (the Promise, Christ, and his Righteousness) can all be apprehended with any one single physical act, there being divers formal objective reasons.

Con. 17. I am bold upon the confidence of the premises to conclude, that in my Judgement, those Divines that will single out any one Physical act of the soul, and call that alone by the name of faith, and teach the People that by this only they are Justified, and that whoever looks for Justification by any other Act, but that one, is a Papist, a Jew, an enemy to Christs Righteousness, destroyeth the Gospel and the Foundation of Christian Comfort, I say, such men, in my opinion, do utterly ruine the Comforts, and torture and wrack the souls of poor Christians, whom they pretend to support, yea they drive them to unavoidable desperation, if their doctrine be practised : For it is not possible for any one of these poor Christians to find out which is the single Physical act of faith ; and then not finding which is it, they must either look for Justification by other acts with it, and so (say their Teachers) forsake Christ and the Gospel, or else venture upon some one act, which yet they are not sure to be but one. Here's comfortable Gospel doctrine indeed ! or if it were granted that philosophical brains can so punctually individuate or specify their acts, yet all the unlearned that cannot, must be damned, as being cast upon an unavoidable necessity of being Jews, Legalists, Papists, &c. For my part, as subtle and profound a Philosopher as Mr. *Crandons* uncharitableness hath feigned me to be (that he might rob me of the name of a Christian, by giving me in exchange the name of a subtle Philosopher) I profess, that neither my naturals or spirituals will serve me to cleave all these hairs, and if this were Christs Law, which they feign, *actum esset de me*, I must needs perish : But I again profess, and that with seriousness, that before I will believe such doctrine which gives up souls to desperation, under pretence of their highest consolations, and which casteth scorn upon Christ and the Gospel under pretence of a zealous vindication of them, I will be yet more prodigal of my Reputation with such men, of what name and note soever ; and I will sooner take them for such scholars as *Festus* took *Paul* for, then I will believe their doctrine, without better evidence then yet I can see.

Con. 18. I am as confident, that by confining Justifying faith to any one single Physical act, men will intolerably abase the nature of faith, making it either no humane, *i.e.* moral act, or so imperfect a one, as God in Scripture doth abhor. If it be only an act
fo

of the Intellect, it will not be strictly moral or humane : the Intellect is but the entrance into the soul, and its acts, the beginnings of humane acts : If it be only in the will, it will be blind : If both, without affection, it is lifeless, and contrary to that which Scripture describeth, which is Affiance in God, &c. Nor will it be the entire acting of the soul, if it be not the act (as I may call it) of the whole soul, that is, of both faculties and the affection suited to that object. Besides, that the soul acteth so harmoniously, that all the faculties will certainly concur.

Yet let none mis-undeſtand me, as if I charged our Orthodox Divines with this opinion, which I am now ſpeaking againſt ; but I am confeſſing mine own Judgement, againſt ſome particular diſputers that have paſſionately inſiſted on this point. Sure I am, our late Reverend Aſſembly are far from it, in their Definitions of Faith.

Con. 19. I do firmly believe that he that Receives not Jeſus Chriſt as Jeſus Chriſt, that is, as God and man, as one that hath perfectly Obeyed, Dyed for us, Ranſomed us, Roſe again, is now in Glory, Lord of all, as our Saviour from Guilt and power of ſin, and ſo as Prieſt, Prophet and King, as one that will bring us to Glory if we believe ; and ſo as a Benefactor, and as Good, (and therefore to be Received with Gratitude and Love) I ſay, he that doth not thus Receive Chriſt, is not a true Chriſtian, nor hath any true Juſtifying faith, but ſhall be damned : and that Juſtifying faith containeth all this in it. And therefore I believe that they who teach men, that ſome one onely of theſe acts is Juſtifying faith, and all the reſt are works, which if we look for ſalvation or Juſtification by, we fall from Chriſt, do lead men the direct way to deſperation and Damnation.

Con. 20. Yet I think that the whole of this Faith is uſually denominated from ſome one act, (or more, which we commonly comprize in one name) as moſt frequently from Aſſent, and frequently from Affiance (which is more then one act it ſelf, and comprehendeth both Aſſent, and Hope, or Expectation) ſometimes from Willing or Receiving. But when ever Faith is ſpoken of as juſtifying or ſaving, the other acts are included under the name of one. Yet at other times in Scripture the word faith is taken in a narrower ſenſe ; as it is by *James*, and by *Paul*, when he

he distinguisheth it from Hope and Love : For otherwise, we are saved by Hope, and Faith is the substance of things Hoped for, &c.

Con. 21. I think that the Jews Conceit was, that Gods Law delivered by *Moses* was so perfect and excellent, that the Doing of of the works therein prescribed, in a laborious task of Ceremonial observances, and in Costly sacrifices and offerings, did by the Dignity and value of the work derived from the Dignity of the Law, procure of it self the pardon of all their sins, and their full Acceptance with God, without any sacrifice of a Mediator : and that this is it that *Paul* disputeth against. So that their principal intent was to extol and maintain the perfection and sufficiency of *Moses* Law, as wanting nothing necessary to Justification and felicity, not understanding how Christ was the end of it; and in Conjunction with this consequentially they trusted to the Merits of legal works. Accordingly I think that *Pauls* scope is both to take down *Moses* Law (especially its necessity and conceited sufficiency), and the Dignity of Legal works (and consequently of any works.) I think therefore that by *Works*, *Paul* meaneth to exclude only *Merits*, or works which are conceited Meritorious, or which for the worth of the Deed done, should procure pardon and Acceptance with God, without a Mediators blood. And so *Paul* himself describes the works that he speaks against, *Rom. 4. 4.* That they are such as make the Reward to be not of Grace, but of Debt.

Con. 22. Our Divines against the Papists do commonly place the Controversie here, and say, that the Question is, whether we are Justified by Works, that is, by the Merit of Works? making them all one. So Dr. *Fowns*, *Rivius*, and it is the common voice. *Vid. Melanct. Loc. Com. p. 427, 429.* and *Exam. p. 689. & 699 & Sotinius Thes. c. 14. §. 6. & 12 Joh. Crocius de Justific. Disp. 12. passim.*

Con. 23. I do not think therefore, that under the name *Works*, *Paul* doth exclude the acts of faith before mentioned, the Love of Christ, or Thankfulness for Grace, or the Confession of our great unworthyness, and our extolling the Freeness of Grace, or our disclaiming Merits, or our owning the true God for our only God, &c. I say, these acts considered, not as falsely Conceited Meritorious, but as Means to Life, (and some of them to Justification

at first) and Conditions without which God will not save us, were never excluded by *Paul* among works. Nay, though some of these do not exist till we are justified, yet did not *Paul* intend them as Works in his exclusion.

Con. 24. I presume to confess it my opinion, that those Reverend Brethren who say, Faith justifieth *quà Instrumentum*, as a true instrument, do most certainly make it to justify as an Action of man : and that in saying, that *It justifieth as an Instrument*, and it justifieth not as an *Act*, or by *Action*, they do speak most gross contradiction : seeing that *Instrumentum est Causa efficiens, & Actio est efficiens Causalitas*. I do therefore say, as well as Mr. *Caryl*, that Faith it self justifieth not as a Work : And I say more then is commonly said (from whence is the indignation) that it justifieth not as an Action of man neither, and so not as a true proper instrument of Justification.

Con. 25. Nay, I will yet say more (and have still said it) that the formal or nearest Reason of faiths interest in Justification, commonly expressed by *quatenus*, is not any Ethical consideration or respect in Faith. This is in the midst between the two former. I before Concluded, that it justifieth not *qua opus*, as a work is taken for Mercenary or Meritorious working, as a workman doth for his wages, as *Paul* means : 2. And that it justifieth not *qua opus*, as a work is taken physically, for an act of man. And thirdly I now add, that it justifieth not *qua opus*, as a work is taken for a Moral Vertue, Pleasing to God, because a Vertue : 4. Nay, nor *qua hoc opus*, as it is a work of singular worth or Aptitude to this office. But it is meerly in its Civil or Law Relation (if I may so call it) that is, as it is freely and positively appointed by God to this Office ; making it, as he is Donor, the Condition of his free gift ; so that it is nothing in the nature of Faith, but the Will of the Donor as such, that in the tenor of his Gift hath given it this Office and Honor : which is meerly extrinsecall to the Nature, or Ethical worth of Faith.

Con. 26. I must therefore profess, that after long consideration, I know no one term that properly expresseth this nearest or formal interest of faith in Justification, but only the term *Condition*, as that word is usually taken for the Condition of a free gift. And when the Scripture telleth us, how faith justifieth, it is in such terms as these, *If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus,*
and

and believe with thy heart, that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved, &c. and He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned : In all which, if the Conditional *If*, and the conditional form of the Promise express not a Condition, I despair of ever understanding it in this life, though it be the foundation and the summe of the Faith.

Conclus. 27. Yet though no Ethical worth or Aptitude in faith be the formal Reason of its interest in Justification, it is nevertheless its immediatly-prerequisite Aptitude for this office and honor : And so far as we may give a reason of Gods appointments and will, from any thing without him, in the object, we may say, that therefore God made it the Condition of the Covenant, or of his gift of Christ and Justification, because it was the fittest morall Grace for this work. So that it was some Ethical or Moral excellency or worth in that grace, that caused God (as we may speak) to make it the condition, and so which is its Aptitude to the office, and the remote reason of its interest in Justification; though not the formal and neereft reason.

Conclus. 28. Yet even here, it was not the meer Morall excellency of this Grace absolutely, or in it self considered, as a good act; or as better in it self then the Rest : but it was a respective excellency or worth, *viz.* because it is the fittest to this special use and end ; as being in its own nature, the believing a word of promise of unseen felicity, and the accepting of a free Gift, &c. and so fittest for God to design to this office, seeing its his high design in Redemption, to extoll his love and Free-Grace; so that though in reference to meer sanctification, some other Grace might be as good as faith, yet none were so ad-Apt-ed for this design. And this I conceive is it which Divines call the instrumentality of faith.

Conclus. 29. If any say, that seeing faith hath a peculiar Aptitude to this office, therefore it must have a peculiar Interest; I answer, so it hath. For 1. It doth alone, without (Merits, or) any positive Gospel-works of obedience (as such at least) procure (as far as belongs to its office) our first full Justification. 2. The love of Christ received, Gratitude, &c. are but as modifications of faith, which is called the receiving it self. Though some of them be distinct Physicall acts, yet all the rest Morally considered, are but as it were the modification of faith, I mean
of

of that act, which is *the acceptance of Christ, and life freely Given.*
 3. And for Iustification at Judgement, and the non-omission of it here, faith hath still the principall interest. Repentance (as distinct from faith) and a return to holy obedience, is a Condition upon a remote reason, *propter finem*, but faith directly, *propter medium Principale*, which is Christ as our Ransom and Saviour: Repentance is presupposed as a Condition naturally necessary, even as Faith in God alone in opposition to Atheism, Polytheism, and Idolatry, is presupposed as naturally necessary, when we are called to Faith in Christ as the Redeemer: and as the moral Law remains naturally necessary, for all the command of special Faith in Christ by the Gospel: But Faith in Christ is an elected condition, elevated to this office above its own nature, by a special Positive Institution and Promise, fitted to its object the Lord Jesus, who is the supernatural and highest means (as Redeemer), and it is revealed also in the Gospel, which is a supernatural Revelation. Besides, as the natural necessity of the moral Law, of loving God, and repenting, and returning to him, are supposed, but these could neither be of any sufficiency or efficacy without Christ the supernatural way to the Father; nor could the said Love and Repentance have been wrought without Christ, if they had been sufficient: So though they are necessary, yet are they insufficient without Faith in Christ, as well as impossible (or beyond our power) so that Faith in Christ is that part of the Condition, which standing next the head, gives life unto the rest; and though as *sine qua non*, they are of equal necessity with Faith, yet as *cum qua*, or as to the sufficiency of the condition *sine qua non*, so Faith hath not only a precedency, but is as the master-pipe, which being next the cistern, conveyeth all the water into the more remote. This I adde to what I said before against the charge of Levelling Faith and Repentance; Though the Charge of equalling Faith and Obedience, is easier avoided: For the Scripture doth expressly make Repentance some Condition, even of our first pardon and Justification: but so it doth not Actual Obedience to Christ.

Conclu. 30. If after all this, I am not so happy as to hit the true or full reason of the difference between Faith, Repentance, and Obedience, in the point of Conditionality, I solemnly profess it is not out of any desire to equal them: Nay, that I have stretcht my brains to the utmost that I was able, to discover from
 Gods

Gods Word the widest difference that I could possibly finde, earnestly desiring (for to avoid offence, and to help me in expounding *Pauls* Exclusion of works) to have found the difference yet wider then I have done : And if I see not all, it is for want of Light, more then of Will or Diligence. And I shall heartily rejoyce to see the difference more clearly stated by my brethren * ; But I dare not in the mean time feign a difference in contradiction to Scripture, or addition to it ; by saying that Repentance is no Condition, or that Faith is a proper Instrumental, efficient cause of Justifying or pardoning us : though I have professed not to contend with any that call it an Instrument of our Receiving Christ (if they will suffer me to use the phrases which I think more Scriptural and proper.)

* I might expect from sober men, that they do cleer up the difference better themselves, or tell us where we may find it done, when they shew themselves offended at the imputation of my endeavours.

Con. 31. I confess that there is such a thing as may be called Justification *in foro Conscientia* : and that Faith may be called either an Instrument, or some efficient Cause of that Justification : (will not this satisfie Mr. *Crandon*?) But I think that this is none of that which Scripture calls Justification by Faith, nor that it is the same Faith by which we are Justified, which is the immediate observable Instrument or Cause of that Justification by conscience (though that also be a cause of it) : but it is that discerning of our interest in Christ and Gods favour through him which is less properly called Faith, and more properly, a discerning, and commonly Assurance or perswasion of Gods Love.

Con. 32. I gladly confess also, that Christ made full satisfaction to God for our sin, and therein intended only and infallibly the actual salvation and Justification of his Elect : And that we may be said to be reconciled to God, and our sins done away, in a diminutive sense as to actual pardon and Reconciliation, even presently upon Christs death and Resurrection, and so before we were born or believed. And if any will call this a Potential or Virtual Justification, though I will not imitate them, because I will keep close to Scripture-terms, yet if they explain their meanings, I will not contend for the word.

Con. 33. I confess also that God did eternally elect a certain number of determinate individual persons, to be infallibly justified and saved by Christ, in time : And that these were given to Christ that he should dye for them, and for them only with a special intention of actually justifying and saving them : and that all that are so given

given him shall come to him, and none shall take them out of his hands.

Con. 34. I believe that none can come to Christ except the Father draw them, and that he converteth them by an infallibly effectual grace, such as is an act of Omnipotency, and is never resisted, so far as to be overcome.

Con. 35. I am certain that the new nature of every Christian containeth a sense of his own great unworthyness, yea his desert of death for the sin of his best duties, and such a sense of the Riches of Gods Love and free Grace in Christ, and how much we are beholden to him; that every such soul must needs be prone to disclaim confidence in any thing of their own, and to give all the glory to Christ, and free Grace: self-denial and ascribing to free Grace, being the most of our Christianity. So that if the zeal of this truth do make the inconsiderate to forget the nature and necessity of holyness, and its due place, and to forget how much the Righteous Lord loveth righteousness, and how Christ intended it in his death and Covenant, considering mans frailty, it is no wonder. And supposing that this is Mr. *Crandons* case, I heartily forgive him his volumn of calumnies, and railing Accusations: being perswaded he intended them much for Christ, though I think that there was too much of the interest of his private opinion, that made him, as it were, call for fire from heaven, and that he little knew what Spirit he was of. The Lord cause him to know it, and forgive him.

O 2 CHAP.

CHAP. V.

*Further Additions occasioned by Mr. Caryl's implied
Accusation; About the freedom of Believers from
the curse of the Law.*

SECT. I.

§. 1.

THE next thing wherein I owe satisfaction, it seems, to Mr. Caryl, is, to shew him how far I take *Believers to be presently freed from the curse of the Law*, and how far not: which I shall do in certain *Conclusions*; 1. Affirmative. 2. Negative.

Conclu. 1. The *Curse of the Law*, signifieth either, 1. The Commination of the Law. 2. The sentence of the Judge, according to the Law. 3. The Execution. The first doth oblige to punishment, when the sin is committed. The 2. convinceth the offender, determineth him guilty, adjudgeth him to death, and referreth or delivereth him over to Execution. The 3. inflicteth the punishment, and fulfilleth the former.

Conclu. 2. I have before declared, that I do confess that God hath by his eternal Decree, Immutably determined to free all his Elect (not yet Believers) from the curse of the Law.

Conclu. 3. I have also declared that I maintain that Christ purged away their sins, *quoad meritum vel satisfactionem*, that is, hath perfectly satisfied and merited their freedom.

Conclu. 4. I believe that all men are freed from the necessity of perishing (by suffering what they deserved,) as remediless. And that no man that ever heard the Gospel (at least) doth perish for want of a ransom, or expiatory sacrifice, or a Christ to dye for him, but for want of Faith or a Will to accept a Christ freely offered him.

Conclu. 5. I believe that the Law of Works stands not now as it did to Adam, as the sole Law in force, but that the Promissory

part.